



WHY I AM A COMMUNIST.

By LEIGH ROTHWELL.

To those of us who have been in the Labour movement for years, and studied it from its many sides, the time has arrived to decide whether we are in favour of taking up what may be called a "Right" attitude, which might be variously described as Democracy, Socialistic Capitalism, or Progressive Liberalism, or whether we are to line up with the "Left," which goes straight for pure Socialism, or Communism ("Socialism in a hurry")—Dictation or Control by those who are in favour of doing useful work for their communal needs.

The "Right" stands for an equality of income, based upon the centralising of service; the "Left" goes consistently for economic equality.

It seems to many of us that the practical example of the Russian system has brought us to the realisation of our theoretic idealism, as well as it has definitely shown us the lack of accord that exists amongst the various leaders in their trend of thought, causing a well-defined difference of opinion, in what was previously thought to be the common end of our great movement.

To make it clear we might describe the difficulties that beset us, as we jog along towards our object, as being tendencies towards the "Right," and the things that seem favourable to the object we have in view, as the tendencies toward the "Left."

"Right" means any agreement, or compromise, with the capitalist group of Tory Liberals, or any imitation of their "ways and means"—even if modified and described by some as Socialistic.

"Left" means Socialism pure and simple, as we understand it—a complete change from old, unfair methods and traditions.

This naturally leads us to the "cross-roads," where a decision must now be made, and basing our conclusions upon this reasoning—most of us who wish to be logical in our decisions—must, we feel, take the road leading to the "Left."

Many of us there were who had already passed the "cross roads" and been well on our way towards an abstract "Left" when the war, that most of us foretold in one way and another, came upon the so-called world of civilisation, and the catastrophic event was for others the means of removing the scales from their eyes, when behold! they saw that they were at the "cross-roads," and, as they stood there—many for a long time (at the present they are a big crowd)—saw, to their astonishment, a considerable number of their leaders and permanent officials take the road to the "Right."

There were those who shouted to these well-known comrades, warning them that the road they were embarking upon led to nowhere in particular; in fact, would only lead them back to where they had started from.

Behold! they saw the world in its true perspective.

To the "Right" was misery and want, 85 per cent. working under unfair conditions in order that 15 per cent. might desecrate their souls in the gluttony of over-consumption of the product of the others. They saw the great national evil, Drink, parading in a gaudy suit of legal attire; the streets at night alive with the pretty daughters of the 85 per cent., driven to prostitution by the uneconomic policy of

the "Right"; the Church, with its palaces and comfortable, pompous attitude—and its empty seats; carpenters getting £5 weekly and gardeners £2; Labour secretaries drawing £600 to £1,000 a year, whilst their comrade clerks took the meagre sum



A biographical article on Tibor Szamuely, by Bucharin, appeared in our issue for December 18, No. 39.

of £125 to £200. They saw the streets, the newspapers, the magazines (the letter-boxes), filled with costly, unnecessary advertising; the nation's Press in the control of an unscrupulous set of money-grubbers, distributing broadcast the filthy untruths that were so necessary to the very being of the "Right" existence.

Turning to the "Left" they saw America go "dry"; they saw a bright light in the East—the Russian Revolution, "the Great Experiment," the abolition of the horrors of the "Right."

Liberty reigned in place of license; freedom in place of slavery. Russia was "dry," Russia was putting an effective stop to prostitution, to unnecessary advertising, to the gamblers of the Stock Exchanges, to the under-educating of the children of the workers.

Russia stopped the looting by the priests, replaced capitalist so-called individuality with communal dependence, and was slowly bringing about that "happy equality of material circumstances" which the Labour Party programme preaches, but which so few of its paid officials want to put into practice and so many ignore—Because they took the road to the "Right."

These reasons, and many others that will occur to the reader, are why I am a Communist ("a Socialist in a hurry.")

To Young Communists.

Watch future issues of the "Workers' Breadnought" and you will find something that will interest you.

LIFE IS CHEAP.

By C. B. JIMACK-WARWICK.

The Slaveless Commune will value human life above all else; for the simple reason that it will be based upon the economic security of the individual. Slaves are necessarily owned; the system of ownership is made right in the eyes of the slaves by means of the law: the "right" is really the slave-ignorance for its stability; indeed, it is only through that very ignorance that the great iniquity of slavery arises. As slave-life is over-abundant, so is it cheap. The British workers like to pride themselves upon their freedom, and scorn the slightest suggestion that their hand-to-mouth struggle within this stultifying system, has anything akin to slavery. But the freedom that is, is relative to one's class position, and whether one is a boss or is bossed; whether one exploits or toils for an exploiter, or whether one starves through being bossless.

We are many, they are few; and we are cheap! The Lord God Capital is our Shepherd, and we are Sheep, led and bled unto death in blind ignorance, taught to follow this "red herring" and that camouflaged scheme for maintaining the Sheep and Shepherd condition of things, and told if we do so we shall not want!—Aye, we shall not want for Dope!

The late war showed our class-cheapness, and singed the flimsy wings of our "freedom," and the present peace that has come amongst us should have scattered the remaining planes of Illusion; shattered all Slavemindedness. The hungry dogs of peace roll by, and as the patchwork schemes fail to cover the rottenness around us, as more of us become free to starve, the Proletarian Tragedy, with its blood-trail through the ages of class domination, draws to the climax. The system breaks up; many a.e. the attempts at consolidation, but the system crumbles. Closer the class-cleavage, and the class-conscious elements in both camps move towards solidarity, preparing for the Inevitable.

There may be set-backs; eventually, there can be but one result: the end of human parasitism, and the liberty of one and all in Communism.

The Red Star in the East is the Symbol.

But what is happening now? Despair mates with Death, reaping slave victims of rampant starvation. The unemployed march and demonstrate. One reads of famished marchers fainting (there were two such cases only a few days ago in Eccleston Square). Every day, even in the perfidious pages of the putrid yellow press, there is recorded some instance of slave-tragedy. There have been several suicidal ends. The Law considers suicide criminal, but not so starvation. The suicide, if he had lived longer, might have been of some use some day! The slave must die on the scrap-heap, in his landlord's ramshackle tenement, by the roadside (a relative of mine died so). An inquest was held the other week on a Chelsea war-hero. He had lost a leg in the war and had been ailing, in and out of hospital, ever since. He got depressed, took poison and ended it all. The verdict was: "Suicide during temporary insanity." He was sane enough to post a letter to his wife beforehand, in which he declared he was "fed up with life." At Christmas Eve, tragedy was the end of a St. Pancras slave, who had starved long, and, as he had been heard to say he had "walked his legs off," in a fruitless search for employment. The same verdict was returned, and the Coroner had the callousness to add insult to injury by handing his widow 20/- from the poor box! Recently, a labourer (50 years of age), was charged at Stratford with leaving his family chargeable to the West Ham Guardians. He had gone away, had tramped and double tramped with the same hungry result. It was stated that he had a good

(Continued on bottom page ten.)

IX Congress of the Russian Communist Party.

The Immediate Problems of Economic Construction.

(Conclusion.)

XVII.—Locomotive Repairs and the Construction of New Locomotives.

In addition to the encouragement which is given to the initiative of every individual group of workers in the work of repairing our rolling stock, it is, however, also necessary to understand that this makeshift method of helping the transport can only be of a temporary character, as this method absorbs too much skilled labour and employs factory plants which have originally been set aside for other purposes.

In view of the fact that little hope can justifiably be entertained for obtaining in the nearest few months or even years a large number of locomotives from abroad, the inevitable necessity arises for a large-scale manufacture of the most indispensable reserve parts, and later on also of locomotives to an extent far exceeding the pre-war output. The one condition of success in this direction is the exact elaboration and energetic realisation of a wide plan calculated for a considerable number of the most suitable works on the American system of production, i.e. of a small division of the process of production to detailed functions, with the substitution of skilled workers by others who are only partly skilled but who are to work under the guidance of trainers.

XVIII.—Model Enterprises.

Along with the general measures for raising the economic production of the country and the industrial output of labour, the

Congress also deems it very important to introduce in suitable districts the establishment of model enterprises of the principal branches of industry. These enterprises which are to be selected in accordance with the general economic plan for technical, geographical and other considerations, are to be speedily supplied with additional plans, with the necessary amount of labour power and engineers, as well as with provisions, fuel and raw materials. The best administrators and engineers are to be placed at the head of these enterprises. All the political propaganda and other such needs of these model enterprises are to be supplied by the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party under its direct supervision and control. Reports of the progress of work on these model enterprises are to be periodically supplied to and published by the Press. As soon as that will become possible, technical and administrative courses of study are to be established in connection with the above enterprises,

becoming a school of industrial education and the hearth of technical and economic creative genius for an extensive region and a vast industrial sphere if not even for the entire country.

XIX.—Paper and Printing.

In view of the fact that the first condition of the success of the Soviet Republic in all departments, including the economic, is chiefly a printed systematic agitation—the Congress draws the attention of the Soviet Government to the deplorable state in which our paper and printing industries find themselves. The ever-decreasing number of newspapers fail to reach not only the peasant but even the worker, in addition to which our poor technical means render the papers hardly readable. The Congress strongly appeals to the Supreme Council of Public Economy, to the corresponding Trade Unions and to other interested institutions to apply all efforts to raise the quantity of paper manufactures, to improve its quality, to introduce general system and order in the printing business which will secure to the workers and peasants of Russia a supply of Socialist printed matter.

XX.—The First of May.

In keeping with the great immediate problems with which the Socialist revolution is faced, the Congress decrees:—

That the International Proletarian Festival of the 1st of May, the date of which falls this year upon a Saturday, should be transformed into a grand All-Russian Labour Saturday.

AT ALL PUBLIC AND TRADE
UNION MEETINGS DEMAND FOR
OUR POLITICAL PRISONERS
FIRST DIVISION TREATMENT.

LIFE IS CHEAP.—Continued from page one.

character; another damned insult, if only our fellow-slave knew it!

One of the great Governmental schemes to consolidate Capitalism consists in the rationing of work. Its a Great Scheme all right! It will mean more scheming on our part to keep out the Great Cold! We shall all work two days per week, perhaps; we shall have equality in starvation, and everybody will play in the fields four days, and pray to Lord God Capital, as usual, on the Sabbath, for letting daylight in the State Brains to conceive such a scheme!

Of course, the Labour Party will put things right! As soon as this number of the *Dreadnought* is in your hands, they will have "confabbed" again, and we are given to understand that they will decide to demand, with a typical Clyn-ish (or Clown-ish) resolution that £2 per week shall be given to "out-of-works" with families, and 25/- to single men? Puzzle it out: which will bring in most, the two quid or the two days? Givutup! Then there are other resolutions, all for the strengthening of Capital (how they love this system, the Fakirs!) "J. H. Thomas will outline the policy of enforcing these demands—" They shouldn't need any enforcing! However, if they do, we're going to have another Conference on February 23rd, after which we shall try and find where the Council of Inaction hath got to, and then we won't half give it the Forces of Fat!

Meanwhile, let us sing: "There's a good time coming." So there is—when Labour is organised on a class basis, and is as Red in its class-consciousness as that Star in the East that I mentioned a few lines back, not until. When we see Light, we shall set our individual selves above the cheapness of wage-slavery, and in our social mightiness, will forge the precious weapon, Social Revolution, for the fulsome life to be.

Serrati, editor of "Avanti!", says that his Party will not desert Moscow for a new International, the conference for which will take place in Vienna on February 22nd.

FREEDOM FOR OUR PRESS.

During the recent convention, when the various Communist bodies were forged into one, a sinister resolution was put forward. Fortunately it was referred to a Committee. But the danger of its coming into effect is not yet passed.

This resolution was that nothing but official literature should be handled and sold by the members of the Communist Party. It may be stated that this is already part and parcel of the rules of the now out-of-date Socialist Labour Party. It runs as follows ("Platform, Constitution and Rules of the S.L.P.", page 8):—

"(4) No branch shall sell or distribute any literature which has not been approved by the N.E.C., but may procure literature required by its members."

It is somewhat strange that the United Communist Party should even consider the idea. Such members as W. Paul and Tom Bell will remember what they were up against when they strove to distribute manifestoes amongst the official element of the S.L.P. on Communist Unity. Paul and Bell were in disagreement with the official Executive as to Unity, and of course the Executive were able to wield the rules in favour of officialism. The unofficial element were therefore at a disadvantage in placing their views before the members of the S.L.P. As an actual matter of fact they had to use the good offices of the Glasgow "Worker" in order to distribute their manifestoes. This, of course, was characterised as "underground" by the official Executive.

In all parties where fighting minorities coalesce, some regard is supposed to be made for the rights of these minorities (always consistent with Party discipline). But the phrase "Party discipline"—as in the case of the S.L.P. can be made to cover a multitude of sins.

If the resolution were passed to sell only official literature, and other publications that had the pontifical approval of an infallible executive, it would mean that only the official "Communist" could be sold by branch members. It is hardly to be supposed that the "Communist" would show itself either impartial or infallible. Already, in the issue of the "Daily Herald" of 5th February, it makes the false statement that "The Communist" was the only paper represented at the Conference."

That this statement is obviously false is shown by the cartoon reproduced by "The Communist" in this same issue of the "Herald." Here we see Jack

Tanner, editor of "Solidarity," and Norah Smyth of the "Dreadnought," depicted as taking part in the Conference! There is also a cartoon of Willie Gallacher (misspelt Gallagher by the official cartoonist of the veracious "Communist"), and everyone knows he writes for and is connected with the Glasgow "Worker."

This is one reason why we must set our faces sternly against any attempt to put official literature of the United Communist Party on a marble pedestal. This pedestal is sure to bear some marks of tar ere long.

"The Communist" is making an outcry against some boycott which newsvendors and wholesale agents are operating against it. Yet there is some danger of "The Communist" being a party to an official boycott of papers in the movement who are not officially passed by the executive.

The branches of the new Party must watch with jealous eyes any effort on the part of the Executive to blockade any unofficial revolutionary papers, literature, or manifestoes. We are often told that the Executive (like Parliament) only does what its membership has authorised it to do. But if the membership is gagged in this fashion, then there might as well exist only a dues-paying membership, and an Executive that can do as it damn well pleases.

There will be a National Conference of the Party ere long to confirm the rules and probably to elect the new Executive. Branches should prepare for this. The rules should be as few as possible, as simple as possible. Work should be spread over ALL the members of the movement. Every member of every branch should be a literature seller, where he is not doing other propaganda work. And he should be able to sell any literature of the movement which he considers the best towards helping on the Revolution. The main business of members should not be necessarily to make members of the Party, but to make revolutionaries, to create a revolutionary atmosphere, to intensify any movement of revolt and discontent. And the business of the Party as a whole should be the Revolution tomorrow.

Further, all new literature issued by the Party should concern itself mainly with the revolution as a practical proposition. Criticism of the obvious faults of the capitalist system must be considered as so much "tripe." The main thing is to get on the job and get on with revolution.

Only in this fashion can the Communist Party become a really Revolutionary Party.

L.A.M.

SOCIALISM IN DANGER.

By DOMELA NIEUWENHUIS.

(First appeared in LA SOCIETE NOUVELLE REVUE INTERNATIONALE, June, 1894.

(Continued from our last issue).

Nobody has expressed himself more clearly on the futility of Parliamentary action than Liebknecht himself; but it was the revolutionary Liebknecht of 1869, and not the Parliamentarised Liebknecht of 1894. In his interesting treatise upon the policy of the Social Democracy, especially in its relation to Parliament, he uses the following language:

"The Progressive Party affords us an example full of instruction and warning. At the time of the so-called conflict over the Prussian Constitution, they indulged in 'grand and potent' speeches. With what energy they protested against the reconstruction—in words! With what overwhelming sentiment and with what ability they undertook to defend the rights of the people—in words! But the Government calmly disregarded all their legislative ideas. It left the law to the Progressive Party, but retaining in its own hand all the resources of civilisation, used them. And what of the Progressive Party? Instead of throwing aside Parliamentary weapons, proved to be useless and a hollow mockery, instead of leaving the House and forcing the Government to despotic action, instead of appealing to the people, they serenely went off as before, drunk with their own verbosity, throwing into the empty air wordy protests and legal disquisitions, and passing resolutions that everybody knew to be gas and nothing more. Thus Parliament, instead of being a political arena, became the home of burlesque: citizens heard everlastingly the same speeches, never saw any result from them, and turned away, at first with indifference, afterwards with disgust. The events of the year 1886 were allowed to happen. The 'grand and potent' speeches of the Prussian Progressive Party made the opportunity for the policy of 'blood and iron,' and they were also the funeral orations of the Progressive Party itself. The Party, in very truth, killed itself by its speeches."

Just as did the Progressive Party in days gone by, so the Social Democracy are acting to-day. How insignificant has been the influence of Liebknecht on his party, when in spite of the warnings uttered by himself, it has pursued the same foolish course. And in place of showing the better way, it has allowed itself to be dragged into the maelstrom of politics, there hopelessly to flounder.

Where are we to look for the revolutionary Liebknecht who was wont strenuously to maintain that "Socialism is no longer a matter of theory, but a burning question which must be settled, not in Parliament but in the street and on the battlefield, like every other burning question?" All the doctrines promulgated in his treatise are deserving of the widest circulation, so that every one may be able to weigh the difference between the brave champion of the proletariat who lived years ago, and the shopkeepers' representative of to-day. After having said that "with universal suffrage, to vote or not to vote is only a question of expediency, not of principle," he concludes:—

"Our speeches cannot have any direct influence on legislation. We shall not convert Parliament with words. By our speeches we can only scatter truths among the people that it is possible to proclaim more effectively in another way. Of what real service then are speeches in Parliament? None. And to talk merely for the sake of talking is the business of fools! Think of it: not a single advantage. And here on the other hand are the disadvantages: sacrifice or compromise of principles; degradation of a sublime political struggle into the discussion of a debating society; and encouragement of the idea among the people that the Bismarckian Parliament is destined to settle the social question. And for practical reasons, should we concern our-

selves with Parliament? Only treachery or stupidity could persuade us to do so."

We could not give utterance to our convictions more forcibly or exactly. But mark the notable inconsistency. According to his premises, and after having reckoned up all the profits and losses, greatly to the discredit of Parliamentary action, he might have been expected inevitably to have given a verdict in favour of non-participation, however, he delivers himself as follows:—

"To prevent the Socialist movement sustaining Caesarism, it is necessary that Socialism should enter into the political struggle."

It is past comprehension how so logical a mind can thus bury itself in contradictions!

But they are themselves in doubt and confusion. Evidently Parliamentarism is the bait by which the catch of fish must be obtained, and yet they try to make it look as if it were a desirable thing in itself, an end as well as the means. Thence the dubiety and indecision on the question.

For instance, at the Erfurt Congress, Bebel said:—

"Social Democracy differs from all preceding parties, inasmuch as they have all been established for a totally different end. We aim to replace capitalistic production by Socialistic production, and are consequently obliged to pursue our objects by ways and means radically opposed to all preceding parties." (Protocol, p. 258).

Perhaps that is why they advise us to take the Parliamentary road, the way pursued by all the other parties, and why they tell us it will lead us in quite a different direction.

Singer found himself in a similar dilemma when he said at Erfurt:—

"Supposing that it is possible to obtain anything valuable through Parliamentary action, that action would necessarily weaken the party, since any possible advantage can only be obtained by means of the co-operation of parties." (Idem, p. 199).

Isolated, the Social Democratic members can do nothing, and "a revolutionary party should hold aloof from any kind of policy which can only be pursued with the assistance of other parties." What business then have they in such a Parliament?

The *Zürcher Sozialdemokrat* wrote in 1883:

"Parliamentarism as a general rule, shows nothing which can be viewed with sympathy by a Democrat, especially by a thorough Democrat, that is, a Social Democrat. For him, on the contrary, it is anti-democratic because it means the supremacy of a class, mostly the middle-class."

And again it affirms that:—

"The struggle against Parliamentary action is not revolutionary, but reactionary."

That is to say, quite the opposite. The risk of compromise was apparent, and if the Government had not been obliging enough to disturb that condition of things by the law against Socialists, who knows where we would now stand? If there had been a real statesman at the head of affairs, he would have given the Social Democratic Party a free hand and rope enough with which to hang itself.

With much truth, the above-mentioned paper in 1881, wrote as follows:—

"The anti-Socialist law has done much for

WISDOM FOR THE WORKERS.—1.

"THE MORE THE PEOPLE
UNDERSTAND
ABOUT THE REVOLUTION, THE
LESS CHANCE OF
BLOODSHED THERE WILL BE."

—E. SYLVIA PANKHURST.

our party, which stood in danger of enfeeblement. The Social Democratic Party had become too pliable, too popular; it latterly had opened the door to political ambition and personal vanity. To prevent it becoming a middle-class party, in theory as well as in action, it was essential that it should experience persecution."

Bernstein said something similar in the *Jahrbuch für Sozialwissenschaft*:—

"In the later years of its existence (before 1878), the party had wandered far from the direct road, so that the propaganda was now very different from that of 1860-1870 and of the years immediately following 1870."

A small Social Democratic sheet too, edited by an enlightened Socialist, A. Stock, wrote as follows:—

"There are comparatively few who think that logically the whole party should forsake its principles, as it would by a union of the active and scientific Marxians with the moderate disciples of Lassalle. The watchword of the Lassallians—'Through universal suffrage to victory,'—a motto often ridiculed by the Marxians before their surrender, now constitutes in very truth—shame that we should say it—the guiding principle of the German Social Democracy."

It was just the same with the early Christians. At first the various schools of thought were in opposition. Do we not read that the war-cries were: "I am of Paul," "I am of Cephas," "I am of Apollos." Gradually their differences became less pronounced, they became more friendly. Opposing doctrines were reconciled and at last, one saint's day was established in honour both of Peter and Paul. The antagonistic disciples were united, but at what a sacrifice of principle!

Very remarkable is the analogy between primitive Christianity and modern Social Democracy. Both found their disciples among the poor, the outcasts of society. Both were subject to persecution and suffering; and yet both grew in numbers and importance in spite of oppression. In the fullness of time came an Emperor, one of the most licentious who ever climbed the steps of a throne (and that is no small thing to say, for licentiousness is at home on a throne), who, as a matter of policy, became a Christian. Immediately a change took place, the salient points of Christianity were rubbed off, and it was made popular. Its adherents obtained the most lucrative posts in the state, and orthodox and sincere disciples were banished as heretics from the Christian community.

Similarly, in our day, we see the selfish and the powerful endeavouring to nobble Socialism. "We are all Socialists now," and we find the doctrine made acceptable to every palate; and if we give them the chance, the opportunists will triumph, whilst thorough and uncompromising Socialists will be excommunicated from the political party, simply because their unbending straightforwardness is regarded as hostile to the schemes of the men plotting for place and power. The victory of Social Democracy will thus mean the defeat of Socialism, just as the supremacy in the state of the Christian church was contemporaneous with the decay of Christian principles. Already international congresses are like economic councils, where the majority presume to expel those who are bold enough to differ from them in opinion. Even now there is a censorship applied to Socialist writing; only after Bernstein in London has examined it, and Engels has placed on it the seal of orthodoxy, is the pen-work regarded as canonical and permitted to be published among the faithful. The form of creed in which Social Democracy is to be enshrined is ripe for promulgation. What more can they do? Ah! who can say? At any rate we have sounded the alarm, and we shall see how far these absurd pretensions will be carried.

(To be continued).

Workers' Dreadnought

Editor: SYLVIA PANKHURST.
Acting Editor: JACK O'SULLIVAN.

All Matter for Publication to be Addressed to the Editor:
Business Communications to the Manager:
Workers' Dreadnought, 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.
TELEPHONE: CENTRAL 7240.

SUBSCRIPTION:
THREE MONTHS (13 weeks) ... Post Free 2/9
SIX MONTHS (26 weeks) ... " " 5/5
ONE YEAR (52 weeks) ... " " 10/10

Vol. VII. No. 47. Saturday, Feb. 12, 1921.

*Our special issue containing the Verbatim
Report of Comrade Pankhurst's speech at
her appeal,
IS SOLD OUT.*

*At the request of several comrades, it will
be republished shortly in pamphlet form.*

POLITICAL PRISONERS.

The Communist Party has some of its members in prison: Comrade Pankhurst for an alleged press offence, the others for revolutionary sentiments expressed in their speeches. In both cases the offence for which they were imprisoned is an offence simply because an emergency act, passed during the war, and consequently under very exceptional circumstances, has not been repealed.

Under the ordinary law of the realm, these prisoners could not have been convicted. They are political prisoners and must be treated as such. They are not guilty of any action that could lower them in the estimation of any useful member of society. In the eyes of their friends and comrades, on the contrary, their imprisonment is a proof—if any were needed—of their honesty and courage.

A feeling of apathy seems to have overcome, at the present moment, many who should take an active part in the agitation. Is it a post-war lassitude, after the agony of the useless and protracted war? Is it that in face of the growing suffering caused by unemployment—the unemployed are the hopeless victims of the class-struggle—we are growing callous to the importance of vital issues?

We should beware lest the incroachment upon the freedom of the press and speech, if not challenged, will weigh heavily upon us and upon a wider circle of the workers, ere many days are out.

But let the ruling class feel that you are unwilling or powerless to take up the defence of your best fighters, and the reaction will rapidly increase.

There are two main reasons why we consider that our demand—the demand that our comrades should be treated as political prisoners—is fully justified, even within the compass of the existing institutions. These are: The transitory character of the legislation under which they were sentenced, namely D.O.R.A.; the fact that the capitalist and bourgeois law itself recognises degrees of miscreancy and has legislated to that effect, establishing First Division prison treatment, appropriately to deal with cases of this kind.

Our comrades are political prisoners and must be treated as such.

As Communists, we press forward our demand for another reason also. There is a class-struggle being waged daily, incessantly. These comrades of ours are victims in this struggle. They fought for us: they are of our ranks: they must be returned to us.

There is a case in point to illustrate our meaning. In Italy, when the metal workers seized the factories, the movement had already gained such importance, although it had not yet extended to many other industries, that the Italian Prime Minister, Giolitti felt, as he con-

fessed the other day, that to have surrounded these factories would have placed the armed forces in a position, not of besiegers, but of besieged. He followed a policy of "wait and see"; he manoeuvred; the reformists did the work for him, and the factories were evacuated. Then followed the arrests of the advanced leaders, amongst whom was Malatesta. He is not a Parliamentarian: owing to the unhappy division which unfortunately exists amongst the exploited as to the best method to gain their economic freedom, the Socialists did not agitate for his release. The Government, which had trembled, felt reassured, and to-day, the "Fascisti," the White Guard of Italy—are burning, sacking the offices of proletarian papers, the offices of the Camere del Lavoro (Trade Councils), and publicly insulting and beating prominent Socialist Deputies. Had the Socialist Party, the General Confederation of Labour, as well as the workers, taken up the challenge when Malatesta was arrested, were it only in defence of the principle of freedom, putting aside, for the time being, political differences, the big landlords who pay the wages of these White Guards, would not have dared to go so far.

But let the ruling classes see that you are unwilling or powerless to defend your comrades, and in this country also, the big financial interests will take courage and attack, in more ways than one, all the workers' organisations.

The Communist Party has a distinct function to fulfil at the present moment, that of concentrating its propaganda in a revolutionary direction.

The rank and file must move and force the E.C. to act promptly in this manner. The agitation in the industrial field would be incomplete if, closely following upon it, the Communist Party fails to agitate, when the occasion arises, in defence of elementary rights, many times won and easily lost if the vigilance is not continuous and alert.

Resolutions passed at Conferences are, if not totally ineffective, at least quickly forgotten. The agitation must be broadened—made as large as the importance of the issue demands.

The Labour Party must be told plainly and distinctly that it must act in the matter, especially in view of the fact that the Emergency Act (the continuation of D.O.R.A.) under which our comrades were imprisoned, was passed without effective protest being raised by Labour M.P.s.

Again, if our demands are justified—and if Lenin is right that we should remain in the present-day Trade Unions—the matter should be brought to the notice of every Trade Union Branch in the country, and members should be asked to vote, not on a mere resolution of protest and of sympathy, but on a clear motion embodying our demands.

The proletarian press should forget fine distinctions concerning the right interpretation of Marxism, and should publish these resolutions and give space and support to the agitation.

It would be perfectly useless, of course, to write upon this subject to the Member for your constituency! Not even the most rabid Parliamentarian would think that an ordinary M.P., in a capitalist Parliament, would raise the question in the House from the right standpoint. Yet, should he speak in public, the question may be put to him, for the benefit of the audience. Free speech and free press Committees can be formed—for, remember: "An injury to one is an injury to all"; and these Committees will devise, locally, the most effective means of agitation.

The speech delivered by Comrade Pankhurst from the dock at her appeal, will shortly be published in pamphlet form. This speech, when published in the Special Number of the *Workers' Dreadnought* (which was quickly sold out), has already converted many to our way of thinking. Get Party Branches to order copies and assist in selling it.

Above all, remember: freedom of speech and of the press is too important a thing not to be defended at all costs, at any time; petty internal, tactical differences in our ranks should not deter us from offering a united front when the capitalist State is attacking us.

Our comrades are political prisoners and they must be treated as such.

HOLLOWAY MEETING REPORT.

A small group of revolutionaries met outside Holloway prison on Sunday, despite the cold and the damp, to hold a meeting and sing Communist songs which we hope penetrated the walls of that capitalist institution, and cheered our Comrade inside.

Comrade Smyth told the audience of her visit to Sylvia Pankhurst at the end of her first month. She was shown into a lobby over the heating apparatus, where she was locked in and kept waiting in an oppressive atmosphere for some time, and at last was taken to D.X., where so many of the Suffragettes had paid the penalty of fighting for the emancipation of women. It is a long ward, with two tiers of cells on either side, and at the window end is a row of glass cells, in one of which was Prisoner 9587. There is room for two people to stand inside the cell, which is separated from that in which the prisoner stands by a fine mesh-wire partition. Comrade Pankhurst was in prison clothes, grotesque garments of a greenish grey, with pink stripes at wide intervals and broad arrows dotted about, a white cap, a blue and white check apron and a check duster for a handkerchief. The prisoner did not look at all well, though she was flushed with the excitement of having a visit and a break in the monotony of her life, which was dragging wearily along. At first she was in an ordinary cell, but the cold was so great, only 42deg. one day, that she had to be moved to a hospital cell, which was warmer. How inhuman it is to keep any prisoner in a stone cell into which the sun never penetrates, which has only a small pane in a small window to open, and which must necessarily be very damp unless constantly well heated, which we know is not the case. The prisoners are only allowed one hour's exercise in the prison yard a day, so that there is no chance of keeping the circulation up, and the cold is felt much more acutely. Before her Appeal, Comrade Pankhurst saw mothers who had just been confined lying on plank beds in cold, damp cells, with the baby in a cot beside them. And we have the hypocrisy to call this a civilised country, and to imprison people who are fighting to do away with this so-called civilisation, and substitute a real civilisation for it! Comrade Pankhurst was naturally eager to hear all about the movement and sent a message to the Comrades outside to carry on. We told her that we held meetings outside the prison every Sunday afternoon and sang revolutionary songs to cheer her in her solitude. Won't you come and help to swell the throng? It is not much that we can do for those inside, but when we can do a small thing like this, which means so much to those who are suffering for the cause, surely we will deny ourselves something for them. I would suggest that we march to Pentonville after the meeting, it is only half-a-mile away, to cheer our other Comrade who is chafing at his enforced inaction there.

Don't forget to come to Holloway at 4 p.m. next Sunday. If we are real revolutionaries, we shall not mind the cold or the wet, and we shall have to sacrifice much more than a comfortable Sunday afternoon by the fire if we are going to bring about the revolution and make it a success.

TO THE RANK AND FILE.

The rank and file members of the Party have got to be active if this Party is to be a really live one. The duties of the members are not merely to sell literature and carry on propaganda, but they have got to formulate the practical policy of the Party and to see that it is carried out.

There are various important questions upon which we have got to have a definite policy. For instance, that of unemployment. Are we going to be content to help the unemployed to collect doles to keep them in semi-starvation, or are we going to organise them to solve the question themselves? The unemployed have a great deal of spare time on their hands. Are we going to educate them by providing them with classes on economics, industrial history, and those who need it, with simple subjects such as reading and writing?

Then we must have a definite policy beforehand with regard to a general strike, or any big strike. Not just a vague resolution that we shall support all strikes, but a definitely organised means of, not only supporting, but of leading forward and developing the strike. If the Party is to take the place it should in the life of the workers, the workers have got to take the place they should in the life of the Party.

A Party composed of members who leave everything to the E.C. is a dead Party, a Party of sheep that can only baa after their shepherd. The E.C. of a Party, like the government of a country, are the servants and not the masters. The members have got to help the E.C. by supplying ideas as well as by helping to carry them out. We preach that the workers have got to take control. If they are unfit to control their own Party, they will be unfit to control their country when the time comes for them to do so. This is a period of preparation and we must not waste our time. Do not let us criticise others, let us concentrate all our energies upon doing our own share in bringing about the revolution.

An Explanation.

We wish to state that the report of the Leeds Unity Conference, which appeared in our last issue, was the official one handed to us by the Press Committee, with the request that it should be the only one we should publish.

THE INTERNATIONAL OF YOUTH.

(Reprinted from the Organ of the E.C. of the Communist International).

The majority of the Party comrades know only by hearsay of the organisations of youth and their international union. Meanwhile the international movement of the young people, which has been in existence for about 30 years, has played and is playing a tremendous role in the world Communist revolution.

The Socialist Unions of the Youth began to form in West Europe in the 'eighties of last century and rapidly spread among all the countries of the capitalist world. They carried on the struggle against the exploitation of the labour of the young people and children which was sufficiently strongly developed in the larger industry, but particularly so in the smaller workshops, crippling physically and morally the apprentices and young assistant workers. They declared war against militarism, which made young men languish in barracks, which poisoned the minds of the wider masses of Youth by its rabid man-hatred, dull-headed patriotism and loyalty to the imperialist ways of the bourgeois government. They set the Socialist education of youth against the bourgeois nationalist ideology, conducted through the schools, the press, the bourgeois unions of young people and other organs of the ruling classes.

In 1907, under the chairmanship of Karl Liebknecht, the First International Congress of Socialist Organisations of Youth took place, and the International of Youth was formed. At that time, the Socialist Unions of Youth were very weak. The International of Youth numbered but a few tens of thousands of youthful proletarians. This movement of the young people, constantly developing, attained enormous proportions by the beginning of the world war (thus, for instance, the German "Working Youth" numbered about 100,000 members). But during the process of their development, many of the organisations of youth modified their organisational form and their work. As a result of the struggle carried on by the opportunist Social Democratic Parties and Labour Unions against the revolutionary spirit of the young people and the independent movement of the proletarian youth, in Germany, Holland and some of the other countries, a social patriotic tutelage was instituted over the various organisations of youth (which found its expression in the appointment of "Committees of Youth" by the Party and the Labour Unions), and in place of the anti-militarist struggle, the chief attention was given to sport, distractions and culture work.

The independent revolutionary unions of youth remained only in a few countries. When the world war broke out, the proletarian youth, carried away at first by the jingoist phrases, very soon got over its spell of intoxication and was one of the first, with Karl Liebknecht at its head, to raise aloft the red banner of the proletarian revolution. The independent organisations of youth passed over wholly to the revolutionary position, moving on rapidly along the road leading from Zimmerwald to Moscow. A split took place in Germany, Austria, and some

of the other countries, the result of which was the appearance of Communist organisations of youth alongside with the old social patriotic or centrist unions of youth. To the revolutionary organisations of youth of all countries belongs the merit of an inexhaustible struggle against the war and social patriotism during the epoch of the most unqualified treachery on the part of the Socialist Parties.

The International of Youth recovered rapidly from the first blows of the imperialist squall. Already, in April 1915, an international conference took place in Berne. At this conference the youth of all countries laid one of the first mines under the seemingly indestructible edifice of "civil peace" between Labour and Capital. The International Secretariat of Youth which had been publishing "The International of Youth" during the war, organising international anti-militaristic days for the young people, revolutionarily deciding all questions of the international struggle for Socialism and the movement

directly formed by the revolutionary organisations of youth.

In November 1919, an International Congress of the International of Youth was held in Berlin. The Congress decided unanimously that the Communist International of Youth should join the Third International. It accepted the new Communist programme of the international movement of the young people which established the essential tasks of the Communist Unions of Youth. The direct struggle for the Soviet power, in close contact with the Communist parties, a Communist uprising of the young people, the struggle against the bourgeois army by means of its internal disorganisation and the organisation of a Red Guard, the struggle for a Socialist reorganisation of labour (possible only during the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat) and a Socialist education of the young—such are the aims given by the Berlin Congress to the young proletarians of all countries. Lastly, the Congress created a strong international centre of youth which, during a short period of existence, proved itself to be the real general staff of the International of Youth. In this way the Second Congress of the Communist International, in which the delegates of the unions of youth took part, stood face to face with a powerful movement, both as to quantity and quality, as the International of Youth includes at the present moment, not less than 450,000 organised young men and girls. And naturally the question of the movement of youth was examined most seriously by the Congress, in its political, educational and organisational aspects. The Third International has completely broken with the cowardly inimical attitude towards the independent movement of the young people, which was maintained by the Second International and against which Karl Liebknecht and other revolutionists struggled so fiercely because the Third International has had the opportunity from the very beginning of the process of its formation, of becoming convinced of the great importance of these Communist Unions for the cause of the revolution.

The revolutionary countries of the world proletariat passed a review of the Labour Army of Youth, drawn up in battle columns, in the Communist International of Youth. And we know that its decisions will double and treble the fighting capacity, the iron organisational discipline and ardent enthusiasm of these hundred thousand reserves of the whole world proletarian dictatorship.

Following upon the publication in this issue of the "International of Youth," taken from the "Communist International," organ of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, No. 13, articles will appear weekly specially written for young Communists. All Proletarian and Socialist Sunday Schools should make a point of having the "Workers' Dreadnought" on sale, and supplying us, for publication, with news of their activities. We realise that the most urgent and important work to be done is the education of the young in Communist principles, especially as we in England are far behind all Continental countries in this respect.



[From The Liberator.
ANY MORE ?

of youth (which caused many of its members and its printed organ to suffer cruelly from the "Democratic" Swiss authorities) proved to the whole world that for the working youth the Union and the international solidarity of the proletarians of all countries are not an empty sound, but a vital, sacred cause.

Therefore, when the October revolution was victorious in Russia, and the rising waves of the world revolution of the workers bore up the Communist International on their crests, the unions of youth in all countries were the first to move out in defence of its principles for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the power of Soviets. And it was from their ranks that numerous cadres of members were recruited and frequently leaders of new Communist parties. In some countries even (Spain, Belgium, Sweden and Denmark) the Communist parties were

INDUSTRIAL JOTTINGS.

I quite agree with Mr. Thomas that mere theatricals and personal abuse of Labour leaders will not help us to solve the problem of unemployment. Still, I fail to see why he should have been so violent in his attack on those delegates who, at the Unemployment Conference at the Kingsway Hall on January 27th, interpreted the resolution as a mandate for direct action if the Government failed to deal adequately with the unemployment problem. He admitted himself that more than one construction could be placed on the resolution, but added that it neither affirmed nor disagreed with direct action. According to the report in the *Railway Review*, he claimed that it would be unfair to enter into the merits or demerits of direct action at that meeting; and argued that only when the Conference reassembles on February 23rd, should such a question be dealt with. He felt, apparently, that the Government should be given a chance to do something in the meantime. To the statement of a delegate that the unemployed would starve in the meantime, he said: "I am sure that if you decide on direct action to-day, the only result will be that there would be more starved and more out of work."

This may be perfectly true, but if direct action is decided on three weeks hence, will there be any less starved and out of work? If not, the argument is perfectly irrelevant, and could only have been used for the purpose of getting out of a difficult corner, and postponing a matter of tremendous importance. It seems to me, that while Mr. Thomas was firmly opposed to the delegates discussing the merits or demerits of direct action at that meeting, he was very careful to introduce an argument against it himself. But it was a very poor argument, for such an argument against it now will be an argument against it three weeks hence; conversely, any argument for it then is an argument for it now. But Mr. Thomas wants the Government to have another chance—as if they haven't had enough chance already!

Was it not Mr. Thomas who declared himself ready to break the Constitution in order to prevent a war with Russia some months ago? Why then should he be so indignant because some delegates interpreted the resolution as a mandate for direct action? I quite admit that unemployment is a different matter

from a war with Russia. Personally, I am not convinced that the Labour movement is sufficiently strong or sufficiently well organised to solve the problem of unemployment by resorting to direct action—yet; but if Mr. Thomas is of the same opinion, why did he not say so bluntly, instead of indulging in irrelevant statements, and condemning all who believe in direct action, as the first who would run away from brimstone?

Mr. Thomas believes that "if you have constituencies where women like Margaret Bondfield are rejected in a working-class constituency, the working-class deserve all they get." This is a sweeping assertion, and if it were true, it would be enough to dishearten anybody in the movement; but it is based on the assumption that the working-classes have nothing but the political weapon to depend on. It ignores the fact that, in a great measure, the improved status of the worker to-day has been gained not by means of political, but by means of industrial action. A great many of the workers have lost all faith in political action, and in the increase in the membership of Trade Unions, and the spread of Trade

Continued on page 8.

OGMORE VALLEY NOTES.

By "SOCRATES."

Shop Assistants.

The suggestion which was given in previous notes in this journal, re the forming of an Unofficial Reform Movement among shop assistants in South Wales, has brought the writer a letter from Liverpool from a comrade interested in the forming of same, and stating his intentions of trying to come to some arrangements. We have the element in such a distant place as Liverpool; what about the boys in the Rhondda, Aberdare, and Merthyr districts? Have we not the element here? If so, where are they? Hurry up, Comrades, and let us make a bid for the Unofficial in the near future, as it is the only driving force, and we certainly require it nowadays.

Economics.

The Economic Class that has been run for the past few months at Bridgend, under the auspices of the Garw District, South Wales Miners' Federation, has very recently come into prominence. A leading article, very strikingly written, appeared in the "Times" at the beginning of last week, commenting on the menace of Bolshevism in this country, in consequence of the Economic Classes now being run in South Wales, and other parts of the country in general. As the result of the "Times" article, the writer understands that the Government has now, in consequence of same, appointed inspectors to visit the different parts of the country where the revolutionary element is active, to locate same, and to report thereon. What does it all indicate, Comrades? Simply the outstanding fact that revolutionary activity, which is prevalent throughout the country to-day, is making the Capitalist Class feel rather uneasy, and, realising that their system is in danger, they are rushing to the forefront. Comrades, keep it going, and let us prepare for the coming Social Revolution. All hail to the Soviets! for to-morrow shall bring the new dawn, and Capitalism will be swept away.

Communist Unity.

Comrades who have been looking forward so eagerly to a United Communist Party in Great Britain have at last had their hopes fulfilled. The fusion of the three parties into one is a step towards solidarity, especially in face of all the seed of dissension now being sown in the Capitalist Press, for the purpose of putting the unemployed against their comrades the employed. Every tactic is being em-

ployed by the governing classes in order to put worker against worker during the present slump in trade, and every device is being engineered to throw the blame on the working classes for the morass in which Europe finds itself at the present moment. Capitalism is breaking, Comrades, and it is up to us as Communists to bring it tottering still further to its final doom, in order to build a system based on Humanity, and not on the blood and sweat of the working classes, as it is to-day.

Lecture.

A very interesting lecture was held on Monday evening, January 31st, at the Church Hall, Nantymoel, when the Rev. T. D. James, Vicar of Llanerfyl, North Wales, delivered his lecture on "Modern Moloch Worship"—very appropriate at the present time. The subject was outlined by means of a diagram, depicting the sacrifice in older days of early religious people of a young child in the hands of Moloch, a so-called idol, and drawing a contrast between that period and the period in the time of the Industrial Revolution of the 17th Century. The lecturer commented on the different epochs in Industrial History, such as the Factory System, Coal Mines, and the sweeping of chimneys by very young children for the sole purpose of profit-making, the iniquities of the Factory System such as the early hours for commencing work at the various factories, which ultimately led to decreased stature. He also drew attention to the horrors of the coal-mines, where the children toiled in hours of darkness, and if not working sufficiently to please the coal-owners were brutally treated. Finally, he dwelt on the excellent work done by Robert Owen, and Earl Shaftesbury, in alleviating the horrors of same, and concluded with the remark that Individualism was the curse of the world. In all, the lecture was very much appreciated. The lecturer was a very outspoken man, and held his audience exceedingly well. We trust that the people who attended the lecture, having had the facts of Capitalism placed before them, will kindly respect the Socialists of to-day who are striving for the overthrow of the system which has been responsible for such a state of affairs, and in joining with us in saying, let our motto always be: "Agitate, Educate, and Organise." We remind the same people also of Miss Sylvia Pankhurst, Colonel Malone, Comrade Steele, etc., who are at present serving sentences for daring to fight for Liberty.

THE BLACK-COATED WORKERS.

A well-attended meeting of the National Federation of Professional, Technical, Administrative and Supervisory Workers, the "Black-Coated Federation," was held in the Central Hall, Westminster, on the 4th inst., at which the principal speaker was George Bernard Shaw on "The Need for the Political Organisation of the Mental Workers."

The Chairman, Mr. E. H. Walker, said that anything sensational was out of place with black-coated workers, and this was the keynote of the meeting; you felt that though they were constantly referred to as the mental workers, their mental development and grasp of the realities of life and of the stupendous period through which we are passing was slight, and that if we have to depend upon them for the reorganisation of society, there is not much hope for us.

Mr. Bernard Shaw adapted himself to the mental capacity of his audience, and gave a discourse on elementary economics, which would have bored many manual workers if it had not been so full of wit and humour. As it was, the majority of those present seemed to find it strong enough food for them. The question of the Revolution was touched upon, and roused a certain amount of enthusiasm, but was received coldly by the bulk of those present. In the discussion they were told that there would be either a bloody revolution or an intelligent revolution, and it depended upon them which it should be, and if they were not on the side of the proletariat, their turn might come to suffer the fate of the aristocracy and bourgeoisie in Russia.

Mr. Bernard Shaw addressed the meeting as "Ladies and Gentlemen" (the meeting was free to all non-manual workers), as he thought there were no manual workers present, unless they were there under false pretences, but he told them that unless they organised rapidly and effectively, they would not be ladies and gentlemen much longer. He pointed out that the mental workers were the middle class, which used to hold a very strong position, but did so no longer, because they came into industry as a favour when there was a shortage, but now there was a surplus their value had declined. The mental workers would be in an inferior position to the manual workers when the workers took control of industry, unless they organised effectively.

He spoke of the new morality which would give us a new standard by which we should decide what was a thief. Under the old morality we were taught from our childhood to admire a man who shifted his work on to the shoulders of others, and who so organised his business that he provided for his children, so that they could live upon the work of others. That man is a thief. We are taught to respect the man who takes away a proportion of what we have earned every year, though he does

not work for it. We are taught to consider it right for the police and military to fire upon looters who want to become ladies and gentlemen without working, like those from whom they are looting. We have got to get the morality of what is thieving and what is not. Under the new morality a man must provide for himself while he is working for his old age, and must give more to his country than he takes out of it. He would not say what he would do those who still tried to live upon the work of others; that would be considered the greatest crime. We should all be called upon to give a good account of ourselves to the community.

Mr. Shaw referred to the unemployed, and said that in Flanders they had something to eat and something to do, but now they were starving in the streets. The same sort of organisation which provided for them then could provide for them now. There was a good deal to be said for the Bolsheviks, though he wasn't going to use that word. When he looked at a country where people were starving, and everyone was made to work, and then looked at another country where people were starving and it did all it could to encourage, admire and glorify idleness, he turned his eyes to the East. But he thought we could reorganise society without doing the things Lenin had had to do. He said we might have to produce a new constitution which will require a great deal more intelligence than carrying on the old one, which was based on tradition and was built up gradually. The Parliamentary machine is for exploitation, and is of no use to us. The building up of the new machine must be done by the mental workers, not by the manual workers, and the proprietary classes are not capable of doing it.

Of course Ireland was not left out, but it was not a popular subject with some of the audience, for one man called out: "They are murderers there," to which Mr. Shaw replied: "Yes, you are paying them £1 a day." He pointed out that the cheapness of the means of destruction, submarines and poison gas, made Ireland a greater menace than Germany. Winston Churchill had said that Ireland was the greatest danger to the British Empire, and may be the means of breaking it up. Lloyd George said that Ireland must be absolutely subjected, and even the Labour Party said that Ireland must not be allowed to be a danger to this country. He, Mr. Shaw, said: "You have made things so dangerous had you not better be a little more careful? What about France, with great Gen. Foch? What about America, who fears we have a secret treaty with Japan?" He said the League of Nations cannot be a League of Nations with Germany, Austria, Russia, and Ireland outside it; these countries may form their own League.

PARTY ORGAN IN THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT.

There are various reasons why the official organ of a Communist Party should not be the only Communist paper in the hands of the members, and why these papers should be conducted by members of the Party, provided that they adhere to the Communist policy laid down in the Theses of the Third International.

One weekly paper is not large enough to contain all the matter which should be in the hands of the members, nor is it large enough to publish all the articles, very often on important questions, and giving the point of view of various sections of the rank and file, which ought to be ventilated. If the rank and file members have not the chance of ventilating their opinions, which in a large Party is impossible in one weekly paper, it is likely to engender discontent and disunity, which should be avoided.

It is difficult for one organ to appeal to the various sections of society. For instance, the Editor of "The Communist" says his appeal is chiefly to the masses. The "Workers' Dreadnought" appeals more largely to Communists who already understand the fundamentals of Communism and the class-war, and need more advanced matter.

There is a tendency for an organ to get into a groove as regards policy, and to specialise in one direction, so that it is an advantage to have more than one paper. The special function of the "Workers' Dreadnought" has been to spur on less advanced sections in the movement. The Editor possesses what a small Scotch paper calls "vision," a rare and precious gift which has been placed at the disposal of the movement instead of being used for personal gain, and which should be recognised and made full use of. It is unsatisfactory and impractical to have more than one Editor of a paper, and yet more than one person may be equally well fitted to fill that rôle; therefore it is a gain to the movement to have more than one paper.

Members have got to beware of putting the Party before the Movement. The Movement is more important than any Party, just as the ideas expressed are more important than the person who expresses them. The Party and the person will both pass away, but the movement and the ideas will endure.

RUSSIA'S MONEY SUBSTITUTE.

The Soviet newspapers publish an official note declaring that the economic situation of the Soviet Republics necessitates the introduction of a new standard of value in place of money. A Special Commission is now considering a proposal to make an hour's work the unit of value.

OUR LITERATURE COMPETITION.

What is wanted to-day is a short pamphlet explaining clearly, in simple language, what is meant by Communism and affiliation to the Third International. Such a pamphlet as we have in mind, is not on any list that we have seen.

We believe that there are some comrades who, with the experience of every-day discussion, know the objections generally raised against Communism.

We have therefore decided to open the following competition:—

CONDITIONS OF THE COMPETITION.

1. The *Workers' Dreadnought* will publish and circulate at the lowest possible price, a pamphlet explaining in an easy and convincing style, the meaning of Communism and affiliation to the Third International.
2. No money prize will be given, but the author of the accepted MS. will receive free 200 copies of the pamphlet.
3. The MS. should reach the *Workers' Dreadnought* offices—in a registered letter (please note this point)—not later than March 25th, 1921.
4. The pamphlet should be of not less than 6,000 words and not more than 10,000. The MS. should be written, or typed, on one side of the paper only.
5. The MS. should reach us unsigned, and consequently the name of the author should not appear on any of the pages of the MS., nor on any part of the registered packet that contains it.
6. On the other hand, a *nom de plume* or a set of figures, should appear on the first and last page of the MS.
7. When sending the registered letter to us, the counterfoil must be kept, to be produced at a later date. The possession of the Certificate of Registration will be deemed the proof of authorship, both in the case of the successful competitor and of the others, to whom their MS. will be returned.
8. In an issue in April, the *Workers' Dreadnought* will publish the number of the registered letter that contained the accepted manuscript and will then invite the successful competitor to send in his or her name. Should the author desire to remain anonymous the *Workers' Dreadnought* will proceed without further delay to publish the pamphlet.
9. The *Workers' Dreadnought* reserves the right to publish at a subsequent date, either in full, or partially, in the paper itself, or in pamphlet form, the next best two MSS., and will announce the names of these competitors at the same time as that of the successful one.
10. The decision of the *Workers' Dreadnought* will be final.

A CHAT WITH Mrs. SNOWDEN. By FRED TYLER.

I have a friend who believes in what he pleases to term "slow gradual evolution." He complacently observes that the world was not made in a day; that society changes, or, as Engels said, "there is an eternal law of change," and my friend stolidly asserts that a fundamental social revolution is in contradiction to Nature's law. He is a Fabian, and deems the workers incompetent in the self-management of industry. They must first become trained in liberty by the passing of reform laws. To such an order of mind Mrs. Philip Snowden belongs, and accordingly her actions and sentiment on current topics are not strange to understand. She belongs to an amusing paradoxical political society, the I.L.P., a society with a dual policy: (1) the achievement of certain minor reforms, by municipal and parliamentary action; (2) the abolition of Capitalism, when the workers have been made fit to look after themselves, by receiving Snowdonian education.

The "intellectuals," to whom Mr. and Mrs. Snowden, Sidney and Beatrice Webb and others belong, declare that the workers must follow a tactical plan laid down by their own humble selves. We must support the Labour Party, the Fabians will supply the brains, and all will be well.

"Revolution is a thing to be abhorred; it is not necessary for the working class to defeat the capitalist class in that way," say the guests at a tea-party in Golders Green. One day a terrible thing happened: something which destroyed in a single swoop Fabianism, smashed completely the faith of millions in Parliament, shook the I.L.P. to its very foundations, made the British Labour Party the laughing stock of the world. The Russian masses had risen in their might and had repudiated the capitalist system and began building up a new society.

A delicate and dainty middle-class lady, well-trained in Christian sophistry, a firm exponent of pacifism and an opponent of violence, cannot reasonably be expected to favour the methods of the Bolsheviks.

One can only repeat the sentiments of Radek, referring to her Russian voyage: "Oh, why did you go to that uncivilised country?"

There is a lengthy article by our "friend" Mrs. Snowden in the *London Magazine*, entitled "What Bolshevism Would Mean for British Workers: The Tyranny of Communism."

An editorial informs the public that Mrs. Snowden is an "extreme" Socialist, and therefore cannot be accused of bias against Communism. We are also informed that she has been to Soviet Russia, and accordingly wishes to lay before us an impartial criticism.

We find in that article an interview with Madame Balabanova, a Bolshevik leader. Madame Balabanova objects to the term Socialist; "We are Communists," she said. "I am delighted and interested to hear this," says Mrs. Snowden. "What distinction do you draw between Socialism and Communism?" The reply clears up all doubts: "The difference is the difference between the Second International and the Third International. The first stands for Socialism gained by democratic methods; the later stands for the dictatorship of the minority and revolution by violence."

[We know Comrade Balabanova too well to believe she used this expression. Instead of the word "violence," read "by the organised force of the workers." Lenin himself has explained this point clearly in a speech he made presenting his Thesis on the agrarian question. "The workers," says Lenin, "must organise and use the force resulting from their organisations in order that the Revolution should not be a

series of isolated cases of rebellion, of violence and indiscriminate destruction, but a progressive, complete transference of power from the hands of the non-producing class to those of the producing class, the workers."—Ed.]

Even if the words of Madame Balabanova were true and complete, not garbled and stripped from a context, what about it?

It is a fact of history that minorities make all changes, and if Mrs. Snowden denies this, she should take up her books and re-educate her mind. Preparation to fight militantly for their rights is the only method that the mass can sensibly adopt; grey hairs and long beards await those who trust to Mrs. Snowden to do the job for them.

Whether a minority directs the mass to achieve a social revolution or endeavours to dominate the mass in a revolution is an entirely different matter, and the difference should be noted. Sentiments follow dealing with a possible difference between Socialism and Communism.

Mrs. Snowden declares that Socialism stands for the gradual passing of land and capital from private to public possession. Confiscation and repudiation are not part of her programme.

Communism stands for the immediate abolition of private property and the socialisation of all social wealth.

I have 4d. in my pocket and think I will, in sporting parlance, back Communism, having an idea that the Socialism "à la Snowden" means paying landlords compensation, and giving them an opportunity, by investment, to increase the charges on industry.

Further, one is forced to ask: What is wrong with Mrs. Snowden? Is she ignorant of what Socialism stands for, or is she a tool of the capitalist subsidised Press? We are next invited, in her article, to answer the query "How did this minority of Communists get power—650,000 in a total population of 125,000,000?" How do they maintain power? might also be asked. Why did the peasants rise and repel Yudenitch? Why has the Red Army tenaciously fought against the Allies in defence of Communism? The object of the White forces was the suppression of Communism, yet the teeming millions of Russia worked and fought to maintain Communism. Six hundred and fifty thousand is the membership of the Russian Communist Party, but this is not the number of Russian adherents to Communism. Its supporters and champions are spread in enormous numbers throughout Russia.

The disbanding of the Constituent Assembly is then quoted. John Reed declared in his pamphlet "Red Russia" that the election to the Constituent Assembly "was arranged by the middle-class, and whole masses of workers were deprived of the power of voting."

But parallel with the sitting of this bogus democratic assembly a conference of delegates from industries took place. This was the first All-Russian Trade Conference—the inauguration of the Soviets. The bogus Parliament was disposed of by a few sailors, who politely suggested that "Constituents" should go to bed, and the government of Russia was thus vested in the Soviets.

WISDOM FOR THE WORKERS.—2.

"ALL OUR LIBERTIES ARE DUE
TO MEN WHO HAVE
BROKEN THE LAWS OF THE LAND."

—DR. CLIFFORD.

In the room where the Russian Snowdens met to talk, the most wonderful event in history took place: the Russian "Westminster talking-shop" was, amidst laughter, turned out; the repudiation of Parliament by the people followed.

Our dear friend continues: "In Russia the people are starving and ragged," but yet she, when speaking against the blockade of Central Europe at the Albert Hall, said nothing about the blockade around the Russian coasts, except "that it was brought upon them by their stupid repudiation of the Czar's debts."

Further, Mrs. Snowden says that no Bolshevik revolution is possible in Britain. "In the first place there are not the conditions essential to a physical revolution here." "The people of Great Britain are not hungry and cold. Food, fuel, and clothing are very costly here, but these things can be bought." She also says: "If one could imagine Bolshevism in Britain." "Kings and Parliaments would have to go, and only workers would vote; the rest, including ministers of religion would be disfranchised" (how awful to contemplate!) Now listen to the "advanced" Socialist: "The confiscation of property would rouse serious and reasonable opposition."

She concludes by saying that Communism is to be barred because it prevents individual liberty. We are told "Britons should cherish as the apple of their eye the large measure of intellectual and spiritual freedom come to them through the ages."

To put it in a nutshell: Mrs. Snowden was an opponent of the British Government during the war because freedom was slain by D.O.R.A. She now helps her old enemy to fight a struggling, tormented people, broken by hunger, stabbed in the back by the machinations of the Allies. She has not the honesty of mind to admit that Russia is passing through a crisis of internal and external military war, forced upon her by the capitalist world.

She is a middle-class Liberal, suffering under the delusion that she is a spokesman of British Socialism. Hence her bickering criticism.

The opposition of the reformist I.L.P. leaders to Communism is the last effort of a dying political force.

The future lies with the workers and with the assertion of their power. When they shall know their hidden strength, they will laugh aloud at the pretended arguments of Mrs. Snowden.

News has arrived from Moscow that Prince Peter Kropotkin died at 3.10 a.m. on Tuesday. Born in Moscow in 1842, his career has proved a very varied one—from page-boy to revolutionary. He has been both imprisoned and exiled, but the Revolution in his native country made it safe once more for him to revisit his native town, in which he spent his last days.

DREADNOUGHT DEVELOPMENT FUND.

Per W. E. McConnell	0 10 0
Mrs. Sweet	0 5 1
Mrs. Brimley	0 10 0

1 5 1

Brought forward 102 13 10

Total £103 18 11

NEW YEAR'S GIFT.

B. Taylor, 5s. Total, £57 16s. 9d.

APPEAL FUND.

We are glad to announce that the costs of Comrade Pankhurst's Appeal have been reduced to £23 11s. 9d. We now have £19 6s. towards it, but still require £4 5s. 9d. to make up the total. Won't you send a donation towards it? W. Smith 2s, J. Lenkey £2 10s, Mrs. Solovitch 2s 6d, S.O. 1s, Misses Vibert and Goodliffe £3, Mrs. Almond £1, Holloway meeting collection 9s 7d, total £19 6s.

BETWEEN OURSELVES.

By L. A. MOTLER.

There is a paper issued in London called "La Cronaca," printed in the Italian language. You may not have known of it, Henry. But it were robbery for the "Dreadnought" to take twopence off you per week, without giving you some information you didn't know before.

Therefore do I assure you, with my hand on my heart, that the "Cronaca" exists. I don't presume to know why it exists, but one may imagine that Italians sometimes read papers in their own language. You see there are too many bold bad papers already existing—"Il Bolsevicco," "Il Comunista," "Il Leninista," and even the "Avanti!" I say "even" because the "Avanti!"—which means "forward"—does not always know in what direction to move forward. It has sometimes been seen to go sideways, and in the morning after the night before it has often been found by its supporters down the wrong turning.

Therefore, again, the "Cronaca" exists. Like all anti-Bolsh papers, it is "impartial, without politics, and the organ of no party whatever." It is really wonderful how all these "independent" papers are tarred over with the yellow brush of anti-bolsevismo. They are indeed more anti than anything else. They are "agin'" most of the things that make the world move, but if you asked them what they were "pro" for, it would take a week of Sunday editions for them to explain.

Of course, the "Cronaca" has a right to exist. No real Bolsevicco will gainsay that. And the "Cronaca" is welcome to talk nonsense if it likes. But in putting this nonsense before the public, it runs the risk of being found out.

And so the "Cronaca" has been found out. Now there is nothing extraordinary in this. Hosts of papers are being continually found out, and even our pet "Communist" made a very bad slip last week in saying it was "the only paper represented at the Communist Conference."

But the mistake made by the "Cronaca" is a mistake that has been getting somewhat common of late. Indeed it is a mistake that has been found out already. The long queues of unemployed here—which are perfectly well known to il Signor Redattore della Cronaca—are a howling reply to the article which I wish to point out to you, Henry lad.

This article is entitled "Fenomeni Economici"—you will not be able to pronounce it at the first go, but you will get its meaning right away. It proceeds to state that "we"—who "we" are—is a dark secret—have 98 milliards of public debt. Now the interest on this debt is so much that the Italian people (meaning the workers, of course!) are unable to keep up with it at the present rate of production. The debt therefore goes mounting up and up, until the Italian proletariat will soon find it will take more than 42 years to pay it off. O happy Huns, to be free in a certain time! What is 42 years? After that they will be able to put out their tongues at the Allies—always provided, of course, that the wicked workers do not try to get out of it by a Revolution. When, of course again, we shall have to put Marshal Foch on the job. Not that we believe in force, but . . .

However, to return to our "Fenomeni Economici." The writer says that "our nation must be prepared to face the most rigid economy, the most heroic sacrifices . . . one word only can save Italy—work!"

Work! Yes; when in Britain we see the blessed results of too much work! You would imagine, Henry, that the "Cronaca" was printed in some far away spot, such as the Cannibal Islands, or perhaps Mars. But no. It is printed right here in London—right in the seething midst of an official return of 1,059,800 unemployed.

Does this dishearten the brilliant writer of the "Cronaca"? Does the spectacle of the long queues outside the Labour Exchanges give him furiously to think? No. With youthful buoyancy, and a hope derived from reading the most profound philosophy of the gallant D'Annunzio, he says "una sola parola più salvare l'Italia—lavoro!"

Work! Do you imagine that the sapient writer of "La Cronaca" means all the Italian nation should work? Do you suppose, Henry, that he means King Vittorio Emanuele to get hold of a spade and cultivate an allotment? Does he say that the Pope should soil his lily-white hands by helping to set type in the "Cronaca" offices and so help the esteemed editor print eight pages where only four grew before? Does he mean that D'Annunzio should make a little less braggadaccio and save the money he spends on his mistresses by handing over the profits on his poems to the Rothschilds who hold Italy by the throat for "un debito pubblico di 98 miliardi"?

No. The writer in the "Cronaca" has no brainwaves of that sort. We want more work. There exists "una classe lavoratore"—a dirty working class. What use a working class if it doesn't work? Call all the shirking workers from Monte Carlo and the Riviera where they have been spending their high wages and put them to work.

And perhaps the Signore Redattore of the "Cronaca"—who shudders at the monster Lenin putting ALL the people of Russia, including himself, to compulsory work—will be glad to stand over the lazy workers with a revolver in each hand.

Bravo Redattore—or rather Dittatore! Al lavoro!



OUR BOOKSHELF.

THE GREEN RING.

(A play in four acts. By S. S. Kotliansky. (No. 4 of Plays for a People's Theatre.) C. W. Daniel, Ltd. London. 1s. 6d. net.)

The review copy of this book has been presented to the Library of Holloway Prison, in the expectation that Comrade Pankhurst may read it and review it, as soon as she receives First Division treatment.

THE IRISH CASE STATED.

(By Henry O'Neill. Burt and Son, 55-56, Porchester Road, London, W. 2. 12 pp. 2d.)

A clear statement of the average Irishman's point of view. Well worth reading.

WOMEN IN TRADE UNIONS.

(By the Labour Research Department. George Allen and Unwin. London. 8s. 6d.)

This book, which meets a much-felt need, is divided into three parts, and forms a very complete survey of its subject, from the historical as well as the present-day point of view. The story of the Women's Trade Union movement is told from the earliest efforts at combination in the beginning of last century down to the end of the critical period of the Great War. The present position of women is reviewed in each industry, the constitution and policy of all important women's organisations being described in great detail. The Tables, which relate the state of employment, management, wages, etc., form a useful addition to this section. The last part of the book is devoted to the discussion of specific women's problems, including such topical matters as "woman's place in industry," "Trade Union restrictions on female labour," and "equal pay for equal work."

THE MODERN PRESS ASSOCIATION.

(Secretary: Robert Peters, Box 205, Madison Sq., New York, N.Y.)

An Association which purports to supply—without cost—to the Workers' Press news that is truthful, timely, and proletarian in character.

It demands the co-operation of all those interested in building up international solidarity, asking them to send regular contributions and news items whenever possible, at the same time asking to be put on the exchange list of all rebel periodicals.

The need of a real "proletarian" news agency, both in Western Europe and in America, is strongly felt and a every-day growing question. This is not the first attempt that has been made in that direction. The idea was discussed—and we believe some preparations were made—by the International Socialist Bureau, even before the war. The capitalist control of wires, both cable and home, the postal censure, the expenses of news-gathering have proved till now an almost impassable barrier. It will be interesting to see how the difficulty can be overcome—and of what tendency the news will be—supplied free of cost by voluntary contributors.

That the rebel Press needs reliable information is proved by a confession of the Editor of the "Industrial Union News," who says:—

"Due to lack of direct information from England, the 'Industrial Union News' has reprinted many articles on the English and European Labour movement from the *Workers' Dreadnought*."

"The article on the English miners' strike settlement published in the issue of November 6th, 1920, was taken partly from an article in the *Workers' Dreadnought*, written by Sylvia Pankhurst."

"Sylvia Pankhurst there urges that the Communists should advocate strike and induce the workers in other industries to strike in sympathy with the miners, agitate for the overthrow of capitalism and the setting up of 'Soviets.'"

"She sees the coal strike as a great clash with capitalism in which, to quote her own words, 'the class-consciousness of the workers needs quickening by strife; only by struggle will the workers be aroused from their present apathy and lack of confidence.'"

"We are free to confess that for good educational articles the *Workers' Dreadnought* is the most virile English paper we receive."

A MEETING

WILL BE HELD

Outside Holloway Gaol,

EVERY SUNDAY AT 4 p.m.

Followed by a meeting outside

Pentonville Prison.

Come and cheer our Comrades Pankhurst and Malone.

INDUSTRIAL JOTTINGS.—Continued from p. 5.

Unionism among the black-coated workers like clerks and journalists, proves that there is a growing faith in action by the workers themselves. If workers had left it to the Labour Party in the House of Commons, or to any other party, to bring up their wages within measurable distance of the increase in the cost of living during the war, they would have been even worse off than they are to-day. And while it is true that many reforms have been gained through Parliament, it is one thing to secure the removal of glaringly iniquitous conditions—improvements which the workers can pay for through increased efficiency—and quite another thing to win a greater share of the wealth which the workers produce.

Take the question of the working day. In the very resolution I am discussing, the Conference calls upon the Government to fulfil its pledge to the Industrial Conference of 1919 by immediate passing into law of a measure restricting the working day to eight hours. After two years, that political pledge remains unfulfilled. Yet during those two years, thousands of workers have, through industrial action, gained considerable reductions of their working hours per day. The resolution also calls for the prohibition of overtime (except where absolutely necessary to enable other workers to be started). Why, there are many trades which have already prohibited overtime by the sure policy of refusing it, and numerous other Unions have, for years, followed the practice of reducing it proportionally as the number of unemployed in their ranks increased. The cumbersome, antiquated machinery of political government is found to work too slowly and with too much uncertainty by a growing section of workers, and as they get more and more class-conscious, political pantomime will cease to have any meaning to them, for they will find that they can get on much better without it.

It is to be hoped that the reference in the resolution to an eight hour working day really means eight and not nine hours. I have frequently heard even labour men speaking of a forty-eight hour week as meaning an eight hour day. This can only be the case when the working hours of the week are equally divided among the six working days. But the vast majority of workers finish work about noon on Saturdays, and the half-holiday has to be made up during the week, which, in most cases, means not an eight hour but a nine hour day. As man lives from day to day, it is a fallacy to assume that the short Saturday morning's work and consequent half-holiday can recompense a man for having worked nine hours per day the rest of the week. That extra hour on top of the eight already worked is much more tiring and devaluing than any previous hour, and in addition to this, after he has fought his way on to a 'bus or been half poisoned in a Tube, wasted the best part of an hour in travelling, had his evening meal and "cleaned up," it is too late to enjoy anything in the way of recreation, and only the exceptional man has any energy left for self-improvement. So let it be a real eight hour day—not a theoretical one!

The *Workers' Dreadnought* can be delivered personally to any address in PECKHAM, CAMBERWELL, SOUTHWARK, LAMBETH, and BERMONDSEY, by sending a postcard with address and order to:—

J. F. KIMBERLEY,

15, Leyton Square,

Peckham, S.E.15.

LARGE LITHOGRAPHIC COPIES of TIBOR SZAMUELY'S portrait (12 by 15 inches), are on sale at our office at 5/- each. A signed copy will be sold to the first applicant for 7/6.

SOCIAL and DANCE.

400, OLD FORD ROAD, BOW.

Every Saturday.

8 TILL 11 P.M.

ADMISSION SIXPENCE : : REFRESHMENTS.

SMALL ADVERTISEMENTS—1d. a Word.

RUSSIAN CLASS (in Olive Beamish's Office), 93, Bishopsgate, on Fridays, 7-8 p.m. For terms apply Mrs. BQUIER, 32, Mount Pleasant Road, Lewisham.

Published by E. Sylvia Pankhurst at 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4 and printed at the Agenda Press, 10, Wine Office Court, London, E.C.4.