

Freedom

VOL. XXXVII—No. 406.

MAY, 1923.

MONTHLY: TWO PENCE.

NOTES.

Agricultural Labourers at 25s. a Week.

The strike of agricultural labourers has been settled and the men are to go back to work. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, the leader of the Labour Party, invited representatives of the farmers and the labourers to meet him, and a settlement was negotiated. The men are to resume work at 25s. for a week of 50 hours! No wonder the capitalist press congratulates Mr. MacDonald on the settlement. Just imagine a man and his family trying to live on that paltry sum, in payment for hard and skilled work, in all weathers. Work which is absolutely vital—producing the food of the community. Would Mr. MacDonald like to have to keep a family on 25s. a week? With what arguments did he persuade the men's leaders to agree to such a disgraceful surrender? The truth is, the Labour Party are afraid that strikes may affect their political prospects, and they are leaving no stone unturned to keep the discontented men at work, however bad may be their conditions. It has been a long and difficult task to stir up the agricultural labourer to kick against the damnable slavery in which he has been content to exist for generations, and now he is handed over again to the tender mercies of the most conservative class in the country, bound hand and foot by this agreement. Perhaps, however, it may have one good effect in convincing him that he has little to hope for from a Labour Government. The Land Nationalisation Bill introduced by Mr. Snowden proposes that huge sums shall be paid to the landlords, and as this must be paid out of the proceeds of agriculture, we fail to see how the labourer can expect any better conditions when land nationalisation comes to pass. His only hope lies in the expropriation of the land without compensation to the landlords, whose ancestors in many cases gained possession of it by force or fraud.

Governments and Gambling.

The Government, hard driven to find money to pay the interest on the huge National Debt, are now looking to a tax on betting and on bookmakers to help them out of their difficulty. Since the War betting has increased enormously, especially among women. The newspapers give much space to horse-racing, and newsagents' notice boards are covered with placards of the various racing papers and tipsters that cater for the crazy folk who expect to make money by backing horses. The Government could certainly get a lot of money by a tax on betting, which would legalise much that is now illegal; but they also realise that betting is a means of keeping the workers quiet, as the man who hopes to make a big coup which will lift him out of his life of toil is not likely to become a revolutionist. In Ireland the Free State Government are encouraging sweepstakes on horse racing, in the name of charity, as a method of increasing the revenue. This is a sorry ending to the idealism and heroism of the struggle which brought the Free State into existence. The Government of Roumania are also exploiting the gambling mania to bring money into their coffers. Advertisements of a loan of £2,500,000 appear in the press as we write, which gives the issuing price of a £100 bond as £67. A certain proportion of the bonds will be drawn for each half-year, and the bonds drawn will be redeemable at par—that is, the Government will pay the lucky holders £100 for bonds they bought at £67. The difference of £33 will, of course, be found by the unlucky taxpayers of Roumania. We Anarchists are often told that without Governments all sorts of vices would flourish, yet here we find these Governments fostering a vice that is responsible for many other social evils—the vice of greed. Before the War there was a pretence of a higher standard in reference to gambling, but now all pretence is cast aside, and "the end justifies the means" is the prevailing motto. Governments do not improve with age, and the more they are examined the more corrupt they appear.

Britain and the Bolsheviks.

The outburst of virtuous indignation against Russia on the part of the press, priests, and politicians has more behind it than the execution of a few religious prelates. Of course, we can understand the Archbishop of Canterbury getting excited about such things, as they establish very bad precedents for other countries nearer home. The agitation is stimulated by the Government as a method of putting pressure on the Bolsheviks, and when Bonar says "Howl!" they all howl. But he will not break off trade relations with Russia for such a paltry reason as that. The Turks have massacred Greeks and Armenians on a wholesale scale, but that does not prevent us trading with them or sitting round a table with them at Lausanne. The Greeks have also done their bit in exterminating Turks and other unwanted aliens, but we are still supplying them with guns and ammunition in exchange for currants and sultanas, and Venizelos is still a welcome visitor to these shores. No; the root of the trouble is probably that the Russians are not so free as our Government would like them to be in handing out concessions to Britishers. The Urquhart Agreement still hangs fire, the Russians insisting on new clauses to their own advantage. Our Government is naturally very anxious to trade with anyone who has anything to exchange, but they think the Russian Government is in a bad way just now and a little pressure may help them to make up their minds. Hence the press propaganda. If the Bolsheviks, however, will only be "reasonable" and realise how useful British capitalists might be in helping to develop that country, and incidentally help to start the wheels again in our own factories, no more will be heard of the wickedness of the present rulers of that country. We tolerated worse happenings when the Tsar was on the throne, and "Business is business" is still inscribed on the portals of No. 10 Downing Street. We may yet see representatives of the Bolshevik Government honoured guests in Whitehall. Misfortunes make strange bedfellows.

Broken Hearts on Show.

There have been two very interesting cases in the law courts recently, both connected with the marriage question. In one case a man brought an action for damages against another man for stealing his wife's affections, a strange feature of this case being that the wife had been dead some months when the action was brought. The co-respondent pleaded not guilty, at the same time raising the question whether such an action was legal, considering the wife was dead and therefore could not be called as a witness. When the appeal on this point was heard the judge decided that it was a good case in law, although hardly one that many men would care to bring into court. The case has not yet been tried, but we cannot imagine any jury being very sympathetic to a man who would drag his wife's name into court when she can no longer defend herself. In the other case a married woman brought an action against a single woman, claiming damages for the loss of her husband, who had, she said, been enticed away by the defendant. The jury decided against her. Probably there were no women on the jury, as men would object to the suggestion that they were the property of their wives. Of course, if someone enticed their wives away—but that's another question. It is very amusing to find people seeking bank notes as a cure for broken hearts. We have known juries give as little as £25 as a solatium for a broken heart, and others have given as much as £10,000; but we could never find out on what principle they worked, although it is generally recognised by juries that a poor person's heart does not cost so much to mend as one possessed by a wealthy person. But it is disgusting to find men and women bringing such cases as these into court, and parading the most private affairs of life before a crowd of gaping strangers. We doubt whether such people's hearts could be broken.

ANARCHISTS AND COMING REVOLUTIONS.

[SECOND ARTICLE.]

Whatever the future may have in store, discussing the action of Anarchists during a revolution (see FREEDOM, March-April), we may foresee, theoretically, Continental revolutionary events in these post-war times of two types: as a result of the initiative of revolutionary parties or as the outcome of a general crisis and collapse of the old system.

In the supposed case of an Anarchist initiative, which, as things are, would be very limited, a local temporary general success might be rushed; but the farther away the smaller this influence would be; and who expects the sincere co-operation of all the anti-Anarchist Socialists who are opposed or indifferent to, and, above all, very ignorant of Anarchism? Such movements may give heroic examples, and if they can be repeated, and the anti-revolutionary character of the other parties becomes manifest to all, they can create sympathy and interest, and larger movements may follow. But for a long time such movements will only be preparatory propagandist efforts and cannot expect to succeed, though hope and not despair must always animate them. They are voluntary generous sacrifices, like many other Anarchist acts; and those who do not take part in them can only welcome them like gifts.

A movement inaugurated, let me say for argument's sake, by a Communist Party would place Anarchists in a dilemma. They would help to destroy, but could not help to reconstruct. If they abstain, they would be excluded from the fruits of the victory; but if they help, about the same would happen and they would have to fight; and if they won, what could they do with the unwilling authoritarians, who would be as ignorant and as hostile to our aims as before. To coerce them would degrade Anarchism and be another form of dictatorship. The question cannot be solved in this way.

If a general crisis leads to the fall of the old system, we may conclude from the experience since 1917 that the wholesale formal eclipse of the old order is comparatively easy and will proceed rapidly. The whole social structure is based on the *servitude volontaire*, the obedience of the many to the few, which is for each single victim more or less compulsory, as starvation or bloody repression meets his individual passive or active resistance; but against the collective will of the masses the paper title-deeds of the monopolists and the weapons of their armed tools are of no avail, and the hour of the lock-out of the bourgeois can strike any day. Of this the workers everywhere are by this time aware, and when news comes of a decisive event in any centre, by which the permanent dread of repression—with all the people standing by and giving no help—is removed, the lock-out of the employers or the expropriation of the means of production will proceed without a hitch. In the same way the idea of direct collective action is sufficiently known, and an infinity of local general assemblies or *soviets* will for the moment take in hand almost everything. It is also extremely likely that *the State*, that is the vast bulk of State officials *minus* the Ministers and the most compromised heads of departments, who would vanish,—this immense body of officials will proclaim its complete innocence of the harm done in the past and its desire to serve faithfully any forthcoming Socialist system; for the only thing which an official really desires is the undisturbed continuation of his office, whoever be his master.

But what next? Evidently the very instant it is quite safe absolutely every party and their members will come for the spoils; everybody is a Socialist then, and these insincere, moderate affirmations often appeal to the indifferent, who are frightened by the whole situation and feel most at home with the moderate parties. In general, the participation of so many of the indifferent and ignorant of the day before in the general assemblies and in public matters from the moment the revolution has succeeded almost provokes the demagoguery and authoritarianism of Socialist revolutionists, who have to hurry on the revolution lest it become stagnant, and who are inevitably but a minority. They are progressive compared to the indifferent, but would establish an authoritarian system which to us is reactionary, and they would prevent Anarchism as much as they could. In short, Anarchists would be in the same dilemma, or worse, as in the case previously described.

The reason of all this is that the revolution does not change the mentality of people in any miraculously advanced way, and we would not necessarily be stronger the day after the revolution than on

the day before it. On the contrary, when all the Socialists and Labour men who had not yet enjoyed power would have a safe chance to rule, can we expect them to resign or abstain? What shall we do with them and the indifferent ones to whom their demagoguery is still a novelty which attracts and reassures them? Could we overthrow them, and what should we do with unwilling, selfish, and ignorant men?

There is, in my opinion, no way out of all this but to recognise frankly that, as Anarchism cannot be imposed by authority, a revolution cannot alter this fact; also that during a revolution Anarchism can only be realised by mutual agreement by and among those who really care for it.

But there is this great difference between our present position and that during a *social* revolution and after: we cannot expect that the present system which we combat both as an *exploiting* and an *authoritarian* system should provide us with means to emancipate ourselves and thereby to fight the system. Therefore we ask for nothing and take what we can.

After a *social* revolution, however, to which we have contributed as Socialists by a century of propaganda and intellectual elaboration of advanced forms of Socialism, and in which no doubt Anarchists would take their full share of risk and work, *we have the right to realise our own social ideal for ourselves and those who choose to join us and to act similarly*; and this means that *land and means of production and raw materials* should be our share in fair proportion to our strength and progress, also *complete independence of localities, groups, or persons* choosing to live in this way from all other social and political arrangements prevailing around them. Of course, questions affecting both or more parties could be arranged by mutual agreement.

The same would apply to every other shade of Socialism, and nothing should prevent peaceful co-existence and emulation.

All parties, and we ourselves, have been guilty of the desire to generalise our ideas too quickly, suddenly. Some are impelled to this by the spirit of domination and intolerance, others by the wish to impart to all what is so dear to them and to give help to all in the quickest way. We might say that *social* help will be given to *all* by the abolition of the capitalist system, and that is quite enough for the time.

We wish also to make people really *free*, but this want is *not yet* felt to an appreciable degree by the Socialists themselves, least of all by indifferent people. Therefore it might be the right way for us to help to realise the *social* emancipation of *all* and *our own freedom*. From that time the example of our freedom would be before people relieved from social misery, and they will join us or not as they choose and as soon as they wish.

This, I think, is the fairest offer that could be made by Anarchists to the Socialists of all shades: co-operation for the social revolution, and then free access for all to the social wealth of the community in proportion to the strength of each section. If there is a real will to achieve this, the difficulties of repartition, etc., will be overcome. This would not mean separation and isolation; on the contrary, as the number of Anarchists is relatively small, but their occupations and interests are very varied, they would live all over the country, here in districts or colonies, there in farms or isolated; their affairs or those of the others would be as separated as those of Freethinkers and all sorts of religionists are to-day, and everyone would join in or abstain from the social life of his neighbours, as to-day. If the different religions which fought such bitter wars some centuries ago can keep the peace now, if the different nationalities which *now* make this globe a hell could keep the peace during most of the nineteenth century and the time before, it can be expected that people free of social cares, but differing on the question of authority and organisation, should be able to live at peace.

If this idea was seriously taken into consideration, it would relieve the working-class movement of that immense waste of energy which mutual quarrelling absorbs. These quarrels, by talking and writing in the West, by murder and persecution in the East, monopolised all the years since 1918 and left the revolutionary work undone, revolutionary opportunities were missed, the Bolshevik or Fascist whip being almost the only definite result. In France, as I learn from a letter received to-day, there are Individualist and Communist Anarchists, moderate and Communist Syndicalists, and four varieties of organised Socialists, all fighting each other as never before, and the next elections may still further increase the present reactionary majority. Reaction everywhere and the Labour movements hopelessly, stupidly divided, Anarchists themselves splitting

hairs whenever they can. By proposing toleration and fairplay, common sense in one word, we lose nothing, because there is hardly anything to lose, but we may begin to win. Not immediately, but by and by.

All other Socialists would be interested in such an agreement, for if things remain as they are either there will only be continued quarrelling and triumphant reaction, from the Conservatives to the Fascisti, or, if a social revolution ever happens, the Russian precedent will be followed and the Socialist party which comes to the top will coerce, crush, exterminate all other Socialists, unless they be its most obedient servants. Only a definite agreement that *the social wealth should be accessible in fair proportion to ALL shades of Socialism and Anarchism, that the inner organisation of each of these sections should be their own affair, and that mutual toleration and goodwill would preside over all relations between these sections*,—only such an agreement could end the present quarrels and make an efficient revolution possible. The idea of monopoly, of generalisation, of coercion, must be eradicated, and the era of natural evolution by free social experimentation be inaugurated. If this is not seen and acted upon by Anarchists, who else will ever do so?

February 23.

M. N.

REVOLUTIONARY POETS.

WALT WHITMAN.

With the coming of May and the advent of Spring one becomes exhilarated with the new rich life around us, the budding and blossoming trees and flowers, the song of birds, the invigorating breeze warmed by the gentle caressing sun, the starry moonlight night, all creating an atmosphere of wonder and the joy of living. These joys that bounteous Nature has endowed us with have been the inspiration of many a poet, dreamer, and philosopher.

It was in the month of May, 1819, at Paumanok, Long Island, New York State, that Walt Whitman was born, and he lived to be one of our greatest humanitarian poets. W. S. Kennedy describes him as "the poet of universal humanity, the breaker of stereotyped thought and institutions, setting free the creative force again." The moral principles running all through Whitman's writings are love, liberty, personal freedom. Be yourself to yourself a law, believe in your own soul's intuitions, equal honour to the body and the mind, reverence for self, "to know that the Sun and Moon hang in the sky for you, whoever you are." Woman the equal of man, and to be equally honoured. "Faith in Nature, to be joyous as Nature is joyous; to exhibit and cultivate manly affections, the love of man for man."

Walt Whitman looked below politics, to the great moral forces that lie beneath. "The free human spirit," he said, has its part to perform in giving direction to history. "Produce great persons, the rest follows."

"Oh the joy of a manly selfhood!

To be servile to none, to defer to none, not to any tyrant known or unknown.

To walk with erect carriage, a step springy and elastic,

To look with calm gaze or with a flashing eye,

To speak with a full and sonorous voice out of a broad chest,

To confront with your personality all the other personalities of the earth."

The reformer who pins his faith to systems or doctrines will find little in Whitman to appeal to him. He rather creates the atmosphere to fashion social change.

"I am for those that have never been master'd.

For men and women whose tempers have never been master'd.

For those whom laws, theories, conventions, can never master."

"To hold men together by paper and seal or by compulsion is of no account,

That only holds men together which aggregates all in a living principle, as the hold of the limbs of the body or the fibres of plants."

"The dependence of Liberty shall be lovers,

The continuance of Equality shall be comrades."

In Whitman's ideal city men and women think lightly of the laws, inward authority taking precedence of all outward authority, children being taught to be laws to themselves and to depend on themselves.

"Let others promulge the laws, I will make no account of the laws,
Let others praise eminent men and hold up peace, I hold up
agitation and conflict."

The "Song of the Broad Axe," embodying "Where the great city stands," is full of vision; likewise the short poem:—

"I dream'd in a dream I saw a city invincible to the attacks of the
whole of the rest of the earth,

I dreamed that was the new city of Friends,

Nothing was greater there than the quality of robust love, it led
the rest,

It was seen every hour in the actions of the men of that city,

And in all their looks and words."

All who believe in fellowship as a basis of life, fellowship in art, fellowship in industry, fellowship in sport, fellowship in striving after great ideals with a common end in view, are bound to be lovers of Whitman, and a study of "Leaves of Grass" would convince them far better than ever I could.

Whitman and his work are one and the same; he offers us his writings, as, if he were present in the flesh, he would offer us his friendship. We seem to be conscious more of the living human being than of the mere author when we read his pages. It was very truly said of his work—

"Comrade, this is no book;

Who touches this, touches a man."

Whitman's splendid athletic figure, robust, lusty, and generous nature, seem to pour through all his work. The world and Nature were more his school than class-rooms and lectures; the study of men and women before that of books. He writes:—

"Logic and sermons never convince,

The damp of the night air drives deeper into my soul."

His unconventional ideas were carried into the settings to his poems. He discarded the conventional laws of feet and rhyme, and wrote in musical, rhythmic sentences of varied length. His poems touch all phases of life, communal and personal, Nature and fantasy. Among the most popular are "Song of Myself," "Song of the Open Road," "Drum-Taps," "Sea-Drift," "Autumn Rivulets," "Birds of Passion," and "Children of Adam." He believed in Equality:—

"As if it harmed me giving others the same chances and rights as
myself, as if it were not indispensable to my own rights that
others possess the same."

"I am the poet of the woman the same as the man,

And I say it is as great to be a woman as to be a man,

And I say there is nothing greater than the mother of men."

To the Anarchist, Whitman's personality and his appeals to personality are his most fascinating contributions. His "Song of Myself" is full of them, and our responsibility to ourselves is well brought out in "By Blue Ontario's Shore":—

"A Nation announcing itself,

I myself make the only growth by which I can be appreciated,

I reject none, accept all, then reproduce all in my own forms. . . .

We are executive in ourselves, we are sufficient in the variety of
ourselves,

We are the most beautiful to ourselves and in ourselves. . . .

Nothing is sinful to us outside of ourselves,

Whatever appears, whatever does not appear, we are beautiful or
sinful in ourselves only.

(O Mother—O Sisters dear!

If we are lost, no victor else has destroy'd us,

It is by ourselves we go down to eternal night.)"

Whatever plight we may find ourselves in, we are responsible, our only hope lies in ourselves; and if this lesson was universally learned, a better and brighter future would be assured.

This is but a brief review of the works of a great man, and I trust the reader will be led to make a study of them for himself. I have a deep regard for Walt Whitman, and, May being his natal month, one's thoughts turn naturally to his living work and its power for inspiration. Nobody's library is complete without "Leaves of Grass."
STANLEY OXLEY.

"Democracy" in U.S.A.

We have restricted credit, we have restricted opportunity, we have controlled development, and we have come to be one of the worst ruled, one of the most completely controlled and dominated governments in the civilised world—no longer a government by free opinion, no longer a government by conviction and the vote of the majority, but a government by the opinion and the duress of small groups of dominant men.—President Wilson (1916).

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 I.L.P. Conference.

Attendance at the Independent Labour Party Conference gave me, a hater of the State and all its works, much food for thought. From the visitors' gallery I looked down daily on a large assembly whose general earnestness and capacity for transacting business it seemed impossible to doubt. The chairman was excellent, and almost without exception the speeches were extraordinarily good, testifying to the training the delegates have had in mass meetings, at municipal councils, and in Parliamentary debates. These are formidable assets, and they are being placed, with a zeal I regard as pitiable, at the service of a philosophy and institution we Anarchists regard as Liberty's most deadly foe. The State! What has it been doing during the last nine years, to go no farther back? It has been murdering men by the millions, and plunging all Civilisation into that abyss of bankruptcy which is, in reality, only a slower and more painful form of death.

Now and again, amid all this speechifying, some delegate would announce that he was no believer in State Socialism; but acts speak more convincingly than words. The Russian Dictatorship, which is Robespierre-Karl Marxism undiluted, found many supporters. The domestic legislation advocated involves a great enlargement of bureaucratic machinery and stands for increased governmental supervision and control. If one had any doubt as to the temper of the Conference, the acclamation that greeted every reference to Hyndman or Keir Hardie settled it, once and for all. These men, both of whom have passed away, were State Socialists pure and simple.

At every Conference there takes place some particular event which lifts, for the moment, the veil of talk and suddenly strips the assembly to the buff. In this Conference three such incidents occurred, each of which seemed to me decisive. I will consider them in the order in which they came.

First, a lonely figure stepped out and, in accents that stamped him as essentially a working man, expressed the opinion that a thousand pounds a year is too large a salary for the editor of the Party's weekly organ, a 16-page paper filled largely with the contributions of well-known politicians who are only too anxious to lay their views before the public. This delegate put his case clearly and forcibly, saying that their movement had no reason for its existence except as the champion of the poor; that the poor to-day are very poor, and that to pay such a salary was to alienate their sympathy and make them suspicious of the Party's good faith. To me that seemed a true and honest statement, but it got hardly a hand of applause. The gentleman who subsequently was elected Chairman for this ensuing year snubbed the protester, politely but firmly, and the vote against him was overwhelming. I leave it at that.

Secondly, an amendment declaring for total prohibition of the liquor traffic was defeated by only 11 votes, 152 delegates being in favour of it. For my part I detest drunkenness, and my worst enemies have never accused me of being a drinking man. Nevertheless, everyone who has given this question the slightest thought recognises that Prohibition is the coercive State supreme, robbing the individual of the guidance of his own life and branding him as still an infant incapable of self-control. Prohibition is an outrage on personal freedom for which only a firm believer in State omnipotence could vote.

Thirdly, Mr. R. L. Outhwaite had a resolution which called for immediate confiscation of the economic rent now charged by

landlords for permission to use the natural resources of this island, and for its payment into a common fund, to be distributed among the people by local authorities. This resolution had been indorsed by several of the Party's branches, and an early and full discussion was expected. It was postponed, greatly against its supporters' wishes, to the very end of the Conference, when a five-minute rule had been adopted and business was being hurried through. As it was, Col. Wedgwood and Mr. Andrew MacLaren spoke powerfully in support of it, and two bitter speeches were made in opposition. Then it was shelved.

Now, in this country above all others the need of destroying Land Monopoly is fundamental. Why? Simply because we cannot, at present, feed ourselves. The back country on which our city population, 80 per cent. of the whole depends is situated thousands of miles away and scattered all over the globe. For us, therefore, a prolonged general strike is an impossible tactic, since it would mean the stoppage of all credit and therewith of necessary supplies; in a word, death for millions by starvation. The working men's leaders answerable for such action would be lynched by famished mobs, and well they know it. Their advocacy of such a policy is the vulgarest of bluffs, and if ever their bluff were called not one of them would have the hardihood to toe the line.

Thoreau, who went to gaol because he refused to pay taxes to the United States Government while it was upholding chattel slavery, accused the Boston Abolitionists of cowardice. He said they were always passing resolutions in support of such men as John Brown, fighting the slave trade some two thousand miles away, but that they dared not tackle the traffic in Boston, which was flourishing and dangerous. Similarly, this I.L.P. Conference talked voluminously for and against Russia, about the Ruhr and other conveniently distant matters; but at the roots of that appalling poverty now dragging our people down to ruin it seemed to me incapable of striking, or even meditating, a single telling blow. No Monoplist will lose a wink of sleep because the Conference passed unanimously, and without discussion, a resolution denouncing Capitalism and declaring for the Socialist Commonwealth. The unfortunates now suffering from unemployment, or shivering at the thought of it, will find in all these resolutions no ray of hope.

I do not write to denounce. On the contrary, my one object is to show that the Independent Labour Party is, by reason of its ability and by the tenacity of its convictions, at once a worthy and most dangerous foe. It stands solidly for Parliamentaryism—which, however, one Member of the House criticised most caustically—and, in our view, Parliamentary Democracy is a proved failure and the hollowest of frauds. It regards itself as a Messiah to the nation, and believes that redemption will come by its capture of political power. This, therefore, is the subject that really interests it, and to this, regarded as the sovereign end, it will sacrifice remorselessly every principle or personality that dares to cross its path. All political parties have done this, from time immemorial. By the very nature of their being they will and must.

Nevertheless I personally have hopes that out of this abominable evil good may come. Transformation is the universal law, and through the alarm now felt by rival politicians this whole question of State Socialism will be dragged into the arena of a nation-wide debate. There it will have to face a cross-examination of which it has at present no conception, for rarely will you find a State Socialist who has studied anything but his own special creed. It will be required to justify its worship of State Monopoly; its denunciation of private enterprise and competition in a country where not one out of a thousand has any opportunity of employing himself, and where business competition is the special privilege of a small possessing class. These and many other similarly awkward questions will be put to it, and I have a suspicion that among the cross-examiners will be a certain gentleman named Lloyd George.

Perhaps then the masses, whose fate remains unchanged whatever Party scrambles into power, will begin to do a little thinking for themselves. Perhaps then we shall draw a little nearer toward realities. Perhaps.

W. C. O.

Revolutionary Studies—No. I. PROUDHON.

Of all the noted Anarchist writers Proudhon seems to me the most scientific. He had the solitary-student disposition which dislikes popularity, as interfering with its researches, and cares only for the pursuit of truth. He concentrated his attention on "tendencies"; that is to say, he tried to trace the course of economic evolution, understanding that it is a racial progress for which individuals and causes, themselves innumerable, prepare the road. As Shakespeare tells us. "For naught so vile that on the earth doth live but to the earth some precious thing doth give. Virtue itself turns vice being misapplied; and vice oft-times by action's dignified."

This great fact—the co-operation of countless forces all working toward one common end—the unscientific seldom grasp. Hence bigoted intolerance and a bewildering multiplicity of schemes for which fanatics cheerfully crucify themselves and others. With such Proudhon had little patience. A Darwin in the domain of economics, he devoted himself to exact analysis of the social developments and tendencies he saw around him. He dealt with society as a botanist deals with a plant, making a cross-section of its organs in order that the entire structure might be exposed to view. For this task he had exceptional advantages, being a Frenchman. France has been the Mother of Revolutions, and Proudhon was enabled to study at close range the three great experiments of 1789, 1830, and 1848. He set himself to analysing the advances to their credit, and the reasons for their having halted short of their goal. He had also the advantage of possessing a fine lucidity of style. He wrote clearly and pungently.

For this reason, and because he stuck tenaciously to principles, his work reads as fresh to-day as when it was first turned out, three-quarters of a century ago. Mr. John Beverley Robinson, of St. Louis, Mo., U.S.A., has done us, therefore, a genuine service by translating Proudhon's "General Idea of the Revolution of the Nineteenth Century," which hitherto had not been rendered into English. We hope to publish it shortly, and, in the hope of attracting attention to a really valuable work, I take it as the basis of this study.

The cornerstone of Proudhon's philosophy is that mankind is ever on the upward march; advancing, over obstacles innumerable, from ignorance to knowledge, from barbarism to civilisation, from slavery to freedom. He was no believer in the primitive man, whom Rousseau hoisted so laboriously to a pedestal of virtue. On the contrary, in his view, the collective mind is ever struggling toward the light, and by the struggle of the collective mind all history is made. It is, beyond all comparison, more potent than the individual mind; its development, and the development of the beliefs and institutions it begets, take place in strict accord with certain natural laws, and there it is our business to study and observe. If we analyse correctly, we row with the stream and arrive. If we analyse incorrectly, we get nowhere. It is the age-long riddle of the Sphinx. As Ingersoll remarked: "Why was I given a thinker if I was not to think?"

This is the most cheerful of all messages, and it is specially applicable to our own times. Proudhon saw Revolution as inevitable; a natural consequence of never-ending change; a necessary corollary to the law of growth, which demands that the old shall die and be succeeded by the young. Life is fluid; it is not static but dynamic; at intervals its increased stature requires that the old garment shall be discarded, as too diminutive and cramping, and that a new and more commodious one shall be put on. This necessity is imperative; larger social opportunities must come with larger social needs, and all the efforts of the State and Authority to evade that necessity are worse than useless. By a scientific examination of the three Revolutions through which France had passed within the course of sixty years Proudhon showed that suppression had only stimulated discontent, enlarged incalculably the field of hostile criticism, and brought nearer to its final doom that omnipotence of Authority which all rulers and all those in possession of special privileges seek frenziedly to preserve intact. This is a great truth, and we need only look around to recognise it. In the United States

during the last eight years Plutocracy has put forth all its strength to strangle criticism, and there to-day the social problem is being discussed, more earnestly and bitterly than ever, from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Canadian border to the Rio Grande. With infinite precaution, from the outbreak of the War, this country's ruling powers proceeded to guard themselves against uprisings, and at this moment the entire Empire is seething with discontent, while Socialism, in its crudest forms, has forced its way into the House of Commons and made itself the subject of debate.

Events must co-operate: the growth must have taken place and the garment become unendurably too small. Kropotkin says somewhere that Revolution is the child of Hope; but that is only half a truth. Immaculate conception is a delusion, and for the begetting of a Revolution two parents are required. Proudhon shows that the other parent is Despair. The masses never revolt so long as they believe their poverty to be merely "the accidental effect of some temporary cause." All the intellect of France, he tells us, was in revolt against the corruption which marked the reign of Louis XV; nevertheless the masses welcomed the accession of Louis XVI, and "it took fifteen years of chaos under an irreproachable monarch to bring them to Revolution." Only when they understood, at last, that the entire social machinery was out-of-date; that it would no longer work; that it had become permanently incapable of ministering to their most elementary wants—only then did they revolt. This seems to us the situation at which we have again arrived, and not in France alone. This, therefore, renders International Revolution, which cannot now be long deferred, as certain as the rising of to-morrow's sun.

In what does the change that has already taken place consist? Simply in the fact that we have passed through an industrial revolution so colossal, so stupendous, that, as yet, we cannot grasp its purport and have lost, for the moment, all our bearings. It has committed us to Industry and carried us finally out of the Military Age. Militarism, which orders and cannot permit its orders to be questioned, is out of all touch with the spirit of an Industrial Age, which lives by experiment, by untiring investigation, by fearless criticism, and by never-ceasing repetition of the question "Why?" Militarism cannot exist save by implicit obedience to authority, and that is precisely the atmosphere in which Industrialism finds it impossible to breathe. Industrialism requires that wills shall meet; that there shall be mutual agreement and free consent. Thus only can it fulfil its proper function of satisfying, fully and superabundantly, the wants of all mankind.

Proudhon's special merit lies in his having seen, three-quarters of a century ago, that Freedom and Coercion, Criticism and Authority, Industrialism and Militarism, cannot be run safely in double harness or made to sleep peacefully in the same bed. Between these two irreconcilables there is a conflict that must be fought to a finish, and we may rest entirely confident that it is not Industrialism which will be driven from the field. Sooner or later Industrialism will reign supreme, and when that day comes she will remodel all social institutions to fit her needs. What she must have for her existence is not the rigour of Authority, but the fluidity and elasticity of mutual agreement; not an eternal "law of the Medes and Persians which altereth not," but free arrangements changing as circumstances and conditions change.

This is Proudhon's inestimable contribution to world-thought. He saw that Coercion, whose other name is Slavery, must go; and that into an entirely new world of liberty we now have entered. In that world Monopoly, which is essentially coercive and authoritarian, can have no place, and before Labour can enter into its own, Monopoly, whose other name is Special Privilege, it must abolish, root and branch. Whether his plans for the overthrow of Monopoly in production and distribution—his suggestions as to the methods by which the land can be freed, and the Mutual Credit Banks, by which he proposed to abolish the present monopoly of credit—were the best that human ingenuity can devise, is merely a question of detail to which thousands of acute and practical intellects will address themselves when they understand that their business is to fight for the triumph of Industrialism, and that Industrialism's first necessity is to be set free. Proudhon's glory is that he saw clearly, and voiced intrepidly, the folly of all attempts to reconcile the irreconcilable and patch up an unstable truce between Coercion and Freedom, between Man and the State. He has been called the Father of Anarchism, and, to my thinking, he deserves the title. At present we have a semi-feudal, semi-modern, semi-militaristic, semi-industrial system, and Proudhon perceived that such an illogical combination would not work.

WM. C. OWEN.

RUDOLF ROCKER—A TRIBUTE.

On March 25 Rudolf Rocker was fifty years of age. Out of that period thirty-seven years have been spent in the service of the oppressed and the disinherited, spent without reserve or stint, lavishly, as rich characters always give of themselves. Rudolf was attracted to serious problems at an age when other boys indulge in wild pranks. In most cases precocious juvenile idealists are like precocious juvenile idealists: they suffer from arrested development before they are barely of age. Not so Rudolf Rocker. His love of freedom and his rebellious genius grew with him. They deepened with the development and maturity of his life. At the age of fifty one is more self-contained and serene. But our comrade has retained the spirit of youth—the fervour and ardour of Spring, ever becoming and renewing.

Rudolf Rocker was born in Mayence on the Rhine, March 25, 1873. He came of proletarian parents, who died when he was but a little tot. He was then placed in the tender care of a Catholic orphan asylum, but he ran away from the orphanage twice, so tender was the care given him. His Catholic foster-fathers, however, dragged him back.

At the age of 13 Rudolf was placed with a bookbinder to learn the trade. It was there that he began to read Social Democratic literature. With the help of an uncle he became a "convinced" Socialist; and straightway he proceeded to proselytise everyone within reach for his newly discovered ideal. He became a voracious reader, dividing his time, however, between reading and the active propagation of his ideas. At the age of 14 Rudolf made his debut as a writer and speaker. His first article was published in the *Hessische Volkszeitung*. Besides that, he circulated Social Democratic literature, which, under the iron law of Bismarck, was most difficult and perilous.

He remained at the bookbinder's until 1888, and then tramped on foot through the greater part of Western Europe. In 1891 the young idealist was no longer satisfied with Social Democratic theories; he began to look about for broader fields and came upon Anarchism. At the International Congress in Brussels in 1891 Rudolf, then 18 years of age, met Domela Nieuwenhuis, and shortly after that became an ardent advocate of Anarchism. With the same fervour that he had proselytised for the theories of Marx, he began the active work for Anarchist propaganda, which was even more dangerous than his former activities. The *Freiheit*, by John Most, the *Autonomie*, an Anarchist paper published in London, and various Anarchist pamphlets were distributed among the workers and in the factories by young Rudolf.

In 1892 he had incurred the wrath of the authorities to such an extent that he was threatened with arrest. Realising that Paris, which was then the great centre of revolutionary ideas and Anarchist activities, would offer greater opportunities for his hungry spirit, to Paris he went. While there he made two discoveries of lasting effect upon his life. The first was the existence of a Jewish Anarchist and Labour movement; the second, the Russian revolutionary type of woman. Rudolf did not know at the time what a tremendous part the first discovery would play in his life. He did, however, realise the importance of the second event. As he so often relates: "To find, after the German type of woman I had left behind, women who can think, who can take part in the discussion of great problems of life, and who can so completely dedicate themselves to the cause of humanity,—that was a never-to-be-forgotten event. These women became my inspiration, the burning ideal in life."

In 1894, after the act of Caserio which struck down Carnot, the President of France, Rudolf was expelled from that country. But his stay in Paris had contributed tremendously towards the widening of his knowledge and towards the depth of his spirit. He met Elisée Reclus, Kropotkin, Malatesta, Grave, Faure, Louise Michel, and many more spirits who had a profound effect upon him. Then, in 1895, Rudolf went to London, and became active in the German Anarchist propaganda. Shortly after that he also began to participate in the activities of the Yiddish Anarchists. He lectured before the Jews of London and the various Jewish labour organisations. But, being of a sunny disposition, he found it hard to acclimatise himself to the London fogs; and in 1898 he and his companion, Milly Witcop, embarked for the freest of lands—the United States. The two young romantic people reckoned without their host. The bigotry of the Puritanic watchdogs of morality, which then, as now, makes America the most provincial country in the world, would not

permit Rudolf and Milly to contaminate the "pure" soil of Uncle Sam. They had to float back whence they came.

While walking about Liverpool Rudolf ran into a stranger who had heard him lecture in London. He offered to take him to the Jewish Anarchists. One of them was a printer. Rudolf and his newly found comrades decided there and then that a Jewish paper should be started, with Rudolf as editor. The fact that he did not then know Yiddish did not in the least trouble the enthusiastic enterprisers. Rudolf could write in German, and as there is "little" difference between German and Yiddish his articles could be translated. However, so brilliant were the translations that our comrade made haste to master the Yiddish language. Blessed be those rotten translators! They have enabled Rudolf to bring to the Jews the literature of half of the world and to enrich Jewish culture as few Jews have done.

Das Freie Wort, as the Liverpool paper was called, did not live very long. Only eight issues appeared, but it made the London *Arbeiter Freund* group aware of the new Yiddish editor. Rudolf was invited to take charge of their paper. When he embarked on his editorial career the group owned the enormous capital of £8; but its supply of devotion and zeal could not be measured by filthy lucre. Thus, in October, 1898, the *Arbeiter Freund* resumed publication. Alas! not for very long. The capital gave out, and printers are not known to live on air and idealism. But it takes more than that to discourage a determined group and an inspired editor. In 1903 a new start was made. From that time until the outbreak of war in 1914, when our comrade was interned in a concentration camp, the *Arbeiter Freund* appeared under Rudolf's brilliant pen and with his burning devotion. Only those who know the appalling poverty of the East End Jewish workers will appreciate the task of Rudolf Rocker and his devoted group to keep the paper alive for eleven years. Even now Rudolf speaks with deep emotion of that period, the beautiful harmony and comradeship which prevailed in that little group of devoted workers.

In 1907 Rudolf attended the International Anarchist Congress at Amsterdam and was chosen one of the members of the International Anarchist Bureau. In 1912 he went to Canada on a lecture tour, and while there slipped into Puritanic America, much to the delight of the comrades who had the good fortune to meet and hear him.

Though always active internationally, it is yet certain that the Jewish Anarchist and Labour movement and general Jewish culture are mostly indebted to Rudolf Rocker. No other writer or speaker has given so much to the development of the Jewish mind and the increase of knowledge on the part of Jews of the world's literature.

Through his magazine *Germinal*, which he published from 1900 to 1908, one of the best Yiddish literary publications, in pamphlets and books, Rudolf brought before large circles of Jews his own translations from the French, Italian, Spanish, Scandinavian, and German. Sociological and scientific works, the drama and fiction—in fact, a new world was opened up to Yiddish readers. It is not an exaggeration to say that it was really Rudolf Rocker who created a large Yiddish literature which hardly existed before him, except, of course, the works of Yiddish writers written in Yiddish.

In March, 1918, Rudolf was deported from England to Germany, but the German military authorities followed suit. He then went to Holland, and returned to his native land only with the outbreak of the German Revolution. In February, 1919, he became one of the targets of the new dictatorship. Noske's henchmen, who had struck down the bravest and finest spirits of the German Revolution, also saw to it that Rudolf Rocker should not be at large. He was arrested and kept in jail. Later he was released, and then became the very spirit of the Anarchist and Syndicalist activities. His capacity for work is truly phenomenal. He lectures constantly in Berlin and all over Germany, and has written numerous pamphlets on Anarchism, Syndicalism, and the Russian Dictatorship. He is also one of the secretariat of the new International Working Men's Association.

Rudolf affects everybody by the simplicity of his being, the clarity of his vision, and the great strength and firmness of his character. Even the Dutch agents of Moscow, who came to Berlin to sabotage the International Syndicalist Congress, could not gainsay him. I think it is because he is totally devoid of rancour or demagoguery. He is never personal, never petty in his criticisms or attacks, which is in itself a sign of greatness.

In a world so enslaved by material values, by the mad chase after the fleshpots of Egypt, for political aggrandisement in newly

fledged Governments, it is nothing short of a miracle to retain one's spiritual equilibrium. Witness the havoc the years of war and the ruin of the Russian Revolution have brought about in the different movements. Many erstwhile idealists and revolutionists have gone back on everything they once held high. Others have become exhausted, disheartened, and have fallen by the wayside. Those who have retained their self-respect and have held firmly to their ideals have done so by dint of superhuman courage and a life replete with suffering. To mention only the stand Rudolf Rocker, Malatesta, Shapiro, and a few others of the London group have taken on the War—a stand taken in direct opposition to their great teacher and friend Peter Kropotkin and his Russian comrades. Not only was much courage needed for that, but also unusual strength of character, for I know how bitterly hard it was to go against one's deep devotion to the beautiful personality of Kropotkin. Rudolf wavered not a moment. He remained strong unto the last and, as the present world-situation proves, much more prophetic than his great teacher. If, therefore, we find the exceptional few who have the perseverance and the devotion to hold out against all odds, the least we can do is to realise their worth and to be grateful to the stars which have helped them to find the right path and to always see the ideal before them.

EMMA GOLDMAN.

Berlin, March, 1923.

MEDICAL MONOPOLISTS.

The policy of Trade Unionism, that a man not a member of a Union may not be hired to perform some work which comes under the activities of the members of that Union, is questionable. But there is no law to prevent a man, be he a member of a Union or not, from doing a piece of work for himself. Doctors, the greater part of whom would consider themselves insulted if the Association to which they belong were called a Trade Union—they being "professional men"—are granted this privilege under the Dangerous Drugs Act.

The Government Bill, the Dangerous Drugs and Poisons Bill, read for the second time in the House of Commons on February 28, would fix the maximum penalty for an offence against its commandments at ten years' penal servitude or a fine of £1,000, or both. Mr. Bridgeman (Home Secretary), who moved the second reading of the Bill, apologised to the medical profession and said there was nothing to prevent doctors ordering drugs for professional purposes. He assured them he did not wish to put any obstacles in their way in relieving patients of pain. There is nothing wrong then, in Mr. Bridgeman's eyes, in the relief of pain by drugs. But that relief must be given by certified members of the medical Trade Union. A patient who wishes to be his own doctor and whose treatment necessitates the use of forbidden drugs may treat himself, if he can obtain those necessary drugs, only under the risk of incurring a penalty of ten years' imprisonment, a fine of £1,000, or both.

Had Mr. Bridgeman introduced a Bill suggesting the infliction of that penalty on anyone, not a member of the Electricians' Union, who fitted an electrical apparatus in his house, or on anyone, not a certified member, attempting to purchase a coil of electric wire, lest he might electrocute his neighbour with the apparatus, the House would have refused to listen. Mr. Bridgeman would make even closer the combination of the primitive worship of the Medicine Man with the corrupt Elizabethan practice of monopoly.

If the Government wish to prevent the indiscriminate sale of poisons in case they should be used for nefarious purposes, why do they not forbid also the sale of razors? If it is afraid those poisons might be used by suicides, why does it not try to remove the causes of so many suicides—poverty and the like? If it wishes to prevent the use of drugs for pleasure, why does it force men to lead lives such as they must strive to put aside, seeking rather to lead visionary lives under the influence of opium and cocaine? Above all, why does the Government not mind its own business?

BRENDAN WILLIAMS.

Through the land the plundering of man began, and in the land it has rooted its foundations. The land is the fortress of the modern capitalist, as it was the citadel of feudalism and of the ancient patriate.—PROUDHON.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT IN JAPAN.

Most of our Unions started recently, but the Japanese Typographical Union, Shinyu-Kai, has a history of 23 years. However, to understand the Japanese Labour movement it is necessary to realise the influence the Socialists originally exercised. Although the history of the Unions is short and their membership small, they made remarkable progress along theoretical lines, and thus they quickly became fighting Unions, as revolutionary as any in Europe or America. This is because they have been much influenced by Anarchism, or Anarchist-Syndicalism. Doubtless the 24th of January, 1911, is still fresh in your memories. On that day, Kotoku and eleven other Anarchists, including a woman named Suga Kwanno, were executed, while twelve other comrades were sentenced to penal servitude for life. Half these have since died in prison. The Japanese Socialist movement thereby suffered greatly, for it lost its bravest comrades. At that very time comrades Osugi, Sakai, Yamakawa, and Arahata were in prison as a result of the Red-Flag affair. After their release they continued their propaganda, despite the greatest oppression. What the Japanese Labour movement is to-day is due largely to these comrades. Osugi, Arahata, and Yamakawa were Anarchist-Syndicalist writers, but Sakai was an orthodox Marxian. After the Russian Revolution, Sakai, Yamakawa, and Arahata turned to Bolshevism, but Osugi is still an Anarchist Communist.

The speeches delivered by Sen Katayama in Moscow about the Japanese Labour movement are full of serious mistakes. He said: "Part of the industrial proletariat is organised. In 1920 there were 838 Unions, with a membership of 269,000; and in 1921 there were 671 Unions, with a membership of 264,000, apart from 229 Tenants' Unions, with a membership of 24,000. There has been, of course, an increase since that time. The Landowners' Union, which, with the exception of 225 members, is really a Peasant Proprietors' Union, has a membership of 1,422,000. There are also mutual aid associations. In 1920 there were 685 of these latter, with a membership of 2,000,000. These Unions aided 3,169,000 persons by advances of money amounting to 1,551,000 yen."

The real figures, however, are as follows:—Workers' Unions, 54; total membership, 29,000. On the Tenants' Unions I have no exact report to hand, but the membership may amount to 2,000. These Unions are concentrated in two great groups. The one is the Japanese Federation of Labour (J.F.L.), the other the Association of Trade Unions (A.T.U.). Their composition is as follows:—

	Union.	Membership.
A.T.U.	21	12,500
J.F.L. and affiliated Unions ...	33	16,000
Tenants' Unions, under J.F.L. ...	13	800

The J.F.L. is strong in Osaka, and the A.T.U. in Tokio, as can be seen from the following figures:—

	A.T.U. Membership,		J.F.L. Membership.	
Tokio	12	9,000	6	1,500
Osaka	9	3,500	28	15,000

In theoretical knowledge the Tokio Unions are well advanced, but those of Osaka are rather backward. Kojokai, the Union of the Osaka arsenal factory workers, and the biggest in the J.F.L., supports, in theory, Japanese Imperialism. This is the only case of that kind. The J.F.L. leaders are university graduates and professors; and there is all the difference in the world between the J.F.L. and the A.T.U., for the latter is conducted entirely by the workers. Katayama declared that the J.F.L. had become Bolshevik, but the real conditions are as described above.

Last year it was proposed to form a National Federation of Labour, and scores of workers from all the Unions assembled at Osaka on September 30th. Anarchists and Communists also attended. While the discussions were in progress the police ordered the conference to disperse. Many of the delegates were arrested on the spot. Nevertheless, the workers of the A.T.U. had no intention of allowing this movement to die. We tried to get another conference, but the J.F.L. leaders declined to join hands with the A.T.U.

What caused the split? I will tell you. Fearing that their

positions would become precarious, the J.F.L. leaders tried to seize power. We, on the other hand, maintained that the executive committee should consist of workers only, and that the organisation should be based on the free federation of Unions, and not on centralisation, each Union being autonomous. Our watchword was:—"We must create in our organisation the germ of our future society."

After the Russian Revolution, the Japanese Socialists fell greatly under the influence of Bolshevism. Japanese Communists receive money from the Soviet Government for their propaganda. The A.T.U., however, has been, from its birth, opposed to a political movement. The J.F.L., therefore, attacked the A.T.U., and the Communists joined hands with them. But the conscious workers are always against Bolshevism and the political movement. We have found this tendency even among some workers in the J.F.L. The J.F.L. Union of Tokio, for example, leans to our side. In Japan, Bolshevism is the philosophy of the Intellectual Socialists, but the Working-Class Socialists' philosophy is Anarchist-Syndicalism. The Communist International has declared for the unity of Trade Unions, but the Japanese Communists are against such unity.

The year before last, a number of Communists were arrested for using a secret association named the Japanese Communist Party (Gyomin Kyosanto). They made an abominable confession in open court. Such a thing had never occurred in the whole history of the Japanese Socialist Movement.

We had, until quite recently, a monthly paper entitled the *Unionist Movement (Kumiai Undo)*, but it has been suppressed. Our great desire is that the truth about the Japanese Labour movement should become known to Unionists, Anarchists, Revolutionists, and Syndicalists all over the world.

No. 44, *Itchome, Motozonocho,* E. K. NOBUSHIMA.
Kojimachi-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

THE ANARCHIST RED CROSS IN U.S.A.

COMRADES,—The Anarchist Red Cross has been re-organised and we therefore give a brief review explaining the causes for such re-organisation.

From 1909 to 1917 the Anarchist Red Cross was active in aiding both morally and financially the captives of the Russian Tsar in Siberia, Schlusberg, etc. The Russian Revolution in 1917 spread a new hope for a better future. The news that all the political prisoners were freed and were met by the Russian people as their brothers, with fraternal love and understanding, brought our comrades to the realisation that their mission was at an end and that, instead of helping prisoners, their place was now among the revolutionary workers and peasants, on the streets and in the cities of the country which sent out a call to the entire world—a call of freedom. But the new freedom did not last long.

At the end of 1917 the Communist Party gained power by adopting the prevailing motto of the Russian people, "Land and Liberty." This motto they forgot as soon as they got into power, and liberty-loving idealists, who foresaw a new autocracy in the aims of the Communist Party, and who stated it openly, were thrown into jail by the new rulers and sent to Siberia, to Archangel, etc.

Among the thousands of political prisoners there were hundreds of Anarchists, men and women, who were brutally tortured by the servants of the Tcheka for protesting against their unjust imprisonment. Among these Anarchists were many very young people who had just begun to work in the revolutionary movement, but most of them were the pioneers of the movement, who gave all they possessed, their very lives, to the cause of the Social Revolution, which was stopped by the new autocratic Government of Russia.

To-day, under Communist rulership, captives of the new régime are being tortured in the very same dungeons from which they were freed only five years ago by the Russian people. A notable exception is the fortress of St. Peter and Paul, which has been converted into a museum for exhibition to foreign visitors. The new rulers have devised new schemes for torturing prisoners, with which those of the ancient fortress cannot compete. Thousands of men and women are kept in the heavily barred prisons throughout the length and breadth of Russia. From Kiev to Vladivostok and from Odessa to Archangel the cries of our comrades are being silenced by death.

The aim of the Anarchist Red Cross is to help these and other comrades who are imprisoned for their ideas in every part of the world. We therefore call upon you to assist us in our task morally and financially, and we hope you will do your utmost to let our comrades in prison know that we outside are doing all in our power to comfort them.

THE ANARCHIST RED CROSS.

Address all correspondence to Y. FIRER, care of *Freie Arbeiter Stimme*, 48 Canal Street, New York City, U.S.A.

Still Hounding Malatesta.

In the poorest quarter of Rome, Malatesta, now over 70, has his little shop. Determined, as always, to support himself by his own labour, he plies his trade of electrician. The police pursue him. He gets a job wiring a house, and a whole platoon of them breaks in to investigate the handbag in which he carries his tools! Everyone is frightened to death and Malatesta, as a workman, becomes impossible. Which is precisely what the police intend. We are glad to find *La Voce Repubblicana* having the courage to protest; for it needs courage under the Fascist reign of terror. We are glad to see it recalling how the Socialists implored Malatesta to return to Italy and "head the Revolution"; how Mussolini himself wrote, in *Avanti*, when informed of Malatesta's arrival, "Good! Very good, by God!" and how with one accord these would-be revolutionists left him in the lurch. We recall a sentence in one of Malatesta's articles in *Umanita Nova*, which ran: "If to-morrow the Socialist dictatorship should persecute the priests, I should stand by them and defend them." "Fine! But such sentiments are not agreeable to gentlemen of the Lenin-Mussolini breed."

"Freedom" Guarantee Fund.

The following amounts have been received to date (April 27): V. Mantovano 12s. 6d., J. O'Brien 5s., B. Plattin 2s. 6d., T. Foxall 5s., T. S. 12s. 6d., Dr. M. A. Cohn £2, F. L. Heath 4s., N. B. Ells 11s. 3d., A. D. Moore 2s., E. Ratcliffe 2s. 6d., L. Sarnoff 8s. 4d., G. P. 1s., J. Petrovich 4s. 2d., L. G. Wolfe (2 months) £2, Wm. C. Owen £1, Gateshead Sympathisers 10s., A. Sanders 4s., W. T. Shore 6s., J. Dimitroff 4s.

THE "WORKERS' FRIEND" PRINTING AND PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION, 163 Jubilee Street, Mile End, E. 1, is prepared to do all kinds of Printing in English, Russian, Jewish, and all European languages. From a visiting card to a book. This Association is run by and for the Movement.

REBUILDING THE WORLD: An Outline of the Principles of Anarchism. By JOHN BEVERLEY ROBINSON. Price 3d., postage 1d. From Freedom Press.

ALBUM OF THE FUNERAL OF PETER KROPOTKIN in Moscow, February 13, 1921. With an Introduction by R. Rocker. Contains 31 photographs, including two of Kropotkin taken after death. Price 1s., postage 2d. From FREEDOM PRESS.

PAMPHLET AND BOOK LIST.

- ANARCHIST COMMUNISM: ITS BASIS AND PRINCIPLES. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3d.
 THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 4d.
 THE WAGE SYSTEM. By P. KROPOTKIN. 2d.
 ANARCHY. By E. MALATESTA. 3d.
 THE PLACE OF ANARCHISM IN SOCIALISTIC EVOLUTION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
 EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. By ELISEE RECLUS. 2d.
 LAW AND AUTHORITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3d.
 OBJECTIONS TO ANARCHISM. By George Barrett. 4d.
 THE ANARCHIST REVOLUTION. By George Barrett. 2d.
 ANARCHISM VERSUS SOCIALISM. By WM. C. OWEN. 3d.
 ENGLAND MONOPOLISED OR ENGLAND FREE? By WM. C. OWEN. 1d.
 ANARCHISM AND DEMOCRACY. By John Wakeman. 1d.
 THE CONCENTRATION OF CAPITAL: A MARXIAN FALLACY. By W. TCHERKESOFF. 2d.
 AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
 THE CHICAGO MARTYRS. With Portraits. 2d.
 ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. 1d.
 FOR LIBERTY: An Anthology of Revolt. 6d.
 Postage extra—1d. for each 3 pamphlets.
- MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM. By PETER KROPOTKIN. Paper covers, 1s.; postage 2d.
 FIELDS, FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. Cloth, 2s.; postage 4d.
 THE CONQUEST OF BREAD. By P. KROPOTKIN. Cloth, 2s.; post. 3d.
 MUTUAL AID. By P. Kropotkin. Paper, 2s. net; postage 3d.
 NEWS FROM NOWHERE. By William Morris. Cloth, 3s. 6d.; paper, 2s. 6d.; postage, 3d.
 WHAT IS PROPERTY? By P. J. Proudhon. Cloth (1 vol.), 4s. 6d.; paper covers (in two vols.), 3s.; postage, 5d.
 ECONOMICS OF LIBERTY. A statement of Proudhon's system of social organisation. By JOHN BEVERLEY ROBINSON. Cloth, 2s.; postage 3d.
 ANARCHISM AND OTHER ESSAYS. By Emma Goldman. 7s. 6d.; postage 6d.
 PRISON MEMOIRS OF AN ANARCHIST. By ALEXANDER BERKMAN. 12s. 6d., postage 8d.
 POLITICAL JUSTICE: Essay on Property. By William Godwin. Cloth, 3s. 6d.; postage, 3d.
 SYNDICALISM AND THE CO-OPERATIVE COMMONWEALTH. By E. Pataud and E. Pouget. Paper covers, 2s. 6d.; postage, 3d.

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.