China and the Next War.

Workers' Dreadnought

FOR INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM.

Founded and Edited by SYLVIA PANKHURST

VOL. VIII. No. 40. SATURDAY, DECEMBER 17TH, 1921. [WEEKLY.] PRICE TWOPENCE.

CURRENT TOPICS.

Last Sunday was the first anniversary of the Cork burning. Prior to July 1st, the body of Michael Collins would have fetched £5,000, as T. M. Healy, K.C., said, dead or alive if brought to the Lower Castle Yard in Dublin. That of De Valera, at one time, would have been a prize equally valuable. But the day before yesterday ended a phase of his career, by cracking jokes with Lloyd George at 10, Downing Street.

To-day, with one accord, the Press informs the man in the street, that the peoples of England and of Ireland are at peace. One may just wonder how that could be, since it has yet to be explained when, why, and how the people of England had declared war on Ireland. Oh! for a world of topsy-turveydom! Just as the nations were dragged and duped into the Great War, without even the faintest consciousness of the real causes of the quarrel, so were the people of this island led by statesmen, pride and conceit, passively to accept coercive measures against Ireland.

As Dr. L. Haden Guest said (he is by no means a revolutionary):

"The biological, vital, human way of regarding other nations has hardly come into the consciousness of statesmen, who are often singularly ignorant of everything but phases and methods of political contest. . . . Foreign policy will remain as it is until we get rid of these fictitious personifications of other countries and treat them, as they are, as groups of very diverse human beings, able to unite with us in a thousand ways, able to fight with us in perhaps the same number, but, on the whole, citizen for citizen, no more wanting to injure us or each other than we want to injure the inhabitants of adjoining counties of England."

* * * *

There are people who, at the back of their minds, still preserve a sub-conscious feeling of the permanence of highly-revered institutions. To them the book of Pierre Gilliard, formerly tutor to the Tsarevitch, should prove valuable reading.

The "great glory" of the House of the Romanoffs lasted, for all the oppression it was able to exercise, a few years less than 200 years. Every second Emperor of Russia, with one exception was either killed or deposed. Mr. Gilliard confirms to-day what many of us knew as far back as 1911, that the Tsarevitch was a "bleeder," popularly supposed to "want a skin," or suffering from a disease medically known as hæmophilia, the culminating point of a long descent of degeneracy.

* * * *

In a society based on the exploitation of labour and on the private ownership of the means of production, with its concomitant evils, truly, as the Bible says: "the guilt of the father descends on the son." One of the ablest of living psychologists, W. McDougall, F.R.S., states that 548 children from the schools of one city were arranged in four groups, according to the professions of their fathers—namely: professional, executive, artisan, labour. The result is stated in terms of a percentage of the children who scored a mark higher than the medium in tests of intelligence:

Professional group, 85 per cent.; executive, 68; artisan, 41; labour, 39.

Since this group distinction indicates the economic position of the father, and therefore the proportionate welfare, food, housing, etc., of the parents, never was the cruelty of the present system more clearly demonstrated than by these simple figures gathered by a non-political inquirer.

The Vice-Chancellor and the Proctors of Oxford University are of the opinion that since "Liberty does not agree with Niggers," it ought also to be a disagreable condition of affairs for Undergraduates. They have therefore taken umbrage at the *Free Oxford*, which describes itself as a "Communist Journal of Youth," and have "sent down" for two terms the associated editor, and removed the name of the editor from the books of the University. There was, if we rightly remember, another young man who was expelled from the University of Oxford, who, later on, did not cut a totally bad figure amongst those who are still remembered, and will for ever be remembered; consequently the Editor of the *Free Oxford*, in spite of the lost status, and maybe of the financial loss incurred, would do well not to worry too much over the little affair.

* * * *

Not life only, but Art, too, is crippled, in more ways than one, by the utterly stupid present-day social organisation. In a very convincing article in the *Observer*, Mr. St. John Ervine shows that, with regard to the theatres of London, conditions are becoming such that the performance of any kind of reputable drama is likely to have a diminishing chance.

The rental of a certain theatre in London is £350 weekly, the original landlord receiving £180, in itself a most excessive sum of money, the difference being divided between a host of speculators. Under these conditions, the only plays produced are those appealing to the lower artistic tastes, through the effect of clothes, combined with the absence of artistic value. Modern art sincere, proletarian art, is thus totally forbidden by the ever-growing power of money.

AN ESPERANTO PRIMER.

ERRATUM.

In the early edition of last week's *Dreadnought*, owing to a miscarriage of the proofs, some errors were found in the Esperanto Lesson III.

The word "Gentila," *polite*, was spelt "gentilor"; no doubt our students spotted it, as an adjective must end in A.

"Ci," *thou*, was spelt "ĉi," quite a different word, and "ĵurnalo," *newspaper*, was spelt "ĵuralo."

Also the word "fratino" in the Exercise was without the translation, "*sister*," "frato," of course, being "*brother*."

In the last line but one of the first paragraph of the NOTE, it should read "as abroad," instead of "or abroad."

Lesson IV.

We have now seen all the letters peculiar to Esperanto, excepting the accented Ĥ, a letter very seldom used; it is pronounced like the CH in Loch, any Scotchman will show the right pronunciation of it.

People in the South of England need also to be told by a Scotchman how to roll their R properly: not to pronounce Varma, *warm*, as if it were spelt *vah-mah*, but to say, boldly, Vah-RRR-mah, also not to pronounce Birdo, *bird*, as they would in English, but to say Bee-RRR-do, otherwise foreigners will never recognise the word.

An interesting little word in Esperanto is ĉu (pronounced Choo), *whether*, it indicates a question.

Skribu ĉu mi venus, *Write whether I should come.*

It serves for any question: Ĉu li venos? *Will he come?*

Ĉu la birdoj estis puraj? *Were the birds clean?*

Ĉu ili estos malvarmaj? *Will they be cold?*

You do not reverse sentences in Esperanto to make a question. If you said "Estos ili malvarmaj, you simply would be understood to mean that "*They will be cold*," and you would not be putting a question.

We now come to the Accusative, or Objective case that is thought much of in ancient languages, but that modern languages tend to disregard.

Mi amas lin, *I love him.*

Li amas min, *He loves me.*

gives the matter in a nutshell; the object loved is in the accusative, and requires an N.

Just as in English one says, "*I love him*," and not "*I love he*," or "*He loves me*," not "*He loves I*."

In Esperanto, every noun, adjective or pronoun in the accusative or objective case requires N, thus:

Mi vidas la grandan birdon, *I see the big bird.*

La granda birdo vidas min, *the big bird sees me.*

Remember to pronounce the R in bird emphatically. Bee-RRR-do.

La katoj manĝis la panon. *The cats eat the bread.*

La pano venenis la katojn. *The bread poisoned the cats.*

Even if you reversed the sentence and said "La katojn venenis la pano," the N in katojn would make it clear that it was the bread that poisoned the cats and not the cats that poisoned the bread; that is an advantage of Esperanto over English, but if, in writing a sentence, you are uncertain about the objective, it is safer to leave out the N than to put it in wrongly; it will be as if you said "*I love she*," instead of "*I love her*," you would be ungrammatical, and that's all.

EXERCISE.

Mi vidis pli malgrandajn birdojn ol vi.
La kato kuris kun mi en la ĝardeno.
La kokino manĝos la novan panon.
Ili ne tre amis la maljunan onklon.
Parolu, mi vin bone komprenos (*kompreni, to understand*).
La filo bone komprenis la patron, sed li ne iris.
Ni parolas al la knaboj, ĉu ili vin komprenas?
Ĝi estas la plej malpura, mi ĝin ne manĝos.
Venu, patrino, ni iros for (*or* foriros *is better*).
Ĉu si venos kun ni? Ĉu vi venos?
Ne, mi ne havas tempon (*time*) mi ne iros.
Kaj la vetero (*weather*) estas tro malbona.
Mi dankas (*thank*) kore vin kaj la filinon.
(Koro is *heart, and* kore *being an adverb means of course, heartily.*)

This exercise, as well as those in the three preceding lessons, should be looked up again, and translated and re-translated several times; it will not be wasted time. People in other lands are making a similar endeavour, and international congresses without translators will certainly be a feature of a not far distant time, let us be ready!

YOUR SUBSCRIPTION.

A blue mark in this space indicates that your subscription is now due.

Increased Postal rates and the high cost of production of the paper necessitate prompt payment.

FRANK PENMAN IN LONDON.

No one seemed to know, or remember, to what nationality Bistre belonged. Some people thought he was French; others said he might be Italian, or perhaps he was a Slav, or one of those Kelts from the mountains between France and Italy. It did not matter. He certainly was not English; but he knew London, as only the long and observant resident knows it, and he knew English as only a lover of words can know any language; yet, though his phraseology in writing was almost perfect, in his accent and certain occasional tricks of speech, he remained always a foreigner, in spite of his mastery of idioms.

Frank Penman and Miss Mayence first met Bistre coming out of one the Labour Conferences in the Central Hall where they had attended as gallery visitors, and Bistre had been at the Press table.

They stopped at the bookstall: Frank Penman fingered one of D. E. F. G. Haw's books, and cast it down contemptuously, remarking that Haw was a milk-and-water fellow, and that he did not see how any Socialist could consider his views worth a moment's notice, since he had not the pluck to stand for economic equality.

"Is it pluck, or is it temperament?" asked Miss Mayence.

Bistre turned to her, smiling in his quizzical, friendly manner: "Have you noticed," he said, "that everyone who talks of Socialism is thinking what he is going to have in the pocket, and what he is going to put in the belly, instead of discussing something intelligent?"

Miss Mayence smiled back:

"Yes, I've noticed it." She was pleased with Bistre; she liked his friendly eyes, guileless and childlike; his look of inquiring, interested alertness, as though everything around him were new and strange. She was attracted by a puzzling duality in his personality; a curious rivalry (it was too swift and vivid to be a blending) of scholarly quietude and gay bohemian unconventionality.

"I haven't met anyone who has come back from Russia who can tell me of anything but what he had to eat," Bistre continued, as they followed the stream of people down the broad, wide stairs.

It was a lovely winter afternoon, warm and balmy as spring. Bistre suggested a stroll through St. James's Park, and the two students agreed readily. Bistre talked and they listened, carried away by his stories to the bolder and simpler struggles of other days.

Finally they settled down in a Lyons' teashop.

"What, you there?" It was Miss Jolly who cried out to Miss Mayence from the midst of a little bevy of women, bubbling over with talk and excitement, to which two silent men were, loosely, rather awkwardly, attached, or semi-detached.

They had been to a Birth Control meeting and, being eager and, for the most part, recent disciples, must tell all the world about it.

"I can't see anything much in it, really," said Bistre, with his most ingenuous, inquiring air. Pouting his lips and shrugging his shoulders as he flicked the ash from his cigarette, he added: "It's a makeshift."

"You wouldn't say that if you'd seen the poor mothers, as I have, expecting another unwanted child," Miss Jolly rebuked, excitedly.

"At this time of unemployment," said Miss Arthur, a little old maid, stiff and elderly, shaking the nodding feathers of her turban hat.

"A makeshift," repeated Bistre, reaching out for an evening paper.

From the enthusiasts rose a low hostile chorus: "It's anything but that; it's the difference between hope and despair," Miss Jolly gushed forth, clasping her hands.

"Is that your resolution?" Miss Mayence thrust the programme of the meeting from her. "It is horrible!"

"What do you mean? How can it be horrible?" the disciples replied, surprised and challenging.

"Don't you realise that it would be impudence, cruel, callous, insulting impudence, for the Government to tell the workless, starving people pleading for the right to be treated as human beings, that the way to meet their troubles is not to have children? The people who drafted this resolution had not the ordinary humanity to ask for sustenance for the destitute. How cold-blooded of them to say: 'Of course, if a child is on the way, the best must be made of it!' However cranky they may be about their pet hobby, they cannot be forgiven for not demanding that the child 'that is on the way' and its mother shall, on no account be allowed to suffer. In riding this hobby of theirs, they forget every other consideration; and they do harm, because they lend countenance to the idea that, instead of providing for the population we should reduce its numbers, and that the destitute are to be blamed for their destitution."

"But what is the good of bringing children into the world one can't provide for?"

"It's sheer madness!"

"Prevention of births is the most obvious remedy."

Miss Mayence had a chorus against her.

"Obvious! Yes, too obvious! Let the Government mind its own business: its business is to see that the people are provided for. People are not to blame for being unemployed: it is not their fault. They have a right to choose whether they will have children or not."

"They've no right to have children when they can't afford to keep them."

"They ought to be provided with what they and their children need. You will be asking next for people to be punished for having children if their income does not reach a certain standard."

"An excellent proposal. I should certainly approve it," said Miss Arthur. "People have no right to burden the community with the children they can't maintain. You must recognise, surely, that the community is the ultimate sufferer from parental imprudence."

Miss Mayence turned on her heatedly:

"Oh, you individualist! Your conception of life is hideous. What right have you to tell another woman: 'You may not have a child, because your man has lost his work'? Already the rich have a terribly great power to determine the lives of the workers. They can force young people who love each other to suppress their natural instincts, to chain down the fresh enthusiasm of their affections. They can rob them of confidence and all security and burden them with care, by lowering their wages. They can make them cowed and hopeless; even degrade them and break them down altogether, by refusing to employ them. You would like to set another hall-mark on the inordinate power of the employer."

The pale-eyed young man with receding chin and pointed nose had listened in silence; his wrists crossed over each other as though he were handcuffed, his feet awkwardly placed, as though he had but recently acquired them and had not become accustomed to them yet. His cheap, ready-made clothes were new and sat uncomfortably upon him. His stiff collar seemed to hurt his neck.

"Excuse me, Miss," he said slowly, "but do you think the poor ought to be allowed to go on breeding in ignorance? The swells don't have these big families; they know how to stop it; why should you object to the poor being put wise to it, too?"

Miss Mayence felt baffled: he was one of the exploited who do not know it. She answered him patiently: "I agree that everyone should be put in possession of all there is to know about such things, and I am sure birth control is a convenience to many people; a help to them in their difficult circumstances. I am not opposing it. What I object to is that it should be coupled with unemployment, and that the Government should be asked to advise the prevention of children, instead of shouldering the responsibility of preventing poverty. It is selfish for those who are comfortable to advocate birth prevention for the poor, instead of recognising that we are all human beings and ought to help each other out, and share alike. There would not be any poverty if we were not too selfish and foolish to do that.

"I understand that the people who go into Parliament and the Government, go there to protect certain interests; I know they believe in Capitalism. I know they think Socialism, Communism, I ought to say, because I do not mean State Socialism, I mean all working together and using what we need, without measure or payment; I know they believe that is contrary to human nature. I know they believe that people can only be forced to produce by individual economic pressure, and will only work fro mindividual self-interest. Whoever believes that people could work together on an equal footing for the common benefit, ought to say so openly and work for it. We ought not to countenance the idea that limiting the population will ever put things right under Capitalism; we ought not to countenance the idea that it is right, or even tolerable that people should be forced not to have children, for want of food.

"It is often difficult to make people understand how terribly cruel the present system is, when the economic questions that are a little difficult and apparently a little remote from everyone's daily life are under discussion. But when it is the question of unemployment; when we see those thousands of unfortunate out-of-work's go marching past, everyone must understand the terrible injustice of their sufferings, and no one ought to attempt to fog the issue by dragging in side issues of this kind. I must say it is difficult to understand how the hardened old politicians can bear the responsibility of ignoring those masses of miserable people. Think of their election speeches, and the professions they make of willingness to consecrate their lives to the service of the people. Think of the eulogies they have to listen to whenever they appear on a platform! However blinded they are by class-prejudice and political fallacies, they must know they are traitors to what they pretend is their trust when they are faced with that!"

The unemployed, shabby and pale and hungry, were tramping past with their banners.

"No one ought to help them to cast their responsibility back on the poor, for whose plight they have assumed responsibility.

"I cannot understand how any organisation pretending to be progressive could frame and try to press on the Government a resolution dealing with unemployment, which makes no suggestion of any help for the unemployed and merely asks for them to be told not to get any more children till they are in a position to support them.

"In spite of all your enthusiasm; all your books about 'Married Love' and 'Wise Parenthood,' you are helping to accelerate a revival of the callous, narrow-minded meanness, not quite so common to-day as it used to be, that makes idle, self-indulgent middle-class women spend their time complaining because their servants have the instincts of average young women, and abusing the poor for having large families and not saving at the expense of their half-starved children.

"It would not matter so much if it was only the well-to-do who have such ideas; but the workers, and especially the black-coated workers, unfortunately share the ideology of the employing class; they take it in with the evening paper, and thousands of working men and women, even to-day, when they are faced with other people's destitution, instead of realising that the system ought to be smashed, simply blame the unfortunates for their poverty.

"Some of your enthusiastic converts may even be so zealous for birth control, that they will forget to be indignant that the Government is cutting down even the grudging, inadequate supply of milk to necessitous mothers and babies, which was so fashionable and so much advertised not long ago.

"By mixing up your birth control propaganda with unemployment and poverty, you are creating a wrong ideal, and pandering to selfishness. You are undermining the poor, feeble social conscience of the nation: it is a fragile, miserable thing at best. You ought to shrink from doing anything to stifle the poor babe!

Continued on page 4.

"Dreadnought" Development Fund.

A. G. Page 5s., D. E. Williams £5, Mrs. and Mr. Chappelow £1, Mrs. Hulley Rawlins £1, Mr. E. Dean 1s., Mr. Katritsky £1. Total, £8 6s.

HISTORIC BACKGROUND OF THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO.

V.

Just as Darwin's theories marked the culminating point of an attempt at finding a guiding principle in the investigation of organic life, so the theory of social development known as the Materialist Conception of History, formulated by Marx and Engels, was destined to mark the culminating point of an attempt to find a guiding principle, a method of research in the investigation of historic-social laws.

Before proceeding with the analysis of the new tendency in the realm of social research we will digress for a moment or two to sketch briefly the character of the men who reduced Socialism to a science.

Marx was perhaps the greatest genius mankind ever produced. His contemporaries—Darwin, Huxley, Spencer—grew to fame during their lifetime, but as time proceeds, their popularity wanes. Marx, on the other hand, persecuted by the various capitalist governments, little known—except in intellectual circles—during his lifetime, is becoming ever more and more known as time passes, and his doctrines are taking on life while millions struggle for their realisation.

His philosophy was not intended merely to interpret the world, but to change it. And now that the race is in the progress of transformation, that the new order is struggling against the old, the millions throughout the world who struggle for the coming day are ever more and more to recognise in Marx their prophet, leader and teacher. And as yet we are far from comprehending—let alone reaching up to—the heights which he attained.

The genius of Marx may best be understood when we recall the fact that, at the time of the writing of the Communist Manifesto, he was but twenty-eight years old, and that in it are contained essentially, though not fully worked out, all the doctrines he ever taught. In the realm of art where, in his creative work, the genius merely aims at self-expression, at giving life and substance to his own inner make-up; there have been geniuses who produced their masterpieces at an early age, i.e., Shelley, Goethe, Heine; But in the realm of philosophy, requiring years of objective study and serene contemplation, the genius, as a rule, does not produce his best works until a late, mature age. In this realm, Marx was the only genius who wrote his master-work when still under thirty—all his subsequent writings being but elaborations, amplifications and expansions of the doctrines outlined in the Manifesto.

Marx's genius again manifested itself in its realism. Many were the thinkers in the field of sociology, contemporaries and predecessors of Marx, who saw the iniquities and inequalities of the present order of society, and dreamt of a future society—class-less, based upon the 'universal brotherhood of man." But Marx was the only one who studied the reality of the bourgeois order and concluded that Communism must be the inevitable outcome therefrom. Marx's realism is most clearly shown in his theories regarding the State.

The State had been the subject matter of jurists and philosophers for centuries, yet all alike failed in its correct interpretation. Marx clearly saw the nature of the State, its historic rôle and historic tendency: "Political power, properly so called, is merely the organised power of one class for oppressing another. If the proletariat, during its contest with the bourgeoisie, is compelled, by force of circumstances, to organise itself as a class; if, by means of a revolution, it makes itself the ruling class, and as such, sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, then it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonisms, and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class. In place of the old bourgeois society, with classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all."

When we consider the fact that men like Kautsky and Plekhanov, who devoted their lives to the cause of the social revolution, lost their heads before the object of their own creation—the Russian Revolution—and then contrast this with Marx's attitude towards the Paris Commune, though he foresaw its failure, Marx's realism stands out most vividly.

Here was a man with a rare combination of gifts: a philosopher, yet not content with mere speculations; a prophet, yet a careful student of contemporary and past history; a destroyer of the existing order and at the same time a builder of the future order.

As to Engels—the very fact that he clung to Marx for forty years shows that he was a man of no mean abilities, for only "a mountain can see a mountain." Contrariwise, the fact that Marx was able to maintain almost a lifelong friendship with Engels, whereas with most of his other contemporaries he quarrelled and separated after a brief acquaintance, is indicative of Marx's esteem and admiration for Engels.

Engels' modesty, which always prompted him to keep himself largely in the background, and his recognition of the value of Marx's teachings which he was anxious to bring before the whole Socialist world, contributed in a great measure to the fact that in modern Socialist circles only Marx and Marxism are generally spoken of. A careful study, however, should convince any one that Engels should equally share with Marx the title of "founder of scientific Socialism."

It would seem as if Marx and Engels had been predestined for one another. Their's was one of those rare cases of friendship where each one, by placing himself unreservedly at the service of his co-worker, is thereby himself elevated. It is impossible to conceive that, without the aid of Engels—financial, moral and intellectual—Marx could have accomplished his enormous task. Theirs was a combination of two complements forming one harmonious whole.

It was but fitting that Marx and Engels should have been the giants they were. For the cause they served was the greatest ever espoused or championed by man. All previous changes in the social make-up were but changes in form—changes in rulership from one minority to another minority. The impending change—the one championed by Marx and Engels—is to make a fundamental change in the structure of society; it is to be a change in the interest of the whole race. This historic movement is "to complete the primary history of man." Such a movement could not be championed by any one at all. It required a genius of first magnitude—hence, Marx. Again, without Engels, Marx could not have brought his teachings into light. Destiny itself seems to favor the proletariat.

(To be continued.)

INDIA'S SILENT REVOLUTION.

(From an Indian Correspondent.)

At last the Karachi State Trial (in which the Ali Brothers, Sri Sankaracharya and four other leaders, were charged with sedition, rebellion, and tampering with the loyalty of the military) was over. The jury gave a verdict that there was no proof that the accused tampered with the loyalty of the troops, and consequently the Bureaucracy had withdrawn the main important charges. Sri Sankaracharya was acquitted, and the other six leaders were sentenced under petty sections of the Bureaucratic law to two years' rigorous imprisonment. The very fact that the main charges were withdrawn indicates a *volte face* on the part of the Bureaucracy. That is clearly a moral triumph of the leaders over the Bureaucracy. The moment the leaders were arrested and the State trial began, the whole country passed a resolution from a number of platforms urging the military, civil and police, to boycott their services. 400 soldiers applied to Mr. Gandhi for advice. Now and then you find the members of civil and military services slowly waking up from their slumber and accepting the congress programme of non-co-operation. Ere long we shall succeed.

On November 8th the All-India Congress Committee (the Executive Committee of the Indian National Congress) met at Delhi, the cremation ground of many an Empire, and adopted Civil Disobedience. The resolution of the Committee runs as follows:—

"Whereas there is not much over a month for the fulfilment of the National determination to establish Swarajya before the end of the year, and whereas the Nation has demonstrated its capacity for exemplary self-restraint by observing perfect non-violence over the arrest and imprisonment of Ali Brothers and other leaders, and whereas it is desirable for the Nation to demonstrate its capacity for further suffering and discipline sufficient for the attainment of Swvarajya, the All-India Congress Committee authorises every province on its own responsibility authorises Civil Disobedience, including non-payment of taxes, in the manner that may be considered the most suitable by respective Provincial Congress Committees subject to the following conditions:—

(a) In the event of individual Civil Disobedience the individual must know hand-spinning and must have completely fulfilled that part of the programme which is applicable to him or her, *e.g.*, he or she must have entirely discarded the use of foreign cloth and adopted only hand-spun and hand-woven garments, must be a believer in Hindu-Muslim unity and in the unity between all communities professing different religions in India as an article of faith, must believe in non-violence as absolutely essential to the redress of the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs and the attainment of Swarajya, and if a Hindu must, by his personal conduct, shows that he regards untouchability as a blot upon Nationalism.

(b) In the event of mass Civil Disobedience a district or tahsil should be created as a unit, and therein a vast majority of population must have adopted full Swadeshi and be clothed out of clothes hand-spun and hand-woven in that district or tahsil, and must believe in and practise all other items of Non-co-operation, provided that no civil resisters should expect to be supported out of public funds, and members of the family of civil resisters undergoing sentence will be expected to support themselves by earning hand-spinning and hand-weaving or any other means, provided further that upon application by any Provincial Congress Committee it is open to the Working Committee to relax the conditions for Civil Disobedience."

The decision was arrived at by the Congressmen after a careful and deep deliberation, and it is pregnant with far-reaching consequences. The struggles for freedom going on in other parts of the world have as their basis the dynamic energy of national brute-force. But in India we have broken new ground, and show a great, noble and dignified path wherein the punishment is not inflicted on anybody but on the civil resister "leaving the opponent to suffer only the moral qualms of conscience if there be any left in him." As one scans the above resolution, one will certainly find that it is more restrictive than loose. It imposes some conditions which make it well-nigh impossible for any big province, much less a district, to undertake it. Gandhi's enemies must thank him for that. Gandhi wants order and peace. Many members of the Committee brought amendment after amendment to lessen the rigour of the conditions imposed, but Gandhi stuck to his guns and succeeded in bringing other members to his side. Gandhi cautiously undertakes mass civil disobedience, and under his direct supervision it will eb first initiated in Gujerat, and then other parts of India will follow.

As for individual civil disobedience there are innumerable persons in India who can satisfy the conditions imposed in the resolution, and ere long in all provinces of India individual civil disobedience will be the order of the day. This form of civil disobedience was practised in one form or other in other climes of the world, and has been attended more or less with success. Christ himself led the way in religious matters. Tolstoy preached it; and Thorean practised it. Thoreau truly said:—

"I know this well that if one thousand, if one hundred, if ten men whom I would name—if ten honest men only—ay, if one honest man in this State of Massachusetts ceasing to hold slaves, were actually to withdraw from this co-partnership, and be locked up in the county jail, it would be the abolition of slavery in America. . . . Because, under a government which imprisons men unjustly, the true place for a just man is also a prison."

Such is the sublime philosophy underlying individual civil disobedience, and then who daresay that it is not bound to achieve its end?

TOLSTOI FOR THE YOUNG.

Translated by R. S. TOWNSEND. With 6 Coloured Plates.

From *WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT* OFFICE, 152, Fleet Street, E.C. 4.

JUST OUT. NEW EDITION.

COMMUNISM AND THE FAMILY

KOLLONTAY'S SPLENDID PAMPHLET.

Price - 4d.

Tells what everyone wants to know about life under Communism.

Strikes a blow at Capitalist Social Conventions.

From *WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT* Office, 152, Fleet Street, E.C. 4.

Workers' Dreadnought
FOUNDED 1914.
Editor: SYLVIA PANKHURST.

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 3/3
SIX MONTHS (26 weeks) ... " " 6/6
ONE YEAR (52 weeks) ... " " 13/-

Vol. VIII. No. 40. Saturday, Dec. 17, 1921.

THE SINN FEIN HOME POLICY.

Agrarian Unrest.

"Only in the West, in Clare, and parts of Kerry, was the land war producing such a storm as would ultimately rouse the Dail from its lethargy, like an angry mother to punish an unruly child . . . in the West they were confusing licence with liberty. . . ."—MR. ART O'CONNOR, Minister of Agriculture under Dail Eireann, in his Departmental Report, August, 1921.

"In County Kerry . . . a violent dispute between labourers who were demanding land, and farmers who were refusing it, had assumed an ugly complexion. Boycotting, burning of crops and threatening letters were rife. Both sides . . . were evidently Republican. . . . Mr. O'Connor was able to ease the strife for a time by an appeal to patriotism. . . ."

"The same class of agitation spread like a prairie fire throughout the South and West. . . . Terrified landowners flocked up to Dublin to beseech protection from the Dail. It is an interesting fact that these aggrieved landowners, persons, for the most part, with strong British sympathies, were the first to advocate the prompt institution of a judiciary responsible to Dail Eireann."—Pamphlet 2, on the constructive work of Dail Eireann. (Talbot Press, Dublin.)

"It is not too much to say that . . . in the West, South and Midlands, where the land agitation was raging, the Arbitration Courts saved society from anarchy. . . . There was a moment when it seemed nothing could prevent wholesale expropriation. But the crisis was surmounted, thanks to a patriotic public opinion, and the civic sense of justice, expressed through Arbitration Courts, and enforced by the Republican police."—Pamphlet 1, on the constructive work of Dail Eireann.

The above extracts show that, in 1920, Ireland was on the verge of an agrarian Revolution; but that Sinn Fein, which is at present dominated by the small middle class, stepped in and eased the situation by appeals to patriotism, concessions to popular land-hunger and coercion. Mr. Art O'Connor describes one of the land court cases tried in May 1920, at Ballinrobe. A farm of a little over 100 acres was held jointly by two men—Murphy and Hylan. A crowd of small holders possessing small miserable holdings, some of not more than £2 Poor Law valuation, had swarmed on to the farm. The Court declared that Murphy and Hylan had large families and the land was barely sufficient for them, and that the smallholders should have turned their attention a large ranch of 700 acres in the hands of the Congested Districts Board. The claimants were indignant at the decision and continued to occupy the disputed land, but four of them were arrested and taken to prison in "an unknown destination." Thereupon the agitation collapsed.

Nevertheless, the Land Courts, in many cases found land for landless claimants, and according to Pamphlet 2, on the constructiev work of Dail Eireann, "some curbing legislation was found necessary."

The Minister of Home Affairs introduced, on June 29th, 1920, a decree that land claimants asserting that they or their ancestors were formerly in possession, must obtain a licence from the Minister of Home Affairs before their claims could be tried; the Land Settlement Commission was also set up to control its own Land Courts, to consist of one Legal Commissioner and two Lay Commissioners appointed by the President of Dail Eireann in consultation with the Minister of Agriculture. The egal Commissioner must be a practising barrister of not less than three years' standing.

All judgments pronounced by the popularly elected Land Courts, now superseded, were to be lodged with the Land Commission, which might confirm them, or order a re-hearing before its own Courts.

A Communist inquiry into the decisions of the earlier popularly-elected Land Courts and the later officially-appointed Courts would probably yield interesting results. We should be glad to hear from Irish comrades who can supply information in this regard.

The Special Land Courts sat from May to December, 1920, and the Land Commission Courts, between January and June, 1921.

In the first period, 229 cases were dealt with, and land was alienated in 83 cases. In the second period, 70 cases were dealt with, and land was alienated in 29 cases.

Inquiry into Resources and Industries.

A Commission of Inquiry into Irish Industries and Natural Resources was set up by Dail Eireann in 1919. It reported on milk production, stock-breeding farms for pure-bred dairy cattle, Irish coalfields, industrial alcohol, and sea fisheries. Up to the present these reports do not appear to have been acted upon, but the situation with Britain would account for that.

A Department of Trade and Commrece was set up in 1919. This appears to have been successful, through the Irish Republican Consulates, in promoting trade with America, France and Belgium.

Co-operation and the Dail.

In the autumn of 1919, Professor McNeill issued a report pointing out the great prospects for an Irish meat-dressing and packing industry; the annual export of cattle, sheep and lambs valuing £21,000,000. Professor McNeill declared there was a grave danger of a Meat Trust dealing with such an industry springing up in Ireland, controlled by absentee British directors. The Dail therefore took steps for the promotion of a Co-operative; a capital of £200,000 was subscribed, several creameries taking £500 worth of shares each. The project has been held up on account of the destruction of property by the British military.

TO A "STYLIST" REVIEWER.

There was a man of learning,
Who in life had a great yearning
To write a book or two
And be one of the few,
So to "Translate" he took, with great discerning.

IRISH REPRISALS.

At Carrickmore, County Tyrone, Roman Catholic quarrymen, by way of reprisal for the exclusion of Catholics from the Belfast shipyards, refused to work with Protestants. Countess Markievicz, Dail Eireann, Minister of Labour, thereupon wrote stating that unless the boycott of Protestants were withdrawn the matter would be "put into the hands of the Republican police."

This letter is cited as an example of Sinn Fein tolerance, but Sinn Fein has not shown a like tolerance where its own affairs are concerned, and by its fighting policy Sinn Fein has secured a victory, even though that victory may not be so complete as it desired. Certainly Sinn Fein never shrank from reprisals!

What has Sinn Fein done to protect the Catholic dockyard workers of Belfast? Whatever has been done has neither restored these unfortunate men to their occupations, nor preserved their families from want. They are here agitating amongst British workers for assistance, and collecting pennies in Trafalgar Square.

The Catholic quarrymen of Carrickmore have discovered what they hope may be a means of assisting their comrades. We should prefer other means, yet, since they find no other to their hand we cannot blame those who employ it.

Certainly we consider it both hypocritical of the Dail to threaten the quarrymen with police action, and a dangerous precedent.

LOOK OUT FOR
GERMINAL
A MAGAZINE
of MODERNITY
MONTHLY ONE SHILLING

:: CORRESPONDENCE. ::

UNEMPLOYED AND BIRTH CONTROL.

Dear Editor,—In your article on the above subject, I think, to some extent, you misunderstand our aims and what we are trying to do for the unemployed in this connection.

So many whose hearts are wrung by present-day conditions of unemployment imagine that it is a matter easy to deal with and exceptional, whereas, as a matter of fact, very similar problems have existed for generations, and I read only yesterday in the British Museum, in a paper called the *Free Labour Journal* for the year 1868, giving an account of a meeting on unemployment, the following: "The unemployed surplus labour of Trades Unions might be profitably employed in building suitable dwellings." Might not this have been written to-day?

This grave problem which has puzzled the biggest brains, the wisest statesmen, and the most sympathetic social reformers for generations cannot be settled by me or our Birth Control Society all at once. What we offer, however, is immediate help to individual married couples who live in the added fear of distress that their love for each other may bring a weak or unwanted child to share their temporary misery. The help of birth control can be given promptly and effectively to these individuals and thus reduce the terrors of their time of distress, giving them voluntary control over their parenthood so as to defer adding to their families until happier times come.

Sound knowledge and sympathetic help is to be obtained by the unemployed at the Mothers' Clinic, 61, Marlborough Road, Holloway, N.19, and because it primarily deals with individual cases and not with the great international problem, I am sure, if you will reflect, you will welcome that measure of help which we are able to give without demanding from us an impossible achievement.

Yours faithfully,
(Sd.) MARIE C. STOPES,
President, Society for Constructive Birth Control and Racial Progress.

[Dr. Stopes says: "This grave problem cannot be settled by me or our Birth Control Society all at once."

Obviously it cannot, but we must widen the statement: "The problem of unemployment can never be settled by birth control."

It is, of course, true, as Dr. Stopes points out, that the problem of unemployment has existed for generations; it is also true that the population limitation theories of Malthus flourished exceedingly in the lean years following the Napoleonic wars.

The modern embodiment of these theories will be no more successful in eradicating unemployment than were their predecessors.

We are not opposed to the spread of knowledge by the Birth Control Society, but we must point out that the limitation of families provides no remedy for evil social conditions, and the exploitation of the workers. Wages are being crushed down to the subsistence level, and if the average working-class family becomes smaller the wage will simply be lowered.]

FRANK PENMAN—*continued from page 2.*

"If only people would desire, really desire, that life, for us all, should be passed in care-free security and abundance! If only they would cease to regard each other greedily as rivals, as a horde of hungry mouths and grasping hands, ever threatening their own supply of the means of existence! If only they would cease to regard the child as a burden! It is a false and stultifying view of life."

Miss Mayence knew that she spoke to deaf ears. The birth control enthusiasts regarded her as an irrational being, a wilful obstructionist, or a prejudiced ignoramus.

Frank Penman had not heard the discussion: he was drawing in his note-book. She met Bistre's sympathetic eyes.

"It is only a makeshift," he repeated; "an unpleasant necessity for some unfortunate people; purely a personal matter, calling neither for interference, nor agitation. No intelligent person would waste five minutes discussing it."

He engaged Miss Mayence in discussing a photograph in an illustrated paper of the vegetation on the moon.

'LEFT WING' COMMUNIST MEETINGS

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 17TH,
Wren's Road, Camberwell Green, 8 p.m.

REVOLUTIONARY ESSAYS.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

III.

Are we prepared to face the Revolution which approaches? Shall we have the audacity of thought which our fathers lacked, frankly to decide the immense economic, political and moral problems in face of which history has placed us? These were the questions which we put at the close of the last article.

It is certain that many things contribute to give to the men of our century a boldness of thought which was wanting in our grandfathers.

The great discoveries of natural science in which our generation has assisted or taken part, is a fact to give thought a daring without precedent. Entire sciences, created but yesterday, have just opened to us immense horizons which our fathers could not perceive. The unity of physical force explaining the whole of the phenomena of nature, including the physical life of animals and man, is a fact to permit us to have bold conceptions of the whole of natural phenomena.

The criticism of religions is made with a depth and sometimes a boldness hitherto impossible. All the scaffolding of venerated prejudices concerning the divine origin of human institutions and the so-called laws of Providence, which served to explain and perpetuate slavery—all that scaffolding has fallen, under the criticism of science. And that criticism has already penetrated to the depths of the masses.

Man has been able to understand his place in nature. He had been able to perceive that he, himself, has made *his* institutions, and that he alone can re-make them.

Besides which, the idea of stability, which was hitherto attached to everything which man saw in nature, is broken down, destroyed and brought to naught! Everything changes in nature, everything is incessantly modified: systems, wages, planets, climates, varieties of plants and animals, the human species. Why should human institutions perpetuate themselves?

Nothing remains; everything modifies itself, from the rock which appears to us immovable, and the continent we call "terra firma," to the inhabitants, their manners, their customs, their ideas.

What we see around us is only a passing phenomenon which *ought* to modify itself, because immobility would be death. These are the conceptions to which modern science accustoms us.

But this conception dates almost from yesterday. Arago is almost our contemporary. And yet, when he spoke one day of continents which sometimes arose out of the seas, and were sometimes submerged by the waves, a learned friend made this remark: "But your continents spring up then like mushrooms," so much was the idea of immobility, of stability in nature, rooted in the mind at this epoch; to-day continual change, evolution, is one of the most popular terms.

And we now begin to understand, however vaguely, that revolution is only an essential part of evolution; that no evolution is accomplished in nature without revolutions. Periods of very slow changes are succeeded by periods of violent changes. Revolutions are as necessary for evolution as the slow changes which prepare them and succeed them.

Life is a continual development, and the plant, the animal, the individual, the society which sticks fast and remains in the same state, will perish and die. This is the mother-idea of modern philosophy, and we may judge from it how much encouragement we have for daring sufficient to change everything.

And besides all this, consider the rapidity of the conquests of the human mind during this century, behold in it—Boldness!

"DARE!" Such is the order of the day in mechanical art. Dare to conceive an arch of 650 yards span, thrown across an arm of the sea at a height of 110 yards—and you will succeed, as they have succeeded on the Firth of Forth. Dare to conceive a tower 325 yards high, and you will have it! Dare to cut through Suez or Panama, to unite France and England by a tunnel, to bore the Alps. Dare to start a cockle-shell of 200 tons with a wide expanse of sail, and you will cross the Atlantic in a fortnight by no other force than the wind. Dare to compress steam fourfold, dare to put an explosive under the piston of your motor; fear nothing! Dare to throw the human voice from Paris to London, and you will transmit the feeble vibrations of the human voice across the twenty miles of the Channel.

All the history of modern mechanism is only a series of variations of the words of Danton: "*De l'audace, et encore de l'audace!*" (Dare and always dare.)

And this daring has already invaded literature, art, the drama and music. Dare to speak, to write, to paint, to compose, as the heart bids you; and if you have thought, knowledge and talent, you will be listened to and understood, whatever be the novelty of style.

But unfortunately the same daring has failed, up to now, in the domain of politics and social economy. Here, in ideas, as in application, timidity reigns supreme.

It is true that in all the course of the century, political history has had to record defeats only. Victories, gained here and there, have even all the character of defeats.

When one remembers all the heroism displayed before 1848 by Italian, Hungarian, Polish, and Irish patriots, to acquire national independence, and that it is proved that it all ended in defeat, one finds nothing of encouragement.

When one sees how the independence of Italy and Hungary was finally acquired, one blushes for the patriots, for concessions to Imperialism, shameless speculation, and retrograde movements by which their ideal was realised.

Hecatombs of victims in June, 1848, and in May, 1871. Militarism in Germany, re-action in France, under the Empire; fruitless efforts of the Russian youth—all these are not facts to arouse and sustain audacity.

The century does not count one single fact like the Independence of the United States, which gave to the French revolutionist the example of a revolution crowned with success, and increased by distance.

And when we dream of the grandiose promises made by the International at its commencement, of the hopes which it aroused in the hearts of the workers—and that it resulted in the debasement of the *Partis Ouvriers* (Labour Parties), who are proud of being its successors—we can understand the despair that reaches the workman's heart, that he loses faith in the future, that he ends by demanding some trifling ameliorations, instead of taking his freedom.

And yet, nothing is more erroneous than that manner of view spread and maintained by those disgusted by politics. For, as soon as we think of the causes of the want of success and the defeats of our century, we perceive at once that what has led to defeat is, that no one dared to advance; they always had their eyes turned backwards.

Even at the time the revolutionary fever seized the people, they did not seek their ideal in the future, they sought it in the past.

Instead of dreaming of a *new* revolution, they sighed for those of the past.

In 1793 they dreamed of establishing a Rome or an ancient Sparta. In 1848 they wished to re-commence at 1792. In 1848 they admired, in secret, the Jacobins of 1793. The German revolutionist of our days dreams of reproducing 1848, and the Executive Committee of Petrograd take Blanqui and Barbès for their ideal.

Even in constructing a Utopia of future life, none dare break through the laws of antiquity. Ancient Rome presses with all its weight upon our century.

While the engineer, the scholar and the artist boldly throw the past overboard, the politician and the economist seek their inspiration in the past.

Where, in fact, would be the engineer's art if he sought his elements in ancient art? Should we have surpassed the bridges and the aqueducts of the Romans if engineers had not availed themselves of new forces ad new materials placed at their service to arrive at new conceptions? Without availing themselves of new forces, the engineers of the Forth Bridge would only have conceived a Cyclopian masonry to block up an arm of the sea, and to produce an arch which would have surpassed the Roman arches only in its dimensions. Without daring they would not have opened a new era of architecture, by devising to throw across an arm of the sea two Eiffel towers, 300 metres each, laid horizontally, each fixed at its base, and joining at their summits.

And what would the science of the evolution of plants and animals have done if Wallace and Darwin had not insisted on overthrowing the facts and ideas of old books? These pioneers understood that a new science required new observations, and they went to Nature to question her and draw out her secrets; they went to find new bases for new deductions.

Now, this is not what is done in the domain of politics and economics; it is this which explains the timidity of conceptions, and consequently the defeats of our century.

We shall not construct a new society by looking backwards. We shall only do so by studying, as Prudhon has already advised, the *tendencies* of society to-day, and so forecasting the society of to-morrow.

The only basis upon which it is possible to the society of the future, is the *new* conceptions which germinate in men's minds. And these alone can give the revolutionist, aided by his revolutionary fire, the boldness of thought necessary for the success of the Revolution.

Comrade Rose Witcop writes to remind us that the four months which Comrade Guy Aldred spent in prison on remand was not deducted, as is usual, from the 12 months' imprisonment passed on him by the magistrate, so that he will be forced to serve 16 months in all. Having struck against doing prison work the usual one-sixth remission for "good conduct" will not be allowed him.

The Glasgow Communist Group has been sending food into its imprisoned comrades, but the authorities have caused the group heavy expenses. The recent claim of the police to retain and destroy the property of the Glasgow Communist Group on the ground that it was an illegal organisation was dismissed because an Act of Parliament would be required to declare the group illegal. Nevertheless, the group had to pay the costs of the defence. Comrade Witcop writes:—

"The Communist Party of Great Britain undertook to meet the cost of our comrades' defence. But something or other has caused them to change their minds. Perhaps it is our 'Anarch-Syndicalist tendencies' (a phrase coined in Moscow). Anyhow, instead of assisting us they decided that solidarity and their cause can be best served by declaring a boycott on all Bakunin Press publications, so that no branch of the C.P. is permitted to sell or stock them. Under the ban come such books as "Michel Bakunin: Communist"; "God and the State"; "Communism and Religion"; "Family Limitation," by Margaret Sanger; and some stories translated from the Russian as well as some publications of W. W. Strickland, none of which are of a controversial, but purely educational, nature."

The publications of the Bakunin Press may now be obtained from the *Workers' Dreadnought* Bookshop.

Fife Miner Pays 2s. for Five Days' Work.

D.P. writes from Fife that many miners in his district have rarely received more than £1 a week since resuming work after the lock-out owing to attacks on piece rates and increased deductions. In one case a miner after deductions had been made on five days' work had to get 2s. from home to pay his "filler."

The breakaway from the Union is so great, that whereas union contributions in February, 1921, amounted to £5,910 17s. 6d., in September they were only £1,602 2s. 1½d.

ESPERANTO FOR YOUNG BEGINNERS : : 2D. NET.
THE BRITISH ESPERANTO ASSOCIATION,
17, Hart Street, W.C. 1.
May be obtained through our Book Service.

(*Continued from last week.*)

WHAT ARE WE PROGESSING TOWARDS?

By Charles W. Wood.

In China, a couple of years ago, I made the mistake of referring to America as a progressive country.

"What is it progressing toward?" asked a Chinese auditor.

It was a most annoying question—the sort of question an American would never ask. Progresion is progression, isn't it? If we are making progress, isn't that enough?

To-day, however, the question sticks out like a sore thumb. China, admittedly, is backward. China invented gunpowder and stopped, while Europe and America progressed. The result is that China is still playing with fire-crackers while we are enjoying our super-Dreadnoughts. Just now, however, we are trying to stop: and if we weren't so darned progressive, maybe we could. We are as progressive, it seems, as a small boy sliding down a slippery roof. We have been content, so far, to look back at the milestones (perhaps I should say, the foot-shingles) of our progress. Now we are beginning to wonder just where we are going to land.

Undoubtedly America and the other small boys of the West have been progressive. Their objective has been somewhat obscure, but their acceleration was wonderful. Their intentions, too, were strictly honourable. They played the game, to be sure, with considerable abandonment, but it was furthest from their wish to bump anything very hard.

But to-day the *line of progress* seems to enter into our calculations. It does make a difference, after all, what we are progressing toward; but every time the question comes up, the Western mind is all confusion.

If we have another war, the question will be answered. At this time of writing, we seem to be preparing to scrap our battleships; but whether we do or not will make no essential difference; the next war will be a chemical war. The amateur tournament of 1914-18, it seems, was not a real war. It was just a laboratory in which modern science learned how to fight. Before we had our findings completed, the gong rang at Versailles; but when the next round opens, we'll all be ready for it, whether we have any battleships or not.

We aren't planning to scrap our merchantmen. Merchantmen can carry wireless and air-torpedoes. Air-torpedoes can be guided by the wireless, and they can expel little spurts of our newly-invented gas which will destroy whole populations. That is, of course, all except the combatants. The combatants will be provided with protective clothing, specially invented to save them from this gas; but the others, the non-combatants, the women and the children and the live-stock, will all be exterminated.

The next war will be the last war; we may bank on that. With the women out of the way, the combatants will soon die off. Then we shall have peace as far as the *genus homo* is concerned. It won't cost much, either, compared with an old-fashioned battleship war. The death-bed of the race will undoubtedly be cheered by the reflection that the income tax is eventually coming down.

It seems plain that we are progressing towards extinction. China, to be sure, may not figure in this progress. Not only is she too backward, scientifically speaking, but her masses are altogether too unpatriotic to fight. If a people simply won't fight us, we can't very well fight them.

In making these calculations then, it is necessary to classify the nations of earth into two classes: those we are going to fight, and those we are going to fight about. Nations too backward and too unpatriotic to go to war can expect no consideration. They must become the prey of the progressive countries; that is, until the progressive countries have all exterminated each other. That, according to the calculations of our American military experts, should occur about 1934.

I do not promise, remember, that we shall have another war. All I know is that another war, if we do have one, will be the last. And I know that, whether we scrap our battleships or not, we are at present heading for another war. We can't avoid it without changing our *line of progress*, and nobody much is suggesting that.

Americans do not believe in peace. They may think they do, but they believe in progress instead. They believe in progress along competitive lines, and progress along competitive lines is war. We are optimistic about it all, somewhat in the spirit of a fellow-countryman who recently jumped from the roof of a New York skyscraper; passing the fifteenth floor, on his way down, this gentleman was heard to observe that "nothing has happened so far." In spite of our optimism and our geniality, however, it is the line of progress which really counts.

Peace in America is unconstituitonal. Fundamentally, we are orgaised to compete. The accumulation of property is our goal. There are 100,000,000 of us all figiting with each other to get as much of this property as we can: and while we have established certain rules as to the conduct of the struggle, we are uniformly determined that the struggle itself shall not cease.

A lot of us work at useful occupations in America, but not intentionally. We work for wages, and if we can make higher wages by doing something useless, we do that. No one much, however, works unless he has to; there is more money in business than there is in producing wealth; so all who can do so go in for non-production. This results in less aggregate wealth and a consequently keener struggle; thus is the American character built up.

But we are decidedly progressive in our competition. We apply modern science to the struggle. Just as we have progressed nationally from monitors to battleships, and finally to gases and air equipment which make the battleships dispensable, so we have constantly improved our units of business competition. The old-fashioned, unequipped competitor is no longer in the running. We are now going after world trade in competition with the biggest and most thoroughly-equipped competitors in the world. It may be observed, incidentally, that we are very optimistic in the prospect. "Nothing has happened so far."

But how to organise a whole world on competitive lines is a knotty problem. Perfect the means of competition. Make the competitive units more and more powerful, while constantly restricting the sphere in which they may compete; then figure out, if you can, how to keep the competitors from getting in each other's way. That was the task of the Washington Conference. The Conference, I believe, brought all the genius to the task that could be expected from them; but did they, or can they, solve the problem?

There is obviously only one answer: War cannot be averted so long as progress is married to competition. If we could compete without progressing, we might conceivably remain just where we are—on the verge of war, but never falling in—an eternal armistice made possible by a general inability to get business started.

If, on the other hand, we could progress without competing—but what's the use? The idea is utterly inconceivable to the American mind. It will take another war, I fancy, to get the idea over; and since there won't be any America if there is another war, that prospect does not seem to promise much.

I do not mean to be pessimistic. Another war wouldn't be such a tragedy as it seems, perhaps; for a dead race is not much worse off than a race engaged in competing against itself. No one was ever made happy by success in such a struggle. It has become an axiom that riches are a fraud. American and English missionaries have been teaching this to the Chinese for many years. America and England are now demonstrating it.

Joy comes, not from having things, but from doing things. Not from getting, but from giving. Not from accumulation, but from creation. Not from property, but from function.

Two thousand years ago, a crazy Galilean seized this great truth. It is more blessed to give, he said, than to receive. It was only to those who were liberated from property, in fact, that he could talk at all. He said that a rich man could not possibly get into the "kingdom of Heaven"—a social order which should be founded upon service instead of upon possessions; and only by seeking first this order, he said, would it be possible for us to enjoy the material fruits of our toil to any extent worth while. Competition, he declared, was a dead loss, while justice, in the matter of the distribution of property, wasn't worth fighting for. So long as property existed, it seems, he was for letting the other fellow have it: that is, ending the establishment of the "kingdom," when property should no longer exist and the whole race should be freed to serve.

That guy was sure enough crazy, but he was right. The Christian Church, for 2,000 years, has done all it could to explode his theories, but it has failed.

The world continued to organise on the old lines, and it got along fairly well until the era of progress came. That finished things. They that believed not, were damned, just as the Galilean said they would be. Among those present in the damnation were America and Europe. Whether China shall participate depends entirely on whether she accepts our line of progress or not.

Which brings me to the present chatter in regard to China and the Washington Conference. The newspapers are full of it. You can hear it from almost every platform. The Embassies are all buzzing with the same big idea. It goes like this:

The whole world is in danger of war. China is the big issue—the stake for which the world is preparing, in spite of itself, to fight. All the big, strong, central governments on earth will be drawn into this conflict, if it comes. What, then, should China do? Why, establish a big, strong central government, of course. Organise along national lines, so that she can compete with the best of them. This, say all the weird prophets who are sliding from the world's roof, constitutes China's "opportunity."

Can you beat it? What is a young man to do in the midst of such chatter as this? The world is hopelessly insane, and the more it learns in the direction it is going, the crazier it becomes. Let us continue to fight each other, but let us fight in a spirit of peace and goodwill. Let us all continue to go crazy, but let us all tie our left hands. Let us fall, all together, from the world's roof, but let's not fall too hard. And finally, if there is any nation so backward that it hasn't got over the edge as yet, let it lose no time in following our example.

These people who talk this way, remember, are our leaders. Almost unanimously, we admit their premises, and if they seem, at the time, to be crazier than the rest of us, it is only because they have carried our logic a little farther than we have ever thought it out.

I have not suggested that we may avoid damnation after all. It is almost against the law in America to suggest anything of the sort. To avoid hitting the ground is an admittedly fine ambition but to suggest that we quit sliding on the roof if we don't want to slide off—that, according to every true American, is contrary to human nature. Some day, after the funeral, the remnants of humanity, if there are any remnants will organise a different sort of game. Necessarily, it will be along the Galilean lines, though though there need not be any mystic bunk about it. It will be anti-war, anti-competition, anti-property. And no American will object to it, for there won't be any Americans to object. But in the meantime, hurrah for progress! Altogether now—For God and Country—America First!

What, I repeat, is a young man to do? There is the occasional individual, you know, to whom this progress toward extinction may not appeal.

The first thought is to enlist in the army, since all the non-combatants will be the first to die; but that means death from old age in a womanless country, rather than immediate demise by gas. It is possible of course, that we might escape from America after the war and go to China, or one of the other countries which refused to progress. Possible, but not probable. I hardly think they'd let us in.

Continued on page 8.

THE MAIN QUESTIONS OF REVOLUTIONARY TACTICS.

(Proposed principles of the K.A.P.D. (Communist Party) submitted to the Third Moscow Congress of the III. International.)

(a) Principles relating to the role of the Party in the Proletarian Revolution.

I.

(1) It is the historic object of the proletarian revolution to place into the hands of the working classes the power of disposing of the treasures on this earth, to abolish private property in the means of production, and thereby to make impossible the existence of a possessing, exploiting and dominating class. The aim is to free the social system of all fetters of political force; of course, internationally.

(2) The actual abolition of the capitalist method of production, the passing of the entire production and distribution into the hands of the working class, the abolition of all class distinctions, the dying out of all political institutions, and the building up of Communist Society is a historical process, the various issues of which cannot all be determined precisely in advance. Concerning the question as to what part political force will play in this process, however, several points may be determined with accuracy.

II.

(3) *The proletarian revolution is at the same time a political and an economic process.* It can neither as a political nor as an economic process be terminated within national limits; on the contrary, the object necessary for its existence is the establishing of a world commune. From this follows that until the final conquest of the power of capital throughout the world the conquering sections of the proletariat still exercise political power for its defence, and, if possible, for an attack upon the outer-political power of the counter-revolution.

(4) To the outer-political reasons that necessitate for the conquering sections of the proletariat the continuance of a political power (also in its own sphere of domination) reasons of the inner development are added. The revolution considered as a political process certainly has a decisive moment; the moment of seizing political power. The revolution considered as an economic process has, however, no such decisive moment, as the concrete taking over of production by the proletariat and the transformation of production for profit into production for use is a task of long duration. It is self-understood that during this process the bourgeoisie will leave no stone unturned to defend their profit, and for this purpose, again to seize political power. To this end it will endeavour in countries of an advanced democratic idealogy—that is to say, in the old industrial countries—to have recourse especially to misleading the proletariat by democratic watchwords defending them. In view of this a strong and resolute political power of the revolutionary workers is needed at least until the concrete passing of production and distribution into the hands of the proletariat is accomplished, and the bourgeoisie has thereby been deprived of the economic basis of its existence. That is the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

III.

(5) The necessity of the political domination of the revolutionary proletariat, even after the political victory of the revolution, proves at the same time the necessity of a political organisation of the revolutionary proletariat after, as well as before, the time of seizing political power.

(6) The political workers' councils (Soviets) are the historically developed broad form of organisation of proletarian domination and administration; they appear at times on the plane as the class struggle rises to a head and develops into a fight for the entire political power.

(7) The historically developed form of organisation for uniting the most conscious, clearest and most entire proletarian fighters is the *Party*. As the entire aim of the proletarian revolution is Communism, this Party can *only be a Party Communist in principles and program and in spirit.* The Communist Party must be an organisation sound in first principles, united in revolutionary will and determination, and uniformly organised and disciplined from down below upwards. It must be *the head and the weapon of the revolution.*

IV.

(8) The first task of the Communist Party before, as well as after, seizing political power is: *in the confusion and vacillations of the proletarian revolution to cling firmly and unswervingly to the only reliable anchor—Communism.* The Communist Party must in all situations show the proletarian masses the aim and the way untiringly and without wavering, not only with words, but also with deeds.

It must in all questions of the political struggle before seizing power press most vigoriously for a decision between reform and revolution, it must unmaske every reformist solution as a patching-up and prolonging of the old system of exploitation, as a betrayal of the revolution, that is to say, of the interest of the entire working class. For just as little a community of interests can exist between exploiters and exploited so little can a political alliance exist between revolution and reform; reformism, of socialdemocratic origin, under whatever guise it may seek to hide, is to-day the most dangerous stumbling-block to the revolution and the last hope of the bourgeoisie.

(9) Hence *the Communist Party itself must, above all, keep away most determinedly from any sort of opportunism*, be it in its progress, its tactics, its press or in its various watchwords and demands; especially, it must not extend its membership beyond such numbers as the sound Communist nucleus is capable of leading to mature revolutionary convictions.

(10) The working masses pass inevitably in the course of the revolution through various vacillations. The revolution is not only in its entirety, but in its separate phases, a dialectic process. The Communist Party, however, as the organisation of the most conscious elements, must endeavour not to succumb itself to these vacillations, but to *master* them. It must help the masses to overcome such vacillations rapidly and completely by the clarity and purity of its principles, the coinciding of its words and deeds, its leadership in action, and the accuracy in its foretelling of events. *The Communist Party must thus by its entire conduct develop the class-consciousness of the proletariat*, even though as a result it should apparently put itself into a passing, outward opposition to the great masses. Only in this way will the Communist Party, in the course of the revolutionary struggles, gain the confidence of the masses and perform the task of revolutionary enlightenment to a wide extent.

(11) *The Communist Party must naturally not separate itself from the masses.* That is to say, it must—apart from the self-understood duty of unceasing propaganda—also keep in touch with the movements of the working masses relating to their economic needs, partial demands, etc., it must endeavour to carry enlightenment into such movements, to induce them to take up the actual fight, to broaden and intensify their nature by calls to active solidarity, so that they may assume a revolutionary, and if possible, a political character. But it cannot be the task of the Communist Party to appear to be more stupid than it really is, that is to say, it cannot be its object to strengthen the spirit of opportunism by putting forth in its responsible capacity as Party partial demands of a reformist character.

V.

(12) The most important practical effort of the Communists in connection with the economic battles of the workers lies in the organisation of that weapon, which, during the revolutionary epoch in highly-developed countries, is the only practical and useful instrument for such fights, that is to say, the Communists must see to it that the revolutionary workers (not only the members of the Communist Party) must be united in the factories and workshops, and that the shop-organisations, again unite their Unions and develop fully into the organised instrument for production being taken over by the working-class.

(13) The revolutionary shop-organisations (the Unions) are the mother soil for Action-Committees arising in the course of the fight, the cadres for workers fighting for economic partial demands and ultimately for production itself, the preparatory stage and the sound foundation for the revolutionary soviets.

(14) By thus creating the wide class organisation of the revolutionary proletariat, whilst at the same time preserving as a Party the strength of a programmatical, unified body and spreading the Communist idea in the Unions and everywhere else as the supreme principle the Communists pave the way for the prevalence of Communist Society.

VI.

(15) *The part to be played by the Party after the political victory of the revolution depends on the international conditions and on the progress of the class-consciousness of the workers.* As long as the dictatorship of the proletariat, the political force of the victorious working-class, is necessary, the Communist Party must do everything in order to ensure the development in the Communist direction. For this purpose it is indispensable, that in all industrially-developed countries, under the intellectual leadership of the Communists, the revolutionary proletarians be made to interest themselves to the widest possible extent in the taking over and reshaping of production. The organisation according to workshops and Unions, the continual training in single conflicts, the creation of Action-Committees are the preparations for this step which in the course of the revolutionary battle are begun by the vanguard of the workers themselves.

(16) *To the same extent as the Union, being a class-organisation of the proletariat, after the political victory of the revolution, gains in strength and becomes capable of firmly establishing the economic foundation of the dictatorship in the form of the soviet system, it will gain in importance as compared with the party.* To the same extent as the proletarian dictatorship is secured by its finding unconditional recognition in the minds of the working masses the Party loses its significance in favour of the workers' soviets. To the same extent, at least, as ensuring the safety of the revolution through political force becomes superfluous, by the dictatorship changing into the Communist Society, the Party disappears.

THE TREATY AGREEMENT BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

Mr. Art O'Brien, the representative of Dail Eireann in Great Britain, has written as follows to the Editor of the official organ of the Irish Self-Determination League of Great Britain, under the heading, "A Word of Counsel to the Irish in Great Britain."

Be not misled into rejoicing and thanksgiving without cause or reason.

The claim of the people of Ireland is, and always has been, the recognition of the complete independence of their country. That is a claim no nation can forego, and until it is met in their case the Irish race cannot rejoice.

If under the threat of renewed and intensified warfare, and as an alternative to seeing their country ravished and laid waste by fire and sword, and their race exterminated, five Irishmen have been compelled to sign their names to the document published yesterday—that is not a cause for us to rejoice or a reason for us to offer thanksgiving.

Our people at home received the news in dignified silence. Let us follow their example. If, finally, the representatives of the people of Ireland accept the document, they will not ask their kindred to do more than bow their heads in resignation and take the road again.

The document which has been signed by our five compatriots is but another milestone on the long road of struggle to Irish freedom. It is not the Goal. The 700 years' war is not ended, because no war can be ended by an enforced peace, nor can understanding between two peoples be attained where one people uses its physical might to hinder the attainment of the other's moral right.

The English people have cause (at all events, a superficial cause) to rejoice. Do not let us interfere with their rejoicing and thanksgiving. They have won another round. We could even, in accepting the fall of the dice, congratulate them; though we could not congratulate ourselves.

Dail Eireann will consider and give its decision on the document. Let us remain calm and silent. In any event, there will be no cause to rejoice, and those to whom plaudits and congratulations will be least welcome are those five men who were forced to put their names to that document.

The circles are narrowing; the rounds becoming shorter, and every milestone marks a further stage of the journey finished. But there is still a bit of the road to travel. The time for rejoicing and thanksgiving will come when Ireland again enters the circle of sovereign and independent nations. But that time is *not yet*. Until then, dignity, calm and work.

The moment is grave, let us turn our eyes only to our native land, and watch and pray. The call may come to us to help in steadying the nation and the race under a sudden and unexpected blow. We cannot undo the past, but we can make the future.

ART O'BRIEN.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

A Seamen's Congress.

The German Seamen's Union, which was represented at the Moscow Red Labour Union International Congress, is desirous of forming an International Seamen's Union to be affiliated to Moscow. It proposes to hold an International Congress in Hamburg in the spring or summer of 1922.

The German Seamen's Union urges comrades here to bore from within Havelock Wilson's Union. Perhaps it is not aware that a new Seamen's Union has been formed here, which is endeavouring to oust Havelock Wilson's Union from the field. This new union is getting the support of many prominent Trade Union officials, who have not got so far as to call themselves Communists or Revolutionaries. The boring from within method will have to be dropped eventually by all who really mean revolutionary business. The subjects to be discussed by the Hamburg Congress include:—

1. Uniform international standard for seamen's wages.
2. Uniform watch system.
3. Uniform manning of ships.
4. Establishment of an international, real social seamen's code.
5. Uniform maximum of working hours on board ship.
6. Exertion of influence on international marine legislation.
7. International rule and regulation of the employment of seamen.
8. Revolutionary propaganda.
9. Compilation of statistics of the world's economic conditions as far as necessary for regulating of marine industry.

ON THE GRID IRON.

Hartshorn and the S.W.M.F.

The fact that Vernon Hartshorn has been appointed President of the South Wales Miners' Federation shows that the majority of S.W.M.F. members are still sleepy, old-fashioned Trade Unionists without a touch of revolutionary Communism in their make-up.

The Left Wing has been trying for many years to capture the Federation. It thought it was succeeding. This and other recent events should spur the Left Wing to the formation of a revolutionary union of their own which will know how to lead in action.

Straker and a Labour Government.

"So long as the present system continues, even a Labour Government would be dominated by the bankers," Mr. Straker of the M.F.G.B.

The Labour Party's News Service sends out this illuminating utterance for Labour newspapers to copy; but what does it mean? It means that a Labour Government would try to carry on without upsetting the capitalist system.

Needless to say, it is because we know that a Labour Party Government would make no attempt to overthrow the capitalist system that we refuse to co-operate with the Labour Party.

SAVING THE BOSS.

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and other Liberals (for you know, fellow-worker, Mr. MacDonald is the most Liberal of the Liberals; there are few to equal him in orthodoxy) are working hard "to save Europe." They are very much pleased that Asquith, Winston Churchill, Lloyd George, and even most of the bluest of the Tories, have come round to their view, that Germany cannot be made to pay for the war.

Winston Churchill says he rejoices "to see that the simple fact that the payment from one country to another, can only be made in the form of goods or service, has once more become recognised by the most enlightened experts in different countries."

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, and other I.L.P. leaders, are greatly pleased to know that Mr. Churchill has said that. They feel that the support their policy is now getting from all parties has completely justified them. They are very much pleased also to find that even those of their Labour colleagues, who were loudest in demanding the German money and who were lately much ashamed of the I.L.P.-ers, are now in absolute harmony with them.

The capitalists of all countries having accepted the I.L.P. policy, are now pulling together to get International Capitalism out of the difficulties into which it has fallen as a result of the war, the proletarian Revolution, so far as it has spread, and the mistakes which Allied Capitalism made during its war madness and victory drunkenness.

Capitalism feels that, for the present, it cannot afford to have friction in its own household just now. Even the Japanese, who are regarded as upstarts in the capitalist camp, are to be left in peace for ten years, it is said, though that agreement may not be adhered to. Big British Landlordism and Capitalism has climbed down from its throne so as to make concessions to the petty-Capitalism of Sinn Fein, and Germany is to be forgiven for ever daring to rival the British Empire. Capitalism must have peace in which to re-establish itself. Trade is thoroughly bad, and the currency is in a terrible mess.

One of the things which Capitalism thinks important, is to get the £ back to its pre-war value. In doing that, it will incidentally double the value of the money that the capitalists lent to their governments during the war. One of the necessary steps in getting the £ back to the pre-war value is to lower your wages, fellow-worker, but to lower the interest on the war debt, which your Government pays to the bosses, is something that the capitalists do not des're, and the Government, being a capitalist Government, does not propose to do. As the greater part of the National War Debt is lent to British capitalists, there will be a very big war debt for you to pay, fellow workers, even if all the international war indebtedness of the nations is wiped out.

British capitalists intend to hold fast to the money they lent in War Loan to the British Government, whilst they play at being magnanimous, in advocating the cancelling of the international war debts and proposing a moratorium for Germany.

Do not be under the delusion, however, that the capitalists and their mouthpieces in the capitalist parties are proposing to cancel the international war debts and give Germany an indemnity from generous motives. They only propose these things because they see that they are ruining their own trade by making other nations bankrupt and reducing the value of money in those nations almost to zero.

The policy of the I.L.P. and U.D.C. was originally put forward from motives of generosity, no doubt, but the capitalist politicians are not adopting it from motives of generosity; they are adopting it because they realise that if they do not there will be a big smash up in the capitalist system. They are adopting the I.L.P. policy to save the capitalist system from disaster. They say they are "saving Britain," "saving Europe," "saving civilisation," but they are saving Capitalism and nothing more.

They ask you to be enthusiastic about what they are doing to save Capitalism, fellow worker, but, as a matter of fact, your interest, and the interest of civilisation, is all the other way. To save Capitalism, means to keep you a wage-slave and to hinder the march of progress to Communism. A breakdown in the Capitalist system would provide the workers with their chance of liberation from the slavery of Capitalism.

Watch for that opportunity; organise to be able to take advantage of it. You have got to do that by bringing the facts of the case before your mates in the workshop.

THE SEARCHLIGHT.

THE WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT BOOK SERVICE.

152, FLEET STREET

(Entrance first door on left in Bolt Court from Fleet Street.)

Open Daily, 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. Saturdays, 10 a.m. to 1 p.m.

We can supply you with any book you desire, new or second-hand, from British, Colonial, or foreign publishers. Give us all particulars you have, and send a deposit.

By buying books from us, trade discount is transferred to propaganda.

At our office you may consult publishers' catalogues and place your order for any book not in stock.

If you order by post, you must add, on the average, one penny for every shilling, to cover postage.

We charge the postage of foreign books, from London only, and fix price at current rate of exchange.

WE CAN SUPPLY!

Books on History and Economics.

Woman and Labour (*Olive Schreiner*) 4/6
Finance and Foreign Exchange (*A. Waight*) Paper, 6d.; Cloth, 9d.
Fields, Factories and Workshops (*P. Kropotkin*) 2/-
Conquest of Bread (*P. Kropotkin*) 2/-
The Intellectual and the Worker (*Philip Kurinsky*) .... 6d.
Industrial Unionism and Revolution (*Philip Kurinsky*) .... 6d.
Modern Science (*Leo Tolstoy*) .... 2d.
An Appeal to the Young (*P. Kropotkin*) ... 2d.
The Axe to the Root (*James Connelly*)... 3d.
Labour, Nationality and Religion (*James Connelly*) .... net. 1/-
News from Nowhere (*William Morris*) 3/6
Useful Work and Useless Toil (*William Morris*) .... 2d.
MONOPOLY, or How Labour is Robbed (*William Morris*) .... 2d.
Report of the E.C. of the III. International (*Zinoviev*) .... 6d.
Anarchism and the World Revolution (*Fred S. Graham*) 1/3
Gold, Prices and the Witwatersrand (*R. A. Lehfeldt*) 5/-
Civil War in France (*Karl Marx*) 3/-
A.B.C. of Communism (*Bukharin*) 2/9
Communism (*Eden and Cedar Paul*) .... 6d.
A History of Trades Councils, 1860-1875 (*Cicely Richards*) 1/-

A large Stock of Russian Literature.

Soviet Russia as I Saw it (*Sylvia Pankhurst*) 2/6
Russia Before and After the Revolution (*S. Carlyle Potter*) 1/-
The Defence of Terrorism: A Reply to Karl Kautsky (*L. Trotsky*) 3/6
The Russian Workers' Republic (*H. N. Brailsford*) 6/-
Red Europe (*Frank Anstey*) 3/3
Constitution of the Red International and Labour Unions .... 2d.
Civil War in France (*Karl Marx*) 1/6
The Russian Republic (*Col. Malone, M.P.*) net. 2/6
The "Reds" in Congress (*J. T. Murphy*) 3d.
Russia in 1921 (*Tom Mann*) .... 6d.
The International Labour Movement, Vol. 2. 9d.

Postage 2d. extra.

Novels, Poetry, etc., with a Communist Tendency

The Good Hope: A Play in 4 Acts, by *Herman Heigermans*. English version by *Christopher St. John* 2/-
The East I Knew (*Claudel*) 3/-
The Spy (*Upton Sinclair*) 3/6
Sylvia's Marriage (*Upton Sinclair*) 2/-
Prison Impressions (*Clara Gilbert Cole*) .... 6d.
Works by Anatole France (*Translated into English*) 2/-
The Crime of Sylvestre Bonnard 2/-
The Red Lily 2/-
Penguin Island 2/-
Thais 2/-
Monsieur Bergeret in Paris 7/6
Clio and the Chateau de Vaux-le-Vicomte... 7/6
On Life and Letters (*3rd Series*) 7/6
" " (*4th Series*) 7/6
Le Comte Morin Deputé (*Illustrated by Henri Basthelemy*) 7/6
Marguérite (*Illustrated by Siméon*) 7/6
Jack London's Novels .... each 2/-

PAMPHLETS EVERY WORKER SHOULD HAVE.

THE LOGIC OF THE MACHINE (*W. F. Hay*).. 4d.
A simple explanation of the problem which confronts the working-class.
SOVIETS OR PARLIAMENT (*Bukharin*) .... 1d.
An explanation of the difference between the Parliamentary and the Soviet or Council System.
THE FINNISH REVOLUTION (*O. Kuusinen*).. 3d.
Showing the fallacy of attempting to obtain Communism through Parliament.
THE REVOLUTION TO-MORROW (*L. A. Motler*) 2d.
A worker's view of how the Revolution will come about.
TO BRITISH WORKERS .... ½d.
Explaining the Soviet system and what it can do, with diagram.
SELF EDUCATION OF THE WORKERS (*A. Lunacharsky*) .... 2d.
A pamphlet on proletarian education.
THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM (*G. Zinoviev*) .... 2d.
The relationship necessary between Trade Unions and the Communist Party.
THE WORKING-CLASS AND THEIR CHILDREN (*Edwin Hoernle*) .... 3d.
An appeal to Proletarian Parents.
THE MINERS' CONFLICT WITH THE MINE-OWNERS (*John Thomas, B.A.*) .... 8d.

COMRADE NORAH SMYTH will speak on her experiences in Russia. Organisations should apply by letter to 400, Old Ford Road, London, E. 3.

The Editorial "at home" in the *Dreadnought* Office, 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C. 4, will not take place this month.

THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.

The Preliminary Committee of the Workers' Communist Party is prepared to enrol members. Apply by letter only to *Workers' Dreadnought*, 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C. 4.

WHAT ARE WE PROGRESSING TOWARD?

Continued from page 6.

But we may go now; for my part, I intend to try, as soon as I can raise the necessary cash, I shall go to China, for China is the least competitive, least nationalistic country I know anything about. It can hardly organise along our lines before 1934, and when it sees what happens to us, there is no danger of its doing so then. The coming civilisation will undoubtedly be Chinese: more fundamentally Chinese than China has ever been before; for China to-day is just about what the whole world was when the Galilean first took issue with the rest of the human race. And China did not progress. She just stayed where she was for 2,000 years, in order to see for herself whether He or the rest of the world was right. She hasn't been opposed, I take it, to the idea of progress; but before starting to progress, she wanted to ascertain what she would be progressing toward. Europe and America, it seems, never thought of that.

NOW IN STOCK.

SOVIET ARMS BADGES.

PINS AND BROOCHES, 6d. each.

In ordering, state which you require.

WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT OFFICE,
152, Fleet Street, E.C. 4.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

DENTISTRY.

For Satisfactory Teeth see
F. ALDRIDGE, Communist, **44 Waterloo Road, S.E.1**
10 per cent. Discount for Comrades.

SMALL ADVERTISEMENTS—1d. a Word.

RED BANNER embroidered with Soviet Arms for sale at moderate prices. Apply Box 10, *Workers' Dreadnought.*

Published by **E. Sylvia Pankhurst** at 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C. 4, and printed by S. Corio at 10, Wine Office Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C. 4.

Advertise your Wants in the "Dreadnought," Deal with our Advertisers and mention the Paper.