

Freedom

C.I.R.A.

VOL XXXII.—No. 352

SEPTEMBER, 1918

MONTHLY: TWO PENCE.

NOTES.

"To Get Rid of the Bolsheviks."

The *Daily Mail* of August 26 says: "Americans, as well as British and French, have now landed at Archangel to help the Russians to get rid of the Bolsheviks." In this sentence Northcliffe sums up the real aim of Allied capitalists: "To get rid of the Bolsheviks." All the lying humbug about helping the Czechoslovaks having served its purpose, and the British people having been seduced into commencing the expedition, the instigators of the invasion of Russia feel free to throw off the mask and announce their true aims, which are to overthrow the Bolshevik Government and put in its place a Government which they hope will be able to enforce payment of the loans of the French and English financiers, and restore to the landlords the land seized by the Russian peasants. This means that the British, French and American workers are going into Russia at the command of their Governments to refasten on the necks of the Russian workers those chains which they broke in the Revolution last year. The Workmen and Soldiers' Council have issued a manifesto to the workers of the world, appealing to them to prevent this tragedy, but the Allied Governments have suppressed it.

The Fight for a Free Press.

Our great "democratic" War Cabinet are still busy trying to stifle every independent paper in the country. In our July issue we reported the destruction by the police of the printing plant of Mr. Street, the printer of the *Tribunal*, the organ of the No-Conscription Fellowship. The persecution of the N.C.F. still continues. Miss Violet Tillard, the general secretary, has been sentenced to 61 days' imprisonment for refusing to divulge the name of the printer of the *News Sheet*; and Miss Beauchamp has been fined £200 and costs for refusing to divulge the name of the printer of the *Tribunal*, which still continues to appear. An appeal has been lodged against this decision. It is all very simple. You put the printer's name on the paper, and the police proceed to smash up his plant. To avoid this, you omit the name, and you are sent to prison. The authorities avoid prosecuting the N.C.F. for anything that appears in their paper, as it would give the N.C.F. an opportunity of defending their propaganda,—which cannot be done on a technical charge of omitting the printer's name. The raid on the Socialist Labour Press in Glasgow is another instance of this policy. Here the police seized type, machinery, thousands of pamphlets and papers, and hundreds of pounds' worth of paper; but they do not prosecute anyone, and the victims have no right of appeal against this robbery. The authorities hope by these methods to cripple the propaganda of the S.L.P. And Mr. George Barnes, Labour member of the War Cabinet, has the audacity to complain because the Glasgow Socialists and their supporters interrupted his meeting in that city.

Labour and the Police Strike.

The strike of the London police has no interest for us except as an illustration of the foolishness of the authorities in allowing the men's grievances to rankle until they had no option but to strike in order to get them redressed. There was one incident, however, which calls for notice. Mr. Carmichael, chairman of the London Trades Council, at a mass meeting of the strikers on Friday, August 30, declared that the organised workers of London were unanimously behind the policemen, and if the demands of the men were not met within twenty-four hours all the organised labour of London would come out on the following Monday. By what authority does Mr. Carmichael make such a statement? The

police force is one of the instruments by which the rich oppress the poor, and it is a simple fact that one cannot be on the side of the police and the poor at the same time. The police do all the dirty work of the exploiters. Has Mr. Carmichael forgot the police charges during the last dock strike or the sending of the police into South Wales to break miners' heads? Has he forgotten that last May Day the police prevented him and his friends holding a demonstration in Finsbury Park? The rich robbers would be helpless if it were not for their tools, the police and military. And we can assure Mr. Carmichael that the London workers have longer memories than he has, and will only sympathise with the police when they discard their uniforms and refuse any longer to help the oppressors.

Capital and Labour to Draw Closer.

When one hears Trade Union officials talking about the necessity of Capital and Labour drawing closer together, one wonders when a gleam of common sense will penetrate their thick skulls. These remarks are called forth by the election address of a gentleman who wishes to become chairman of the London Society of Compositors. Now "comps" are credited with being a fairly intelligent set of workmen, but somehow or other this gentleman presumes they are not, for he says that a drawing closer together of Capital and Labour is "what we must earnestly strive for." Capitalists live by picking the brains of the producers and the pockets of the consumer, and when they draw closer to Labour it is to enable them to carry on these operations to greater advantage. A sense of humour and a knowledge of the history of his own society would have prevented him making such an unfortunate remark. Some years ago a Newspaper Proprietors' Association was formed, and in seeking to get closer to Labour they selected the secretary of the news branch of the Compositors' Society as the secretary of their new association. Recently, this secretary resigned, so the news bosses looked round for someone to fill his place; and lo and behold they selected the chairman of the Compositors' Society, who drew closer to Capital and to a nice fat salary. And now this aspirant to the chairman's job also strives to draw closer to Capital. We wonder whether the "comps" see the joke!

The "Block" Vote.

The Jingo Press, aided by those stalwarts of the Labour movement, Havelock Wilson and "Captain" Tupper, have just discovered that the "block" vote at Trade Union Congresses enables the leaders to smother the patriotic element in the unions. They denounce the leaders as "pacifists" because they ask for passports to Switzerland for an international conference (to include Germans and Austrians). But the block vote has been in use in Parliament ever since the Reform Act. In an election where 30,000 vote and there are three candidates, one of them may be elected with but 11,000 votes; yet when he sits in Parliament as the "hon. member for Sheepfold" he votes and acts as though he represented the 30,000. As a matter of fact, however, the voting at Trade Union Congresses "cuts no ice," as our American friends say, unless action backs up the voting. A Trade Union Congress voted against conscription, but the Labour members (or most of them) voted for it in Parliament. Labour voted for a Stockholm Conference, but when the Government refused passports Labour took it lying down. You may count votes, but votes do not count unless there is a kick in them. A wolf does not care how many sheep there are; neither does a Government.

The receipt of a free copy of this paper is an invitation to subscribe—2s. 6d. per annum.

IN REVOLUTIONARY RUSSIA.

How far are Russian revolutionists succeeding, by their economic arrangements, in securing the promise of leisure and well-being for all who serve the community in any useful way; and to what extent do their political changes tend to secure the removal of class obstacles to personal freedom of thought and action, whilst maintaining a strong front against all who would re-impose the old economic or political shackles? Our capitalist governors are very anxious we shall not know much about this. The last manifesto issued by the Soviets, asking for the help of the Socialists and workers of the world against the invasions by the international capitalists, who are bent on the destruction of the Soviet Revolution, has up to now been prevented from appearing here.

At the beginning of March an all-Russian Co-operative Congress was held at Moscow. Although largely representing the moderate elements, it was a very different affair from ordinary English or International Co-operative Congresses. Hearty supporters of the Kerensky Coalition Governments, and keen antagonists of the Bolsheviks and of Soviet rule, as many of them were, they yet had no doubts about private capitalism being largely a thing of the past. They proceeded in a cautious but practical way to consider how they could construct a voluntary co-operative organisation of production and distribution that should take its place. But they were unable quite to free themselves from the prejudices due to their capitalist and State education and training. They cast wistful glances backwards in the direction of the vanished Constituent Assembly, hoping for some miracle by which its ghost might in some way or other materialise. The definite destruction of the parliamentary fetish, and recognition of the political State as a detestable coercive machine, well adapted to serve the general interests of capitalism, but with no part to play in a society of free men and women, is of course one of the great gains of the Soviet Revolution.

These moderate Russian Co-operators did not vote for an economic "war after the war," but urged the necessity of a speedy restoration and strengthening of the activities of the International Co-operative Alliance, and instructed the Council "to take all possible measures for the resumption of International Co-operative relations and for the convocation of an International Co-operative Congress as soon as conditions exist making the realisation of these aims practicable." As one Russian Co-operative paper said, "Frontier posts and State boundaries are not compulsory for Co-operation." They previously tried, a year ago, to get an International Co-operative Conference called, but were rebuffed by the timidity and governmentalism of the moderates amongst English and other Co-operators.

Their resolutions speak of "the permanent aim of Co-operation" as being the "transferring of capitalist concerns to the possession of the labouring masses." In their bold schemes for economic reconstruction they were anxious to work with the Co-operative Societies of other countries, but thought it would be necessary for a time to combine with foreign capitalist firms, both for the home and export trade, inviting them to open branches in Russia, under the condition that they should have the right of buying them out on agreed terms and dates. They wanted to attract "hoarded capital" to their societies. They hoped to organise on Co-operative lines the agricultural and industrial enterprises that were formerly conducted on the big estates. The Congress proceeded at once to create various organisations for dealing with the different articles available for export—grain, timber and forest products, meat, eggs, butter, fruits, vegetables, and hemp; for the purchase of supplies at home and abroad, and their transport and storage in cold stores, elevators, etc.

The turnover of the Russian Co-operative Bank increased from about one hundred and ten million roubles in 1914 to over three thousand million roubles in 1917. Only 4,450 Co-operative Societies out of a total of about 50,000 yet use this bank, but it gives some idea of the scale of Co-operative operations.

A few weeks later, April 11, the Co-operators' programme had considerably widened out, and, as we saw last month, after conferences between Co-operative and Soviet organisations, all the working-class institutions of the country had come to working arrangements for a national organisation of distribution; and by June 4 the whole of the foreign trade was brought within similar arrangements, and from being purely Co-operative became a national business, and was joined by the forces of the Trade Unions and Soviets as well as by all the available technical knowledge and experience in the country; and all traces of the capitalist type of ideas that existed in the Co-operative resolutions had disappeared.

The Bolsheviks have nationalised the mercantile marine on similar lines to those on which they dealt with the land. All large

ships have been taken over by the community, but smaller ones, that are worked by their owners without hired labour, are left as before, provided they join some Co-operative shipping society (artel).

A few points may help us to understand better the Russian land question. We should remember that during a very long period the private ownership of land was undreamed of either in Europe or Asia, and that an immense amount of force and fraud was used by the growing State power to overcome the long and desperate resistance to its establishment. Everywhere traces of this older communal system still survive. But throughout Eastern Europe and Asia the communal holding of land by village communities, and the ideas associated with it, are still a living force amongst the tillers of the soil. In 1905, of the total amount of land held by Russian peasants, 124 million dessiatines, 83 per cent. were held by communal tenure and only 17 per cent. by individual tenure. After the abolition of serfdom in Russia, a certain amount of land was allotted to the peasants, but it was recognised at the time that it was inadequate, both in quality and quantity, to supply their reasonable needs. With the increase of population this position has steadily grown worse. In 1860 the peasant lands amounted to 5.1 dessiatines per head; in 1880 to 3.8 dessiatines per head; and in 1900 to only 2.7 dessiatines per head.

According to Zemstvo investigations, some time before the Revolution, about one-third of the village population had a surplus of grain and food stuffs which they could sell; one-third produced just sufficient for the needs of their households; and the other one-third did not produce sufficient for their own small wants, and were obliged to obtain it by further work in home industries, with richer farmers or landowners, or in capitalist works of various kinds.

In the province of Saratov, during the war, the number of peasant households that have a horse has decreased by 10 per cent, and those that have a cow has decreased by 5.7 per cent. On the other hand, the payment of military allowances, Government requisitions, and high prices of agricultural produce have brought a much larger amount of money into the villages, which has resulted in an enormous strengthening of various Co-operative organisations.

A few facts for the consideration of the workmen and Socialists who are spending their energies and risking their health and lives in the endeavour to regain the oil-producing district around Baku for capitalist exploitation. The companies, carried on by Allied capitalists, that are engaged in the petroleum industry at Baku have a total capital of about £40,000,000, of which £20,000,000 belong to the 70 British companies which exploit a great conglomeration of different races in their oil wells and refineries there. Last March the local Soviets took possession of the plant in this district, and have since been working it in the interest of the whole community, the local People's Commissary having confirmed the Decree nationalising the oil industry, and declaring petroleum, naphtha, and all its products and by-products a Government monopoly. It is in accordance with the nature and functions of capitalist Governments that they should want to send machine guns and high explosives against these workmen, who refuse to be exploited any longer for the benefit of the unknown shareholders in these capitalist companies. They readily marched troops through Persia, a neutral country (not Belgium); if necessary they would send men through Hades. But what are the workmen, Socialists, Co-operators, and democrats who compose these armies thinking about? They have often downed tools for infinitely smaller things than this.

In Bessarabia, which was a part of Russia before the Brest-Litovsk treaty, an Agrarian Committee has decided on the expropriation of private land, and the handing of it over, together with all implements, etc., to peasant organisations. Existing owners are allowed to retain a certain fixed amount, under regulations drawn up by the Committee.

At Vladivostok the workers showed their antagonism when the tools of foreign capitalist Governments, the Japanese and Allied troops, were landed. These "liberating" troops (can they really include workmen?) abolished the Soviet, arrested all prominent Bolsheviks, set up a puppet Government, and proceeded to hold elections in their way on the old register. In spite of all they could do, the Bolsheviks won a majority of the seats on the municipality, against all other parties combined, and elected the mayor. Foreign troops still keep all the Bolshevik candidates in prison, and announce they will not recognise such results. What about the sincerity and value of Labour politicians in our own Allied Governments? But the labourers, dock workers, printers and others are carrying on a vigorous strike of protest against the presence and doings of these troops. In Japan, when the mobilisation order was issued, and the first detachment of troops left for Siberia, serious rioting broke out in most of the large cities. The capitalist papers describe these as due to the

high price of rice, and as being directed specially against profiteers and their newspapers; some suggest it is an extension of the open class war to Japan. After considerable fighting "order" was restored by the police and troops.

In Siberia the Amur Union of Distributive Co-operative Societies and the Producers' Union of Co-operative Credit Societies of the Maritime Province have been working under an agreement which involves direct barter, without the use of money, under which the Distributive Societies supply the members of the other societies with whatever goods they have in stock or can procure; in return for which the Producers' Union collects wheat from their members, which is handed over to the Union of the Distributive Societies.

Last January, after the nationalisation of the forests, the tree-cutters in one of the districts of the Tver province met to discuss the position. They formed themselves into district artels (Co-operative working parties), made agreements with railways and factories that used their wood, arranged to be supplied with food and forage, and started work, highly satisfied with the new conditions, apparently quite undismayed by the disappearance of the capitalist middleman.

F.C.C.

ANARCHY AND THE WAR.

August 4 has come and gone again, and after four years of this great war, the people are as hostile towards peace as ever. The chance of a military victory is as far removed as ever, and although our professed object was to destroy "Prussianism," the more we have tried the more "Prussian" have we become. Whether the people want the war or not, they hold that it is not their business to interfere, but rather to strengthen the rule of authority by quiet submission. If they want more conscripts, "very well"; if more men should be combed out of certain industries, "very well."

The politicians are still preaching a plausible patriotism, whilst our ministers of religion still assure us that Christ is on our side, and all's well with the big war business. The men in the trenches still have to do the suffering, each day bringing its fresh casualty list, with its wrecking of many homes. One is constrained to ask: "Is the forcing of this unnatural life upon the flower of our youth any good to the country? What do we hope to achieve by it? Apart from the more horrid side of war, what result may we expect from military discipline?" "Yours is not to reason, but to obey," we are told. Is the country going to benefit by closing an inquiring mind? Is it our desire that a few only should do all the thinking that is necessary, compelling the majority to act upon those thoughts? Does not this course destroy initiative and personal responsibility? I think we will agree that it does.

The idea of casting responsibility on the State, becoming a tool in their hands, acting according to their thoughts in a mechanical sort of way, crushes individuality, vitality, life. Decay is the only possible result. On the other hand, Anarchy is the doctrine of life, it teaches responsibility to oneself, it encourages reason, denounces authority. It is the gospel of minding your own business, not handing it out to politicians to mind in their way. It denounces capitalism with its private ownership of land and industrial capital, it looks upon Parliament as the legal expression of capitalism, and that therefore the workers should achieve their emancipation through direct action, seeking free access to the means of life, rather than use the political machine, State control not being the same thing as Free Communism. Anarchy denounces Imperialism, Empire, and patriotism, likewise war, which is the reflex of these causes.

We are reaching a serious crisis, and a few personal questions are necessary. Are we going to do a little thinking on our own account? Is the war our business? Does it appeal to our reason to expect after four years fighting that military victory is likely? What is victory? What will it mean? What will you have to show for it? If you place hope in the politician, the war will go on another year, and still be as far from the end. It must be your cry added to the cry of your fellows that will bring effective results. Direct refusal of any further participation in the war is the best means towards peace. So it behoves each of us to do what we can to arouse a public opinion that will quickly finish the war, if we have any desire or craving for a more natural life. This will block the passage to stagnation and decay. The exercising of our reason and thinking for ourselves will create within us fresh vitality, stir us to turn our minds to present-day needs, help us to win back the liberties we have lost in our more servile state, and encourage us to strive for a larger share of liberty in the future.

S. OXLEY.

LIFE IN MOSCOW.

A Russian comrade has received a very interesting letter from his brother, who went from London to Moscow after the Revolution. Writing from Moscow on February 28, after some personal remarks, he says:—"I will give you a short summary of events and conditions in Russia. First: Food conditions are at present very bad, as you must know from the newspapers. Second: There is the war situation. The Russian Revolution and freedom are being threatened by the enemies of freedom outside and inside, viz., Germany by her humiliating peace terms, which free Russia has no other option than to accept; then there is Roumania, at one time the ally of Russia, is now trying to seize territory from her; and there are the Ukraine and Siberia, where serious fighting is taking place. . . . The change in Russia, politically and economically, is simply marvellous. To some people here it must seem a dream. Only working eight hours a day, when they have been used to ten and more, and rotten pay in the bargain. The workmen practically control the workshops and factories—this I can say from experience; holidays all paid for, and there are a good many. The master has no say and does not count. The way it is done is this: At the end of the month the firm has to make out a list of wages owing to the employees, and the employer is allowed 500 roubles for the month. This list has to be signed by the bookkeeper, shop steward, and a workman; then they take this to the Commissioner of "Police," who signs it; then it is taken to the bank, where there is usually a long line waiting, people coming as far as 100 miles to obtain money, as no one can take money out of the bank without a permit, and the reason must be stated distinctly. The idea is to stop food speculation, as this used to be done through the banks, and also to stop the wealthy classes from withdrawing all their money.

"It is admitted by the upper classes and employers that the Bolsheviks have a firm hold on the country's affairs, and they show practical ability. Lately they issued a decree to the effect that all gold above a certain amount must be handed over to the State. The trams here are controlled by the Bolshevik workmen, and they were well utilised by them during the Revolution, moving troops backwards and forwards and also the wounded.

"I might mention that when a dispute occurs between master and employees, and the master refuses to concede their demands, his factory is immediately confiscated and carried on by the workers. Should a master wish to discharge an employee, he has to pay him three months' wages.

"The Anarchists here are very active, continually making searches for firearms in the principal hotels and houses of the town. A fortnight ago they seized the house of the largest cotton manufacturer in Russia, which they intended to make their headquarters; but it is such a beautiful place—simply wonderful—that they decided to preserve it as a museum instead. The Anarchists have since seized the finest club of the Junkers, which they are now using as headquarters. They are well armed with rifles and machine guns. Of course, the Bolsheviks have the soldiery and the Red Guards on their side, and God help the people who speculate here with foodstuffs or anything else; it does not matter what it is, even soap or playing cards; they are ruthlessly dealt with; no mercy is shown them. The trains are stopped before coming into Moscow; everybody is searched, bread and flour, sugar, and other commodities taken away. People used to travel from towns where bread is 20 kopecks a pound and sell it here in Moscow at three roubles. This has all been stopped.

"We have a novel method of supplying the people here with the food that is obtainable. Each house has its food committee, which buys everything possible and sells to the tenants at practically cost price. Our committee has everything in stock and supplies bread, butter, sugar, soap, matches, paraffin, and does in this way to some extent eliminate the food profiteer. This committee also controls the house, collects the rent, and carries out the various decrees of the Government; also sees about repairs and similar things. Of course, rents are fixed. The committee is composed of tenants, and each house has its committee. I might mention that the house in which I live contains more than 1,000 people; it is really four large buildings. Before you enter the house you pass through a gate into a courtyard, and here you find the buildings. Sometimes these courtyards are quite as large as some of the largest streets, with any amount of houses in them, but only one number; really a street in a street, quite the opposite to London, and therefore you do not find children playing in the street as you do in London.

"At the present moment I hear that the Germans (the dogs!) are advancing on Petrograd and probably Moscow, but I hope it is not true. Posters have just been posted over the whole town urging the people to take to arms and so preserve the Revolution. 'To do or to die' seems to be the motto here."

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

Monthly, Twopence; post-free, 2½d. Annual Subscription, post-free, 2s. 6d.

Wholesale price, 1s. 6d. per dozen (13) post-free in the United Kingdom.

All communications, exchanges, etc., to be addressed to

FREEDOM PRESS, 127, Ossulston Street, N.W. 1.

 The Editors are not necessarily in agreement with signed articles

Notice to Subscribers.—If there is a blue mark against this notice, your subscription is due, and must be sent before next month to ensure receipt of paper.

Money and Postal Orders to be made payable to **FREEDOM PRESS.**

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK.

With the above phrase as their battle-cry, the women engaged on the 'buses in London and one or two other places were successful last month in their demand for the same pay as the men engaged in similar work. But they only gained the day after a short but unanimous strike in which they were supported by the men. Since then women engaged in other occupations have threatened to strike unless similar terms are conceded to them, and writers in the press have pointed out how many millions a year it will cost the country if the Government pay the women engaged on munitions the same as the men. Those who support the women, however, usually demand it on "democratic" grounds. We are rather doubtful as to what is meant nowadays by the word "democratic," as so many queer fish are called (or call themselves) democrats; for instance, Lord Milner, General Smuts, Lloyd George and Lord Northcliffe. What we really think the writers mean is that it stands for equality for all men and women—and in this they are mistaken.

"Equal pay for equal work" means the continuation of the wages system, which is the basis of capitalism. It does not mean equal pay for all work, or equality, but that for doing a certain piece of work men and women shall receive the same pay. This will not solve the social question, however, for it does not decide the question as to what is equal work, and leaves the classes as much divided as ever. None of our "democratic" writers said that a road scavenger should be paid the same as a doctor, or the fireman on an engine the same as the driver, or a clerk in a Trade Union the same as the secretary. Of course not, says someone; that would be ridiculous. You would never get men to do the superior work if they were not to get superior pay. People who argue like that, however, have never really thought the question out. Probably if the scavenger had had an equal opportunity he might have shown enough ability to qualify as a doctor, but it is almost certain that if the doctor had been born in the same surroundings as the scavenger he would never have become a doctor.

Our opponents cannot get out of their habit of arguing from the class standpoint of capitalism. They do not see that even if you abolish the present system of private property and instituted a system of nationalisation of property, the old division of the people into classes would still continue unless you abolished the wages system, with its grades of pay for different classes of work. Any man or woman who does work that is useful and necessary in a community should stand in a position of equality with any other person in a community. As human beings their wants as regards food, housing and clothing are the same as those of every other worker, and on those grounds their claim is indisputable.

In our present complex society, with its class divisions, we can see when a strike takes place how useful to society are the so-called unskilled labourers. Have we not often seen large factories laid idle because a few of the poorest paid workers have gone on strike, and the wheels only start again when they have returned, thus proving that their share in the industry was essential. And yet their wages, perhaps, were only about half those paid to other workers. Again, consider the agricultural labourers. Whose work is more necessary than that of the men who provide the community with food? If the value of their service to the welfare of society was the standard by which to judge their wages,

they should be paid at least as much as a member of Parliament; yet whilst the latter gets £400 a year, the agricultural labourer prior to the war had to be satisfied with anything from 12s. to 18s. a week. Which shows what a topsy-turvy society we live in. The basis of it all is slavery, and with the coming of the new society we must start on a basis of equality. If a social revolution does not bring equality the battle must be fought over again.

The society of the future must fight against all attempts to draw a line between the value of one man's work and that of another and to pay him accordingly. With the land free for the people to cultivate and with all social parasites eliminated, about three or four hours' work per day by each person would provide all the things necessary for a healthy life, leaving ample time for leisure in which to cultivate the finer arts such as music, painting, literature and the drama, or anything else. It is folly to think it will be necessary to calculate everybody's work to see whether he or she is "doing their bit." We Anarchists believe that compulsion is useless in bringing out the best in men and women, and declare that the organisation and labour which would be necessary to check everyone's work would be more costly to the community than the few shirkers who might eat and drink from the common store without helping in the work of production.

Many Socialists say to us: "Your Anarchist ideas are very good, but in the change from capitalism to the free society of the future some form of government will be necessary to keep in check the unsocial elements which are a legacy from the old society." To which we reply that you are more likely to counteract the evil tendencies in these individuals by openly welcoming them as comrades who are free to share the necessities of life with yourselves than you would by continuing the prison and police system of the barbaric society you have just overthrown.

"Equal pay for equal work" may be a good motto for a capitalist state of society, but "Equality for all" *must* be the motto for any society which wishes to be free. Beware of the men and women who want to rule you for your good!

THE PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNMENTS.

What are the principles of all governments? To make the people fitter for freedom and to give it them as they become fit? Not at all. The object of all governments and all educated classes has been to establish tyrannies, to standardise men as much as possible, to turn them all out of the same mould, to stifle freedom. They do this on the pretext of civilisation, because civilisation has never meant freedom. They never study human life in order to understand it and develop it; they never try to understand wherein happiness consists and pursue it. They take as an axiom that human nature is evil; they then retire into their inner consciousness and imagine a "perfect man," and having done this, they use every power they have to reduce humanity to that standard. And because freedom revolts they try to reduce freedom as much as possible, especially by education, so that no man should think for himself, but blindly and dumbly accept them as masters. The world grows more unhappy and restless in consequence, and the remedy is always more and more coercion. That is the ideal of all classes, from the highest to the lowest, from the hereditary legislator to the socialist and syndicalist.

It is exactly the same thing with the social trouble and the sex trouble. They all arise from a lack of freedom and a lack of intelligence, and the cure proposed is less freedom than there is now and less intelligence. In fact, all the ideas that people have in the face of trouble is to change masters and still further reduce freedom. A country, a class, a sex, is discontented. What is the proposed cure? Freedom for each sex, class or country to manage its own affairs, and wider freedom for individuals in each, a wider understanding of differences? Not in the least. "Change the governing class and make the laws more stringent yet," is the cry. Socialism is the "cure" to aristocracy, and to hand over the government to women the "cure" of the sex trouble. "Human nature is evil; repress it," is the motto of modern civilisations even more than of old ones. Can you wonder, then, that human nature revolts in wars?

If, then, we are to avoid war, we must therefore make new civilisations, whose objective is the same as that of evolution, namely, an ever-increasing freedom, variety and intelligence, not in or for a class or classes, but for everyone and for all humanity. Everyone has an equal right to this, and it is for the benefit of the whole that no part of the nation, no individual even in the nation, nor in any other nation, should be deprived of his just development, and his proper freedom.

H. FIELDING HALL in "The Nature of War and its Causes."

THE WAY OUT.

The Allies have celebrated the commencement of the fifth year of war in characteristic fashion. They have demonstrated their ability to fight for freedom and democracy by invading Russia and Siberia, and making war upon the Soviet Councils. With customary hypocrisy they appear to stretch out the right hand in friendship, but cautiously hide the weapons of war held in the left. As the *Nation* of August 10 puts it: "We are invading a neutral country and assailing men who are defending their revolutionary freedom. We are doing, in short, what the Germans have done from Finland to Odessa." We went into this war to fight, it is said, German militarism; but Britain, true to her traditions, kept her eye on the main chance. We are reminded of Washington Irving's sketch of "John Bull":

"He is continually volunteering his services to settle his neighbours' affairs, and takes it in great dudgeon if they engage in any matter of consequence without asking his advice. . . . He cannot hear of a quarrel between the most distant of his neighbours but he begins incontinently to fumble with the head of his cudgel, and consider whether interest or honour does not require that he should meddle in their broils. . . . All that I wish is that John's present troubles may teach him more prudence in future; that he may cease to distress his mind about other people's affairs; that he may give up the fruitless attempt to promote the good of his neighbours and the peace and happiness of the world, by dint of the cudgel; that he may remain quietly at home; gradually get his house into repair."

The real cause of this new Allied military expedition is not far to seek. The continued existence of Russian Bolshevism is, and will remain, a menace and challenge to capitalism all over the world. Therefore the microbe must be sterilised in the land of its origin. The financiers, being anxious about those Russian loans, mean to enforce repayment. Moreover they know that Russia and Siberia are extremely rich in valuable minerals. The little adventure is worth the risks, particularly when the Allies appear as the great liberators of the Russian people from the impossible Bolshevik tyranny, which oddly enough is sanctioned by the great mass of the population. Thus do we find Canadians, Japanese and Americans shooting down our one-time Allies in order that capitalism may be re-established.

Meanwhile, at home, a few of the less reckless financiers dare to face our financial position. They assure us that from being in the enviable position of a creditor we have become a debtor nation. Our National Debt was about £650,000,000 in August, 1914. If the war continues, by March next it will stand at some £8,000,000,000. This will need £700,000,000 revenue to keep the ship of State afloat. But we are faced with the problem of providing this enormous sum out of an impoverished nation. The trade goose that laid the golden egg has been killed by the war, and an ever-increasing army of non-producing State functionaries has to be maintained by the working population. Mr. Molteno, M.P., informed a recent audience at Essex Hall that our ordinary expenditure of £700,000,000 represented the work of 7,000,000 men for a whole year. Now when we consider our army of 5,000,000 men, possessing, as they do, a higher wage-earning capacity than any other workers because of their physical fitness, we begin to understand how utterly impoverished the whole of the workers in this country will remain for many generations to come.

Assuredly, John Bull sadly needs to get his own house into repair. The workers show increasing signs of restlessness, Ireland is in active revolt, and the great mass of the people are thoroughly war-weary. Yet the same recklessness marks the policy of the men who rule us. Engaged in sundry wars spread over three continents, there is no time left to consider the wishes or the needs of the humble people who "carry on" in this most blessed isle. We merely pay the piper—they call the tune, and it is the working classes of this country who will have to provide the means for crushing the Russian working classes. For we are moving round in a vicious circle, incapable of extricating ourselves from an impossible position. We obey the old party leaders and vote them into office, although we know that our interests are opposed to those who merely use us as pawns. The cry of a coming general election finds us responsive to the usual clap-trap of the party officials. We hasten to assist in voting away our human rights. We place ourselves unreservedly in our so-called representatives' hands, and delude ourselves into believing that we have exercised our rights and helped to save "old England" from disaster.

But it is just this mental laziness that is at the root of all our ills. We cannot realise that only by our own conscious effort

can we rid ourselves of the war incubus. The Government uses both workers and consumers in the service of its financial masters; but it has not yet occurred to the people of this country that as workers and consumers their interests are diametrically opposed to those of the Government. When they realise that it is impossible to fight the Government by the mere act of returning men to sit in Parliament and so become puppets of the executive, they will begin to think of themselves as just workers and consumers, and organise as such. As individually they become conscious of their power they will unite in order to protect their own interests. The Government then becomes superfluous and a prehistoric sort of institution that has survived an inglorious past.

Thus our sole hope for the future lies in Co-operative effort in the workshop, factory, office, store and home. To those who still doubt the possibility of Communism let them reflect upon that £700,000,000 yearly revenue which will have to be provided, and the vast army of officials necessary for its collection. Also let us remember that already the financiers have laid their schemes for "reforms" and reconstruction after the war. Then we shall learn to ignore the ballot box and seek our own salvation by means of direct action.

M.B.H.

ARTHUR LEWIS ON KROPOTKIN.

Lewis, in his book, "Vital Problems in Evolution," says: "Kropotkin reached the third mental stage, the positive, in his views on biology, but he never emerged from the second mental stage—the metaphysical—in his political and social theories." The mental stages referred to by Lewis are those postulated by August Comte; namely, the first or theological, second or metaphysical, and the third or positive. Those stages, he contended, are successively experienced by mankind in its upward progress from savagery to civilisation. Lewis agrees with Comte that each individual comes through each of those stages in their proper evolutionary order; just as Haeckel has proved that the embryo always passes through or shows signs of every well-marked differing physical form of its ancestors.

Though it is not intended to discuss the truth of Comte's theory in this essay, one may legitimately point out that there is an easily recognised difference of construction between a fish and a human being; but it has yet to be proved that the same is true of the brain of a metaphysician and the brain of a Positivist. Lewis himself recognises this when he says: "The minds of most men are an incongruous mixture of all three stages."

One wonders what Lewis thought of Comte's theory, when in "Science and Superstition" he wrote: "There is no organic process by which beliefs can be made congenital. Ideas are transmitted from one generation to another by education." Lewis also supplies a curious criticism of his support of Comte, the founder of Positivism or reasoning from all available facts, when in "Blind Leaders of the Blind" he says: "This analogy of Comte's is usually regarded as merely fanciful and suggestive, deriving whatever force it has from the facts often or usually being as the theory implies."

It is interesting to note that Max Nordau, in his "Interpretation of History," thinks or suggests that Comte adapted his "mental theory" from the "metaphysical" divisions of human progress used by Vico—the Divine Age, Heroic Age, and Human Age. The mental stages to be passed through by the individual, as affirmed by Max Stirner in "The Ego and His Own," seem to have a close resemblance to those mentioned above.

Supposing that Comte's theory is true, Lewis fails to prove his charge against Kropotkin. As Lewis praises highly Kropotkin's "Mutual Aid," and as "Mutual Aid" belongs as much to sociology as to biology, Lewis seems to be contradictory when he asserts that Kropotkin as a sociologist is a metaphysician. Kropotkin, in his political and social theories, is certainly not a metaphysician in the sense of one who personifies abstract ideas, or who attributes properties of living matter to non-living objects. Kropotkin is an idealist, not in the sense of one who believes that the idea only has an independent or real existence, but in the sense that he seems to attach too much importance to the part played by ideas in changing social forms in the past. From the historical point of view this may be a defect, but as the time is now ripe for a change this historical fault has great propaganda value.

In regard to the past changes of social forms, we have Lafargue in "Evolution of Property" stating: "Unquestionably it was the desire to shake off this feminine ascendancy and to satisfy this feeling of [sexual] animosity which led man to wrest from woman the control of the family." Bebel in

"Woman" states: "The foundations of private property, the family, the tribe, and the State, were laid when man first desired permanent possession of one woman." Kautsky talks of revolutionists attacking traditions of thought upon which certain institutions rested; and a search through the works of the "Materialists" would reveal further proof of the fact that Kropotkin is not alone in failing in this metaphysical age to keep clearly before the workers the material basis of all schools of thought.

Kropotkin has also been charged with making metaphysical abstractions of "well-being" and "justice." Without entering into a lengthy argument as to the truth or otherwise of this charge, it will be sufficient to point out that the Erfurter Programme states: "The socialisation of the means of production is necessary in order to transform the capitalist mode of production from a source of misery to a source of well-being and harmonious development." And Enrico Ferri in "Positive Science" writes: "Scientific Socialism continues the generous efforts to realise an identical aim to sentimental Socialism." In pre-war times it was frequently claimed by the Scientific Socialists that during a crisis they would necessarily remain true to the proletariat, whilst those designated by them "Sentimental Socialists" would not. The war has proved that for a person to have a partiality for the prefix "Scientific" is no guarantee that he will not become pro-war and therefore anti-workers. Kropotkin became pro-war, but so did his scientific critic, Plekhanoff!

Lewis simply makes the assertion that Kropotkin is a metaphysician; he does not attempt to substantiate the charge. One cannot say whether this omission is intentional, but it will prevent many readers of his book from becoming acquainted with Kropotkin's writings. As a Revolutionary Socialist, Lewis must recognise that this will not be beneficial to the cause of the Social Revolution; because it is obvious to any candid reader that Kropotkin's writings are more likely to alter the ideas of the average worker than many of the literary efforts of the Marxians. Anarchist Communists have nothing to gain by prejudicial remarks on any Socialist publication. We desire free discussion, because we are confident that ultimately the "fittest" view of the social problem will prevail, and we believe our view is the "fittest." Desiring free discussion, we advise those who have read Lewis's assertion, to turn to Kropotkin's works, and there find the assertion demolished.

In Kropotkin's books one will find the same animating spirit which is found in a quotation used by Boudin from Sada Gunter's writings: "In Historical Materialism a practical idealism is not only possible but necessary. This is the reason why the goal of Socialism, the emancipation from the yoke of capitalism, and the establishment of a more harmonious social order, could seize upon the masses so powerfully, impel them forward, and elevate them even while the present system lasts." ROBERT SELKIRK.

SOUTH AMERICAN NOTES.

Our South American comrades seem to have grasped the immense importance of the Social Revolution in Russia, this stupendous breach made in the defences of capitalism and government, which will be widened by the coming revolutions in other European countries until the whole human race shall march through and achieve the utter destruction of the existing evil order and the construction in its place of a true society based on the freedom and wellbeing of each individual member.

In Uruguay they organised on March 17 great demonstrations to celebrate the 47th anniversary of the Paris Commune of 1871 and the first anniversary of the Russian Revolution. They have grasped the connection between these two events, and whilst extending a joyous welcome to the new Russian Communes of 1918 they are busy preparing themselves to play their parts in the establishment of still more communes to-morrow. They realise there are two urgent duties before Anarchists everywhere: (1) To spread the light about Russia by every available means; (2) To equip ourselves in every way, including clear ideas about our aims and methods, for playing a worthy part in the Social Revolution at home. This implies not only clearness about our ultimate aims, but about the immediate steps to be taken under existing conditions to bridge over the transition period from the present social disorder to Free Communism.

La Batalla, of Guadalupe, has devoted much of its space for several numbers in succession to these two points and has conducted a very valuable and detailed discussion by various writers of points suggested by the development of the Russian Revolution. By studying the lessons this has for us they have endeavoured to gain clear ideas of what immediate steps can be taken to extend the Social Revolution to their own country and to form definite plans for the practical carrying on of industrial

and social life during and after a successful Social Revolution. They have concluded the discussion of one series of questions, and are now engaged on clarifying their ideas on the following subjects:—

(1) What would be the best way of going to work to organise an equitable form of production and consumption during the revolutionary period and afterwards?

(2) What means should the revolutionists in cities use to establish confidence amongst the cultivators of the land in order that they may not suspend the delivery of their products, which form the essential basis of the food supply?

(3) Would it be well for the workers in each trade organisation to begin at once the consideration of the definite form by which they will replace the masters, and what would be the best form of agreements between allied branches of industry and with all the other unions in general?

(4) Recognising the influence of the Russian Revolution in the political and economic life of all countries and the possibility and necessity for revolutionary minorities to direct the people towards forms of life superior to those now existing, in what form in the case of Anarchist successes should we intervene and help to carry on labour organisations and popular movements in general?

(5) On the political side, what would be the best means to take, the revolution being triumphant, to maintain and consolidate this success and at the same time to place the people in the way of self-development without the intervention of outside persons?

(6) In view of the fact that in most countries the Russian Revolution took Anarchists by surprise, would it be advantageous or disadvantageous to cease for a time our present activities in order to devote ourselves to studying especially the urgent questions that the existing situation is bringing to the front?

(7) Would it be well for various groups to take the initiative in editing pamphlets in which should be worked out in detail what each considers the best constructive sketch of new forms for the production and distribution of the most essential articles of everyday use and the necessary steps to take at the moment to build the bridges that shall enable us to escape from the existing disorder and take the road towards a better future?

These questions seem worthy of the serious consideration of English-speaking Anarchists, too. F. C. C.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS (not otherwise acknowledged). (August 1—September 3.)

"FREEDOM" GUARANTEE FUND.—R. Peddie, 2s. 6d.; E.M., 2s. 3d.; Mat, 6d.; H. Burton, 2s. 6d.; H. Haxon, 2s.; J. C. Sewell, 1s.; G. W. Tindale, 1s.; W. H. Brown, 5s.; R. Mangrartti, 5s.; A. Sanders, 2s. 6d.; E.A.J., 2s.; J. Cotton, 1s. 9d.; H.W.J., 12s.
"FREEDOM" SUBSCRIPTIONS.—H. Burton, W. H. Brown, H. Huyton, A. Peters, C. Jones.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

Send postcard for list of books and pamphlets.

ANARCHIST MORALITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3d.
ANARCHIST COMMUNISM. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3d.
TALK BETWEEN TWO WORKERS. By E. MALATESTA. 2d.
THE PYRAMID OF TYRANNY. By D. NIEUWENHUIS. 2d.
LAW AND AUTHORITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3d.
THE COMMUNE OF PARIS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
THE CHICAGO MARTYRS. With Portraits. 2d.
ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. 3d.
WAR. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
THE CONCENTRATION OF CAPITAL: A MARXIAN FALLACY. By W. TCHERKESOFF. 2d.
DUTY OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE. By H. THOREAU. 4d.
FOR LIBERTY. AN ANTHOLOGY. 6d.
THE ANARCHIST REVOLUTION. By GEORGE BARRETT. 2d.
APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. By P. KROPOTKIN. 2d.
Postage extra— $\frac{1}{2}$ d. for each Pamphlet.

MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM. By PETER KROPOTKIN. Paper covers, 6d.; postage, 2d.
THE CONQUEST OF BREAD. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1s. 9d. net, postage 3d.
MUTUAL AID. By PETER KROPOTKIN. Boards 1s. 6d. net, postage 3d.
ANARCHISM. By DR. PAUL ELTZBACHER. 6s. 6d.; post. 6d.

Orders, with cash, to be sent to
FREEDOM PRESS, 127, OSSULSTON STREET, LONDON, N.W.1.

Printed by the BLACKFRIARS PRESS, LTD., 5, Parsonage Buildings, Blackfriars Street, Manchester, and Published by FREEDOM PRESS, 127, Ossulton Street, London, N.W.