

Freedom

VOL XXXIV.—No. 369.

FEBRUARY, 1920

MONTHLY: TWO PENCE.

NOTES.

Trade with Russia.

It almost seems as though stern economic necessity is forcing the British Government to trade with Soviet Russia. The high rate of exchange with America raises the price of everything bought in that country, so the Government are turning to Russia, from whence they hope to get a million tons of grain, which proves that the feeding of Soviet Russia was a matter of transport and not lack of food. Even now the Government say that they have no intention of altering their policy towards the Bolsheviks, and the Churchills and Northcliffes say we cannot make peace with them; but as the Government have always said that they are not at war with Russia, of course in that sense they cannot make peace. However, Lloyd George will wish to save his face by a little camouflage which deceives no one. The fact is that the smashing of Koltchak, Denikin, and Yudenitch has proved the immense strength of the Red Armies, and now the Allies realise that the task of fighting them is bigger than they can cope with—at present. We are told that the treaty of peace between Esthonia and Soviet Russia gives Esthonia sixteen million roubles in gold and a concession to build a railway from Reval to Moscow. We think it will be found that English capitalists will have a share in that concession, which is merely a forerunner of the good things to come when trade with Russia is thrown open to all. These concessions, as Litvinoff pointed out recently, are really the aim of their enemies, and the Bolsheviks were prepared to grant them to gain peace. The cry of "atrocities" has always been used by Western Powers to cover up their greed for profits and territory.

The White Terror in America.

The Department of "Justice" are continuing their brutal methods of persecution against Communists and Anarchists and I.W.W. members. Raids are still taking place; in fact, the Attorney-General says they have only just begun. Men and women are arrested and thrown into jail merely because they are members of propagandist organisations, and if they are foreigners they are at once sent to Ellis Island to await deportation. Trials under the Criminal Anarchy Law are a farce, witnesses for the defence being warned that their lives will be in danger if they appear. Sentences of five, ten, and twenty years' imprisonment are being given for offences which in ordinary times passed as legal, and judges and juries have lost all sense of proportion in their verdicts and sentences. Five Socialists who were elected to the New York State Legislature have been refused permission to take their seats. This action has met with protests from Republicans and Democrats alike, as they know it will advertise Socialist ideas more than ever. Besides, the only alternative to Parliament is revolution. In the meantime the Russians deported from America a short time back, including Emma Goldman and Alex Berkman, were landed at Helsingfors and marched across the Finnish frontiers into Soviet Russia, where they were met by Madame Gorki and others with bands and banners, and heartily welcomed. Our good wishes go with them into Russia, which they will certainly find more congenial than the much-vaunted "land of the free."

America's Price for Helping the Allies.

America is now claiming her reward for helping the Allies against Germany. Frantic appeals have recently been made to Uncle Sam to render more financial assistance to Great Britain and France, as otherwise they will be unable to pay the interest on the loans they floated in the U.S.A. Uncle Sam says he will let them have the cash if they will sell him their possessions in the West Indies—about thirty or forty islands, including

Jamaica and Trinidad. For some years American statesmen like Roosevelt have had their eyes on this string of islands, and since the Panama Canal was opened American naval and military authorities have pointed out that these islands are a danger to the Canal in case of war, as Great Britain uses them as naval bases. A few months after America came into the war a conference of well-known public men and editors was held to discuss ways and means of enlightening Americans on foreign affairs, and two of the speakers demanded that Britain and France should be compelled to sell their islands in the West Indies as Denmark had done. Now that the exchange in America is going from bad to worse, Uncle Sam seizes the opportunity of compelling his "associates" to give him something as compensation for the plunder gained by the Peace Treaty, which President Wilson helped them to shape.

The Railway Settlement.

The railwaymen—and other workers—now know that the capitalists are determined to use "force to the uttermost" to prevent them raising their standard of living above that which obtained prior to the war. The Government experts having decided how much it costs to keep a railwayman alive, so that he can do his work, they have fixed his wages for him to a nicety, and not a farthing more shall he have unless he and his mates are prepared to fight for it. In effect the capitalists say: "Your wages were £1 before the war. The cost of living has increased 150 per cent. We will now pay you £2 10s. And we will fight before we will pay another penny." But it was impossible for the railwaymen to take up the challenge. Their secretary, Mr. J. H. Thomas, whose salary they had just raised to £1,000 a year, spiked their guns by declaring it "an honourable settlement." Where was the much-vaunted Triple Alliance in their hour of need? Well, the miners were busy with their campaign for the nationalisation of the mines, and the transport workers were engaged in negotiations for an increase of wages for themselves. But apart from the weakness of the Triple Alliance, it is practically impossible for the workers to improve their conditions inside the capitalist system. As long as they recognise private property in land the capitalists can always starve them into submission. Men can never be free until they have free access to the land, and when railwaymen and other workers recognise this fact they will no longer worry about gaining an extra shilling or two per week, but will join together and take back the land from the monopolists, sweep away all the social parasites, and enjoy the full product of their labour. But "leaders" at £1,000 a year will not tell this to them.

"The Standard of Living."

What do people really mean when they speak of "the standard of living"? How do they fix the standard? A compositor's "standard" wage is about £4 10s., whilst a railway porter's "standard" may be only £2 10s. To us these contradictions prove that a "standard" of living is an illusion. Surely a railway porter needs as much food, shelter and clothing for himself and his family as does a compositor. A porter's work is just as essential to the community as the work of a compositor, and on those grounds he should have as full a share of the wealth produced. In fact a porter's work entails more physical exertion than that of a compositor, and for that reason he might require more food to maintain his strength. These distinctions in wages are artificial. Let everyone do his fair share of the necessary work of the community, and there would be so much food and clothing for all that we would never need to quarrel about "standards of living." But as long as some men take £10,000 or £100,000 a year from the wealth of the community so long will others have to be content with £2 a week. The humour of the situation is that the man who gets only £2 a week is frequently the strongest supporter of the man who gets £10,000.

PERSECUTION OF POLITICALS IN U.S.A.

Practically every political and industrial prisoner in the Federal Penitentiary at Atlanta, with the exception of Eugene V. Debs, has been the victim of special discrimination and persecution. In the case of Debs, the authorities considered it best, owing to his great popularity, to assign him to hospital, where he enjoys better food and treatment, without any particular work to do. At the same time this partial isolation of Eugene V. Debs from the rest of the prisoners precludes opportunity on his part for spreading his ideas among the inmates.

With the sole exception of Eugene V. Debs, all other political prisoners in the Atlanta penitentiary have suffered special persecution:

A. Hennecy, a young Socialist from Ohio, was kept in complete solitude and isolation for eight consecutive months. He was allowed neither to receive or send mail, no books or papers of any kind, nor was he permitted work or exercise, or any other privileges usually accorded the average prisoner. The "crime" for which he was being thus inhumanly punished was, according to the official report of officer Demoss (formerly whipping master at Atlanta prison), "Conversing in a suspicious manner with another prisoner in the yard, the other prisoner being Louis Kramer." Both Hennecy and Kramer were at that time employed in the prison shops and permitted, like the other inmates, to be out in the yard every Saturday and Sunday afternoon, privileged to speak to anyone.

A. Hennecy is now finishing a one-year sentence in the Delaware County Jail, Ohio, having been released from the Atlanta prison in February, 1919. He served in Atlanta two years on the charge of obstructing the draft. His present sentence is the result of his failure to register on June 4, 1917.

Walter Hershberger, a conscientious objector, serving twenty years for refusing to don a military uniform. (His sentence has since been reduced to four years.) Hershberger has been kept in solitary confinement and isolation almost continuously since the early part of December, 1918. His solitary is "broken" by frequent visits to the dungeon, a dark hole 2½ by 4½ by 6 feet, where he is kept on an insufficient bread-and-water diet for periods ranging from 3 to 15 days. He was in isolation when I left the prison on October 1, 1919.

Nicholas Zenn Zogg (spelled on the prison records Zough) serving ten years on the charge of aiding a young man to evade the draft. He was transferred to the Atlanta penitentiary from the Federal prison at McNeill's Island, State of Washington. Zogg is in the last stages of tuberculosis, and is being practically starved to death by the refusal of the authorities to permit him to buy or to receive suitable food from friends. He has been a strict vegetarian all his life, as were his father and grandfather before him, and he is neither physically nor conscientiously able to partake of the regular prison diet. He is forced to live mostly on oatmeal, badly prepared and served in the most unpalatable manner. Notwithstanding the fact that Zogg is barely able to walk about, he has been repeatedly thrown into the dungeon for alleged breaches of discipline.

Jack Randolph, an I.W.W., serving ten years for opposition to the war, in very delicate health and unable to perform the amount of work demanded of him in the tailor shop, was repeatedly punished in the dungeon and in solitary.

"Red" Massey, an I.W.W., from New Orleans, sent to the Atlanta prison on a frame-up charge under the Mann Act. This man has been kept in solitary and in isolation almost continuously for a year, and punished in the dungeon on the slightest pretext.

Morris Becker, sentenced to twenty months on the charge of conspiracy against the draft. This young man, of very slight physique, weighing about 100 pounds, and for over a year unable to eat anything except bread and oatmeal because of his poor physical condition and also because he was a vegetarian, was ordered to do yard work. His job consisted in wheeling a large barrow full of bricks and cement up a very steep incline. Becker was unable to perform the work. For his "refusal to work" he was sent to the dungeon and there kept for twenty-one days on two slices of bread and water a day. He was released from the dungeon almost half dead, whereupon the authorities admitted that he was unable to perform the hard toil allotted to him. He was then assigned to the tailor shop.

Louis Kramer, serving two years for conspiracy to obstruct the draft, assigned, like Becker, to the same yard work, and equally unable to perform the task. Kept in the dungeon twenty-one days on bread and water. Subsequently repeatedly punished in the dark cell on the slightest or no provocation, chained up by

Louis Kramer is now serving one year in the Essex County Penitentiary, N.J., for refusing to register.

Alexander Berkman, sentenced to two years on the charge of conspiracy to obstruct the draft. Kept in the dungeon for five days on bread and water for circulating a petition in the tailor shop, protesting to the Warden against the brutal clubbings of defenceless prisoners; also in protest against the unprovoked murder of "Kid" Smith by Officer Dean. Sentenced to solitary and isolation for 7½ months for calling the attention of Deputy Warden Girardeau to the brutalities practiced by the keepers in the wrists to the door, and kept in isolation for five months till his discharge in June, 1919.

his charge, and for calling the Deputy a hypocrite. Kept thirty consecutive hours in the "dark hole" with the blind door on, which almost absolutely excludes all light and air, with the result that the man thus punished is put through the torture of gradual suffocation—one of the worst forms of punishment known in prison life. During three months forbidden to receive or send mail, read papers or books, or to have any exercise whatever. Held in solitary and isolation continuously from February 21 to the day of discharge, October 1, 1919.

As an instance of wilful brutality practiced upon the ordinary prisoner, I may cite the case of A. Popoff. In the latter part of 1917, while in a state of temporary mental aberration, Popoff killed a former deputy warden of the prison. He was taken out for trial and sentenced to life imprisonment. Upon his return from the court, the Atlanta penitentiary authorities confined him in a dark dungeon and kept him there continuously for two years, most of the time on a bread-and-water diet. Almost every week Popoff was subjected to a terrific beating by several guards, after which he would be carried to the hospital unconscious, and later again returned to the dungeon. This treatment was kept up from 1917 till August, 1919. Popoff became a raving maniac, and still his punishment in the dungeon continued. Finally, in the latter part of 1919, he was transferred to an insane asylum.

This is one of the instances of a prisoner of infantile mentality being deliberately driven into insanity by torture and by barbaric treatment.

This is but a small fragment of the numerous brutalities practiced daily in the U.S.A. Penitentiary at Atlanta, Ga. The lot of the average prisoner is hard enough, but the politicals are particularly discriminated against in the matter of work, of general treatment, and specifically in relation to their mail privileges. A young keeper, whose education does not exceed the three R's, is the chief prison censor, with the result that most of the mail sent to the politicals never reaches its destination.

In the daily routine of prison life there are many and various opportunities to make the existence of the inmates unbearable. In Atlanta there are quite a number of petty officials, from the Deputy down, who make the best of these opportunities, especially in regard to the politicals. To the average prison keeper the political offender is a non-understandable thing. He knows that the convict is either a murderer, robber or a thief, but that a man should be willing to go to prison for no material benefit to himself, is beyond his ken. That one should risk his liberty merely for the sake of ideas or ideals is almost beyond belief and positive proof—in the eyes of the average prison keeper—that the man is either crazy or hopelessly depraved. Such a man need expect neither understanding, sympathy, nor mercy. The average man is inclined to distrust and hate the thing he does not understand, and we always try to suppress the thing we hate. Hence, the more than usually inhumane and brutal treatment of the political prisoners in the penal institutions of America.

ALEXANDER BERKMAN.

WHO IS RIGHT?

One or two of the recent by-elections seem to show that the middle-class elector is for the moment inclined to vote for Labour candidates. A conversation with two anti-Coalition voters in a suburban constituency threw rather a lurid light on the perplexities of the situation. The middle-class elector thought a Labour Government would be beneficial on the score that it would ruthlessly suppress strikes against itself. And the working class elector (who has a shorter working day than the other and yet earns almost as much, without having to keep up appearances) thought that "direct action" could achieve anything and everything under a Labour Government, which would never dare to oppose strikers even in a nationalised industry. "We'd have every chap in the Cabinet on a string," he triumphantly concluded. Which of the two was right? Here is a question which ought never to be overlooked when a Labour candidate is being heckled.—*Morning Post* (8-1-20).

PROUDHON CONDENSED.

We give a hearty welcome to "Economics of Liberty," by John Beverley Robinson; a neat volume of 116 small pages, printed excellently. In it the author has condensed the voluminous teachings of Proudhon, and it is well for us to remember that Proudhon has been called, and properly, the "Father" of Anarchism. He was a cool, clear-headed analyst of the existing social structure, and our ranks are full of alleged Anarchists who seem to think understanding of that structure needless. He was able to make the most powerful of all attacks on tyranny, because he could show that freedom—voluntarism as opposed to compulsion—is the mark of industrialism and the goal toward which civilisation inevitably tends. Militarism, on the other hand, is the reversion to barbarism, and its essence is compulsion. How many of our modern Anarchists are clear on that?

Anarchists universally denounce Militarism, and usually they quarrel bitterly with the Socialists. That, in our opinion, is entirely logical; for Socialists believe in restrictions and regulations without number. That is to say, they believe in compulsion. That is to say, their creed is at bottom a military creed. Their philosophy is the authoritarian philosophy of the Church of Rome, and neither Militarism nor Roman Catholicism will have the least difficulty in allying itself with Socialism. What is now going on in Germany ought alone to teach us that.

By what right, however, do Anarchists, who criticise so caustically the two great champions of compulsion—Militarism and Socialism—applaud in the same breath the compulsions to which Trade Unionism, Syndicalism, Spartacism, etc., are pledged and habitually commit themselves? What reason can they show for favouring "dictatorship by the proletariat"? To me only two explanations seem possible: (1) That they do not know enough of Life to appreciate that the illogical is always the weak; (2) That they have no real comprehension of the belief they profess. A few words on these two points.

Whether we like it or not, cause produces effect with inexorable logic. Take one step in the direction of compulsion and you will find yourself logically compelled to take another. It is physically impossible to run with the hare and also hunt with the hounds. As the saying goes, you cannot have it both ways. The man or movement that tries to carry on two tasks, each of which by its very nature cancels the other, cannot accomplish anything.

That seems to me about the position in which the Anarchist movement at present finds itself. It has helped to bring great problems to the front. Before them it is standing helpless. This is not, as I think, because Anarchists are deliberately false to their creed, but because for the moment they have forgotten what it is. The war, the military thought it has engendered, the desire to make alliances with anybody and everybody as against the common foe—these have swept them temporarily off their feet.

Herbert Spencer has pointed out most simply that work can be carried on either voluntarily, by mutual agreement, or involuntarily, by orders issued from above to those below. Under either system society can exist. The first system is that of freedom, while the second is that of slavery. There is no third way. The choice is between these two.

Anarchists are supposed to stand for the system of work by voluntary agreement. They oppose Government because Government runs things by compulsion, which is the slavery plan. They oppose official authority because it does not enter into agreements but issues orders. For the same reason they oppose Militarism, Nationalisation, all those extensions of State activities so dear to Socialism. All these they attack because they represent the compulsory philosophy of life. Their attack was most powerful when it was directed clear-sightedly along this, its proper and impregnable, line. By all the upholders of the compulsory system it was dreaded. I think that to-day, since it has muddled itself up with Socialist and semi-Socialist tactics, the attack has become weak, confused, and one that may be laughed at.

Mr. Robinson's book will make much of this clear. For that reason it should be read. With his working out of certain details I myself may not agree, but that does not matter. Honest differences of opinion are healthy. I think, however, that, like Benjamin R. Tucker, he does Henry George injustice. George opposed Land Nationalisation. His remedy, very improperly called the Single Tax, is an individualistic measure, based on the free and equal right of every human being to the equal use of land. That, at least, is as I understand it; and I believe I understand it.

W.C.O.

FIT OR NOT FIT?

It is difficult to see what Mr. Winston Churchill had in mind when he made the important announcement that Labour is unfit to govern. Did he compare the doings and achievements of the workers with his own immortal exploits, or did he think of their unpractical demand that this country should make peace with Russia? Possibly the latter; for to desire to make peace with a country that is non-existent (as so ably and conclusively proved by Lloyd George) does not only show a lamentable ignorance of the subtle art of government, but reveals a most deplorable lack of information in the very essentials of foreign policy. From the profound silence into which they (the workers) have since sunk on the Russian question, it is to be inferred that they have recognised their sad error, and are perhaps trying to devise means of neutralising its damaging effects.

That this should have occurred is most regrettable, in view, particularly, of the rapid strides with which the workers were approaching to that happy condition of rulership to which they (or at least their leaders) believe themselves to be destined. We can only hope that the strenuous efforts which the chosen leaders of Labour are now making to vindicate their governing capacity will eventually lead to their rehabilitation.

I believe it will. For not only are they successfully proving their political superiority in theory, but, by their masterly handling of industrial disputes, have given actual demonstrations of it in practice. Take, for example, the recent railway trouble. In the hands of people having no ability to govern we would undoubtedly have witnessed a repetition of those terrible days of last September when dukes had to milk goats and drive engines—and who knows what other degradations people that have never done a day's work in their life might not have been reduced to.

Happily, we have been spared that humiliating spectacle, which is due to the men being fortunate in having leaders who not only know how to lead, but, what is more, understand how to govern. For what, indeed, is the secret of good government? It is to produce in those over whom you rule a state of contentment, a feeling of satisfaction, with things that have in reality very little satisfactory elements in them.

True, this is not always an easy matter to accomplish. It was certainly not easy as regards the last railway settlement. As Mr. Thomas admitted, "We have had a difficult—probably the most difficult—of any tasks." The fact, however, that it has been done will no doubt redound to the eternal honour of Mr. Thomas and his colleagues, and do much to dispel that mischievous impression about Labour being unfit to govern.

Let us not ask "Who won?" for have we not been told that "that is an unfair question"? Enough that we are assured it was "an honourable settlement." Indeed, what could be more just and honourable than to pay the men strictly according to the amount of food necessary for them to consume? This ingenious arrangement will at last raise the workers to the same level as their fellow-labourers in the animal world, viz., the horses. We need only remember the condition in those days before the Great War inaugurated the new era of peace and plenty and true universal brotherhood (need I mention instances?) to realise what it means—the immense step forward that has thus been taken. How often, in those far-off times, have we seen men go for days, nay, for weeks and months, without a decent meal, whereas care was taken that their four-footed brethren should be constantly well-fed, whether they worked or not?

Of course, this happy and desirable condition of the horse—to be fed whether in or out of employment—has not yet been attained by men—I mean the working portion of them. But this is surely no discredit to their leaders. We must not forget that the Labour Party is not yet in power; and what we see in the sliding-scale device is only an instance of their ruling capacity and statesmanship, and suffices to give us an idea of the great and beneficent reforms they would bring about when at last they have realised their long-coveted dream and seized the reins of government. That the working classes would then be raised to the same status as the horses is certain. But possibly their conditions under a Labour Government would be so far advanced, their needs and comforts so well provided for, the details of their daily lives so well ordered and arranged, that the horse, as a labouring animal, might then be entirely dispensed with and his place taken by his present competitor—the working man.

S. DAVIS

The late Lord Salisbury opposed the extension of the franchise because he believed that a popular suffrage meant ruin to the cause of privilege and caste. He lived to discover that democracy—menacing and terrible while suppressed—could be converted into the most effective buttress of his class.—*Daily News*.

* "Economics of Liberty." By John Beverley Robinson. Published by Herman Kuehn, 31, Prince Street, Minneapolis. Copies can be obtained from FREEDOM Office. Price: 2s. 3d., post free.

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.**

NATIONALISATION OF MINES.

The campaign now being fought by the miners in favour of nationalisation of mines has brought to the front the question of nationalisation of many other public utilities, and also raises the question of Nationalisation *versus* Expropriation. In the series of leaflets issued by the "Mines for the Nation" Campaign Committee we have failed to find any reference to the most important point of all—the question of purchase. The miners' leaders have stated that they are not in favour of confiscation, which means that they are prepared to buy out the mineowners at the market value of their property. In the five years 1914–1918 the total profits and royalties of the coal-mining industry amounted to £160,000,000, or an average of over £30,000,000 a year. That is the annual sum that must be guaranteed to the owners if there is to be no confiscation. The Campaign Committee in one of their leaflets say: "End this profiteering! Demand the mines for the nation!" But you do not end profiteering by purchasing the mines. All that happens is that the Government takes control of the mines and collects the mineowners' profits. It may be an excellent bargain for the mineowners, but profiteering will not be abolished in that way. The parasitic shareholders who at present live idle lives at the expense of the miners and coal consumers will still live idle lives, the only difference to them being that they will be paid by a Government official instead of by the secretary of a mining company.

The above remarks apply equally to nationalisation of railways or any other thing. The parasites are not eliminated by purchase—like the mineowners, they will take their toll from the community as Government bondholders instead of as shareholders. The railwaymen and the miners will still be working to produce profits for people who will never drive an engine or go down a pit shaft.

In another of the leaflets mentioned above we are told we should not only demand the mines for the nation, but also "the profits for the people." But how can there be any profits for the people? If the coal is sold at cost price, there can be no profits. If the coal is sold at a price above the cost of production, it will mean "profits from the people," not profits for the people. Yet another leaflet is headed: "You do not want the mines managed by profiteers!" This contradicts the previous leaflet, for if there are profits there will be profiteering—but perhaps the Campaign Committee will explain.

From the Anarchist point of view we regard the question of nationalisation as a red herring to draw the workers off the scent of something more drastic. They are told that under Government ownership waste will be eliminated, therefore they will be able to get a greater share of what they produce. And with the formation of workers' councils they will be in a position to control the management of the industry in which they are employed. How simple it all seems! Do not listen to the Anarchists or Syndicalists, who want to confiscate the property of the poor shareholders, but work for nationalisation with workers' councils, and all the evils of Capitalism will gradually and peacefully be swept away. As you will not wish to rob the poor widows and orphans of their livelihood, we will pay all the shareholders the market value of their shares, so that they will not oppose our nice, peaceful scheme of nationalisation. The shareholders will get their profits, the people will get their profits, and the workers' councils will be able to raise the workers' wages—and the Labour leaders will get fine fat salaries! What a brain the man had who thought it all out! How to bring about the Revolution without robbing the capitalists!

We refuse to believe that this nice little scheme will work as its authors desire. The war has torn the mask from the face of Capitalism and shown up the monster in all its hideousness.

Many who previously dreaded Revolution on account of the bloodshed which it might entail now realise that Capitalism is the cause of all the bloodshed and famine of the past five years, and that if it is not abolished soon, other and greater horrors will follow. The war that was to end war and bring about disarmament and peace has brought instead larger armies and navies and rumours of other and more terrible wars between those who were Allies. Men and women now realise that the whole system of land monopoly and production for profit and Imperialism must be swept away, and in its place they will build a society where the workers will have free access to the land and freedom to exchange the produce of their labour with each other. A society in which all will share equally in the work and the wealth of the world, and from which exploitation will have been abolished.

The capitalists, with the assistance of the experts of the Fabian Society, have laid a very clever trap for the workers, in the hope of checking the revolutionary spirit, but we think the workers' eyes have been opened, and few of them are likely to be caught by such a simple stratagem. The capitalists have sown the wind and must reap the whirlwind.

ANARCHISM AND SOCIALISM.

"Our [the Anarchist] movement . . . is as yet a mere outgrowth of Socialism and still yoked to Socialism's car. Socialism has no principles. It is partly an emotional and partly an opportunist movement, bent on twisting this way, that way and every way, that it may climb to power."

Those sentences from W.C.O.'s article in the January **FREEDOM** are worthy of a little more consideration than perhaps they have received.

Socialists tend to fall into two classes: Economic Socialists and Political Socialists. Between them no strict dividing line can be drawn, for the issue becomes very beclouded when we take into account the latest University product, Guild Socialists. The slogan of the first class is "The Dictatorship of the Proletariat"; of the second, "Democratic Government." But these two cries—meaningless jargon of words as they really are—represent the same thing, Government. On this essential desire of Government all Socialists may and do unite, whether they enjoy plain English or not. Men and women are to be bullied and forced into "ways of pleasantness" much to their benefit, though whether their paths will be "peace" remains at best a problematical question. "You can do anything with bayonets," said Talleyrand, "except sit on them."

Now, what Anarchists protest against most hotly and vigorously is this very thing, Government, opposing to it the definite assertion that while government of the individual by himself has been proved to be a good thing, government of one individual by another individual—or any number of him for that matter—has been proved to be a bad thing. For us William Morris drew the "shearing sword," "No master high or low." The issue between Anarchism and Socialism is, I hope, made perfectly clear.

And our Socialist friends, to convince us we are wrong and they are right, bring with them poor old Madam History. After undressing her and disembowelling her and chopping her up into little bits—no one can possibly be in love with a number of little bits on a plate, as W. S. Gilbert remarks—they announce that, as the result of their investigations, they have made a great and profound discovery. This discovery appears to mean that there are "economic factors" in existence, and that while in one age those work to the detriment and injury of the working classes, in another age they will work only and solely to the benefit and advantage of these very same working classes: It may be a most profound discovery, but it is not at all logical.

But it will be objected—and properly, too—by Socialist apologists that it is only in so far as these "economic factors" are commanded and used by working people they can derive benefit and advantage from their operations. Here the sinuous curve of Socialism touches the straight line of Anarchism. To part again in an instant though, for while Anarchism suggests co-operation and mutual aid as the means for the mastering of these "economic factors," Socialism proposes government—majority or minority as you will—and repression as the *modus operandi*.

Let us hear Nicholas Lenin on this point:

"We are not Utopians, we do not indulge in dreams of how best to do away immediately with all management, with all subordination; these are Anarchist dreams based upon a want of understanding of the tasks of a proletarian dictatorship.

They are foreign in their essence to Marxism, and, as a matter of fact, they serve but to put off the Socialist Revolution until human nature is different. No, we want the Socialist Revolution with human nature as it is now; human nature itself cannot do without subordination, without control, without managers and clerks."—"The State and Revolution."

With a few unimportant alterations those sentences written by the leader of the Russian Revolution might be reiterated by any tyrant in the world. By his very advocacy of a "dictatorship," Lenin demonstrates—intentionally or not—that to achieve a "Socialist Revolution" human nature *must* be changed. Or why should it be necessary to *compel* a sameness upon human nature if it is to remain the same? W.C.O. is quite right. "Socialism has no principles." Does anyone imagine the proletariat will engage in a Socialist revolution until it believes in Socialism? Of course not! And a change of belief is equivalent to a change in human nature; or perhaps some kind friend will enlighten my darkness.

And analysed to its logical conclusion, revolution in Socialist belief means merely a change of names. Lloyd George or Northcliffe is to be put down, some other persons, at present unknown, are to be put up. New methods of wealth distribution are to be applied to the community, while at the same time *unchanged* human nature continues to believe in the old tyrants and the old methods of distribution. Such is the Marxian argument; for it Anarchists may disclaim all responsibility.

My space has nearly run out, but in a concluding note let me say that we are in entire agreement with the Socialists when they protest against the exploitation of working people by capitalists and landowners. But while the Socialist proposes to smash the power of exploitation by means of another kind of power, government, the Anarchist calmly goes on to argue that the first kind of power *exists only inasmuch as the proletariat believe in it and consent to it*. It is a delusion, a superstition, a relic of priestcraft and fraud. Think this over until next month, my friends, and let us have a symposium on Anarchist policy.

And I will anticipate a little of what is to follow by saying that the Anarchist Revolution will have been begun when there is manifested a general refusal to pay rents either to private or State owners of land and property. The individual man or woman will rely on his or her own strength, instead of on the strength of those who are sent to the Parliament or Soviet or Chamber of Deputies or Provisional Government.

JOHN WAKEMAN.

CHURCH OF ROME AND REVOLUTION.

With a long-sighted sagacity of which our own Junkers and profiteers seem incapable, the Church of Rome has always kept touch with revolutionary movements, and, aiming to control them—for the Church of Rome, essentially feudal, regards the masses as children to be protected—has declared itself constantly in accord with revolution's most fundamental tenets. Thus, here in England, it was Cardinal Manning who asserted, publicly and vigorously, the right of a starving man to help himself to food; and the support given to the Land League by the Irish priesthood is well known. We take it, therefore, as most significant that in Spain the Church, a dominating factor, has found it necessary to hold a congress of workers' Syndicates. Representatives of 192 working men's Syndicates and 43 working women's Syndicates, speaking for a membership of 60,000, met recently in Madrid, and the declaration of principles they adopted is remarkable. The opening section lays it down that work is a moral obligation compulsory on all, and that the rich should be forced to work. Society is denounced as being at present badly organised, and "consequently we consider it a régime of transition and aspire to see its passing." They declare themselves Syndicalists because the workers' liberation cannot be expected from the State, or from any other class; and they recognise the class-war as an existing fact, which they deplore and hope to see finally abolished. The last section deals with Socialism, and is as follows:

We are not Socialists, because the Socialists wish that no one should own property, while we—we wish that all should; and because associations animated by their spirit attack our liberty of conscience and try to make us their accomplices and allies in their struggle against our faith and intimate convictions."

A shrewdly-drawn and, in many respects, most Anarchistic document, with sharp economic points put capably. The Church understands these things. Our Junker-Plutocracy does not.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

A French View of Russia.

In *Les Temps Nouveaux* we have a penetrating critique of the revolutionary situation in Europe from the pen of Christian Cornélissen. His view is not an optimistic one, but it seems to the present writer correct. Three empires have been laid in ruins; in Germany alone twenty-three crowns and crownlets have gone into the melting-pot, and yet, thus far, what has been accomplished? Except for Russia, and a desperate attempt in Hungary, subsequently drowned in seas of blood, the changes wrought have been merely political. The economic structure stands unaltered. The masses still struggle for a living and the opportunity to make a living, as they struggled before the war. In Russia, on the other hand, there has been a far-reaching economic change, for the landlords have been ousted by the peasants. But there has been no socialisation of the soil; no revival or extension of the Communistic system embodied in the ancient Mir. The peasants streamed back from the front to seize land—as private proprietors, precisely as the French peasants seized land during their great Revolution. Cornélissen points out that almost immediately strife broke out between the rich and the poor peasants, the latter being those who got back from the front too late. He considers that the only true Socialist program was that of Tchernof, and that the Bolsheviks, recognising the proprietary ideals of the masses, bent before them. Subsequently they took generally the part of the poor as against the rich peasants, and he remarks: "What an irony of history that we should see these Marxists, who had declared that the small peasant was doomed to ruin, collaborating in the creation of tens of millions!"

The details, taken from official reports, of the incapacity the city workers displayed when they themselves attempted to run industries make melancholy reading. For example, the tramway employees would divide up every evening each day's receipts. Under such conditions it was inevitable that sooner or later the old managers would have to be recalled. Of finance, as might have been expected, the ideas were childish, and the proposal to nationalise banks resolved itself into the concentration of the entire country's credit in the one State bank established in Moscow!

As against all this, however, must be set an enormous, an inestimable gain. The masses have shaken off their old servility and are showing an individual initiative which is marvellous. Their appetite for information is enormous, and recently published extracts from one of Kropotkin's works have had a colossal sale.

Cornélissen reminds us, however, that "the Bolsheviks, viewed comprehensively, are flesh of our flesh. They have seriously tried to realise Socialism, and their errors have been largely due to their superannuated dogmatism, which dates back to Father Marx and is some eighty years old." Fidelity to our own cause demands that we should criticise honestly those errors and not shout hysterically, as most of the so-called Parisian Revolutionists are shouting: "Long live the Soviets," "Long live the Proletariat Dictatorship." The two cries contradict one another, and in France, as in England and the United States, life has become during the last century so democratic as to be "incompatible with the political and social centralisation of which the Bolsheviks dream, or with the dictatorship by any group of individuals." That we have to make quite clear—"before it is too late."

Jean Grave again exposes remorselessly the Protection lie. In the United States only ten per cent. of the workers are employed in protected industries, and their wages are the lowest of all, because the protected industries have been cornered. In France some 30,000 State officials are employed in the collection of customs duties at a cost of more than a quarter of the sums collected. Protection is essentially a system of Special Privilege and leads necessarily to a large increase in the number of bureaucratic parasites.

Spain.

In Barcelona the struggle between locked-out workers and their employers has become most bitter, the State, as always, coming violently to the assistance of the masters. Under date of January 7 the National Confederation of Labour issued a protest in which it stated that more than 1,500 Barcelona workers had been imprisoned! From the capital, Madrid, come reports of the most high-handed stopping, searching and arresting of passengers on the streets by an illegal association known as "The Citizens' Union." In Saragosa, according to the *Heraldo de Aragón*, an attempt was made to inaugurate a Soviet Republic; the offices of daily papers were invaded, publication being stopped. There was a mutiny at artillery headquarters, resulting in a considerable loss of life.

In the Parliament in Madrid there have been long and bitter debates over the situation, both there and in Barcelona. Thousands of working men are reported as in the greatest misery owing to the lock-out in Madrid, and the Government has been attacked vehemently for its inactivity. The employers offered to their locked-out workers terms that would have seemed infamous in the Middle Ages. Granpera, president of the employers' association, had fifty shots fired at him in the street and is not expected to live. His assailants may have been Anarchists or Syndicalists who wished to rid the country of this Catalonian Koltchak, or more probably some employers who had been drawn into the lock-out against their will and ruined. Martial law was immediately proclaimed and many hundreds arrested.

At Malaga the authorities wanted the soldiers to blackleg, but at the barracks of the Bourbon regiment the walls were placarded with appeals to the soldiers not to blackleg. The regiment was paraded and the commander ordered the man who had posted the placards to step forward. The whole regiment advanced as one man. The commander was almost struck dumb and after a few words of warning he dismissed the men. This incident proves that many of the soldiers are on the side of the workers.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

- A Fragment of the Prison Experiences of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman.* 10 cents. New York: Stella Comyn, 36, Grove Street.
- Sentenced to Twenty Years' Prison.* (A report of the case of three young men and one woman, of Russian nationality, who were sentenced, the men to twenty years' and the woman to fifteen years' imprisonment, for distributing a leaflet protesting against intervention in Russia.) 15 cents. New York City: Political Prisoners' Defence and Release Committee.
- Russian Code of Labour Laws.* 3d. London: People's Russian Information Bureau, 152, Fleet Street, E.C.4.
- Britain Victorious!* By M. de P. Webb. 2s. 6d. London: P. S. King and Son, Great Smith Street, Westminster. (The author pleads for a voluntary sacrifice of War Loan by all classes as the only method of putting Britain's economic and financial affairs on a sound basis.)
- The Policy of the International.* By Michel Bakunin. 1d. London: Bakunin Press, 17, Richmond Gardens, W.12.
- Dumnezeu si Statul,* de Mihail Bakunin. (Roumanian translation of "God and the State," by P. Musoiu.) Bucarest: Biblioteca Revistei Ideei.
- Gott und der Staat.* Von Michael Bakunin. (German translation of the same, by M. Nettlau.) Leipzig: Hirschfeld. (Part 12 of a series of reprints of the best early Socialist works, *Hauptwerke des Sozialismus*.)
- Bakunin und die Russische Revolutionäre Bewegung in den Jahren, 1868—1873.* Von Max Nettlau. Leipzig: Hirschfeld, 1915. (A few copies only reprinted from Vol. 5, part 3, of *Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus*, Professor Grünberg's Socialist historical review.)
- Anarchismus und Wissenschaftlicher Kommunismus.* Von N. Bucharin. 50 pfg. Hamburg 11: Willaschek and Co.
- La Cité des Humbles.* Par Maurice Bataille. 1 franc. Paris (V.): Les Humbles, 4, Rue Descartes.

ANARCHIST PROPAGANDA GROUP.

Our concert and dance at the Crown Hall on January 17 was a decided success. Although some of the artistes failed to turn up others took their place and gave general satisfaction. Thanks are due to the comrades who assisted at the bar, door, and cloakrooms. We are holding another dance at the same hall on February 28, the proceeds from which will be devoted to the publication of our new paper, *Labour's Voice*. Owing to many difficulties we are unable to fix a definite date for its appearance, but we hope to do so in the near future. Our treasurer would be pleased to receive subscriptions, many of which are now overdue.

We have received very few replies from comrades as to the suggested Easter Conference; please let us have your views at once, as time is drawing near when a decision must be made.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS (not otherwise acknowledged). (January 4—January 31.)

"FREEDOM" SUBSCRIPTIONS.—R. Moore, W. Trout, W.H.C.L., T. Foxall, H. T. Dixon, G. Senior, B. Adams, W. Sinclair, G. Marin, F. Le Pla, L. Bioulet, C. Pindar, M. Bailey, A. Bishop, W. Brooks, C.R.A.G., A. Hazeland, W. Warren, E. Cranham, A. McL.

"FREEDOM" GUARANTEE FUND.—R. Moore, 2s. 6d.; T.S., 2s. 6d.; J.S., 1s.; G. Senior, 2s. 6d.; L. Bioulet, 1s.; C. Pindar, 2s. 6d.; T. Foxall, 2s. 6d.; E. Ballard, 3s.; R. Peddie, 2s.; F. Goulding, 2s.

ANARCHIST PROPAGANDA GROUP.

A "LEAP YEAR" SOCIAL & DANCE

will be held at the

**CROWN HALL, REDMAN'S ROAD, E.,
ON SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 28th.**

Doors open at 6 p.m.

Dancing from 7 till 12.

"Daily Herald" League Band Tickets from A.P.G. & Freedom Office.

PAMPHLET FUND.

Another £10 came in this month, leaving £8 to make up the £50 for which we appealed. Of course, there is no limit to the amount we require, as the more money we receive the more pamphlets we can print. We have in hand the MS. for a splendid new pamphlet, and hope comrades will continue their efforts. We hope comrades overseas will also rally to our assistance, as we send our literature to all parts where English is read. Three pamphlets are now printed and on sale. The following sums have been received to date (January 31):

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Brought forward	32	18	10	G. Ashley	0	1	0
Two friends (Scott and Cox)	0	8	0	A. Ashley	0	0	6
G. Verrinder	0	0	6	C. Ashley	0	0	6
F. Kendall	0	2	0	L. Ashley	0	0	6
R. Marquez	5	0	0	B. Moore	0	1	0
T. Foxall	0	3	6	Friend	0	1	0
A. Symes	0	1	0	A.O.M.	0	0	4½
F. Symes	0	1	0	L. Macartney	0	2	1
G. Marin	0	2	6	J. Benson	0	2	0
W.M.S.	0	1	6	J. Wakeman	0	10	0
"H.H."	0	1	0	W. Warren	0	1	6
Anon.	2	0	0	A. J. McConnell	0	0	6
H. Firth	0	0	6	W. R. McConnel	0	0	6
W. Fuller	0	0	1½	P.F.M.	0	1	0
Anarchist, Chairs, B'mth	0	5	0	A. Gray	0	1	0
A. Moore	0	1	0	J. Poole	0	1	0
J. White	0	0	6	A. McL.	0	7	6
T. Swash	0	1	0				
E. Firth	0	0	6				
				Total	£43	0	5

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

- MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM. By PETER KROPOTKIN. Paper covers, 6d.; postage, 2d.
- FIELDS, FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. Cloth, 2s. 6d.; postage, 4d.
- THE CONQUEST OF BREAD. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1s. 9d. postage 3d.
- ANARCHIST MORALITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3d.
- ANARCHIST COMMUNISM. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3d.
- LAW AND AUTHORITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3d.
- THE CHICAGO MARTYRS. With Portraits. 2d.
- ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. ½d.
- 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.
- LIBERTY THROUGH ANARCHIST COMMUNISM. By H. OAKLEY. 1d.
- ANARCHIST COMMUNISM IN PLAIN ENGLISH. By L. A. MOTLER. 1d.
- THE ANARCHIST REVOLUTION. By GEORGE BARRETT. 2d.
- ANARCHISM AND DEMOCRACY. By JOHN WAKEMAN. 2d.
- REFLECTIONS ON POLITICAL JUSTICE. (Selections from the Writings of WILLIAM GODWIN.) 4d.

Postage extra—½d. for each Pamphlet.

- MUTUAL AID. By PETER KROPOTKIN. Boards 2s. net, postage, 3d.; cloth (with Appendix), 3s. 6d.; postage, 6d.
- NEWS FROM NOWHERE. By WILLIAM MORRIS. Cloth, 3s.; paper, 2s.; postage, 3d.
- SYNDICALISM AND THE CO-OPERATIVE COMMONWEALTH (How we shall bring about the Social Revolution). By E. PATAUD and E. POUGET. Paper covers, 2s.; postage, 3d.
- WALDEN. By H. THOREAU. Cloth, 1s. 6d.; postage, 3d.
- SONGS OF FREEDOM. Edited by H. SALT. Cloth, 1s. 6d.; postage, 3d.
- POLITICAL JUSTICE: ESSAY ON PROPERTY. By WILLIAM GODWIN. Cloth, 2s. 6d.; postage, 3d.
- THE SOUL OF MAN UNDER SOCIALISM. By OSCAR WILDE. 2s. 6d.; postage, 2d.

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.