

Freedom

Vol. XXXIII.—No. 363

AUGUST, 1919

MONTHLY: TWO PENCE.

NOTES.

The Coming Crisis.

The signing of peace with Germany has increased the intensity of the struggle between Capital and Labour in this country. The war with Russia (costing £5,000,000 a week) and the numerous smaller wars on the continent prevent trade returning to normal conditions, and with unemployment on the increase and the price of food beginning to jump up again, the coming winter will be a much harder one here than at any time during the war. The capitalists, taking full advantage of the situation, are squeezing profits and dividends out of the workers to an extent never known before, whilst the reactionaries, led by Winston Churchill, are getting ready to fight the "Triple Alliance" before the latter have closed up their ranks. "Direct action" will be the motto on both sides and every Anarchist and Socialist should be ready for the struggle, which cannot be delayed much longer. The fight will be a hard and bitter one, but if the workers stand together to the end they can shatter their chains for ever. Let our watchword be: "No masters, old or new!"

The Trial of the Kaiser.

Mr. Lloyd George's statement that the Kaiser is to be tried in London for his responsibility in bringing about the war has set many tongues wagging. We do not believe that he will be brought to London for this trial, but if he should be, of course he must be allowed to call evidence in his defence, in which case we may be sure a great deal of it will be heard *in camera*, as many State secrets would come to light. The Jingo Press prior to the war would furnish evidence in his favour, because many papers here were just as anxious for a war as were the Kaiser and the military clique in Germany. For example, the *World's Work* of July, 1913, in discussing the dissensions between the Powers over the Balkans, and the possibility of a war between the Entente and the Triple Alliance, said:

"Germany has seen herself at the brink of a war in which her chance of success was about as poor as it is ever likely to be. The country of the Ems telegram is not unaware of the ways in which a conflict can be precipitated by those who desire to see some fun. What was England likely to do when she found the fate of her really provocative rival placed to some extent at her disposal? Was she going to stand by her oft-professed love of peace? Was she going to seek peace on this occasion when Germany, for excellent reasons, was terrified of war? Or was she to scheme for the delivery of the long-premeditated blow?"

The writer in the *World's Work* uses this phrase, "the long-premeditated blow," in another part of the same article, and subsequent events prove that British statesmen thought 1914 a better time than 1913 for aiming at Germany "the long-premeditated blow," and that they were as much responsible for the war as the Kaiser. At the same time, we think the real responsibility lies with the workers, who put into the hands of these scoundrels the power to make war.

The Peace Celebrations.

The celebration in London was really a "war" celebration. The procession through the streets was composed of the fighting forces, and although we were told the war was an engineers' war, no representatives of the workshops were present. The authorities showed their usual contempt for the men and women who feed and clothe the soldiers, as well as provide them with the munitions of war. Yet even as a "war" celebration there was much lacking. A few tableaux on cars showing the glory of war would have given a picturesque touch to the procession and avoided the monotony of column after column of marching men. For instance, a model of a trench after the explosion of a shell, showing bleeding fragments of what a few moments previously were living men, would have brought

home to the spectators at a glance those pleasures of soldiering which were not dwelt on by our polite war correspondents. Another tableau likely to raise the enthusiasm of sightseers whose friends had been notified as "missing" would be one showing a wounded soldier drowning in a shell-hole, or a representation of "No Man's Land," with dead British and German soldiers hanging on barbed wire, with rats and other vermin gnawing them to pieces. Some of the unemployed discharged soldiers would have been glad to earn a few shillings whilst giving a lifelike sketch of the joys they had left behind. Then, as a tribute to the work of "our silent Navy," a few coffins full of starved German and Austrian children would have made a fitting wind-up. Really, the people who arrange these processions suffer greatly from a lack of imagination. Still they may do better after the next war.

The Blockade Weapon.

Many Trade Unionists and Labour men have recently passed resolutions demanding the raising of the blockade against Russia and Central Europe, principally on the ground that it is starving defenceless women and children. We Anarchists quite agree with them in their protest, but would point out to them that they should be logical in their attitude and protest against the blockade in this country. Perhaps they do not think there is a blockade here. Well, what happens when there is a big strike or lock-out in this country? The men and women find themselves out of work—that is, they cannot earn a living. For a time they live on their Union pay and their savings. But soon those are exhausted, and they look round for another means of securing food, to save themselves from agreeing to the employers' terms. There is only one way to get food—cultivate the land. Then they bump up against the blockade which they had not noticed previously. Wherever they go they see boards up, "Land to let" or "Land to be sold," but no land open to them to grow food without they first agree to pay away as rent or purchase money a large part of the food they produce. This is the blockade which is in force day and night all the year round. Men and women are practically forced into factories and workshops and offices to get a living, as the land is shut off from them, but few of them have ever thought of it in that way. Yet the blockade of the land is the weapon by the use of which wage-slavery is enforced in this country. To get free from slavery, the workers must break through this blockade of the land. This means a revolution, but it is the only way in which true freedom can be gained, and is the surest means of breaking the blockade against Russia and Central Europe.

Watson's Appeal Dismissed.

We often wonder why revolutionists expect to get a fair and impartial trial in the Courts. If W. F. Watson thought his sentence of six months' imprisonment for his Albert Hall speech would be reduced or remitted entirely, he must be a very simple rebel. His speeches for some time had been of a most revolutionary character, and his arrest and imprisonment were the natural consequence. He could only hope to escape punishment if his arrest had been followed by indignation strikes on the part of his supporters in the Engineers' Union; but as that did not happen, his imprisonment was certain. To compare his case with Carson's is ridiculous. Carson's arrest and prosecution would bring a hornet's nest about the heads of the Government; therefore he says what he likes. If one has force at his back, he is certain to be free from trouble, unless it is a matter of vital importance to the Government. Watson had no force at his back, so he goes under. The most interesting feature of his case, however, was his statement that he had been approached by the heads of Scotland Yard and offered a weekly salary to become an informer. He was told: "You will never be in the dock, Watson, if you work for us." Fortunately, he was strong enough to spurn this insult, but his statement of the offer helps us to explain many strange incidents in the Labour movement of the past few years.

LIGHT ON RUSSIA*

In his "Six Weeks in Russia" in 1919," Arthur Ransome, the well-known correspondent of the *Daily News*, gives us an interview with Professor Timiriazev, the great Russian Darwinian foreign member of the Royal Society, Doctor of Cambridge, and a Bolshevik. Professor Timiriazev is of English descent. He read Ransome a protest against intervention that he had just written; spoke of his life-long love of England, and suddenly broke into tears. Excusing himself, he said: "I suffer as an Englishman when I see the country that I love misled by lies, and I suffer as a Russian because those lies concern the country to which I belong and the ideas which I am proud to hold."

Ransome himself strikes the same note in his "Introduction," saying: "Very many times during the revolution it has seemed to me a tragedy that no Englishman properly equipped in this way [with a knowledge of economics, both from the Capitalist and Socialist standpoints] was in Russia studying the gigantic experiment which, as a country, we are allowing to pass abused but not examined. I did my best. I got, I think I may say, as near as any foreigner who was not a Communist could get to what was going on. But I never lost the bitter feeling that the opportunities of study which I made for myself were wasted, because I could not hand them on to some other Englishman, whose education and training would have enabled him to make a better, a fuller use of them." He then remarks that such a man would have received every assistance from the Bolsheviks, for they have welcomed delegations opposed to them, and have expressed themselves willing to admit committees of inquiry sent by any of the bourgeois Governments actually at war with them.

This probes the subject to the quick, and points straight to the wrong our own Government is doing to its own people. On what is probably the greatest social experiment recorded, since the birth of Christianity, at any rate, it is shutting out the truth and closing every avenue that leads to knowledge. It has so little confidence in the rectitude of its own policies that it feels it necessary to blind its subjects. There can be no greater insult or more injurious crime.

Russia is struggling with desperate problems. Cut off from foreign intercourse, she is being compelled to develop her own resources, under appalling difficulties. Her natural wealth is enormous, but much of it has been seized by the armies now attacking her on every side and seeking to starve her out. Her great corn granaries, in the Ukraine and Siberia, have been occupied; but she is winning them back. She has been shut off from her main fuel supplies, and her whole textile industry has suffered unspeakably from this and from her inability to import the machinery it needs. Apparently, however, she has reorganised this indispensable industry, and done it capably. Transportation is still the weak point, and to this she has been devoting herself most actively, though hampered seriously by the war we ourselves have levied against her. "To meet the immediate needs of the army," said Pavlovitch, President of the Committee of State Constructions, "we have already repaired or made 8,000 versts of roads of various kinds. As a matter of fact, the internal railway net of Russia is by no means as bad as people make out."

Progress depends mainly on mental activity; and Russia's mental activity at present is phenomenal. If we had but a twentieth part of it in England half our most pressing problems would solve themselves. Education is free; and, although the hands of the lecturers are often frostbitten, workmen crowd their courses. Libraries have been multiplied everywhere amazingly; the sale of literature, by the best writers, is enormous; the stage—Ransome gives sample programmes taken from the "Theatrical Bulletin," of Moscow—is striking a high intellectual note, and the theatres are patronised most generously. "Looking from face to face that night," he says, "I thought there were very few people in the theatre who had had anything like a good dinner to digest. But, as for their keenness, I can imagine few audiences to which from the actor's point of view, it would be better worth while to play."

Meanwhile, what is Bolshevism itself? Its centre is evidently the Soviet; that is to say, the self-governing, local council of the working people, endeavouring at a thousand scattered points to rid themselves of parasites and work out their own economic salvation by their own methods. Things are still in process of formation; still in the melting-pot. A most important element is unquestionably Socialism, of the Karl Marx type, as represented by Lenin and Trotsky. But there are others. Trade Unionism plays a rôle. As against the foreign invader the Anarchists have come in. Above all, the peasant, who looks askance at communes and

inclines to individual management of such land as he individually cultivates, has had to be considered. Compulsory membership in the Commune has now been discarded by the Central Government. In short, a nation of nearly 200,000,000 souls working out a gigantic social experiment, and determined to do so without foreign interference.

Mr. Ransome, having revisited Russia after a twelve months' absence, considers that the Revolution has gained much stability and is settling down; that its essential bases cannot be overthrown; that the Soviets have come to stay. Against this force the British Empire still apparently intends to hurl itself. What else can it do if its rulers are to maintain the privileged economic institutions by virtue of which they rule?

NICHOLAS TCHAIKOVSKY.

By HARRY KELLY (in FREEDOM, New York, June, 1919).

The *Survey* for April 26 contains one of the saddest articles it has ever been our misfortune to read. When a friend dies or goes away we accept it as part of a scheme ordained, and reconcile ourselves to it as one of the sad but unavoidable things of life. But when a friend who has been a life-long revolutionist and fighter for freedom, as he understood it, becomes so reactionary as to join hands with the Koltchaks, Denikins and Sazonoffs, and calls for "Allied troops to constitute a screen behind which a Russian army could be reorganised," to overthrow the Bolshevik Government and the Soviet principle of social organisation, it is an affliction truly hard to bear. The article in question is the thirteenth of a series under the heading "Social Aspects of the Peace Conference," by Lewis S. Gannett, and is entitled "Tchaikovsky and the Social Programme of His Arctic Commonwealth." It is temperately written, and from what we know of Tchaikovsky bears every impress of truth. The author says: "Tchaikovsky is not a Bolshevik, Menshevik, Social Revolutionary of the right, left or centre, Social Democrat, Cadet, or member of any of the better-known Russian parties. He belongs to the Popular National Socialist Party, which differs from the Social Revolutionaries of the right, chiefly in that it does not recognise the right of violence against individuals and opposes terrorist methods. Despite the name of Socialist, there is nothing in its programme which would not be covered amply by the word Democrat or Liberal in Western Europe."

The first time we met Tchaikovsky was at the home of Alfred Marsh, editor of FREEDOM, an Anarchist paper published in London, in the spring of 1895. He was a member of the group that published the paper for many years, and many times during the years 1898 to 1904 we used to meet regularly at the offices of FREEDOM, and with Tcherkesov, Nettlau, Marsh, John Turner, A.D. (a wonderful Welsh-Irish woman), Mary Krimont, Cantwell, and, later on, T. Keell, to print the paper.

FREEDOM was printed on an old Oscillator press of the Wharf-dale type, and it had neither power nor sheet delivery, so it took three persons to operate it. As the one "professional" excepting Cantwell, it was my function to feed the press; A.D. or M.K. took the sheets off after the cylinder made its revolution, and Tcherkesov, Tchaikovsky, Turner, Nettlau and Marsh alternated in turning the handle and doing the work that should have been done by a motor or engine. Sometimes we stopped a labourer in the street and hired him at ninepence an hour—that was 50 per cent. more than the docker's "tanner"—but that only happened when the others were unavailable. It was very hard work turning the press, and we never tried it unless two or more men were there to take turns. We often regaled ourselves with kippers and tea after getting off a forme of four pages, and the others had at least two hours' rest while the writer made the second forme ready. Those were glorious days for all of us.

The occasion of our first meeting with Tchaikovsky was a conference called to take steps towards the Anarchists participating in the Socialist and Workers' Congress, which was to meet the following year (1896) in London. This Congress, by the way, was the parting of the ways for the Anarchists and Socialists, for although Tom Mann, Domela Nieuwenhuis, the Dutch Communist, and Keir Hardie tried their best to have the Anarchists admitted, Jaures, Hyndman and others out-voted them, and the Anarchists were excluded because they refused to accept Parliamentaryism. At the meeting at Marsh's house there were such well-known revolutionists as Kropotkin, Tcherkesov, Tchaikovsky, Turner, Nettlau, Kampfmeier, Marsh, and a number of others whose names escape me at the moment. It was during my second visit to London—a rather long one, for it lasted nearly seven years—that we got to know Tchaikovsky very well, and during the last year of our stay there we worked together nearly every day. We spoke at scores, and perhaps even a hundred, meetings together; worked on

* "Six Weeks in Russia in 1919," by Arthur Ransome, London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. Price 2s. 6d.

FREEDOM, and in many ways got to know and understand each other—and yet *did* we understand each other? Subsequent events would seem to indicate that we did not. During all these years Tchaikovsky called himself an Anarchist-Communist, and advocated these theories tirelessly and insistently. He lacked the genius and creative ability of Kropotkin, the scholarship of Tcherkesov, and the strength of character of both, but he was more indefatigable than either, perhaps because he was younger, and more loved than they were by the Russian element of London because of this softness of character. He was far more likely to be found in the East End of London speaking, organising or working for the "Russian Fund" to publish literature and send it to Russia, than he was at his comfortable and typically bourgeois home in Harrow, some distance from the city. He never seemed to be tired, and it was a marvel to his friends how he could stand it and earn a living for himself and family, consisting of a wife and four children.

Although calling himself an Anarchist, and working with the Anarchists for years, he once told me he was not so particular about that title as he was about the one of Communist. Communism was the great aim and end of all his work, and it would be the rankest of folly, now that he has gone back on that theory, to assume he had never been one or did not understand its principles. His life was ideal in the sense of trying to live by his principles and his work was so devoid of any vanity or self-seeking that the only theory or explanation we can give for his apostasy is weakness of character and age. And yet there is in Mr. Gannett's article no more sign of senility with him than there is with Breshkovskaya in her writings.

We returned to New York in the Fall of 1904, and about a year later Tchaikovsky came to America as the official representative of the Socialist Revolutionary Party of Russia, to raise funds for the revolution. One of the last things he had told us before leaving London was of a coming break between him and Kropotkin and Tcherkesov. He was of the opinion that the revolutionary upheaval at that moment all over Russia made the preaching of theories inadvisable, whereas the other two insisted more than ever on the necessity of spreading their theories among the masses. It was a hard break for him, he said, after working together for so many years, but he saw it coming. As to terrorism, he was as much of a terrorist in 1905 as he had been when he organised the Tchaikovsky Circle some thirty years before, and which finally did Alexander II. to death. He insisted, however, on organised or party terrorism, as he was afraid if terrorism was resorted to without a party back of the individual it was likely to make for a slackening of the moral concept back of such acts, and without a party to explain and defend it the propaganda effect would be lost.

I saw him the second day after his arrival here, and was asked by him to read and correct his statement to the American people. He was stopping in a small room at an hotel in Lower Broadway, and it was there we went over his manifesto together. The manifesto at one point used the word Anarchy in the sense of chaos, and, coming from him, it shocked me deeply, and an explanation was asked of him. His answer was a conventional one, "You know what I mean." He insisted it was the proper word to express his meaning regarding the conditions in Russia. We protested that Anarchy meant a society without government and without chaos. Chaos and Anarchy were absolutely opposed, we argued. One word was clear and definite and the other was a conclusion derived from a promise we believed to be true. It might be true that some people honestly believe that a society without government meant disorder and disruption, but we who believe in the capacity of the people for self-government knew that it meant nothing of the sort. At any rate, it was unfitting for those of us who called ourselves Anarchists for years to use the term in any such misleading sense. He acquiesced, and the word chaos was substituted for Anarchy.

His first trip was not very successful, for the Roots and Roosevelts, who later on acclaimed the Russian Revolution of 1917, were engaged in other occupations more suitable to their temperaments and their interests, and he returned to Europe. He came back again about a year later, and, by a coincidence, a few days after John Most had died. A memorial meeting was arranged for the following Sunday at Grand Central Palace, and Tchaikovsky informed me of his intention to speak there, as he had known Most in London years before, and had a high regard for him. He had not been invited, but he rightly considered this of no importance, as he would have been welcome. Emma Goldman, Max Baginsky and several others, including the writer, were the speakers, but notwithstanding this we advised him not to come, pointing out that a tribute to a man like Most was a fine thing and well deserved, but he was here as the official representative of the Socialist Revolutionary Party to raise money for the revolution, and to align himself at the very start with the Anarchists was to ruin any prospect of getting it. It was the revolution that had to be considered and not the memory of an individual, no matter who or how great he

was. He saw the point, or said he did, and refrained from speaking. It was advice that we see no reason to regret, even though a dozen years have passed.

On this trip he raised very little money—but that is another story. His work took him among men like Lyman Abbott, Dr. Adler and Herbert Parsons, and he soon lost touch with us altogether; so much so that Emma Goldman had to rebuke him for some of his statements about Anarchy in the press, to which he made no reply. Aladin came here by his instructions, and later on both returned to Europe, although not together. Shortly after he returned to Europe he went to Russia and was there arrested about the same time as Madame Breshkovskaya, and, sad to relate, he did not cut a very heroic figure. Although he had openly asked here at Carnegie Hall, in the presence of three or four thousand people, with Dr. Lyman Abbott as chairman and Dr. Adler as one of the speakers, for money to buy arms and ammunition to overthrow the Czar's Government, and stated that they—the Socialist Revolutionary Party—had a "government" all ready to take over the machinery (he had informed me privately of his plans to establish schools along American lines), when arrested he denied any overt act, etc. Breshkovskaya stood her ground, and was sent to Siberia, while Tchaikovsky was acquitted. It has always been my impression that some "deal" was made, for the authorities knew of his life-long activity, yet he was allowed to remain in Russia and devote himself to scientific work and later on to work with Lvoff. Perhaps the authorities were of the opinion that he was a broken and harmless old man; at any rate, none of his old friends here ever heard of any revolutionary activity of his after his release.

At 58 years of age, Siberia is a terrible place to contemplate, and even though Breshkovskaya faced it and Tchaikovsky quailed, we had and have no word of condemnation for him. It was weakness, yes; it was, at the same time, human, or as Nietzsche would say, "human, all too human." And yet, as we read the following: "We overturned the Bolsheviks (at Archangel) twenty-four hours before the British landed. It wasn't hard, though we had to use force. Not half-a-dozen lives were lost. We arrested some of the leaders, and after a trial a few were killed, in accordance with Russian law," we cannot help feeling it might have been better if he had been sent to Siberia and died there, so as to have spared himself this ignominy. We hold no brief for the Bolshevik Government any more than we do for other Governments, for we are opposed to them all, but if 93 per cent. of the people are back of them, as Col. Raymond Robbins told us last month, then it is the crime of crimes to call in outside Imperialists to try and upset them.

Lewis Gannett writes: "I asked him what he thought of Koltchak, Denikin and the other anti-Bolshevik generals who have so often been called autocrats and reactionaries. 'They are the most honoured generals in Russia,' Tchaikovsky replied; 'personally, nothing can be said against them. [The Red Cross Magazine for March tells an appalling and most heartrending tale of a train of death, containing hundreds of prisoners taken by the Koltchak forces, who were dragged from one end of Siberia to the other end until they succumbed from hunger, cold and disease]. But their position as dictators is dangerous. The political power should be in the hands of a collective representative body.' 'He believes in intervention. . . . Statements like 'Allied troops would constitute a screen behind which a Russian army could be organised,' dance before my eyes and cause me to dream of another Tchaikovsky—and a better one. Looking back over that long stretch of years, those glorious revolutionary days and nights come back to me and make me live them over again. Those nights when we spoke to eager and expectant crowds from the prize ring in 'Wonderland,' the old hall in Whitechapel; the lectures at the 'Athenæum' in Tottenham Court Road; the discussions in the upstairs room of Tom Mann's 'pub' in Long Acre; the afternoon teas at A.D.'s, or the talks at Kropotkin's little cottage in Bromley, where we so often foregathered on Sunday afternoons; of how Tchaikovsky would say to my sometime pessimism, 'We are educators, Harry; we are educators.' Life is full of illusions, and while it is absurd for Tchaikovsky to talk of having lived Communism because he lived in a Shaker Colony and worked in the co-operative movement of Russia, one can forgive many things in a man of 69; but to consort with reactionary monarchists like Koltchak, Sazonoff, Denikin and others is unforgivable and unforgettable. The one grain of consolation left us is the words of his countryman and compeer, Kropotkin, to Voltairine de Cleyre. She had lamented, as we all do at times, over the fact that so many young people join hands and work with us for a season and then drift out into the night. With the wisdom of a sage and the heart of a child Kropotkin said soothingly, 'Let them go, Voltairine; we have had the best of them. We had them when they were young.' So say we to the revolutionary movement about Tchaikovsky, 'We had the best of him; we had him when he was young.' Kismet.

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

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

U.S.A. and Canada, 1 dol.; France 4 fr. 50 c.

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.**

FALSE ROADS TO FREEDOM.

Clamour for stability and peace comes naturally from the weak and aged, who wish only to be allowed to rest their weary limbs. It comes naturally from the rich and privileged, whose one hope is that the world shall be allowed to remain exactly as it is. The old, the rich, the privileged—and it is England's supreme misfortune that she is ruled exclusively by these—all cling instinctively to what is called the "static" philosophy of life, which upholds certain ideals as standards never to be removed; considers that the present social structure embodies those ideals, and believes, like the ancient Medes and Persians, that it can establish laws which never shall be altered.

All priesthoods are wedded to that preposterous philosophy. All Imperialism, and the forces it maintains, are sworn to the defence of the existing, and have the establishment of the permanent as their ideal. A slave philosophy, with which, if we understand ourselves, we cannot sympathise.

It is not merely a question of not understanding ourselves; it is the vastly more important question of not understanding the people—that huge mass of struggling intelligence of which we are a part. The mass is never old and weak and weary. Nature takes care of that, and renews its youth untiringly. The mass never wants peace, but always the struggle for such changes as shall make life better worth the living. Its instinct is always for life instead of death; for expansion, for the enlargement of its horizon, for new sensations and experiences that shall stir its blood, and lift it to something higher and bigger than its present self. Without reasoning the matter closely, it feels that contented apathy is an evil, and that only when it is struggling to satisfy its desires does it begin to live.

This is the "dynamic," as opposed to the "static," view of life. Galileo's telescope showed that this earth does not stand still, and since then all scientific progress has been one continuous exposure of the "static" fallacy. Nothing is permanent, and those who seek to establish their own rule in perpetuity eventually go the way of all who combat nature. Empires fall into ruins; the hosts of the mighty melt, like the snow upon the desert's face, beneath the sun of Life.

Labour leadership itself is but one of the innumerable proofs of this. Experience shows conclusively that the Labour Movement grows in bulk and power exactly in proportion to the intelligent energy with which it moves. When there is "something doing" propaganda becomes active, new members join with a rush, funds are subscribed voluntarily, and the humblest private in the ranks feels himself spurred on by the conviction that, after all, he and his cause amount to something. When, on the other hand, the leaders assert their authority and call a halt; when, crushed with the sense of their own responsibility as drivers, they grow afraid of their horses and counsel caution, the old apathy asserts itself once more, and eventually all movement stops. This lesson, however, the leaders never learn. They have constructed their organisation, they have formed their party, they have published their creed, they are now all for permanency. Unconsciously they have passed over to the other side, for they no longer take the "dynamic," but the "static," view of life. "Struggle!" may still fall from their lips, but deep graven on their hearts is the paralysing thought: "We have arrived. Let well enough alone."

I am anxious to set out, as clearly as I can, and in criticism of Mr. Bertrand Russell's "Roads to Freedom," the scientific truth by which, as I see it, Anarchist philosophy and activities are justified. Between the "static" and the "dynamic" we cannot compromise. We cannot lend our aid to activities the ultimate object of which is the building-up of permanent power. It can make no difference to us whether those activities are undertaken by selfishly-ambitious or well-meaning, but short-sighted persons. Nor are we in the least concerned as to the label they

may bear. What strength we have—and it is all too little—must be used in overthrowing the obstacles to that natural development which is the very heart of Life. We cannot waste that strength in putting up more obstacles, which, in their turn, we shall be compelled to overthrow.

Mr. Russell is entirely clear on certain issues. He recognises that majority rule strait-jackets progressive minorities and individuals. He abhors the State, whose tyrannies he properly attributes to the fact that power is always abused. His dread of State Socialism is evidently very real, and in the chapter entitled "Government and Law," his remarks on our Civil Servants, our legislators and our Labour leaders are well worth reading. Of the last named he writes:—"Trade Union officials, as soon as they become part of the governing forces in the country, tend to become autocratic and conservative; they lose touch with their constituents, and gravitate, by a psychological sympathy, into co-operation with the powers that be." On all such questions the book rings very true.

Nevertheless, Mr. Russell leans towards Syndicalism, as expressing revolt against State omnipotence; writes sympathetically and justly of the I.W.W., and is himself, one supposes, a Guild Socialist, since he considers it the best system yet devised. He describes it as aiming "at autonomy in industry, with consequent curtailment, but not abolition of the power of the State." At this point I find myself compelled to take an opposite road, and that by reason of the very arguments and illustrations Mr. Russell himself presents. For proof I turn to p. 180, wherein, after stating that "there still remain some not altogether easy problems" (!), he considers the publication of a book. Let us examine that.

Under State Socialism the State would publish or refuse to publish it. Would the State advise the expenditure of public labour and money on books devoted to attacking it? Would it print, circulate, and push energetically **FREEDOM**, for example? It would have to edit it also, and what would **FREEDOM** be like then?

Under Syndicalism or Guild Socialism, as Mr. Russell admits frankly, the question of publication or non-publication would rest with the printing craft. Supposing **FREEDOM** had attacked, quite honestly, the way in which the Printers' Guild was being run? Supposing it had denounced the management as tyrannical, and had convicted it of embezzlement? What chance would **FREEDOM** have?

Man does not live by bread alone. His happiness depends on the intelligence with which he interprets the planet on which he lives, and adapts it and himself to his own uses. His success depends on the breadth and accuracy of his ideas; and he gathers his ideas from the co-operative experience of his race, as communicated by writing, printing, or word of mouth. The power of stopping that gathering of ideas is one that neither Mr. Russell nor we Anarchists are willing to confide to the State. By what hocus-pocus of a thought-jumble, therefore, are we to be induced to entrust it to that State within the State, the Printers' Guild?

It is not one of those side problems "not altogether easy to solve." If the Printers' Guild are to decide whether **FREEDOM** shall or shall not be published, the Wheat Growers' Guild will decide whether its editor shall have bread, the Builders' Guild whether he shall have a house over him, and the Tailors' Guild whether he shall have a coat to put on his back. You think such a scheme workable? I, for one, think it about the most unworkable that human ingenuity could possibly conceive. You think it will carry you towards Freedom? It will bear you in precisely the opposite direction. You see clearly the absurdity of concentrating these powers, which are the powers of life and death, in the hands of the present State, and you think to escape from it by creating a multitude of smaller states, to be composed—as you fondly imagine—exclusively of working men!

It is not by any such compromise with State Socialism that the workers will get free. Their enemy is the Monopolist who rides them, and the way to get rid of Monopoly is to get rid of it. To do that you must set free, for each and every one, the means to produce, and give each full freedom to exchange, by agreement with others, what his labour has produced. You must tackle the land and money questions. To the former Mr. Russell gives practically no attention. Of the latter, as I gather from a passage in this book, he knows nothing. He refers to Proudhon more than once, but one feels that he has no conception of what Proudhon taught.

W. C. O.

LIBERTY THROUGH ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

By H. OAKLEY.

Price One Penny; post free 1½d.

Published by the Anarchist Propaganda Group, 127, Ossulston Street, London, N.W.1.

THE NEW ANARCHISM.

This is not the beginning of a new cult. It is a restatement of what we want and what we intend to do towards realising it. The New Anarchism is the old Anarchism in new clothes. It is set out in a way that he who runs may read.

WHAT ANARCHISTS WANT.

We want to place certain ideas before the people. These ideas we believe will contribute towards the making of a better people and a better world. Anarchists are not alone in holding such ideas. But the ideas of Anarchists differ essentially from others in some main points.

The world has so evolved by now that most nations are more or less self-governing States. That is to say, we have nations such as the British, French, German and many others spread over the five continents. They are Empires, Monarchies, Republics, according as the main body of each nation has asserted itself. In the main, however, the controlling force is the Government, however it may be elected. These Governments rule the people by laws already framed, new laws being added as circumstances arise.

The main body of the people have had nothing to do with the framing of these laws; they were there when they were born into the world. The new laws are invariably framed without consulting the people. These laws are made for the preservation of the State or the defence of the realm.

Most of these laws are property-protecting laws. They are laws against theft of property, destruction of property. And as most of the property is held by a few "owners," it follows that the laws are made for the benefit of the few, not for the benefit of the nation.

A man who starves has no right to take bread where he may find it. That is one instance.

The laws are upheld by judges, lawyers, policemen, jailers and hangmen. Property inside the country is protected in this way. Outside the country the property of individuals in a nation is protected by an army and a navy. These are to prevent other nations interfering with the rights of property of other people resident or holding property in those countries. The property in any given country is, as we said, held by a few. The land belongs to a few landlords. The mills, mines, factories, docks, ships, and so forth are held by a few capitalists. The rest of the nation, having no property from which to get a living, have to work for these property owners. This is the case in all countries. Each nation is, therefore, divided into the Haves and the Have-nots: the masters and the workers. This is described by most Socialists as the two classes of capitalists and workers (or proletariat).

Now as to the "rights of property." The land was made by no one; consequently, it cannot have "owners." The whole of the nation is, therefore, entitled to free access to the land. The mills, factories, docks, ships, and so forth were made by the workers; the pretence that the workers were paid for the work will not hold. The full value of work done is never paid; otherwise there would be no "profit." The workers are, therefore, robbed of the value of their work in the form of "profit."

So far the Anarchists and the Socialists agree. Where they differ is in the cure. The Socialists want all the land and all the industries, all the buildings and the ships to belong to the nation, nominally, but really to the State. This State will be a Parliament elected by the people, and this State will control all industry. Consequently there will be only one master—the State—and the people will have to work on the terms of the State. This State will control everything, and, consequently, the State will have to make laws for the control of the people. In order to uphold these laws the State must have recourse to some punishments that will make the disobedient obey these laws. The people, then, will be well housed and fed, but they will be exploited by the State. In other words, they will still be slaves, although well-fed slaves.

The Anarchists, being for the fullest freedom possible, are in all cases against the State; that is to say, against government. The individual is unable to develop where he is controlled from above; progress and evolution are thereby hindered. The individual is, however, not always able to battle for himself; and individualism lends itself to abuse by the strong, who invariably turn out despots or tyrants. They can only develop themselves at the expense of the community. The Anarchist is, therefore, for co-operation, or a Communistic state of society. The Law of Nature is that the best progress is made where individuals are bound together by mutual aid. With the present rate of progress of civilisation, it is impossible for an individual to be independent of others.

The Anarchist suggests, therefore, that the best form of society, and the most natural, is where men can form together in free organisations for the common good. These free organisations are impossible under a Government, therefore government must go. No free organisation can do anything unless there is free access to the land and to industry. The land and industry are held

by a few "owners" as private property. It follows then that private property must go.

The essence of Anarchism, therefore, is free land and free industry. The people, organising themselves in groups and communities, will then be able to supply all their wants without the interference of a State or Government. And since the people will look after their own wants, there will be no money, either as wages or for exchange. This means the abolition of the wage system.

Free land, free industry, free exchange, and the people looking after themselves in free organisations—this is the essence of Anarchism. This is what Anarchists want. We now come to

HOW IT WILL BE DONE.

The Anarchists do not pretend to put forth a cut-and-dried plan, an easy method of changing society for the better. The saving of the people must be the work of the people themselves. They have only to decide what they want done and to do it. This is the main thing of all, that this change must be accomplished by the people themselves. They have only to take over the land and work it. They have only to take over industry and run it for the good of all. This does not mean that the land and industry will be run on the same lines as at present. It is sufficient to say that all useless work will be cut out, and science brought to the aid of cultivation and industry. This will save an enormous amount of labour, and mean more leisure all round.

Anarchists want to hasten this change; they, therefore, do all they can to spread their ideas by publishing literature and by speaking. They try always to point out that any trouble and distress that may arise cannot be cured by the State. The trouble (or "questions") of poverty, unemployment, lack of housing, and so on, are part and parcel of the present system of ownership by the few and toil by the many. They can only be done away with by changing the whole system, and running the country as the Anarchists suggest.

It is not necessary for the people to proclaim themselves Anarchists—and wait for something to happen. They will have to make something happen by doing it themselves. Once they have got the idea, it only remains to be carried out, and they are the ones to do it.

This is Anarchism and How to Get It.

L. A. M.

"DORA" IN AUSTRALIA.

The *Socialist* (Melbourne) for April 11 and 18 gives some interesting news of the tyrannical actions of the Government under the War Precautions Act. Many prosecutions for flying the Red Flag take place every month, six months' imprisonment being the usual sentence. Ten such sentences are announced in one issue of the *Socialist*. But in spite of these prosecutions, some one hoists the flag every Sunday at the Yarra Bank, the open-air meeting-place of Melbourne. Mrs. Jennie Baines, well-known for her Suffragist activities in Leeds a few years ago, was sent to prison, but hunger struck, and was released. She raised the Red Flag again, and will probably soon be in prison for another term.

On April 3 the police and military raided the offices of the Industrial Independent Workers (I.W.W.) and those of the Social Democratic League, in Sydney. All business books, correspondence, and much printed matter was seized. No one was arrested, but at the S.D.L. rooms the raiders took away portraits of Marx, Lenin, Trotsky, Liebknecht, and others. Even portraits are seditious nowadays.

To show the lengths to which the authorities will go—if permitted—we read, regarding the Eight Hours' Procession on Labour day:—"The officers have been notified of the conditions to be observed. Two flags of average size, 6ft. by 3ft.—or thereabout—the Union Jack and Australian Ensign—must be carried unfurled at the head of the procession. The display of red flags or other emblems of a revolutionary character will not be permitted. . . . 'God Save the King' must be played by one or more of the bands when the procession arrives opposite Parliament House." The Australians may have been lions at Gallipoli, but they will be sheep if they put up with this sort of thing. Australia is the classic land of Labour Governments!

For news of the American Movement, read

"FREEDOM,"

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF CONSTRUCTIVE ANARCHISM.

Annual Subscription: One Dollar.

Address: R.F.D. No. 1, Box 130, New Brunswick, N.J., U.S.A.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

Portugal.

For some time past the Portuguese workers have developed a far stronger and modern mentality. They have organised themselves strongly, and to consolidate and to develop their organisation and mentality they started a daily paper, *A Batalha*. The Republican Government, which is no better for the workers than was the monarchical one, and that was very bad, got frightened and decided to suppress the workers' daily. The editorial staff got to know it and announced it. The typographers met and decided that should the Government suppress *A Batalha* they would suppress all the capitalistic Press by refusing to compose their newspapers.

The workmen of the "Compania Fabril," numbering 2,000, were on strike, and the Government sided with the employers. Immediately all the other workers decided on a general strike of solidarity. This happened on June 18. The Government lost its head and closed the offices of the workers' Unions and of *A Batalha*. The typographers therefore refused to compose the other newspapers, and only *O Secolo* appeared with the aid of blacklegs. In view of this attitude the offices of *A Batalha* were re-opened the very same day by the Government, but the typographers refused to return to work and started another paper, *Avanti!* The newspaper companies united and were able to publish one paper, *A Imprensa*, with the help of typographers lent by the Government from the army. After two weeks an agreement has been come to and the papers are all published.

The railwaymen employed by the private companies are on strike, but the absence of communication with Portugal since this strike prevents us learning much about it. We know that the Government persecuted the strikers relentlessly, and the latter replied to them with sabotage.

On July 19, 20 and 21 the Congress of the Portuguese Workers' Confederation was to have been held at Coimbra.

Spain.

Several English newspapers have mentioned an amnesty in Spain for the Peace, but although it had been promised, we do not know whether it has been conceded yet. In Barcelona there are over 5,000 imprisoned, and arrests are made daily.

Tierra y Libertad has informed us that as long as they have to submit their articles to the censor the paper will not be published; they will print pamphlets instead.

Several employers and foremen have been assassinated, which has been made the excuse for persecuting Anarchists and Syndicalists. When in this way the police went to arrest Elias Garcia, who is known for his articles in *Tierra y Libertad*, they were received as they deserved to be: Elias killed two policemen and injured a third. Another comrade, Manuel Villalonga, has been sentenced to death, but we are certain they have no proofs against him.

To prove how little liberty there is in Barcelona it would be sufficient to copy this telegram from the *Sol* of July 7: "Barcelona, July 6.—Buenaventura Vicente, Ceferino Navarro, Aurelio Navarro and Jose Ciurana have been put at the disposition of the generals of their respective zones for collecting contributions for their Trade Union."

PROPAGANDA GROUP'S REPORT.

The ramble and tea arranged by the Propaganda Group for July 20 was not the success one could wish for; the meetings protesting against the intervention in Russia being held the same day obviously lessened the attendance at our outing, and, realising the importance of the Russian demonstration, those of us who were present at the ramble swallowed our disappointment. Another factor was the weather—evidently the clerk of this office was disgusted at the leniency of the "Piece terms," for he started a flood on the Saturday and damned everything and nearly everyone continuously till Sunday evening.

The Group has issued its first pamphlet, entitled "Liberty through Anarchist Communism," price 1d. It can be supplied to groups or comrades at trade rates on application to secretary, or is obtainable from FREEDOM Office.

Look out for a dance about September, details later; also a leaflet for distribution.

We should be glad of more replies re organisation. Will comrades please note and move.

THE SECRETARY, PROPAGANDA GROUP.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

- A New School in Belgium.* By A. Faria de Vascomcellos. Translated by Eden and Cedar Paul. 5s. net. London: George G. Harrop and Co.
- Social Politics in the Peace Covenant and in the League of Nations.* By Dr. Ludwig Heyde. Amsterdam: S. L. van Looy.
- Memoranda on International Labour Legislation.* 1s. London: Labour Party, S.W.1.
- Invocation and Peace Celebration Hymn for the British Peoples.* By Robert Nichols. 1s. London: Henderson's, 66, Charing Cross Road.
- Towards a Co-operative Commonwealth.* By Civis. 2d. London: Commonwealth League, 43, Chancery Lane, W.C.2.
- Red Paper on Executions and Atrocities Committed in Russia by Czechoslovaks and Russian Counter-Revolutionaries, Assisted by the Allies.* 3d. *The Russian Soviet Constitution.* 3d. Both published by the People's Russian Information Bureau, 152, Fleet Street, E.C.4.
- Red Russia: Book II.* By John Reed. 4d. *The Social General Strike.* By Jack Tanner. 2d. Both published by the Workers' Socialist Federation, 400, Old Ford Road, E.3.
- Fifty Points on Industrial Unionism.* 1d. Industrial Workers of the World, 3, Great Garden Street, Whitechapel, E.1.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS (not otherwise acknowledged).
(June 29—July 26.)

- "FREEDOM" SUBSCRIPTIONS.—W. H. Brown, R. Silverstone, H. Taylor, A. Peters, R. J. Davey, G. Glass, B. Halpern, E. A. James, H.P.B.
- "FREEDOM" GUARANTEE FUND.—W. H. Brown, 2s. 6d.; A. Sanders, 2s. 9d.; R. Silverstone, 2s. 6d.; A. Peters, 2s. 6d.; G. Glass, 7s. 6d.; B. Halpern, 1s.; Zero, 2s. 6d.; F. Puerta, 1s. 6d.; R. Marquez, 9s. 6d. E.M., 2s.

NOTICES.

- "FREEDOM" OFFICE is open for sale of books and pamphlets every Saturday afternoon from 3 to 5-30.
- CARDIFF.—Our comrade, A. BANKS, has opened a "Bomb Shop" for the sale of revolutionary literature at 1, Carmarthen Street, off Market Road, Canton, Cardiff. FREEDOM and Anarchist books and pamphlets on sale. Will be pleased to get any book not in stock.
- BROADHEATH, ALTRINCHAM.—FREEDOM and Anarchist literature can be obtained from J. WHINFIELD, 62, Brunswick Road.
- GLANAMMAN (Carmarthenshire).—FREEDOM and Anarchist literature can be obtained from JIM COLTON, Station Cottage.

"FREEDOM" AGENTS IN LONDON.

- HENDERSON'S (wholesale and retail), 66, Charing Cross Road, W.C. Anarchist books and pamphlets also on sale.
- NATIONAL LABOUR PRESS (wholesale and retail), Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, E.C.
- H. EDWARDS, 68, Red Lion Street, High Holborn. Also books and pamphlets.
- ISENBERG, 61, Cleveland Street, Fitzroy Square, W.
- MRS. ELLIOTT, 304, High Road, Willesden, N.W. 10.
- JACQUES, Old Street, near City Road, E.C.
- E. BARHAM, 188, Lillie Road, Fulham, S.W. 6.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

- ANARCHIST MORALITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3d.
- ANARCHIST COMMUNISM. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 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. 1/2d.
- WAR. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
- THE CONCENTRATION OF CAPITAL: A MARXIAN FALLACY. By W. TCHERKESOFF. 2d.
- FOR LIBERTY. AN ANTHOLOGY. 6d.
- APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. By P. KROPOTKIN. 2d.
- THE PLACE OF ANARCHISM IN SOCIALISTIC EVOLUTION. By P. KROPOTKIN. 2d.
- Postage extra—1/2d. for each Pamphlet.
- MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM. By PETER KROPOTKIN. Paper covers, 6d.; postage, 2d.
- THE CONQUEST OF BREAD. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1s. 9d. postage 3d.
- MUTUAL AID. By PETER KROPOTKIN. Boards 2s. net, postage 3d.
- NEWS FROM NOWHERE. By WILLIAM MORRIS. Cloth, 3s.; paper, 2s.; postage, 3d.

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

Printed by the BLACKFRIARS PRESS, LTD., 30, Blackfriars Street, Manchester.
and Published by FREEDOM PRESS, 127, Ossulston Street, London, N.W.