

Workers' Dreadnought

ORGAN OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY.

VOL. VII. No. 43. [Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper]

SATURDAY, JANUARY 15th, 1921.

[WEEKLY.] PRICE TWOPENCE.

ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF TWO SOCIALIST MARTYRS.

By CLARA ZETKIN.

ROSA LUXEMBURG.

Rosa Luxemburg was a woman of indomitable will. Severe self-control put a curb on the mettlesome ardour of her temperament, veiling it beneath an outwardly reserved and calm demeanour. Mistress of herself, she was able to lead others. Her delicate sensitiveness had to be shielded from external influences. Her apparent coldness and strict reserve were the screen behind which was hidden a life of tender and deep feeling; a wealth of sympathy which did not stop short at man, but embraced all living beings, and encircled the world as a united whole. Once in a while Fed Rosa, weary and worn with work, would turn out of her way to pick up a stray caterpillar and replace it upon its appropriate leaf. Her compassionate heart warmed to human suffering and grew more tender as the years went by. Always did she find time to lend a willing ear to those who needed advice and help; often did she joyfully give up her own pleasure in order to succour those who came to her in their need. A severe taskmistress to herself, she treated her friends with an instinctive indulgence; their woes and their troubles were more poignant to her than her own. As a friend she was a model of both loyalty and love, of self-effacement and gentle solicitude. With what rare qualities was she endowed, this "resolute fanatic"! How pregnant with thought and vivacity was her intercourse with intimates! Her natural reserve and dignity had taught her to suffer in silence. Nothing unworthy had any existence for her. Small and delicate in body, Rosa was nevertheless consumed with an energy which was unrivalled. She made the most remorseless demands upon her own powers of work, and she achieved positively astounding results. When it seemed that she must succumb to the exhaustion consequent upon her labours, she would embark upon another task demanding yet greater expenditure of vitality. Such endeavours were undertaken "in order to give myself a rest." Rarely was heard on her lips the phrase "I cannot"; more frequently were heard the words, "I must." Her frail health and the unfavourable circumstances of her life did not lessen her vigour. Sorely tried by bodily infirmities, encompassed with difficulties, she remained true to herself.

Comrade Mehring was right in affirming that Rosa Luxemburg was one of Marx's most perceptive and intelligent followers. Gifted with shrewdness and with complete independence of thought, she refused to accept any traditional formula on trust; she probed every idea, every fact, which thus acquired a special and personal value for her. She combined to a rare degree the power of logical deduction with an acute understanding of everyday life and its development. Her dauntless mind was not content merely to know Marx's teaching and to elucidate the master's doctrines. She undertook independent researches, and continued the work of creation which is the very essence of Marx's spirit. She possessed a very remarkable capacity of lucid exposition, and could always find the aptest words wherewith to express her thoughts in all their plenitude. Rosa Luxemburg was never satisfied with the insipid and dry theoretical disquisitions so dear to the heart of our erudite Socialists. Her speech was brilliantly simple; it sparkled with wit and was full of mordant humour; it seemed



Rosa Luxemburg

The Russian Soviet Government has declared 16th January a day of Mourning, with general stoppage of work, in remembrance of the murder of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht

to be the incarnation of enthusiasm, and revealed the breadth of her culture and the superabundant wealth of her inner life. She was a splendid theoretician of scientific Socialism, but had nothing in common with the paltry pedants who cull their wisdom from a few scientific works. Her thirst for knowledge was insatiable. Her receptive mind, her intuitive understanding, turned to nature and to art as to a wellspring of happiness and moral perfection.

Socialism was for Rosa Luxemburg a dominating passion which absorbed her whole life, a passion at once intellectual and ethical. The passion consumed her and was transformed into creative work. This rare woman had but one ambition, one task in life—to prepare for the revolution which was to open the way to Socialism. Her greatest joy, her dream, was to live to see the revolution, to take her share in its struggles. Rosa Luxemburg gave to Socialism all she had to give; no words can ever express the strength of will, the disinterestedness, and the devotion, with which she served the cause. She offered up her life on the altar of Socialism, not alone in death, but in the long days of her labour, in the hours, the weeks and the years consecrated to the fight. Thus had she acquired the right to demand of others that they, too, shall sacrifice their all for Socialism—everything, life not excepted. She was the sword, she was the fire, of the revolution. Rosa Luxemburg will remain one of the greatest figures in the history of international Socialism,

KARL LIEBKNECHT.

We should never forget that in Germany Karl Liebknecht was the first Social Democrat, and that for long he was the only Social Democrat who dared to throw off the disastrous yoke of party discipline—that party discipline which had ceased to be a mere secondary means for the furtherance of practical activities, and had become an end in itself, a great Huitzilopochtli, an idol to which everything was sacrificed. We should never forget that he was the first, and for a long time the only Social Democrat to speak and act in the German Reichstag as an International Socialist, thus in very truth defending "German honour," the honour of German Socialism. The majority of the Social Democratic Parliamentary group voted war credits for the murder of their brothers; they darkened and poisoned the judgment of the masses through their reputation of Socialist ideals and their adoption of bourgeois watchwords. The dissentient minority discreetly submitted and held its peace. Karl Liebknecht alone, every inch a man, had the courage to hurl his invincible "No!" in the face of Parliament and the world.

Scorched by the indignation of the bourgeois parties, reviled and calumniated by the Social Democratic majority, forsaken by the Social Democratic minority, he none the less made of the Reichstag a battlefield against Imperialism and Capitalism, missing no chance of unmasking these deadly enemies of the proletariat, and seizing every opportunity of arousing the exploited masses against them. Thus did he continue at work until the day when the Reichstag, to its everlasting disgrace, surrendering its own privileges, suspended Liebknecht's Parliamentary immunity, delivering over to the venomous bourgeois class-justice this man alleged to be guilty of high treason. New life sprang from the brave and unceasing struggle. Through Liebknecht's example, popular confidence in Socialism flamed up vigorously once more, and the proletarians, their courage revived, made ready for battle. Karl Liebknecht transferred the venue of the fight to the place where it has to be decided. By word and deed he wrestled with Imperialism for the soul of the masses. This continued down to the day when bourgeois society wreaked vengeance on the dreaded and detested foe—until the prison swallowed him. Why was he immured? Because he, soldier of the revolution, had in the open street urged the workers to make the first of May festival a formidable demonstration, to repudiate the "truce of parties" in the name of International Socialism, to put an end to the slaughter of the peoples, to sweep away the Government of malefactors. The masses made no move to follow their far-sighted and trusty leader. But this disappointment availed just as little as danger and persecution availed to shake Karl Liebknecht's convictions or to daunt his fighting spirit. This is evidenced by the brilliant and defiant speech he made at the court-martial, a speech that was a classical example of self-defence on the part of a political champion. Our conviction that his courage was unabated was reinforced by all his subsequent activities.

The Provisional (Red) International Council of Russia has sent an invitation to British Industrial Unions to send delegates to the World Congress of Trade and Industrial Union Organisations, convened for May 1st in Moscow.

THE TRIAL OF THE MURDERERS OF ROSA LUXEMBURG AND KARL LIEBKNECHT.

We advise all those who wax indignant over Bolshevik "atrocities," all those who speak with admiration of the splendid civilisation of the democracies of Western Europe, to read the report of the trial of Karl Liebknecht's and Rosa Luxemburg's murderers. These official records, colourless as they are, arouse deep emotion, burning indignation. They appeal to the heart and to the mind far more strongly than do the most inflammatory speeches, or the laborious writings of lawyers and politicians who aim at proving the beneficence and the justice of the bourgeois regime of liberty, equality, and fraternity.

The military judges displayed the most considerate attitude towards the accused, towards those charged with the murder of proletarian leaders. These judges did their utmost to make it impossible for light to be thrown on the crime. The indefatigable energy of the president of the court kept at a distance all those who might have been able to elucidate the preparations for the murder and the motives of the murderers. As for these last, during the trial they lied shamelessly in order to exculpate themselves, and in order to distort the significance of the crime by imputing it to an outburst of popular indignation. With the aid of the suburban witnesses, they made it appear that as soon as Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, then under arrest, were seen in the street, a crowd of soldiers fell upon them and knocked them about. Subsequently, when they were being taken to prison, a mysterious "civilian" sprang upon the foot-board of the motor and killed Karl Liebknecht with a revolver shot. But all these monstrous fables vanished into smoke the instant the judges touched them—despite the extreme tenderness of the touch. Indisputable evidence showed that the murders took place in the following circumstances:—

For a time after their arrest, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were kept at the Eden Hotel. Thence, on the morning of the crime, they were to be transferred to the Moabit lock-up. Rosa Luxemburg was to be accompanied by First-Lieutenant Vogel, by another officer whose name was not divulged, and by three common soldiers. Directly Rosa Luxemburg emerged from the Hotel, the soldier Runge rushed at her and struck her twice with the butt end of his rifle. She fell insensible, bathed in blood. The soldiers threw her body brutally into the car, and as this began to move forward, the unidentified officer struck her violently on the head while she still lay unconscious; finally, First-Lieutenant Vogel pistolled her point-blank. The soldier seated beside her felt her last convulsive movement. The murderers then took the body into the Tiergarten and hurled it into the pond. Some of the details as to the murder of Karl Liebknecht still remain obscure. This much is certain, that Captain von Pflug-Hartung, First-Lieutenants Stiege and Von Rütgen, together with the non-commissioned officers Lippman and Schultz, took him to an out of the way part of the Tiergarten, where he was killed by three shots, one in the head and two in the back. It seems probable that on the way thither he had been rendered insensible by blows from a rifle butt.

This succinct account of the crime makes us shudder at the thought of the wretches who basely perpetrated it. But let us consider the criminals more closely. With the exception of Private Runge, they were all members of the upper class. They belonged to the typical riff-raff of the drawing-rooms. Enough to witness their nonchalant air before the judges. Von Rütgen, still little more than a boy, smiled all the while as he answered the president's questions; during the proceedings, another of the accused read a newspaper with an affectation of intense boredom, so that the president had to call him to order; the third accused went on quietly eating sandwiches while one of the witnesses testified how he had thrown the victim's body into the water. I have already referred to these gentlemen's lies; I have previously explained that they had suborned some of the witnesses. When the soldiers who had been in charge of Liebknecht came back to the hotel, the officers among the murderers gave them wine and cigarettes. Von

Pflug handed Peschel, the chauffeur, five hundred marks, and promised him as much more if he "behaved well." A comrade of the accused, Sander, a non-commissioned officer, suggested to Judge Grützer, at that time a commissioned officer—and the suggestion seemed to come well-nigh with the force of a command—that he should bring pressure to bear upon the soldiers who had been on sentry duty at the Eden Hotel to induce them to bear false witness.

If, further, we take into account the coarse brutality of these "civilised Europeans" (one of them, in private conversation, related that the insensible Rosa Luxemburg was "thrown into the motor as if she had been a sack"; another, who was at the door of the hotel, cried out to the soldiers as he pointed at Liebknecht, "Strike down that swine!"), their mentality and the part they played in the crime become fully comprehensible. No longer does there exist, as regards them, any psychological enigma. But how do we find Runge, the private, among these druggs of high society? The other privates appear to have obeyed orders passively, from fear of the consequences if they did otherwise. An unknown soldier on sentry duty near the hotel picked up one of Rosa Luxemburg's shoes which had fallen off, and hid it, saying he would keep it as a relic (evidence of Anna Vandenger, washer-woman). Private Runge, a carpenter by trade, is the most disheartening individual we encounter in the trial. In the report he is described as follows: large ears, heavy jaw, excessively large teeth, the general appearance of the face and the shape of the skull suggest a quite abnormal type. According to the medical evidence he was only partially responsible. Returning home after the crime, he quietly went to bed. He detested the Communists because, so he said, "they want to take away my little house in the suburbs of Berlin." One of his brothers is a Communist, and this brother was among the audience in court. Recognising him in the crowd, Runge leapt from the dock, seized a hand grenade from a soldier, and was about to attack his brother as a "gaol-bird" and a "sans patrie."

Worthy accomplice of Ebert and Scheidemann!

SUPPORT THE FAMILIES OF THOSE WHO ARE IN PRISON.

The appeals of Comrades Harvey and Steele against their sentences of four months' hard labour were heard on Friday, 7th January, in Birmingham. We are glad that now they are in the second division, and that Comrade Steele has had his sentence reduced to three months, though we had hoped that the sentences would have been remitted altogether. Our comrades are now serving these harsh sentences imposed for propaganda speeches. Their imprisonment means that seven dependants are left without means of subsistence. We therefore appeal to all friends and fellow-workers to send along their donations, however small, to enable us to support these dependants. Contributions should be sent to Tom Watkins, National Treasurer, 5, Pentre Hill, Cliffton, Neth, South Wales. On behalf of the Executive Committee of the Communist Party (B.S.T.I.), TOM WATKINS, Treasurer. EDGAR T. WHITEHEAD, Treasurer.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

(These short notices do not preclude a more exhaustive review in our next issues, by competent writers, according to the timely importance of the volumes here mentioned.)

WHAT IS WRONG WITH IRELAND?

By John Hampden Bright. A sober and well-informed pamphlet of thirty pages dealing with the present position of Ireland. The author concludes: "Save us from our enemies; save us from our friends."

GOVERNMENT AND PEOPLE.

By Conrad Gill, M.A. (With the collaboration of C. W. Valentine, M.A., D.Phil. Methuen and Co., Ltd., London. 7s. 6d. net.)

The author believes "That in future every man and woman will be called upon to take some part in the government of the country"; also "that our Government is in form truly democratic." A well-indexed volume of 300 pages, quite safe and orthodox. The authors think that as a system "Bolshevism is not likely to endure long in any country." Of the Soviets: "... as a means of choosing a body which should represent public opinion, systems under which men voted according to their age, height or weight, or the initial letters of

their name, any of them, would be better than the Soviet system."

REVOLUTIONS FROM 1789 TO 1906.

(Documents selected and edited, with notes and introductions, by R. W. Postgate. Grant Richards, Ltd., London. 18s. net.)

Credit must be given to the comps. of the Pelican Press for the excellent get-up of the book. The author has worked hard and has given us in less than 400 pages many important documents—the Communist Manifesto in full—that are as landmarks in the history of the political thought of Western peoples. To each period an extensive Bibliography is appended, with useful explanatory notes. There are lacunae, due, we assume, to limitation of space—and also to the fact that the author deals with events from a point of view that is chiefly political and does not give enough importance to the purely economic tendencies. The work of Malatesta in the First International, of the French Syndicalists, of the early Russian Revolutionists is either ignored or not adequately represented. Yet it is a book that should be in the library of every Socialist Club or organisation, and on the shelf, in a handy position and ready for reference, of every social student.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR LEGISLATION.

(By H. J. Hetherington, M.A., Professor of Philosophy at the University College, Cardiff. Methuen and Co., London.)

A short account of the International Labour Conference held at Washington in November, 1919, where Government, employers' and workers' delegates sat together. The full list of the delegates is given. For England, next to the Right Hon. G. N. Barnes and Sir Malcolm Delevigne (Assistant Under-Secretary of State for the Government), see directions of Armstrong and Whitworth, Ltd., of Kynoch, Ltd., of Brimsdown Lead Co. of the North and North London Railways for the employers and G. H. Stuart-Bunning, of the Parliamentary Committee, Trades Union Congress, with the assistance of Miss Mary MacArthur, Miss Margaret Bondfield, Messrs. O'Connell, M.P., Shaw, M.P., Sexton, M.P., Bowerman, M.P., of the Labour Party. This book should be borrowed and read by all Communists in order to realise once more the futility of this kind of Labour legislation, and also the lack of class-consciousness in our Labour Party.

IT'S THE WORKER'S PAPER.

Push along the Dreadnought,
Push with all your might;
It's the Worker's paper,
Out for truth and right;
Out for Revolution—
Cure for every ill—
Not for Boorjoi Plaster
Or Reformist Pill!

Push along the Dreadnought,
Sell it at the works—
He's not true Communist
Who just dreams—and sighs.
Show your rebel mettle,
Start revolt at home—
Any ass can deal in
Gas, and froth and foam.

Push along the Dreadnought,
Push it on your mates;
You'll find Revolution
Round the corner waits;
It won't come from Moscow
At your whispering call;
Revolution comes with
WORK—hard work—for ALL!

Push along the Dreadnought,
Push it on the car,
Push it at the barbers',
Push it at the bar;
Leave it under doorways,
Leave it in the trains;
Sell it when it freezes,
Hails or snows or rains.

Push along the Dreadnought,
Let the workers know
There's a paper for 'em
Full of push and go.
Then they'll do the pushing
And with pleasant grin
Kick old Fatman out and
Show Revolution in.

L.A.M.

Comrade Malone's appeal is to be heard at the Surrey Sessions, on Friday, January 14th.

The following donations have been received for Comrade Pankhurst's costs of appeal, which may amount to £80. Further donations should be sent as soon as possible to Norah Smyth, *Workers' Dreadnought*, 152, Fleet Street, E.C.4:—
Mr. Mitchell, 5/-; Mr. and Mrs. Hart, 5/-; Mrs. Bouvier, 2/6; Misses Dorothea and Madeleine Rock, 10/-; Anon., with apologies, 8d.; Anon., with all good wishes, 2/6; Mr. Thomas Wilson, 2/-; A Sympathiser (Liverpool), 2/-; A Sympathiser in Holloway, 5/-; B. Howell, 1/- (Total, £3 12s. 8d.).

GRATEFULLY ACKNOWLEDGED.

Hammersmith Comrades, 18/4; Barking Comrades, 10/-; Exeter Comrades, 6/-; Altrincham Comrades, 14/-.

THE GREAT TASK.

BY T. ISLWYN NICHOLAS.

Last week I promised my comrade readers of the "Dreadnought" to give them some idea of the best method for the conducting of a Proletarian School. Times without number I have been asked: "Do you supply teachers for the schools?" This is a most important question, and which I will answer at the outset. No, we do not supply teachers; the Communist branch or the comrades who take upon themselves the great task of starting a school select a teacher or teachers from amongst themselves. An important point which must be kept in mind when selecting a teacher is that he must be a Scientific Socialist. If a comrade is not a Revolutionary Socialist, how can one expect him to teach the children of the working-class Revolution. The children are taught such subjects as writing, reading, spelling, grammar, geography, drawing, painting, mathematics, music, etc., at the public schools, therefore we are not concerned with the foregoing subjects. In regard to books, Tom Anderson says this: "Books! There is no end to the books that can be used by the Revolutionary Socialist; in fact, every book of any importance can be used." From Grant Allen's book, "The Evolution of the Idea of God," Tom gave a series of lessons extending over many months. A most strange thing done in the delivering of these lessons was that the lecture used as a companion book, to prove his subject, the Holy Bible. These lessons were brought down to the intelligence of boys and girls about seven to ten years of age. They were delivered as a story in most simple language. Other good handbooks for teachers are "Das Kapital," "Ancient Society," or the Sue Novels; the children specially enjoy the lessons from Sue. We have published many little booklets by our worthy comrade, Tom Anderson. One of them, the story of "John Davidson," is a most interesting story illustrating the Class Struggle. Then we have published poems by him and other revolutionaries, along with a Proletarian Song-book. The following makes a splendid agenda for a complete session (that is from September till April):
First Sunday: "The State," by William Paul.

Second Sunday: "The Origin of the World," by McMillan.
Third Sunday: "The Workshop."
Fourth Sunday: Musical Sunday.

Tom Anderson gives the following advice: "The State" gives a groundwork to the school, and educates your grown-ups as well as the children. A comrade should be selected at the beginning of the session to give a series of lessons on "The State."
"The Origin of the World" is a splendidly written little book for children; the chapters are very short, taking about eight to ten minutes to read. Select two boys and two girls, aged from 10 to 14 years, and mark off an equal passage in the chapter for them to read.

It is generally known as the Children's Day. The children take great interest in it, and they listen far more attentively to the young people reading, and they remember more about it than the best grown-up speaker you may have. Different books should be selected every session, both for the first and second Sunday lessons. On the third Sunday the subject is "The Workshop." This lesson should be given by a comrade of the kind of work at which he is engaged; our women comrades should also be invited to give these lessons; it should be a different speaker every time. These lessons have been proved to be of great educational value, and give the children the entire gamut of working-class occupations. The comrades should always bear in mind when speaking that it is a Children's School. The lesson should never occupy more than fifteen minutes. On the fourth Sunday, a musical Sunday should be held; this is a great attraction for the children. The children should

be trained to sing songs that breathe spirit of Revolution; to learn and recite the Ten Proletarian Maxims and poems that inspire us to greater efforts and enthusiasm in the great proletarian cause. A boy and girl should be taught a real live, burning red-hot revolutionary speech, to take from five to ten minutes in delivering. How this shames the grown-ups! Adult comrades should take advantage and develop the varied and wide talent of the youngsters for one purpose—for and on behalf of the revolutionary movement. In the "Young Worker's Book of Rebels," by J. S. Clarke, and published by us, will be found a splendid series of stories for any teacher to select from. When there is an extra Sunday in the month, the lesson should be on some historical story which may be found in the above series. Tom Anderson tells us "that in speaking to children you must be brave, bold, and resolute, that is if you wish to hold their attention. You must not speak too long; the ideal time is ten minutes." The following is a model agenda for carrying out the service of the school (by Tom Anderson):—

1. Opening song by school. A girl reads the first verse.
2. Minute of last school service. By a junior secretary.
3. Text. Children all repeat it together.
4. President's remarks.
5. Song by school. A boy reads the first verse.
6. Lesson. Speaker allowed 15 minutes.
7. Questions. The children are invited to ask questions.
8. Roll call, junior and senior. Optional.
9. Song by school. A senior girl reads the first verse.
10. Reading. Solo or musical selection by any member of the school.
11. Collection. Intimations.
12. Number of children and grown-ups present.
13. Closing song. One verse only. Grown-ups read. No books used.
14. President: "Good afternoon, children." Children respond: "Good afternoon Comrade."

This service occupies about one hour, and is conducted like a big meeting, the children and grown-ups forming one class. If there is a very large school it is sometimes advisable to divide children into separate classes according to the different ages. In next week's issue I hope to deal further on the important question of the organisation of the International Proletarian School Movement. Later on I shall also deal with the work of the Young People's Communist International in other lands. Comrades! We of the young movement demand the complete surrender of the capitalist class; we are working for the complete destruction of the Capitalist Class State, along with its E.C.—Parliament. We work towards the establishment of the Communist Industrial Republic, through the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

Comrades of the Communist movement, you must support us, because our movement is your movement. Revolutionary Youth has sounded the clarion call to the young workers of the world—Ours is the world, despite all. It is within your power to echo that militant call so that it may reach the youngsters who have not yet heard it by forming schools and by helping us financially. It remains with you to show the boss class what you can do if you try.

An Appeal to the Young.

By JAMES STEWART. Post free 2½d. Should be read by all interested in the Proletarian School Movement. Twenty-five per cent. reduction on quantities from the Communist Party, 400, Old Ford Road, E. 3.

The Coming Revolution in Britain.

By H. M. EMERY. Post free 1½d. To be obtained from the *Workers' Dreadnought* Office, 152, Fleet Street, E.C. 4.

The Schooling of the Future.

By E. SYLVIA PAVKHURST. Price 1½d.

NEWS FROM SOVIET RUSSIA.

Telitcher, the People's Commissary for Foreign Affairs, asked the Italian Government for a passport for Zinoviev and Bukharin, in order that they could attend the Congress of the Italian Socialist Party, shortly to be held at Livorno.

Private Theatres Closed Down in Russia.

All the private theatres which existed in Russia have been closed down as from January 1st. This measure is in connection with the abolition of an entrance fee for the performance. All theatres of artistic value will be nationalised. Every visit will be registered on personal cards.

The Russian Peasants Agree with the Soviet Republic.

On December 24th, a meeting took place in the Kremlin of the non-party delegates to the Eighth Soviet Congress. Kullin, Chairman of the Central Executive, was present. After a debate which lasted over four hours, and in which the peasants' delegates took a prominent part, the policy of the Soviet power towards the peasantry has been agreed to, and a draft of a Bill about the reconstruction of the agricultural production has been unanimously accepted.

Trotsky and the Russian Transport Crisis.

At a meeting session of the English All-Russian Soviet Congress, Trotsky gave a thorough report of the Soviet transport system and of the valiant struggle of the Russian railwaymen for reconstruction. "Last winter," he said, "the situation of our traffic was so hopeless that we could not look forward to any improvement in our general situation. The running of ruined engines and trucks gave small results. The People's Commissary for Traffic had even to give an order for the use of the engines which had been marked down for repair. That time our slogan was: 'All for the Red Front!' Now the position is changed; we have not the peril of death before us now, as we had last winter, and we may look forward to great improvement."

Trotsky communicated the following figures: The number of locomotives repaired in 1920 were as follows: January, 259; February, 296; March, 524; April, 603; May, 769; June, 947; July, 1,075; August, 1,042; September, 1,074; October, 1,096.

Possible Deadlock in the Russian-American Negotiations.

Telitcher instructed Martens, the Bolshevik representative in New York, to leave the United States, with his whole staff, and to declare void all the contracts entered into with American firms.

Russia to Dictate Peace on the Rhine.

Bukharin writes in the *Pravda*, that the annihilation of Wrangel, Buzhovich, and Petlura, does not mean peace. The Bolsheviks must break the Polish will, shake hands with the German comrades, and dictate a Proletarian Peace on the Rhine.

Trotsky has recently visited the Red troops at the Minsk-Smolensk front. He appealed to the troops to be ready to act for the liberation of the West-European proletariat.

The Fear of Communism.

The number of Communists interned at Prague prison amounts, at present, to 730 persons.

Free Fuel in Russia.

By a decree of the Council of Commissaries, beginning from January 1st, all workers' Soviet officials, soldiers' families, and invalids will receive free fuel rations. The same groups have also the free use of the post, the telephone, and the telegraph.

A New University in Soviet Russia.

A University for workers and peasants has been opened in Karsk. At the meeting of the Congress on December 29th, Mrs. Kollentay, the Commissary for Social Welfare, in a splendid speech, explained the position of women in Socialist development. She said:—

"We must free the woman from that load of unproductive work in the household which has suppressed her for centuries. In this way we will liberate new creative energy. Unfortunately, many of you still possess the old prejudices, but in our three years' work we have already passed the difficult part, and we are also approaching victory in the realm of the emancipation of women."

The Study of Electricity.

After a speech by Sosnouski, over the importance of electrification, the Eighth Congress unanimously decided that it should be the duty of all Soviet administrations to introduce the study of electrical subjects as widely as possible, and for this purpose, to make use of the co-operation of the Trade Unions.

The Anglo-Russian Negotiations.

Telitcher, the Commissary for Foreign Affairs, makes the following statement in the Moscow press. On the 30th June, 1920, the English Government proposed to the Soviet Government the following four principles for negotiations:—

1. England and Soviet Russia refrain from all hostile acts.
2. Exchange of prisoners of war shall take place at once.
3. Both States to compensate the members of the other States for personal and commercial loss.
4. Both States propose a treaty for the mutual resumption of trade.

As is known, these conditions were accepted by the Soviet Government, and on July 10th, the English Government was informed of this. However, the English Government, which until recently had recognised the July agreement, has now completely changed its attitude. England wishes to back out from the undertakings which she herself proposed. On account of this open breach of the treaty, the Soviet Government has decided to recall Krassin, the Russian representative in London, for the purpose of a conference in Moscow.

Published by the Communist Party.
(British Section of the Third International).
Editor: SYLVIA PANKHURST.
Acting Editor: JACK O'SULLIVAN.

All Matter for Publication to be Addressed to the Editor:
400, Old Ford Road, London, E.C.3.
TELEPHONE: EAST 1787.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY DOES NOT HOLD ITSELF RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY OPINIONS APPEARING OVER INDIVIDUAL SIGNATURES.

Business Communications to the Manager:
Workers' Dreadnought, 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.

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

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.

Vol. VII. No. 43. Saturday, Jan. 15, 1921.

UNITY AND THE WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT.

DEAR COMRADES—

On January 29th and 30th, a Conference of the Communist Party (B.S.T.I.), the Communist Party of Great Britain, Scottish Communist Labour Party and others, will be held with the object of merging into a united Party.

If I were free to attend this Conference, I should advocate the formation of a United Party under the following conditions:—

1. That the Left Wing elements keep together and form a strong, compact Left block within the Party. Lenin advised this when I discussed the question with him in Moscow, and I think the advice is sound. The Left block should have its own conveners, and its own special sittings, prior to Party conferences, to decide its policy. In the Italian Socialist Party, the Right, Left, and Centre sections hold their special sittings each evening during the Party's conference week, in order to formulate their policy for the next day's session. The policy is thus classified and hammered out. The same procedure should be followed here by our Left block. The activities of the block will not be confined to Party conferences. Every district will have its Left block, working to mould the policy of the Party, to act as the "ginger" group and give the lead.

2. The Left elements should insist that the constitution of the Party shall leave them free to propagate their policy in the Party and in the Third International as a whole.

3. The entire Executive of the Party, and all the officials, should be elected at the inaugural conference, and thereafter at Party Conferences. This is a question of vital importance. All officials and members of the Executive should be subject to recall by a special Party Conference, called on the initiative of one-third of the branches.

I believe that a united party ought to be formed. I have not changed my view that there are elements in the Communist Party of Great Britain (B.S.P.), which are not revolutionary, not Communist, and which belong in spirit to the Second International. In the Communist Party (B.S.T.I.), there are also, in my opinion, non-Communist elements.

I believe that the interests of Communism can be best served at this juncture, by forming a united Party and fighting to make it a genuine Communist Party, and to expel from office all those who are not Communist revolutionaries.

When the Communist Party (B.S.T.I.) merges in the new united Communist Party, as I believe it will, or if the Communist Party B.S.T.I. should split into separate factions, the conditions under which I placed the *Workers' Dreadnought* at the disposal of the Party as its organ, will have ceased to operate.

The *Workers' Dreadnought* will then become an independent organ, giving an independent support to the Communist Party from the Left Wing standpoint. The paper will be run by the comrades who are now responsible for it, until my release from prison.

E. SYLVIA PANKHURST.

THE EDITORSHIP OF COMMUNIST PARTY PAPERS.

There has been some discussion in the Communist Party (B.S.T.I.) about the democratic control of the Party organ.

When the W.S.F. merged in the Communist Party (B.S.T.I.), the editorship of the organ, the *Workers' Dreadnought*, was an honorary office. The paper had only known one editor, to whose energy it owed its existence and maintenance. When libel actions and prosecutions threatened in the early days of the paper, the Treasurer insisted, and the Executive Committee agreed, that Sylvia Pankhurst, who was the editor, should be also the legal proprietor of the paper, in order that no one else should run any financial or other risks as a result of the *Dreadnoughts'* activities.

When the Communist Party was formed, this fact was disclosed to the new Party. No suggestion was made that the situation should be changed. The W.S.F. representatives present, and Sylvia Pankhurst herself, were asked whether the *Dreadnought* might be used as its organ. They replied in the affirmative, and suggested that the editor should be elected by the new Party. Sylvia Pankhurst was elected editor unopposed at the Manchester Conference in September. Sylvia Pankhurst then suggested that a financial committee should be appointed to assist in covering the deficit on the paper, but the suggestion was not taken up and she remained personally responsible for the liabilities. Later, when she was arrested in October, Sylvia Pankhurst asked for the appointment of a *Dreadnought* Finance Committee, but though the members of the Executive were appointed to form a *Dreadnought* Committee, they took no steps towards raising funds or assisting the paper in any way. Nevertheless, the Editor repeatedly informed the Executive Committee of the Party that she was prepared to submit herself to its control in matters of policy, and though the Committee only expressed desires on insignificant minor questions, these desires were complied with in every respect.

The *Dreadnought* has in fact, been an independent organ, lent to the Communist Party (B.S.T.I.). The Party has never made itself responsible for any part of the burden of maintaining it. Therefore, in discussing theoretically, the conditions under which Communist Party papers should be edited, I will not take the *Dreadnought* as a typical case in point. Several propositions regarding editorship are at present under discussion in the British Communist movement, and these have importance just now, since a new united Communist Party will shortly be formed.

Firstly, there is the question: Should the Editor be elected by the Party or by the Executive?

To this, I reply emphatically that the Editor should be elected by the Party.

The editorial policy is of paramount importance to the Party; in fact the Party organ will largely make or mar the Party itself. It is the Party's chief mouthpiece. The Editor should be known and held responsible for the editorial conduct and policy of the paper. At the same time, the Editor should not be left to bear the financial burden, for which the Party should hold itself responsible.

The Editor should be elected by the Party, and subjected to recall by a special conference of the Party, summoned on the requisition of one-third of its branches.

The Editor should be responsible to the Executive Committee of the Party and the Party conferences should see to it that the paper shall give a spirited and effective expression to that policy. This means that the general lines of policy should be under the constant supervision of the Executive and the Party as a whole, and that the Editor is bound to keep in line with the trend of thought in the Party.

But the Editor must also display initiative and assist in the development of the policy. The Editor should indeed be chosen for the capacity to serve the Party in this manner.

The Editor should be chosen also for literary and editorial competence.

Should an editorial committee or board decide everything that is to appear in the paper?

No! Such a proposition is absurd! To engage a competent, full-time Editor, and then to hold up the copy he has prepared and passed for the paper till three or four comrades, without journalistic experience, come jaded from work, to wade through the manuscripts with the object of discovering whether the Editor has made theoretical or journalistic mistakes, would be a farce, which would delay the publication of the paper and rob it of freshness and topicality.

If there is to be an editorial board, let it be an advisory committee of the editorial staff (providing the paper is large enough to have an editorial staff), and let the Editor have the final decision and responsibility.

Comrades should view with distrust the proposal to let little sub-committees of members of the Party who live in London, the most reactionary centre of the movement, put a brake on the policy of officials elected by the national movement as a whole. To do this is to distort the national policy of the movement and to force it to the Right.

I must add, most decidedly, that all the officials of the new Communist Party should be elected at the Party Conference.

No bargain should be tolerated, by which a certain proportion of the existing Executives or Unity Committee are drafted without election on to the new Committee.

No bargain should be permitted by which existing officials share out the official positions in the new Party. All the officials should be elected.

A. T.

COMMUNIST UNITY.

A further meeting was held at Leeds on Saturday last of the committee appointed to organise the convention to establish a united Communist Party. Those present included A. Macmann and A. Inkpin, representing the Communist Party of Great Britain; J. V. Leckie and J. Maclean, representing the Communist Labour Party; and R. Beesh and T. Watkins, representing the Communist Party (B.S.T.I.).

The Unity Convention was definitely fixed to be held at Leeds on Saturday and Sunday, January 29th and 30th. Representation will be of branches of participating organisations, as well as of independent Communist groups willing to join the united party, on the basis of one delegate for the first 25 members and one delegate for additional membership above 25. Voting at the conference will be on the basis of one vote for every 25 members represented. Notices convening the conference will be issued this week and all inquiries and applications for delegates' credentials should be addressed to Albert Inkpin, 16, King Street, Covent Garden, London, W.C.2.

"HOPE IN THE HEARTS OF THOUSANDS"

January 2, 1921.

Dear Comrade Sylvia Pankhurst—I hesitate to call you Comrade, for the term holds an assurance of equality, yet when you came to live at Bow you made yourself at one with the least, in which I too, was included. I want to say, as facing that which faces you, "Be of good courage," for your name has become a symbol of courage and you have inscribed "Dreadnought" on the banner of your sacrifice. I would wish you success, but success is yours whatever fate has in store for you. It cannot be otherwise. Your lines are set in heroism. And whether you will or no—consciously or unconsciously—the process of your experience holds hope or judgment into the hearts of thousands. I know you are nothing to you, that you want yourself nothing, and that the Cause alone is great; yet because you symbolise the Cause our earnest will is to strengthen yours and buttress your purpose with our own. I am old, and my thought, language and labour differ from many you know more immediately, yet your brave witness has been a joy to me from the beginning. I know that it is only so that social salvation may come. I was with you when you testified for liberty outside the closed gates at Westminster; I shall be with you if once again you testify from within the prison walls. You have overcome again and again. I believe that you are strengthened for mighty work. My faith is to this issue. Do not trouble to make any reply to this. I know in whom and for what I have believed, and in such honourings remain, yours faithfully,

J. E. PHILLIPS.

135, Lavender Sweep, Clapham Junction.

Self Education of the Workers.
By LUNACHARSKY. Post free 2d.

THEY ARE MAKING ONE FRONT.

By ROBERT MINOR.

The struggle between the privileged class and organised workmen is changing its form. The old line of struggle is being quickly obscured; and the familiar forms no longer exist, or, if they exist, are nothing but empty shells. As the battle-lines of the old struggle on the prairie between the Red Indians and the scattered groups of the white-men scouts were lost and forgotten in modern warfare under the great system of steel and concrete trenches—so the scattered group formations of labour, craft unions that resembled social clubs, as well as the little intimate "radical groups" of personal friends that us'd to

The Capitalist International is what it is. It marches into the open, coolly taking its place in battle. We see it everywhere. In America it cynically announces its programme: "All Unionism to be destroyed; workmen, you are commanded not to organise; we lied to you during the war, to keep you quiet; now we will break you on the wheel: the open shop."

The same throughout the world. The White Terror of the Capitalist International. You can see it in Finland, where a rifle-shot sends staggering the ragged form of a workman caught carrying a despatch to Russia, and you hear at the same moment the shot of the Baldwin-Felts' detective in the West Virginia mountains as the American mountaineer falls to his death for bearing a despatch from the Union into a non-Union territory. The battle-front now between Labour and Capital is a huge girdle around the earth. And it knows no mercy, no relenting, and fast it drops the last of its camouflage.

Workmen, who in the old days used to sit in back-rooms over a glass of beer, to discuss an imagined future and to weigh the question as to whether the struggle would take the form of violence or whether, on the other hand, the change would be voted in with peaceful ballots, are interrupted. "Will it happen by means of peaceful—?" But the voices are drowned under the rattle of rifle-fire, heavy and incessant and fast increasing, from all quarters of the globe. The question is answered.

Everywhere the working-class, too, is stirring, jolted and bruised, and rudely awakened from its day dreams. The cries of mobilising men come also from the depths, from the alleys and kennels where workmen live. Men who have been dreaming of this time, have dreamed of it being in a different way. Some are still dreaming. Here and there we see some brother-workman still in the midst of his dream, running out with a tea-pot full of water to put out the burning house; here and there a workman comes with a wooden lath to take his place in the concrete trench. He had got so used to his dream that he thinks it a dream battle. But the old methods are no good any more. The dangerous weapons of a generation ago are foolish toys to-day. Men find that their "important organisations" of yesterday are dolls' houses to-day.

Dolls' houses no more. It is a concrete dug-out now flung across the hundreds of miles, the thousands of miles; and the faces of intimate friends are lost in a sea of men that we never saw before, and that are familiar only in this, that they carry the marks of labour. Do not be displeased by the strange faces. Do you not understand? It is at last the workers' answer to your own cry: "Workers of the world, unite!" These are the workers of the world. Don't you know them, now that they have come? The millions have answered and are coming into the trenches.



J. STEERLE.
Sentenced to four months and serving a sentence of three months (reduced).

talk with glistening eyes of imagined future societies built to their taste—all these are disappearing now, or will soon disappear. A new tremendous battle front is being flung across the earth, a fortified line of steel and concrete, so to speak, takes the place of the old scattered skirmish line.

Fast the little things are dissolving, whether the little things know it or not. Little groups, little cliques, little sects, are quickly melting into and crystallising in either one or the other of two giant forms. Every little formation may still scream of its separateness, but the monster iron dividing line—the "front"—is flung calmly and silently through the multitude and divides all things and men whether they will or not, into two and only two hard-crystallising divisions. Fast all men and things line up for one struggle, one war—one world divided into two civilisations, with a vast gulf between them. On each side of the gulf is one organisation, and can be but one. Each side crystallises its own international organisation. Each can have but one. It is an international world.

We hear a clamour of mobilisation. It is the one great capitalist class, which hurries together and talks no more of nationality. The flag inscribed "La Patrie" lies bloody and torn in the gutter with the bodies of the ten millions that were slain for nationality when nationality was the best lie. But Capitalism screams now that it was all a mistake, that we must not be loyal any more to "our country," but that those of us that are not yet dead must reverse ourselves and be loyal now to a hideous, mechanical international League of wealthy classes which is the best lie of to-day. Everywhere we hear the cry of the herd—monarchists, republicans, liberal-bourgeois, Catholic, atheist-bourgeois and Protestant, reformer-pacifist and military reactionist—all together the herd whip men into line of the new loyalty that will make men slaves—loyalty to the one great Capitalist International. The League of Nations, some call it, and others call it the Association of Governments.

Labour, too, forms into one vast concrete-bound front, that stretches around the world as a girdle. It stretches out to meet Capital in battle.

An international world. An international fight. Two international organisations—only two—clashing in a combat that will end in the death of one—and after that, only one international organisation—the administration of things by non-state-workers' commune.

The mobilisation of each side has its tragedies, of old sentiments rooted up. No man can come



H. P. PURGESS.
Late Manager of the WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT.
Served six months.

into a new battle without shedding some part of his old equipment. Here they come, watch them, the variegated philosphers, this man with an "ism" and that one with an "ism" and each "ism" having its own beauties of fancy and its own vanities of permanency in this world which is not even itself permanent. There in the corner, right over there, where you see the ashes and tin cans, that is the place for your dogmas. Don't shed any tears about them; just drop them, and pass on.

One front. One international organisation.

What will the international organisation be? I think it already is. It is the "Third International." To many persons this is a bitter thing to hear. There is the smell of warfare in it, and there is the discipline of iron unity. But the soldiers entering the new battle line must sacrifice, every one will have to sacrifice. And with some it hard. It is hard to concede anything to another man's philosophy; but we have to do it. We hear Hillcutt scream as he is forced to drop the saw-dust doll of Parliamentarism or be dropped himself. He is frightened with being told to associate with strange fellows called Anarchists, or else to admit he is not fit for the fight. He screams in horror that the Third International is taking in "the Anarcho-Syndicalist groups and the groups that now and then simply call themselves Anarchists." It doesn't matter. One front. The past few years have settled many questions. One question is Parliamentarism, and it was settled to the extreme dislike of most Socialist lawyers. Another question is the question of a temporary military organisation resembling a State, and that was settled to the distaste of many Anarchists. But history has settled it. It has proven that the working-class, whether we like it or not, is going to win its fight by means of a temporary dictatorship, and we take our choice between being out of the fight or in the fight in the form which it takes, not in an imaginary form. The one front has been drawn by history, and no man can draw it otherwise. Whether we like it or not, there will be one front. And I think that one front is the Third International.



C. L'ESTRANGE MALONE.
Appealing against a sentence of six months.

A PERSONAL TRIBUTE TO SYLVIA PANKHURST.

A close friend of Comrade Pankhurst has communicated the following personal note that may be read with interest by our comrades abroad and by those comrades who have recently joined the movement.

Comrade E. Sylvia Pankhurst was born in Manchester. Her father was Richard Marsden Pankhurst, barrister-at-law and author.

Since childhood, she worked in the I.L.P., which she joined at the age of 16, the earliest age for joining the Party.

Her father died when she was 15. She obtained a free studentship to the School of Art (Manchester), then the Lady Whitworth Scholarship for the best woman student of the year. Also the Proctor Hand-day Travelling Studentship for the best student of the year. She went to Venice for nine months to study painting.

On her return to England, she decorated Pankhurst Hall, erected by the I.L.P. in Salford, to the memory of her father.

She won the National Scholarship to the Royal College of Art, being first on the list for the Kingdom.

She remained at the Royal College of Art (London) for two years, at the same time earning money to help her family.

During this period, she became hon. Sec. to the Women's Social and Political Union for about a year, and for a while represented Fulham I.L.P. on the Metropolitan District Council of the Party.

In 1906 and 1907, she went to prison in the agitation for Votes for Women.

Sylvia Pankhurst then spent the best part of two years going to factories in various parts of the country, getting permission to paint workers while at work, and writing articles on political and economic questions.

In 1908, during her sister's imprisonment, she took her place as Organising Secretary to the W.S.P., and went to many by-elections.

In 1909, she returned to her artistic avocation, and with eight assistants, executed the decorations for a Bazaar at the Prince's Skating Rink, with figures 13 feet high.

In 1911, she decorated the Bazaar at the Portman Rooms, designed the stall-holders' costumes, an imitation of an Old English market, the merry-go-round, etc. She enjoyed her work thoroughly. She made several thousand friends for the Cause, at the same time earning less than the people she employed.

In the same year she went to America on a three months' tour, returning there a second time in 1912, for a tour of the same length of time.

On her return to England, she wrote her first book: "The Suffragette—History of the Militant Movement."

In 1912, Sylvia Pankhurst went to the East End and organised branches of the W.S.P.U. in Bow, Poplar and Stepney; big demonstrations and deputations to Lloyd George, and formed the East London Federation of the Suffragettes, which soon developed a Socialistic tendency.

In the spring of 1913, she was arrested in East London, and was forcibly fed for five weeks. In July, she was arrested again, for advising a Hyde Park audience to go to Downing Street to hoot the Prime Minister, and received a sentence of three months. During her sentence, she did ten hunger and thirst strikes, and when let out for a week under the "Cat and Mouse" Act, she used to speak two or three times during that period, being sometimes carried to a meeting on a stretcher.

When her licence expired, she used to go disguised to meetings and leave amongst the crowd, who many times fought the police who had come in dozens to re-arrest her. Sometimes she managed to get away, at other times she was arrested. The period of "Cat and Mouse" life, including the ten hunger and thirst strikes, lasted about a year.

In 1913, she left the country, under disguise, and went to Denmark and Norway, where she addressed several meetings on the Votes for Women question.

In March, 1914, the *Workers' Dreadnought* was started.

At Easter of that year, she again left England in disguise and spoke in Budapest, Vienna, Dresden, and Brussels, being forbidden by the German police to speak in Berlin.

In July, she demanded that the Premier, Mr. Asquith, should see a deputation of the East End women who wanted Adult Suffrage. Asquith refused five times, and finally Sylvia Pankhurst was arrested (when she was being carried on a stretcher), with a deputation to the House of Commons. She announced that she would hunger and thirst strike till the deputation was received. She was released after nine days of hunger and thirst strike in Holloway and brought home in a cab by a wardress. She immediately went to the House of Commons, and being refused admission, she sat down on the doorstep, refusing to move. When the police came to arrest her, Keir Hardie, came out of the House and announced that Asquith would see the deputation two days later. He (Asquith) then made the most sympathetic response yet made and showed the first



E. SYLVIA PANKHURST.

THE LION AND THE HAIRPINS.

By G. BERNARD SHAW.

MY DEAR SYLVIA PANKHURST—

I am very sorry your appeal has not succeeded; though, like all the sensible people in the movement, I am furious with you for getting into prison quite unnecessarily. Why didn't you make up your mind to keep out of prison, instead of persistently breaking into it? The lion will let you put your head into his mouth, because the law says he must; but if you shake your hairpins in his throat, he is only too glad to have an excuse for snapping. However, there is no use scolding you now; so keep up your spirits, and look forward to the day of your deliverance.

G. BERNARD SHAW.



KARL LIEBKNECHT SPEAKING IN BERLIN.

sign of climbing down from his position of hostility towards Woman Suffrage.

Then the war broke out. It was a period of great distress in the East End. With a few enthusiastic friends, Miss Pankhurst opened two restaurants where 2d. meals were given to grown-up people and for a penny to children; free tickets were distributed to the workless and people in distress. She started a workshop for women for the making of garments, and a toy factory; a minimum wage of £1 a week was paid to the female workers, a wage which at that time was equivalent to that of the unskilled labourer in that district. Queen Mary's Workrooms started later under Government auspices, only paid 10s a week. An agitation was then set afoot to force these Queen Mary's Workrooms to pay £1 also.

At the same time, she started four infant and maternity clinics with free milk in needy cases; also a day-nursery to which a Montessori class was later added. She worked to secure allowances and pensions for soldiers and sailors' wives and families, formed the "League of Rights," and went with many deputations of East End women to Government Departments, the Board of Trade, the Admiralty, the War Office, the Cabinet Committee on Distress, Food Control, etc.

Immediately on the outbreak of the war, she demanded the nationalisation of the food supply, a measure that would have saved much suffering and much profiteering. Whilst assisting distress, Sylvia Pankhurst always worked against the war. In 1915, she saw Conscription coming, and refused to register under the National Registration Act, steadily working against Conscription, agitating during the week-end for soldiers and sailors' wives and families, and in the evening of other days in London.

In 1916, she was arrested in Poplar, and fined for speaking against the war, and the *Dreadnought* offices were raided many times.

In 1917, she took the responsibility of keeping 30 children that no one wanted, and maintained an Orphanage for them for two and a half years.

When the first Russian Revolution took place, Comrade Pankhurst supported the Bolsheviks before they came to power, and addressed many meetings on that question.

She then started the People's Russian Information Bureau in July 1918, and in October, was charged at Cresswell and fined £50, under D.O.R.A., for causing disaffection amongst civilians and the troops.

In September 1919, she attended the Italian Socialist Party Congress at Bologna, where that party declared its adherence to the Third International; she then crossed the Alps on foot, without passport, got into Switzerland, and then, still without passport, to Germany.

In January 1920, she attended the Amsterdam Congress, and once more went to Berlin to study the revolutionary movement there.

In August and September, 1920, without passport, she went to Russia, Petrograd and Moscow, attending the Second Congress of the Third International. She has described her journey and her impressions of Soviet Russia in a book which will shortly be published, and which was written during the brief time she was out on a £2,000 bail, whilst awaiting her appeal against the sentence of six months, which she is now serving.

A NEW YEAR'S GIFT.

A special *Dreadnought* Fund was raised and given as a New Year's gift to Comrade Pankhurst, as a mark of appreciation of her work and devotion to the cause. She greatly appreciated the thought of those who started it, and those who contributed to it. Before entering Holloway, she charged Norah Smyth to convey to them her gratitude, expressing the hope that whilst she is incapacitated from active propaganda, all who are outside, will keep the flag flying by assiduous work, each in his own sphere, however humble. The following is a list of the contributions received, and if there are some who have not known of this Fund and would like to be associated with it, contributions may still be sent in to the *Dreadnought* office and a list will be given to Comrade Pankhurst on the first visit she is allowed to receive:—

Mrs. Ellis, £1; Mr. and Mrs. Durant, 8/6; M. O'Brien, 10/-; J. E. Phillips, £3; Anon, £1; H. G. Russell, 3/-; R. Pott, £1; F. Vickers, 10/-; Tom Mann, 10/-; per W. T. Williams, 10/-; Mrs. Simpleton, £1; J. Clarke, 1/-; R. Nathan, 10/-; S. Gardner, 1/-; A. St. John, 10/-; C. V. L., £25; A. Holdsworth, £1; M. E. Marsh, 2/-; E. Palmer, £2 2s.; Mr. and Mrs. Hart, 5/-; Mrs. Hubbard Ellis, £3; Mrs. Gilbert, 5/-; per Mrs. Drake, 10/-; A. Naylor, £1 1s.; J. Eich, 2/3; R.C. 2/6; A. J. Page, 10/-; Mrs. Westrope, 2/6; H. Morris, 10/-; G. J. Sear, 5/-; T. Pye, £1 10s.; E. M. Brett, £1; J. Staples, 2/6; J. Tierney, 5/-; V. Lemmon, 5/-; W. W. and A.H.H., 5/-; W. Carter, £1; Mrs. Moschewitz, 10/-; Annie Langdon and John Thomas, 5/-; A. Friend, £1; Mrs. Cahill, 5/2; Dr. Bramley Moore, 8/4; W. McIntosh, 10/- (Total, £54 4s. 8d.).

MEETING OUTSIDE HOLLOWAY PRISON.

An enthusiastic and well-attended meeting was held outside Holloway Prison on Sunday last, at 4 o'clock. Comrade Smyth took the Chair, and Comrades Birch and Bishop spoke. Communist songs were sung and cheers given for Comrade Pankhurst, which we are sure, must have penetrated the thick and dismal walls of the prison. Meetings will be held every Sunday at 4 o'clock, and next Sunday we have been promised that a band will be in attendance.

Verbatim Report of Sylvia Pankhurst's Appeal.

Conviction and Sentence Upheld.

On Wednesday of last week the appeal of Miss Sylvia Pankhurst against the conviction and sentence passed upon her under the Defence of the Realm Act, for articles appearing in the *Workers' Dreadnought* on the 16th October last, was heard at the Guildhall in the City of London. The Court consisted of Sir John Bell (chairman), the City Recorder, and the following Aldermen:—Sir Vansittart Bowater, Sir Charles Hanson, Messrs. Moore, Pryke and Geo. Briggs, with Sir William Dunn, Sir John Baddley and Sir Louis Newton; the last three being unable to find room on the Bench. Mr. Travers Humphreys (instructed by the Director of Public Prosecutions) appeared on behalf of the Crown. With him was Mr. Ronald Pavell. Miss Pankhurst conducted her case in person.

The Registrar having read out the particulars of the conviction and sentence, Mr. Travers Humphreys addressed the Court. He said: May it please the Court, I appear to support the conviction from which the Appellant, Miss Sylvia Pankhurst, is appealing. The Court has heard read the terms of conviction which set out, perhaps in rather more detail than is usual, the particulars which, in my submission, justify the conviction. The conviction is under Regulation 42 of the Defence of the Realm Regulations, and that regulation, so far as it is material to this case, proceeds as follows: "If any person does any act calculated or likely to cause sedition or disaffection among any of His Majesty's forces, or among the civilian population, he shall be guilty of an offence against the Regulations." As the Court is aware, it is provided by other regulations, which I need not read in detail, that any person alleged to be guilty of an offence against the regulations is in this position, that it is left to the competent military or naval authority to decide whether the case is one which is properly triable at summary jurisdiction, or whether it should be tried as an indictable offence, and in this case the certificate of the competent authority will be produced to the effect that this was a proper case to be tried summarily. It was that certificate which gave the learned Alderman his jurisdiction to try the Appellant, and that was the charge which was made against her. The conviction states that the act which she did, which is said to be calculated and likely to cause sedition and disaffection amongst His Majesty's Forces, was to publish and circulate, in a newspaper which was published by her, or among the civilian population, articles which were alleged to be of this description: that they advocated disloyalty and refusal to obey orders in His Majesty's Navy, the destruction of Parliament by force, and the looting of the docks of London; and if the Court comes to the conclusion that these articles are reasonably correctly described in the conviction, I venture to submit that the Court will not have much doubt as to whether those articles do not come within the language of Regulation 42 as going far beyond the language of the Crown or the civilian population. Now the Appellant here is the editor of a publication which is called the *Workers' Dreadnought*, and the issue of the 16th October, which is the issue in question, a copy of which I hold in my hand, shows that the *Workers' Dreadnought* is published by the Communist Party (British Section of the Third International). 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. It was at the printing office of the paper, in a Wine Office Court, that the defendant was in fact found, and she there admitted that she was the editor and was responsible, as, of course she would be as editor, for all the articles which appeared in that copy of the *Workers' Dreadnought*. The conviction sets out and refers to three articles which are to be found in that copy of that paper. I do not propose to read them in detail. I propose to read one or two extracts from them, but the Court will, of course, for itself, if it desires, read the whole of the newspaper; and particularly if there is any part which would seem to lead one to any opposite conclusion to that which I invite the Court to draw. The passages which I read, of course I will read, or the Appellant can read them for herself. So far as I am aware, having glanced through the paper, there is nothing from beginning to end in it which detracts from the nature of the statements which are made in the three articles, parts of which I propose to read. The first is headed, "Discontent on the Lower Deck." My submission is that so far from doing anything to allay any discontent on the lower deck, the whole object of this article is to inflame it. It is said to be by S. O. (Gunner), H.M.S. Hunter. Perhaps I may here inform the Court that reference was made to that article when the Defendant was arrested. The police, going to the place where she was, began to search, and as she quite rightly anticipated, what they were searching for was to see whether they could find the manuscript of these articles, particularly this one, with a view to taking steps against the person who was responsible for the article; the writer, the Defendant, anticipating that, said at once to the officer, "If you are looking for the Hunter letter"

—you see it purports to come from H.M.S. Hunter —you will not find it. I anticipated a visit from the police, and you will not find anything of the sort kept here." Now, if I may just refer to the bottom paragraph on the left, that is the bottom of the first column, "Stand by your class. Men of the Lower Deck: Are you going to realise that the fight of the working class is your fight? Are you going to see your class go under in the fight, with the capitalist brutes who made millions out of your sacrifices during the war?"—and then, after a reference to various articles and memorandums by the Admiralty, this is how the article sums up the situation: "The heading is, 'To win the Navy for Communism.' It is on the right column of the paper. 'Now then, Comrades, here is fertile ground for propaganda in accordance with Method B. of the Party's Provisional Resolutions, viz. 'To win the allegiance of the Army and Navy to the cause of the workers.' Comrade Leon especially stresses this point; he says: 'But a refusal to do such work would be equal to treason against the revolutionary cause, and is inconsistent with their belonging to the Third International.' Seeing that the Army and Navy are recruited from the working class, it devolves upon the Communists to urge at Branch meetings and at Trade Union Branch meetings that all workers having relations or friends serving in the forces, should make it their business to write to them from now onwards, urging them to become class-conscious, and not let themselves be used to blackleg the working class, or to oppose them in any way at all. Quite effective work could be done in this manner, especially as it is very difficult for our comrades in the Navy to 'bore from within.' To the rank and file of the Navy I say: You are the sons of the working class, therefore it is your duty to stand by that class and not the class and the Government which is responsible for the starving of your ex-service brothers. Therefore, hail the formation of the Red Navy, which protects the interests of the working class, and repudiates the dirty, financial interests which you are protecting now." My submission to the Court is that to ask men in the Navy to hail the formation of a Red Navy, as it is called—it means a revolution, the whole object of it is not to obey the orders of the Government, which means, of course, the orders of their superiors—is calculated to cause disaffection amongst the Navy. That is that article, on the next page, is "How to get a Labour Government." A person calls himself H. Rubinstein, and it is preceded by a note by the Editor. I will just read the first paragraph of the note by the Editor. "The Editor reports to Parliament. Comrade Rubinstein's article, which we print below, leads off with a defence of the Communist use of Parliamentary action, but his article should really have been entitled, 'The Unimportance of Parliament.' Its purpose is to demonstrate that the Revolution will most probably be brought about by action independent of and outside Parliament." That shows that the Editor of this paper has read this article with some care; if she had not read it she could not have summed it up in that way. This is how the article begins: "Sirkes and Parliamentary action. There seems to be much misunderstanding—and perhaps misrepresentation—in our own ranks, of the meaning of Communist Parliamentaryism. Let us try to make it clear popularly, and then see whether and how it is applicable in this country. We shall soon have the scientific Thesis on this question, from the Moscow Conference. Parliament is an institution of the Capitalist State for duping the workers, and it can never become anything else. The Parliamentary majority—whether the Government be Tory, Liberal or Labour—remains a part of the oppressive machinery of the bourgeois State. Consequently, it is our mission, as Communists, to destroy it—and, perhaps as William Morris said, turn its building into a storehouse for manure. How are we going to destroy Parliament? Firstly, by destroying the faith which millions of British workers still have in it." I draw the attention of the Court to this paragraph: "Secondly, when we have secured power enough, by dispersing it by the force of Red Guards in the street, and the force of paralyzing strikes in industry. To destroy the faith of workers in Parliament requires an enormous amount of direct propaganda outside it. We must preach the futility and humbug of Parliament, unmask, reveal and denounce parliamentarians. That is obvious. To disperse Parliament by force it is necessary to organise and prepare, also outside Parliament for the armed mass-revolt—"the armed mass-revolt and the general industrial strike. This is equally obvious." I think that fairly summarises the whole of the article. That is the article, "How to get a Labour Government." The third article which is referred to in the conviction is one which will be found upon page 5, called, "The Yellow Peril and the Dockers." The article itself, which is by a gentleman called Leon Lopez, I need not read, because I do not suggest that the substance of the article has anything to do with the matter of this conviction. Just to summarise it, Mr. Leon Lopez takes the view that there is nothing undesirable in the connection of white women with yellow men. That is substantially the substance of the article; he does not see why white women, whom he has seen living perfectly happy with Chinamen down the East End, why they should not. He is certainly entitled to his opinion; it is a

matter of opinion; his name is Leon Lopez. But what he says at the end of the article is this: having said that he does not see why the dockers should concern themselves with their sisters living with yellow men—for that has nothing to do with them—he says that what they should concern themselves with is this: I am now reading the last paragraph of the article: "The dockers instead of being unduly concerned about the presence of their coloured fellow men, who, like themselves are the victims of Capitalism and Civilisation, should turn their attention to the huge stores of wealth along the water front. The country's riches are not in the West End, in the palatial houses of the suburbs; they are stored in the East End, and the jobless should lead the attack on the bastilles, the bonded warehouses along the docks to solve the question of unemployment." That is, as I understand it, and submit to the Court, a perfectly plain and simple invitation to the dockers to loot the docks. One must not lose sight of the fact of the suggestion being made in the days in which we are living. While it might be, in times gone by, that one might have afforded to perhaps treat with contempt that sort of thing—because the dockers of London were not in the least likely to do anything of the sort at the invitation of some unknown person called Leon Lopez—one cannot lose sight of the times through which we are passing. The danger of a firebrand must always depend to some extent on the amount and the combustibility of the material into which it is thrown, and my submission is, that in these days, to suggest in an article, that the best thing the dockers could do is to loot the docks of London is about as serious a thing as anyone could possibly put in a newspaper. Now, sir, the appeal of the Appellant is on two grounds. She says "I am not guilty of the offence," and in the alternative, "The sentence passed upon me was too severe, having regard to the nature of the charge"; and I shall be glad of a ruling of the Court upon this matter. I rather propose, myself, to deal only with the question of a conviction in the first place, because if the Court is of opinion that the conviction in this case should be upheld, then there is something else I should have to say upon the question of whether the sentence against which she is also appealing is or is not a right sentence under the circumstances. I propose, subject to the ruling of the Court, to say nothing about that matter at present; but to ask the Court in the first instance to decide whether the conviction is a proper one, and then, if necessary, to allow me to call a witness on the question of whether the sentence was a proper one. But on that matter I should be glad of a ruling of the Court. Of course I am entirely in the hands of the Court. The Appellant: Is it in order for me to make an observation on this question? It is a case which concerns me.

Mr. Humphreys: Of course, my Lord, if the Appellant were represented by counsel I should have had an opportunity of speaking to him, and found out whether this was really an appeal against conviction, or against sentence, or both.

The Appellant: These questions can hardly be decided until I have had something to say; you have not heard my point of view yet.

The Chairman: Certainly.

The Appellant: I want to know, seeing that the counsel is asking you to decide something, if I am not to have an opportunity to reply to you?

The Chairman: Mr. Humphreys is endeavouring to ascertain the opinion of my brother magistrates on a question of procedure. We think we should deal with the whole question now.

Mr. Humphreys: If your Lordship please. Then the Court should know that quite apart from the seriousness of the articles themselves, the Alderman who sentenced the defendant to six months imprisonment in the second division, had before him the fact that she had had a very serious warning administered to her as to the danger of contravening the provisions of Regulation 42. That took the form of a conviction on the 28th October, 1918, when she was convicted of an offence against the same Regulation 42, and was fined £50 and costs. Therefore it is not a case of a person who did not know quite well the seriousness of infringing this Regulation. This is all I want to say upon the question now.

Counsel then proceeded to call witnesses. Lionel Kirchner was called and sworn, and then examined by Mr. Humphreys.

You are an Inspector of the Special Branch of New Scotland Yard?—Yes, sir.

Do you produce a certificate of the competent Naval authority dated the 18th October?—I do, sir. Directing that proceedings should be taken against the Appellant if the case is of such a character that it can be adequately dealt with by a Court of Summary Jurisdiction?—Yes, sir.

On the 18th October did you visit the offices of the Communist Party, 152, Fleet Street?—I did, sir.

And did you there seize a quantity of papers and documents?—I did, sir.

Amongst others, there was a copy of the *Workers' Dreadnought*, which is produced here, of the issue of the 16th October, 1920?—Yes, sir.

Have you been in Court this morning?—No, sir. You have not?—Only just now. I will just get the fact from you that the first article is headed "Discontent on the Lower Deck," and is said to be by S. 000 (Gunner), H.M.S. Hunter?—Yes, sir.

The Chairman: You put in the whole paper, of course? Mr. Humphreys: Certainly. The paper will speak for itself. (To witness): Did you then go to Wine Office Court?—Yes, sir, I did. It is stated on the imprint to be the printing office of the paper?—Yes, sir. And did you see there the Appellant writing in the composing-room?—Yes, sir. Did you show her a copy of the Workers' Dreadnought?—I showed her the copy of this Dreadnought and asked her whether she held herself responsible for the publication. She said, "Yes, certainly I do."

Did she tell you what position she held in regard to the paper?—She said she was the Editor. And did you then take possession of some other copies of that paper?—I took possession of a number of other copies.

And also some printer's proofs?—Printer's proofs. Were you then making a search for either printer's proofs or manuscripts?—Yes, sir, I was. Well, continue; did the Appellant say something to you?—She said, "If you are looking for Hunter's letter you won't find it, because I anticipated a visit from the police, and it is not likely that anything of that sort would be left on the premises."

Did she tell you what was done with the copies of the paper printed at Wine Office Court?—She said that all the copies of the paper printed there were sent to 152, Fleet Street, for distribution. Cross-examined by the Appellant:

I put it to you that I did not say the "Hunter" letter; I said the "sailor's" letter. The reason I put that to you is that I think you said it was the Hunter letter, because it is the Hunter letter; I said the "sailor's" letter. I said, "I don't want to suggest there is any man called Hunter. You won't find the letter."

The Chairman: What is the question? The Appellant: I put it to the witness that I did not say the "Hunter" letter; I said the "sailor's" letter.

The Chairman (to witness): What did she say? The Witness: I say that she said the "Hunter" letter. Inspector Smith, called and sworn, was then examined by Mr. Humphreys.

Hugo Smith, Detective Inspector, City Police, on the 19th October did you go to 10, Wine Office Court with a warrant for the arrest of the Appellant?—Yes, sir.

The Recorder: On what date? Mr. Humphreys: The 19th October, my Lord; the day after the visit of the last witness. (To witness): What did you say to her?—I told her that I had a warrant for her arrest. I read this warrant to her and she said, "Are there any more more to come into this?"

The Recorder: Yes? The Witness: That is all, sir. The Recorder (to Appellant): Do you want to ask this witness any question?

The Appellant: No, thank you. Sergeant Albert Foster, called and sworn, was then put under examination by Mr. Humphreys. Albert Foster, are you a Sergeant of the Special Branch of Scotland Yard?—Yes, sir.

Do you produce the certificate of a conviction, dated the 28th October, 1918, of the Appellant at Eckington, in the County of Derby, for an offence against Regulation 42, when she was fined £50 and costs?—Yes, sir. The Recorder: What is the date?—28th September, 1918.

Mr. Humphreys: That is the date of the offence; the date of the conviction is 28th October?—28th October, 1918, at Eckington Petty Sessions in Derby, the Appellant was fined £50 and £8 5s. special costs.

Mr. Humphreys: Will you hand that in. (Witness handed the document into Court). Cross-examined by the Appellant:

I want to ask a question. I was fined, I believe, as the result of a public meeting. Was that so?—I could not say.

You did not know it was a meeting of the local Labour Party?—I could not say.

You did not know that the Treasurer and Secretary of the local Miners' Federation were there giving evidence against the charge?—I could not say; I heard you were found guilty.

You did not know that the Miners' Federation subscribed the money for my fine?—I think it extremely probable, but I do not know.

The Appellant: That is so. Mr. Humphreys: That will be the case. The Appellant: I am appealing against the sentence, both because I say that the articles have been misconstrued, and it was not until the end and summing up that I realised the construction put on certain words which had been taken from their context; and I am also appealing on the ground

that even should I be guilty the sentence is too severe. I want to deal with the second part first, because I have a witness I wish to call, and do not wish to detain unnecessarily, and I will put the witness in the box at once.

Doctor Ettie Sayer called. The Recorder: What is the witness to prove? The Appellant: It is with regard to the sentence.

The Recorder: As to whether it is excessive or not? The Appellant: Yes.

The Recorder: That is not admissible. That is for the Court to determine. The Appellant: May I question her? I think the facts I shall bring forth you will find material.

The Recorder: You see you are appealing. You must be guided by us. The Appellant: May I explain. I wish to say that the sentence is particularly hard in my case owing to my state of health.

The Recorder: Oh, that is a different matter. The witness was sworn, and questioned by the Court.

The Recorder: What is the lady's name?—Dr. Ettie Sayer. Are you a doctor of medicine?—Yes. M.D. I suppose?—No, M.B., B.S.

Examined by the Appellant. You have been treating me for some time, have you not, Dr. Sayer?—Five weeks. And you know that I was under the treatment of Dr. Vaughan some time ago for the same complaint?—Yes.

What is it I am suffering from?—Endometritis, an internal inflammation. Mr. Ronald Pavell: What is that? The Appellant: Perhaps you could explain to the Court what it is, as the Solicitor does not seem to understand it.

Mr. Ronald Pavell: It does not matter whether the Solicitor understands it. The Witness: It is an inflammation of internal organs, that I think in your case is secondary to inflammation of the intestines—which appears to have been chronic for many years—probably set up by repeated hunger striking.

The Recorder: Will you repeat that?—It is secondary to intestinal inflammation. Caused by hunger striking?—You can get chronic inflammation after hunger striking, especially repeated hunger strikes like those of Miss Pankhurst. I think she did nine or ten.

Then I am right; in your opinion that is one of the causes of this complaint?—Yes. You get it through the thirst strike, the withholding of all fluids. The membranes become inflamed. I have been treating Miss Pankhurst for five weeks. It seemed to me that she required several months' treatment, during which she could follow her ordinary avocation; but the point is that she tells me, this morning, that as a first division prisoner she would be able to continue her treatment and, as a second division prisoner, she would be subject to hardships in diet, and in want of water and want of exercise. That is why I am here.

Mr. Humphreys: Dr. Sayer, may I ask you a question. Are you aware of the fact that there are very skilled doctors in prison who look after their patients?—There are not specialists for this kind of thing.

You think not?—I think not. The Appellant: Is there any special danger?—If you stopped your treatment in the middle you might very likely be landed in an operation, which would be serious.

Do you think that a diet of this kind?—The Recorder: We know nothing about the diet yet. We have no evidence of the diet. If your condition is such as to require special diet, it is dealt with by the prison doctor in the usual way.

The Appellant: I must beg to state, after long experience of Holloway, that is incorrect. (To witness): Doctor, you are of opinion that it would be very unsatisfactory to stop this cure on which you are a specialist?—Yes.

And that it might lead to an operation?—Yes. Is it at all infectious?—Not exactly, no. No, it is not infectious—not infectious to other people. Is it likely to be caused by a chill or anything of that kind?—Chill and fermentation.

Do you think that, owing to the fact that I am suffering from this complaint, the prison treatment would be more injurious to me than to other people, and cause greater hardship?—Yes. Therefore you think the six months' sentence?—Not the length, but the conditions under which you are.

Thank you very much, indeed; I am sorry to have brought you from your work. (To the Court): I now think it is necessary to revert to the paper itself; which is, of course, the charge against me. I want to point out that the articles in question are not written by me. They are written by other people. It is rather interesting to notice that though the articles signed by me in the paper, none of these have been brought up. It is only the things written by other people; and what I have written myself has not been brought into question. Now, of course, it was the business of the prosecution to

make the matter as black against me as possible, and so the prosecuting counsel has only read certain sections; and has taken the matter from its context. I want to deal, first of all, with the "Yellow Peril and the Dockers," by Leon Lopez, and I am going to say to you that the concluding sentence of this article does not mean to me what is alleged by the prosecution; and I was not aware that it bore that construction to other people until I heard the Lord Mayor say so in summing up the case finally—when I had not the opportunity to reply. If the article had borne the construction to me that it bears to some other people, the prosecution, I should not have put it in; because it is contrary to my policy, and to how I think things should be done. It is said that it means that the docks should be looted as a cure for unemployment. Well, now, I am a Communist, and my views are not confined to myself—it is a scientific doctrine—and therefore I say it is opposed to my views to say that unemployment could be cured by looting. What the article means to me is that the workers should have control of the means of production, of these great productive and distributive concerns—that they should have control, and that things should not be organised under Capitalism but under Communism, in which these things would belong to the nation; and the workers who took part in the production of them would be the administrators of them. Just as we have in Soviet Russia, where I have been. It is not fully Communist yet, they have not had long enough for the change; but they are on the way to Communism. At the same time it is a change of system that I am out for, and I am going to prove to you by things I have written in the paper which, after all, express my views—and I am the person being tried here to-day—that that is my opinion. I do not think breaking into a few shops would cure unemployment. The article by Lopez was interesting to me because I know a good deal about the conditions in the East End. I have lived there since 1912, and had a great deal to do with coping with poverty and unemployment, and various evils down there. This article is a plea that the workers should not turn their backs on the workers who are employed by the Capitalist class in this country and found by them to be profitable—that they should look to deeper causes for the cure of unemployment. This is referred to in the article: "A few evenings after, a Hammersmith Northlife news-sheet blazoned the remedy from its portals all over London:—Chinatown scandal. White girls and yellow men. Poplar Council appeal to Home Office. There was some excitement in the West India Dock Road. Mr. Cairns and the Evening News had turned the trick. For the first time in many hopeless weeks, the jobless dockers and seamen would forget their hunger to vent their wrath on the Chinamen and the other coloured elements in Poplar." We know that is precisely what happened. I was returning home one evening down East India Dock Road, and I found the place a shambles. I asked "What is the matter?" and I was told, "They are stabbing coloured men." Some were killed that night, and for three nights the thing went on in Poplar. Out-of-work soldiers and other unemployed were stabbing the coloured men. This is some time ago now, though it was since the war; we have had it in other towns and docks as well as in East London. The fact was that the Trade Union was objecting to the employment of these coloured men. They were left here in this country, and the men out of work, seeing, they thought, they were going to get their jobs, took to stabbing them. A very sad affair it all was. Leon Lopez, being himself a coloured man—who is not a British subject, perhaps—felt this keenly, and he put his letter in this paper; and I, as editor, felt he had a right to put it there, and I point out to the workers that unemployment is caused by deeper things than this. As a Socialist and Communist I believe there are deeper causes. I believe that Communism is coming all over the world. It is beginning in Russia; it is spreading westward; we shall have it here. I believe that is the solution of these evils. When this man made this plea in this paper, I felt that it was not only my right but my duty to put it in; and when he said they must look to the docks and bonded warehouses, he meant they must look to the administration of the country—which I contend is built up by labour working on raw materials and so on. That is the purpose of the article. I want to say that other things in the paper are not things which I have invented. They are current ideas, which were current before I was born. My father brought me up from my early childhood as a Communist and Socialist. These ideas are current, legal, and circulated in this country. I am giving utterance to these ideas. We have standard works here that refer to them. We have *News from Nowhere*, a book anyone can buy and read, given to me by my father when I was a little girl. It is referred to here. Here we have this question of Parliament being used as a storehouse, and he says here, on page 34—this is at the time, you know, when a man woke up and found Communism was in this country—it tells exactly what happened, and what is what is referred to in the article. It says: "We went on a little further, and I looked to the right again, and said, in rather a doubtful tone of voice, 'Why, there are the Houses of Parliament! Do you still use them?' He burst out laughing, and it was some time before he could control himself; then he clapped me on the back and said: 'I take you, neighbour; you may well wonder at our keeping them standing, and I know

something about that, and my old kinsman has given me books to read about the strange game that they played there. Use them! Well, yes, they are used as a sort of subsidiary market, and a storage place for manure, and they are handy for that, being on the waterside." Here, again, it says: "Now, said I, 'I have come to the point of asking questions which I suppose would be dry for you to answer and difficult for you to explain; but I have foreseen for some time past that I must ask them will I nil I. What kind of government have you? Has Republicanism finally triumphed? Or have you come to a mere dictatorship, which some people in the nineteenth century used to prophesy as the ultimate outcome of democracy? Indeed, this last question does not seem so very unreasonable, since you have turned your Parliament House into a dung market. Or where do you house your present Parliament? The old man answered my smile with a hearty laugh and said: 'Well, well, dung is not the worst kind of corruption; fertility may come of that, whereas mere dirtiness comes from the other kind, of which those walls once held the great supporters. Now, dear guest, let me tell you that our present parliament would be hard to house in one place, because the whole people is our parliament.' 'I didn't understand,' said I. 'No, I suppose not,' said he. 'I must now shock you by telling you that we have no longer anything which you, a native of another planet, would call a government.' 'I am not so shocked as you might think,' said I, 'as I know something about governments. But tell me how do you manage, and how have you come to this state of things?' Said he: 'It is true that we have to make some arrangements about our affairs, concerning which you can ask presently; and it is also true that everybody does not always agree with the details of these arrangements; but, further, it is true that a man no more needs an elaborate system of government, with its army, navy, and police, to force him to give way to the will of the majority of his equals than he wants a similar machinery to make him understand that his head and a stone wall cannot occupy the same space at the same moment. Do you want further explanation?' 'Well, yes, I do,' quoth I. Old Hammond settled himself in his chair with a look of enjoyment, which rather alarmed me, and made me dread a scientific disquisition; so I sighed and abided and he said: 'I suppose you know pretty well what the process of government was in the bad old times?' That means our times—' was not the Parliament on the one side a kind of watch committee sitting to see that the interests of the upper classes took no hurt; and on the other side a sort of blind to delude the people into supposing that they had some share in the management of their own affairs?'—History seems to show us this.—'To what extent did the people manage their own affairs?—I judge from what I have heard that sometimes they forced Parliament to make a law to legalise some alteration which had already taken place.'—'Anything else?' 'I think not. As I am informed, if the people made any attempt to deal with the cause of their grievances, the law stopped in and said, this is a rebellion, revolt or what not, and slew or tortured the ringleaders of such attempts.—If Parliament was not the government then, nor the people either, what was the government?—Can you tell me?' 'I think we shall not be far wrong if we say the government was the Law Courts, backed up by the executive, which handled the brute force that the deluded people allowed them to use for their own purposes; I mean the army, navy, and police.'

The Chairman: Do I understand these statements are from your father that you are reading?

The Appellant: I am reading a book, *News from Nowhere*, a standard work quoted in this article. It is not a seditious book; neither is this paper. "It is a commonplace that even rich men looked upon a law suit as a dire misfortune, even if they gained the case; and, as for a poor one—why, it was considered a miracle of justice and beneficence if a poor man who had once got into the clutches of the law escaped prison or utter ruin."

The Chairman: Miss Pankhurst, the Court have ruled that it is wholly irrelevant. Therefore we cannot allow you to go on reading the whole of that book.

The Appellant: My defence is that these things do not infringe the current practice of free speech in this country, and I am quoting from a standard work to prove I am right. With regard to the question, "How are we going to destroy Parliament? Firstly, by destroying the faith which millions of British workers still have in it. Secondly, when we have secured power enough, by dispersing it by the force of Red Guards in the street, and the force of paralysing strikes in the English People," by John Richard Green—another standard work given to me when a child at school. In this book it applauds Cromwell first of all for having organised Pride's Purge—in which 150 Members of Parliament were arrested quite illegally by the Army, and, secondly, for dissolving Parliament. Because Parliament was doing wrong it was thought right for the Army to revolt. We think Parliament is no doing right to-day, and we say that in making these statements we are analysing scientific causes and scientific results; and we are predicting what is going to happen unless there is a change in this country. We are allowed to express our opinions—because such opinions are expressed in standard works which are given to children at school—

and these ideas are current in common use and practice. We have the same right to express those views, we think as any one else—those who have written in this paper. Here is another work, the "Manifesto of the Communist Party"—not the Communist Party of to-day, but published long ago; in 1872. We have here a much more violent statement than anything I have in my paper, and the Government is not proceeding against this document, published in 1872 by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles. Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, baron and serf, guild-master and journeyman"—and so on. He says it is a history of class struggle and he says: "The bourgeoisie, since the establishment of modern industry and the world-market, has at last conquered exclusive political power in the modern representative State." He says further: "The weapons with which the bourgeoisie conquered feudalism are now turned against the bourgeoisie itself. But the bourgeoisie has not only forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also produced the men who will wield these weapons—the modern workers, the proletariat. . . . they are not only the slaves of the bourgeois class, the bourgeois State, they are daily and hourly enslaved by the individual bourgeois manufacturer himself. . . ."

The Chairman: What is the object of reading all this? The Appellant: To prove that since these are standard works, circulated freely in the country, for me or others in my paper to express the same views is not illegal.

The Chairman: It does not follow, all we are concerned with is the actual publications you have issued; the question is whether they infringe this Regulation.

The Appellant: Now we are coming back to this question of Leon Lopez, and whether it means that they are to loot the docks or control the docks. There is a little article by myself which has a bearing on the question, which I am going to read to you, because I want to prove to you that I want something much deeper and quite different from that, which is called "The Capitalist Checkmate Proves Revolution Necessary and Reform Impossible." It says, "The refusal of capitalists to lend money to Queensland's Labour Government and the barriers which they have raised against the opening of trade with Soviet Russia, reveal in a striking manner the fact that gradual and peaceful transition from Capitalism to Communism is impossible, because the Capitalists will fight against the change with all their power and with every weapon at their disposal."

The Chairman: What we want to know is what you are reading from now. The Appellant: I am reading from the issue of the "Workers' Dreadnought," page 4.

The Chairman: The same as we have now? The Appellant: The same one, a leading article by myself.

The Chairman: What page? The Appellant: Page 4, right in the middle of the paper: "The experience of the Queensland Government will be the experience of the coming Labour Government on this country, should it make any inroads on capitalist interests. If it fails to attack the privileges of Capitalism, the coming Labour Government will be overthrown by the workers on whom it will depend for support. Should it attempt reforms which interfere with capitalist privileges it will have to engage in a life and death struggle with Capitalism, in which either the workers' revolution will destroy the capitalist system, as in Russia; or victorious Capitalism will overwhelm the entire working-class movement, even its most moderate sections, in a blood bath of White Terror, as happened in Hungary and Poland. When the Queensland Labour Government is formed, it will have to choose between these two alternatives."

The Chairman: What is the purpose of this? The Appellant: I want to point out that you did not interrupt the solicitor for the prosecution when he was reading extracts from the paper. I wish to read extracts from it.

The Chairman: I was trying to point out to you that you are not prosecuted for this particular article.

The Appellant: I believe I am entitled to prove the meaning of certain paragraphs by adding to them the context.

The Chairman: Certainly you are, but you are not prosecuted for this paragraph at all. The Appellant: No, but I am proving the meaning of that paragraph by reading the context.

The Chairman: This is another article; it cannot be the context of the paragraph. The Appellant: The context is the entire paper. I am responsible for the entire paper. I wish to prove what I took this article to mean. The whole paper is an article to me. I am responsible for the whole. "When the Queensland Labour Government desired to pass an Act which, as Capitalism complains, violated the contracts under which the Crown pastoral leases were held, it found the capitalists in the Upper House of the legislature lined up against it. It created additional members of the Upper House, only to find that the capitalists were holding a metaphorical pistol at the Government's head, by declaring that unless the provisions of the new Act were set at nought, Capitalism would prevent the Government from raising money. Mr. Theodore, the Prime Minister, himself

came to London, attempting to raise £2,000,000, which, where governments are concerned, is a very little loan, but he found the door of every financial house closed against him. He now declares that the money will be raised in Queensland, and London capitalists draw from the "firms operating in Queensland will be tapped," in its financial columns, replies in threatening style; it declares that this is a policy of "vengeance" and says: "We can assure the people of Queensland that such a policy will completely fail in its purpose." The naked truth is that this is a clash between the capitalists of the City of London and the people of Queensland, and that this is only the beginning of the struggle. To-day, the capitalists only hold a metaphorical pistol, a very substantial weapon, nevertheless, in the shape of a financial boycott. To-morrow, if the capitalists consider it necessary to do so, they will use even more formidable and powerful weapons. Those who doubt should remember Carson's Ulster Volunteers, the "republicans" that Lloyd George is so proud of in Ireland; the attack on the Socialist Movement in Finland. In the negotiations for trade with Soviet Russia—"

The Chairman: Miss Pankhurst, the Bench are of opinion that you are wasting the time of the Court; it has no bearing on the case.

The Appellant: I respectfully submit that it has every bearing. I wish to put to you that I am not the person, and my paper is not a paper advocating indiscriminate looting. We advocate an entire change of system. I want to put it to you, as gentlemen referred to in this article, city financiers and so on, that if you are so persistent in interrupting me when I am trying to explain my views, and to defend myself in this case, people will say that you were interested parties and that you did not wish to have the fact of how you had set the Government at naught by your financial power, to be brought out in Court.

The Chairman: We are sitting here as magistrates. The Appellant: You don't allow me to develop my case. It is most unfair to a person with no legal training.

The Chairman: We are not sitting here as city financiers. The Appellant: We know you are the Bench of Aldermen, and they are city financiers. "The British Government—"

The Chairman: We have already said that we cannot hear any more of this article. The Appellant: Well, then, we shall have another article.

The Chairman: I think you will do better to take the whole of it as read.

The Appellant: The next thing is for me to develop the fact that I am working on scientific Communist principles, and not on indiscriminate looting; which could not displace the system but only put some men into gaol. It could not displace the capitalist system in the least respect. Here is another article, not written by myself; but it will do very well.

The Chairman: The Bench want to know what this is to prove.

The Appellant: It is to prove that there is no advocacy of indiscriminate looting in this paper, but the advocacy of a change of system from Capitalism to Communism, a propaganda which is not illegal in this country, and has been carried on by many other people before I was born.

The Chairman: The only question we have to determine is whether you have infringed the Regulation.

The Appellant: I am proving to you what the Regulations means to me. You are surely not going to convict me of what it means to you if it does not mean that to me.

The Chairman: We have already heard you at a length we should not have thought of allowing if you had been represented by Counsel.

The Appellant: Am I not right to give evidence? The Recorder: In this class of cases, people appear personally because they think they will be allowed a greater latitude than if represented by Counsel.

The Appellant: That is not my experience; I always find Counsel get much more latitude. The Recorder: That is not my experience, I am sorry to say, and I have fifty years experience nearly.

The Appellant: I again come back to the point that these views are current, and if you wish to stop them, you cannot confine yourself to me and the "Workers' Dreadnought"; you will have to prosecute other people, because the ideas are current. Now we have a pamphlet here with articles from a book, "Capital," by Karl Marx. In that you have "Violence is the midwife of every old society about to give birth to a new. Violence is an economic factor. . . . material violence can only be abolished by material violence. Theoretical teaching itself becomes material violence as soon as it permeates the majority." And even if that is not yet sufficiently explicit, what shall we say of that quotation from Marx in the "Neue Rheinische Zeitung," "There is only one means of lessening, of simplifying, of concentrating the fatally criminal sufferings of this old society, and its heart-rending pangs in bringing to birth the new, and

BRANCH NOTES.

Sheffield.

This Branch has decided to take part in the Unity Conference, providing this is not binding. The Branch also agrees unanimously that the whole of the E.C. of the Communist Party (B.S.T.I.), is put up for election in the new E.C. of the United Party. All local enquiries to A. Carford, 183, West Street, Sheffield.

Birmingham.

Branch meets on Wednesdays at 7.30 p.m., at A.S.E. Institute, Spical Street, Bull Ring. Comrades, sympathisers, and would-be members, rally in the time of adversity.

A. C. Webb (Secretary).

Altrincham.

This Branch very much resents the action of the E.C. in only sending Theses to Branches with more than ten members, and say they have a right to the Theses. (Note.—The E.C. have had the greatest difficulty in getting sufficient copies of the Theses for even the larger Branches.) All local enquiries to Comrade Jack Whinfield, 62, Brunswick Road, Broadheath, Cheshire.

Staines.

This Branch unanimously agrees to the acceptance of the whole of the Theses and Statutes of the Communist International without further referendum. Comrade Morgan has been elected E.C. delegate for the following two meetings. All local enquiries to Comrade J. Silvester, 4, Factory Path, Staines, Middlesex.

Portsmouth.

At a specially summoned meeting of the Portsmouth Branch on January 2nd, a resolution was passed, asking for a referendum on the question of the January Conference, and we understand by a referendum, ballot papers for individual members, not one ballot paper to the Branch, as was done in the referendum for Secretary. We also desire to protest against the action of the Executive in deciding that half the Branches must ask for a referendum, seeing the numerical difference between Branch and Branch. Surely, if we believe in the principle of Soviet rule, we should apply it to our own Party? The membership of our Branch at present is 13 financial members.

All local enquiries to Comrade M. E. Marsh, 12, St. John's Road, Fratton, Portsmouth.

Soho.

A well-attended Branch meeting was held on the 5th inst. We regret that our Secretary, Comrade Cornwallis, had to go to hospital, and hope that he will soon be up and among us again and continue the good work he has done for the Party.

After a long discussion, it was decided to send the following letter to our Manchester comrades:—

DEAR COMRADES—

We thank you for your letter and note your remarks contained therein.

We have given the matter very careful consideration, and have weighed up the pros and cons from every conceivable standpoint.

We would like it to be clearly understood that we agree with all you say regarding "Parliamentary action," but as far as we understand the Theses, we can accept them and yet remain anti-Parliamentarians.

In order to explain our position, we summarise herewith the clauses of the Thesis dealing with Parliamentarism:—

§ 17. Summary.—"The formal acknowledgment that the participation in Parliamentary elections and in the sittings of Parliament is desirable for Communists in certain countries, at certain times, and under certain conditions, does not imply that Communists in all countries, and at all times and under all conditions are to participate in Parliamentary elections and Parliamentary work."

§ 18. Summary.—"The Communist Party must DECIDE the question according to the specific conditions of the given moment. Boycotting the elections or Parliament are permissible."

In our opinion, this leaves it open to any Communist Party which may be formed in Britain to refuse here and now to participate in Parliamentary action.

§ 20. Summary.—"Since the question of Parliamentary action is comparatively unimportant, and since the difference of opinion upon this tactical question are the only differences among revolutionary Communists all revolutionary Communists, whether Parliamentarian or anti-Parliamentarian, are urged to unite on behalf of direct action and the D.O.P."

We believe this is a direct invitation to anti-Parliamentarian Communists to join the Third International, without abandoning their anti-Parliamentarian principle, and it is left to us to decide, if we choose, as a united Communist Party for Britain, to take no part in Parliamentary action. It rests with us in the B.S.T.I., convinced anti-Parliamentarians as far as Britain is concerned, to have our full voting strength, including that of the Manchester Groups, represented at the Leeds Conference.

We should then, in conjunction with the contingents from Scotland and South Wales, and with the anti-Parliamentarian elements in the existing Communist Party of Great Britain, be able to enforce our own interpretation of the Thesis.

It was because we interpreted the Thesis as put before you in this letter, that we of the Soho Branch, after careful study and prolonged discussion, instructed our delegate at the Cardiff Conference, to vote in favour of participation in the Unity Movement. We feel that the Manchester comrades' withdrawal from the Unity Movement at this stage will be a grievous error,

COMMUNIST PARTY

British Section of the Third International.

CONDITIONS OF MEMBERSHIP.—The acceptance of the following points: (1) The complete overthrow of Capitalism and the establishment of Communism. (2) The Class struggle. (3) The Dictatorship of the Proletariat. (4) The Soviet or Revolutionary Workers' Council system. (5) Affiliation to the Third International. (6) Refusal to engage in Parliamentary Action. (7) Non-affiliation to the Labour Party.

MINIMUM WEEKLY SUBSCRIPTION: Three pence. **Entry Fee:** One Shilling.

Provisional Secretary: EDGAR T. WHITEHEAD, 8, Sinclair Gardens, West Kensington, London, W.14.

Branches' notes and list of meetings, sent in for publication, should reach the Secretary not later than first post Thursday morning.—All articles and news matter (other than Branches' notes) to be sent to: 400, Old Ford Road, Bow, London, E.3, and marked: "The Editor, The Workers' Dreadnought."

The "WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT" may be obtained for sale at 3/- per quire (26 copies). Usual Trade rates for wholesale and retail newsagents.

All Members should make a special effort to see that our paper is on sale and posters displayed at local newsagents, trade union branches, in the workshop and at all public meetings in their districts.

and will be of the utmost disservice to anti-Parliamentarian Communism in Britain.

Yours fraternally,

—The Soho Branch.

All local enquiries to the Secretary, Soho Branch Communist Party, c/o 58, Old Compton Street, Soho, W.

OGMORE VALLEY NOTES.

BY "SOCRATES."

C.W.S.'s Finance.

A campaign has been launched recently throughout the country by the Co-operative Wholesale Society, for the specific purpose of getting members of Co-operative Societies to invest capital in the C.W.S. Bank, in order to further enhance the building of productive works, which are essential to the advancement of the Co-operative movement in general. On January 19th and 20th, Mr. Burt Williams of the C.W.S., will address meetings on the need of the above at both Halls in the Valley, and we trust that the meetings will be well attended by all professing Co-operators. Co-operation in all spheres is vitally necessary to-day, and it behoves all Trade Unionists in Ogmogre Valley, during the coming week, to make the above campaign a complete success, and let the motto of Co-operation again resound, "Each for All, and All for Each."

Sunday Cinemas.

Controversy on the above subject is still raging in the Valley, and not a few letters have been written in our local weekly, the *Glanorgan Gazette*. The religious element seems to be rather annoyed over the matter, inasmuch as the introduction of films to illustrate different scientific lectures will be desecrating the Sabbath, and as such, will tend to make people irreligious. What a terrible catastrophe! Assuming for a moment that practically all our young men and women are such sincere Christians as our deacons will have us believe, are they absolutely afraid of Cinema Houses competing with that deeply-rooted, intense religious feeling, which they maintain, grips so many of our young men and women? The answer is obvious, friends; religious teaching is losing its hold on the masses, especially the young element. That is why our deacons are sore afraid. To the religious element I say, take a vote of all young men and women of the Valley to-day, as to whether lectures shall be held on Sunday evenings or otherwise, and I'll guarantee a tremendous majority for the continuation of the said lectures. Why not try it, my religious friends?

Half-Day Saturday.

The weekly half-holiday, namely, Saturday afternoon, is now being introduced by a good many Co-operative Societies throughout the country. In South Wales, it is practically accomplished, with a few exceptions. We had it in Ogmogre Valley, with very little opposition, and we are hoping to see it become general throughout the Valley, among the private traders who are behind in this matter. It is up to us as fellow employees to agitate during the next few months, in order to make Saturday afternoon the weekly half-holiday, and in so doing, to extend the agitation right throughout the country. Practically all sport in the district is confined to Saturday, so why not agitate on behalf of the shop-assistants in South Wales, in order to make it a reality. Hurry up, friends, and re-commence the agitation. With the amalgamation that has taken place recently among us as shop-workers, and with the help of other unions, it should be easily overcome. The Miners have an "Unofficial Reform Movement," why not the Shop Assistants? Prepare, sooner we make a move, the better. Let us get a move on.

MAKE PROPAGANDA AND ASSIST OUR PAPER.

In response to my appeal to sympathisers to take out subscriptions for four weeks, for friends likely to be interested in the paper, I have received 1/- from Miss Causton, and 2/- from Mrs. Cahill. I hope others will follow their example.

Norah L. Smyth.

WILLESDEN UNEMPLOYED COMMITTEE.

The Willesden Unemployed Committee sent a deputation to the local Council of Action on Wednesday, January 5th.

The Council of Action has agreed to send a circular to every local T.U. Branch, instructing them to call a special general meeting to discuss the unemployment question. Each Branch to appoint a delegate, armed with a majority minority mandate in favour of a general strike for peace with Russia, as a means of ending unemployment and short time. Other Unemployed Committees are asked to follow suit.

The continuation of the "Immediate Problems of Economic Construction" will appear in the next issue.

LONDON MEETINGS: OUTDOOR.

Whitechapel.
Osborne Street, Sundays, at 11.45 a.m.

Poplar.

Dock Gates, Sundays, at 7 p.m.

Camberwell.

Saturdays, at Hanover Park, Rye Lane, at 7.30, Sundays, Peckham Rye, at 11 a.m.

Birmingham.

Bull Ring, Every Friday at 7.30. Every Sunday at 7 p.m.

Barking.

Near Barking Station. Sundays, at 6.30 p.m. Communist speakers.

INDOOR BRANCH MEETINGS.

Soho International.

58, Old Compton Street, Soho, W. Every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. prompt.

Bow.

400, Old Ford Road. Every Wednesday at 8 p.m.

Poplar.

20, Railway Street. Every Thursday at 9 p.m.

Camberwell.

16, Peckham Road, Mondays, at 7.45 p.m.

Hull.

Argyle House, Anlaby Road. Every Wednesday night at 8 p.m.

Hammersmith.

Branch meetings held Fridays, at 8 p.m., at 154, Goldhawk Road, Shepherds Bush, W.

Barking.

Thursdays, at 8 p.m. At "Glenhurst," Ripple Road, Barking, E.

Stepney.

Branch meetings held Thursdays, at 8 p.m., at the I.S.C., 28, East Road, City Road, N.1.

Central London.

Branch Meeting, Mondays, at 8 p.m., at the International Socialist Club, 28, East Road, City Road, N.1.

HYDE PARK PROPAGANDA GROUP.

Sundays. 4 to 10 p.m. Hyde Park, Marble Arch.

Thursdays. Branch meets at 7.30 p.m. at the Laurie Arms, Crawford Place, Edgware Road, W.

Saturdays. 6 to 10 p.m. Hyde Park, Marble Arch

EAST LONDON LECTURES.

(Organised by the Union of Post Office Workers), R. BROWN, Hon. Sec.

You are cordially invited to attend the following FREE LECTURE, to be held at the

"INSTITUTE," 27 Romford Road, STRATFORD,

January 16th, 1921.—MR. J. TOGHATTI, "Social Problems and Problems for Workers."

STEELE AND HARVEY MAINTENANCE FUND.

Mrs. Solovitch, 10/-; Working Lady Sympathiser, Edinburgh, 1/-; Comrade Richardson, Leeds, 1/-; John McLean, M.A., 5/-; South Shields Comrades, per J. Beadham, 1/-, made up as follows: J.W., 2/6; T.D., 5/-; J.B., 2/-; Friend, 6d.; J.F., 6d.; H.H., 2/-; J. Lawson, 1/-; G. Harvey, 1/-; Dot, 1/-; J.H.P., 1/-; E.H.W., 6/-; J.T.D., 1/-; J.F., 1/-; J. Johnson, 1/- (Total, £2 16s.).

SMALL ADVERTISEMENTS—1d. a Word.

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

GRAMOPHONES FOR SALE, splendid Xmas presents; first class quality; new; good Records.

Buy direct from the Maker, who is giving you the opportunity of purchasing at first hand and at the lowest possible prices.

Sixpence allowed on any old or broken record, upon purchasing a new one. One new record given for six old ones.

Bring a copy of the *Dreadnought* as a coupon for extra reduction.

"RACHOPHONE"

152, ROMAN ROAD, BOW, E

Published by E. Sylvia Bankhurst for the Communist Party at 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4, and printed at the Argenta Press, 10, Wipe Office Court, London, E.C.4.