

Freedom

VOL. XXXV.—No. 389.

NOVEMBER, 1921.

MONTHLY: TWO PENCE.

NOTES.

The Washington Conference.

There are few lovers of humanity who expect much good from this gathering of Government officials, diplomats, politicians, financiers, military and naval experts, and other representatives of the parasitic classes. Many questions will cause endless discussions before agreement is reached, but on the great question of safeguarding their power of living on the fruits of other people's toil there will be universal and immediate agreement. The Russian Revolution and the many social upheavals in Europe and Asia have caused the rulers much anxiety during the past few years, and the question of ways and means of relieving that anxiety is the most important the Conference will discuss. At Versailles the "old gang" of diplomacy entrapped President Wilson in a cobweb of words and agreements, and the poor old schoolmaster left the Conference a beaten and humiliated man. Now, however, the United States will speak with a far greater prestige due to her commanding financial and commercial position, and Mr. Hughes's speech on limitation of armaments is a direct challenge to Great Britain's sea-power. Our press at home has been trying hard to persuade its readers that Japan will be the prisoner in the dock at Washington, but to us it looks much more likely that Great Britain will occupy that unenviable position. Japan certainly got some loot in China during the war, but John Bull picked up so much at the Peace Conference that he finds it rather difficult to assume his usual pose of the disinterested champion of all the virtues. There is only one good point he can put forward at his trial—viz., his jury will not have clean hands. Speaking seriously, however, to us the one outstanding feature of this Conference is the sublime audacity of this comparative handful of men who take upon themselves to make decisions which they will consider binding upon the countless millions whom they are supposed to represent. We Anarchists deny their claim to represent the working peoples of the world, and we challenge their right to decide the relationships of the workers of one country with those of another. We say that the Conference is simply a gathering of thieves who have quarrelled over their booty, and their decisions will carry no weight with the peoples whom they have robbed. Let us stop the robbery!

A Cheap Insult.

The Government Bill for the relief of the dependents of the unemployed is about the limit of insolence even for a Government, but it was passed by a House of Commons which invariably acts as a rubber stamp for the decisions of the Cabinet. This precious Bill grants extra relief for a married man, to the extent of 5s. a week for his wife and 1s. a week for each of his children. Now we Anarchists are utterly opposed to the principle of looking to the Government for assistance in all or any of our troubles, but if the thing is to be done let it be done with decency. To give 5s. to a man to keep his wife from starving seems to us such an insult that it passes our understanding how the Labour movement can tolerate it. We have heard much of the power of the women's vote in Parliament, but this Bill exposes the hollowness of the women's political power. Why did not the Labour Party and all the women's organisations raise hell over such an insult? If there was any fight or pluck at all in either movement they would have poured such scorn on the Government that brought in this outrageous Bill that it would have been compelled either to increase the amount or withdraw the Bill altogether. And the 1s. a week for each child! If the Labour movement accepts this Bill, we can only conclude that its spirit is so broken and its manhood so degraded that it has not the courage to resent the insult it conveys.

The Great Change in Russia.

The fourth anniversary of the Russian Revolution sees the end of everything for which the Dictatorship was an excuse—except the Dictatorship. That alone survives, backed by the Red Army, the bureaucracy, and the secret police, the inevitable accompaniment of all Governments. Lenin says: "We made a blunder, we decided to pass immediately to Communist production and distribution. We thought that the peasants would supply us with bread, thanks to the system of commandeering; that this bread would then be distributed in the factories and workshops, and we should thus arrive at Communist production and distribution." Experience, however, had compelled them to recognise that their economic policy "did not at all correspond to what was going on among the masses and was incapable of restoring the forces of production. That restoration had been hindered by the *requisitions in the villages* and the introduction of Communist methods in the towns." This brought about the economic and political crisis of last spring, when a return to private capitalism was decided on. Now it is a question with the Bolsheviks whether they can organise State capitalist production so competently and well as to make it exist parallel with private capitalist production, or to be swept away by the rising tide of private capitalist enterprise. And as Lenin points out: "The whole question is who will be first in the race." In this sentence Lenin admits the death of the Russian Revolution, which was to bring freedom and hope to the peasants and workers of that unhappy land. Whilst this tragedy for the Revolution is happening, in the famine-stricken districts the coming of the snow and ice is erecting an impassable barrier to relief, and ere the spring sun thaws the land some seven million human beings will have passed away.

In the Land of Disarmament.

Whilst Harding is entertaining the Washington Conference with his proposals for disarmament and "world tranquility," the unending war between exploiters and exploited, between governors and governed, is being fought bitterly. In the U.S.A. six million or more unemployed are looking for the job that does not exist, and all the great Trusts and other employers are using the occasion to cut wages ruthlessly and to enforce the "open shop"—that is, to break the power of the Unions. More than one million railwaymen threatened to strike on October 30 to resist a 12 per cent. wage cut. Immediately the Government got busy on the side of the employers, and mobilised a national motor service to ensure the food supply, at the same time threatening gaol and injunctions against the leaders. The men stood firm, but two days before the time fixed for the walk-out the leaders gave way, saying: "If we did strike we would be fighting the Government and not the railroads. It was never our purpose to combat the Government." This settlement was the outcome of a vague promise by the U.S. Railroad Board, a Government organisation, that they would not consider any further wage reductions until working rule problems had been decided. Three days later it was officially stated that within thirty days every railroad in the United States will announce a reduction of wages! The appeal for a new trial in the Sacco-Vanzetti case is postponed till December 1. Meanwhile *Industrial Solidarity*, the official organ of the I.W.W., calls attention to the number of class-war prisoners in Leavenworth Penitentiary, serving long sentences under the criminal anarchy or criminal syndicalism laws, their "crime" in some cases being merely membership of the I.W.W. Ten prisoners are serving 20-year sentences, 54 are serving 10 years, 31 are serving from 9 to 5 years, and several others are serving "indeterminate" sentences of 1 to 10 years. This is how Harding hopes to reach "world tranquility."

ANARCHISM VERSUS SOCIALISM.

By WM. C. OWEN.

(Continued from last month.)

It is urged that we Anarchists have no plans; that we do not set out in detail how the society of the future is to be run. This is true. We are not inclined to waste our breath in guesses about things we cannot know. We are not in the business of putting humanity in irons. We are trying to get humanity to shake off its irons. We have no co-operative commonwealth, cut and dried, to impose on the generations yet unborn. We are living men and women, concerned with the living present, and we recognise that the future will be as the men and women of the future make it, which in its turn will depend on themselves and the conditions in which they find themselves. If we bequeath to them freedom they will be able to conduct their lives freely, as the changed and improved conditions, brought about by the growth of human intelligence and the added mastery of Nature that will spring from such intelligence, may dictate.

To overthrow human slavery, which is always the enslavement of individuals, is Anarchism's one and only task. It is not interested in making men better under slavery, because it considers that impossible—a statement before which the ordinary reader probably will stand aghast. It seems, therefore, necessary to remind him once again that Anarchists are realists who try to see Life as it is, here on this earth, the only place where we can study it, indeed the only place whereon, so far as hitherto discovered, human life exists. Our view is that of the biologist. We take Man as we find him, individually and as a member of a species. We see him subject to certain natural laws, obedience to which brings healthy growth while disobedience entails decay and untimely death. This to us is fundamental, and much of Anarchism's finest literature is devoted to it.

Now, from the biological standpoint, Freedom is the all-essential thing. Without it individual health and growth are impossible, and wherever the development of the Individual is thwarted the progress of all Humanity receives a check. We cannot measure the innumerable checks, or show by exact figures the injury inflicted on our own liberties when the pendulum swings back to slavery elsewhere. Nevertheless, beyond all question the injury is there. It must be. Biologically we are all parts of one organic whole—the human species—and, from the purely scientific standpoint, an injury to one is the concern of all. You cannot have slavery at one end of the chain and freedom at the other. In our view, therefore, Special Privilege, in every shape and form, must go. It is a denial of the organic unity of mankind; of that oneness of the human family which is, to us, a scientific truth. We refuse to ignore or flout it, as the Churches have ignored and flouted human brotherhood, by professing which they gained the support of the disinherited and climbed to power. Internationalism is, to us, a biological fact; a natural law which cannot be violated with impunity or explained away. The most criminal violators of that natural law are modern Governments, which devote all the force at their command to the maintenance of Special Privilege, and, in their lust for supremacy, keep nations perpetually at war. Back of all this brutal murdering is the thought: "Our governing machine will become more powerful. Eventually we shall emerge from the struggle as rulers of the earth."

This earth is not to be ruled by the few. It is for the free and equal enjoyment of every member of the human race. It is not to be held in fee by old and decaying aristocracies, or bought up as a private preserve by the newly rich—that hard-faced and harder-conscience mob which hangs like a vulture over every battlefield and gorges on the slain. It is to be used, freely and equally, by all the living. For, just as the human species is one organic whole, so the earth, this solid globe beneath our feet, is one economic organism, one single storehouse of natural wealth, one single workroom in which all men and women have an equal right to labour.

In these few words I have endeavoured to display the standpoint from which Anarchism views the Land Question, and to explain why, of necessity, it cannot view it otherwise. To every Anarchist the right to free and equal use of natural opportunities is an individual right, conferred by Nature and imposed by Life. It is a fundamental law of human existence; and because our present so-called Civilisation obstinately refuses to recognise that law it is bleeding to-day at every pore and the death-rattle is already in its throat. A house so bitterly divided against itself is bound to fall. A society of wolves, each tearing at the other's throat, is not a society to be preserved but one to be extirpated as speedily and painlessly as mercy and intelligence can do it.

It is a question of intelligence, and to Anarchists the

methods generally proposed for restoring the land to the use of the living do not appear intelligent. Clearly Nationalisation will not do; for Nationalisation ignores the organic unity of the human species, and merely substitutes for monopoly by the individual monopoly by that artificial creation, the State, as representing that equally artificial creation, the Nation. Such a philosophy lands us at once in absurdities so obvious that their bare statement suffices to explode them. For example, the district of Tampico, in Mexico, embraces one of the richest oil fields yet discovered. Is it maintained that the few Mexicans are entitled to monopolise that great gift of Nature solely because it lies within the territory at present marked on the maps as Mexico?

Even Capitalism knows better than that. If Mexico shut down her oil wells she would be warned promptly that the world had need of them, and the warning would be enforced. In theory, as in practice, Capitalism is international; for it recognises that what is needed by the world at large must pass into the channels of international trade and be distributed for the satisfaction of racial needs. That, however, does not prevent individual capitalists from locking up their own private properties, nor does it prevent capitalist rings from decreeing that an entire industry shall be brought to a standstill in order that their personal profits may be enhanced. Similarly, Capitalism would not permit England to starve the world by shutting down her coal mines, but it does permit a few monopolists of coal lands to hamper production by levying tribute on English miners who want to work. Nothing more unsatisfactory, more unjust, or more illogical can be imagined. What good interest is served by allowing the Duke of Northumberland, for example, to exact £80,000 a year for allowing Labour to dig out what he is still permitted to call *his* coal? Biologically the man is a parasite of the most deadly type. Economically he is a huge leak through which social and individual effort goes to waste.

To all Anarchists, therefore, the abolition of Land Monopoly is fundamental. Land Monopoly is the denial of Life's basic law, whether regarded from the standpoint of the individual or of the species; and by no human ingenuity can we successfully evade that law. So long as certain individuals are allowed to corner land on or by which others have to live, those others are at their mercy. They are helpless and, therefore, helplessly enslaved. They are robbed, and cannot escape the robbery. They are ruled, and cannot get away from the rule. They must work on the terms offered them, or starve. From this fate no organisation, however complete, no skill or learning, however profound, no private virtue or public philanthropy, can rescue them. Here, if anywhere, action is needed. A huge boulder blocks the path, and until that boulder is removed progress remains unthinkable.

In some way or another the Individual must assert and maintain his free and equal right to life, which means his free and equal right to the use of that without which life is impossible, our common Mother, Earth. And it is to the incalculable advantage of society, the whole, to secure to each of its units that inalienable right; to release the vast accumulations of constructive energy now lying idle and enslaved; to say to every willing worker—"Wherever there is an unused opportunity which you can turn to account, you are free to use it. We do not bound you. We do not limit you. This earth is yours individually as it is ours racially, and the essential meaning of our conquest of the seas, of air and space, is that you are free to come and go whither you will upon this planet, which is at once our individual and racial home."

The Land Question, viewed biologically, reveals wide horizons and opens doors already half ajar. Placed on the basis of equal human rights, it is nobly destructive, for it spells death to wrongs now hurling civilisation to its ruin. Were free and equal use of natural opportunities accepted as a fundamental law—just as most of us accept, in theory, the Golden Rule—there would be no more territory-grabbing wars. Racial conflicts, now looming up so threateningly, would die of themselves. Free exchange, so essential to international prosperity, would follow automatically, and with it we should shake off those monstrous bureaucracies now crushing us. We should be plagued neither with the multi-millionaire, whose evil fortune is always founded on Monopoly, nor with that degeneracy-breeding army of paupers whom Monopoly, first rendering them helpless, drags down to pauperdom. Hate, to-day righteous in its indignation, would be lifted from the heart of Labour, because Labour, no longer tied to the chariot

wheels of Plutocracy, would claim and get its own. We Anarchists indorse and make our own Tolstoy's great statement that "the rich will do everything for the poor except the one thing needful—get off their backs." We understand thoroughly that when the hive no longer harbours parasites, the honey, increased enormously in quantity, will go where it belongs.

These doors already are standing more than half ajar. War! Science has revolutionised it, as it previously revolutionised industry, and War henceforth means racial suicide. Frontiers and national divisions, those hothouses of ignorant fanaticism and of that narrow patriotism which is always the first resort of scoundrels! Science, annihilating distance, has made, potentially at least, the human family one. What sense is there in fencing off countries by protective tariffs when the very purpose of the railway and the steamship, the cable and the wireless station, is to break through those fences? If rule by the sword is to endure, and if the masses are still to be governed with a rod of iron, we should stop educating them, for the first result of education is that the pupil becomes eager to manage his own life. If our rulers want the workers to remain content with poverty, they should call a halt to invention, for no intelligent human being is satisfied to starve because production has outstripped consumption.

(To be continued.)

Unemployed Demand Land.

The following petition to the Prime Minister was handed in at 10, Downing Street, on November 2, by a deputation of working women, in the name of the organised unemployed. It is a hopeful sign to see that attention is concentrated on the land question, but something more drastic than petitions will be necessary before the land is freed for the unemployed—and the misemployed.

We, the widows, wives, sisters, and mothers of the unemployed (men unemployed through the result of your Capitalistic war), come on behalf of the men whom you baton when they come in a peaceful and orderly manner to voice their starvation and wrongs.

We protest against more battleships being built. This will but provide extra profits for the rich, make enemies abroad, and use up the energy of the workers on armaments which will finally be used against themselves. The result of the last race for armaments is too evident to need comment.

We demand that, if there is to be a Conference on Disarmament, a working woman shall be sent as a representative of the class which has paid the biggest price and suffered the greatest losses. We refuse to allow our men be set to work on arterial roads which are really for military purposes. Already £10,000,000 have been spent on these roads since August, 1920, in order to transport blacklegs and troops to fire on the workers. There are enough roads in the country to carry on industry, and the growing of corn and the building of houses is more necessary at the present time to make ready against the day when the many enemies we have made abroad put the blockade on us.

The land is the source of all wealth. We therefore demand that the land and all that therein lies, which you have stolen from us, be returned, reclaimed, and the £27,000,000 about to be spent and wasted on battleships shall be used to maintain the workers whilst they cultivate the land.

Money is saved up labour. The workers paid for the war in labour and owe no National Debt. That debt is an imaginary bogey held up to force more labour from the workers in order to keep the idle rich.

Why should the Minister of Health get £100 per week, and the men who fought in the war and spent their lives in toil get less than £5 a week? The prevailing conditions of unemployment, slum-housing, and semi-starvation in a land of plenty, render this Minister's office a farce.

You have Conscripted Life; we would Conscript only Wealth and Land. Your Government Minority Report on Game says:

"The time has now come when it is essential to make the interests of food production paramount. Instead of preserving game, Parliament ought to preserve the people and the people's food. It has come with a shock of surprise to many to learn that about one-fifth of the whole area of Scotland, or from 3,500,000 to 4,000,000 acres, are devoted exclusively to deer forests."

We agree with the Minority Report, and our men demand this land.

M. Clemenceau has made a great speech in which, defining France's position, he declares: "Our motto may be expressed in a word—neither to be dominated nor to dominate." Anarchism, pure and simple! However, not one Government in all the world has the slightest intention of trying to live up to it.

FREE SOCIETY.

Issued Monthly by the Anarchist Communist Groups of the United States and Canada.

No Subscription. Voluntary Contributions. Order through FREEDOM.

THE FUTURE OF WAR.

The vast multitude which is afraid not to bend the knee to God or its employers, to science or to the Government, while begging humbly for a crust or some pitifully-small reform; this multitude which lacks either the sense or daring to make an end of the iniquitous regime now oppressing and exploiting it, is marching toward the great cataclysm the bourgeoisie and science, under the instigation of professional criminals, are preparing for it. We might well say to the masses: "Prepare yourselves for suicide, and then at once you will be free!" Because to-day, for the first time in the history of mankind, the methods to be employed in war have been placed on a purely scientific basis.

Will Irwin has written a most interesting little book on the subject of the next war, and I think it worth while to translate a few significant passages. Here is what he says:—

"That exact scientific method of research, which wrought miracles in industry, has now been taken into the service of war. With poisonous gases, liquid fire, tanks, and other murderous devices for annihilation, the human race has taken a great step upwards to that peak toward which all fresh discoveries are carrying it. Cannon, guns, etc.—all these now appear trivial, as did the bow and arrow of preceding generations. The human imagination has devoted all its powers to killing, and has discovered—gases.

"At the date of the armistice we were manufacturing Lewisite gas for the 1919 campaign. It was invisible and so penetrating that it would have forced into the open all those who had taken shelter in trenches or dug-outs. To breathe it, even though it did not pass through the lungs, was instant death. Wherever it came into contact with the skin it poisoned the whole body, the effect being almost always fatal. It attacked all living cells, animal or vegetable. Against this gas masks were useless, and it had a velocity 55 times greater than the gases then in use. An expert declared that had they used in 1918 a dozen Lewisite bombs of the largest calibre, and done so when the wind was favourable, they could have wiped out the population of Berlin.

"Probably he exaggerated, yet not greatly. The armistice came along, but the search continued. We have now data for a gas superior to Lewisite, of greater chemical power and far higher velocity. A simple capsule of this gas in a small-sized grenade would kill everything over an area of two acres and a half."

Thus, dear readers, while you were supposing there would never be another war, and that the human race would devote itself henceforth to working in the cause of progress, the scientists were continuing imperturbably their researches into methods of extermination. It is logical; the crawling rabble is not entitled to a long life. Will Irwin says that the next war will be one not of armies but of peoples. Listen:—

"In the next war gas bombardments of cities and large towns are not only possible but highly probable and almost certain. The great military States have had time for reflection, and for carrying the discoveries made in the Great War to their logical conclusion. They foresee that, even with the gases now known and the aeroplanes to-day existing, a Paris, a London, or a Rome can be transformed from a metropolis into a necropolis."

"And why not?" said Maj.-Gen. Swinten, of the English Army, in a discussion on the new methods of war. "It was more than ever our tendency," said this uniformed criminal, "to consider everything from one special point of view, viz, how to kill men by fifties, by hundreds, and by thousands. But when you talk of gas you are talking of an arm which must be considered from every standpoint; and if you use it—and I see no reason why you should not—you can kill, or disable at any rate, hundreds of thousands."—"Prometeo," in *Il Risveglio*.)

The author of the above article, translated from the Italian, quotes Gen. Swinten further as saying that all Nature's forces should be utilised in war; that we shall come finally to the scattering of germs and spreading among our enemies the deadliest of plagues. He approves of that, and insists that we should assiduously encourage our inventors and scientists to study this "strategy of war on the grand scale."

This makes "Prometeo" blaze with indignation; but there is, as it seems to me, another side which ought to be presented. To me, at least, it appears beyond all doubt that this stupendous progress in the art of killing *must* end eventually, and at no distant date, in killing War itself; that, with the development of gases, aeroplanes, and submarines, the Dreadnought has become already a ridiculous anachronism, and standing armies little better than tin soldiers. This means, of necessity, the death of professional militarism; and no greater boon to humanity, no longer stride to universal peace, is thinkable.

Another point. The more one studies the tremendous development of the arts of peace and war, the more one realises how unfathomably profound is the transformation now in process. How foolish to think that we can stop it! How absurd to think that we can tinker society into its old-time shape with the mediaeval tools Trade Unionists, Socialists, and all the other reformers have in their kits! As I look at it, even Anarchism, though far more thoroughgoing and long-sighted, cannot begin to measure the changes events will force on us. We are now struggling out of the chrysalis, and the life of the full-fledged chicken differs enormously from that which satisfied all its requirements when it was still shut up in the egg.—TRANSLATOR.

FREEDOM.

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

Monthly, Twopence; post-free, 3d. Annual Subscription, 3s. post-free.
U.S.A. and Canada, \$1.00. France and the Continent, 2s. 6d.
Wholesale price, 1s. 6d. per dozen (13) post-free in the United Kingdom.

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

Freedom Press, 127 Ossulston St., London, 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.

Let the Landlords Emigrate.

We have no wish to exaggerate matters, but it passes our understanding that the present economic condition of this country is almost ignored by organised Labour. The Government statistics, which are issued month by month, show that the collapse of our foreign trade continues, and those who study seriously the situation in Europe and Asia, where most of our foreign trade was carried on, agree that there is not the remotest possibility of a general revival of trade for many months to come. Russia will be giving out large orders for manufactured goods in the near future, and these will increase as time goes on; but this country will receive but a small portion, as capitalists from all parts of the world are taking part in the scramble for orders. There is no other country from which a demand for our manufactures on a large scale can be expected. This means that our unemployed may look forward to many months of unemployment, with all its consequent misery and the degradation that comes to men who are compulsorily idle for any length of time.

The latest statistics show that about two million are out of work, besides the enormous number who are working only one, two, or three days a week. In South Wales many thousands of miners will be "frozen out," as there is no earthly chance of a living for them again as miners, and this probably is true of miners in other parts of the country. Many other trades are also permanently crippled. In fact, it has been roughly estimated that between eight and ten million people—workers and their families—will be unable to get a living in this country, and will have to emigrate or starve. Those who talk in that strain imagine, of course, that our present system of society is a permanent one. We are not so sure about that.

But surely the workers are going to have a voice in the matter. We cannot believe that they will for ever wait pathetically for the Government or their Labour M.P.s or their Trade Union officials to settle this question of life and death to so many of their fellow-countrymen. We know what the Government will do. They have two objects in view. One is to use the unemployed to force down the wages of those at work, and to use the weapon of starvation to compel the unwanted surplus to leave the country; and the other, their principal object, is to save the system under which they and their friends manage to live in luxury and splendour on the wealth they plunder from the workers at home and abroad. Whatever misery the system may bring to the workers, these rich folk never feel the pinch. Their class has thrived on this system for so many centuries that they have every reason to believe in it as a divine institution sent for their especial benefit, and they will use all the powers at their disposal to prevent sacrilegious hands being laid on it.

We also know what the Labour Party will do. They are looking forward with a great hope to becoming the Government themselves, therefore they will do nothing likely to frighten that sober and respectable body of folk with a small balance at the bank, who decide the fate of elections. The Labour Party will call mass meetings and pass resolutions calling on the Government to tackle the question; and Mr. Henderson and his friends of the National Brotherhood may even offer up prayers for the unemployed at the Pleasant Sunday Afternoons; but they will "refuse to exploit the unemployed for political purposes," as they condemn the wicked Communists for doing. In other words, they will do nothing, but raise a lot of noise in doing it.

Therefore, the workers must settle the problem themselves. A petition presented to Lloyd George by women on November 2, on behalf of the unemployed, referring to the land monopolised for deer forests, says: "Our men demand this land." And as we pointed out last month, and often before, that is the only solution of the problem. There is not the slightest reason why any man should go abroad for a living if the land in this country were utilised to the utmost and cultivated suitably. Kropotkin, in "Fields, Factories and Workshops," has dealt very thoroughly with the possibilities of agriculture in this country, and he draws the following conclusions: "If the cultivable area of the United Kingdom were cultivated as the soil is cultivated on the average in Belgium, the United Kingdom would have food for at least 37,000,000 inhabitants . . . if the population of this country came to be doubled, all that would be required for producing the food for 90,000,000 inhabitants would be to cultivate the soil as it is cultivated in the best farms of this country, in Lombardy, and in Flanders, and to utilise some meadows, which at present lie almost unproductive, in the same way as the neighbourhoods of the big cities in France are utilised for market-gardening."

The problem, therefore, is easy of solution given the necessary goodwill. The workers must refuse to be driven abroad to get a living, they must refuse to starve in a land which could produce food for themselves and their families, and they must refuse to recognise the right of the wealthy to monopolise land for sport which could be utilised for food production. Let them agitate this question in their Unions and at all their meetings; let them press the question upon all their fellows, and when they get sufficient support and courage let them insist on using land now lying uncultivated and producing food on it. Lloyd George used some very strong language when dealing with the land question some years ago. Let the workers translate his words into deeds. In any case, do not emigrate and do not starve. Let the landlords emigrate.

NIETZSCHE ON DISARMAMENT.

No Government will nowadays admit that it maintains an army in order to satisfy occasionally its passion for conquest. The army is said to serve only defensive purposes. This morality, which justifies self-defence, is called in as the Government's advocate. This means, however, reserving morality for ourselves and immorality for our neighbour, because he must be thought eager for attack and conquest if our State is forced to consider means of self-defence.

At the same time, by our explanation of our need of an army (because he denies the lust of attack just as our State does, and ostensibly also maintains his army for defensive reasons), we proclaim him a hypocrite and cunning criminal who would fain seize by surprise, without any fighting, a harmless and unwary victim.

In this attitude, all States face one another to-day. They presuppose evil intentions on their neighbour's part and good intentions on their own. This hypothesis, however, is an inhuman notion, as bad as and worse than war. Nay! at bottom it is a challenge and motive to war. Foisting, as it does, upon the neighbouring State the charge of immorality, and thus provoking hostile intentions and acts. The doctrine of the army as a means of self-defence must be abjured as completely as the lust of conquest.

Perhaps, perhaps, a memorable day will come when a nation, renowned in wars and victories, distinguished by the highest development of military order and intelligence, and accustomed to make the heaviest sacrifice to these objects, will voluntarily exclaim, "We will break our swords," and will destroy its whole military system, lock, stock, and barrel. Making ourselves defenceless (after having been the most strongly defended) from a loftiness of sentiment—that is the means toward genuine peace, which must always rest upon a pacific disposition.

The so-called armed peace that prevails at present in all countries is a sign of a bellicose disposition, of a disposition that trusts neither itself nor its neighbour; and partly from hate, partly from fear, refuses to lay down its weapons.

Better to perish than to hate and fear, and twice as far better to perish than to make oneself hated and feared—this must some day become the supreme maxim of every political community.

Our liberal representatives of the people, as is well known, have not the time for reflection on the nature of humanity, or else they would know that they are working in vain when they work for "a gradual diminution" of the military burdens. On the contrary, when the distress of these burdens is greatest, the sort of God who alone can help here will be nearest. The tree of military glory can only be destroyed at one swoop, with one stroke of lightning. But, as you know, lightning comes from the clouds—and from above.—*The Wanderer and the Shadow*, §284, from Vol. II of *Human, All-too-Human*.

Push the sale of "Freedom."

TROTSKY ON TERRORISM.*

This book is greatly to my liking. Trotsky speaks straight out and shows us exactly where he stands. He is uncompromisingly logical, and, in my opinion, logic dominates our lives. If I know the road on which a man has started I know whither he will be compelled to go.

Trotsky has chosen his path and treads it firmly. There are no half-lights to dazzle us. His book, therefore, is educational and strong. It scatters at a touch the fogs in which Social Democracy has lost itself, and under the hammer of a remorseless realism Kautsky and all the horde of temporising pedants, who for half a century past have been wasting themselves on words, are ground to dust. Does Kautsky believe in Marxism? Then he should have the pluck to follow his doctrine wherever it may lead.

Given Trotsky's standpoint, any forthright man, as it seems to me, would have to act as he apparently is acting. Such a man would be bound to regard Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries, Socialists of the Chair, and Step-at-a-time Parliamentary Opportunists as neither fish, flesh, fowl, nor good red herring. As for Anarchists, he would have to treat them as open enemies. Being convinced that only through a military dictatorship could Capitalism be overthrown he would have to stand by it through thick and thin. This, I take it, was Napoleon's standpoint, and he is credited with having had a powerfully logical mind.

In a word, it is the military conception of the struggle, and I myself have insisted repeatedly that the social problem is at bottom a military problem. It is a question of how to bell the cat; how to get power out of the hands that at present grip it, and confer it on all the people. Or, rather, according to the Anarchist conception, how the people themselves can be induced and enabled to take the power. Trotsky, a Marxist, thinks logically that this can be accomplished only through the establishment of a strongly centralised State, sufficiently powerful to enforce its views. In common with all Anarchists I think this means will defeat itself, resulting in the institution of a lifeless machine and killing in the masses all insurrectional virility.

The Trotsky position is intelligible. He considers that the struggle must be forced on the many by the few, who, when victory has been attained, will present the masses with their freedom. The Anarchist position is intelligible, being that the masses must themselves win their own freedom by waging a guerrilla warfare at a thousand points. But poor Kautsky!

Kautsky has been for many years the high priest of the State. He has been a field-marshal in that Social-Democratic army which has written "Discipline and Obedience to Authority" on all its banners. And he gets into controversy with Trotsky, who really believes in that and enforces it inexorably! Instantly Kautsky turns, of necessity, to Anarchism for his arguments, and we find him lauding the Paris Commune as having been a spontaneous eruption, emerging unexpectedly, not "artificially" prepared. Trotsky demolishes him with a breath. The Communards failed, he remarks, precisely because they did not prepare and only played at war. We Bolsheviks have succeeded because we knew what we were going into and took beforehand every precaution to insure success.

That is the heart of the whole controversy, and it seems to me that Kautsky is left without a leg to stand on. If this question is to be settled by annihilation of a specific enemy—the bourgeoisie—when you march against him you must be prepared to annihilate him, or he will annihilate you. There is no sense in throwing unarmed masses against an enemy armed to the teeth. It is criminal lunacy to boast of your intention to put the job through while making no preparations to do it. You must either make mass action effective, or, if you find that impossible, you must find some other means.

Trotsky has no difficulty in showing that the Paris Commune, engineered by Marxist romanticists, was defeated because it only played at war. I ask myself whether Trotsky is not also one of these weakly-calculating romanticists; whether it was ever conceivable that Capitalist-Imperialism could be overthrown by a Dictatorship which is only Imperialism under

another name. I express the opinion that the real revolutionary power, still to be developed, must be sought for along very different lines. I think that the Bolshevik effort to settle the social question by a *coup de main* has failed.

The unarmed crowd is shot down, having hugged the amiable delusion that the police or soldiery, its fellow-countrymen, will not fire. The victims are given a public funeral and fine orations are delivered. The Communards have a similar fancy respecting the Versailles troops, and pay for it with I forget how many thousand lives. That happened fifty years ago, and revolutionists still celebrate that mistaken fancy as if it were a triumph. The military party in Germany thought itself more than a match for all the world, and the Bolsheviks apparently dreamed that they could declare war on International Capitalism, and that the enemy would not hit back. Now, having miscalculated so grossly, they capitulate; and the capitulation does the revolutionary movement incalculable harm.

Of course the Dictatorship may stand for some time yet against its disarmed internal enemies, the peasantry, the Social Revolutionaries, Mensheviks, Anarchists, and others. Against them it will seek to consolidate itself by granting concessions to foreign capitalists and entering into alliances with foreign Governments. Every such concession and alliance is obviously a confession of failure; for the Dictatorship's excuse is that it exists to free the proletariat, and the reality is that it is landing them once more in prison.

I praise Trotsky's book for its frank advocacy of dictatorship, an attitude far nobler than that of the Kautskys who work incessantly for the creation of strong Governments and then prate hypocritically of freedom. On the other hand, his fulminations against the Powers leave me entirely cold. He who draws the sword must expect his adversary to strike him, if possible, to the heart. However, Trotsky shares that fault with all the revolutionary movement, which still howls loudly whenever it is hit, and still, "like a slave, unpacks its heart with words." In all that there is not one particle of strength.

W. C. O.

Berkman and Emma Goldman under Arrest.

The following paragraphs, translated from No. 41 of the *Alarm* (Hamburg), show that the persecution of Anarchists in Russia still continues:—

The Bolsheviks have decided to extirpate all true Revolutionists. Two of our foremost champions, Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, have been placed under protective arrest (*Schutzhaft*) by the revolutionary Bolshevik Government.

Berkman and Goldman have been protesting energetically against the Terrorism, which increases constantly in baseness and is directed especially against the Anarchists. The public sympathises with both of them, but is not allowed to learn anything as to their detention. Our friends are closely guarded in their rooms by spies and political police.

Food is bad, and to appease their hunger both these well-known revolutionists have had to sell their books and other belongings.

For Anarchists continuing in Russia there remain only either a struggle against the Bolsheviks, or death, prison, or banishment.

THEN AND NOW.

From 2,000 years ago the words have been preserved for us that were addressed to the discharged soldiers of Rome by the great leader of the people, Tiberius Gracchus. The landlords and profiteers assassinated him, but the truths he uttered remain, and to-day are strangely relevant:—

"The wild beasts of Italy have their caves to retire to, but the brave men who spill their blood in her cause have nothing left but air and light. Without houses, without any settled habitations, they wander from place to place with their wives and children; and their generals do but mock them when, at the head of their armies, they exhort their men to fight for their sepulchres and domestic gods. For, among such numbers, perhaps, there is not a Roman who has an altar that belonged to his ancestors, or a sepulchre in which their ashes rest. The private soldiers fight and die, to advance the wealth and luxury of the great; and they are called masters of the world, while they have not a foot of ground in their possession."—(Plutarch's Lives: Langhorne's trans.)

Because the ex-soldiers of Rome were denied their rights and kept quiet with "bread and games," the Roman Empire perished, and a Roman historian pronounced the verdict: "The great estates destroyed Rome and her colonies."

*"The Defence of Terrorism" [Terrorism and Communism.] By L. Trotsky. 3s. 6d. London: The Labour Publishing Co., 6, Tavistock Square, W.C.1.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

Russia.

Our limited space renders anything like a complete review impossible, and here we can only touch an occasional outstanding point. Apparently the transition from what the Dictatorship calls "Military Communism" to what it calls State Capitalism is being pushed persistently. That is to say, large-scale industry is being organised in State Trusts, and other enterprises are being handed over to co-operative societies or private enterprise, domestic or foreign. In other words, the door is thrown wide open to international Capitalism. How quickly and extensively Capitalism avails itself of the opportunity will depend obviously on the profits in sight and the risk certain to be incurred. The assurance given to the British Government that pre-war debts will be recognised and paid is an attempt to convince foreign capitalists that the risk will not be great.

The State, which has arrogated to itself ownership of all the resources of what was once—and to all intents and purposes is still—the Russian Empire, remains supreme. The role of the Trade Unions, the relations of the State to home and petty industries, the question of what shall remain under Government control and what shall be leased, are all settled by decrees of the Council of People's Commissaries. A scheme of "collective provisioning" is applied to workers in certain industries wherein the remuneration granted by the authorities is determined not by the number of workers but by the amount of work turned out. The aim is, of course, to discourage slackness, but we doubt if a more drastic sweating system was ever devised. So much product, so much bread.

Bernard Shaw has stated succinctly, in his recent article in the *Labour Monthly*, "The Dictatorship of the Proletariat," the Russian Government's attitude towards Trade Unions. His language is as follows: "A Socialist State would not tolerate such an attack on the community as a strike for a moment. If a Trade Union attempted such a thing the old Capitalist law against Trade Unions as conspiracies would be re-enacted within twenty-four hours and put ruthlessly into execution." We observe, however, that in the United States the I.W.W., whose members are constantly on strike and make it a religion to uphold all strikes, still enthusiastically support the so-called Soviet Government.

Apparently *Le Debut*, an Anarchist paper published in Moscow, has been suppressed permanently. Its last issue stated that the one preceding had been confiscated and the editor imprisoned. It affirmed that its only crime was an explanation that the requisitions made on the peasants restricted production and led to famine, and that it advocated the releasing of co-operation from control by the bureaucracy and State intervention. Necessarily under any State Socialist régime such views are criminal.

The Russian Government applied to Roumania recently for the extradition of "Makhno and his bands, as well as the other counter-revolutionaries who have found an asylum in Bessarabia." Roumania replied that she would do so, although not under any treaty to that effect, as soon as formal charges had been preferred, but that she required a promise that they should not be executed, she herself having abolished capital punishment. Tchitcherin sent back an indignant note protesting against such "exaggerated and intolerable formalities."

According to numerous telegraphic reports, uprisings continue and are put down mercilessly. We think the persecution of alleged counter-revolutionaries increasing in severity, Tolstoyans being among the latest victims. From Buenos Aires, Argentine, we have received a strongly-worded collective manifesto protesting against the strangulation of all Anarchist propaganda in Russia. It is stamped with the seals of twenty-two Labour and educational associations.

Germany.

The economic situation, aggravated greatly by the precipitous fall in value of the mark and the consequent sudden rise in prices, dominates everything. For the rest, and so far as the revolutionary movement is concerned, here, as throughout Europe, whether to join or not to join the Third International is still the burning question. Lenin sent the Jena Congress of the United Communist Party of Germany a huge letter which, to our thought, was inexpressibly tedious and pedantic. The

Party apparently achieved unity, but the Left wing procured the insertion in the Resolution on Tactics of paragraphs which slapped Trotsky in the face by upholding the course he had sternly chided the Party for having taken.

We confess that these interminable Socialist polemics, which never lead to anything, weary us; but we note with some interest the proceedings of the Communist Labour Party of Germany, which held its Congress on September 12, has broken formally with the Third International, and declares that it has done so because that body "has become an instrument of the Bourgeoisie against the Proletariat—the twin brother of the Second International." Curiously enough it condemns the Soviet Government for its "concessions to the peasants." According to all our reading the peasant—a real producer—has been the one man to whom, from first to last, the Soviet Government has been remorseless. However Socialism has seldom been able to see or extend its sympathies beyond the workshop.

Reappearance of "Free Society."

We are pleased to greet again this "underground" paper which our comrades across the Atlantic manage to publish in spite of all difficulties. The September issue is a splendid number, and contains some very good matter dealing with subjects that will come up for discussion at the International Anarchist Congress. Our comrades have been running their paper since April, 1919, which in itself speaks volumes for their courage and tenacity. We hope they will get the support they deserve. Orders for the paper will be received at FREEDOM Office. Subscriptions are not fixed, but we would suggest a minimum of 2s. 6d. (\$1.00 from U.S.A. and Canada).

A Pamphlet for the Unemployed.

A very good pamphlet for distribution amongst the unemployed is "England Monopolised or England Free?" by Wm. C. Owen ("Senex"). To enable it to be sold for 1d. we will send 12 copies for 9d., 26 for 1s. 6d., 100 for 5s., all post-free. Cash must accompany all orders.

With each copy of this issue we present our new List of Books and Pamphlets in stock.

FOR THE BENEFIT OF "FREEDOM."

A Social and Dance will be held at the "Workers' Friend" Club, 62 Fieldgate Street, Whitechapel, E., on Saturday evening, December 3. Comrades, turn up and make this a success, and help our funds.

International Anarchist Congress.

A Conference to discuss the agenda for the Congress (see October FREEDOM) will be held at the Workers' Friend Club, 62 Fieldgate Street, Whitechapel, on Sunday, November 27, at 7.30. We hope comrades will send us donations towards the expenses of our delegate.

INTERNATIONAL MODERN SCHOOL.

Comrades are requested to note that C. B. Warwick has no connection with this School. Money for the School should be sent to E. Michaels, 62 Fieldgate Street, Whitechapel, E. 1.

To Correspondents.

F. NEUWIRTH.—As you charge us with publishing "anti-Bolshevik lies and silly, senile slanders against the Soviets," we can hardly think you are sincere in sending us 3s. for the FREEDOM Birthday Fund. We have, therefore, sent it in your name to the *Communist*, for the Russian Famine Fund.

CASH RECEIVED (not otherwise acknowledged).

(October 9 to November 16.)

"FREEDOM" GUARANTEE FUND.—W. H. Benson 1s. 6d., P. Mason 1s. 3d., T. S. 10s., Gateshead Group (per J. Armstrong) 10s., Chinese Comrades 3s. 9d., J. Beskin 2s., W. C. Owen £1, S. Downing 2s. 9d., N. Melinsky 10s., F. Goulding 1s. 6d., A. D. Moore 2s., E. W. Lynch 1s., A. Smith 2s., Club Volonta (San Francisco) £1 10s.

"FREEDOM" SUBSCRIPTIONS.—W. H. Benson, M. B. Hope, A. Kendall, M. B. Ellis, H. O'Neil, S. Downing, V. Levine, M. Dennison, A. C. Luca, S. Matarazi, F. D'Amico, F. Distefano, A. Di Russi, J. Denorey, D. Ducceschi, O. Caporale, J. Amitrano, A. Comerio, C. Newlander, J. Friedman, P. B. Swanson, E. J. Dreis, E. Bercowitz, A. W. Hildinger, N. L. Grist, M. Michels, M. Grossman, C. Elkus, J. Ogdon, M. Anderson, A. Carlsson, V. Garcia.

INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONGRESS.—Ferrer Group (Abercraze) 16s.

Printed & Published by the Freedom Press, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N. W. 1.