

The Searchlight on the Lockout.

Workers' Dreadnought

FOR INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM.

Founded and Edited by
SYLVIA PANKHURST

VOL. IX. No. 1.

SATURDAY, MARCH 18TH, 1922.

[WEEKLY.] PRICE TWOPENCE.

WHAT TO FIGHT FOR

COMMUNISM.

ABUNDANCE FOR ALL.

FOOD FOR ALL.

CLOTHES FOR ALL.

HOUSES FOR ALL.

LEISURE, PLEASURE, AND EDUCATION FOR ALL.

THE COMMON OWNERSHIP OF THE LAND, INDUSTRY AND TRANSPORT.

WORKERS' ADMINISTRATION OF PRODUCTION AND TRANSPORT THROUGH THE WORKERS' OWN SOVIETS.

THE ABOLITION OF CAPITALISM.

THE ABOLITION OF POVERTY.

THE ABOLITION OF WAGEDOM.

THE ABOLITION OF BUYING AND SELLING.

THE ABOLITION OF PARLIAMENT.

THAT NONE MAY LIVE ON THE EXPLOITATION OF OTHERS.

HOW TO FIGHT

SOLIDLY.

ACTIVELY.

DO NOT FIGHT MERELY FOR THE TRADE UNION TO CONTROL YOUR OVERTIME; FIGHT FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF YOUR INDUSTRY AND YOUR ECONOMIC EMANCIPATION.

FROM ALL ACCORDING TO THEIR CAPACITIES, TO ALL ACCORDING TO THEIR NEEDS.



LIFE TO-DAY.

KUZBAS OR COMMUNISM *Questions that Must be Answered*

Comrade Tom Barker sends us the prospectus of an industrial venture now being advertised under the auspices of the Russian Soviet Government. The scheme is laid in the Kuznets Basin, hence the name, "Kuzbas." The printed prospectus says:—

"The Russian Revolution gave the land to the peasants, and the factories to the working man. Through four years of most terrific struggle, these victories have been maintained. This is the great historic fact that keeps the eyes of all working men on Russia."

Yes, that historic fact filled all Communists with enthusiastic hope, but now the Soviet Government sells piece-meal the victory won by the blood of Russia's millions. As the prospectus truly observes:—

"Soviet Russia offers her industry to the capitalist concessionaire, to world labour, or to both."

The Kuzbas scheme is explained thus:—

"Two of the most valuable concessions in Soviet Russia have been taken off the concession market, and are now held for exploitation by an organisation of American workers."

The term, "exploitation" has an ominous sound, but let us examine the scheme:—

"The plan is to develop Concession Number One offered to world capitalists—the Kuznets Coal and Iron Basin, with its two hundred and fifty billion tons of coal, its iron ore, timber and agricultural land, and to operate Nadejensk's Zavod, a complete steel plant in the north-eastern Urals, which, in pre-war years, produced 20 per cent. of the total steel and cast iron of the Urals, being the largest producer of charcoal pig iron in the world. It is an opportunity so large and amazing that it takes the breath away. It is as if one were being asked to be the founder of a new America."

It is proposed to induce industrially qualified men from countries outside Russia, mainly America, to emigrate to Russia. Each worker is expected to pay his travelling expenses, to provide himself with clothes for two years, minimum value two hundred dollars, and to provide two hundred dollars or more to pay for his

food and tools and so on for two years. Each worker must therefore find 800 dollars beside his travelling expenses. Additional money must also be raised for other needs. "An endeavour will be made to get the worker to supply this additional capital as far as possible." It is proposed to bring in thus six thousand foreign workers to carry out the first year's programme. Men are chiefly invited, but "Some women and children are desirable, to maintain the proper home life and home atmosphere. The engineers will in many cases be accompanied by their wives and families."

"Single women will also be considered, providing they are also industrially qualified, physically fit and politically reliable." Apparently the standards set for women are somewhat stricter than for men. Doubtless it is realised that the proletarian woman able to contribute upwards of £100 is practically non-existent, and that, of single women, only the middle class are likely to apply.

On the face of it it seems regrettable that the Soviet Government should have made it a condition that the worker should be a little capitalist before he may go to Kuzbas; but there is worse to come. The scheme entails some of the most ugly features of capitalist exploitation.

Says the prospectus:—
"Most of the details of the enterprise were worked out in Russia, so that everything as stated in the following pages is authoritative."

Then, in detailing the advantages which the scheme offers to the capitalist-proletarians from America, it says:—

"Kemerovo is a little industrial Gary in Kuznets Basin in the heart of Siberia. The

YOUR SUBSCRIPTION.

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

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

S. O. S.

SEND A DONATION TO THE "WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT" £500 FUND TO-DAY.

GIVE THIS PAPER TO A FRIEND.

For Embroidery SOVIET ARMS TRANSFERS.

Large size, 12 inches wide, suitable for handkerchiefs, cushion covers, etc., 6d. each. Smaller sizes, two designs on a sheet, 4 inches wide, 2 1/2 inches in width, 2d. a Sheet. Larger or smaller sizes supplied to order.

American workers will take over this town of 11,000 population, together with all the auxiliary industries. The mining part of the town is on the east bank of the River Tom, and the industrial part connected with the chemical plant, on the west bank. The town is well laid out, with broad streets and attractive double log bungalows of three or four rooms, with fenced yards. The houses are lighted with electricity and many have running water. The town and all buildings have been built since 1913, and five hundred workers can be added to the existing population with but slight repairs to existing buildings. As the immigrant workers arrive, Russian peasant labour, to the amount of about half the population of the town, will return to the village, since the peasant labour has been mobilised for work in the mines.

The following municipal industries will be taken over in Kemerovo and operated by the foreign workers' unit:

"A well-built hospital, situated in the forest of pine that comes down to the edge of the city, now employing a medical staff of 61, including two doctors, a surgeon, two dentists and two midwives.

"A bakery now employing four bakers. (Siberia uses white flour.)

"A hotel dining room accommodating 250, and employing ten persons.

"Three bath houses, one for miners, one for the general public, and one for old people. Each bath house has an attendant.

"Two Swedish sawmills of one frame each, which are now in operation—one on each side of the river.

"A blacksmith shop with small equipment and nine forges in good condition.

"Two theatres of 1,000 capacity each, and equipped with moving picture machinery, as well as a stage and scenery for the production of plays.

"A grammar school with 25 teachers and 500 school children.

"Three small brick plants (with no machinery) where 20 thousand bricks are made by 20 workers during the summer months.

"One barber shop with two barbers.

"One tailor shop with two tailors.

"A shoe repair shop with 22 shoe-makers.

"A five-bench carpenter shop."

And again:—

"Unskilled labour Russia has in abundance, but because of her free land, the wages must necessarily be above what the peasant labourer can earn in his village."

That reads like a phrase from the report of a capitalist director to his shareholders.

"Kuzbas organisation will operate a glass factory and Hoffman brick kilns at Tomsk. . . The population is 80,000 . . . in 1921 there were 6,000 students at Tomsk University."

It seems that the greater part of Tomsk city—lucky Tomsk!—is outside the Kuznets Concession! The report describes within the territory of the concession to be "exploited" by the foreign proletarian-capitalists, stone quarries, coal mines, chemical plants, tinplate works, blast furnaces, iron mines, iron and steel plants, charcoal burning plants, cement plants, brick kilns, timber forests and lumber works, saw-mills, railways and railway locomotive works, flour mills and bakeries. Some of this plant is of first-rate modern type. Moreover, there is the agricultural land and everywhere are the Russian people who are working the land and the industries to a certain extent, and whose wages, as the prospectus says, must necessarily be above what the peasant labourer can earn in his village. What part are the natural inhabitants to have in Kuzbas?

Says the prospectus:—

"All the properties will be operated as a State industry, as an economic unit under the management of the organisation of foreign workers. The organisation will function on the basis of a special statute approved by the Council of Labour and Defence. All the properties will be operated by the Kuzbas Organisation as one property: with one board of managers and one technical staff."

Remember that the foreign workers will form but a tiny proportion of the population of Kuznets territory.

What is to become of the Russian workers' dream of controlling their own industry through their industrial Soviets?

"The Russian Revolution gave the land to the peasants, and the factories to the working men. Through four years of a most terrific struggle, these victories have been maintained."

Alas, poor Russia! Was it for this thy people died? Is another Africa governed by colonists of other races, to be created in Siberia?

It is true that the report says "Russian workers within the unit shall have the same legal and material rights as the other participants from America and other countries." This, however, evidently does not mean all Russian workers living within the Kuznets' territory, but all Russian workers able to provide the 300 dollars that are required of the foreign worker.

Is that the case? We ask that question urgently, insistently of Tom Barker and all who are pushing this scheme, and of the Soviet Government itself.

How is the Russian worker to find 300 dollars? How many million roubles would that amount to? No Russian worker can do this, unless he has been playing the part of profiteer and exploiting his fellow workers. In that case he is a specially dangerous person to put in authority over his fellows.

But where is the Communism; where is the workers' control of industry in this Kuzbas venture?

"A productive organisation is created," says the prospectus, "that can give the worker the full product of his labour." These Marxians of Russia and America, certainly defy the doctrines of Marx! See his notes on the Gotha programme, in which he exposes the absurdity of the term "the whole product of labour," showing that the "whole product" must inevitably be reduced to part of the product of labour. Having exposed the falsity of the term, he justly says:—

"Within the co-operative commonwealth based upon common ownership of the means of production, the producers do not exchange their products; just as little does the labour embodied in products manifest itself as a material quality possessed by them; for now (in contrast with what happens in capitalist society) the individual acts of labour no longer exist indirectly, but exist directly as constituents of associated labour. Thus the term 'product of labour,' which to-day is already open to objection, on account of its ambiguity, becomes totally devoid of meaning."

Again, says Marx:—

When the productive forces of society have expanded proportionately with the multifarious development of the individuals of whom society is made up—then will the narrow bourgeois outlook be utterly transcended, and then will society inscribe upon its banners: 'From everyone according to his capacities, to everyone according to his needs.'

But what is to be the fulfilment of the promise to give, in Kuzbas, its whole product to labour (foreign labour with 300 dollars to invest)? What sort of control of their industry are the foreign engineers to get?

The "Organisation Statute" adopted by the Soviet of Labour and Defence (whose members are the heads of the nine Economic Departments of the Council of People's Commissaries, which is actually the Soviet Government) states:—

"The management of the Unit will be in the hands of a Managing Board of seven members, three to reside in the Kuzbas, three in the Urals, one in Moscow. These members will be selected by the workers in the Unit, subject to the approval of the Soviet authorities. The election will be for a term of one year, with the provision of recall by the workers, or by the Soviet Government, who will have a representative on the Managing Board."

It would appear that the Soviet Government does not trust these foreign workers much, since it takes the right to dismiss all their chosen managers.

"The Board of Management is the highest organ of the Unit, and will be responsible to the Soviet authorities. It will appoint and discharge the technical staff, which will supervise all labour, as well as act as adviser to the Board of Management.

"All workers in the Unit will belong to their respective industrial unions, which will act in an advisory capacity to the Board of Management. All workers in the Unit will belong to their respective industrial unions, which again will act in an advisory capacity to the Board of Management and the technical staff. The Industrial Unions within the Unit will constitute a part of the All-Russian organisation of Industrial Unions."

"The members of the Unit pledge themselves, in case of misunderstanding or conflict, to accept as final the decision of the highest State authority in Russia."

The Organisation Statute for Kuzbas, as quoted above, states that the Board of Management will be responsible to the Soviet authorities, and since it may be dismissed by the Soviet, no doubt that is so. The prospectus states under the heading "discipline":—

"Responsibility for the progress of all rests with the technical staff, who are responsible only to the Board of Management and the Board of Management are responsible to the workers and to the Russian Socialist Federation of Soviet Republics. The work discipline and methods will be absolutely determined by the technical staff or its proper sub-division superintendents, foremen, etc."

As to Communism, that will not appear in Kuzbas: there is to be no application of the Marxian standard (which was by no means the patent of Karl Marx) "from everyone according to his capacities, to everyone according to his needs." Says the prospectus:—

"The workers will receive from their production a satisfactory standard of living, which will include a yearly bonus. The remaining product (except the customary Soviet taxes) will be used to extend the industrial equipment of the enterprise."

"What is meant by a satisfactory standard of living will be determined by the Board of Managers who are responsible both to the workers and to the Soviet Government. As a minimum, it is a standard based on productive efficiency. For the first two years each worker will put his labour into Kuzbas. On the basis of production a yearly bonus will be determined and placed to the individual credit of each worker. This bonus will consider the severities rendered, hardships endured, the future prospects of Kuzbas, and what a similar amount of industry would return to the worker in the United States, in the form of savings."

What becomes of Communism: the holding and using of all things in common, without stint or measure, the abolition of wages, the abolition of buying and selling? Might not Communism have been attempted amongst the members of the Kuzbas community?

As to the relations between Kuzbas and the Soviet Government:—

"Kuzbas will pay the customary State taxes in products, especially coal.

"The total product of agricultural and building industries is at the disposal of Kuzbas Organisation, less the usual taxes.

"In regard to other industries: Kuzbas Organisation will turn over to the Soviet Government the equivalent of the production secured by the Soviet Government in 1921, which was approximately 10 per cent. of the total capacity; also 50 per cent. of all production over that of 1921. For all products turned over to the Soviet Government, a credit will be given and an equivalent in other commodities received through exchange on a commercial basis. The equivalent received and the remaining production is at the disposal of the Kuzbas Organisation for individual consumption or the expansion of the enterprise. Products at the disposal of Kuzbas can be exchanged with the peasants or others. Part of the products will be used for a satisfactory standard of living; the remainder for the extension of industrial equipment to create a big machine industry. The amount reserved for extension of the whole organisation will be determined by the Unit as production justifies it."

In short, at Kuzbas will be created an organ of little capitalists who will be paid something not yet determined, to maintain them, and a bonus which they can draw out after two years.

(continued on page 8).

FRANK PENMAN IN LONDON

The literature seller, a robust, energetic Irish woman, pressed her wares vigorously; she would by no means take a refusal. Frank Penman admitted her active zeal: zealous activity he often found lacking in the movement. He bought from her a red covered pamphlet, for its colour and for its title, "Communism."

"Who is the author?" Miss Mayence asked.

"There seem to be two of them," answered Penman.

"Do you know them?" Miss Mayence inquired.

"This time turning to Bistre.

"They have written many pamphlets."

"Is this one good?"

"I wouldn't answer for it: they are makers of books."

"What do you mean by that?"

"I am not in the witness-box," Bistre protested, and Miss Mayence smiled her apologies.

"There seem to be an amazing number of fallacies in this document," announced Penman.

"Listen to this:—

"Communism to-day signifies an organised attempt to overthrow the existing social order and to replace it by a better."

"I thought," said Miss Mayence, choosing her words slowly, "that Communism is itself a social order, the social order by which we hope to replace the existing capitalist order. I thought—am I wrong?—that it is a method of organising our social relationships, or, broader than that: a way of life. I don't see how it can be an attempt to overthrow Capitalism: I thought it was the thing towards which we are striving in attempting to overthrow Capitalism." She turned to Bistre appealingly, as to one who knew.

"Precisely," Bistre answered.

"I thought," she continued, "I thought that the main outlines of Communism were generally accepted: holding property in common, producing for the general use, and not for wages or profits—general use of the general products. No buying and selling. I thought those were the main accepted characteristics of Communism."

"The writers of this pamphlet do not seem to think so," Penman said, reading a further phrase:—

"Underlying this attempt are five main convictions."

Dick Barbour laughed:

"In the old B.S.T.I.," he said, "there were five cardinal points! The Pauls and Bonehead were always rubbing them in. Old Eden and Old Bonehead were never tired of those Five Cardinal Points! I used to wonder which of them it was that first fished up the phrase. You know those old tags some people hang on to, as though they would save the world and make the world revolve. It used to be 'Ergatocracy' and the 'Ergatocrats.' Those take more or less of a back seat now. Communist psychology has taken the front place."

"But what are the 'five main convictions' in the pamphlet? Are they Communism?" Miss Mayence asked.

"I suppose the writers think so," said Penman. "You must judge for yourself: I will simply tell you what they say. One, 'Capitalism has become incapable of conducting its own affairs.'"

"I don't think!" jeered Dick Barbour.

"Two, 'order can only be regained through the dictatorship of the proletariat.' Four, 'necessity of the revolution and forcible suppression of the counter-revolution. I am not giving it in their own words, mind you: this is the gist in brief. Five, the overthrow of Capitalism must be international.'"

"That is not Communism," said Bistre: "those are tactics—good or bad, complete or incomplete—for obtaining Communism."

"I propose we sample the chaos of Capitalism at Lyons' Corner House," said Dick Barbour.

"You can't thrash these things out in a busy spot like this: you must have a chance to sit down."

"They agreed.

"Give me a cup of coffee," said Bistre, "out of the Ergatocrats."

"I say!" broke in Penman, when they had gathered round a table. "This is a bloomer!"

"What is it?" everyone asked him.

"I'll explain, if you'll give your minds to it:

they are quoting the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels. The Manifesto says that when the proletariat has become the ruling class, it will use its political power to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, and to centralise instruments of production in the hands of the workers' State, the proletariat organised as the ruling class. The Manifesto says this cannot be done all at once, but measures will be used which appear economically insufficient and untenable, but which, in the course of the movement, outstrip themselves, and are indispensable as revolutionising the whole mode of production."

"I take it that these are put forward by Marx and Engels as temporary measures: blows at the power and stability of Capitalism in the stages preceding its complete abolition. The Manifesto contains ten of these measures. The authors of this pamphlet select seven of them:—

"1. Abolition of property in land. . . .

"3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.

"4. Confiscation of the property of all refugees and rebels.

"5. Centralisation of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.

"6. Centralisation of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.

"8. Equal liability of all to labour. . . .

"9. Free education for all children in the public schools."

"Marx certainly did not for one moment consider such measures to constitute Communism, or as a proper basis on which to erect the Workers' Republic. These were merely temporary measures; weapons of the struggle, or slogans intended to appeal to those as yet incapable of grasping the idea of Communism. Personally, I don't think these measures are good slogans for use nowadays, if they ever were."

"Your view that Marx regarded these measures as temporary, insufficient, and untenable, is, as you say, expressed plainly enough in the Manifesto itself," said Bistre. "and the three points which have been left out substantiate your view. They are:—

"2. A heavy progressive income tax.

"7. Extension of national factories and instruments of production, cultivation and improvement of waste lands, in accordance with a general social plan.

"8. Combination of agricultural and industrial labour, in order to remove the distinction between town and country."

"But what about the bloomer?" prompted Barbour. "I want to hear it. You will be posing as one of the high-brows yourself next, Frank."

"The bloomer is this—I expect even you can see it. The Pauls say:—

"Now the most interesting point about this programme—the preamble no less than the numbered items—"

"They are referring, you understand, to the words quoted from the Communist Manifesto and the seven points I read you. The most interesting point about this programme, they say:—

"Is that, with trifling changes in wording, the Communist programme of 1848 would serve for a statement of the revolutionary measures whereby the Communist Government of Russia secured itself in power seventy years later."

"There can't be any mistake that they are referring to those measures I read you; can there?" Penman asked, handing the pamphlet to Bistre: "Read it for yourself."

Bistre scanned the page. "It seems quite clear," he said.

"Well, can't you all see it is a bundle of bloomers? Take the first measure: 'Abolition of property in land'; was that achieved by the Russian Revolution? It was not. The Bolsheviks did not say: 'Make the land common property.' They said: 'All the land for the peasants.' They said the great landowners should be expropriated and the land divided into peasant holdings. It is true that the Bolsheviks would have preferred communal farms: that does not alter the fact that what it promised and what it did was to let the peasants cut up the land amongst themselves. I will admit that the peasants may be holding the

land according to the old customs of the mir, that they have not an absolute title to the ownership of the land, and that it is re-divided by the growth of families every ten years or so. At the same time, the peasants, for all practical purposes own the land. They sell its produce.

"The one kind of private property that Marx and Engels proposed to abolish in these measures was private property in land; the one kind of industry they proposed to socialise was agriculture. Marx and Engels in these measures only indicate a partial nationalisation of industrial property. 'Extension of national factories,' they say."

"The Russian revolution, on the other hand, attempted to abolish all sorts of property except small property in land. Its great effort was to socialise industry: when it called on the workers to seize the industries, it meant that they should do so, not to become small producers and petty traders, but that they should work the industries in common. One of the great slogans of the Russian Revolution was the seizure and administration of industry by the workers in the shops."

"It seems to me that the Russian Revolution of 1917 was the first which was animated by the principle that the people are entitled to an assured subsistence, because they are members of the community, living creatures, and that the where-withal to feed, to clothe, to house them, must be provided freely for them, irrespective of their social, physical, or moral condition, or any services they may perform. The earlier revolutions—desired or attempted to provide soup kitchens and public works for the poor, marking them off from the people who could afford to shift for themselves. The Russian was the first to attempt the free supply of the means of subsistence for all. The Russian revolutionaries in command, however, recognised only the necessity of providing freely a bare subsistence. All comforts and extras, they decided, must be earned by wages."

"The Communist Manifesto does not refer to this question of providing for the subsistence of the people. It does not refer to workers' control of industry, which was one of the main efforts and incentives of the Russian Revolution, although the Soviet Government has gone back on it, and which will undoubtedly be a main factor in the proletarian revolution all over the world.

"I don't think Marx foresaw that these things would come to be the big issues in our time; otherwise he would have dealt with them. Also one of the main slogans by which the Bolsheviks secured mass support was, of course, their promise to get Russia out of the war. That is not mentioned.

"I think I have proved to you that the Pauls are making a hopeless bloomer when they cite those measures from the Communist Manifesto and say: 'The Communist programme of 1848 would serve for a statement of the revolutionary measures whereby the Communist Government of Russia secured itself in power seventy years later.'"

"The fact is," said Bistre, "those slogans of the Manifesto could only be issued under the impression that Communism was very far away. Marx himself would have changed them had he written a little later."

THE TOILER

A NEW YORK WEEKLY PAPER FOR WORKERS.

4D. Weekly.

This and all publications may be obtained from the Workers' Dreadnought office, 152 Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.

JUST OUT. NEW EDITION.

COMMUNISM AND THE FAMILY

KOLLONTAY'S SPLENDID PAMPHLET.

Price - 4d.

Tells what everyone wants to know about life under Communism.

Strikes a blow at Capitalist Social Conventions. From WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT Office, 152, Fleet Street, E.C.4.

Workers' Dreadnought

FOUNDED 1914.
Editor: SYLVIA PANKHURST.

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

Subscription:
THREE MONTH (13 weeks) ... Post Free 3/3
SIX MONTHS (26 weeks) ... " " 6/6
ONE YEAR (52 weeks) ... " " 13/-

Vol. IX. No. 1. Saturday, March 18, 1922.

THE LABOUR WAR. THE RAND STRIKE.

Our readers will watch with interest the articles on the Rand Strike which L. A. Motler is contributing to our columns from the storm centre. In its war upon Labour in South Africa, Capital is using all the forces of the Government. The police and the soldiery are already in action. The sailors from British warships at Simonstown will be called in if trouble spreads to Cape Town, at least, so *The Times* predicts. Bombing from aeroplanes, for which the Germans were so greatly condemned by the Allies, although, of course, the Allies were equally guilty in that respect, is being used by the South African Government against the strikers. An official announcement from Pretoria, dated March 12th, says:—

"All our machines now carry bombs, in order that every advantage may be taken when revolutionary commandos are discovered in the open, or marked down in one of the many plantations on the East Rand.

"In two instances to-day (Saturday) commandos were successfully bombed, in each case direct hits being made. The revolutionaryaries suffered severely on these occasions."

How the fighting actually started will be told in a subsequent article by our correspondent, L. A. Motler.

The general strike is apparently only partial as yet and solidarity has not been shown, as it ought, by the workers in other parts of South Africa. The railwaymen, especially, have shown a grievous lack of comradeship in transporting the troops from Cape Town and other parts of South Africa to attack their brothers in Johannesburg.

The soldiers and police are workers, too, but they have forgotten that fact so far.

The possessing classes have shown more solidarity: they have organised a volunteer force to replace the strikers in transport and other services.

Labour will not be victorious till it learns the lesson of solidarity and is prepared to fight as a class.

Labour will not be victorious whilst it merely strikes and starves. It must take control of production and distribution before it can achieve anything.

The South African Labour leaders have played the old game of trying to prevent united action by all the of the working class.

The Nationalist politicians have plainly shown that they are not on the side of the workers. That was to be expected as a matter of course.

THE BRITISH LOCK-OUT.

In Britain, also, the need is for the solidarity of the workers. The engineers and shipbuilders cannot successfully fight the employers alone. The workers in all other industries, and especially the main industries, must join the engineers and shipbuilders in their struggle, or the employers must certainly win.

Moreover, the war of Labour and Capital has now so far developed that the workers will gain no real victory by merely going home to starve; they must act if they mean to win. They must show themselves able and ready to supply their own needs and those of the proletarian community as a whole.

Our settled policy is that the rank and file should form a rank and file workshop organisation able to act in this crisis. The Right-Wing-Parliamentary Communists, by agreement of

many sections, have been allowed great latitude and scope in monopolising the field of action. The Right-Wing-Parliamentary Communist Party refrained from advising the formation of rank and file workshop councils. It declared, on the contrary, that the officials of the Trade Unions must be appealed to—that the Union officials must be left to handle the situation. Then on the very eve of the Lock-Out, when the battle was actually joined, out came the Communist, the organ of the Parliamentarians, with this message:—

"The rank and file must come together. In every locality affected we must set up Lock-Out Councils consisting of representatives from every workshop, to control and carry on the workers' struggle in that region."

Very good, very good; but the message is several months late in the day. The warnings were given last year: the organisation should have been prepared in advance!

The Right-Wing C.P. has hitherto opposed this policy. Has it now permanently changed its mind?

What a slow lot of people we are in this country, to be sure. "Occupation of the factories!" Why, if we do not wake up, all the other peoples of the world will have become masters of the art before we even begin to try it!

The questions the locked-out workers have got to ask themselves are just these:—

1.—"Why should we suffer want in a land of plenty?"

2.—"How can we avoid doing so?"

The Engineers' Lock-Out is a serious business. It was firstly and superficially a question of the prestige of the Trade Union official. The issue raised was whether the Trade Union officials should or should not decide when and under what conditions their members should work overtime. The A.E.U. officials cling to this privilege, both to uphold their power and that of the Union as a whole, and also to limit overtime with a view to checking the growth of unemployment.

So far, the issue is not an exalted one: limiting overtime will not greatly limit unemployment. Class conscious workers will refuse to work overtime if the interests of their fellows requires that refusal. Class conscious workers do not require a Trade Union official to say no for them if they have agreed with their fellows that they will refuse.

It will be replied that the mass of the Trade Union membership is not class conscious enough to stand firm on this issue. Certainly the fact that only 20.1 per cent. of the A.E.U. membership voted against the employers' terms shows how little the members really care for this question. That only 50,240 voted against acceptance of the employers' terms and 35,523 voted in favour of the terms, out of a membership of 425,714 is a significant fact that no degree of desire to discover a fighting spirit in the Union ranks can explain away. Nevertheless we believe that more fighting solidarity will be displayed by the workers for a big and vital issue than for an issue of this kind.

Now that the A.E.U. officials have got the workers into this struggle, they shrink from using the Union machinery and the solidarity of the workers to put up an effective fight.

To be effective, the struggle must be conducted on a bolder and broader scale than ever before. The officials, hide-bound in conservatism, shrink from adopting new methods, the more so as a well-fought struggle would doubtless bring the heavy hand of Government coercion down upon the officials themselves.

The employers have deliberately picked this quarrel. Trade Unionism hedges industry about with hampering restrictions on output, and restricts the mobility of labour. The employers desire to sweep away such restrictions. Moreover, they wish to bring the engineers to their knees, to break their spirit as the spirit of the miners has apparently been broken, to reduce them to the plight when they will be ready to accept employment at any wage and on any conditions. The employers have enlarged the scope of the struggle; it is not a mere question of overtime; it is a question of Trade Unionism. The employers refuse now to employ the members of a particular Trade Union—the A.E.U.—because that is the Union whose officials refused to

accede to the employers' terms. To-day it is the A.E.U., to-morrow it may be another Union. What the employers are aiming at is to break the power of the Trade Union. They desire that the workers shall be a driven herd. The Lock-Out is a part of the campaign to bring wages and working conditions down to the lowest possible level. If successful, the attack on the A.E.U. means that its members must either join other Unions or cease to belong to any Unions at all, unless the A.E.U. should negotiate itself back into the favour of the employers.

An organisation formed on industrial lines and covering every worker in the industry is the first essential in fighting a struggle of this kind. This is clearly illustrated by news items such as the following:—

"Between 400 and 500 men stopped work yesterday at the Gothic Works, Edmonton, in sympathy with the ten members of the A.E.U. locked-out at that establishment."—*Daily Herald*, March 14th, 1922.

Suppose the four or five hundred men had not thus supported the A.E.U. members?

It requires tremendous solidarity, in these hard times, for 400 or 500 men to go on to the streets, without a prospect of the unemployment dole, that being refused to strikers, and with the Trade Union funds so much depleted that strike pay is problematical. It requires great solidarity when the issue is not a clear cut and noble one. The issue, remember, is not that there shall be no overtime whilst there is unemployment, or "no overtime for the men in our workshop unless we all decide that there shall be overtime."

No: the issue for which the 500 have struck is whether ten men shall work overtime except by permission of a Trade Union official with whom the 500 have no connection. The overtime of the 500 is not at present in question, though potentially it is involved.

The members of the 47 other Unions connected with the engineering industry are now balloting on the employers' overtime proposals. Their ballot papers are not returnable till March the 28th. The A.E.U. might actually be beaten before the decision of the other workers were made known! What criminal mismanagement of the situation!

Here is another striking news item, which should cause every worker to ponder the question of the honesty and efficiency of the Union officials.

"A resolution asking the Executive to call out all members of the A.E.U., except those employed in hospitals, was passed yesterday by a mass meeting of locked-out men in Willesden, where about 1,500 men are affected."—*Daily Herald*, March 14th, 1922.

So there is not even unity of action within the A.E.U. itself!

That the rank and file should find it necessary to make such appeals to the Union officials in the course of a great struggle like 'his, and with the example of the recent miners' defeat before us, shows the lack of initiative of the rank and file. It also raises the question as to whether the Union officials, or some of them, have entered into a deliberate conspiracy with the employers to bring about a smashing defeat of the workers in the engineering industry. The minutes of the A.E.U. Executive Committee meetings would make instructive reading just now. And what about that underground organisation started by the Coal Association, with which some Labour leaders have been so closely in touch?

The supreme questions of the present great struggle are, whether the rank and file workers are going to see to it that their struggle is efficiently and honestly conducted, and, still more important, whether the struggle is to be for objects that are substantially worthy of the terrible hardships which the struggle will bring, not upon the Trade Union officials, comrades, but upon the workers.

Our appeal to the workers is to form their own unofficial organisation and to make their own terms.

Our appeal to the workers is not "Watch Your Leaders," but: "Do It Yourself!"

NOW IN STOCK.

SOVIET ARMS BADGES.
PINS AND BROOCHES, 6d. each.
In ordering, state which you require.
WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT OFFICE,
152, Fleet Street, E.C.4.

SOUTH AFRICAN LABOUR STRUGGLE.

By L. A. Motler.

As regards the strike here, events have justified my forecast of the reception of the proposed "revolt" by the Nationalists. As was resolved at the Town Hall meeting, the resolution was taken by the prime mover, Bob Waterston, M.L.A., and others, to Pretoria. There the "Rump Parliament" of Nationalists rebuffed the "revolutionists," and without putting it in so many words, intimated that their talk of a Republic was (to use an Americanism) simply punk. They refused, point-blank, to constitute themselves any sort of Government, and instead sent a deputation of their precious selves to Smuts. This gentleman received them cordially and listened seriously to their rhodomontade. And that was as far as it went. They came out by the same door at which they entered; but, then, nobody expected to see them come flying through the window.

Then the redoubtable "revolutionary" Waterston gave an interview to the reactionary *Star*, and told the reporter, and through him the breathless public, that revolution was his last resource merely. He would first exhaust every possible avenue of constitutional means. Having said that, it only remained for him to put the blame on somebody else. Which he did. It transpires that the people who put the goods across him were an ex-Service man and a "Son of England."

The Sons of England, I may explain, is another White Guard organisation in embryo. Its main planks are the Crown, the Throne and the Flag. In the meantime, the local "Miners' Arms" receives their strongest support. It is there they imbue the true loyalist spirit—from certain black bottles.

Needless to say, the Sons of England threw Bob Waterston's gross insinuation about revolution, in his teeth as soon as they heard of it. A proper Son of England, they explained, would never dream of no such thing. Alternatively, as truthful lawyers put it, if he did, he didn't know what he was doing. The prisoner is declared Not Guilty, but is warned not to do it again.

In the meantime, seeing that the "Provisional Government" resolution had declared the Nationalist supporters of the strike to be on the side of Lorander, the police began to get busy. The first bombshell that they hurled at the strikers was an ultimatum as follows:—

OFFICIAL WARNING.

THE USE OF BODIES OF MEN, SUCH AS COMMANDOS, TO PULL OUT OFFICIALS WORKING ON ESSENTIAL SERVICES CONSTITUTES A CRIME OF PUBLIC VIOLENCE, AND EVERY PERSON WHO FORMS A UNIT OF SUCH BODY OR COMMANDO, OR WHO COUNSELS, INSTIGATES OR INCITES TO THE COMMISSION OF SUCH ACT IS GUILTY OF THE CRIME OF PUBLIC VIOLENCE, AND WOULD, IF CONVICTED BY THE COURTS, BE SUBJECT TO HEAVY PUNISHMENT. THE POLICE HAVE BEEN INSTRUCTED TO TAKE ACTION IN ALL SUCH CASES.
THEO. G. TRUTER,
COLONEL, COMMISSIONER OF POLICE.
JOHANNESBURG,
February 7th, 1922.

This was issued in Dutch as well as in English, the languages having a legal equality here. It is peculiar that the Dutch "Waarschuwing" was dated a day later than the one in English, but as Chief of Police Truter was in a hurry to rush his ultimatum, it was issued in English only, on the 7th February. The next day the Dutch version appeared to make the Warning apply legally to the Dutch as well. Since the Dutch are supposed by the press to have originated the Commando movement and to be its mainstay, it is strange that the first warning was not in Dutch. It shows how Smuts, who, of course, put Truter up to it, has been in haste to prove what a true British Statesman he is.

Truter, or rather Smuts, made a further movement the next day. I will return to this presently. I now want to point out how events have followed on the outcry in the press, against

the commandos, as I outlined in my previous letter. First, amused tolerance; then, as strikers began to do other things than merely marching up and down the Reef, a venomous leading article on violence; finally, as the "essential services" on the mines began to look like being threatened, a rabid vituperation against Anarchist elements and a call to the Government to protect property and the lives of the men still at work in the mines. Note that the good editor always puts property first, and throws in a few lives as an afterthought.

As is usual, the workers are being well watched, whilst the Fat Men of the Chamber of Mines do as they please. Take, for instance, the following Notice by the S.A. Railways:—

SOUTH AFRICAN RAILWAYS AND HARBOURS.

REWARD

An attempt was made to dynamite the railway line near Anzac Halt on the 27th January, 1922, but was frustrated.

On the night of the 2nd or morning of the 3rd February, 1922, dynamite was exploded on the railway line between Geduld and Welgedacht, and certain damage done.

As outrages of this description may endanger the lives of the travelling public and cause serious damage to Government property, the Administration hereby offers a reward of £300 for information (which should be given to the nearest Police Station) leading to the arrest and conviction of any person or persons responsible for the above-mentioned offences.

A reward will also be given for information which leads to the prevention of any such contemplated outrages in the future, and to the conviction of the guilty parties.

W. HOY,

General Manager.

General Manager's Office,

Johannesburg,

3rd February, 1922.

When the alleged dynamite outrage was reported in the press, it was also suggested that it was the work of strikers. The authorities promptly offered a reward, as outlined above, obviously aimed at the strikers. Somebody wrote to the press, and this was repeated by certain Labour leaders, that the "outrage" may have been the work of provocateurs. But the police didn't issue a notice, in English and Dutch, in the papers read specially by the Fat Men of the Chamber of Mines, nor was such a notice posted outside the notorious Rand Club.

What I want to draw your attention to is this. The last paragraph states that "A reward will also be given for information . . . of any such contemplated outrages in the FUTURE . . ." I want to point out what a temptation this is to anyone to report "contemplated outrages" that have no existence in fact.

The public roads here commonly cross the railways at points just outside the thickly populated areas, on a level crossing. What would be easier than for some strikers to be seen crossing the railway where some dynamite would be subsequently "discovered" and a "contemplated outrage" frustrated?

Point is lent to this by the fact that the "Reward" notice was first published in English only. No reports having transpired from the English section, it was thought advisable to tempt the cupidity of the Dutch. A notice in Dutch was therefore issued a few days afterwards. Unfortunately for the authorities, this met with no better success than the first. Both Dutch and English are standing solidly together and are not to be divided by racial appeals.

This week (February 9th) we have reports of another "outrage" on the railway. This time it happened some 70 miles from Johannesburg. But even there, by a peculiar coincidence, the thing was noticed in time, as in other cases.

It seems that the Rhodesian mail train was partially derailed on the Zeerust portion of the line. A piece of rail on one side was found to

have been taken up. The engine fell on one side of the line and the tender on the other. The dining coach was only derailed, and nobody seems to have been seriously hurt. The engine driver saw what was coming—just a little too late. That is all.

I do not wish to be thought prejudiced about these "outrages"; but I cannot help noticing queer coincidences. Take this one. An old buffer plate was found between the joints of the rails on the up main line near Maraisburg (West Rand). Here, again, the reporter observes: "Fortunately it was discovered before any untoward accident occurred." Now this was exactly the case at Anzac Halt. How did the authorities manage to "discover" these outrages before an accident happened?

Another item. Two current-carrying standards have this week been damaged near our old friend, Anzac Halt. Three explosions took place at the supposed time of the "outrage." These were noticed by a policeman, who was fortunately awake at that time of night. He at once went to the scene of the outrage—or I should say "proceeded." (All good policemen "proceed.") On arriving there, or thereabouts, he suddenly came across six white men, who fired three shots at him. Our gallant friend in blue promptly took to cover, and the six white men took to their heels. It is unfortunate that the policeman had no corporeal proof of this. I say it is unfortunate, that is all.

The Rand has had police imported from all over the Union, yet all these "outrages" (the affair at Maraisburg is boldly described by the *Rand Daily Mail* as "sabotage," although foul play is only "suspected")—these outrages, I say, have brought no arrests.

There have been arrests of a sort, however. Immediately after Truter's "Warning," five arrests were made amongst the officials of the S.A. Miners' Union. Be it noted that there were no arrests among the Executive of the S.A. Industrial Federation, which is conducting the strike, and under whose orders the Miners' Union is. Even the "revolutionary" Bob Waterston is still at large. These seven men were brought up in court, charged with incitement to revolt. A kindly magistrate remanded them for a fortnight. And the evidence? No evidence whatever was offered by the prosecution. Bail was refused.

These arrests were announced at one of the strikers' daily meetings in the Town Hall. A resolution was passed, asking the Industrial Federation to call a general strike and demand the release of the prisoners. The Federation turned down the proposal.

Next day a raid was made by the police on strikers on picket duty at Robinson Deep (Gold Mine) and seven men arrested. These being of the rank and file, they were allowed out on bail of £20 each. And all the Executive of the S.A. Industrial Federation does is to ask the men to "stand fast and fight on."

As regards the "outrage" to the Rhodesian mail train, although an actual derailment occurred, no reward has been offered for the apprehension of the "misdoers." No notices whatever have been issued by the S.A. Railways save to state that the line would be in running order the next day. (The derailment occurred somewhere about seven in the evening.)

This is the position to-day. As to developments: although Bob Waterston is now talking of a general strike, I do not anticipate anything will happen. The strike will simply proceed on the old lines.

Now that the commandos have ceased to march en masse on mines to pull out "scabs," the press has reverted to its sympathy with the commandos. The Government is urged not to suppress peaceable bodies that provide the strikers with something to keep them out of mischief. No references are made to "Waterston's Army." Commandos now march to the Fort (the local prison) to sing "The Red Flag" and cheer the imprisoned officials of the S.A. Miners' Union. The only anti-"scab" activity now apparent is among the women.

The first Women's Commando—if such it can be called—rose at Vereeniging, near the Vaal River, (continued on page 7).

THE WAGE SYSTEM.

By Peter Kropotkin.

III.

"To each according to his deeds," say the Collectivists, or rather, according to his share of service rendered to society. This is the principle they recommend as the basis of economic organisation, after the Revolution shall have made all the instruments of labour and all that is necessary for production, common property!

Well, if the Social Revolution should be so unfortunate as to proclaim this principle, it would be stemming the tide of human progress; it would be leaving unsolved the huge social problem cast by past centuries upon our shoulders.

It is true that in such a society as ours, where the more a man works, the less he is paid, this principle may seem, at first sight, a movement towards justice. But at the bottom it is but the consecration of past injustice. It is with this principle that the wage-system began, to end where it is to-day, in glaring inequalities and all the abominations of the present state of things. It has ended thus because, from the day on which society began to appraise services in money or any other sort of wages; from the day on which it was said that each should have only what he could succeed in getting paid for his work, the whole history of Capitalism (the State aiding therein) was written beforehand; its germ was enclosed in this principle.

Must we, then, return to our point of departure and pass once more through the process of capitalist evolution? These theorists seem to desire it; but happily it is impossible; the Revolution will be Communistic; or it will be drowned in blood, and must be begun all over again.

Service rendered to society, be it labour in factory or field, or moral service, cannot be valued in monetary units. There cannot be an exact measure of its value, either of what has been improperly called its "exchange value," or of its value in use. If we see two individuals, both working for years, for five hours daily, for the community, at two different occupations equally pleasing to them, we can say that, taken all in all, their labours are roughly equivalent; but their work could not be broken up into fractions, so that the product of each day, each hour, or each minute of the labour of one should be worth the produce of each minute and each hour of that of the other.

Broadly speaking, we can say that a man who, during his whole life, deprives himself of leisure for ten hours daily, has given much more to society than he who has deprived himself of but five hours a day, or has not deprived himself of any leisure at all. But we cannot take what one man has done during any two hours and say that this produce is worth exactly twice as much as the produce of one hour's work from another individual, and reward each proportionately. To do this would be to ignore the extent to which all individual work is the outcome of the former and present labours of society as a whole. It would be to fancy oneself in the Stone Age, when we are living in the Age of Steel.

Go into a coal mine and see that man stationed at the huge machine that hoists and lowers the cage. In his hand he holds a lever whereby to check or reverse the action of the machinery. He lowers the handle, and in a second the cage changes the direction of its giddy rush up or down the shaft. His eyes are attentively fixed upon an indicator in front of him, which shows exactly the point the cage has reached; no sooner does it touch the given level than, at his gentlest pressure, it stops dead short, not a foot above or below the required place. And scarcely are the full trucks discharged, or the empties loaded, before, at a touch to the handle, the cage is again swinging up or down the shaft.

For eight or ten hours he thus concentrates his attention. Let his brain relax but for an instant, and the cage would fly up and shatter the wheels, break the rope and crush the men, bring all the work of the mine to a standstill. Let him lose three seconds upon each reverse of the lever, and, in a mine with all the modern improvements, the output will be reduced by from twenty to fifty tons a day.

Well, is he who renders the greatest service in the mine? Or is it, perhaps, that boy who rings from below the signal for the mounting

of the cage? Or is it the miner who risks his life every moment in the depths of the mine, and will end one day by being killed by fire-damp. Or, again, the engineer who would lose the coal seam and set men hewing the bare rock, if he merely made a mistake in the addition of his calculations? Or, finally, is it the owner, who has put all his patrimony into the concern, and who, perhaps, has said, in opposition to all previous anticipations: "Dig there, you will find excellent coal?"

All the workers engaged in the mine contribute to the raising of coal in proportion to their strength, their energy, their knowledge, their intelligence and their skill. And we can say that all have the right to live, to satisfy their needs, and even gratify their whims, after the more imperative needs of every one are satisfied. But how can we exactly value what they have each done?

Further, is the coal that they have extracted entirely the result of their work? Is it not also the work of the men who constructed the railway leading to the mine, and the roads branching off on all sides from the stations; and what of the work of those who have tilled and sown the fields which supply the miners with food, smelted iron, cut the wood in the forest, made the machines which will consume the coal, and so on?

No hard and fast line can be drawn between the work of one and the work of another. To measure them by results leads to absurdity. To divide them into fractions and measure them by hours of labour leads to absurdity also. One course remains: not to measure them at all, but to recognise the right of all who take part in productive labour, first of all to live, and then to enjoy the comforts of life.

Take any other branch of human activity; take our existence as a whole, and say which of us can claim the highest reward for his deeds?

The doctor who has divined the disease, or the nurse who has assured its cure by her sanitary cares? The inventor of the first steam engine, or the boy who one day tired of pulling the cord which formerly served to open the valve admitting the steam beneath the piston, tied his cord to the lever of the machine, and went to play with his companions, without imagining that he had invented the mechanism essential to all modern machinery—the automatic valve? The inventor of the locomotive, or that Newcastle workman who suggested that wooden sleepers should take the place of the stones which were formerly put under the rails and threw trains off the line by their want of elasticity? The driver of the locomotive, or the signalman who stops the train or opens the way for it?

To whom do we owe the Trans-Atlantic cable? To the engineer who persisted in declaring that the cable would transmit telegrams, whilst the learned electricians declared that it was impossible? To Maury, the scientist, who advised the disuse of thick cables and the substitution of one no bigger than a walking stick? Or, after all, is it to those volunteers, from no one knows where, who spent day and night on the deck of the Great Eastern, minutely examining every yard of cable and taking out the nails that the shareholders of the maritime companies had stupidly caused to be driven through the isolation coat of the cable, to render it useless?

And, in a still wider field, the vast track of human life, with its joys, its sorrows, and its varied incidents, cannot each of us mention some one who during his life has rendered him some service so great, so important, that if he were proposed to value it in money he would be indignant? This service may have been a word, nothing but a word in season, or it may have been months or years of devotion. Are you going to estimate these, the most important of all services, in labour notes?

"The deeds of each"! But human societies could not live for two successive generations, they would disappear in fifty years if each one did not give infinitely more than will be returned to him in money, in "notes," or in civic rewards. It would be the extinction of the race if the mother did not expend her life to preserve her children; if every man did not give some things without counting the cost, if human beings did not give most where they look for no reward.

If middle-class society is going to ruin; if we are to-day in a blind alley from which there is no escape without applying axe and torch to the institutions of the past, that is just because we have calculated too much. It is just because we have allowed ourselves to be drawn into giving that we may receive; because we have desired to make society into a commercial company based upon credit and debit.

Moreover, the Collectivists know it. They vaguely comprehend that a society cannot exist if it logically carries out the principles, "To each according to his deeds." They suspect that the needs (we are not speaking of the whims) of the individual do not always correspond to his deeds. Accordingly, De Paepe tells us:—

"Even Collectivists suspect that a man of forty, the father of three children, has greater needs than a youth of twenty. They suspect that a woman who is suckling her child and spends sleepless nights by its cot, cannot get through so much work as a man who has enjoyed tranquil slumber.

"They seem to understand that a man or woman, worn out by having perhaps worked overhard for society in general, may find themselves incapable of performing so many 'deeds' as those who take their hours of labour quietly and pocket their notes in the privileged offices of State statisticians.

"And they hasten to temper their principle. Oh, certainly, they say, society will feed and bring up its children. Oh, certainly it will assist the old and infirm. Oh, certainly, needs not deeds will be the measure of the cost which society will impose on itself to temper the principle of deeds."

What, Charity? Yes, our old friend, "Christian Charity," organised by the State.

Improve the founding hospital, organise insurance against old age and sickness, and the principle of deeds will be "tempered." "Would that they may heal," they can get no further.

Thus, then, after having sworn Communism, after having sneered at their ease at the formula, "To each according to his needs," is it not obvious that they have forgotten something, i.e., the needs of the producers. And thereupon they hasten to recognise these needs. Only it is to be the State by which they are to be estimated; it is to be the State which will undertake to find out if needs are disproportionate to deeds.

It is to be the State that will give alms to him who is willing to recognise his inferiority. From thence to the Poor Law and the Workhouse is but a stone's throw.

There is but a stone's throw, for even this step-mother of a society, against which we are in revolt, has found it necessary to temper its individualistic principle. It, too, has had to make concessions in a Communistic sense, and in this same form of charity.

It also distributes halfpenny dinners to prevent the pillage of its shops. It also builds hospitals, often bad enough, but sometimes splendid, to prevent the ravages of contagious disease. It also, after having paid for nothing but the hours of labour, receives the children of those whom it has itself reduced to the extremity of distress. It also takes account of needs—as a charity.

Poverty, the existence of the poor, was the first cause of riches. This it was which created the earliest capitalist. For, before the surplus value, about which people are so fond of talking, could begin to be accumulated, it was necessary that there should be poverty-stricken wretches who would consent to sell their labour force rather than die of hunger. It is poverty that has made the rich; and if poverty had advanced by such rapid strides by the end of the Middle Ages, it was chiefly because the invasions and wars, the creation of the States and the development of their authority, the wealth gained by exploitation in the East, and many other causes of a like nature, broke the bonds which once united agrarian and urban communities, and led them, in place of the solidarity which they once practised, to adopt the principle of the wage-system.

Is this principle to be the outcome of the Revolution? Dare we dignify by the name of Social Revolution—that name so dear to the

ESPERANTO.

LA DUPIEDULO.

De K. EVALD. Tradukita de Dr. I. PATAKY. Unua ĉapitro.

Okazis unu tage antaŭ longa tempo. Kaj okazis en la varmaj landoj kie la suno brilas pli forte ol tie ĉi, kaj la pluvo pli dense falas kaj ĉiuj bestoj kaj kreskaĵoj pli bone prosperas, ĉar la vintro ne subpremas ilin. La arbaro estis plena ye vivo kaj bruo.

La muŝoj murmuretis, la pasero manĝis la abelojn kaj la akcipitron manĝis la paseron. La abeloj serĉante mielon gratadis en la floroj, la leono kriegis, la birdoj kantadis, la rivereto murmuras, la herbo kreskaĵoj kaj verdigis. La arboj murmuretis per siaj branĉoj, dum iliaj radikoj suĉis la sukon el la tero. La floroj radioris kaj floradis.

Subite ĉio silentiĝis. Kvazaŭ ĉiuj haltigus la spiron, starigis kaj auskultus.

La murmuro de la branĉoj mutiĝis, la violo vekigis el sia revedo kaj mirigite supren rigardis. La leono levis la kapon kaj auskultante starigis. La cervo ĉesis paŝtiĝi; la aglo ripozis alte en la aero je siaj flugilejoj.

La malgranda muso elvenis el sia truo kaj atente auskultis.

Trans la arbaro du estuloj marŝis, kiuj estis tute aliaj kiel la ceteraj kaj kiujn neniu ankoraŭ vidis.

Ili marŝis rekte, iliaj fruntoj estis altaj, iliaj okuloj klaraj. Ili prenis unu la alian per la mano kaj seivole ĉirkaŭrigardis, kvazaŭ ili ne sciis, kie ili estas.

Kiuj povas esti tiuj-ĉi? demandis la leono. Ili estas bestoj, diris la cervo ili povas iri. Sed ili havas strangan iradon. Kial ili ne saltadas per ĉiuj iliaj kvar piedoj, ĉar ili havas kvar? Tiamaniere oni marŝadas pli rapide.

Eh, diris la serpento, mi tute ne havas kruojn kaj tamen mi tre bone antaŭeniras, mi pensas.

Mi tute ne kredas, ke ili estas bestoj, diris la najtingalo. Ili ja ne havas plumojn, nek harojn, ĉar la kelkajhareroj sur ilia kapo ne estas preparolinda.

Ankaŭ skvamojn ili ne havas diris la ezoko, kiu momente malsubakvigis.

Kelkaj devas esti kontentaj je la nuda haŭto, diris la bimbriko mallaŭte.

Ili ne havas voston, diris la muso. Tiuj ĉi neniam estis bestoj.

Ankaŭ mi ne havas voston, diris la bufo, kaj tamen neniu malkonfesos, ke mi estas besto.

Rigardu, rigardu nur, diris la leono, nun ja unu prenas ŝtonon en sian antaŭan piedon. Tion mi ne povus imiti.

Sed mi jes, diris la orangutango, tio ne estas malfacila. Cetero mi povas kontentigi vian scivolemon. Ili ambaŭ estas veraj bestoj. Ili estas viro kaj virino kaj nomas sin dupieduloj kaj estas miaj malproksimaj parencoj.

Ha, tiel! Diris la leono, sed kial ili ne havas pelton.

Eble ili demetis ĝin, opinias la orangutango.

Kial vi ne salutis ilin? demandis la leono.

Mi ne konas ilin, diris la orangutango, kaj ne multe klopodas konatigi kun ili. Mi aŭdis jam pri ili. Estas speco de mizeraj kaj trege degeneraj simioj. Mi volonte lasos al ili oranĝon, kiam ili estos en mizero, sed mi nenial povas garantii je ili.

—Daŭrigota.

DREADNOUGHT £500 FUND.

Brought forward, £99 3s. 1d. E. King, 2/6; C. Garnett, 10/-; Mrs. Cronin, 2/-; S. C., 2/6; P. Cautierley, 2/-; Tom Mann, 2/6; Minerva Café Collection, £1 4s. 8d.; N. Rosenbloom, 2/6. Total, £101 15s. 9d.

THE IRON HEEL.

By JACK LONDON.

Price 2s.

THE GERMAN ONE BIG REVOLU-

TIONARY UNION CONSTITUTION

Price 1d. 2s. 6d. PER HUNDRED, POST FREE. All Industrial Revolutionaries should read it.

PROLETARIAN SCHOOLS.

By TOM ANDERSON.

A PRINCESS.

Very few of you girls and boys have had the opportunity of seeing a real princess. You have all heard about them in your fairy tale book.

"Oh, a princess," a little girl exclaims; "she will be wonderful; she will be beautiful. Is she a fairy? What world does she come from? Oh, if I could see a princess, it would be so nice."

Little girl, little girl, a princess, like a prince, a king or a queen, a lord or a lady, a duke or a knight, a baron or a baroness, a marquis or a marchioness, are all parasites, because of the tradition of slavery, on "the mentality of the 'hewers of wood and drawers of water.'"

A princess is not a fairy; she is not wonderful, nor is she very beautiful; she is not made of pure gold. But for her clothes, she might be taken for a washerwoman. She has beautiful clothes, hundreds of dresses, boots and shoes, blouses and hats. She has more of these things in one short season, than all the girls at this School will have in all their life. She has wonderful pearl necklaces, costing thousands and thousands of pounds. She has rings on her fingers, that sparkle like stars; her underwear would cost more than that of a thousand working women. She has all these things because she is a princess, and a princess is but a parasite. She has a great number of slaves to attend her, and the poor slaves are called superior slaves, because of the high honour of attending on a princess. They wash and dress her, take off her clothes and put her to bed; they do everything for her, as if she were a little infant, newly-born. They feed her and stand by her until she is finished, and every wish of the princess is attended to at once. The princess lifts her hand and beckons a slave, the slave flies to her at once. The princess is sick, all the most skilled doctors are called in; all the great newspapers in the land herald the message to the uttermost parts of the earth. The princess laughs: they take her photograph. The princess speaks to a poor woman whose husband was killed in the war. The princess takes a little child in her arms at one of the shelters for the homeless. The princess gets married, and it takes 15 priests to marry her; the streets are decorated along the way on which she will pass through; all the slaves' children are given a holiday from school, so that their little brains may be impressed with the greatness of a princess; all the great people in the land attend the wedding. It is a great and wonderful affair; so great and wonderful that it makes the slaves forget their poverty and misery, and they line the pathway and shout in their rags and misery, "Joy and happiness to the princess," and the princess laughs.

No wonder! It is a huge joke. All the people at the great function laugh at the poor slaves; at their child-like simplicity.

The slaves crawl back to their homes, and their priests tell them it is God's will, and the slaves are content.

WRIT ON COLD SLATE.

By E. SYLVIA PANKHURST.

Price 1s. 7d., Post Free.

This verse was written on the prison slate by the author during her six months' imprisonment in Holloway Gaol, and is printed as then conceived, as a memory and as a document.

PROLET CULT

THE MAGAZINE OF THE PROLETARIAN SCHOOLS FOR BOYS AND GIRLS.

EDITED BY TOM ANDERSON.

Monthly : : : 1d.

Stories by Tom Anderson, W. J. Brodbeck, A. Fleming, R. M. Fox, Nairn Richardson, Sylvia Pankhurst, El' a Wilson, etc.

All Proletarian Schools should obtain it from the *Workers' Dreadnought* office, 152 Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.

THE LOCK-OUT. QUESTIONS FOR YOU.

Here are three questions for you to consider, fellow workers. They are important questions to you: consider them well.

- 1.—What are the engineers fighting for?
2. How are the engineers fighting?

3.—What are you going to do to help the engineers, to help the shipyard workers who will presently be locked-out also, and to help yourselves, to help the entire working class?

The answer to the first question is that the engineers are fighting to maintain the old conditions: to keep things as they are, when they ought to be fighting for better conditions.

The answer to the second question is that the engineers' struggle is not being properly conducted.

It is not a united fight: only some of the workers engaged in the industry have joined in the struggle. Only some of the members of the A.E.U.—the organisation the employers have attacked—have been called out by the A.E.U. officials to stand by the rest.

The fight is conducted by officials who are old-fashioned in their methods of meeting the attacks of the employers, who will use all the most modern tactics. It is a fight conducted by officials, some of whom are grossly inefficient, even according to accepted Trade Union standards, and some of whom have been publicly and privately proved to be employers' men. In plain words that means that some of the Union leaders are traitors to the workers. The traitors are doubtless in a minority, but determined unscrupulous people working for determined unscrupulous employers are able to do as they please with timid bunglers.

The third question is: what are you going to do to help yourself and your comrades who are locked out?

The rank and file must get together: you and the others who work.

The rank and file workers must decide how the struggle shall be run and what the struggle shall be for.

It is an urgent question: speak to the workers in your shop. Hold a meeting with them: do it at once.

The rank and file ought to have prepared their organisation already. Begin it now; it is never too late to choose the right way.

THE SEARCHLIGHT.

THE WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT BOOK SERVICE.

152, FLEET STREET (ENTRANCE, FIRST DOOR ON LEFT IN BOLT COURT FROM FLEET STREET.)

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

By buying books from us, trade discount is transferred to propaganda; for this reason, send your order direct to us, and not through other societies.

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

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

We charge the postage of foreign books, from London only, and fix price at current rate of exchange. Purchasers will save themselves trouble by opening an account of 10/- or 20/- with us, in order to avoid the repeated sending of small postal orders, which means paying useless poundage to the Government.

WE CAN SUPPLY!

Books on History, Economics, etc.

Table listing various books on history and economics with prices, including 'The Collapse of Capitalism', 'Capitalism To-day', 'The Right to be Lazy', etc.

Paper Covers.

Table listing various paper-covered books with prices, including 'The Irish Labour Movement', 'Left Wing Trade Unionism in France', etc.

Table listing various books under 'THE SEARCHLIGHT' with prices, including 'The Rights of the Masses', 'The Right to be Lazy', 'The Way Out', etc.

PAMPHLETS EVERY WORKER SHOULD HAVE

Table listing various pamphlets with prices, including 'THE LOGIC OF THE MACHINE', 'A simple explanation of the problem which confronts the working-class', 'SOVIETS OR PARLIAMENT', etc.

Table listing various international and national congresses with prices, including 'Russia in 1921', 'The International Labour Movement', etc.

Novels, Poetry, etc., with a Communist Tendency

Table listing various novels and poetry with prices, including 'Dreams', 'Looking Backward', 'Looking Beyond', etc.

KUZBAS OR COMMUNISM.—Continued from page 2 and may re-invest in some other capitalist enterprise.

The little foreign capitalists of Kuzbas will employ the native Russian workers as wage labourers, giving them no share in the management of the enterprise or that of the colony.

The Management of the vast territory will be carried on by seven persons, only three of whom will be anywhere near the scene of operations, and all of whom must be appointed with the approval of the Soviet Government and may be dismissed at will by it.

The ultimate power of decision over the management and even over the wages and bonus of the little capitalists who are to run this colony, will therefore rest theoretically with the Soviet Government. If, however, the colony becomes strong and prosperous, we do not believe the little American capitalists will submit to such dictation. The little proletarian-capitalists of will once more be displayed by the hard-headed Yankees unless the constitution of Kuzbas be changed. The little proletarian-capitalists of Kuzbas may yet join the bigger Yankee and other concessionaires in fighting the Soviet Government.

Since the Yankees are appealed to commercially, they will respond commercially. The Kuzbas constitution does not appeal to them as Communists.

As for the natives of Kuzbas, it seems that another Revolution will be needed to free them from the proposed yoke.

The prospectus states that S. J. Rutgers, a Dutch engineer who has worked in America, and H. S. Calvert, an American expert in machine production, prepared the Thesis from which this scheme has arisen.

We should find it difficult to believe that Comrade Rutgers, whom we know is responsible for proposing these anti-Communist provisions.

E. SYLVIA PANKHURST.

COMMUNIST WORKERS (LEFT-WING ANTI-PARLIAMENTARY COMMUNISTS)

WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT MEETINGS.

MINERVA CAFE. A well attended meeting was held at Minerva Café, 144 High Holborn, on Sunday March 12th.

ST. LEONARD'S ACADEMY. 698 HIGH ROAD, LEYTONSTONE. SUNDAY, APRIL 2ND.

Discussion on "Communism and the Unemployed." Opened by Sylvia Pankhurst.

PORTSMOUTH COMMUNIST WORKERS' PARTY.

TRADES HALL, FRATTON ROAD. SUNDAY, MARCH 26TH, AT 7 P.M. Sylvia Pankhurst on "Communism."

On Sunday, March 19th, Sylvia Pankhurst addresses the Mexboro' Communist Party on "The Second, Third, and Fourth Internationals."

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

Buy all your books through the "Dreadnought" office.