

Freedom

Vol. XXXIII.—No. 358.

MARCH, 1919.

MONTHLY: TWO PENCE.

NOTES.

Government Preparations for Revolution.

If a Revolution takes place here, as many of us hope, our rulers will not be taken unawares. Already they have brought back the Guards from the front, as they are supposed to be more reliable troops than the ordinary line regiments. Their officers are all members of the old aristocratic families and may be trusted to stand no "damned nonsense" from unruly strikers when the crisis comes. Winston Churchill says that "loyal rather than large armies will be required" in the near future, and by "loyal," of course, he means men who can be trusted to shoot down their own brothers and fathers, if necessary, when given the order to fire. An evening paper says that there is to be "a good deal of shifting of troops up and down the country," but rather innocently adds: "It would be a mistake to suppose that the sending of troops to industrial centres has any connection with the possibility of strikes." Oh dear no, they are going there to play marbles. Another evening paper says that cavalry and other regiments are to be sent to South Africa, but "no political significance attaches to this programme." It has nothing to do with the Boers' demand for an independent Republic. The cavalry will be sent to Potchefstroom, "in the neighbourhood of which are spaces pre-eminently suited for cavalry training." The infantry regiments are being sent out probably so that the troops may learn the Dutch language. We are a simple folk! We really thought they were being sent out to shoot the Boers who want "self-determination," but now know we were mistaken.

The "Triple Alliance."

The united demands of the miners, railway workers and transport workers have caused a scare in capitalist circles, and the whole force of the Government was brought to bear on the problem. The miners showed by their overwhelming vote that they were not to be put off by the 1s. a day increase offered by the Government, who now know that their lavish promises of a new world "after the war" will have to be met by something more substantial. To talk of "ruining the country" is ridiculous. Huge fortunes have been made by speculators during the war, fought to protect their interests at home and abroad, and the workers are determined that their own claims to wellbeing and leisure shall come first. The same applies to the other members of the Triple Alliance and also to all other workers. Lloyd George said a strike of miners would be a strike against the State. Certainly it is, as to him "the State" means the wealthy classes. But to listen to some of the men's leaders it is certain that they do not recognise this fact. Men like Brace and Thomas talk like capitalists, and the latter runs in and out of Buckingham Palace as though he were a member of the ruling class, advising the King on the matter. We are afraid the leaders of the "Triple Alliance" have been frightened by Lloyd George's threats, and if a strike does come it will be through the initiative of the men in the mines and docks and on the railway. Their leaders have not sufficient courage to accept responsibility for such a struggle. By agreeing to discuss the price of coal at the pit's mouth they threw over the men at the coal face. Smillie's indignant protest that he was not taking advantage of coal scarcity to force undue demands shows that he does not recognise that the men are really at war with the coal barons, who as soon as a strike starts look to a scarcity of food to defeat the men. The coal barons will take advantage of every point in their favour, and the men must have no sentimentality in the matter either.

The League of Nations.

There is one point about the League of Nations which we would bring to the notice of those "constitutional" Socialists who were so loud in their praises of that scheme. For many years they have been preaching in favour of capturing political power as a means of bringing about economic changes. Do they realise that if the League of Nations is established, all economic and political power will be centred in its Executive Council? Suppose a Labour and Socialist Ministry comes into power in this country and wants to bring into being a Socialist Republic, they will soon find the League of Nations threatening them with its whole force. In fact, they will find that they occupy the same position in the League of Nations as each individual State occupies in the United States. That is, they will have no power to change their economic basis until the League of Nations agrees. Economic and political power will be restricted to such small changes as buying out the shareholders in gas, water, mines, railways, etc., and giving them Government bonds in exchange. But if they attempt to expropriate the exploiters they will find the International Police Force of the League of Nations at their door the next morning! Have our Labour and Socialist parties thought of this?

The Ethics of Assassination.

The recent attack on Clemenceau and the murder of Kurt Eisner and other Bavarian ministers have caused the usual wild outburst on the part of the Press. The people who in December last were shouting, "Hang the Kaiser!" are loudest in their denunciation of Cottin, the young Anarchist who shot Clemenceau. But if it is right to execute the Kaiser, by what reasoning is it wrong to execute Clemenceau? Personally we do not think either execution would do much good. But our critics of the Press are not consistent. When the Grand Duke Sergius was killed in Russia some years ago, the English Press (it was before the Anglo-Russian alliance) condoned the assassination because of the tyranny in Russia. So really it is not a question of ethics, but a question as to how many people think that a tyrant should be removed. Jaurès, the French Socialist, was shot at the beginning of the war, but up to the present his murderer has not been brought to trial. Why? Will Clemenceau explain? Yet as soon as Clemenceau is shot, Anarchists and Socialists have their houses and printing offices raided and the police run riot in their hunt for clues. This inconsistency we leave to others to explain. They certainly have not preached the sanctity of human life since August, 1914.

Bolshevik and other Atrocities.

An extract from a letter from Col. John Ward to Mr. Appleton, the secretary of the General Federation of Trade Unions, recently appeared in the daily press. He there has some interesting things to say about what he is pleased to term "Bolshevik Atrocities." We understand that the Reconstruction Society (formerly the Anti-Socialist League) is having it reprinted as a leaflet, in order to try to persuade British trade unionists what a very criminal, hideous thing the Bolshevik bogey is. We understand, however, that the British trade unionists already know too much about the atrocities committed by Col. John Ward to care about his delectable story of murdered Grand Dukes. They will remind Mr. Appleton and the Reconstruction Society that this same heroic Col. John Ward shot down railwaymen who were on strike at Zeme in mid-Siberia on October 16 last. We might in turn remind those trade union leaders who delight in writing to the capitalist press, that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones in case the bill for repairs for their own roofs should end in their own bankruptcy. The capitalist press is still keeping up its unenviable reputation for lying, and its hirelings are still busy in the lie factory. A recent cable from Stockholm on Bolshevik atrocities concluded with the remark: "This may be doctored for British consumption." What a commentary on our intelligence!

"HANDS OFF THE PLANET."

An English soldier told his friends a short time ago of a significant incident which occurred one day as he was returning to his billet "somewhere in France." The train was full of soldiers, and after they had sung the usual songs, someone timidly started a verse of "The International," the other men in the carriage began to beat time with their feet and then joined in the chorus. This was eventually taken up in various languages along the whole train, and as it stopped at various small stations and parties of soldiers tramped away into the darkness, strong voices could be heard far down the road and across the fields, shouting out in their several tongues its message that "this is the last fight and to-morrow the International shall be the human race."

Those who have attended recent "Hands off Russia" meetings must have been impressed with the spirit that is growing up everywhere and is best embodied in the phrase used at the London conference, warning capitalism and its twin evil, Political Government, to take their "hands off the Planet," and to do it this year, too. Lenin is reported as saying that he thinks the World Revolution may occupy the next fifteen years. But this evidently depends upon the amount of resistance it encounters on its march. It is now obvious that whatever amount of fighting this resistance may cause will be just a useless waste of human energy. All intelligent observers can now see that we are in very truth already in the first phase of the last fight and that the final result in a very near future admits of no possible doubt.

The speed with which the World Revolution wins its way depends very much upon us. When what is now the British Empire becomes a Federation of Soviet Socialist Communities and a bulwark of Freedom instead of as now one of the great reactionary forces in the world, the final and universal collapse of Capitalism will be very nearly reached.

Multitudes of working men and women are beginning to realise that all this may come about in the British Isles at all events before this year has run out. It probably only needs an immediate consolidation of the claims of various bodies of organised workers into some short and easily understandable programme which would appeal to all workers, men or women, employed or unemployed, in or out of khaki, such as an immediate 30-hour week with largely increased wages, based on the enormous development which has recently taken place in our means of producing all forms of useful wealth, and then a determination by means of a revolutionary general strike to enforce these demands. This would involve a vigorous campaign and also a hearty support of the most thoroughgoing programme that may be worked out by the Soldiers' Union, both for its members still in the Army and for those who are already demobilised. Of course, as events develop, it will soon be seen that all power must be taken by the Workers' Committees and Soldiers' Councils united into one body, and then very much bigger and finer things than the initial programme will become both necessary and easy of realisation.

Whilst politicians in their usual way are pompously discussing at Paris shabby little peace schemes and are giving an exhibition of how far removed from the real modern world is the unreal one in which they live and move and have their being, the heroic pioneer work of our Russian comrades is already bearing fruit, and in every capitalist country in the world encouraging signs are appearing that the great body of workers are getting a clearer view of the present position and its possibilities, of how easy it would be under a Soviet Socialist Society for us all to live; probably even middle class people would find their material position at once very largely improved. Not only are they grasping more clearly what could be done, but how it is actually being done to-day in many parts of the world. Everywhere, in spite of the censor, news leaks through of what is happening around us and it arouses in all classes deep feelings of fear or hope, of forebodings or expectations.

The President of the Swiss Republic said to the representatives of Labour organisations: "You possess a terrible power," and this fact seems to be penetrating to the workers' consciousness. Both Japanese and Chinese Socialists have recently sent very hearty congratulations to their Russian neighbours on the splendid work they are doing. Like all observers on the spot, they are struck with admiration at the wonderful creative powers these workmen's Soviets are showing.

On February 12, the *Daily News* published a letter from a soldier in the Canadian Expeditionary Force in Siberia, who says:

It would be difficult to exaggerate the ridiculous nature of this Allied intervention, but it has its serious side. First, it would be difficult to make Russians believe that our word is

worth more than the Kaiser's. We quite solemnly promised not to interfere in their private affairs. I assure you that there are very few of their private affairs with which we do not interfere every hour of the day and night. Second, it would be very difficult to persuade the Russians that we have any real belief in democracy for Russians, however much we may like it for ourselves. We are at this moment assisting in the most active way possible a man who in every way represents autocratic as against even the semblance of democratic power. He calls himself Supreme Ruler, has locked up all elected representatives, and deported many of them from the country. . . . Political liberty of every kind has simply ceased to exist. No one dare say a word for fear of being dragged before a field court, and either killed or getting penal servitude for life. Workmen have been flogged in numbers, the meetings of labour union committees forbidden; in fact Siberia has never had less liberty. And this governing Admiral Koltchack wouldn't last five minutes without us, so we are in fact supporting ruthless tyranny here.

Even if we do claim the right to interfere in this obvious civil war—a very unusual claim, only possible because of the curious circumstances under which we originally came to Russia—we at least owe to truth and decency a denial of our original statement that we would not interfere in internal affairs, and we owe to justice and democracy a demand that the side we take in this civil war should conduct its policy, both civil and military, according to the recognised standards which we adopt for ourselves. . . . Our present position is shameful and unprincipled, and is so regarded by the great majority of Russians. We are supporting one side against the other, and the side we support is very properly regarded as the enemy of freedom.

One of the outstanding features of the German Revolution was the infamously brutal way in which Liebknecht and Rosa Luxembourg were done to death. They survived, with various terms of imprisonment, the Junker and Kaiser régime (although keen opponents of the war from its beginning), and it was left to a Government composed of jingo Socialists to bring about their deaths. The lying official reports published were quite on a par with similar documents issued by ordinary capitalist Governments. The report given to the Workers' and Soldiers' Council by one said to have seen it was that they were clubbed to death with the butt end of rifles and finished off with revolvers. These were troops formed by the Government from the junker officers and other reactionary elements in the demobilised armies as the result of an appeal for volunteers to fight the Spartacus workmen. They inaugurated a reign of terror worse than the Kaiser rule, searched houses in the workmen's quarters and killed a number of men and women Spartacists in peculiarly brutal ways. Either this was done by the direct order of the Socialist Government, in which case they were infamous scoundrels, or they were unable to foresee the likely results of their appeal to a panic-stricken bourgeois class, in which case they showed themselves weak fools.

One of the last manifestoes signed by Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxembourg, Klara Zetkin, and Franz Mehring was published in Switzerland at Christmas. It included the following:—

The hour of reckoning with capitalistic class rule has struck. The German proletariat, however, cannot accomplish this great work alone. . . . In the belligerent countries, we know that your Governments . . . are dazzling sections of the people by the glamour of victory . . . inducing forgetfulness as to the causes and aims of the slaughter. . . . The worker will realise ever more clearly that when Governments spoke of "Right and civilisation," and the "protection of small nationalities," of "defending the Fatherland," they meant the protection of capital and profits, and that the peace of right and the League of Nations amount to the same thing as the despicable robberies of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. In both cases the same shameless rapacity, the same will to oppress, the same determination to use to the utmost the brutal supremacy of instruments of murder. Imperialism in every country knows . . . only one right, capital and profit; only one language, the sword; only one means, violence. Workers of all lands, this must be the last war! We owe that to the twelve million massacred victims; to our children; to humanity . . .

If the working class representatives of every country join hands . . . peace can be made in a few hours. Then there will be no quarrels about the left bank of the Rhine, Mesopotamia, Egypt or Colonies. Then there will be only one people; only one working humanity of all races and tongues. . . . only one aim: welfare and progress for all. Humanity stands before the alternatives, death and destruction in the

capitalist chaos, or regeneration by means of social revolution. The decisive hour has come! Workers of all lands, we call upon you . . . not for the sake of German capitalists, who, trading as the German nation are trying to escape the results of their own crimes, but for our sakes and for yours. Consider well! Your victorious capitalists stand ready to crush our revolution which they fear as though it were in their own country. Victory has not rendered you yourselves more free, but more enslaved. If your ruling classes succeed in strangling the proletarian revolution in Russia and Germany, they will then turn against you with redoubled ferocity afterwards. . . . The time of empty manifestoes, platonic resolutions and sounding words is past. We appeal to you: vote everywhere for the Workers' and Soldiers' Councils, who will seize political power, and together with ourselves, establish peace. Neither Lloyd George nor Poincare, neither Sonnino, Wilson, Erzberger nor Scheidemann may conclude peace. Proletarians of all countries! we appeal to you to accomplish the work of Socialistic deliverance, once more to lend a human countenance to the degraded world, and to prove the truth of the words with which we separated: the International will be the human race!"

Reports have appeared that Russian and German Communists are arranging to call a revolutionary International Congress, and are preparing a manifesto urging Labour everywhere to establish the dictatorship of the workers, oppose the Imperialistic Socialists, expropriate capitalism, suppress private property in the means of production, disarm the bourgeoisie and its tools, and arm the workers, believing that the present time will see the end of capitalism in the world.

F.C.C.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS.

The demand for the release of the C.O.'s is growing in strength, as many people are beginning to see that the continued imprisonment of these men after repeated sentences for the same offence is in reality slow torturing to death. Some have died and some have been driven insane by their imprisonment. In many cases men are serving their third, fourth and even their fifth sentences; but the most damnable method of the Government is to release men whose health has broken down, only to rearrest them when they are considered fit to stand fresh tortures. The devilish brutality of this system is worthy of a Government which, with its Allies, is deliberately starving to death probably millions of Russians because they refuse to repay the money lent to their oppressor, the late Tsar. Now that the war is over, the Government have no excuse for keeping these men in prison. We look to the increasing revolutionary spirit among the workers to bring about their release, and the release also of many other victims of our system of "organised vengeance, called Justice."

Extracts from a prison letter from our comrade, Bob Seaton, now in Carlisle Jail, dated January 3, 1919:

"I write with a consciousness to fully express all I feel. What do I feel?—my weakness; the apathy of the masses; and the shameful desertion of others. With unity my weakness becomes strength,—the apathy of the masses may be turned into living and conscious enthusiasm; the deserters we can leave to posterity.

"What think ye of the Russian Revolution? In prison we have thrilled; we have rejoiced to think that the terrible and vindictive oppression has been overthrown, and that Liberty has raised her head. 'Think of the bloodshed!' say some people. We are not unmindful of that, but what is the picture of Europe for these past four years? A daub of red would suffice; yet it is believed to be a Christian business. In a few years the harvest fields will be waving fair over these late scenes of slaughter; the peasant at his toil will perhaps give no thought of the manure that has made the ground fertile. To the imaginative traveller the waving tops of corn, etc., will seem to be the motion of human bodies in their last struggle with life.

"Many vivid pictures of prison come to my mind, but long absence from social intercourse has robbed me of many parts of speech. Daily my vocabulary grows less. I experience difficulty of concentration. There are times when I have to make an effort to stop thinking.

"Prison life is not easy. Some people add insult to injury by talking about the quietness and the meditation it affords. These people ought to try it; they would find the silence oppressive, the meditation develop into brooding."

Many petitions in favour of release have been signed by influential men and women, even by strong believers in the "righteousness" of the war; but the Government remains as obstinate as ever. Direct action alone seems likely to have any effect.

ANSWER TO CORRESPONDENT.

A.B. 101.—Sorry no room. Your plan would leave the coal owners in possession, which is the root cause of the trouble.

FACTS ABOUT MINERS.

Mr. Lloyd George, the erstwhile champion of democracy, shall step on the stage and deliver himself. Addressing the Miners' Federation he said:

"The State could not surrender, if it began, without abdicating its functions. It is not a question of this Government or that Government, but of government—every government. The community, before we enter into this conflict, will be either for or against us. If the community is against us, then another Government must undertake the task. If the community is behind us, it is a conflict with the community; and these concessions could not be given without handing the Government over to the triumphant industry; and a country which has faced four and a half years of the perils and the horrors of war would not do that very easily. We have thought out what it means. I am perfectly certain each and all of you have done so."

It is to be devoutly hoped that every working man and woman will get those words by heart. They are as clear and as formidable an indictment of Government as any Anarchist could hope to make. Government is not primarily concerned with questions of justice or right, but with the maintenance of itself. This is one of the main reasons why we oppose and attack government. We maintain that the common people would be better off, morally and materially, without it than they can possibly be with it.

The miners, in appealing to the Government, have made a mistake that has been made by working people many times in the past. I write as one who has lived among miners, who knows the conditions of their lives as well as anyone who is not a miner can hope to do. And I have vivid memories of the last coal strike. I saw the strikers digging out the outcrop coal on the Duke of Norfolk's land. His Grace was cautious enough to put no obstacles in their way. Had he asserted his legal and fancied rights there would have been riot and bloodshed. The thought occurred to me then: If miners can dig coal for themselves during a strike, surely they can go on digging it for themselves in normal times. For myself, no sum of money that could be offered to me would tempt me to go down a pit shaft.

The one hard, solid fact to be constantly borne in mind about the coal industry is: that the output of coal from any pit is limited by the capacity of its shaft. If in twenty-four hours the travelling cages can only bring up to the surface 5,000 tons of coal, it matters not if the men below are hewing 20,000 tons in the same time: the output will remain at 5,000 tons per day. This elementary fact concerning coal is apparently unknown to every person who has given his views on the subject an airing, and to the politicians also. The question is not how much the miners can hew, it is how much can be carried up the shaft in twenty-four hours.

And speaking generally, the housing conditions in mining communities are the worst in existence. A daily bath is a necessity for the miner. It is the first thing he must have after coming from the pit. Will it be believed that not one in fifty of the houses in which miners must live has a bathroom, or indeed a bath of any kind? The dirty man must strip and bath in front of the kitchen fire. And for him there is no possible privacy. His underclothing, reeking with sweat, has to be dried on a line over the fireplace. The smell of it infests the house. The sanitary conveniences he has to use are of the foulest and vilest description.

I could take my readers into streets of houses in the South Yorkshire coal district and he could not for the life of him distinguish one street from another. The houses—kennels is a better name—are all exactly alike; the grace of ornament and distinction are absolutely lacking in these street tunnels. Bottomley would most certainly refuse to stable his horses in them.

Well, we hope that the miners of the country have decided to put an end to these things, and we earnestly advise them to rely, not on the plausibility of our Government, but on the good strength of their brains and hands. They are entitled to ask, when the "interests of the community" is presented to them, what interest the community has taken in their lives and welfare. They should not pay another penny piece in rent, and they should insist on their checkweighman crediting to them the market value of the coal they get out. Then the mystery which at present is over rents, wayleaves and profits would be lifted and the truth revealed. Here is one concluding fact. In 1910 a certain class of coal was being got in a pit at Sheffield. For every ton brought to the pit-head the miners got tenpence, which was shared among them. Yet that same coal was being sold in Sheffield at from sixteen shillings to seventeen and sixpence per ton. Who was getting the difference? A question I commend to Lloyd George and the other gasworkers.

JOHN WAKEMAN.

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

Monthly, Twopence; post-free, 2½d. Annual Subscription, post-free, 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, 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 SOCIAL WAR.

For the moment there is a lull in the industrial struggle. With the return to work of the strikers in Glasgow, Belfast, London, and on the Tees and Tyne, all attention is now concentrated on the demands of the "Triple Alliance" of miners, railway workers and transport workers. Lloyd George, by skilful manoeuvring and by veiled threats, got the miners' leaders to postpone the strike notices whilst masters and men discussed the price of coal. It is highly improbable that any terms the masters will concede can come anywhere near to what the men have demanded, and it seems that even though the men's leaders may advise acceptance, the men will refuse and force a strike. If this happens, a general strike throughout the country is almost certain, as the temper of the workers is very different now from pre-war days. The revolutionary spirit is found in all large bodies of workers, who have been strongly influenced by events in Russia and on the Continent generally, and who are only awaiting their opportunity to throw off the chains of Capitalism as have their comrades in Europe. The workers here are now beginning to realise the truth about the war, as the doings at the Peace Conference have exposed the hideousness of the tragedy and the hypocrisy of those who led them into it.

Two facts stand out clearly as the primary cause of all our social troubles—private property in the means of life, which means slavery for the great mass of the workers; and the power now in the hands of the Governments, by means of which they have forced the workers to join the Army or Navy and kill or be killed. Until these two evils are swept away there can be no peace. Reduction of hours, increases in wages, better housing—all these are nothing if it is in the power of one man or body of men to dictate the terms upon which others shall be allowed to earn their livelihood. And in the Revolution which is bound to come sooner or later this will be the supreme test by which to judge the sincerity of all Revolutionists—Are you in favour of the total abolition of private property in land and the means of life, and the abolition of authority of one man over another? The man or woman who wants a "democratic" government or a "Socialist" government does not believe in equality, but merely wishes to occupy the position of those now in authority. They talk glibly of the "brotherhood of man," but the day after they are elected to power they begin to make rules and regulations for others just in the same old way as those who ruled before them.

To us Anarchists, the Social Revolution is not merely a question of bread and butter, it is a question of breaking all the chains by which men and women have been bound for centuries. Too long have they been crushed beneath the weight of laws passed by legislators now dead and forgotten; too long have we tolerated the making of new laws by those who claim the right to rule us. To get rid of these legal chains, forged for us by our oppressors, past and present, must be the first task of the Social Revolution, for then only can men and women breathe freely and be free to build up the new society founded upon Communism and true equality. Quarrels about wages and hours of labour are mere skirmishes in the Social War which will prepare us for the final struggle, when our battle cry will be "Down with private property! Down with all forms of authority!"

The receipt of a free copy of this paper is an invitation to subscribe—2s. 6d. per annum.

MARRIAGE AND CAPITALISM.

The extraordinary decree published in the *Times* of February 11, under the heading "Bolshevist Marriage," and the universal outcry against it raised by the bourgeoisie impel us to ask what is this sacred marriage which the hirelings of the capitalist press are so very anxious to defend?

In every so-called civilised, Christian country we find that what is known as monogamous marriage exists. According to English law, "marriage is the voluntary legal union for life of one man with one woman to the exclusion of all others." But in actual practice marriage does not exhibit these ideal features, for not only in this country, but wherever monogamous marriage holds sway, there is found existing side by side with the "ideal" legal system of marriage, the hidden canker of prostitution. Thus wherever legal monogamous unions exist, in every village and town, there exist also the ramifications of that world-wide sex relationship known as prostitution. The curious will ask why two sex relationships should exist—one legal, the other illegal. Are both necessary to the well-being of society and is one form an unmixed blessing and the other a necessary evil?

When we come to analyse the history and growth of marriage we find that, like all else in life, it has been subject to the law of change. Thus in the days of primitive society we had promiscuous sex relationships, with the resulting matriarchate, fatherhood being unknown. Descent could be traced only through the mother. Group marriage and marriage by capture and purchase have held sway at different periods in the history of the races. An inquiry into the origin and development of marriage discloses one fact, that like political institutions, marriage inevitably follows the lines of economic evolution. That is why the "monogamous" form of marriage in England to-day reflects the capitalist system of society. The need for legitimate heirs who could inherit the property of their sires undoubtedly gave rise to our present legal system of marriage. But because it was primarily a property relationship, and took no account of the physical or mental needs of the sexes, the promiscuous form of sex relationship known as prostitution came into existence. So we see that the sacred relationship of marriage in reality has its roots in the banking accounts of the property owners and land grabbers. True, the Church has from time immemorial given its blessing to this monogamous form of "holy matrimony." But in actual practice we find that this particular form of sex relationship can and does become sordid, squalid and dishonest. If it were not so, prostitution would not be so wide-spread and persistent. The whole system of marriage, therefore, rests on an economic basis.

The sex contract thus entered upon is of an unequal character. The male, being the property owner, has certain privileges. The children of such a union are his property and he is the one with authority over the wife and family. There is no equalisation, for that would involve the economic independence of the mother, who cannot be both an effective child-bearer and an effective bread-winner. So the married woman exists in a perpetual state of dependence on her husband, and has her mental outlook narrowed by her restricted environment. At best she is the slave of her wealthy lord; at worst she is the slave of the wage-slave.

But let us turn to those unfortunates who have failed to secure the legal seal for their sex relationships. They become outcasts, forced into selling their sex as a means of livelihood, not, perhaps, permanently to one man as in a "marriage of convenience," but to any buyer that chance might provide. Economic necessity thus forces the woman into sex relationships that in the last resort prove harmful to herself and the community. Harmful because they are contrary to the law of nature. For they differ from the promiscuous sex relationships of primitive society in that they are not based on instinct or choice, but upon the necessity of procuring some sort of existence.

The net result of these two systems of sex relationships existing side by side is wholly harmful to society. The moral character is warped by the sordid nature of both types of union, and physical deterioration results from the spread of venereal disease. But though the results are manifest to those in authority in both Church and State, a guilty secrecy is maintained, the form of legal marriage is upheld and promiscuous sex relationships secretly sanctioned. We see, therefore, that while capitalism lasts with all its sordid makeshift philosophy of life, so will monogamous marriage plus prostitution persist.

In a state of society founded upon co-operative industry prostitution could not exist, for no woman would be forced to maintain herself by the sale of her sex. Love would become absolutely free, and no form of compulsion would affect the choice of the marriage partner. The old capitalist forms of monogamous marriage and prostitution would disappear because of the altered economic form of society. In place thereof sex relationships

would result from the free choice of lovers. In every sense such unions would be free—would be maintained only so long as love remained. There would be no economic necessity forcing a woman to remain with her partner, and causing her to continue (as so often in marriage to-day) a sex relationship that has become repugnant to her.

In order to understand the actual meaning of "free unions" it is necessary to conceive a state of society in which no form of private property exists. When we can understand the immense effect private property has had upon modern marriage, then we shall get a better perspective of the so-called Bolshevik marriage decree, with its insistence upon the community's right to *own* women. The whole document is so obviously faked that it is hardly worth while attempting to criticise it. For instance, the absurdity of abolishing private property in inanimate things, and instituting private property in human beings, does not appear to have struck the inventors of the document. Clause 6 of the decree declares: "All women according to this decree are exempted from private ownership and are proclaimed to be the property of the whole nation." This suggests the myth used by the old opponents of Socialism, that Socialism meant the communal ownership of women. The originators of this myth conveniently forgot that property in women implies ownership. That in a state of society where each human being is free to work and where private property does not exist there can be no compulsion in sex relationship or in other directions.

The whole twenty-two clauses of this absurd decree bristle with rules and regulations that are certainly most un-Anarchistic in conception. The suggestion that the State should own and regulate sex relationships of the women of the community is too ridiculous for belief. It is true that the Bolsheviks have abolished capitalism and are socialising industry. It is also true that some sort of marriage still exists. From all accounts marriage still rests upon the customs and tradition of the particular village or commune. Russia is at present passing through a transition period. New forms—economic, political and social—are everywhere appearing, and it is quite possible that in marriage as in other respects old forms may have been superseded; but it is very certain that if new sex relationships have replaced the old such relationships will follow the new economic conditions and will undoubtedly make for the greater freedom of the individual and would not transfer ownership from the husband to the State. One important factor must be borne in mind when we are considering Russian conditions: economically Russia is undeveloped and capitalism was not as deeply rooted there as in the Western European countries. Therefore the primitive marriage customs may have survived, and may to some extent still affect the communal form of society. But at all costs let us realise the fact that capitalism on the one hand means monogamous marriage and prostitution, and on the other, Communism stands for free unions founded upon love and the individual needs of the sexes.

The one vital thing to remember is that capitalism means slavery in *every* phase of life, and that economic freedom will bring with it also freedom to love and an opportunity for self-expression unknown to-day.

M.B.H.

EDUCATION IN RUSSIA.

"The child of to-day is the citizen of to-morrow." While we in England have been dwelling upon this fine phrase, Soviet Russia has carried into effect a series of reforms in education. The Montessori system, *here* the luxury of the few, is there in vogue in most infant schools, and so the child at an early age is taught to develop its own faculties instead of turning its brain into a patent elastic funnel to receive the ideas which the Board of Education see fit to pour into it. While we have been *talking* of the cinema as an aid to education and continue to depict thereon war scenes and smutty stories, these Bolsheviks have brought out sets of instructive cinematograph films for use in schools. While we are content to listen to speeches from our Minister of Education dealing with making University life possible for the sons of the poor, Soviet Russia has quietly gone ahead and opened six new Universities over Russia, and all existing Universities are free to the workers.

While we have looked on quietly and watched the price of books rising and rising, while our Government has told us that we are helping our country when we save paper, Soviet Russia, that land of "barbarism," has been issuing editions of its classics at an incredibly cheap rate, and has circulated by means of the Red Trains masses of cheap literature and, according to Rhys Williams, is really inspiring its people with a love of learning. As an example, the Bolsheviks have spent some two million roubles on bringing out a very cheap edition of all Tolstoi's works, in order to bring them within reach of everybody.

E.S.

ANARCHIST MANIFESTO.

COMRADES,—

Revolution approaches; are we ready for the exigencies which may arise on the morrow? Providing we keep alive within our own libertarian ranks the virile spirit of Revolution, we shall not fear any impotency of effort.

We of the Stockport Workers' Freedom Group, in welcoming back our fellows from their splendid fight with the military tyrants of this country, re-assert our determination to place ourselves wholeheartedly in the propagandist van of Anarchy, and call upon all comrades to raise aloft again the banner of rebellious education and pure idealism.

We call, knowing only too well the reason for our apparent quiescence during the immediate past, knowing well why our groups have been well nigh crippled as far as expression goes. The capitalist system is tottering, its upholders are seeing "red" and are preparing to maintain their position at all costs, but the workers also are gaining vision, and everywhere the world over the various organisations making up the revolutionary movement are becoming stronger in their forces and more persistent in their work as sappers undermining the rotting structure of the "Pyramid of Tyranny." So we call upon isolated comrades to come together and form embryonic groups wherever possible and, where groups already exist, for the comrades forming such to act in unity with ourselves, with a new enthusiasm born of the bitter experience of the past four years' persecution, in amalgam with a clearer realisation of the splendid potentialities underlying even the deepest ignorance and despair; urging, moreover, the greater inter-linking of all existing groups (and others we hope to see spring into being) for unified effort wherever expedient or possible, and for increasing the social relations between all comrades.

We re-affirm our determination to further and increase our own activities on the basis of propaganda, for which our groups were originally and definitely formed.

Wherever needful let us rejuvenate and revitalise thoroughly each group organism's interior. Do not let any of us sink into fossilised apathy. We can aid one another by inter-group communications dealing with various activities carried forward or suggested. All who have the courage of reasoned conviction have a hard struggle against organised misrepresentation and suppression. We Anarchists expect resistance of the most brutal character to our endeavours, because our masters fear the progress of our ideas among the servile masses. It is incumbent upon every one of us to explain to our fellow workers the reason for their masters' actions against us,—the cause of our governors' fears. Let us issue and disseminate expressive literature explaining plainly our ideas and the means of attaining them, thrusting deep the truth that all complex ideas imbued with the governmental spirit are alien to the spirit of liberty and alien, therefore, to any real issue concerned with Labour's complete emancipation.

Comrades, to struggle is to live; let us struggle *together*, not isolated; let not the most determined individualist fear the Communism we advance,—the Free Society of Free Individuals,—based upon the *order of equality and liberty of expression*, voluntary agreement and social service according to ability, desire and opportunity.

Forward!—for the Anarchist Revolution!

STOCKPORT WORKERS' FREEDOM GROUP.

18, Park Street, Stockport, Cheshire,

January, 1919.

OUR APPEAL FOR FUNDS.

We are pleased to note that cash is coming in fairly well, in spite of the fact that unemployment is causing many to look to the future with anxiety. But with the foundations of capitalism tottering, we must be prepared to hit as hard as we can, and our propaganda should be intensified to the utmost. In these circumstances, we ask all our friends to redouble their efforts and ensure that FREEDOM is kept on a strong financial basis. Let us have every penny you can spare, and in this way help to spread anarchist ideas as widely as possible.

Received up to March 1: E. Archer, 1s.; G. Wheatley, 2s. 6d.; T. S., 2s. 6d.; R. J. Davey, 2s. 6d.; A. Smith (Ayr), 2s. 6d.; Educational Club, Knockaloe Camp, 8s.; E. M., 4s.; A. Sanders, 8s.; H. Boal, 10s.; C. Moxon, 10s.; E. C. B., 1s.; E. Goulding, 1s.; E. W. Lynch, 1s. 6d.; J. Davidson, 1s.; J. S. B., 2s. 6d.; Gateshead Sympathisers, 16s. 6d.; W. Lagsding, 4s.; Mangiarotti, 17s. 6d.; Bardusco, 10s.; A. Gislew, 6s. 6d.; Campanini, 6s. 6d.; Gualtieri, 2s.; Cano, 1s.; Rossi, 2s.; Sarti, 1s.; Bonet, 6s. 6d.; Sheder, 1s. 6d.; F. Fonte, 1s.; Baldieri, 1s.; Lorami, 1s.; Ferrari, 1s.; G. I., 1s.; Mosi, 1s.

B. RUSSELL ON ANARCHISM.*

It is very interesting to Anarchists to find a philosopher of Mr. Bertrand Russell's standing weighing the arguments for and against Anarchism; and although he says that it is "for the present impossible," he admits that pure Anarchism "should be the ultimate ideal to which society should continually approximate."

The author has divided his work into two parts—the first part dealing with Socialism, Anarchism and Syndicalism from the historical point of view, the second part being devoted to the author's views on "Problems of the Future" and how they might be solved.

Mr. Russell in his first chapter gives a sketch of Karl Marx and his Socialist doctrine and points out that although State Socialism might be the outcome of the proposals of Marx and Engels, as put forth in the "Communist Manifesto," they cannot be accused of any glorification of the State. It is their followers who have made an idol of the State.

The second chapter on "Bakunin and Anarchism" deals with the struggle between Marx and Bakunin in the International Working Men's Association. The Germans and English followed Marx, but the Latin nations in the main followed Bakunin in opposing the State and disbelieving in the machinery of representative government. Although Bakunin did not produce a finished and systematic body of doctrine, he may be regarded as the founder of Anarchist Communism. "There is something of Anarchism in his lack of literary order." If we wish to understand Anarchism, says Mr. Russell, we must turn to his followers, and especially to Kropotkin, who presents his views "with extraordinary persuasiveness and charm," although our author says, "the general tone of the Anarchist Press and public is bitter to a degree that is hardly sane." In speaking of what he calls the "darker side" of Anarchism, "the side which has brought it into conflict with the police and made it a word of terror to the ordinary citizen," he says the revolt against law leads to "a relaxation of all the usually accepted moral rules." In another part, however, Mr. Russell says that "those Anarchists who are in favour of bomb throwing do not in this respect differ on any vital principle from the rest of the community. . . . For every bomb manufactured by an Anarchist, many millions are manufactured by governments; and for every man killed by Anarchist violence, many millions are killed by the violence of States." Is it a "revolt against law" that leads States to relax "the usually accepted moral rules"?

The chapter on "The Syndicalist Revolt" is a brief sketch of the Syndicalist movement in France, which arose as a protest against Parliamentary Socialism. Syndicalists wish to destroy the State, which they regard as a capitalist institution, designed essentially to terrorise the workers. They wish to see each industry self-governing. Similar in its aims and methods is the I.W.W. (Industrial Workers of the World), an American organisation which has branches in most English-speaking countries, and whose clear-cut policy has been summed up by its secretary in one sentence: "Complete surrender of all control of industry to the organised workers."

Mr. Russell finds something to accept and something to reject in each of the "isms" he deals with, but says that "the best practicable system, to my mind, is that of Guild Socialism, which concedes what is valid, both in the claims of the State Socialists and in the Syndicalist fear of the State." We cannot deal with Guild Socialism now, but will turn to Mr. Russell's criticism of Anarchism in the second part of the book.

The author first deals with the questions of production and distribution under Anarchism. He quotes largely from Kropotkin's "Anarchist Communism," which is the basis of his criticism. Mr. Russell admits that the production of food and other necessities of life sufficient for the wellbeing of all could be so easily maintained that every one would be able to take just what he or she required without any check being necessary. But as to the other Anarchist proposal, that there should be no obligation to work, and no economic reward for work, he has his doubts. He thinks that idlers could only be influenced if society were divided into small groups and each group only allowed to consume the equivalent of what it produced. The members of each group would thereby be interested in seeing that all did their share of work. But, of course, that would not be Anarchism, he admits. He then deals with the Socialist theory, that work alone gives the right to the enjoyment of the produce of work—all who can should be compelled to work, either by the threat of starvation or by the operation of the criminal law. Mr. Russell does not agree with this, as he says that "the only kind of work recognised

will be such as commends itself to the authorities," which will leave little freedom of choice to the individual. "If the Anarchist plan has its dangers, the Socialist plan has equal dangers." Anarchism has the advantage as regards liberty, Socialism as regards inducement to work. So he suggests as a combination of these two advantages that a certain small income, sufficient for necessities, should be given to all, whether they work or not, and that a larger income should be given to those who are willing to engage in some work which the community recognises as useful. This, of course, means that a governing body of some kind would be necessary, an argument that runs through the whole book.

In the chapter on "Government and Law" Mr. Russell gets to grips with the Anarchist position, and in this is very disappointing. At times he uses arguments against Anarchism which Anarchists use against government. For instance, he says: "Envy and love of power lead ordinary human nature to find pleasure in interferences with the lives of others." Surely that should be a powerful reason why power should not be put into the hands of any body. Again, he says that without government "the strong would oppress the weak." Does Mr. Russell really believe that governments exist to protect the weak? Up to the present every government has protected the interests of the strong, and any government in future will be compelled to stand by those who put it in power.

In dealing with the question of "crime," such as theft, cruelty to children, crimes of jealousy, rape and so forth, he admits that some of these are due to our present system of society, but says they are almost certain to occur in any society to some extent. Granted, but in an Anarchist society people would learn to protect themselves from such anti-social acts. At present people look to the police and government for protection; in fact, we are frequently told by magistrates that we "must not take the law into our own hands." But the spirit of mutual aid is still alive, and Anarchists have never preached non-resistance. But we have found by experience that government and police do not protect us. Mr. Russell's sentence of six months' imprisonment taught him that lesson.

In spite of his belief in the necessity of some central organisation, backed by law and force, Mr. Russell shows very strong leanings towards Anarchism in his constructive proposals. On page 192 he says:

"From the point of view of liberty, what system would be best? In what direction should we wish the forces of progress to move? From this point of view, neglecting for the moment all other considerations, I have no doubt that the best system would be one not far removed from that advocated by Kropotkin."

And on page 210:

"The system we have advocated is a form of Guild Socialism, leaning more, perhaps, towards Anarchism than the official Guildsman would wholly approve. It is in the matters that politicians usually ignore—science and art, human relations, and the joy of life—that Anarchism is strongest, and it is chiefly for the sake of these things that we included such more or less Anarchist proposals as the 'vagabond's wage!'"

Altogether "Roads to Freedom" is a very readable book, and—an exceptional feature with critics of Anarchism—the author certainly understands the principles he criticises, even if he does not agree with them.

As the publishers of all other books and pamphlets quoted are given, we hope that in the next edition the publishers of Kropotkin's "The State" and "Anarchist Communism"—the Freedom Press—may also be given.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS (not otherwise acknowledged).

(February 4—March 1.)

"FREEDOM" SUBSCRIPTIONS.—G. Wheatley, N. Sall, R. Narayan, S. C. Potter, H. Burgess, A. G. Barker, W. Ms., W. C. O., E. E. Wilkinson.

"FREEDOM" GUARANTEE FUND.—See page 17.

NOTICES.

"FREEDOM" OFFICE is open for sale of books and pamphlets every Saturday afternoon, from 3 to 5.30.

"FREEDOM" can be obtained (wholesale and retail) at National Labour Press, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, E.C.; also at Henderson's, 66, Charing Cross Road, W.C. Anarchist books and pamphlets are on sale at the latter bookshop.

COWDENBEATH.—"FREEDOM" and Anarchist books and pamphlets can be obtained at the Communist Literature Depot, 128, Perth Road, Cowdenbeath.

CARDIFF.—"FREEDOM," books, and pamphlets can be had from A. Banks, 1, Carmarthen Street, off Market Road, Canton, Cardiff. Call and have a chat.

WILLESDEN "FREEDOM" LEAGUE.—Discussions on Political and Social Questions are held every Sunday evening (7.30) at Hamilton Hall, High Road (close to Pound Lane 'bus terminus).

Printed by the BLACKFRIARS PRESS, LTD., 80, Blackfriars Street, Manchester. and Published by FREEDOM PRESS, 127, Ossulton Street, London, N.W.

*Roads to Freedom: Socialism, Anarchism, and Syndicalism. By Bertrand Russell. 7s. 6d. net. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 40, Museum Street, W.C.1.