

Freedom

VOL. XXXVI.—No. 397.

JULY, 1922.

MONTHLY: TWO PENCE.

NOTES.

The Battle of Dublin.

The civil war between Free Staters and Republicans which has been threatening for some time broke out on June 28 with the bombardment of the Four Courts in Dublin, where the Republicans had established their headquarters. After a week's fighting the Free Staters have gained the upper hand in Dublin, but the fighting in the country may last some time, as the Republicans will probably adopt guerrilla tactics. One noticeable feature of the struggle is the small number of casualties. We read of a long and intense bombardment being replied to by a hail of bullets; after a time the garrison of the "fort" hoists the white flag and surrenders, and the report says: "At the most 15 men were taken prisoners; some were mere boys." Very few have been killed on either side, and it almost looks as though the Republican leaders had just put up a stage fight to save their face. The results of the elections must have proved to De Valera and his friends that their countrymen are sick and tired of the long-drawn-out wrangle over the Treaty and want to get back to work. The destruction of the Four Courts and the greater part of Sackville Street should provide plenty of work for the unemployed, whilst the destruction of so many important legal documents will keep the lawyers busy for many years. The points of difference on the working of the Treaty had been narrowed down so close that they were hardly worth fighting about. We think the success of the Labour Party at the polls will bring Free Staters and Republicans together, for, however much they may differ on political questions, they will act solidly together when the workers demand a fuller life and a bigger share of the wealth they produce.

The Labour Party Conference.

The Conference at Edinburgh was mainly engaged in window-dressing for the General Election which cannot be very far off. The refusal of affiliation to the Communist Party was a foregone conclusion, for it would be useless for Labour candidates to ask respectable middle-class voters for their support whilst the Communists were officially connected with the Party. Besides, the Communists had never shown sufficient strength in any constituency to oust a Labour man, so they can be ignored. When they unseat a few Labour M.P.s, the Labour Party will be ready to bargain with them and buy their votes. Why the Communists should want to join such a crowd as the Labour Party we cannot understand. Of course, there may be a few plums to pick up; but we should think any real live Communist would be bored to death by a meeting of the Executive with Sidney Webb in the chair and Henderson holding forth in his best Sunday afternoon style. The Conference shirked a decision on the question of reducing the interest on War loans. During the War nearly two million people invested their money in Government loans for the first time, and there are countless thousands of workers and of the lower middle class holding saving certificates who would immediately turn down any candidate who suggested a reduction of interest on their holdings. Someone was put up to refer the matter back to the Executive for further consideration. This was agreed to and a discussion avoided on a very delicate question. They were "willing to wound, and yet afraid to strike." The two million unemployed and partly employed workers will have gained little hope from the deliberations of the Conference; in fact, J. H. Thomas has told them that a Labour Government will not be able to solve the unemployed problem. If they cannot even find work and bread for the workers, we wonder why the workers take the trouble to vote for them. That is the very least they might expect from a Labour Government. Even ancient Rome provided bread and circuses for the mob.

Dictators Out of Work.

The "new economic policy" of the Bolshevik Government is having a disastrous effect on the workers, the men who, according to the Communists, dictate the policy of their Government. In *Russian Information and Review* (June 1), issued by the Russian Trade Delegation, an article on unemployment in Moscow states that in April last 19,401 persons were registered as unemployed, an increase of 4,400 since January. Last October there were 13,566. This latter item is very interesting, as it proves how little value can be attached to the statements of those enthusiastic visitors to Russia who have an official standing in the Communist International. Tom Mann attended the Congress of the Red Trade Union International in Moscow last year, and made the usual round of official sight-seeing. On his return to England he published a little booklet giving his impressions, "Russia in 1921," with the usual rosy tints peculiar to all Communist visitors. On page 23 he says:—

"I am writing this on 4th October, at the office of the British Bureau of the Red International, a few doors from the Strand, London. For twenty minutes past a procession of London's unemployed has been passing in marching order. . . . Naturally my mind turns to Russia. There no man is or ever need be unemployed. . . . In this vital matter Russia is a beacon light to all the world. No unemployed, work for all."

At that very moment, according to the Russian Government's own figures, there were 13,566 unemployed in Moscow alone! Even the "dictators" who are working are not in a very enviable position, as, owing to the rise in prices, wages were worth only one-third as compared with the previous November. Of course, the statement that the workers constitute a "Proletarian Dictatorship" is a pretty little fiction served up for the consumption of such innocents as Tom Mann.

Labour's Step by Step.

"British Labour believed that Socialism would proceed step by step from one industry to another, and, in general, would exclude expropriation of private property without compensation." Thus spoke Arthur Henderson, M.P., to the delegates of the Second International who met in London last month. Of course, with Fabians so much in evidence in the counsels of the Labour Party, expropriation would be out of the question. But Henderson's statement opens up a pretty prospect for the country when the Labour Party get control. They will "nationalise" the railways and the mines and other large undertakings, and issue Government bonds to their full market value to the many thousands of shareholders, guaranteeing them the normal rate of dividends. The lucky shareholders will then retire to their country seats and suburban villas, knowing that regularly every quarter-day the cheque will arrive without fail. The Government will save them from all the worries attached to wage questions and the ups and downs of their shares on the Stock Exchange. In return, the grateful shareholders will vote for the continuance of Labour Governments, and train their sons and daughters for the many new posts in the Civil Service which the policy of nationalisation will entail. It is an idyllic picture—for the shareholder. But there is always a thorn in the rosebush. The railway workers and miners and other wealth producers are already opening their eyes—it is about time they did—and asking why they should do all the work and get little pay whilst the idle shareholders get all the cream. Even Labour Members cannot fool the workers for ever, and in the not far distant future the demand for expropriation without compensation will become so strong that the Hendersons and the Webbs will be swept aside and the people take possession of the land and all the means of wealth production, the only compensation for the legal holders being the right to an equal opportunity to use it with the rest of the community. The privileged parasites must be shaken off the tree of life.

A MARXIAN FALLACY.

In *Forward* (Glasgow) of May 20 there is an article by "A. P. L." on the Bolsheviks and Georgians, in which the writer deals with an article on the same subject in a previous issue by our comrade W. Tcherkesoff. In order to discredit Tcherkesoff, "A. P. L." tries to pour ridicule on Tcherkesoff's pamphlet, "Concentration of Capital: a Marxian Fallacy" (published by Freedom Press). "A. P. L." says, "I know little of Marx," and then goes on to prove his self-asserted ignorance, for he says that it is obvious to him that "the growing amalgamation of Capitalist forces is a fact; this concentrated control under fewer hands is on the increase all around us." Now, Marx never foretold the amalgamation of capitalist forces. He prophesied the very opposite of that, but in treating the subject in this way "A. P. L." has merely copied the trickery of so many Marxian writers. As this question is a very important one for the revolutionary movement, we will first explain the theory of Marx and then show how present-day facts and figures contradict the theory absolutely.

In Vol. I. of "Capital" (pp. 788-9, English edition) Marx says:

"Capitalist production begets, with the inexorability of a law of Nature, its own negation. It is the negation of negation. . . . This expropriation [of many capitalists by few] is accomplished by the action of the imminent laws of capitalist production itself, by the centralisation of capital. Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital, who usurp and monopolise all advantages of this process of transformation, grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation."

Here it is plain that Marx prophesies that there will be a constantly diminishing number of capitalists—(One capitalist kills many—*Ein Kapitalist schlagt viele tot*, says Marx). On the strength of this prophecy Social Democrats for many years taught that the only thing necessary for the Social Revolution was to organise the workers politically whilst the capitalists fought between themselves until only a mere handful would be left for the workers to expropriate. The present writer several times heard H. M. Hyndman say that in forming the great Trusts the capitalists were "doing our work," and many Socialist writers and speakers in this country propagated the same fallacy.

Fifty years have passed since Marx formulated his theory, and we might reasonably expect to see some signs of its working by this time. But when we look around do we find fewer rich men, fewer wealthy parasites, or do we not rather see many more? Without knowing anything of the statistics dealing with the growth of large incomes, any observant and intelligent person can see that the number of wealthy people living in fine mansions and riding in luxurious motor-cars is now greater than ever. Within twenty miles of London alone there has of recent years been an enormous increase in the number of large houses, with garages attached, which only men of wealth could maintain. But perhaps a few figures will help to prove our point.

According to the income tax returns, in the year 1906-7 there were 38,318 incomes from £500 to £1,000, and 29,821 from £1,000 to £5,000, whilst 9,259 had incomes of over £5,000 a year. In the House of Commons on May 16 the Chancellor of the Exchequer gave the following table showing the number of incomes exceeding £2,000 assessed to income tax up to March 31, 1922 (which he said was not complete):—

Range of Total Income.		Number of Individuals Assessed.
Exceeding.	Not exceeding.	
£2,000	£2,500	12,021
2,500	3,000	11,561
3,000	4,000	14,558
4,000	5,000	8,746
5,000	10,000	15,904
10,000	20,000	6,416
20,000	50,000	2,549
50,000	100,000	461
100,000	150,000	92

According to further figures quoted by Mr. J. Swan, M.P., since 1914 the number of persons with incomes exceeding £100,000 has increased from 80 to 126. And from the Chancellor's figures we see that the number of incomes exceeding £5,000 a year has increased from 9,259 in 1907 to 25,422 in 1922. No signs there of the capitalists killing one another.

In the United States the figures tell the same tale. In 1919, according to figures published by the Internal Revenue Bureau, there were 6,639 incomes of 90,000 dols. or over, of which 65 exceeded 1,000,000 dols. and five 5,000,000 dols. In the previous year only one (that of John D. Rockefeller, sen.) exceeded 5,000,000 dols. Yes, we think we can safely say that Tcherkesoff is right and Marx all wrong.

The great amalgamations taking place to-day are simply a recognition by capitalists that their interests are mutual. Lord Leverhulme has practically gained control of all the soap companies in this country, but not one shareholder was frozen out. Under the

Railway Act of 1921 the 121 separate railway companies in this country have been amalgamated in four group companies. This is expected to prove so beneficial to the many thousands of shareholders that the price of the shares has since increased enormously. All the economies effected in working under the new system will go into the pockets of the shareholders. Not one capitalist has been killed by this "concentration of capital."

To-day, owing to the great power of advertising, large fortunes are being made out of such insignificant things as toffee, chocolate, chewing gum, corsets, patent medicines, flea powder, and other modern luxuries unknown to Karl Marx.

The fact is that the inventive genius of man has brought into existence machinery which produces wealth in such profusion that unless the workers could keep it in their own hands a great increase in the number of wealthy people was inevitable. As the workers have no control over the wealth they produce, the number of those financially interested in the present system increases year by year, and this tendency will continue until we put an end to exploitation and monopoly and build a more humane and saner society.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

Italy.

Here the situation evidently goes from bad to worse. In a powerfully comprehensive review of world conditions *Il Risveglio* (Geneva) says: "Throughout Italy misery increases, daily the crisis makes itself felt more cruelly, and the now-starving, who fought for the glory of their country, cannot get even a passport to leave it unless some foreign employer has certified that he has bought the unhappy emigrant's labour-power. Meanwhile the Fascisti have taken in hand the task of reconstruction by burning down Labour's meeting places and the dwellings of such workingmen as are too rebellious to bend the knee to the employer or to show respect to the misgoverning Government and its laws, which send the honest workers to the galleys while acquitting and protecting Mussolini's brigands. Thus the Monarchy, allied to criminal Fascism and with its royal guards, carabinieri, spies, pimps, receivers, thieves, etc., is dragging the country back to medieval barbarism." The review goes on to say that in Switzerland things are little better. If, on the one hand, they have no Fascisti, on the other hand they are crushed by Draconian legislation against the rebel, and by immigration restrictions. Political refugees are extradited remorselessly and without the slightest ceremony. "In Austria and Germany one sees men and women, who are not beggars, in tatters or, at best, clad in patched garments. The food is of the worst. Apart from the bourgeoisie and the priests, marks of suffering and exhaustion are visible on every face. A beaten people which has relapsed into silence; a whole generation crippled and deformed. The conquered."

In *Umanità Nova* Malatesta is conducting a long controversy on Syndicalism—a subject that has to be thrashed out, since opinions differ widely. Evidently he is meeting with considerable Italian opposition, and his own position, viz., that "the Syndicates can and ought to play a most useful, and perhaps necessary, part in the transition to an equalitarian society," is strongly qualified. He insists that they must be taken only at their proper value, and that we have always to be on our guard against their natural tendency to become simply the champions of certain special interests. His article concludes: "The Syndicates will be of great service during the revolutionary period—provided always that they are as little Syndicalistic as is possible."

Italian politics sink more and more deeply into the savagery of jungle life. There are now nineteen political groups in Italy, two new ones having developed recently; and each, when it is not sticking its knife into the others, is bargaining for loaves and fishes. The mutual extermination might be, indeed, a blessing. Of the never-ending intrigues the sole victims are, in the final analysis, the workers.

Meanwhile, the Fascisti, always supported by the existing Government, are at present a real power. They held a largely attended Congress in Rome recently, at which "Co-operatives and Syndicalism" was the subject for discussion. According to their own figures, they have now formed more than two thousand Syndicates with a membership of half a million. This is, of course, a counter-organising against the revolutionary movement.

Parliamentary representatives are being circularised by fathers of families whose complaint is that their sons, of the 1901 class, called to the colours for a term of eight months only, have now been under arms for eighteen months, with no prospect of relief in sight. *Umanità Nova* solemnly counsels patience. "The Genoa Conference has been working for peace."

The trial, at Milan, of the Anarchists and Syndicalists charged with causing the bomb explosion in the Diana Theatre in that city, has ended in the acquittal of three of the accused and the passing of terrible sentences on fourteen others. Mariani and Boldrini are sent to prison for life, the former being also condemned to ten years' and the latter to seven years' solitary confinement. Aguggini, in consideration of the fact that he is under age, has been given thirty years' imprisonment. Mariani and Aguggini had confessed, and both in open court declared that Boldrini had no hand in the attack and was entirely innocent.

The others received sentences running from fourteen years downwards. The revolutionary press vehemently protests their innocence, while, on the other hand, the verdict and sentences were greeted by the orthodox papers with shouts of joy. On leaving the dock, to begin his term of fifteen years' imprisonment, Parrini turned to the Court and said: "At this moment we have no feeling of hatred for you. In our attitude toward you we remain, as always, faithful to that principle of love which informs all our thought. Oh! Love! The future belongs to thee. You we forgive."

The "Diana affair" grew directly out of the prolonged imprisonment, without trial, of Malatesta and other comrades, who subsequently were acquitted. The news that they had gone on a hunger strike, in order to compel the authorities to bring their cases before the courts, and the report that some of them were dying, had worked up revolutionary indignation to fever pitch. As happens always under the existing barbarism—the result is punished ferociously; the cause goes still unwhipped.

France.

Syndicalism holds at present the centre of the stage here, the struggle between those who favour centralisation, dictatorship, and participation in politics, and the revolutionary element that opposes all such tendencies, being most bitter. Our exchanges have contained little else during the past few weeks. *Le Libérateur* expresses itself as well pleased with the work accomplished at the Preliminary International Conference of Revolutionary Syndicalists, held in Berlin on June 16, 17, 18, and 19. Its declaration of principles is lengthy, but, as illustrating the general trend of thought, we translate the second clause, which runs as follows:—

"Revolutionary Syndicalism is the confirmed enemy of all monopoly, and seeks its abolition through the media of economic communes and other administrative machinery operated by the workers, whether of town or country, through a system of Councils free from all subordination to power or politics. As against the politics of State and parties it sets up the organisation of Labour on an economic basis; as against the governing of men, the management of things. Consequently it has not as its aim the conquest of political power but the abolition of all the functions now exercised by the State. It considers that with the disappearance of monopoly in property must come also the disappearance of domination, and that the State in all its forms, the 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat' included, can never be an instrument for securing the freedom of the people but will be always the creator of new monopolies and new privileges."

This Conference was attended by delegates from central Labour bodies and confederations in Russia, Italy, Spain, France, Norway, and Sweden. It is, we think, safe to say that even the drawing up, and still more the passing, of such a declaration of principles would have been impossible twenty years ago, thought being then far less developed than it is to-day. We express with profound regret our conviction that in England, Scotland, and Wales that development has yet to come.

An important Congress of the new United General Confederation of Labour—the C.G.T.U.—has been held at Saint Etienne, in connection with which the Anarchist delegates issued a splendidly frank manifesto.

A translation, into French from the Italian, of Luigi Fabbri's work, "Dictatorship and Revolution," is announced. This book we hope to review in an early issue of FREEDOM. In this connection we express ourselves much astonished at the variety and volume of literature being issued by "La Librairie Sociale," as advertised in *Le Libérateur*. Two reflections suggest themselves. The first is that the Anarchists broadmindedly publish and advertise Socialist works, their object being to get the social problem studied from every angle. The second is that, according to the reports of all booksellers and news-agents, the demand for radical and revolutionary literature in England has sunk almost to zero.

Anti-military and anti-clerical agitation seems to be particularly active in France just now, as well it may be.

Le Réveil de l'Éclaire, Individualist-Anarchist, reproduces the following sent to the *Daily News*, of London, by its New York correspondent:—"President Wilson asked for a standing army of 500,000. General Pershing is now asking despairingly for one of 150,000. Congress, however, is inclined to limit it to 100,000, which gives one soldier to every 1,000 inhabitants. One notes here that Canada has one to every 4,000, Japan one to every 100, while France has one to every 50, or thereabouts." In its June issue this paper is in a strenuous controversy with M. Follin, of *L'Ordre Naturel*, also Individualist-Anarchist; bitterly attacks Jean Grave, who is now writing for *L'Émancipateur*, of Flémalle Grande, Belgium; and has some cutting words for Kropotkin. It quotes John Stuart Mill and Oscar Wilde approvingly, and sneers at Herbert Spencer. We permit ourselves the liberty of pointing out that Benjamin R. Tucker's estimate of Spencer is very different, and that Tucker, on the subject of Individualist-Anarchism, is an acknowledged master. We wish, however, that we could get more of these controversies in England. They show, at least, that thought is stirring.

E. Armand, another Individualist-Anarchist, has just been released

from prison, where he served a four and a half years' sentence for anti-military propaganda. Armand has been long known as a distinguished writer, and *Le Libérateur* and other Anarchist papers worked strenuously for his release. He has started immediately a paper, *L'en Dehors*, which he announces as being the implacable enemy of "Archism," or rule by some of others, in all its manifestations. On this same subject he has now in preparation another book which he expects to publish soon.

Les Vagabonds is another "Individualist-Libertarian" journal that comes to our table. It reviews the Individualist and Communist movement in quite a number of countries and in many of its phases. A special issue devoted to England is promised, and note is taken of FREEDOM's attitude toward the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat." We find our standard of values, however, differing greatly from that of the reviewer. Evidently he considers the historical articles on Bakunin, contributed to FREEDOM by Max Nettlau, as of great interest, and with this we cordially agree. On the other hand, he speaks of the Russian question as "tedious." We confess ourselves astonished. As it seems to us, this is one of the most poignant chapters in all our race's history, and the importance of our taking up a correct attitude toward it is something quite impossible to overrate. We can understand the serious student being overwhelmed by a drama so stupendous. That it should bore him is amazing.

The increasing number of these French periodicals and reviews surely testifies to a great awakening of thought and interest. No symptom could be more healthy.

United States.

We take the following from the *Bulletin* (New York) issued by the International Anarchist Aid Federation:—

An international protest meeting against the reign of oppression by the Socialist State upon the Anarchist movement in Russia was arranged by this Federation. It was to be held on Saturday, March 11, at the Labour Temple in New York. Handbills in five languages spread broadcast announced the meeting. The Federation planned in the beginning to hire the very largest hall possible, but no hall seemed obtainable. The Government saw to that. Anarchism thus continues to be outlawed. As a last resort the Labour Temple was applied for, and the hall was very willingly granted, merely for the sake of the principles of "free speech and free assemblage." Thus we decided to have the meeting here, glad of even a small hall wherein to express ourselves and raise our moral protest in defence of our suffering and persecuted comrades. Unexpectedly, however, a few days before the meeting we were informed that the last free speech upholders had gone the way of their predecessors. The Labour Temple managers changed their mind about the meeting and broke their voluntary agreement. Scores of workers who did not learn of this came in the fierce rainy weather, only to find the doors closed.

Though no meeting was held, yet the moral effect was the stronger. The refusal to rent any hall proved more emphatically than a hundred protest meetings could that at present there are no such things as free speech and free assemblage in this country. For centuries past tyrants were ever endeavouring through ruthless oppression to stifle men's thoughts; till this day they have not learnt that ideas are more powerful than the individuals who proclaim them.

TO COMRADES IN SAN FRANCISCO.

We are asked to announce that the Libertarian Communist Group meets on the first and third Sunday of each month.

AN APPEAL FOR "FREEDOM."

Our appeal last month for financial help has brought a fairly good response, but we must have considerably more money at once if the paper is to continue publication. Money is an immediate and urgent necessity. If you cannot make a donation yourself, perhaps you can get others to do so. You might get some annual subscriptions for FREEDOM, or sell the paper at meetings, or help us to dispose of our large stock of Anarchist literature. We want agents everywhere, and you might become one in your district. But in any case do what you can personally to help your paper. It is the only Anarchist paper in the country, it is a paper that has no axe to grind, no one behind it seeking office of any kind; and we earnestly ask you who are reading these lines to do all you can at once to give it a push. The life of FREEDOM depends on your efforts this month. The following donations have been received:—

E. M. 4s., T. S. 10s., A. J. R. £1, W. D. £1, B. Black 2s. 6d., E. R. £1, W. M. S. 2s. 6d., A. D. Moore 2s., A. Sanders 2s., T. S. Wetter 10s. 9d., T. Cooney 8s., "Freie Arbeiter Stimme" Group (San Francisco) £1 1s. 9d., A. Corum 2s. 9d., J. A. Osborne £1 1s., A. B. Howie 1s. 1d., W. Cunningham 1s., M. Carvill 1s., K. Siebel 4s., J. Scarceriaux 4s. 4d., L. G. Wolfe £1, N. B. Ells 10s.

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 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.

The "Anarchy" in Ireland.

Unhappy Ireland is still the scene of bitter strife. Seven hundred years of English misrule was bound to have its aftermath, and it now culminates in civil war—Nationalists against Nationalists in the South, Protestants against Catholics in the North. In addition, Irishmen shooting Irishmen in London. One paper describes the situation in Belfast as "anarchy," and Mr. Arthur Griffiths says the assassination of Sir Henry Wilson is an "anarchic deed." Never was there a grosser distortion of the ideas of Anarchism, which is opposed to government in every shape and form. The civil war and also the assassination are the direct result of government. In the South both sides are Governmentalists, and differ only as to the form of government for Ireland. In the North, the shooting is carried on principally by the Orange special constables, organised by the Ulster Government and financed by the English Government, which also supports them with an army of twenty-three battalions of soldiers. That is not Anarchy, that is the triumph of government A.D. 1922.

The shooting of Sir Henry Wilson, on June 23, by two young Irishmen, at the door of his house in the West End of London, brought the Irish question home to the public, who, as usual, vented their wrath on effects rather than on causes. Everybody wanted to know why the Government had not given police protection to the Field-Marshal; no one stopped to inquire why these young Irishmen should have selected him as a target. No one connected events in Belfast with the event in Eaton Square, but there is a connection. Sir Henry Wilson, who was an Ulsterman, had been called in by the Ulster Government to assist in the maintenance of "law and order," which meant driving every Nationalist and Catholic out of Belfast, if not out of Ulster. A correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* has given a vivid description of the reign of terror now existing in Belfast. About two years ago 8,000 Catholic workmen were driven out of the shipyards and have since been unable to get employment there. With the grant of self-government to Northern Ireland the persecution of Catholics increased. The latter quite naturally tried to defend themselves, and received armed assistance from their friends in the South. The Ulster Government then organised and armed a force of special constables to the number of 49,000, largely recruited from Orangemen, who have been allowed a free hand in terrorising the Catholics.

One of the principal activities of this force is the eviction of Catholics from their homes. Between Easter of this year and June 7 over 800 families (involving probably over 4,000 people) have been thus rendered homeless. If a street is inhabited entirely by Catholics, it is invaded by an Orange mob, "usually accompanied by specials, who provide the petrol, the firearms, and immunity from interruption. Whole streets are burnt or wrecked, and their inhabitants maltreated, sometimes shot or bombed." If the street has a mixed population, the Catholics receive an anonymous warning to quit, which they ignore at their peril. Sometimes the house is looted and wrecked, but if it is preserved it is handed over to a Protestant family. "There is," says the correspondent, "no redress for the Catholic. The Union Jack goes up to mark this new addition to the British Empire and the downfall of Popery."

The Catholics retaliate by burning down business premises owned by Protestants, and this is made an excuse for further attacks on Catholic districts by the specials. At night, says the *Manchester Guardian* correspondent, "caged cars and lorries will come crashing and swaying down the narrow streets, pouring out volleys of

machine-gun and rifle bullets, raking every side-street and passage-way with their fire, indifferent to whom or what they hit." As a result, the wards of the Mater Hospital are filled to overflowing with women and children suffering from gunshot wounds. Can we wonder that Catholic Belfast is convinced that "such casualties form part of a special campaign to exterminate the Catholics of the city"? This campaign increased in intensity after the arrival of Sir Henry Wilson, who acted as military adviser to the Northern Government. With the help of men and money from the English Government, Belfast has become a veritable hell to its Catholic inhabitants. This murderous campaign is described as "anarchy" by the newspaper correspondent, but he and his employers know that when you see murder *en masse*, when you hear the rattle of the machine-gun and the crash of the high explosive, you may be sure the State is at its grim work of killing those who refuse to bend the knee at its altars. All the blood that has ever been shed by Anarchists is but as a drop in the ocean compared with that shed every year by the cruel, insensate monster we call the State.

THE CONGRESS OF ST. IMIER, 1872.

Our Swiss comrades are preparing for the celebration of the Congress of St. Imier, which in September, 1872, half a century ago, was the first to formulate the principles by which the International Anarchist Movement still steers its course. The Congress was the immediate sequel of the Marx-Bakunin controversy which split the old International from stem to stern, and revealed, once and for all, the unbridgeable chasm that separates Authoritarians from Anti-Authoritarians, State worshippers from State abhorers. We reproduce, translated from the original French, the three resolutions adopted by the Congress, which were as follows:—

(1) That the first duty of the proletariat is the destruction of all political power.

(2) That every organisation formed for the capture of political power, even though it may claim to be provisional and revolutionary, and may assert that it seeks to destroy political power, is merely another deception which will turn out to be as great a danger to the proletariat as are the Governments existing to-day.

(3) That, while rejecting all compromises as a means of bringing about the Social Revolution, the proletariat of every country ought to establish a solidarity of revolutionary action which shall be outside of and apart from bourgeois politics.

Assuredly those resolutions did not compass the entire field of Anarchist activities. No resolutions could. No true Anarchist would endorse a Congress that attempted to dictate the future and map out dogmatically the road to be trodden by a humanity struggling to escape from slavery. The Congress, held half a century ago, could not even presume to present an economic programme that would guarantee to free the world from parasites and unhorse the rider still seated on Labour's back. All it could say was that the rider must be unseated; that special privilege—this was Bakunin's incessant cry—must be abolished by a united revolutionary effort; that the political system existing at any given moment was the necessary outcome and inseparable shadow of the economic system then dominant, and that it was an absurdity to believe that one of these Siamese twins could be expected to kill the other.

Political Socialism never has been able to understand this simple truth. We believe ourselves to be speaking justly when we say that, misguided by leaders intoxicated with the dream of power, it has not understood because it did not want to understand. Even to-day it will not see that a rider is a rider, and that to the poor beast of Labour it makes not an atom of difference whether the master astride of him belongs to the Left Wing or the Right, whether he wears the tag of Conservatism, Radicalism, or Red Communism of the Moscow pattern.

It has not been easy for the Labour world to grasp the situation. In reality, no one can outline clearly, as yet, the vast readjustment that must be made to complete the industrial revolution by placing its achievements at the equal service of all mankind. The most we can say at present is that Monopoly must go; that no one class must be allowed to hold another class in helpless pawn; that equal freedom of opportunity must be given to all. The problem is strictly economic. The end aimed at is the abolition of the rule of some by others, and this involves the eradication of special privilege in all its forms.

Fortunately, events have cleared the way. The War revealed to all the world, as by a flash of lightning, to what the much-vaunted Social-Democratic Party amounted as a revolutionary force. Since then all Socialistic parties have marched steadily down the path of failure, and it only remained for the Russian Marxists, under the so-called "Dictatorship of the Proletariat," to take the final, fatal plunge.

We trust that our Swiss comrades will make their celebration a great success. By no possibility could a more auspicious moment have been found.

THE STORY OF BOLSHEVIK TYRANNY.

By EMMA GOLDMAN.

Reprinted from the *World* (New York).

THE CARE OF THE CHILDREN.

The vicious circle created by the Communist State, and which thwarts the most sincere endeavours, is nowhere so evil and apparent as in the Bolshevik activities in behalf of the child. For though much of the accounts of child life in Russia is mere legend, still it must be admitted that a great attempt had been made. Why has it failed?

I remember vividly the impression made upon me by one of the speakers at the second anniversary of the October Revolution, held in Madison Square Garden, in 1919. The man had just returned from Russia. He roused the audience to great enthusiasm by his description of the care and treatment of the children in Russia. My heart went out to the people of that country—the masses who had thrown off the yoke of ages and were now being “led by the hand of a child.” It was so wonderful.

All through my voyage on the floating prison, the *Buford*, the thought of the work done for children in Russia sustained and warmed my spirit. How full of promise was the future; how inspiring to become part of that splendid new life! But in Russia I realised that I had reckoned without the vicious circle—the Socialist State which has compressed every effort within its orbit.

It is true that the Bolsheviks have attempted their utmost in regard to the child and education. It is also true that if they have failed to minister to the needs of the children of Russia, the fault is much more that of the enemies of the Russian Revolution than theirs. Intervention and the blockade have fallen heaviest upon the frail shoulders of innocent children and the sick. But even under more favourable conditions the Bureaucratic Frankenstein monster of the Bolshevik State could not but frustrate the best intentions and paralyse the supreme effort made by the Communists in behalf of the child and education.

It was not until I had been in Russia several weeks that I had an opportunity to visit the first school, the best in Petrograd. It is called *pokazatel'naya shkola*, model school, literally “show school.” I did not grasp its meaning until later. The school was situated in the Hotel de l'Europe, the place still retaining much of its former elegance, with spacious rooms, beautiful chandeliers, and luxurious furniture.

In the winter of 1920 the shortage of fuel was so great in Petrograd that the population all but perished. It was therefore necessary to crowd the children in as few rooms as possible. But they were clean, well kept, and comfortable. The children, averaging from six to thirteen years, looked healthy, well fed, and contented. The physician in charge conducted me through the place, including the kitchen, shining with lovely copper dishes, and explained everything in detail.

The school was used as a sort of receiving and distributing centre. Children were brought there from all part of Russia, from the provinces mostly. They came in vermin-eaten clothes, emaciated and ill. They were bathed, weighed, measured, fed up, and given general treatment. For a short period they remained in the school receiving elementary instruction, and later they were sent to other boarding schools for children.

What I saw impressed me tremendously. Here, indeed, was proof of the reports that had come to America about the great things done for children in Russia.

There was only one disturbing note in the beautiful picture. A chance remark of my hostess, the physician, disclosed that several children could not be seen because “they were in isolation.”

“Some contagious disease?” I asked. “No,” said the lady, “but they are little thieves, so we must keep them away from the other children.”

I was dumbfounded. I saw before me the schoolmaster Tolstoy as portrayed by Ernest Crosby. One of the children in his school had stolen something. The other children had denounced him as a thief and asked their teacher to punish him. Pupils and teacher agreed that a sign bearing the inscription “Thief!” should be hung on the offender's neck.

While putting the string over the boy's head, Tolstoy was struck by the look in the child's eyes—a look of humiliation and dumb accusation. No, not the child was the offender. It was

he, Tolstoy, and the other children—all of society—that could commit such a cruel thing, to brand the child a thief.

Never again thereafter was a child punished in Tolstoy's school. Yet here in great, free, revolutionary Russia were children punished, kept isolated, branded thieves, and continuously spoken of as “moral defectives.” I was disturbed, and puzzled. However, I would not let that obscure the beautiful picture I saw in the Hotel de l'Europe.

A little later I was visited by a woman I had known in America for many years. With her husband and young son, she had rushed to their native land shortly after the February Revolution. She had participated in the great October days, and since then she had been engaged in various work, but her main interest was in the care of children. At the time of her visit she was matron in an *internat*, a boarding school for girls. The woman related to me much about her work, the children, and spoke of the bitter struggle to procure the necessary things for her school. Her story was so utterly at variance with what I had seen at the Hotel de l'Europe that I could not credit it. Yet I knew my friend to be absolutely honest and trustworthy. It seemed inexplicable.

I asked my friend to remain for supper. We talked about people we both had known in America, about the October Revolution and its effect upon the oppressed of the world, while I was peeling potatoes in my improvised kitchenette.

“Don't throw the peelings away,” my friend warned me.

“Why, what do you want with the peelings?” I asked.

“The children make potato cakes of them and are so glad to get them.”

“The children?” I wondered. “How is that possible? Are they not getting the first rations?” I saw myself at the Hotel de l'Europe that the children were fed on milk, cocoa, rice, farina, white bread, chocolate, even meat.

My visitor smiled. “Come to my school,” she said, “and convince yourself.”

I went, not once but many times. There I saw the other side of the medal. Yet even then I would not be convinced so easily. There were sixty-five children in that school. Their food was scanty and of poor quality. Most of them were sustained by what their people or relatives sent from the country. They had little warm clothing, and the majority were without shoes. My friend had to waste much of her time and all her energy in the various departments of the Education Board.

It took her two weeks to get twenty wooden spoons for her sixty-five children. After a whole month of effort, of standing in line, waiting to be admitted to the high officials, she was given twenty-five pairs of snowshoes. It required much wisdom and great tact to divide these among the sixty-five children without causing envy, hatred, and quarrels among them.

Each time I revisited that school I became more convinced that there was something wrong somewhere. How else explain the difference between the care the children received at the Hotel de l'Europe and those of the school on Kronversky Prospekt?

There the children were given the best of everything—food, clothing, rooms, concerts, dances—in fact, almost too much considering the general situation. Here the children had so little that they were constantly hungry, and what little they got had to be obtained with the greatest difficulty.

Soon I learned a few facts. There was not enough food or clothing in Russia for all the children. The Bolsheviks thought it necessary to have a few show schools in each city for the benefit of the foreign missions, delegations and reporters. The children were exhibited, paraded on every occasion, and written about. These schools received the cream of everything. What was left went to the other schools, which were of course in the majority.

Persons that visited the show schools only and judged of the care of children in Russia by them went away utterly ignorant of the true conditions of the mass of children under the Bolshevik regime.

Allied intervention and the blockade are chiefly responsible for the terrible poverty in Russia. Yet whatever there was of life's necessities for the children could have been distributed more equitably. The Bolshevik system itself involved discrimination and inequality in regard to the children, as it did in the treatment of the workers. For the latter there were various categories of rations, officially planned and carried out.

For the children the same situation obtained in practice, though more unofficially. In the first place, the system of “show” schools itself was vicious, demoralising, and estab-

lishing special privileges. That in return involved pretence, sham, and deceit, which could not help having their effect upon teachers as well as children.

But most of all, it was the centralisation of the State and its resultant complex machinery of bureaucratic officialdom that made the best efforts of the Bolsheviki, in this as in other directions, futile and barren.

"DEAD SOULS."

A hundred years ago Gogol startled his countrymen by his great work "Dead Souls." It was a scathing arraignment of Russian feudalism and its parasitism. "Dead Souls" have come to life again in Russia. But there is no Gogol to pillory them. And if there were, he would have much less chance of a hearing in the Russia of to-day than the great Gogol had in his time.

Who are the modern dead souls? That will be best clarified by illustration. Every creche, boarding school, reformatory—in fact, every institution where children and grown people live—is entitled to as many food and clothing rations as the number of its inmates.

All institutions depend on the Central Distributing Department (in Petrograd, the *Pterokommuna*; in Moscow, the *Moskommuna*, etc.) for their supplies. Numerous orders signed and countersigned by scores of *tchinovniki* must be secured for everything needed by a given institution.

The *tchinovniki* systematically delaying matters until they receive some bribe, it becomes necessary to get orders for more than the actual number of the population in the institution, so that some "extras" may be left for bribes as well as for the hungry friends of the "economic manager" of the institution in charge of the supplies.

For instance, the school of my friend had sixty-five children. All former matrons had added a number of fictitious names—"dead souls"—to the actual total of the children in the schools. In return for the extra rations thus secured and used as a bribe, the matrons were assured quick service. Having in this manner provided themselves with "influence" in the various departments, it did not matter if the managers in charge of the schools sabotaged their work, neglected and even abused the children, or often speculated with the provisions obtained for the inmates. They had "friends on high."

The results of this pleasant arrangement, universal in Russia, are obvious, of course. But my friend wouldn't be a party to such practices. She refused to add "dead souls." She knew that each dead soul was living on the already insignificant ration of some child.

She declined to feed the numerous inspectors, examiners, and correctors of her district. The result was a long and bitter struggle against the vicious circle, a struggle which undermined her health and ended in her being ousted from her position, literally thrown out on the street. In vain she tried to call the attention of the "comrade" at the head of the Petrograd Department of Education, Mme. Lilina. She could not be seen, and she never visited the school of my friend. The "show" schools took up all of her time. Besides, Mme. Lilina would hardly have credited my friend's story. It is not customary to pay attention to "outsiders" that make complaints against Communists. And, incidentally, it is a dangerous thing to indulge in.

Later I met Mme. Lilina. I think she is sincere and very devoted to her work. But she is a bigot, without vision. She depends entirely upon her chief subordinates, all Communists, for her information about the conditions in the schools. The criterion of fitness and veracity in Russia is adherence to the Communist Party. It is hardly necessary to emphasise the result.

All this (the partial starvation of children in Bolshevik schools) I learned gradually, painfully, day by day. At first I refused to believe that the "dead soul" method was a general practice. Next door to me, in the Hotel Astoria, "First House of the Soviet," lived a little woman and her two children. She was a Communist, but one who fought hard against the "dead soul" method. She worked in various child institutions. She not only corroborated the condition I found at the school on Kronversky Prospekt, but she took me to many others where the same practices prevailed.

Everywhere "dead souls" lived off some of the half-starved children. My neighbour related the experience she had had with her own children, a boy of three and a girl of nine. Both had been placed in a colony. Out of her own meagre earnings the mother regularly sent the children extra provisions, as they did not get enough there. At the end of six months both children took sick and had to be removed to the one room they shared with their mother. The girl had developed a pernicious rash

and the boy was badly run down. Both cases were diagnosed as due to malnutrition.

I became friends with my neighbour, a sincere and hard-working Communist. Through her I learned much of the general status of children. More and more I came to see that the Bolsheviki were trying to do all they could for the child, but that their efforts were being defeated by the parasitic bureaucracy their State had created. Above all proved destructive their notion that even the child must be used for propaganda purposes.

The "show" schools were a most evil influence, especially on the children at large. They poisoned the child's mind with a sense of injustice and discrimination. For quicker and more correctly than the adult, the child senses wrong and sham. And while these "show" schools were being used as newspaper copy abroad, the masses of children in Russia were neglected as the workers' children are in the rest of the world. Everywhere the privileged few receive all the advantages. Bolshevik Russia is not exempt from this cruel situation.

I have said in the beginning that I was deeply disturbed when I first heard that children were isolated as "thieves and moral defectives." At the time I ascribed this attitude to the old-fashioned notion of the physician in charge at the Hotel de l'Europe. An article in the official *Pravda* and the talk I had with many leading Communists, among them Maxim Gorky, Mme. Lilina, and others, convinced me that nearly all of them believed in "inherent moral depravity."

Some high-standing pedagogues even favoured prisons for such "moral defectives." But that was too much for Lunacharsky, the Commissary of Education, Gorky, and others of the more progressive element, whom orthodox Communists regard as sentimentalists. Lunacharsky fought the barbarous proposition and, fortunately, his side scored a victory. Yet even as late as September, 1921, there were 200 juveniles, among them a child of eight, in the Taganka Prison of Moscow.

I am certain neither Lunacharsky nor Gorky knew about it. But therein lies the curse of the vicious circle; it makes it impossible for those at the head to know what the host of their subordinates are doing. The presence of the children in the Taganka was discovered by the political prisoners who had been sent there. They reported it to their friends on the outside, who took the matter up with Lunacharsky. The children were finally removed from the prison.

However, schools and colonies for the "moral defectives" are not much better than a prison. An investigation made by a committee of the Communist Youth disclosed harrowing conditions in some of those schools in Petrograd. The report was published in the Petrograd *Pravda* of May, 1920. It substantiated the charges frequently made—among them the general practices of "dead souls," the multiplication of attendants at the expense of the children's rations, and other methods of corruption and inefficiency. The committee found, for instance, 138 attendants in a school of 125 children. In another, 38 attendants to 25 children. These were not exceptional cases.

Besides that, the committee's report showed that the children were badly neglected, clad in dirty rags, and permitted to sleep on filthy, ill-smelling bedding without linen; that some children had been punished by being locked in dark rooms for the night, others forced to go without supper, and some had even been beaten. The report caused a great stir in official circles.

A special investigation was ordered, and, of course, like similar things in America, it resulted in a whitewash. The committee of the Communist Youth was rebuked for "exaggerating." It was stated that the article in the *Pravda* should have never appeared, such stories are water on the mill of the counter-revolutionists, and so forth.

I discussed the matter with some Communists. How could such a thing happen in Soviet Russia? I received the stereotyped reply, "lack of dependable and efficient workers." I offered to take up work among the unfortunate children branded as "moral defectives."

"Oh, you must see Comrade Lilina," I was advised. "She will be delighted to have you."

Several days later Comrade Lilina called. She is a frail woman with a hard face, the typical New England schoolm'am of fifty years ago. She assured me that she was intimately familiar with the best methods of pedagogy and psychology. I ventured to tell her that I did not believe in the theory of the moral depravity of children, and that no modern educator held such antiquated notions; that even defective children could not be punished or be branded moral degenerates.

I told her of the modern methods and of the experimental work with delinquent children done in America by Judge Lindsey

and others who had repudiated the moralistic conception of sinner and saint. Oh, yes, that was all very well in a capitalistic country where food and everything else was plentiful, but in starved Russia "moral defectives" were the inevitable result of long war, revolution, and hunger.

The interview convinced me that if I were to take up work among the little victims my efforts would be thwarted at every step by this prim and dogmatic lady. She in her turn probably thought that it would not be safe to entrust the care of children in the Communist State to an Anarchist. At any rate, nothing came of the project.

I give this as an illustration of the falsity of the oft-repeated Bolshevik claim that the corruption, abuse, and inefficiency of their regime are due to the lack of dependable workers. During my stay in Russia I came in contact with a surprisingly large number of persons able and willing to co-operate in the educational, economic, and other non-political work. Not being Communist, however, they are discriminated against, discouraged and surrounded by a spying system that makes all initiative and effort futile.

During my four months' travel through the Ukraine I had ample opportunity to visit creches, kindergartens, boarding schools, and colonies—unofficially, of course. Everywhere I found the same situation: a model "show" school with well-fed and well-cared-for children, while in the other institutions the children were hungry. Often I saw how the men and women in charge were beating their wings against the bureaucratic machine, earnestly striving to defend the interests of the children; but striving in vain, only to be finally eliminated by the all-powerful machine.

I saw a striking illustration of this phase in Moscow shortly before I left. In a certain district there is a model creche, the best organised and equipped I came across in Russia. The matron was a very rare type of womanhood, an idealist, an educator of long experience, and a tireless worker. She set herself sternly against the "dead soul" practice. She would not rob Peter to feed Paul. She would not bribe the petty officials of the sub-department.

As usual, a campaign was started against her. The leading spirit in the miserable attack was the physician of the creche, a Communist. All sorts of accusations were laid at the matron's door, none of which had any basis. But the machine would not let up until the woman was forced out of the place. Incidentally, that meant also being deprived of her room. The woman was the mother of a four-month-old baby.

It was in November, the weather was cold, the damp penetrating. Yet the matron who had fought for the creche was ordered to leave the creche. For the sake of her infant she refused to go until assured of a room in the building. She was then given a little, dark, damp room in a basement which could not have been heated for three years. In that tomb the infant fell sick and has been ailing ever since.

Does Lunacharsky know of such cases? Do the leading Communists know? Some no doubt do. But they are too busy with "important State affairs." And they have become callous to all such "trifles." Then, too, they themselves are caught in the vicious circle, in the machinery of Bolshevik officialdom. They know that adherence to the party covers a multitude of sins.

During my two years' stay in Russia I visited many institutions, but I met very few happy children. In all that time I heard a really hearty child's laugh only once, in Archangel. I may have occasion to write about that experience in a future article. On the whole, most children in Bolshevik institutions impressed me as colourless and stereotyped, veritable children of orphan asylums.

There is something practically gripping about those children. They are not only starved for food, but even more so for affection—they are lonely children. I know this does not correspond with the legends circulated of the millennium come to the child in Bolshevik Russia. But, then, I have no intention of perpetuating legends.

There was one other factor which set the Communist State above the other Governments—the abolition of child labour. That was its most significant achievement, for which the Communists deserved much credit. But now that Lenin's new economic policy is fast resurrecting the dead, now that capitalism and private exploitation are slowly but surely returning to Russia, the Bolshevik Government will soon be the "equal" of all other civilised Governments, with child labour as its great source of national wealth.

A VISIT TO PETER KROPOTKIN.

Among those I wanted to see most when I reached Russia in January, 1920, was Peter Alexeivitch Kropotkin. I immediately made inquiries how to reach him. I was informed that I could do so only when I got to Moscow, as Kropotkin lived in Dmitroff, a small town 60 versts from the city. Now, one does not travel at will in a country so stricken by war and revolution as Russia—a country where the State is in absolute control of every breath of life. There was nothing to do but wait until I would be given the chance to go to Moscow. Fortunately, that opportunity soon presented itself.

Early in March a number of prominent Communists went to Moscow, among them Radek and Gorky. I was permitted to go in the same car. When I reached Moscow I began to look about for means to reach Dmitroff. But again there was a delay. I learned that it was almost impossible to travel the ordinary way. Typhus was then raging. The railroad stations were overcrowded with people lying around for days and weeks. There was always a savage scramble for an inch of space. Five hundred unfortunate beings would crowd into a car that had room only for fifty. Starved and worn out, they would crowd even on the roof and platform of the car, unmindful of the biting frost or the imminent danger of being thrown off. Not a journey but some of the victims froze to death—others hurled from the speeding train.

I was in despair, for I had heard Kropotkin was ailing that winter. I feared he might not live until spring. I would not ask to be given a special car; neither could I muster up courage to go the ordinary way. An unforeseen circumstance came to my rescue.

The editor of the London *Daily Herald*, accompanied by one of his reporters, had preceded me to Moscow. They also wanted to visit Kropotkin, and they had been given a special car. Together with Alexander Berkman and A. Shapiro I was able to join Mr. Lansbury and make the trip in comparative safety. The journey was made in fairly good time; it was a starry night, and the whole country was one vast sheet of snow. Our footsteps resounded in the silence of the village asleep.

The Kropotkin cottage stood back in the garden away from the street. Only a faint ray from a kerosene lamp lit up the path leading to the house. I afterward learned that kerosene was scarce in the Kropotkin household, and light had to be economised. After Peter had finished his day's work the lamp would be used in the living room, where the family gathered in the evening. We were warmly received by Sophie Kropotkin and the daughter, and taken to the room where we found the Grand Old Man.

The last time I had seen him was in 1907, in Paris, which I had visited after the Anarchist Congress at Amsterdam. Kropotkin, for many years barred from France, had just been given the right to return. He was at that time already sixty-five years of age; but he looked so full of vitality, was so alert, that he seemed much younger. He was a great inspiration to all of us who were fortunate to come in close contact with him.

Somehow one could never think of Peter Alexeivitch as being old. Not so in March, 1920. I was shocked by his altered appearance. He was fearfully emaciated. He received us with the graciousness that was so characteristic of him.

We felt from the very beginning that our visit would not be satisfactory; Peter would not be able to talk freely with us in the presence of two strangers, journalists at that. But we had to make the best of the situation. After an hour's talk, we asked Mrs. Kropotkin and Sasha to entertain the English guests while we conversed with Kropotkin in Russian.

Aside from my concern in his health I was eager to get some light from him on the vital questions that had already begun to trouble my mind—the relation of the Bolsheviks to the Revolution; the despotic methods which, as everybody had assured me, had been imposed upon the ruling party by intervention and the blockade. What was Kropotkin's opinion about it, and how explain his long silence?

I had taken no notes, and I can give only the gist of our brief talk. It was to the effect that the Russian Revolution had carried the people to great heights and had paved the way for profound social changes. Had the people then been permitted to utilise their released energies, Russia would not now be in her ruined condition.

The Bolsheviks, who had been swept to the fore by the gigantic revolutionary wave, had at first caught the popular ear by extreme revolutionary slogans. Thus they gained the confidence of the masses and the support of the militant revolutionists.

Early in the October period the Bolsheviks began to subordinate the interests of the Revolution to the building up of

their dictatorship. It coerced and paralysed every social activity. Kropotkin referred to the Co-operatives as the main medium which, in his opinion, could have bridged the interests of the peasants and the workers. But it was these very Co-operatives which were among the first to be crushed.

He spoke with much heat of the depression, the persecution, the cruel hounding of every political shade of opinion, and he cited numerous examples of the misery and distress of the people. Above all, he was most emphatic against the Bolshevik Government for having thus discredited Socialism and Communism in the eyes of the Russian people. It was a heart-breaking picture which Kropotkin unrolled before us that evening.

Why, then, had he not raised his voice against these evils, against the machine which was sapping the life-blood from the Revolution? Kropotkin gave two reasons: First, because so long as Russia was being attacked by the combined imperialists of Europe, and Russian women and children were starved to death by the criminal blockade, he could not join the shrieking chorus of the ex-revolutionists in the cry of "Crucify!" He preferred to keep silent for the present.

Secondly, there was no medium of expression in Russia itself, hence no way of reaching the people. To protest to the Government was useless. Its concern was to maintain its power at any cost. It could, therefore, not stop at such trifles as human life or human rights. But then, he added, "We have always pointed out the blessings of Marxism in action. Why now be surprised?"

I asked whether he was noting down his impressions and observations. Surely he must see the importance of such a record to his comrades, to the workers; in fact, to the whole world. Kropotkin looked at me for a moment, then said:

"No, I do not write. It is impossible to write when one is in the midst of great human suffering and distress, when every hour brings new tales of woe which one may not ameliorate. Besides, all personal privacy and safety have been destroyed. There may be a raid any moment—the Cheka comes swooping down in the night, ransacks every corner of the house, turns everything upside down, and marches off with every scrap of paper.

"Under such constant stress it is impossible to keep records. But more than all these considerations is my book on ethics. I can work only a few hours a day, and I still have much to do. I must therefore concentrate on that to the exclusion of everything else."

We had already monopolised our comrade too long. Though there was still much to talk about, we had to content ourselves for that evening. The conversation again became general. But it was getting late, and our host was fatigued. Soon we took our leave. We agreed to come back in the spring, when we should have more time to talk over matters.

After a tender embrace, which Peter never failed to give those he loved, we returned to our car. My heart was heavy with the great Russian tragedy, my spirit confused and troubled by what I had heard. I was also distressed by the physical condition of our comrade. I feared he could not survive until the spring. The winter of 1920 had been most terrible. People had been dying from typhus, hunger, and cold. The thought that Peter Kropotkin might go to his grave, and the world never know what he thought of the Russian Revolution, was appalling.

I felt somewhat impatient. Kropotkin had braved the despotism of the Tsars and the raids of their political Okhrana. Why could he not write now? It was just like the old: they for ever dwell in the past while the present passes them by. It was only much later that I understood why Kropotkin had been unable to write about the events in Russia.

In July, 1920, I again came to Moscow. I was with the expedition of the Museum of the Revolution on the way to the Ukraina. One day Sasha Kropotkin called me up. She had obtained an auto. from one of the Government officials, and would Alexander Berkman and I go out to Dmitroff? The next day we started out, reaching Dmitroff in a few hours. The garden surrounding the Kropotkin house was full of bloom, completely hiding the cottage from view. Peter was having his afternoon nap, but he rose as soon as he heard our voices. He joined us; he had improved marvellously; he was so alert, so active, so energetic. He immediately took us to the vegetable garden, which was almost entirely Sophie Kropotkin's work, Peter's pride, and the chief support of the family. He took great delight in showing us a new species of lettuce which Sophie had grown, having large heads like cabbage, with leaves of fragrant green. "You must have some for dinner," said Peter jovially. The spring had certainly wrought a miracle in him. He was a different man.

The first seven months of my stay in Russia had almost

crushed me. I had come with so much enthusiasm, with a passionate desire to throw myself into the work, into the holy defence of the Revolution. What I found completely overwhelmed me. I was unable to do anything. The chariot wheel of the Socialist State rolled over me, paralysing my energy. The wretchedness and distress of the people, the callous disregard of their needs, the persecution and the repressions tore at my mind and heart, and made life unbearable.

Was it the Revolution which had turned idealists into wild beasts? If so, the Bolsheviks were mere pawns in the hands of the inevitable. Or was it the cold, impersonal character of the State which by foul means had harnessed the revolution to its cart and was now whipping it into channels indispensable to the State? I could not answer these questions. Not in July, 1920, at any rate. Perhaps Kropotkin could.

KROPOTKIN ON THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION.

During the second visit to Peter Kropotkin we had an hour together. In that time Peter spoke in detail of the Russian Revolution, the part played by the Bolsheviks, the lesson to the Anarchists in particular and the world in general. He considered the Russian Revolution in scope and possibilities greater than the French Revolution. While it is true that the people were not developed in the Western sense, yet they are more responsive to new arrangements of life. The spirit of the masses during the February and October Revolutions demonstrated that they understood the great changes waiting their concerted efforts, and they were willing to do their share.

The people knew that something tremendous was before them, which they themselves must face, organise, and direct. That spirit, though now fettered by hunger, privation, and persecution, is yet very much alive. The dogged resistance offered by the people of Russia to the Bolshevik yoke is the best proof of that. The Bolsheviks in their march to power were far from being the advance guard of the revolution, as they claim. On the contrary, they were the dam which had thrown back the rising tide of the people's energies.

In their fixed idea that only a dictatorship can direct and protect the revolution, they went about strengthening their formidable State which is now crushing the revolution. As Marxians they never have, nor will they ever realise that the only protection of the revolution lies in the ability of the people to organise their own economic life. For the rest, Kropotkin added, he had set forth his views on the Russian Revolution in his letter to the workers of Europe, which was, I believe, widely published.*

Kropotkin also spoke of the part the Anarchists played in the revolution, of the death of some, the heroic struggle of many, the irresponsibility of the few. Above all, he emphasised the need for all the Anarchists to be better equipped for reconstructive work during the revolution. I distinctly remember these words:

"We Anarchists have talked much about the Social Revolution. But how many had ever taken pains to prepare for the actual work during and after the revolution? The Russian Revolution has demonstrated the imperativeness of such preparation for practical reconstructive work."

In a letter to one of his closest friends Kropotkin wrote that he had come to see in Syndicalism the economic basis of Anarchism. In other words, the medium for the economic organisation and expression of the energies of the people during the revolutionary period.

It was a memorable day. Alas! the last I was ever to spend with our Grand Old Man. When I was called to take care of him during his last illness I reached Dmitroff an hour after his death. The usual bureaucratic confusion, inefficiency, and delay robbed me of the opportunity to render Kropotkin some slight service in return for all that he had given me.

Two things had struck me in Kropotkin on both visits: The lack of bitterness toward the Bolsheviks and the fact that he never once alluded to his own hardships and privations. It was only after his death that I learned a few details of his life under the Bolshevik régime. In the early part of 1918 Kropotkin had grouped around him some of the ablest specialists in various branches of political economy. The purpose was to make a careful study of the economic resources of Russia, and to compile these resources in monographs, to make them of practical help in the reconstruction of Russia.

Kropotkin was the editor-in-chief of that undertaking. One volume was prepared, but never published. The Federalist League, as this scientific group was known, was broken up by the Government and all the material confiscated.

* Peter Kropotkin's letter to the Western workers appeared in FREEDOM, August, 1920.

On two occasions the Kropotkin apartments were requisitioned and the family forced to find other quarters. It was after all these experiences that the Kropotkins moved to Dmitroff, where he became an involuntary exile. Even in the summer it was difficult to visit him. Special permission had to be procured to travel, and that involved much effort and time. In the winter it was almost altogether impossible. Thus he, who had in the past gathered at his home the best in thought and ideas from every land, was now forced to the life of a recluse.

His only visitors were unfortunate peasants, workers of his village, and some of the intelligentsia who would come to him with their daily misfortunes. I remember that the evening of our visit Kropotkin had received a letter from an old friend in Moscow, a scientist. The man was living with his wife and two children in one room. Only a small lamp was lighting up the family table at which the children had to prepare their lesson, the wife copy some manuscripts, while he used one corner to do his scientific research. He was employed at a place twelve versts from home, and had to walk that daily.

Kropotkin, who had always kept in touch with the world through numerous publications in every tongue, was now cut off entirely from that source of life. He was not even able to learn what was happening in Moscow or Petrograd. His only channel of news were the two Government papers, the *Pravda* and the *Izvestiya*. He was much handicapped in his work on ethics while he lived in Dmitroff. He could not obtain the necessary books of research. In short, Kropotkin was mentally starved, which was, no doubt, greater torture to him than physical malnutrition. He received a much better *payok*, or ration, than most people; but even that was by far not sufficient to keep up his vitality.

Fortunately, he received from time to time assistance—in the form of provisions—from various sources. Thus his comrades from abroad, as well as those from the Ukraine, often sent him foodstuffs. He also received similar gifts from Makhno, then heralded by the Bolsheviki as the terror of the counter-revolutionary forces in Southern Russia. But especially was felt the lack of light and fuel. When I visited the Kropotkins in 1920, they were considering themselves fortunate to have light in more than one room. During part of 1918 and all of 1919, Kropotkin wrote his ethics by the flicker of a tiny oil lamp that nearly blinded him.

During the short hours of the day he would transcribe his notes on a typewriter, slowly and painfully pounding out every letter. However, it was not his own discomfort which sapped Kropotkin's strength. It was the hardships of Russia, the suffering about him, the suppression of every thought, the persecution and imprisonment for opinion sake, the endless *raztreks* of people, which made his last years the deepest tragedy.

If only he could have done something to help, to lessen the suffering, to bring the dictators of Russia to their senses. But he could not. He could not, like some of the old revolutionary guard, make common cause with the enemies of the revolution. Even had he found a way of having his protests published in the European Press, the reactionists would have used them against Russia. No, he could not do that. And he knew only too well that it was useless to protest to the Bolshevik Government.

Yet, so great was his anguish, that on two occasions Peter Kropotkin addressed himself to that deaf ear. Once in protest against the terrible practice of taking hostages; the other time against the complete suppression of publishing undertakings other than the State's.

Ever since the Cheka began its sinister existence, the Bolshevik Government had sanctioned the taking of hostages. Old and young, mothers, fathers, sisters, brothers, even children, had been held and often shot for the offence of one of their own—offences which, in nine cases out of ten, they knew nothing about.

In the fall of 1920, the Social-Revolutionists that emigrated to Europe threatened retaliation if the repressions against their comrades continued. The Bolshevik Government announced in its official press that for every Communist it would take ten Social-Revolutionists. It was then that the famous revolutionist, Vera N. Figner, and Peter Kropotkin sent a protest to the powers that be. They pointed out that the practice of taking hostages was a blot on the Russian Revolution, an evil which had already brought terrible results in its wake, that the future would never forgive them for such a barbaric method.

The second protest was made in reply to the attempt the Government was making at "liquidating" all publishing undertakings, whether political, co-operative, or private. This protest was addressed to the President of the then sitting Eighth All-Russian Congress of Soviets. It is interesting to note that

Gorky, himself an official of the Commissariat of Education, had sent almost on the same day from Petrograd a similar protest.

Kropotkin, in his statement, called attention to the danger of such a policy to all progress; in fact, to all thought. Such State monopoly on thought would make creative work utterly impossible. The situation in Russia during the last four years has given ample proof of that.

One of the striking characteristics of Peter Kropotkin was his reticence in everything concerning himself. In my stay of thirty-six hours at his Dmitroff home, while his body lay in death, I learned more of his personal life than during all the years I had known him. But few even of his immediate circle knew that Peter Alexeievitch was an artist and a musician of considerable talent. Among his effects I discovered a whole collection of his drawings of great merit.

He loved music passionately, and was himself a musician of no mean ability. He spent much of his leisure moments at the piano. No doubt he was able to find some forgetfulness and peace in the masters whose works he rendered with deep understanding.

He lay in his workroom as if peacefully asleep, his face as tender in death as it had been in life. There he lay, this great son of Russia. Through strife and stress he had remained true to the Revolution, and would not forsake it. He did not live to see Capitalism in Russia erected as a monument upon the grave of the Revolution. But even that would not have robbed him of his fervent faith in the resurrection of the people, the ultimate triumph of a Libertarian Revolution.

The final article in this series, "The Trade Unions," will appear in our next issue.

COR CORDIUM.*

(TO SHELLEY.)

Beneath the dome of blue Italian sky,
Upon the wave-kissed shore of yellow sand,
Thy mournful comrades near the pyre did stand
And watch the smoke-wreaths float away on high.

'Twas in the sea thou lovedst thou didst die,
Thy corse was kindled on its breeze-swept strand;
Thy heart, from burning plucked by friendly hand,
Now with thine ashes 'tomb'd in Rome doth lie.

O Heart of Hearts, O foe of Tyranny,
Singer of Freedom's songs in beauteous words,
Herald of Dawn like Morning's star above!

The night shall pass—thy dream fulfilled shall be:
Mankind at peace 'mid flowers and beasts and birds
On Earth redeemed by Liberty and Love.

TOM SENHOUSE.

Death of Mary Krimont.

Mary Krimont, one of the founders of the Ferrer Colony of Stelton, New Jersey, and among the most devoted and active workers for the Ferrer Modern School, passed away on May 2, after a short illness. Some twenty years ago when she lived in London she was an active member of the Freedom Group and a friend of Peter and Sophie Kropotkin, W. and Freda Tcherkesoff, Marsh, Turner, William and Doris Wess, Miss A. Davies, and others of that time. A memorial meeting was held in the School building on the 4th of May, and appreciations of respect for her personality and her work for the School were expressed by many colonists. She will be missed by many, but particularly by her children, Elsie Krimont-Kelly and Walter Krimont, and by Harry Kelly, her friend and comrade for twenty-five years.

From the moment a people gives itself representatives it is no longer free.—*Rousseau*.

* NOTE.—It will be remembered that, at the suggestion of Leigh Hunt, the words "Cor Cordium" were inscribed on Shelley's tomb in the cemetery at Rome where his ashes were interred with his heart, which had been snatched from the flames by Trelawny towards the conclusion of the cremation. Shelley was drowned in the bay of Spezzia on July 8, 1822—just 100 years ago.—T. S.

THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE CONGRESS.

The International Anarchist Congress held in Berlin in December last was not thoroughly representative of the Anarchist movement of the world, for various reasons. The notice was too short. The oppression that Anarchists suffer from in various countries prevented them receiving early information of the holding of the Congress, and the restrictive passport regulations hindered their participation. Therefore the Congress can be considered only as an informal preparatory conference that laid the foundation for another gathering in the future which shall really be international in the true sense of the word.

The proceedings and resolutions of the Congress are now known to all. The time is therefore appropriate to analyse its most important phases. The Anarchist cannot follow the action of the Bolsheviks who swallow with approval everything that their International Congresses decide. We certainly should give our approval to whatever is understood by us as being sound and justifiable, yet never fail to voice our disapproval of the actions of a Congress that seem to us unsound or unjustified.

The most important accomplishment at Berlin was the establishment of a Correspondence Bureau, which will no doubt bring the Anarchists of the world into closer relationship with each other. The resolutions dealing with organisation, the need of an international language, and other minor questions are also timely and useful. Some of the other resolutions show that the delegates failed to grasp the needs of the moment. The Anarchists of practically every country have come out against Dictatorship. It was therefore useless for the Congress to merely pass a resolution restating this. What most of us looked forward to was a clear-cut statement as to what Anarchists hold out in preference to a dictatorship. Such a statement was necessary as would not only have been definite enough to prevent a recurrence of the utter ruination of a social revolution by Marxism, but that would have also become a hope and an inspiration for assuring better success in future revolutions than has been the case with the one in Russia.

In this task the Congress did more than fail utterly. It adopted a resolution advising the Anarchists of the world to help in organising a Syndicalist International. In doing this it gave, for the first time in the history of the Anarchist movement, complete support to and approval of Syndicalism. To those acquainted with the Anarchist movement and with the growing Syndicalist movement not much need be said with regard to the diverse opinions of Syndicalism that prevail among Anarchists. Some of the ablest exponents of Anarchism and the greater part of the rank and file are much opposed to it. The fact cited at the Congress by our comrade Rocker, that Kropotkin before his death expressed a desire to work with the Syndicalist movement, and that Malatesta in Italy is now favourably inclined to it, was by no means a sufficient reason for coming out in favour of Syndicalism. For, as Anarchists, we are not going to follow blindly Kropotkin or Malatesta as the Bolsheviks follow Lenin or Trotsky.

Apart from this, it can be shown that the "Nabat" Federation of Ukrainian Anarchists came out in absolute opposition to Syndicalism at their Conference in September, 1920. Also at the Congress of the Federation of Russian Anarchists of the United States and Canada, held in November, 1921 (at which delegates from the Ukrainian and English-speaking movements were present), not only was no favourable resolution on Syndicalism adopted, but during the discussion on this question most of the delegates expressed themselves utterly opposed to it. And even in Germany, where the Congress took place, a comrade contended before the delegates that Rocker did not represent the Anarchist Communist movement, which is being harmed more and more by the Syndicalist one, which is eating up its most energetic forces. These few facts in themselves show that the delegates have done a great wrong in passing such a resolution in the name of the Anarchist movement, when they knew that the movement was by no means in accord with Syndicalism.

This, however, is only one part of the blunder made by the passing of this resolution. At the International Syndicalist Conference held in Berlin in December, 1920, one of the resolutions adopted unanimously (and assented to by Rocker) was in favour of the "Dictatorship of Work" instead of the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat." The conclusion to be drawn from this is that the Syndicalist International that is to be founded will support the "Dictatorship of Work." The "Nabat" Federation was confronted with the same situation, but was strongly opposed to this changing phraseology as a mere subterfuge which is as dangerous and deceitful as the Bolshevik phrase, the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat." Thus, indirectly, the delegates at the International Anarchist Congress supported the "Dictatorship of Work." They did not realise that another resolution adopted by them expressed itself *against any form of dictatorship!*

It seems that most of the delegates at the Congress were either Syndicalists or sympathetic to Syndicalism. Still, a comrade like Rocker ought to have had sufficient foresight to have abstained from using his energy to get the Congress to adopt a resolution which, when analysed, becomes a very foolish, if not harmful, contradiction.

Being unable to send forth the message that was needed so much as to what we Anarchists propose instead of a dictatorship, the Congress would have done well if it had refrained from adopting such a resolu-

tion. It is to be hoped that the next Congress will be more representative, and will be able to state in clear terms the real Anarchist position.

In the meantime, the resolutions adopted at the Berlin Congress need not be looked upon as binding on those not in agreement with them. By all means, no. Let the resolutions be discussed thoroughly by the Anarchist groups and press. In this manner opinions will be exchanged and thought clarified, and by the time the next Congress arrives we shall know more definitely what message we Anarchists have for the enslaved masses.

Though the Congress failed to rise to the height hoped for and expected by some, yet its organising accomplishments alone have laid the foundation for an Anarchist International, which makes up for its mistakes and deficiencies.

FRED S. GRAHAM.

CASH RECEIVED (not otherwise acknowledged). (June 1 to July 6.)

"FREEDOM" SUBSCRIPTIONS.—R. Cohen, J. Dick, S. Black, E. Archer, J. Du Bois, H. Hansen, V. Mantovano, S. K., T. S. Wetter, J. Macario, H. Havel.
FOR ANARCHISTS IN RUSSIAN PRISONS.—Previously acknowledged £27 16s. 10d.
A. Hendel £1 2s. 3d., R. Cohen 9s., G. A. R. (Bath) 1s., E. F. Dean 6d.,
Per T. S. Wetter £4 7s., T. K. 2s., N. B. Ellis 10s. Total, £34 8s. 7d.
ANARCHIST REFUGEES IN GERMANY.—N. B. Ellis 10s.

RUSSIAN REVOLUTION SERIES.—No. 1.

The Russian Tragedy.

(A Review and an Outlook.)

By ALEXANDER BERKMAN.

With Introductory Sketch of the Author by Emma Goldman.
Price, Fourpence; postage, 1d.

This is a splendid review of the Russian Revolution, giving an outline of its various phases and the causes which brought about its degeneration to State Capitalism.

FREE SOCIETY.

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

Subscription, \$1.00 per annum. Order through FREEDOM.

NOW READY.

ANARCHISM VERSUS SOCIALISM.

By WM. C. OWEN.

32 pages, with Wrapper. Price, Threepence.
FREEDOM PRESS, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W. 1.

Some Agents for "Freedom."

London.—E. ARCHER, 68 Red Lion Street, Holborn, W.C.
INTERNATIONAL BOOKSHOPS, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, E.C.
HENDERSONS, 66 Charing Cross Road, W.C.
L. ISENBERG, 61 Cleveland Street, Fitzroy Square, W.
A. GOLUB, Osborne Street, Whitechapel, E.
J. ASTON, 9 Kingston Road, Merton, S.W.
MRS. ELLIOTT, 304 High Road, Willesden, N.W.
Belfast—W. ROBINSON, 167 York Street.
Bristol—JACK FLYNN, 19 Haymarket.
Cardiff—A. BANKS, 1 Carmarthen Street, Canton.
Dublin—J. KEARNEY, 59 Upper Stephen Street.
Dundee—L. MACARTNEY, 207 Overgate.
Glasgow—HERALD LEAGUE, 94 George Street.
Leeds—G. FROST, 31 Windsor Street, York Road.
Liverpool—E. G. SMITH, 126 Tunnel Road, Edge Hill.
Manchester—REFORMER'S BOOKSHOP, 24 New Brown Street.
Plymouth—F. J. WAKE, 10 Martin Street.
Sheffield—FELLOWSHIP BOOKSHOP, 109 Devonshire Street.

BOOK AND PAMPHLET LIST.

THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 41.
THE WAGE SYSTEM. By P. KROPOTKIN. 21.
ANARCHY. By E. MALATESTA. 3d.
THE PLACE OF ANARCHISM IN SOCIALISTIC EVOLUTION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. By ELISEE RECLUS. 2d.
ANARCHIST COMMUNISM: ITS BASIS AND PRINCIPLES. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3d.
LAW AND AUTHORITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3d.
THE ANARCHIST REVOLUTION. By George Barrett. 2d.
ANARCHISM VERSUS SOCIALISM. By WM. C. OWEN. 3d.
ENGLAND MONOPOLISED OR ENGLAND FREE? By WM. C. OWEN. 2d.
ANARCHISM AND DEMOCRACY. By John Wakeman. 2d.
THE CONCENTRATION OF CAPITAL: A MARXIAN FALLACY. By W. TCHERKESOFF. 2d.

Postage extra—1d. for each 3 pamphlets.

Orders, with cash, to be sent to

FREEDOM PRESS, 127 OSSULSTON STREET, LONDON, N.W. 1.

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