

Freedom

VOL. XXXV.—No. 381.

MARCH, 1921.

MONTHLY: TWO PENCE.

NOTES.

Need the Unemployed Starve?

With two million out of work and many others working short time, it is quite certain that the employers will try to force a reduction of wages all round. Trade Union funds have already been severely drained by out-of-work pay, leaving little with which to carry on a strike, although there will probably be strikes in some industries. The resumption of trade with Russia will not materially affect the situation for some time, and the decision to seize 50 per cent. of the value of imports from Germany must seriously affect trade with that country. Taken altogether, from the workers' point of view the outlook is very black. They are still looking to their leaders to help them, but those gentry are as helpless as themselves. All the agitation in this country during the past thirty years has not taught the workers that commercial crises and unemployment are bound to happen under Capitalism, and that whilst that system lasts their attempts to improve their condition are about as useless as trying to lift themselves up by their bootlaces. Trade Unionists have never set themselves seriously to the task of seeking a way out of Capitalism, and they have acquiesced in the monopoly of the land and the means of production by a comparative handful of people. Now that so many are out of work owing to the collapse of trade with foreign countries, they should boldly insist on using the land and the factories to produce for themselves all that they require. Instead of that, they tamely walk out of the factories, leaving all the splendid machinery idle, and wait and starve until it shall please their kind masters to tell them to come back again. Is there any other animal on the face of the earth that would starve whilst the means of life were close at hand? We do not know of one.

Trade with Russia.

At last the British Government has agreed to trade with Russia. We heartily welcome this as a sign that open hostilities between the people of the two countries are at an end. In spite of all the camouflage, this agreement implies the recognition of the present Government in Russia, and to that extent will strengthen its position. The negotiations have been long drawn out, and we have heard a lot about difficulties over this clause and that clause; but when the history of the negotiations comes to light we think it will be found that these clauses had little to do with the delay, but that it was really caused by negotiations about various concessions granted to greedy British capitalists to exploit the raw materials in certain parts of the Russian Empire. Speaking at the tenth All-Russian Congress of the Communist Party, Lenin is reported as saying that owing to the slow development of the world revolutionary movement, they could not consider its speedy victory a premise in their policy. Therefore, "the Soviet Government has raised the question of the necessity of agreement with the bourgeois Governments, and the granting of concessions to foreigners in Russia." Translated into plain English, this means that owing to the starvation and misery caused by the wars and the blockade carried on by the Allies, the Russians have been forced to throw open their country to exploitation by foreign capitalists. Except for a few futile protest meetings, British workers have allowed their rulers to wreak their vengeance on the Russian people for having dared to overthrow the capitalist system in Russia, just as they are now allowing them to wreak their vengeance on the people of Ireland. Unless they wake up speedily to the danger, British workers will find themselves suffering from the same evils at the hands of their rulers. And in that day they will wish they had answered the calls for help which came to them from Russia and Ireland. Wrongs, like curses, come home to roost.

War on the Communists.

The arrest and imprisonment of active Communist propagandists during the past few months show that the Government is alarmed at the growth of the revolutionary spirit, and is determined to check it by the old brutal methods used by all Governments. These prosecutions prove the truth of the revolutionists' contention that a peaceful change from Capitalism to a free commonwealth will not be possible, as the wealthy classes will not voluntarily surrender their powers and privileges. They have lived in luxury and idleness for many generations because they had the necessary might on their side, and their answer to all demands for a change is a blunt "No!" We have never been under any illusions about the "right" of free speech and free press, and know that they are tolerated only so long as they are not dangerous. So when prosecutions take place they prove that the danger-point has been reached, and that the temperature of the revolutionary spirit is high. Therefore, whilst we regret that the fighters are being put under lock and key, we have the compensation of knowing that our rulers are feeling a strong draught from the East. Incidentally, we are pleased to announce that the King gave an afternoon party recently at Buckingham Palace, and amongst the honoured guests were Mr. Adamson, ex-chairman of the Labour Party; Mr. Vernon Hartshorn, of the South Wales Miners' Federation; Mr. J. H. Thomas, of the Railwaymen's Union; and—of course—Mr. Bottomley. There were also present lots of dukes and duchesses and viscounts and viscountesses and other small fry. This shows how democratic the King is nowadays—hospitality for Communists at Pentonville, and hospitality for the others at Buckingham Palace.

Child Scares U.S.A.

There must be some artful Anarchists in the United States Department of Justice, because in no other way can we account for actions which are making it and the Government look very ridiculous. Last year's wholesale raids and arrests of native and alien "radicals," followed by outrageous sentences and deportations, were due to the authorities being in a state of panic. We might have expected that by this time they had calmed down. But the great American Republic is still in danger, and the Department of Justice again throws itself into the terrible fray and arrests—a little girl of only 12 years! This desperate character—her name is Valentina Bukovetsky—has been officially classed as a deportee, and the "crime" for which she is being expelled from America is the distribution of leaflets announcing a Communist meeting. To make the U.S.A. safe for plutocracy, this child and seventy other Russians are being deported to their native country, amidst sighs of relief from the authorities. Cases like Valentina's are splendid Anarchist propaganda, for no self-respecting nation would tolerate for long a system which brings upon them the ridicule of all sensible people. Valentina, you suffer in a good cause!

Shooting Prisoners-of-War.

In shooting Sinn Feiners for carrying arms the Government is copying the "methods of barbarism" which they employed in the Boer War. To all intents and purposes the Irish people are at war with the British Government, but by labelling them rebels, as they did the Boers, the Government claims the right to shoot all those they capture. It is simply damnable that it should be allowed to continue this diabolical practice, which will further embitter the relations of the people of the two countries for many generations. Surely there has been enough bloodshed and enough hatred during the past six years. Are we always to allow the military caste to carry fire and sword throughout the world? We appeal to the rank and file of the Labour movement to unite in an effective protest against these atrocities and thereby save us from the odium of being known as the most hypocritical and most bloodthirsty people on earth.

OBJECTIONS TO ANARCHISM.

By GEORGE BARRETT.

(Continued from last month.)

No. 11.

If two people want the same piece of land under Anarchism, how will you settle the dispute?

First of all, it is well to notice here that Questions 11, 12, and 13 all belong to the same class. No. 11, at least, is based upon a fallacy. If there are two persons who want the exclusive right to the same thing, it is quite obvious that there is no satisfactory solution to the problem. It does not matter in the least what system of society you suggest, you cannot possibly satisfy that position. It is exactly as if I were suggesting a new system of mathematics, and someone asked me: "Yes, but under this new system suppose you want to make ten go into one hundred eleven times?" The truth is that if you do a problem by arithmetic, or if you do it by algebra, or trigonometry, or by any other method, the same answer must be produced for the given problem; and just as you cannot make ten go into one hundred more than ten times, so you cannot make more than one person have the exclusive right to one thing. If two people want it, then at least one must remain in want, whatever may be the form of society in which they are living. Therefore, to begin with, we see that there cannot be a satisfactory way of settling this trouble, for the objection has been raised by simply supposing an unsatisfactory state of affairs.

All that we can say is that such disputes are very much better settled without the interference of authority. If the two were reasonable, they would probably mutually agree to allow their dispute to be settled by some mutual friend whose judgment they could trust. But if instead of taking this sane course they decide to set up a fixed authority, disaster will be the inevitable result. In the first place, this authority will have to be given power wherewith to enforce its judgment in such matters. What will then take place? The answer is quite simple. Feeling it is a superior force, it will naturally in each case take to itself the best of what is disputed, and allot the rest to its friends.

What a strange question is this. It supposes that two people who meet on terms of equality and disagree could not be reasonable or just. But, on the other hand, it supposes that a third party, starting with an unfair advantage, and backed up by violence, will be the incarnation of justice itself. Commonsense should certainly warn us against such a supposition, and if we are lacking in this commodity, then we may learn the lesson by turning to the facts of life. There we see everywhere Authority standing by, and in the name of justice and fair play using its organised violence in order to take the lion's share of the world's wealth for the governmental class.

We can only say, then, in answer to such a question, that if people are going to be quarrelsome and constantly disagree, then, of course, no state of society will suit them, for they are unsocial animals. If they are only occasionally so, then each case must stand on its merits and be settled by those concerned.

No. 12.

Suppose one district wants to construct a railway to pass through a neighbouring community, which opposes it. How would you settle this?

It is curious that this question is not only asked by those who support the present system, but it is also frequently put by the Socialists. Yet surely it implies at once the aggressive spirit of Capitalism, for is it not the capitalist who talks of opening up the various countries of the world, and does he not do this in the very first instance by having a war in order that he may run his railways through, in spite of the local opposition by the natives? Now, if you have a country in which there are various communes, it stands to reason that the people in those communes will want facilities for travelling, and for receiving and sending their goods. That will not be much more true of one little community than of another. This, then, not only implies a local railway, but a continuous railway running from one end of the country to the other. If a certain district, then, is going to object to have such a valuable asset given to it, it will surely be that there is some reason for such an objection. That being so, would it not be folly to have an authority to force that community to submit to the railway passing through?

If this reason does not exist, we are simply supposing a society of unreasonable people and asking how they should co-operate together. The truth is that they could not co-operate

together, and it is quite useless to look for any state of society which will suit such a people. The objection, therefore, need not be raised against Anarchism, but against society itself. What would a government society propose to do? Would it start a civil war over the matter? Would it build a prison large enough to enclose this community, and imprison all the people for resisting the law? In fact, what power has any authority to deal with the matter which the Anarchists have not got?

The question is childish. It is simply based on the supposition that people are unreasonable, and if such suppositions are allowed to pass as arguments, then any proposed state of society may be easily argued out of existence. I must repeat that many of these questions are of this type, and a reader with a due sense of logic will be able to see how worthless they are, and will not need to read the particular answers I have given to them.

No. 13.

Suppose your free people want to build a bridge across a river, but they disagree as to position. How will you settle it?

To begin with, it is obvious, but important, to notice that it is not *I*, but *they*, who would settle it. The way it would work out, I imagine, is something like this:—

We will call the two groups who differ A and B. Then—

- (1) A. may be of opinion that the B. scheme would be utterly useless to it, and that the only possible position for the bridge is where it has suggested. In which case it will say: "Help our scheme, or don't co-operate at all."
- (2) A. may be of opinion that the B. scheme is useless, but, recognising the value of B.'s help, it may be willing to budge a few yards, and so effect a compromise with B.
- (3) A., finding it can get no help from B. unless it gives way altogether, may do so, believing that the help thus obtained is worth more than the sacrifice of position.

These are, I think, the three courses open to A. The same three are open to B. I will leave it to the reader to combine the two, and I think he will find the result will be either—

- (1) That the bridge is built in the A. position, with, we will say, the half-hearted support of B.;
- or (2) The same thing, but with letters A. and B. reversed;
- or (3) The bridge is built somewhere between, with the partial support of both parties;
- or (4) Each party pursues its own course, independent of the other.

In any case it will be seen, I hope, that the final structure will be *representative*, and that, on the other hand, if one party was able to force the other to pay for what it did not want, the result would not be representative or just.

The usefulness of this somewhat dreary argument will be seen if it be applied not merely to bridge-building but to all the activities of life. By so doing we are able to imagine growing into existence a state of society where groups of people work together so far as they agree, and work separately when they do not. The institutions they construct will be in accord with their wishes and needs. It will indeed be representative. How different is this from the politician's view of things, who always wants to force the people to co-operate in running his idea of society!

No. 14.

What would you do with the criminal?

There is an important question which should come before this, but which our opponents never seem to care to ask. First of all, we have to decide who are the criminals, or rather, even before this, we have to come to an understanding as to who is to decide who are the criminals? To-day the rich man says to the poor man: "If we were not here as your guardians you would be beset by robbers who would take away from you all your possessions." But the rich man has all the wealth and luxury that the poor man has produced, and whilst he claims to have protected the people from robbery he has secured for himself the lion's share in the name of the law. Surely then it becomes a question for the poor man which he has occasion to dread most—the robber, who is very unlikely to take

anything from him, or the law, which allows the rich man to take all the best of that which is manufactured.

To the majority of people the criminals in society are not to be very much dreaded even to-day, for they are for the most part people who are at war with those who own the land and have captured all the means of life. In a free society, where no such ownership existed, and where all that is necessary could be obtained by all that have any need, the criminal will always tend to die out. To-day, under our present system, he is always tending to become more numerous.

No. 15.

It is necessary for every great town to have a drainage. Suppose someone refuses to connect up, what would you do with him?

This objection is another of the "supposition" class, all of which have really been answered in dealing with question No. 1. It is based on the unsocial man, whereas all systems of society must be organised for social people. The truth, of course, is that in a free society the experts on sanitation would get together and organise our drainage system, and the people who lived in the district would be only too glad to find these convenient arrangements made for them. But still it is possible to suppose that somebody will not agree to this; what then will you do with him? What do our Government friends suggest?

The only thing that they can do which in our Anarchist society we would not do, is to put him in prison, for we can use all the arguments to persuade him that they can. How much would the town gain by doing this? Here is a description of an up-to-date prison cell into which he might be thrown:

"I slept in one of the ordinary cells, which have sliding panes, leaving at the best two openings about six inches square. The windows are set in the wall high up, and are 3 by 1½ or 2 feet area. Added to this they are very dirty, so that the light in the cell is always dim. After the prisoner has been locked in the cell all night the air is unbearable, and its unhealthiness is increased by damp."

"The 'convenience' supplied in the cell is totally inadequate, and even if it be of a proper size and does not leak, the fact that it remains unemptied from evening till morning is, in case of illness especially, very insanitary and dangerous to health. 'Lavatory time' is permitted only at a fixed hour twice a day, only one water-closet being provided for twenty-three cells."*

Thus we see that whilst we are going to guarantee this man being cleanly by means of violence, we have no guarantee that the very violence itself which we use will not be filthy.

But there is another way of looking at this question. Mr. Charles Mayl, M.B. of New College, Oxford, after an outbreak of typhoid fever, was asked to examine the drainage of Windsor; he stated that:—

"In a previous visitation of typhoid fever the poorest and lowest parts of the town had entirely escaped, whilst the epidemic had been very fatal in good houses. The difference was that whilst the better houses were all connected with sewers, the poor part of the town had no drains, but made use of cesspools in the gardens. And this is by no means an isolated instance."

It would not be out of place to quote Herbert Spencer here:—

"One part of our Sanitary Administration having insisted upon a drainage system by which Oxford, Reading, Maidenhead, Windsor, etc., pollute the water which Londoners have to drink, another part of our Sanitary Administration makes loud protests against the impurity of water which he charges with causing diseases—not remarking, however, that law-enforced arrangements have produced the impurity."

We begin to see therefore that the man who objected to connecting his house with the drains would probably be a man who is interested in the subject, and who knows something about sanitation. It would be of the utmost importance that he should be listened to and his objections removed, instead of shutting him up in an unhealthy prison. The fact is, the rebel is here just as important as he is in other matters, and he can only profitably be eliminated by giving him satisfaction, not by trying to crush him out.

As the man of the drains has only been taken as an example by our objector, it would be interesting here to quote a similar case where the regulations for stamping out cattle diseases were objected to by someone who was importing cattle. In a letter to the *Times*, signed "Landowner," dated 2nd August, 1872, the writer tells how he bought "ten fine young steers, perfectly free from any symptom of disease, and passed sound by the inspector of foreign stock." Soon after their arrival in England they were attacked by foot and mouth

disease. On inquiry he found that foreign stock, however healthy, "mostly all go down with it after the passage." The Government regulations for stamping out this disease were that the stock should be driven from the steamer into the pens for a limited number of hours. There seems therefore very little doubt that it was in this quarantine that the healthy animals contracted the disease and spread it among the English cattle.* "Every new drove of cattle is kept for hours in an infected pen. Unless the successive droves have been all healthy (which the very institution of the quarantine implies that they have not been) some of them have left in the pen disease matter from their mouths and feet. Even if disinfectants are used after each occupation, the risk is great—the disinfectant is almost certain to be inadequate. Nay, even if the pen is adequately disinfected every time, yet if there is not also a complete disinfection of the landing appliances, the landing-stage and the track to the pen, the disease will be communicated. . . . The quarantine regulations . . . might properly be called 'regulations for the better diffusion of cattle diseases.'" Would our objector to Anarchism suggest that the man who refuses to put his cattle in these pens should be sent to prison?

(To be continued next month.)

A BRIEF ANALYSIS.

Perhaps Mrs. Cole has not reflected that Anarchism was born out of the experiences of the French Revolution, thereby inheriting a structure from which it cannot separate itself and live. Structure cannot be shaken off at will. Were it possible—perish the thought!—for Mrs. Cole to transform herself into a man, she would no longer be a woman. Were Anarchism to become a political party, formed for the capture of power and the consequent exercise of authority, it would cease to be Anarchism.

At the time of the French Revolution it was observed that the attempt of the Jacobins to dictate the special form society should take had resulted in the Reign of Terror, militarism, conscription, and Napoleon I., the God of War. As the result of that observation Anarchism came into being as a definite movement, and its first great exponent was Godwin, selected by Eltzbacher as one of the seven most representative Anarchist teachers. Godwin taught exactly what Anarchism still teaches, and must continue to teach if it intends to survive. On the other hand, Lenin still teaches exactly what Jacobinism—now known as State Socialism, or State Communism—taught; and Mrs. Cole will have noted that I quoted Lenin himself to that effect.

There came another great revolutionary movement, that of 1848; and again Jacobinism, by that time rechristened State Socialism, broke down most hopelessly. Instantly Anarchism reasserted itself more vigorously than ever, with Proudhon as its spokesman. He dissected the upheaval of his day precisely as Godwin had dissected that of 1789 to 1783, and with exactly the same result.

Next came the Paris Commune of 1871, and again the experiment of dictatorship failed most tragically; the orders issued by the General Council of the International Working Men's Association, sitting in London, with Marx and Engels as its dominant spirits, leading to a terrible fiasco. This brought Bakunin to the fore, and started that great rebellion against State Socialism which, in the main and to this day, has been the strength of modern Anarchism. Again the cause was the same. Again the diagnosis was identical; and the later writers cited by Eltzbacher—namely, Kropotkin, Tolstoy, Stirner, and Tucker—merely applied to the conditions of their day the tests used by Godwin, Proudhon, and Bakunin, and reached the same conclusions.

Let me suggest that it is not seemly to denounce, as "uncalled for attacks," criticisms devoted to an explanation of the difference between two philosophies now struggling for supremacy, with the certainty that by one or the other civilisation will be guided in making those profound readjustments now clearly imminent. To explain that difference is, in fact, the paramount duty of the hour; for in proportion as the explanations on either side are clear and honest will be the capacity of the masses to form correct decisions. It pains me to say that Mrs. Cole is not doing her share of that great duty by garbling what I wrote.

I did not write merely, "Lenin sits in the Kremlin," thereby affording Mrs. Cole the opportunity of asking, "Why shouldn't he?" and declaring that "he gains no better food or privileges than the man in the street." On the contrary, I was careful to add: "Quite naturally—for Lenin is a Robespierre and those who have suffered at his hands are many—he sits in the Kremlin, guarded by soldiers and inaccessible." That was evidently the point of the whole paragraph. Similarly, I did not blame Trotsky for attending the opera. What I called attention to was "Bertrand Russell's pen-picture of Trotsky at the Opera House—the picture of the Man on Horseback, posing as Napoleon would have posed." The tearing of a few words from their context seems to me always the form of misquotation most indefensible.

WM. C. OWEN.

* The typhoid and the cattle disease cases are both quoted in the notes to Herbert Spencer's "The Study of Sociology."

* "Women and Prisons," Fabian Tract No. 16.

FREEDOM.

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

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

Indemnities Britons Pay.

The huge indemnities demanded from Germany, as reparation for damages caused by the war, are so exorbitant and so absurd that they have caused a great outburst of indignation from all those who have any sense of justice or humanity, as the payment of these huge sums for forty-two years would mean reducing the German workers to the level of bond slaves.

We join in this outburst of indignation, but we wish to point out that some of this indignation might be spent on the indemnities which the people of this country have to pay to the financiers at home. During the war, owing to the numerous war loans, the National Debt mounted up year by year, until at the present time the total is about £8,000,000,000 (eight thousand million pounds). The interest to be paid on this for the current year is no less than £345,000,000, without reckoning the cost of collection and administration. This amount will have to be paid by the people of this country year in and year out, and they will still owe the original £8,000,000,000 to the financiers who graciously lent it at a high rate of interest whilst the manhood of the Empire was shedding its blood on the battlefields of Europe and Asia.

Since the Napoleonic wars, when the National Debt first grew to any magnitude, interest has been paid on loans then incurred, loans which a Chancellor of the Exchequer once said only brought about half of their face value into the public treasury. But still the interest is being paid to the financial parasites who have inherited the bonds from those who drove hard bargains with their fellow-countrymen in their time of necessity over a hundred years ago. And now we have begun to pay interest on our greatly swollen National Debt, which is an indemnity wrung from the people of this country when they were at grips with a foreign foe. We know, of course, that this war was forced on us by our ruling class to protect their own interests, but the bill has to be paid by all those who work, for each pound of interest represents a pound's worth of wealth produced by working men and women. All the fine houses and jewels and clothing, all the expensive food and motor-cars and other luxuries of the money lords, are produced by the workers and handed over to these parasites, in payment for the loans advanced during the war. And the holders of war-loan stock and their descendants will exact this tribute as long as the people are foolish enough to pay it. The German indemnity is to come to an end after forty-two years, but our National Debt runs for all time. We know that a lot of it is to be "redeemed" sooner or later, but the holders will be given lump sums which will be banked and interest will be drawn in other ways.

This, however, is only one of the many ways in which these parasites suck the life-blood of the nation. Rent of land takes an enormous amount out of our pockets every year, but the profits on capital are simply gigantic. The number of new companies registered from July, 1919, to June, 1920, was 11,829, with a capital of over £700,000,000. This is simply for twelve months, and is a mere flea-bite compared to the capital of the companies formed during the past century or more, which draw huge profits every year, profits which enable their owners to live in luxury whilst the producers have a hard struggle to keep themselves and their families in the necessaries of life. It was to protect these profits that mere boys were torn from their homes and sent to France and Flanders, where many were blown to pieces, whilst the survivors returned home to join in the melancholy unemployed processions which are now parading our great cities, shaking collecting-boxes for the pence of the passers-by.

To show how well the profits were protected we will give a

few more figures. During the past year 244 rich people died leaving fortunes varying between £100,000 and £500,000, twenty left fortunes of between £500,000 and £1,000,000, whilst ten fortunes which these rich people had to leave behind them ranged from £1,000,000 to £2,146,000, four of these millionaires being drapers or manufacturers of clothing, and two others merchants dealing in the raw or manufactured articles of those trades.

We have quoted all these figures to give some idea of the huge "indemnity" which is squeezed out of the workers of this country every year. The excuse given for demanding an indemnity from Germany is that it is to repair the damage wrought by her during the war. But what excuse can be advanced for the indemnity wrung from the people of the British Isles? The wealthy class have carried on their exploitation so long that they do not think any excuse necessary, and the people pay up so willingly that they seem to think it a normal condition of things. But the war has set many people thinking and they are beginning to question many things which previously they took for granted. During the war, when conscription was enforced, we heard much about "equality of sacrifice." Now one hears on every side an ever-growing demand for equality of wealth and equality of opportunity. The wealthy classes are finding out that their system of robbery is not built on a rock but on sand which may shift at any moment and sweep it all away. That they recognise this danger is shown by the activity of their propaganda societies, which are busy preaching the identity of interests of Capital and Labour. Now is the time for all of us to spread Anarchist ideas everywhere and to prove to the workers that there can be no identity of interests between robbers and robbed, that the rich give nothing in return for all the good things they consume, and that only by keeping for themselves the wealth they produce can the workers hope to get rid of the idle class which oppresses and robs them. Capitalism is crumbling. Anarchists should use all their energies now in preparing the foundation for a nobler and more humane system of society.

KROPOTKIN'S DEATH AND FUNERAL.

The following telegram from Moscow was delayed in transmission and reached us too late for insertion in last month's issue:—

Daily Herald, for *Freedom* and *Workers' Friend*, London.

Peter Kropotkin passed away peacefully at ten minutes past three on Tuesday morning, February 8th, after three weeks' illness with inflammation of the lungs. Death was due to heart failure. He retained full consciousness, brightness, and humour almost to the very end. The United Anarchist organisations of Russia have taken charge of all arrangements, and are planning opening Kropotkin Museum. Funeral will take place Sunday, 13th February. Please notify Anarchist and Syndicalist papers.—ANARCHIST ORGANISATIONS, *Golos Truda*, Moscow.

The following telegraphic report of Kropotkin's funeral was sent to the Russian Trade Delegation, and kindly passed on to us by Mr. W. N. Ewer, the Foreign Editor of the *Daily Herald*:—

Moscow, February 13th.—To-day's funeral of Peter Kropotkin, arranged by the united Anarchist organisations of Russia, was a very touching and inspiring procession, never to be forgotten. It was undoubtedly the most unique demonstration ever witnessed in any country. Long lines of Anarchist organisations, Labour bodies, scientific and literary societies, and student bodies marched for over two hours from Unions House, where Kropotkin's body had laid in state for three days, to the burial place seven versts away. The removal of the remains was accompanied by the requiem, "Eternal Memory," beautifully rendered by 200 voices of the celebrated Grand Opera chorus. At the head of the procession marched endless rows of students and children carrying wreaths presented by all the Anarchist bodies and almost every Labour, Socialist, and scientific organisation. A bright winter sun shone upon hundreds of Anarchist banners of deep black, interspersed by flashes of scarlet. Red flags of Anarchist organisations closed the mile-long procession. The militia of Red Army soldiers was neither seen nor needed during the many hours of the huge procession. Perfect order was kept by the multitude itself spontaneously forming itself in several rows, while students and workers organised a live chain on both sides of the procession. The inscriptions on the black and scarlet flags and banners spoke most eloquently of great love and admiration for the great Anarchist, Kropotkin, teacher of individual liberty without government, and social well-being within Free Communism.

Numerous speakers paid their last tribute to Kropotkin the scientist, revolutionist, Anarchist, and lover of mankind. Six of these

were Anarchists, others representing Maximalist, Left Social Revolutionist, Social Revolutionist, Menshivist, and Bolshevik parties and the Third International. Foreign countries were represented by the French Syndicalist, Rosmer; by Emma Goldman, for the Anarchists of America, who also on this occasion spoke on behalf of the Swedish, Norwegian, and Danish Anarcho-Syndicalists; and by others. The sun was sinking behind the horizon when this unique funeral of the great Anarchist Communist was over, and the huge concourse of people started on its way back to the city to the strains of Anarchist songs.—FUNERAL COMMITTEE OF ANARCHIST ORGANISATIONS.

The *Manchester Guardian* report states that Kropotkin was buried in the cemetery near the river, opposite the Sparrow Hills. It also states that two of the Anarchist banners carried the inscriptions, "Anarchists demand liberation from the prison of Socialism" and "Where there is authority there is no freedom."

KROPOTKIN MEMORIAL MEETING.

A very successful meeting in memory of Peter Kropotkin was held at the South Place Institute, Finsbury, on March 2. The hall was full, comrades coming from all parts of London to pay their last respects. The speakers were W. Ponder, H. W. Nevinson, J. Tochatti, Wm. C. Owen, and F. Tyler. All bore eloquent testimony to his work as an Anarchist and as one who had given himself to the cause of the oppressed of all lands. H. W. Nevinson and J. Tochatti gave personal reminiscences of Kropotkin, and Wm. C. Owen drove home the lesson of his teachings, that the State could never emancipate us from the evils of monopoly and special privilege, but that it must be swept away before we could gain our freedom.

There was a very good sale of the Kropotkin number of *FREEDOM* and also of Kropotkin's books and pamphlets.

The best tribute we can pay to the memory of our comrade is to carry on his great work and spread Anarchist ideas broadcast among the masses, and thus help to realise the society of free men and women of which he dreamed.

"FREE SOCIETY" PUBLISHED SECRETLY.

The persecution of Anarchist propagandists in the United States has forced our comrades to publish literature secretly. For eighteen months up to last December they had issued a paper called the *Anarchist Soviet Bulletin*, but the title has now been changed to *Free Society*. In explanation, the editors say that they supported the Soviets when they first sprang into existence in Russia, because they really represented the people's desire for freedom; but under the Dictatorship their character has changed and now they are simply tools of the Communist Party, which rules Russia. Therefore, to continue to use the word "Soviet" in the title of the paper would make it appear that they supported the present Government in Russia—which they do not. Hence the change to a name more in accord with their Anarchist ideas.

January and February issues of *Free Society* have reached us, and they contain plenty of good propaganda. The paper is "issued by the Anarchist Groups of United States and Canada," and distributed free. As it is published secretly, no address or imprint appears on the paper; but comrades can send their subscriptions to *FREEDOM*, and we will forward them to the proper quarter. The difficulties in the publication of such a paper are very great and need much courage to surmount them. We therefore hope that comrades will give it all the financial support they can. Subscriptions will be acknowledged in *Free Society* in any name desired.

WANTED—£100!

The tremendous amount of unemployment is probably responsible for the fact that our appeal has not brought in the amount for which we asked. We have therefore decided to close the appeal, but we would ask comrades to continue their support of the *FREEDOM* Guarantee Fund, and all future donations will be acknowledged under that heading. Our financial difficulties are as great as ever, and we trust that all who can possibly help will do so. The following amounts have been contributed since our last issue:—

Previously acknowledged, £48 10s. 2d. T. Y. M. 10s., F. Goulding 1s., G. Wheatley 2s. 6d., R. Peddie 2s., H. W. 1s., A. M. 1s., M. Tiboldo 10s., W. A. Smith 6d., Anon. 17s. 6d., A. B. Howie 4s., E. Travaglio 16s. 8d., A. Snellenberg 11s., C. E. Miller 3s., P. Hertford 7s. 6d., E. W. L. 1s., W. C. O. 10s., L. G. W. £1. Total, £54 8s. 10d.

We still have some copies of last month's Kropotkin Memorial number on hand; price, 3d. post-free.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

Spain.

We are receiving hardly any Spanish papers, for those that dare to utter a revolutionary thought are almost invariably suppressed. This has been, for example, the fate of *Solidaridad Obrera* and *Tierra y Libertad*, both of Barcelona, and of *Solidaridad Obrera*, of Valencia. Syndicalist papers, such as *El Socialista* and *Espana Nueva*, are subjected to constant persecution. General conditions, as set out in *Le Libertaire*, of Paris, seem incredible, it being stated that within six months more than fifty thousand workers have been imprisoned in Barcelona alone. Vessels lying in the harbour, hospitals and other buildings have been utilised as gaols. All Syndicalist headquarters have been shut down, and the National Confederation of Labour declared an illegal body. Even so conservative a paper as *La Tribuna*, of Madrid, has denounced the murders and outrages committed by the "black bands" the Government employs in its crusade of extirpation. Trial by jury has been suppressed, and special tribunals appointed for the examination of those accused of "social crimes." In a word, Spanish history is repeating itself, and the country of the Inquisition is running true to type.

France.

The Correctional Tribunal of the Seine has declared the General Confederation of Labour (C.G.T.) an illegal body, ordered its dissolution, and fined each of its directors 100 francs, declaring that, by going into politics and attempting the reorganisation of the railways, it has violated its constitution. Of course, the Confederation, an old-established and essentially conservative Trade Union body, will continue its work, doubtless under another name. Equally of course it has published a most indignant protest, in which it declares that the Government would never have taken action so high-handed had not the organisation been weakened by internal dissensions. In short, Labour here, as everywhere, finds itself in the old dilemma. Without ideas it is a rope of sand, and with the introduction of ideas the artificial combinations it has formed so laboriously fall to pieces. At present the French Socialists, and even some of the Anarchists, seem to be hopelessly at loggerheads over Bolshevism and the Third International. A recent leading article in *Le Libertaire* is a bitter indictment of the Lenin régime, which it denounces as "infinitely more dangerous than Parliamentary demagoguery," though having the same end in view—the domination of the collectivity by a special group. At a largely attended Anarchist conference Sebastian Faure spoke of "the régime of terror under which the Russian workers and peasants are living, under the heel of a militarism more widely spread than ever, and of an officialdom which is becoming more highly developed and triumphant." The Anarchist revolutionary propaganda, he said, has no place for dictatorship. If the attacks of the Allies made a dictatorship inevitable at first, it should now be ceasing. From this one might infer that Faure does not understand the essential inwardness of State Socialism and the Imperialism to which, by the logic of its centralising philosophy, it is inextricably bound. One feels sure, however, that he understands it very thoroughly.

With the increasing severity of the economic crisis the tone of the revolutionary press grows correspondingly more bitter. In *Germinal* a leading article by Georges Bastien is headed "The C.G.T. Amuses Itself." The leaders of that body, having been fined 100 francs, as stated above, find themselves able to pose as martyrs, and they have been making a triumphal tour, in the course of which they have been feted unstintingly by local politicians. The article concludes with this reflection:—"The centralisation of the Syndicalist movement in the hands of a few parasitical officials has produced the only results to be expected from an authoritarian and centralised system. It has killed all initiative, all energy. It has created a new bourgeois class which is automatically on the road to joining its brother bourgeois." In the number immediately preceding the same writer opposes vigorously the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, defended, as it invariably is, on the plea that the masses are too weak and stupid to govern themselves. This, he rightly says, is the plea of all dictatorships, the one thing on which they agree being distrust of the people. Like other French Anarchist papers, *Germinal* is uncompromising in its opposition to the Russian dictatorship.

China.

The first issue (December, 1920) of a new monthly, *La Libereco*, in Chinese and Esperanto, has come to hand. It contains a brief account of activities in China, showing that Anarchist ideas are spreading there as well as in more "progressive" countries. The following items of news are culled from the Esperanto portion of the paper.

In Peking some University students were arrested for distributing in the streets copies of a newspaper in which a translation of Kropotkin's "Memoirs" was appearing.

At Peking, Shanghai, and Canton men and women comrades rode through the streets in motors, and scattered broadcast a strongly-worded Anarchist leaflet. One arrest was made, followed by release.

Two comrades, teachers at the Chinese Boarding School at Yokohama spoke to their pupils about Anarchism, making several converts among the elder students. After being warned by the school authorities

to desist, they increased their propaganda efforts, with the result that they were dismissed.

The editor of *La Libereco* desires to exchange with Anarchist and Esperanto papers, and asks sympathisers to send greetings; he would also be glad to receive books, articles, and news items. He writes: "Help our propaganda; demonstrate that our Esperanto is not the language merely of stamp-collectors and idlers, but also of internationalists."

Correspondence to Mr. Pekon, Oriental Hotel, Nankin Road, Shanghai, China.

Our Articles on Bolshevism in Practice.

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

DEAR EDITOR,—Thank you for your fairness in inserting my letter, especially considering the withdrawal of subscription. I, too, "regret the differences," and recognise the good fight put up by FREEDOM for freedom in the past.

Regarding my attitude towards conscription, it is *war* I am against, and, being a Communist, if I submitted to the idea that war was right, I would submit to conscription as the only fair means of sharing the necessary dangers and sufferings involved. As to compulsory labour, Nature sees to that. Even on an island where every man was a law unto himself (an Anarchist), freedom would be a relative term, as Nature would inexorably conscript and force him to obtain his own food or die. I shall not in the least mind being forced to spend an hour or two producing food (or work equivalent) providing everybody else does the same and that the food is shared equally. I do not call this conscription but a voluntary acknowledgment of public duty. I shall continue to fight military conscription wherever I am, but I have no place for inactive pacifists who take away armaments and will not support the workers in their use of other weapons such as the strike or non-co-operation in order to control their own industries.

The whole tone of the criticism in FREEDOM of the Russian situation is as if Communists had had every chance to initiate ideal Anarchist conditions. As a matter of fact, they have encountered a more tremendous opposition than any revolution in the history of the world has ever experienced. As yet they are the only people who have overthrown Capitalism, and in no such country has such progress to Socialism been made. It ill becomes those who have done nothing to carp and cavil. The least they can do if they cannot help is to remain silent till Russia is in such a position that the application of stringent criticism is fair and allowable. Even if our editor is unrepentant, I hope this matter will be looked upon in a broader light. I have pleasure in enclosing 5s. for this year's subscription.—Yours truly,

CLARA GILBERT COLE.

[Mrs. Cole seems to think it surprising that we should have published her letter last month, but it is always our policy to invite discussion, as in that way we reach the truth, even if we get a few hard knocks in the process. Her analogy between the compulsion of Nature and the compulsion of a Dictatorship cannot have been put forward seriously. Anarchists are sensible people, and recognise that he who will not work neither shall he eat; but, as a matter of fact, as we pointed out last month, compulsion is used in Russia against men who want to work on the land, where they can get more food, for which purpose they desert from the factories, and have to be brought back by force to the towns, where food is very scarce. That is the compulsion to which we object. Mrs. Cole says we should not criticise Bolshevism now. But she is very unfair, for week in and week out the Communist press of the world is lauding it to the skies as a system which the workers of every country should take as their example. We would certainly fight against it being imposed on this country, and therefore we shall persist in our criticisms. Even in Russia criticism is beginning in the Communist Party. Lenin admits that "new means must be applied and tried," and that "the struggle against bureaucratism is essential, and we shall do everything we can to help the workers and to crush the bureaucratic idea." But bureaucratism is inherent in State Socialism, and as long as the Dictatorship lasts the the bureaucracy will flourish like mildew in a damp cellar.—ED. FREEDOM.]

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

FELLOW-WORKER,—Whilst not taking the extreme step of Mrs. Cole in refusing to subscribe to FREEDOM (which, by the way, I have been doing since 1903, with but few breaks through being in inaccessible parts of the globe, such as South Sea Islands, etc.), one cannot but agree with most of her contentions. You admit in your articles that the complete economic freedom of the subject, or, rather, individual, is a necessary and even vital condition of the fullest freedom and liberty in all things. Under Bolshevism as we see it in practice there is not that freedom, so you say. Admitted. But let us for a moment face the realities as they have existed in Russia. First we will assume that immediately, as a result of the November, 1917, Revolution, Anarchist federations of agricultural and industrial workers arose, with all that that would imply. Would they, do you imagine for a moment, have

been allowed to go on and develop in peace? Russia is a country rich in natural wealth, and the vultures of International Capitalism had intended that it should be devoured when the world war ended, Tsardom having been modified or "reformed" to enable this to be done. This being the case, how long would it have been before the Anarchist federations would have fallen easy victims, seeing that their means of organising resistance would have been practically *nil*?

"W. C. O." (who, by the way, may remember my meeting him in Los Angeles in 1911) may really believe that the Entente capitalist Governments had no desire to attack the workers and peasants in 1917, but I do not, for the reason stated; and, to repeat Mrs. Cole's question in another form, what earthly alternative did they in Russia have except the course they pursued?

Regarding the statement in your footnote, that you were simply combatting the fairy tales of the Moscow-subsidised Communist press, allow me to state that they are not exactly quite what you describe them. Two days ago the writer had the privilege of hearing a lecture by H. N. Brailsford on his last visit to Russia (September, 1920), and heard him describe what he saw in the typical Russian agricultural town of Vladimir, many hundreds of miles from Moscow; and his recital proved that there was certainly little if any Bolshevik tyranny in existence there, and that, as far as he could see, Communism of the Anarchist type was in vogue. The tyranny of conscription as it applied there worked out in this fashion. When two emissaries of Moscow came to appeal for volunteers for the Polish front, because the Revolution was in danger, they had two hundred ready to start within two hours without any coercion whatever—and H. N. Brailsford is not a Communist and is as free in his criticism of what he regards as the shortcomings of the Bolsheviks as H. G. Wells himself.

But to return to my point, that full and unrestricted liberty and freedom for the individual presupposes full economic freedom. How much of the former are you or anyone else going to enjoy without fighting for the latter? And that is what they in Russia have done in the only effectual way, by scientific organisation. Emma Goldman, when asked on her return to Russia what her attitude to the Bolshevik Government was going to be, said that as long as outside Capitalism and inside counter-revolutionaries were attacking it was having her undivided support, and in that attitude she would have been supported by nineteen out of twenty followers of Michael Bakunin. Hoping that you will find space to publish this as it stands, Yours for the Cause,
Neath.
SAM MAINWARING.

[We never imagined that Anarchists would be allowed to develop a new society without fighting, and hard fighting, too, for a time; but our objection is to the fact that whilst the workers in Russia are compelled to do the fighting the Communist Party alone dictates the policy. Why does our critic try to prove that there is no military tyranny in Russia? Even the Bolsheviks admit it and plead necessity. Mr. Brailsford's account of what he saw at Vladimir proves that the workers will fight voluntarily to defend the Revolution when the situation is explained to them, and that the compulsion used is simply evidence of the working of the military mind of the State Socialist, who believes in discipline for discipline's sake, as do all military men. To insinuate that Bakunin would have supported the Dictatorship is to distort the whole spirit of his teachings. In a letter written in 1868 he quotes approvingly Proudhon's remark that "the most disastrous combination that could be formed would be that which united Socialism with Absolutism—the tendencies of the people towards economic emancipation and material well-being with the dictatorship and the concentration of all the political and social powers of the State." And Bakunin continues: "There can be nothing vital and human without liberty; and a Socialism which discards it from its bosom, or which does not accept it as a principle and as a base, will lead us straight to slavery and bestiality."—ED. FREEDOM.]

CASH RECEIVED (not otherwise acknowledged).

(February 14 to March 8.)

"FREEDOM" SUBSCRIPTIONS.—G. Marin, M. C. Houghton, M. Turner, W. Drury, T. Chaotsin, G. Wheatley, E. H. Olds, G. C. Cole, M.L.I.-B., E. Travaglio, A. Snellenberg, M. E. Fitzgerald, W. M. Fischer, J. Macario, G. A. Taylor, G. G. Reeve, C. Y. Chi, C. Crook, H. Dickens.

NOTICES.

INTERNATIONAL MODERN SCHOOL.—Garment Workers' Hall, 54A Bedford Street, Commercial Road, E.1. Opened March 6 under the auspices of the Educational Group. Comrades and sympathisers are asked to send their children every Sunday from 2 to 6 p.m. Teachers willing to assist should write to HETTY LEWIS, Sec., 43 Frederick Place, Burdett Road, E.1.

EAST LONDON.—An Anarchist Group is being formed in East London. Comrades wishing to co-operate are requested to write to E. L. A. G., care of Freedom Press, 127 Ossulston Street, N.W.1.

LONDON.—FREEDOM can be obtained from our comrade ESTHER ARCHER, Secondhand Bookshop, 68 Red Lion Street, Holborn, W.C.1.

CARDIFF.—Our comrade A. BANKS, 1 Carmarthen Street, Market Road, Canton, Cardiff, stocks FREEDOM and all Anarchist publications, and is willing to supply groups and branches with advanced literature of all kinds. Comrades calling will be welcomed.

LEEDS.—G. FROST, 31 Windsor Street, York Road, stocks FREEDOM and all other Anarchist publications, and would be pleased to see comrades.

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

Push the sale of "Freedom."