

Freedom

VOL. XXXVI.—No. 394.

APRIL, 1922.

MONTHLY: TWO PENCE.

NOTES.

The Genoa Conference.

The so-called great statesmen are finding the task of ruling the world a very difficult one. Their best-laid plans come to naught, and they run about Europe holding conference after conference in a vain endeavour to mould the nations to their will. Peace treaties signed and sealed one day are found to be unworkable the next. The Versailles Treaty gave vast sums on paper to the Allies, but every one now knows that these sums will never be paid. France is insisting on her pound of flesh, but she will only get it if her allies forego their share. The Sevres Treaty is also a scrap of paper, the conquered Turks refusing to be conquered, and the conquering Greeks showing their inability to conquer. Britain has put her money on the wrong horse again, her Greek tools having proved unreliable. It is the same with Russian affairs. Lloyd George is now quite plainly anxious to make peace with Russia, in a desperate effort to start the wheels of industry again in Britain; but this peace could have been made three years ago, when Mr. Bullitt brought him the Russian terms at the time of the Versailles Conference. Now, after millions of lives have been lost through the blockade and the wars of intervention, the politicians are taking credit to themselves for accepting the proffered hand of Russia. Yet in spite of all these gigantic blunders the world is still looking to the politicians and diplomats at Genoa to help it out of its troubles, although they are really responsible for most of them. But those troubles will not be removed by the gang of political and financial jugglers now at Genoa, parasites bred by an unhealthy society. In earlier days the people looked to heaven for salvation, now they look to the politicians; but their salvation will come only when they learn to trust in their own strength.

The Irish Muddle.

The Irish Peace Treaty is another treaty that has not worked as its authors claimed it would. The De Valera section of the Republican Army refuses to recognise the Provisional Government, and would like to become dictators of the country. Belfast has had another blood-bath, and at any moment civil war may break out in the South. Members of the Republican Army are shooting down other members of the army, and raids on barracks are the order of the day. But Ireland's troubles are not all political; economic ones are forcing themselves to the front. The Irishman's hunger for land is deep and lasting, and is now showing itself. In the county of Tipperary large numbers of agricultural labourers, members of the Transport Workers' Union, have seized large tracts of grazing land and staked it off with red flags. And a correspondent, writing to us from the county of Limerick, says: "The Land and Transport Workers here are taking the matter into their own hands and are ploughing up the farmers' grazing land, while some are keeping guard with guns. Each labourer is to get so much for tillage. The Red Flag flies from trees in the vicinity. The farmers are in some places turning back the ploughed land, and are also armed." In an agricultural country like Ireland the land question takes precedence of all other questions, and whether there is an Irish or an English Government in Dublin Castle matters little to the man who lacks land. What a shock it would cause if some of the unemployed in this country were to follow the example of these Irish labourers. It would be a pleasant change from haunting labour exchanges, and would certainly call attention to the land question.

Churchill on Individual Enterprise.

Speaking at Dundee on April 8, Winston Churchill tried to scare his audience by saying that one supreme issue was arising in the country which would array the British people in two opposite camps. "It was the great issue of Socialistic organisation of society versus individual enterprise." Of course, he is on the side of individual enterprise. With much of his criticism of a Socialist Government we Anarchists can agree, but when he says that Socialism is barbarism we can but remind him that it was certainly not the Socialists who opened the floodgates of hell in August, 1914. It was the supporters of "individual enterprise" who were responsible for that relapse into barbarism, which Churchill described as a war for democracy. The present system of society has brought profit, power, and privilege to the Churchills, a family that usually has a representative in the inner ruling ring in this country. Therefore it is quite natural that Churchill should be opposed to a change. But what good has individual enterprise brought to the workers of Dundee? Have they anything special to brag about just now? Surely they must soon recognise that a system which breeds war, famine, unemployment, and politicians must be brought to an end, and the sooner the better. But let them avoid putting a Socialist Government in its place. That would be jumping out of the frying-pan into the fire with a vengeance. The only sane alternative to Capitalism is Anarchism, and many thinking folk are beginning to realise it at last.

A Triumph for Communist Discipline.

"When father says 'Turn,' they all turn." We are reminded of this old wheeze by the wonderful alacrity with which the Communists have obeyed the orders of Moscow on the new unity tactics. For the past three years they and their papers have denounced every Socialist or Labour leader who would not bend the knee to the high priests of the Third International. Their Congresses at Moscow have been perfect orgies of denunciation of the Second International, the so-called Two-and-a-half International, and the Amsterdam International Federation of Trade Unions. These social-patriots were the greatest enemies of the workers. As for the Syndicalists and Anarchists, they were to be exterminated by the Tcheka. And now this is all changed. Now the order goes forth from Moscow that a "united working-class front" is to be formed and is to include not only the three Internationals above-mentioned, but also "those workers still belonging to the Syndicalist and Anarchist movements." And at the word of command all the well-drilled Communist parties, from Palestine to Terra del Fuego, immediately changed front with the precision of a battalion of the Guards. The Third International has met the other Internationals, and although it would have been expecting too much for them to kiss each other, still they managed to sit together for a couple of days without any casualties, and have agreed to meet again some day. The Communist Party of Great Britain and Covent Garden have also shown splendid discipline, and their recent Conference instructed the Executive Committee "to seek methods of approaching working-class organisations of this country, including the I.L.P., S.L.P., Anarchists (!), Left Wing and anti-Parliamentarians, S.D.F., Fabian Society, Labour Party, etc., to put before them the proposals of the United Front." So we may shortly expect to receive a card of invitation to this happy family gathering, with a notification on the bottom left-hand corner: "Goose-step optional."

Push the sale of "Freedom."

ANARCHISM VERSUS SOCIALISM.

By WM. C. OWEN.

(Continued from February issue.)

What men desire to do they strive to do, and it is foolish to look for revolutionary action if revolutionary conceptions and aspirations remain unborn. Always the idea must lead the way, and if the idea be muddled and indecisive the action it begets will lose itself in a wilderness of uncertainties and end by arriving nowhere. For example, what made the late War possible? Obviously the infamous but clear and clearly-grasped idea, into which the masses had been miseducated, that their lives belonged to their rulers and must be sacrificed unquestioningly when those rulers so ordered it. This is the State fallacy, and none could be more fatal; for, having hypnotised his subjects into this delusion, any ruler has it in his power to start and carry on a war. He organises an invasion, the invaded resist, and Hell once more breaks loose.

My own hatred of State Socialism, in all its forms, springs from my conviction that it fosters in the Individual this terrible psychology of invasion; that it denies the existence of Rights which should be secure from assault; that it teaches the Individual that in himself he is of no account and that only as a member of the State has he any valid title to existence. That, as it seems to me, reduces him to helplessness, and it is the helplessness of the exploited that makes exploitation possible. From that flow, with inexorable logic, all wars, all tyrannies, all those despotic regulations and restrictions which to-day are robbing Life of all its elasticity, its virility, its proper sweetness. State Socialism is a military creed, forged centuries ago by conquerors who put the world in chains. It is as old as the hills, and, like the hills, is destined to crumble into dust. Throughout the crisis of the past eight years its failure as even a palliative policy has been colossal.

It seems to me imperative that we should be clear upon this fundamental fact, and understand that our suffering and danger do not come from Free Industrialism but from an Industrialism that is not free because it is enslaved by Monopoly and caught fast in the clutches of that invasive military machine—the State. Monopoly is the enemy, the most dangerous enemy the world has known; and never was it so dangerous as now, when the State has made itself well-nigh omnipotent. Monopoly is State-created, State-upheld, and could not exist were it not for the organised violence with which everywhere the State supports it. At the behest of State-protected Monopoly the ordinary man can be deprived at any moment of the opportunity of earning a livelihood, and thrown into the gutter. At the command of the State, acting always in the interests of Monopoly, he can be converted at any moment into food for powder. Show me, if you can, a tyranny more terrible than that!

I call myself an Anarchist because, as it appears to me, Anarchism is the only philosophy that grips firmly and voices unambiguously this central, vital truth. It is either a fallacy or a truth, and Anarchism is either right or wrong. If Anarchism is right, it cannot compromise in any shape or form with the existing State régime without convicting itself thereby of dishonesty and infidelity to Truth. Tyranny is not a thing to be shored up or made enduring, but a disease to be recognised frankly as unendurable and purged out of the social system. Personally I am a foe to all schemes for bolstering up the present reign of violence, and I cannot regard the compulsions of Trade Unionism, Syndicalism, and similar States-within-States, as bridges from the old order to the new, and wombs in which the society of the future is being moulded. Such analogies seem to me ridiculous and fatally misleading. Freedom is not an embryo. Freedom is not a puling, helpless infant struggling into birth. Freedom is the greatest force at our command; the one incomparable constructor capable of beating swords into ploughshares and converting this war-stricken desert of a world into a decent dwelling-place.

As I go to and fro in this huge metropolis of London there is dinned continually into my ears a never-ending discussion of wages, hours of work, the greed of employers, the tyranny of Unions, all the anxieties and miseries natural to a society that has outgrown its past but not thought out its future. That in itself is something. It is something that the sufferer recognises that his health is not what it used to be, but I see little sign of his understanding that life as he has known it hitherto is now becoming impossible. Hardly ever is it suggested that the garment, to-day a hundred times too small, is no longer wearable. Almost always it is taken for granted that, somehow, we shall be able to go on indefinitely multiplying our capacity for production while still leaving to the masses only such oppor-

tunities of consuming as just enable them to live; that, somehow, the hordes of unemployed we are thus begetting will be taken care of by the police or fade away quietly and die; that a good God has so arranged it that when there is too much the ordinary man must starve, and that always he should go down on his knees and thank the Monopolist for granting him the privilege to toil and live. That is the existing system as it has worked itself out; and in that system the people, their leaders, and their rulers still believe. They think that they can patch it up, and we Anarchists regard it as beyond all patching.

Consider the case of England—a country which most deliberately has evicted ninety-nine hundredths of her population from their native soil, herded them into cities, forced them into factories, and compelled them to stake their very lives on the capacity of a master class to furnish them with work in supplying the wants of other peoples. What tenure of existence could be more precarious, and what mode of transacting Life's great business more sordid or more senseless? The man works, when he gets the chance, not to minister to his own proper needs but to satisfy the whims of nations and races whose very names are to him unknown. He takes what comes, and if he gets a steady job in some Birmingham foundry, casting brazen images for voodoo worshippers in South Africa, thinks himself thrice blessed. An astounding system, but more astounding still the fact that it has lasted even one short century. To-day it is breaking down, beyond redemption.

The markets are failing, as, sooner or later and War or no War, they were bound to fail. By no possibility can the English master class prevent that of other countries from starting its own factories, exploiting its own territory, and barring out by protective tariffs the unwelcome competitor who still wishes to share, and at one time monopolised, the spoil. That is the evolution now in process, and all the Labour organisations ever formed and all the Labour leaders ever born are powerless to stop it. Before me lies the report of the debate in the House of Commons on the lock-out of the engineers, and Mr. Gould, who presented the employers' case, made the following declaration:—"The engineering and shipbuilding industries are to-day faced with a practically total cessation of work within the next six or nine months in any event. In the engineering trade there is not the slightest prospect of getting orders; the shipbuilding industry is paralysed, and yet there is a dispute manifesting total ignorance of economic conditions and of the position in which employers are placed." It will be retorted that Mr. Gould is a biased witness, and it may be granted; nevertheless he voiced unquestionably a general truth. Shorn of markets, England's entire industrial machine is slowing down, steadily and surely. In the Amalgamated Engineers' Union alone 90,000 members were out of work before the lock-out.

Anarchism rests on the conviction that human beings, if granted full and equal opportunity to satisfy their wants, could and would do it far more satisfactorily than can or will a master class. It is inconceivable to us that they could make such a failure of it as the master class has done. We do not believe that the peoples, having once become self-owning, would exhaust all the resources of science in murdering one another. That particular insanity springs, as we see it, from the fact that the master class in each and every manufacturing country finds itself compelled to capture foreign markets in order to keep its own population in some sort of work. The wars so engendered the masses necessarily support, because, under the reign of Monopoly, jobs they must have at any price.

We do not believe for one moment that without the Capitalist or Monopolist we could not live. On the contrary, we are extremely positive that the Capitalist, the Landlord, the man who has cornered the means of life, is the one who has made it impossible for us to support ourselves. He holds the key which we must have. He lies growling in the manger from which we have to feed. In the desert created by himself he bars us from the springs at which, on his own terms, we are compelled to drink. It should not be a desert. Let us have but liberty to irrigate it and it will be transformed into a boundless oasis of inexhaustible fertility.

We are for abolishing Capitalism by giving all men free and equal access to capital, in its strictest and most proper sense, viz., the chief thing, the means of producing wealth—that is, the well-being of themselves and the community. For my part, I look at the world thus. The few, the comparatively very few, by facing facts and courageously pursuing knowledge, have put within our

(Continued at foot of next column.)

The International Anarchist Congress.

(Report continued from last month.)

ANARCHISM AND SYNDICALISM.

The Spanish comrades reported the Syndicalist movement in their country as being entirely in the hands of the Anarchists, and federalised. The grouping is no longer by trades, for each locality now has its own Syndicate in which all workers are united. These local bodies are organised by districts which, in their turn, belong to the National Confederation of Labour. They claimed that bureaucracy in their ranks had disappeared almost entirely; that the great strikes of 1917 were the work of small but active bodies, and that out of three million organised workers a million was syndicated. Persecution had driven the movement underground. At the 1920 Congress they declared their adhesion to the Moscow International, but later and fuller information forced them to change, and they were now opposed to the Dictatorship and favoured Communism only when it was free. They considered the condition of their revolutionary movement critical, the forces of reaction being most powerful and ruthless.

Harry Kelly gave a detailed account of the Labour organisations of the United States. He reported the American Federation of Labour as having 2,500,000 members, chiefly skilled workers; the Industrial Workers of the World—I.W.W.—as numbering 150,000, chiefly manual workers; and the Communist Party (Bolshevist) as having a membership of 20,000. The Russians, he said, have some eight or ten secret groups, and there are Jewish groups. The Anarchists have three papers, viz., *Free Society*, *Volna* (in Russian), and *Freie Arbeiter Stimme* (in Jewish). There is also, in New York City, a Ferrer school. The Anarchists work with the Syndicalists, but their main object is the formation of Anarchist organisations. They reject the teaching of Sorel and Pouget, according to which there has to be a transitional Syndicalist period. The I.W.W., though concentrating on Industrialism, have favoured in the past political activity. Since the Russian Revolution, and more especially since their delegates returned from Moscow, a considerable section of their membership has declared itself opposed to participation in politics. The I.W.W. are Centralists, and their organ, the *Pioneer*, called itself Marxist and accepted the

(Continued from previous page.)

reach the possibility of lifting the race, once and for all, above all fear of want. The work of their brains—these few “who scorned delights and lived laborious days”—has put into our hands a capacity to produce which is practically illimitable, and a power to distribute which laughs at physical obstacles and could, by the exercise of ordinary humanity and common sense, knit the entire world into one harmonious commonwealth and free it for ever from the mean and sordid struggle that still keeps it in the sewer. These few, knowing no God but Truth and no religion but loyalty to Truth, have made Nature, which was for ages untellable Man's ruthless master, to-day his docile slave. In all history there is nothing to compare with the Industrial Revolution wrought by Science, but the harvest of that mighty sowing we have not as yet even begun to reap.

What blocks the way? Simply, on the one hand, the servile stupidity of the masses who still deem it their duty to live as their poverty-stricken forefathers lived, and, on the other hand, the crass immobility of the ruling class, which still believes itself entitled to rule as did the Caesars, to live at the expense of others, to fence in for its own private enjoyment what should be, and what ultimately must be, for the use of all. I am for the overthrow of Monopoly, of all Monopolies; I am for tearing down the bars, all bars; and this I conceive to be the great task to which the Anarchist movement has set its hand and on which it should never allow itself to turn its back.

This is the dream; but it is not a dream. The abolition of human slavery is essentially the most practical of things. The adjustment of individual and social life to conditions that have been completely revolutionised by the advance of human knowledge is an adjustment that must be made. When the inevitability of that adjustment is understood, it will, in my humble judgment, be made, and not till then. In the hope of hastening, however infinitesimally, the thought that this great step must now be taken I wrote this pamphlet originally, and have revised it slightly. For the elaboration of details I have had no space; but, as it appears to me, when Humanity feels the necessity of learning it will learn, and when the spirit of Liberty burns fiercely Slavery will perish in its flame.

THE END.

theories of the class struggle, surplus value, etc. The Jewish Anarchists work through the I.W.W., but also endeavour to form purely Anarchistic groups in various factories and workshops.

Reporting for France, Mauricius read a letter he had just received from Paris which stated that most of the delegates to the Syndicalist Congress then being held there had declared themselves in favour of a federalist form of organisation. Hitherto, he said, the conflict within the C.G.T. had been over the ideas of class collaboration, authoritarian Communism, and free Federalism. He made a bitter attack on officialdom as having been the ruin of the Syndicalist movement in France, and urged the necessity of thinking out and formulating an economic programme and line of revolutionary tactics for use among the Syndicalists.

THE LAND QUESTION.

On this subject there was a most interesting discussion. Mauricius quoted statistics showing that in France the great estates are becoming less and the small properties more numerous, Karl Marx's concentration dogma having been proved false in the agricultural as in the industrial domain. He explained how the peasants co-operated voluntarily, and insisted that, although dominated generally by the idea of private property, they are opposed to authoritarian Communism and would favour a régime that would free them from the various tributes levied on them by the State. He emphasised, as did the recent Lyons Congress, the necessity of making propaganda among the rural population, Russian experience having proved conclusively that without the aid of the peasants no revolution can be a success. “In principle,” he said, “the land should belong to him who cultivates it, and the duration of labour and the exchanges to be effected as between the country and city workers can be settled through the co-operative societies, communal councils, and syndicates. Meyer, speaking for Holland, Rocker for Germany, and Kelly for the United States, declared themselves in full accord with the general tenour of these remarks; and Kelly added that in North America farming on the grand scale, from which such great results were once expected, had been unable to hold its own as against the smaller cultivators. All agreed on the paramount importance of this question, and on the necessity of studying it more deeply, in order that the Anarchist movement might reach a clear and definite conclusion as to the stand it ought to take.

THE CLOSING SESSION.

A letter from an Anarchist Congress which had been held clandestinely in Spain was read. It answered the “questionnaire” which had been issued by this Congress with the declaration that it was opposed to all authority, whether exercised by the bourgeoisie or proletariat, and that it favoured organisation on a federalist basis, being entirely in accord with the motion passed recently at Lyons. In connection with the land question it stood for the Syndicalist organisation of agricultural workers, but not of peasant proprietors, for it believed the latter would infect the organisations with a petty-bourgeois mentality. Workshop councils were advocated, and it was considered to be the duty of the workers not merely to abstain from party politics but to struggle for the dissolution of political parties. “We are for the Anarchist International.”

Rocker gave the closing address. He pointed out the failure of State Socialism in 1848, and said that in the Russian Revolution we are witnessing the second stage in the decomposition of the State Socialist delusion. Socialism, as Bakunin stated, will have to be free or it will not be at all. This liberation, however, will not come of itself. For it every one must work, with all the faculties and energy at his or her command.

In the evening a well-attended public meeting was held, Rocker, Volgin, Fister, and Mauricius being the speakers.

RESOLUTIONS.

The following resolutions were passed unanimously by the Congress:—

ON ORGANISATION.

The clarity and power of our idea, coupled with the activity we display, should assure the Anarchist movement a preponderant influence on the development of the Revolution and of society's life. The realisation of our ideal necessitates the organisation and cohesion of the Anarchist movement. A bond, both moral and material, should unite individual comrades and local and federation groups, while paying due consideration to the liberty and autonomy of each. Political parties are strongly organised, and exercise thereby a great influence on the working-class movement. It appears, therefore, to be all the more necessary for Anarchists to organise.

(Continued on page 26.)

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 Street, 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.

Down to Perdition.

We should like to write encouragingly, but neither the engineers' lockout nor the shipbuilders' strike gives any sane and decently informed person the slightest chance. The old story repeats itself, but in feebler and more melancholy fashion. As with the struggles in which the miners and railwaymen became involved, negotiations, started instantly by the workers, drag on their weary way; Government intervention is besought, again by the workers, and besought in vain; kindred unions, relied on to stand solid, desert *en masse*. In this instance no less than 47 organisations affiliated with the engineers took the earliest opportunity to break away.

With conditions as they are the workers are attempting the impossible. Can it be honestly maintained that the engineers have any prospect of succeeding when their industry is passing through the severest crisis it has ever known, and when, before the fight began, ninety thousand of their members were out of work? As for the shipbuilding business, the state of things is even worse, experts reporting that within the next three or four months the scanty contracts now in hand will have been completed, and that no new orders are as yet in sight. In such circumstances we do not blame the workers for accepting such terms as they can get, and we congratulate them on not having taken the advice of the *Communist*, which placarded all London with blood-red posters crying out: "Fight! Damn you, Fight!" Such advice was not merely idiotic, but brazenly dishonest, for the *Communist* knew well enough that it would not be taken, and that it could not be. Its real object was to swagger; to impress the public, whose intelligence it rates too low, with the idea that it, and it alone, dares to rebel.

If we blame anyone it is the Labour leaders; and we blame them only for not facing facts. These men will not move with the times. Despite a long and unbroken succession of appalling failures, they refuse to acknowledge that the game of seeing who can starve the longest is now utterly played out. They shut their eyes deliberately to the patent fact that, with the foreign markets prostrate, it is often to the personal advantage of the employer to shut up shop. They ignore the real economic situation confronting them, and continue, as of old, to preach the omnipotence of the Union which lifts them into office, and to teach their followers that only in organisation lies salvation, because organising is their special trade and furnishes the due whereby they live.

There is no baser lie than this. There can be no more cruel or pernicious a teaching than that which leads Labour to believe that if it will only once again re-stock the emptied treasuries it will sweep to triumph, though Westminster and Bedford have cornered the land on and by which it has to live; though Northumberland and Hamiltons hold in their grip the coal it needs for warmth and all the materials it requires for shelter; though Labour itself owns nothing but the so-called right to beg for a job, if it can get it; to rattle collection-boxes in the face of a worn-out public, or to keep itself barely alive with doles dished out by the very parasites that have reduced it to this pass.

Gentlemen of the Trade Union and Labour movement, you are deceiving the too-trustful masses. You are called on to do a real man's work, and you are flinching. Your business is to rescue your followers from their helpless dependence on the Monopolist, and you decline to tackle the job. You know as well as we do that the position of the wage-slave is becoming completely hopeless, and that a truly revolutionary condition now confronts him. You are afraid to face it. You lack the moral courage needed to grapple with the facts, and in your time-serving cowardice you are dragging not only your own class but the entire nation to perdition.

Some Bolshevik Lies about the Russian Anarchists.

By ALEXANDER BERKMAN.

It is not long since that the Bolsheviks, especially those outside of Russia, absolutely *denied* that the Anarchists are persecuted, imprisoned and often shot by the Bolshevik State. It is significant that they have now changed their policy. They do not deny the facts any more. They *admit* them now, but they try to "explain" them. Evidently they have received a tip from Moscow that the facts previously denied *in toto* have become too well known to make further denial practical.

The Bolshevik "explanations," as we shall presently see, are characterised by the same degree of veracity as their former denials. The general term of "counter-revolutionist" is enjoying great popularity with the Bolsheviks. That term has of late been applied by Moscow and its uncritical apes in all the other Communist parties so indiscriminately to every criticism that it has lost its meaning entirely. I think the Bolsheviks will soon have to find some other "explanation" for their despotism and tyranny. At any rate, the cry of "counter-revolutionist" has lost its power to frighten, and it will surely not prevent *me* from telling the whole truth about the situation in Russia. Only by learning the truth will the workers know how to avoid the terrible mistakes committed by Russia—mistakes that killed the Revolution and have finally turned the country back to capitalism. It is therefore useless for the Communist Press of Europe and America to keep their "new" methods up much longer. It smells too much of the ancient practice of the thief crying "Hold the thief!" For when at last the full truth will be known about Russia and the development of the Revolution, it will be clear to every unprejudiced mind that the greatest counter-revolutionary factor in the Revolution was *not* Denikin, Koltchak, etc., but the *Communist State itself*.

The Communist Press is now making the following "explanation" why the Anarchists are kept in prison by the Bolsheviks:—(1) the Russian Anarchists have actively aided the counter-revolutionary elements; (2) they have assisted the *pogromstchik* Makhno; and (3) they have participated in the uprisings. Let us examine these charges point by point.

In the first place, those who know anything at all about Bolshevik Russia know this fundamental fact: in Russian prisons there are *no* persons who took part in counter-revolution or in uprisings. Such people are shot by the Tcheka as soon as caught. Nor is it necessary that they should have *actively* supported counter-revolution or uprising. Mere suspicion of even sympathy is enough cause for immediate *razstrel*; that is, shooting without trial or hearing. Now let us see about the more definite accusations. The Communists claim the Anarchists helped "the *pogromstchik* Makhno." In the first place, it is infamy to call Makhno a *pogromstchik* (attacking and murdering Jews). The Russian Bolsheviks themselves had repeatedly hailed Makhno as a true revolutionist and a great military hero—whenever their relations were friendly, of course. In October, 1920, the Bolshevik Government made an official political and military agreement with Makhno and his army. Do the Communists of Europe and America mean to say that Lenin would enter into agreements with a *pogromstchik*? There were, indeed, isolated cases of pogroms made by some *otryads* (military detachments) of the Makhno army. Such things happen in every army. Was not the Red Army guilty of such incidents? Was it not a frequent practice of the famous cavalry of Budenny, of the Red Army, to make bloody pogroms upon Jews? Were not several regiments of Budenny's army cashiered, punished, and a number of his soldiers even shot for it, as late as March, 1921? Was not Melnichansky, a prominent Communist and former President of all the Labour Unions of the Moscow district, specially rushed South with a large party of other Communists to investigate the pogrom activities of the army of Budenny? This is known to everyone in Russia who kept in touch with events. I was friendly with Melnichansky, and he personally corroborated all the facts to me. But because every army necessarily has scoundrels, brutes, and Jew-baiters, there is no reason to blame the whole army for the evil deeds of some part of it. I should certainly not say that Trotsky is a *pogromstchik* because Budenny's army, or some other parts of the Red Army, were guilty of pogroms. Yet this is exactly what the Communists do when they call Makhno a *pogromstchik*. As a matter of fact, there were, as I have already stated, very few pogroms, and of very insignificant extent, committed by the *otryads* of Makhno. Many pogroms made in the Ukraina by the "Zeleny" and other counter-revolutionary bands were often ascribed to the Makhno army. But investigation proved in 99 cases out of every hundred that the

Makhno army had not even been in the neighbourhood at the time. Makhno is an Anarchist, and it is a historic fact that he and his staff kept up a continuous propaganda and agitation against religious and nationalistic superstitions and prejudices. Jew-baiting was punished severely in his army. The punishment for pogroming was death by the sword, always. Thus, for instance, in the case of the pogrom in the Jewish Colony of Garkoy (Alexandrovsky uyezd), where on May 12th, 1919, several Jewish families were killed. The Makhno staff appointed a Commission of investigation, which found that the Jews were killed by certain peasants of the village Uspenovka. Though those peasants were not members of the Makhno army, they were sentenced to death for the pogrom. More such facts could be related which prove the attitude of Makhno and his army against pogroms. A significant case is on record, showing Makhno's personal feeling in the matter.

It was on the 4th or 5th of May, 1919, when Makhno, accompanied by several members of the military staff, hurried from the front to Gulyai-Pole (generally the headquarters of the Makhno army), to meet in conference with L. Kameneff, the special representative of the Republic, and some members of the Bolshevik Government of Kharkov. At the station called Verkhny Takmak, Makhno suddenly noticed a big poster on the wall, which read: "Kill the Jews! Save Russia! Long live Batka Makhno!" Makhno halted. He sent for the stationmaster, and found that the latter himself had put up the poster. The stationmaster proved to be a former *povstanetz* (peasant rebel) who had fought against Denikin. Makhno shot him on the spot.

In my collection of Makhno posters, proclamations, handbills, etc., there are numerous appeals of Makhno to the Ukrainian peasantry to respect and protect the Jews against hooliganism. In the Makhno army itself there were Jews, and some of them were the close personal friends of Makhno, members of the Executive Committee of the Revolutionary Soviet, of the Educational Department, and so forth. In conclusion, on this point, it is enough to remember that everybody in Russia knows the story of Ataman Grigorieff, leader of a large army of *povstantzi*. Grigorieff wanted to add his forces to the Army of Makhno. A mass meeting was called, middle of July, 1919, in a village near the town of Alexandria, province of Kherson. Grigorieff, with a part of his army, was present, as well as the peasantry of the provinces of the neighbourhood. It was at the time of the zenith of Ataman Grigorieff's power, his army then amounting to 7,000 to 10,000 men. He had taken the cities of Alexandria, Snamenka, and Elisavetgrad, and was threatening Ekaterinoslav. At the mass meeting the main speakers to address the peasants were Grigorieff, Makhno, Tchubenko, and representatives of the local peasantry. Grigorieff spoke first. Makhno, following, accused Grigorieff of being counter-revolutionary, produced the proof of it in the letters and telegrams he had received from Grigorieff, and finally denounced him for the numerous pogroms Grigorieff and his army had committed in May, 1919. Makhno then and there declared Grigorieff an enemy of the Revolution and a disgrace to the revolutionary movement of the rebel peasants. Pausing in his speech, Makhno turned towards Grigorieff and shot him in view of the whole audience.

So much for Nestor Makhno, the "*pogromstchik*." I hold no brief for Makhno, but in the interest of historic truth I considered it necessary to nail down some of the infamous lies spread about the Ukrainian movement of the peasants. I understand that in the near future there is to appear a complete history on that subject, so that those interested in Makhno and the Makhno movement may learn at first hand.

Now let us examine the Bolshevik accusation that the Anarchists of Russia "have aided Makhno, have been active in counter-revolution and participated in uprisings." I know that on this point our comrades abroad have but little definite information, especially on the matter of "helping Makhno." There have been rumours, accusations, denials. A few facts in that connection will therefore be in place. As is well known, there are several branches ("*tetcheniya*") of the Anarchist movement in Russia. The most important are: (1) the Confederation of Anarcho-Syndicalists; (2) Group "Golos Truda"; (3) the Federation of Anarchist Communists; (4) the Universalist Anarchists; and (5) the Confederation of Anarchist organisations of the Ukraina, known by the name of its organ, "*Nabat*." In the near future I mean to write a short history of the role the Anarchists played in the Russian Revolution (a very important role, by the way), together with an analysis of the theories, methods, and tactics of the various currents of Anarchism now existing in Russia. For the purposes of the present article it will be sufficient to state the oft-declared attitude of the organisations mentioned toward the Makhno movement and the question of uprisings.

The Confederation of Anarcho-Syndicalists does not consider the Makhno movement as an Anarchist movement. It has never favoured it or had any relation to it. It is opposed to armed uprisings against the Bolshevik Government until the people of Russia will be ready for a revolution.

The "Golos Truda" group has always been opposed to the Makhno movement, has criticised it severely, and is against armed uprisings. This group is Anarcho-Syndicalist, though differing in certain questions from the views of the Confederation of Anarcho-Syndicalists. It devotes its energies almost exclusively to the publication of the works of Kropotkin and other Anarchist writers.

The Federation of Anarchist Communists, known as the Karelin organisation, has always been very close to the Bolsheviks, even to the extent of withholding from criticism of the Bolshevik State. It has been officially praised and approved of by the Communist Party of Russia. (See official publication of the Central Committee of the Party, *Vestnik Agitatzii y Propagandi*, No. 11-12, May 25th, 1921, Moscow.) In the information and directions regularly sent by the Central Committee of the Party to its locals in the provinces, Karelin himself and his organisation are characterised as "very respected" and "very friendly to the Bolsheviks." These Anarchists are surely not counter-revolutionists, from the Bolshevik viewpoint, or Makhnovtsi.

The Universalist Anarchists have always been, as the Bolsheviks till very recently admitted, on friendly terms with the Communist regime. They were not molested. They were permitted to issue their publication, the *Universal*, to open a bookstore and to conduct a *stolovaya* (restaurant) at their club-rooms on the Tverskaya Street, Moscow. The Universalists have always been opposed to Makhno and to uprisings. This organisation did not suffer any persecution from the Bolshevik Government until recently; that is to say, they began to be hounded when there was no more counter-revolution in Russia, when Makhno had retired to Rumania, and when the peasant uprisings had practically ceased with the abolition of the *razvyorstka* (forcible food requisition) and the introduction of free trade. It was in the night of 1-2 November, 1921, that the Moscow Section of the Universalist Anarchists was broken up and a large number of its members arrested. Among the arrested are also Askaroff, Barmash, Shapiro, Stitzenko, and Simtchin, members of the Secretariat of the Moscow Section. Askaroff and Barmash are members of the Moscow Soviet, elected by an overwhelming vote of the workers of certain Moscow factories. They are both comrades of long standing in the revolutionary movement: Askaroff has been active for 17 years; Barmash almost as long. They are Anarchists of intelligence and experience, and very effective public speakers. Both are men of energy and practical application, and—as I have said—they were members of the Moscow Soviet. Maybe the reader can perceive why the Bolsheviks thought it best to "eliminate" them. And that is very easy in Russia, with the Tcheka all-powerful, working in secret and owing no one any responsibility. In this connection a little incident within my own experience will be interesting. It throws a significant light on how the "dictatorship of the proletariat," alias the Tcheka, works in practice.

It was in October, 1921, I dropped in for dinner at the Universalist restaurant, Tverskaya, No. 19. Barmash, Askaroff, and Shapiro were there. (Not A. Shapiro, of "Golos Truda," but the Universalist Anarchist Shapiro.) They invited me for a little informal consultation about some misunderstanding Barmash had had with the authorities of the village where his parents live, and where Barmash spends every summer working his piece of land, like a regular peasant. It appeared that Barmash and the village authorities could not satisfactorily settle the matter under dispute. Barmash said that he intended to have the central authorities in Moscow decide the question at issue. Askaroff and myself agreed with Barmash he should consult Kameneff, President of the Moscow Soviet and one of the leading Communists of Russia. Accordingly Barmash went to see Kameneff. Shapiro accompanied him. They never returned. They just disappeared. Three days we passed in terrible anxiety, searching all over Moscow for them. I telephoned to Kameneff. Yes, Barmash and Shapiro had visited him and he had advised them to talk their business over with the Tcheka. The matter began to look suspicious. I telephoned to the Veh-Tcheka (the All-Russian Extraordinary Commission), then to M-Tcheka (the Moscow Extraordinary Commission), and finally to the Ossoby Otdel (special secret police department). They had heard nothing of the sudden disappearance of the two Anarchists. They knew me well and they seemed to give the information willingly. I was finally referred to Tchistyakoff, one of the highest officials of the Veh-Tcheka. Yes, Barmash and Shapiro had been to see him, he told me. They had a very friendly conversation, and then they left. "We parted most amicably," Tchistyakoff assured

me, repeatedly. Where did the two men disappear, then? we wondered. It seemed inexplicable. We searched the hospitals, visited police stations—all in vain. Only on the fourth day Tchistiyakoff admitted that the men were in the Tcheka. They had been arrested after their interview with him; and they were there all the time. *They have been kept there ever since, and more have been added to them.*

Incidentally, it is the Soviet law that none of its members may be arrested, for any cause whatever, except upon a warrant signed by a member of the Presidium of the Soviet. Barmash and Askaroff were arrested without such warrants. The Tcheka is a law unto itself; as a matter of fact, the highest law in Russia to-day. I leave it to the reader to judge what chance a poor, friendless, unknown citizen of the "Socialistic Republic" has, when members of the Moscow Soviet, men widely known all over Russia and having many friends, can suddenly disappear as I have described above.

I have explained the attitude of the various Anarchist organisations towards Makhno. But I have not spoken yet of the relation of the "Nabat" Federation to the Makhno movement. The Nabat groups were active almost exclusively in the South. They were close to the Ukrainian peasantry, to their conditions of life, and they went through the numerous changes of government in the Ukraina. (In some places there were 14 different regimes within the years 1918—1920.) To them the Makhno movement was not the theoretic question it was to the Anarchists in the northern and central parts of the country. Through force of circumstances the members of the Nabat had to come in close contact with the Makhno movement, as, for instance, when Makhno's army would occupy the district where they lived, as happened frequently in the Ukraina. They know more about the true character, the purposes and activities of the Makhno *povstantsi* (rebel peasantry) than anyone else. Soon they will be able to speak about it, some of them now having left Russia. Members of the Nabat groups had visited Makhno and his army, studied that movement on its native soil, worked in its educational and propagandist departments, and they are therefore fully familiar with it. I shall not speak for them, but I want to call the reader's attention to the official publication of the "Nabat" groups, of the year 1920, which throws light on their attitude to Makhno and the movement known by his name.

When the Bolsheviks despaired of defeating Wrangel, and the latter was advancing further north from the Crimea (latter part of 1920), they entered into the well-known politico-military agreement with Makhno, in October, 1920. The Bolsheviks, indeed, made no mistake about the military genius of Makhno and the wonderful heroism and dare-devil effectiveness of his army of *povstantsi*. It is no secret that the Makhno army bore the brunt of the last campaign against Wrangel, which completely defeated that counter-revolutionary tool of the Allies. The politico-military agreement of the Bolshevik Government with Makhno, as finally signed and sealed, consisted of seven paragraphs. For the Government signed the special representative of R.S.F.S.R., Y. Yakovlev; for the Makhno army, Kurilenko and Popoff. Article II of that agreement reads:—

"Fulllest freedom of agitation and propaganda, oral and written, for Makhnovtsi and Anarchists, without, however, the right to call for the forcible overthrow of the Soviet regime and subject to military censorship. In the matter of publication, Makhnovtsi and Anarchists, as revolutionary organisations recognised as such by the Soviet Government, are entitled to use the technical apparatus of the Soviet Government, subject to the rules of the technic of publishing."

This is a literal translation of Article II of the agreement. It will be seen from it that the Bolshevik Government did not regard the Makhnovtsi and the Anarchists as counter-revolutionary elements. As a result of that agreement, the Anarchists then imprisoned in the Ukraina were released (several also in some other parts of Russia), among them Comrade Volin and others. This was provided for by Article I of the agreement. The "Nabat" group began again issuing their paper *Nabat* in Kharkov. And here is a very significant thing. Though permission to issue the *Nabat*, and the release of the Anarchists from prison, was entirely due to Makhno and his fellow *povstantsi*, who insisted on those conditions of the agreement, yet this is what the new *Nabat* wrote: "The Makhno movement is not an Anarchist movement, and the Anarchist movement is not Makhnovshchina." That, then, was the attitude of the Ukrainian Anarchists. Their organ, the *Nabat*, sought to analyse the Makhno movement and bring clarity upon that much-misunderstood and much-maligned phenomenon.

As soon as Makhno and his army succeeded in defeating Wrangel, the Bolshevik Government treacherously broke its agreement with Makhno. But that is another story. Here, however, it must be mentioned that the Bolshevik treachery to

Makhno involved also the arrest of scores of Anarchists gathered in Kharkov for a Conference which was legal and permitted by the Government. The Tcheka suppressed the *Nabat* after the publication of the fourth number, broke up the Anarchist magazine headquarters and book store, and made a general raid upon all the comrades in Kharkov. This took place in the night of 25—26 of December, 1920. Some of the comrades arrested at that time are still in Bolshevik prisons. It is these Anarchists that the Communists dare call counter-revolutionists. May history be their judge.

February, 1922.

THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONGRESS.

(Continued from page 23.)

In order to unify their propaganda in each district the Anarchists unite their forces in a district federation. The various federations in each country form a national Anarchist union. By acting thus the efforts of Anarchists everywhere will become unified. Organisation details and the raising of the funds needed for propaganda are left to each group's initiative. It is, however, necessary that the local and district federations furnish the national unions with the resources the propaganda regularly requires. Similarly the national unions should meet the Anarchist International's financial needs. Thus our principles of decentralisation, federalism, and autonomy for each and all become translated into actual fact.

ON THE DICTATORSHIP.

The Congress finds with satisfaction that the Anarchists of the whole world are opposed to all dictatorship. In order to insure themselves against this danger the Anarchists declare that, more than ever, they are just as much the enemies of dictatorship by the Left as of dictatorship by the Right, of the so-called Dictatorship of the Proletariat as of that by the bourgeoisie. The Congress puts on record the fact that in every country those Anarchists who occupy the first rank in the revolutionary activities of the day are unanimous on this.

ON SYNDICALISM.

(1) The Congress considers that, from the economic standpoint, all the means of production and their organisation should belong solely to the workers.

(2) All social organisation must start with the cell, the individual, the producer, grouping himself freely with others and remaining always free in the successive and co-ordinated organisms of which the federation is formed.

(3) Such a social organisation ought to find its economic expression in the workers' Unions.

(4) The Congress finds that the Reformist Syndicates, such as the American Federation of Labour and the Amsterdam International, are imbued with a narrowly corporative and class spirit; that the Red International of Moscow is under the immediate influence of the Communist International, which strives to maintain itself by the conquest of political power and the establishment of new States whose very existence is hostile to the complete liberation of the people. It declares, therefore, that the Syndicates have nothing to expect from Amsterdam or Moscow, and that still less should they take orders therefrom. It is as autonomous and sovereign bodies that the Syndicates, entirely independent, have voiced the desires, needs, and aspirations of the working class, of which they are the natural groupings.

It appears, however, to be necessary for the workers' revolutionary organisations to unite across all frontiers. Anarchists who are working in the Syndicates are invited, therefore, to assist every project that may have as its aim the formation of a truly revolutionary Syndicalist International which will be independent of all external influences.

The Congress declares the bureaucratic spirit an evil which transforms society's officials, organs, and servants into its masters. It expresses, therefore, the opinion that in all workers' organisations the necessary administrative tasks ought to be performed by employees and responsible professionals, who shall not be the Syndicate's leaders but simply its employees.

The Federalist-Syndicalist revolutionary movement is of great importance for the realisation of Anarchism, and is its economic base. Nevertheless Anarchists should not confine their militant activities to the Syndicates, but should utilise for the spread of their philosophy every department of the revolutionary struggle.

All economic organisations that are battling for the creation of a new social order—such as Socialist guilds, workshop councils, shop-steward organisations, free councils, etc.—should have the Anarchist influence brought to bear upon them. Anarchists, therefore, should penetrate such organisations, in order to propagate our ideal and make them conversant with it; but it should never be forgotten that such organisations are not specifically Anarchist, and that Free Communism is Anarchism's sole economic aim. Comrades who enter these organisations ought to defend in them federalist and anti-bureaucratic ideas.

Accordingly, the Congress urges the workers to avail themselves of every form of struggle that can aid in the development of the Revolution, understanding by that word a Revolution for autonomy and freedom.

Acknowledgment of cash received will appear in May Day issue.

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