

Freedom

VOL. XXXVII.—No. 412.

NOVEMBER, 1923.

MONTHLY: TWO PENCE.

NOTES.

The Devil's Dance in Europe.

The attempt of the British Government to draw the United States into the Reparations tangle has been foiled by Poincaré, who has adopted the Briton's motto: "What we have we hold." He knows that, for the present, at any rate, no Power is in a position to seriously challenge his hold on the Ruhr. French troops (black and white) and the French air fleet are holding down the German people, and the French Government is mercilessly maintaining its stranglehold until it gets everything it wants, while the world looks on helplessly. The German industrialists are now "coming to heel," to use the elegant words of Poincaré, and will soon be eating out of the hand of the conqueror. Stresemann, the German Chancellor, has assumed the now common rôle of Dictator, in order to force the terms of settlement on workers and Nationalists alike. The former, as usual, will have to bear the brunt of the burden; and they will now be squeezed to the uttermost in the interests of their French and German masters. Their heroic passive resistance has not helped them, and was initiated by their Government merely to decide by whom they should be exploited. Whatever the result of the struggle, the workers were bound to lose. The Socialist and Communist parties tried to exploit the situation for their own ends, and now they have been beaten they are making a scandalous attempt to throw all the blame on to the Syndicalist Unions. (We hope to deal more fully with this matter next month.) For two generations the German workers have put their trust in Marxian politicians in their fight for freedom. Their terrible betrayal will surely teach them, and the workers of other countries also, that politicians of all creeds use them simply as stepping-stones to place and power; and that only by their own efforts can they hope to break their chains.

Edison Predicts Four-Hour Day.

Thomas Edison, the well-known American inventor, speaking in New York recently, said: "The time will come when full automatic machinery will be so largely introduced that production will not require a man's working more than four hours a day. . . . Then old men need never work. The young can work and support the family." Mr. Edison may know all about the productive power of modern machinery, but he evidently knows very little about the workings of Capitalism. Four hundred years ago, when machinery was unknown, Sir Thomas More, in his "Utopia," said that six hours' work a day would suffice for all the wants of the people. Benjamin Franklin said, about 150 years ago, that five hours' work would be sufficient. Now, with machinery increasing production a thousand-fold, Edison says we may *look forward* to a four-hour day. But he forgets, or ignores, one factor in his prophecy. The machines are not the property of those who work them. If the people who carry on the work of production also controlled the distribution of their products, we are certain that even less than four hours' work a day would provide everyone with all the necessities and many of the luxuries. But, unfortunately, we allow a privileged minority to control the enormous wealth produced to-day, and they return to the producers only just sufficient to keep them alive to continue production. To-day we have fast motor vehicles and other "time-savers" and live in a constant hustle; but is our day's work any shorter since they were invented? They seem only to have got us into the "Through the Looking Glass" state of things—you remember when Alice and the Red Queen began to run. The Queen kept crying, "Faster, faster!" On they went, "they seemed to skim through the air, hardly touching the ground with their feet." And when, at last, they stopped, Alice said, "Why, I do believe we've been under this tree the whole time!" And we also are under the tree the whole time.

A General Election?

Judging from the chatter of the politicians, it looks as though a General Election is coming before Christmas. The Prime Minister's declaration in favour of Protection has been challenged by his opponents, so he will ask John Smith and his wife to decide for or against. Consequently we shall soon be overwhelmed with floods of oratory from the rival politicians, all of whom will try to convince us that "Codlin's your friend, not Short." The Tories want Protection, the Liberals want Free Trade, and Ramsay MacDonald says the Labour Party "want to combine moral rectitude with economic wisdom." The Communist Party are waiting for a wire from Moscow. But all of them will promise us a heaven on earth if we will but put a cross against the names of their candidates. The old party programmes that have done duty on previous occasions will be brought out and polished up to look like new. And the poor simple voter, dazzled by the flattering attentions of people who do not recognise him at any other time, and dazed by the conflicting cries, will probably put his cross against what he considers the wrong party. What will it matter if he does? Is any worker so foolish nowadays as to think that a change of Government will relieve him of one hour's toil a week or put two loaves on his table instead of one? Does anyone really imagine that if his "comrade" of to-day holds the whip of Government to-morrow, it will fall any the gentler on his own back? Labour Governments in Australia, Socialist Governments in Germany, the Communist Government in Russia—all made the same old promises and all acted the same as every Government must do. In some cases it has been a case of "My father chastised you with whips; I will chastise you with scorpions." It is high time we ceased all this mockery of electing rulers. The world has been turned into a slaughter-house by these rascally politicians, and if we would save ourselves from similar calamities in future, we must drive them out of power and manage our affairs ourselves.

Hodges' Humbug.

Mr. Frank Hodges, secretary of the Miners' Federation, has been hobnobbing with Sam Gompers and the American Federation of Labour, and has just returned with some marvellous stories as to how unemployment was wiped out in the States. He explains it in a two-column article on the front page of the *Daily Herald*. He says that two years ago the United States had an army of unemployed of between five and six millions. "That colossal army has vanished. The problem no longer exists." How was it done? Hodges says the employers suddenly discovered that high wages would stimulate trade, and they all fell over each other in their haste to increase the size of the pay envelopes of their employees. And in two years every worker was in a job. "The fortunate country is the Mecca of miserable Europeans." We can brand two of Hodges' statements as downright lies. One is that the United States Steel Corporation "in the early part of this year actually advanced wages by 11 per cent." We have before us the *Labor Age* (New York) for October of this year. It contains a cartoon of a Steel Trust official and a steel worker. Under it are these words: "With a grand flourish, the Steel Boss presents him with the Eight-Hour Day. At the same time taking \$4.80 out of his pay envelope." The other lie is: "Workmen own their own homes." A Federated Press telegram published in *Industrial Solidarity* (Chicago) of November 3 says: "New York, the world's richest city, herds its workers in dark, overcrowded, unheated 'holes, flats, and dungeons,' 10 and 12 persons jammed into two or three small rooms, for which they are gouged by greedy landlords to an extent that leaves little of their wages for food and clothing. One hundred and sixty-five thousand families, or 700,000 persons, in Greater New York, are in need of apartments of any kind." Mr. Frank Hodges' truthfulness may be judged from these two samples.

PERSECUTION OF ANARCHISTS IN RUSSIA.

[Molly Steimer, the writer of the following letter, was arrested in New York in 1918 for protesting against intervention in Russian affairs, and sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment. After serving two years she was deported to Russia. She has been arrested twice by the Bolsheviks: for aiding imprisoned Anarchists and corresponding with her comrades abroad, and for Anarchist propaganda. The Bolshevik Government has now exiled her from Russia for ever.]

COMRADES AND FRIENDS—From the facts stated in the enclosed bulletin about the persecution of Anarchists and other Left factions in Soviet Russia, you can see that when Losovsky, Chicherin, or Trotsky states that Russia does not jail idealistic Anarchists, these "Communists" are deliberately lying! Of course, it is not to their interests that the world should know that the "Communist" prisons *to-day* are overflowing with political prisoners, as they were during the existence of the Tsar. Therefore, they are shamelessly denying the truth.

When I reached Russia at the end of 1921, I found that most of my Anarchist comrades were imprisoned, and those few who were out were so terrorised that they would not be together several at a time for fear that the Government will suspect them of having a meeting. I soon began to interest myself in the conditions of those incarcerated, and did what little I could in order to help them. But, alas! in Soviet Russia it is far more difficult to aid a political prisoner than it is in any capitalist country. The Communists very seldom try a political opponent. During my stay in Russia hundreds of idealistic rebels were sent to different jails, concentration camps, and exile; but only a few of them were given a trial. Usually, the local Government Political Department sends the accusation papers to the Administrative Prosecuting Committee in Moscow, and this Committee, in the *absence* of the accused, decides his fate!

Often such people are arrested and accused secretly. In such cases, the attempts on the part of the relatives to find out the whereabouts of the victims end without result, because the Government Political Department declines to give any information whatsoever. A striking instance of this is the case of David Rohen (known amongst the comrades as Juises) and Ivan Achirsky, two old Anarchists who were very active before and during the Revolution in Russia. Remaining true to their ideas, they were continuing to do Anarchist propaganda during the existence of the Soviet Government. In October, 1922, these two comrades were arrested in Moscow. Ever since relatives and friends have been trying in every possible way to find out their whereabouts, but all in vain. Until this day the fate of these two idealists is unknown. Are they alive? Or—were they shot? We do not know, as the almighty Okhrana refuses to tell what has been done with them. To the questions of Maria Veger (the sweetheart of Achirsky) the head of the Petrograd Government Political Department, Maysing, answered: "*Forget about him! You will see Achirsky when you will see your ears!*"

Very many of the political prisoners are sick with scurvy, malaria, and tuberculosis, as a result of the unspeakably damnable prison conditions: dampness, uncleanness, lack of fresh air, and under-nourishment. Not a week passes by that there should not take place some hunger strike, obstructions, or attempts to commit suicide as a protest against the miserable treatment to which they are subjected by the "*Communist*" jailers!

The only help which we can render to those imprisoned is to supply them with food, clothing, smoking material, and books. But in order to do this we must have funds. Therefore I appeal to all men and women who have any sense of justice to help the incarcerated revolutionists who are at this moment suffering in the jails of Russia.

Friends and comrades! I speak to you in the name of idealists who have given their lives to a cause which they sincerely believe will free humanity from existing wrongs. Stretch out to them your hands in this hour of need! Help them not only materially, but also morally. Protest against the continued persecution of revolutionists in Soviet Russia. Do not allow yourselves or others to be fooled by the shameless lying Communist propagandists, who are denying their tyrannical deeds because they do *not* have any justification for them.

MOLLY STEIMER.

Berlin, October, 1923.

The bulletin enclosed with the above letter is published by the

Joint Committee for the Defence of Revolutionists Imprisoned in Russia. It gives many details of the continued persecution of revolutionists by the Russian Government, a large number of Anarchists and Left Social Revolutionists having been arrested during the past few months. Some have been sentenced to various terms of imprisonment, some have been forbidden to live in certain cities, while others have been exiled from Russia for ever.

"All the political prisoners of the Peretominsk Camp, numbering about 175 persons, were transferred last July to the dreaded Solovetski Monastir. The latter is an island in the White Sea, entirely cut off from the rest of the world during nine months in the year. Malaria, scurvy, and other diseases are the scourge of the place. The prison administration, with the exception of the chief warden and his assistant, consists entirely of criminals serving time or on probation, of Communists convicted of crime, and of Tchekists in disgrace. These vie with each other in brutality towards the political prisoners, in order to curry favour with the higher administration. There is a hospital attached to the prison, but an attempt to visit a sick prisoner was met with the information that visits are permitted only when, according to the physician's opinion, the sick prisoner is about to die. There is no post office at Solovetski. Mail goes only as far as Archangel, and no letters are delivered to the prisoners. Politicals who have served in Schlussemburg and Petropavlovka (the worst places of imprisonment under Tsarism) say that Solovetski is the most terrible experience they have suffered."

The Committee make an earnest appeal for funds to relieve the sufferings of the prisoners and exiles. Funds and correspondence are to be addressed to FRITZ KATER (Joint Com. Def. R.I.R.), Kopernikusstr. 25, Berlin O. 34, Germany.

We shall be pleased to receive donations at FREEDOM Office and forward them to the Committee.

Socialisation and State Control.

We wish to call attention to a confusing of Socialisation with State control in which both the bourgeoisie and the Socialists are often pleased to indulge. In Russia we have never had anything that could properly be called Socialisation, but we have had what has been probably the greatest experiment ever made in State control, under the Dictatorship of a Party. The State and Society are not at all one and the same thing. . . . Enemies though we are of all State monopoly, and of the State itself, we are bound to recognise that in Russia State control has been exercised in the most unfavourable circumstances, and could only be conducted with violence and by blind sectarians. Elsewhere the results would have been less disastrous, but never would they have been good. Socialisation is direct administration by all the workers—artisans, technicians, managers—attached to an industry, on the basis of equivalent services, and for the profit of the collectivity as a whole.

—Le Réveil (Geneva).

SECRETS OF INDUSTRY.

That bright little paper, the *Economist*, contained a suggestion a few weeks ago that there should be no secrets between the employees and the employers of a business. It also claimed that the general public had a right to know these things as well.

It certainly would be comforting to know exactly the proportion of ptomaines in the fish paste you eat, and how much soap goes to the production of a liver pill. Then, again, think how interesting it would be if we could have described to us the intricate machinery that is used in the manufacture of those beautiful mahogany pips they put among the carrots to make raspberry jam. While it would be nice to know how to take one old horse, weighing half a ton, and convert him into two tons of corned beef, a set of ivory umbrella handles, and ten gallons of calves-foot jelly. Perhaps they would also let us into the secret of how his teeth are cut down to make piano keys, how much cardboard is added to his hide to make a thousand pairs of boots, and how one tail makes sufficient horsehair to stuff twenty-four beds. I believe it is a fact that they don't waste much raw material in factories in these hard times.

But the secrets we Trade Unionists would like to see revealed are these. How is it that they manage to pay a penny for raw material, a farthing for labour, fourpence for advertising, a shilling for profit, pay no excess profits tax, and yet charge five shillings for the finished article? This is actually the case with a celebrated patent medicine. I dare not mention its name because my wife takes it, and if she knew the facts it would never do her good any more.—*The Signal*.

THE DAY AFTER TO-MORROW.

FREEDOM = NO GOVERNMENT.

(Continued from last month.)

My Freedom theory, which follows, will be opposed, on points, by many who, nevertheless, believe in No-Government.

The basis of my position is freedom. Freedom from government or authorised control. I consider that *I* am the correct one to decide my own actions in any circumstances. I do so now in all matters within the law; and when I am in doubt I resort to the *advice* of my friends, just as they resort to mine. Often, I make mistakes. So do Governments! Often, Governments act with wisdom. So do I!

We, who do not believe in government, take the world for our range. It is not only one country we wish to have free access over: we covet the lot. We do not recognise national boundaries and national monopolies. If it were not paradoxical to use the term, our outlook might be said to be international. Once freedom is secured, international relations, as such, will cease to present any problems, for the simple reason that nations will be disintegrated, and there will be no national problems to parley over.

National armies and navies will go the way of national boundaries. There being, technically, no nations, there will also be no national armies or navies. Neither, therefore, will there be international wars. Free conditions will see the end of conscription and the end of national wars. The stupid, tragic spectacle of men fighting others with whom they really have no quarrel will no longer be possible. Wars there may be. But they will be factional affairs, little local squabbles, perhaps; and those involved will entangle themselves voluntarily, from really personal motives, and with full personal responsibility.

With the passing away of the nation as a unit will come the end of the judicial system as we at present understand it.

"But what," gasp our opponents, "what will happen to criminals? Are crimes to go unchecked? And who is to say what is a crime? It is the function of the judicial system to do this." Let such people remember that "justice" and legal decisions are man-made; and that *if* men have been competent to mete out deterrence and punishment in the past, they will be no less so in the future. "Justice" is not justice because it is boxed up in statutes. Moreover, we hear a good deal about the defects of our present legal rulings. Many cases come up before the courts and are decided in a manner which does not meet with popular approval. Under Freedom, crimes against society would certainly be open to the vengeance of mob law. But mob law can certainly be more merciful as well as more stringent than Book Law, and has the inestimable superiority of permitting discrimination. And this free method gives a healthy sporting chance all round.

Much the same remarks apply to morality and ethics. Objectors say that free conditions would alter present standards. The obvious retort is that if present standards cannot stand on their own feet, there is not much to be said for them.

These objectors should realise that morality and ethics are deeper, wider things than the petty concerns of legal institutions. They go down into the depths of life; nay, beyond this life, into eternity. How can they depend upon legal rulings and conventional traditions? Freedom would usher in the preachers' and teachers' hey-day; for they would be addressing the naked souls of free men—men with both opportunities and responsibilities in relation to good and evil. There would be no State system to shelve the blame on to; no accepted conventions to baulk the issues.

The trickiest problem of all, of course, will be the territory problem. The land and all its wealth rightly belongs to no one, any more than do the sea or air. Under Freedom, territory will become relieved of its present "owners," and rent will disappear. What will happen? Simply this: there being no State, the danger of State control will have passed. There being no police and no army, the private grabber will not be able to monopolise *and hold* what other people want. The simple result will be that people will squat where they can, and be *liable* to be challenged by free competitors. But being liable to a thing is not the same as perpetually coming up against it; and there is no doubt that, with the exception of individual quarrels here and there, the territory question will work itself out on lines of general convenience or opportunity.

The insecurity of tenure under conditions of virile competition will be healthy. And always remember that the real monopolist (in the big, objectionable sense) will be immediately curbed by his

watchful and interested neighbours. We may assume, also, that the claims of the reasonable person will be safeguarded in the same way.

With the passing of the State we shall witness the exit of several familiar bugbears: income tax, defence tax—in fact, the whole burden of taxation!

If we want any of the things we at present pay taxes for, we shall have to buy them from another source; *and we shall not have to buy what we do not want, or pay for what ought to be free.*

Under conditions of real freedom there will be no need to abolish Capitalism on principle. We shall always have supermen of commerce, together with thrifty individuals willing to risk their savings, and others who prefer working for a wage (under free contract) to setting out on a personal enterprise.

But the grave objections which hang round the skirts of Capitalism to-day—such as the exploitation of the worker through low wages, under economic conditions which he is powerless to resist—these will have been swept away. With the release of the land, and the earth's fulness generally, to the free access of all, waged-labour will naturally become scarcer, and counter-opportunity all round will become greater. Therefore, the capitalist's profits will be sapped down to a sane level.

In conclusion, I should like to quote a quibble which is continually put forward by our opponents. Jones says: "It would be all right for *me*. I am a reasonable human being, and require no bossing by Government. *But what about Smith?*" Smith turns up and, pointing at Jones, he says: "It would be all right for *me*. I am a reasonable human being, and require no bossing by Government. *But what about Jones?*"

I leave it at that!

MARJORIE PEACOCK.

[Miss Peacock has stated her position fully and frankly, and we are pleased to welcome her to the ranks of the Freedomites, as she prefers to call the Anarchists. But she hints at the coming of other recruits whom we would not welcome. The "pro-autocrats" who find their will to dominate curbed by the State will also, we hope, find their will to dominate curbed by Freedomites. We look forward to the time when there will be unlimited opportunity for the free expression of every individuality, but we should certainly oppose all attempts to dominate. Our contributor says the instinct of the "true autocrat" is to dominate. Yes; but when she says "his goal is personal freedom," it seems this personal freedom is only for himself. We Anarchists aim at personal freedom for all.

With regard to Free Communism—or Anarchist Communism, as we term it—we see no reason why men and women in a free society should not be able to work together Communistically without sinking their individuality. But a Government can never govern a country on Communist principles. Communism means all things in common; if a Government claims the ownership of the land and the instruments of production, then they are no longer held in common. We are quite prepared to admit that individuals should be free to experiment in other economic methods, and we never expect one system to prevail everywhere. But when Miss Peacock says there will be no need to abolish Capitalism on principle, we disagree. Capitalism has ever stood for the production of wealth by slaves who are not allowed to enjoy it. It has ever meant war and waste on an enormous scale—waste of human life and waste of wealth. Europe to-day presents a spectacle of Capitalism in action. The "supermen of commerce" stride across the world trampling on all who come in their way. We are working for a society where men and women will be jealous of their own personal dignity, neither dominating nor dominated; a society where we shall produce things because we need them and not because they may bring us privileges other than those common to all; and a society in which we shall recognise that the possession of superior physical or mental abilities is no excuse for taking advantage of others less favoured in those respects.—ED. FREEDOM.]

Professor Huxley on Anarchism.

Anarchy, as a term of political philosophy, must be taken only in its proper sense, which has nothing to do with disorder or crime, but denotes a state of society in which the rule of each individual by himself is the only government the legitimacy of which is recognised. In this sense, strict Anarchy may be the highest conceivable grade of perfection of social existence; for, if all men spontaneously did justice and loved mercy, it is plain that all swords might be advantageously turned into plowshares, and the occupation of judges and police would be gone.

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

Anarchists Assassinated by Japanese Government.

Evidence is now to hand that immediately after the earthquake in Japan, the authorities set afloat rumours that Anarchists and Socialists, and also Koreans, were responsible for the fires which swept over Tokyo. An ex-soldiers' organisation attacked Koreans in all parts of the city, and it is estimated that about 3,000 were massacred in cold blood. Several hundred Japanese were also killed through being mistaken for Koreans. At the same time, a systematic hunt for Anarchists and Socialists took place. How many were killed is not known, but at least fifteen or twenty of the more prominent men and women in the Anarchist movement were killed while under arrest.

In a detailed report published in the *Industrial Worker* (Seattle) of October 31st, our Japanese comrades say that when the new Government was formed shortly after the earthquake, it sent out propaganda for the citizens to kill Anarchists. But the people refused to take part in the murders, and the Government had to do it secretly. However, the truth was soon discovered, and to appease the indignation of the people the Government ordered the trial of Captain Amakasu, who was charged with the manslaughter of our comrade Sakaye Osugi, his wife, Noye Ito, and Osugi's nephew, a seven-year-old boy. All the victims were strangled to death by the captain.

In a censored report of the trial which was published in the *Nichi-Nichi* (Tokyo) of October 9th a sergeant-major gave evidence about a bulletin which had been received by the Gendarmerie headquarters, and he said: "Everybody was saying in those days in the corps that Communists and Socialists should better be —." The censor has cut out the end of the sentence, but one can imagine what it was. The same issue of the *Nichi-Nichi* prints a summary of the official report on the murders, which says that Captain Amakasu "believed that it was a timely measure in the interests of Japan's welfare to kill Sakaye Osugi." The accused gave a frank statement of the affair, and apparently gloried in his horrible deed. On September 16th, as Commander of the Kajimachi Gendarmerie Corps, he went to Osugi's house, and took him and his wife and nephew by motor-car to the headquarters of the corps, and locked them in an empty room on the upper floor. The accused said:—

"I then ordered supper for them. At 8 p.m. I instructed Sergeant-Major Mori to conduct Osugi to another vacant room and question him. As the sergeant-major was so doing I entered the room where Osugi was sitting with his back towards the door. Without any warning I stretched my arms and choked him with a jiu-jitsu hold. . . . After ten minutes he was dead. With a cord which I carried with me I tied his neck, and left him lying as he was."

He then went to the room where Osugi's wife was detained. "Her position was somewhat difficult for me to get a stranglehold on her." So he began to ask her questions, at the same time manœuvring for a better position.

"I managed to get to her right side, and caught hold of her in the same way as I did her husband. However, her position was disadvantageous to me, and I was not able to handle her in as easy a fashion as I disposed of Osugi. In her attempt to free herself she inflicted a few deep scratches on my left arm. It took about ten minutes to kill her. I took another cord and tied her neck with it."

This scoundrel then went to the poor boy in the next room, who thought something was wrong and commenced to cry. "I

caught the child by the neck and choked him to death. He did not utter any cry. I also tied him with a cord." The three bodies were then thrown down a well and rubbish piled on top of them. Thus did this patriot save Japan from the dangers of Anarchism. Despite the statement of Captain Amakasu that he acted on his own responsibility, it is believed that he was incited to the murder by high Army and Government officials. The result of the trial has not been reported.

Sakaye Osugi joined the Anarchist movement after the Russo-Japanese War, at about the time of the execution of Kotoku and other Anarchists by the Government. In 1907 he translated Kropotkin's "Appeal to the Young" into the Japanese language. For this he was imprisoned, and from that time he was in jail many times. He was considered very dangerous by the Government, but the common people considered him a hero. He attended an international Anarchist gathering in Paris this year, and was arrested and deported. He had returned to Japan only about two months when he met his death.

Mrs. Osugi—Noye Ito—was editor of a magazine, *Seito* ("The New Woman"). She had translated some of Emma Goldman's writings, and was the first woman Anarchist in Japan.

Other comrades murdered included K. Hirasawa, an Anarchist-Syndicalist, who with four other leaders of the workers were arrested and nearly beaten to death in the police station, some officers completing the vile deed with their swords. The bodies were removed secretly and burned in kerosene oil.

Our comrade, E. K. Nobushima, who has contributed articles on the Japanese Labour Movement to the columns of *FREEDOM* (May and July, 1923), writes to the *Industrial Worker*, saying: "We are now confronted with the great danger of being arrested or murdered. . . . You are requested to send this information to the world on our behalf by Japanese revolutionary workers."

TO OUR READERS.

We beg our readers to bring these atrocities by the Japanese authorities to the notice of any Trade Union or Socialist organisation to which they may belong, and to send their protests to the Japanese Ambassador in London. This publicity cannot bring back our dead comrades, but it may prevent the Japanese Government murdering any more of the Anarchists and Socialists now in prison.

TO THE UNKNOWN WARRIOR.

(On the Fifth Anniversary of Armistice Day.)

Again our loyal Britains celebrate
The day they won the world-historic War;
They throng your sepulchre, O Warrior!
In patriot zeal—or anti-German hate.

All this you heed not. You have passed the gate
To endless rest; you hunger now no more:
While *warriors known* must seek a distant shore,
Or beg, or starve on pittance from the State.

Perchance you thought to serve Democracy;
Or joined to please your pal, or knew not why;
Or went—a conscript—dumbly to the strife;

I cannot tell but *this* is clear to me:
Whate'er you willed, you battled for a Lie,
And all in vain you yielded up your life!

TOM SENHOUSE.

Democracy has been defined as the principle that "one man is as good as another, if not a little better." Anarchy may be defined as the principle that one government is as bad as another, if not a little worse.—*Benj. R. Tucker.*

ANARCHISM VERSUS SOCIALISM.

By WM. C. OWEN.

32 pages, with Wrapper. Price, Threepence.

UNDER THE CLUB

On reaching Paris, despite the fact that all his papers were in order, our Swiss comrade, Bertoni, was arrested. As he himself remarks, there was nothing astonishing in that, and a happening so common nowadays should not be worth a comment. A noted Anarchist, editor of two well-known Anarchist papers, intruding himself on France to attend an Anarchist Congress! What else could he expect? Let such people stay where their own police can keep the proper watch on them.

In truth, we ourselves would not devote an inch of space to such a trifle were it not for the illuminating account of his adventure which Bertoni himself has furnished in *Le Réveil*. That, as it seems to us, deserves recording, because it gives us an unusual peep behind the scenes; and we imagine that even this experienced journalist and fighter left Paris a wiser man than when he entered it. Evidently he knew how to take things as they are, for a long succession of inspectors and minor officials talked "shop" freely in his presence, and, having a retentive memory, he is able to tell us all about it. The following is a brief account of modern society as it appears to the Parisian police.

Arrests give the police but little trouble, the only subjects to be at all afraid of being street Apaches of from fifteen to twenty years of age, who are apt to draw a gun or knife. However, two officers are needed to arrest a woman, because women usually struggle violently and make a terrible outcry. The meekest victims are always the politicians, for all of whom police contempt appears to be supreme. Among them the Royalists are probably the best, because they have money, whereas all the others are ravenous to make it, and especially the Socialist politicians and the leaders of the various Syndicalist groups. The police still maintain a special Bolshevik section, but it has nothing to do, for the Communists cut no figure in the life of Paris. "It is really astounding that there are still ninnies who will let their heads be broken for the sake of such fellows. Think of it! A Cachin, notoriously rich. A Laffont, no less so. A Vailant-Couturier, whom the Inspector knew at the front when they were both officers. He was noted for his hardness to the men under him, and it is assuredly not among them that he can hope to make his Communist propaganda. In politics everyone is after place and money." On the whole, the police think the Anarchists the best, but they remark that to every twenty Anarchists there are fifteen spies.

A revolution in Paris is an absolute impossibility with the armed forces the Government now commands. To-day, more than ever, any attempt in that direction would be certain to come to grief. Even the general strike of 1920, though it made a fine show at starting, amounted to nothing. As for ordinary demonstrations, such as those on May Day, everything is seen to beforehand. Every known "militant" is under the surveillance of two officers, who have orders to arrest him, even if he does nothing, unless he will consent to go home and stay there. The Fleet and the Republican Guard can take care of such affairs, and it is remarked cynically that a heavy rain will always send the mob fleeing for shelter.

These gentlemen chaffed Bertoni for allowing himself to be nabbed so easily, for it is really a simple matter to slip in unobserved. They were even so kind as to point out to him various ways of doing that; and he found them an interesting and by no means unintelligent crowd. There was an inspector who was really charming. One had been a professional violinist, another was master of six languages, another an explorer who had studied French and English colonies, and yet another was a free-thinker whose criticism of two admittedly radical papers was that they were not "sufficiently advanced." They passed the most caustic judgments on France's present leaders, and on those at the head of their own force. As for their special part in all this, they defended it with the plea that everyone is on the make. They regard their own position as entirely secure; for, whoever goes out of or comes into office, their services will always be needed. Respecting one thing only have they the slightest fear—a revolution in Germany, the Separatist move-

ment in the Rhineland, and, ultimately, the possibility of Revenge.

How long was it before the Fall of Rome that the gladiators became the ruling power, and the Pretorian Guards made and unmade Emperors? Nor is it only in the so-called French Republic that these sinister omens have appeared. New York and many another American city could tell a similar tale, to say nothing of our own dear London. All modern civilisation is on that most uncomfortable of seats—the bayonet's point.

WHO ARE THE UNFIT?

An hysterical wave of fear of the "rapid multiplication of inferior stocks"—"the unfit"—is being spread over the country. Horatio M. Pollock, Ph.D., in the *Homecroft*, says:—

"Society is fully justified in using close supervision, segregation, or sterilisation whenever necessary to prevent reproduction among the markedly unfit. Aggressive measures will be necessary to accomplish desired results. We can never expect to be entirely free from the burden of the unfit, but by taking thought we can lighten the burden for ourselves and future generations. The emphasis must be continually placed on the prevention of disease and defect."

This evidently means compulsory legal control. And it deals with effects, not causes. Who are the unfit, and why? What is the criterion of unfitness? He does not say. Like all unscientific attempts to remedy things, he fails to define his terms. A thing is unfit when it does not fit. All depends upon what it is to fit. A rascal does not fit an honest environment. Freedom does not fit despotism. Strict honesty in everything cannot be made to fit our present institutions. What, then, is "fit" and what "unfit"? The unfit are those who do not fit their environment—not those who are merely physically or mentally defective. Such defectives may be the most fit. It depends upon the environment. As a matter of fact, the interaction of natural forces tends constantly to the elimination of all forms that do not fit the environment they produce. The existence of any form, then, is in itself proof that it *does* fit, to some extent, at least, its environment. If it seems to be an undesirable form, then the environment that permits its existence must be similarly undesirable.

The surest way to secure the propagation and dominance of the highest physical and mental qualities in our species is to so shape the environment as to fit that purpose. But this necessitates a study of Nature and conformity to its trend. Here is where the Eugenists and all who desire to resort to the physical force of legal control go astray. Nature always secures obedience to its order by inducements that give pleasure, not by prohibitions and compulsions. Freedom of choice and pleasure in performance and satisfaction with results are the means that Nature uses. And disobedience is as invariably punished by the opposite consequences—there is no escape.

—*The Equitist* (Phoenix, Arizona).

International Right.

Ever since the last war ended in the triumph of the armies that stood for Liberty and Justice, the whole world has been living in an atmosphere heavy with oppression, arbitrary rule, and continuous alarms. The conflict between Italy and Greece appears to have been settled, but already there comes another between Italy and Yugoslavia, to say nothing of the formidable interrogation point set before us steadily by the problem of the Ruhr. The various capitalisms can agree only on one single point—the shattering of the claims of Labour.

To justify the blow he struck at Corfu, Mussolini has published in the Italian press a long list of the assaults made by the great Powers on the weaker States during the last thirty years. And this communication bears the heading; "International Right"! Yes, the right of bombardment, which other Powers had exercised in the past, springs directly from the crimes committed against the people's independence. It is true that the League of Nations was founded for the express purpose of putting an end to these bombardments as an expression of right, but only the simple-minded can have believed that the intention was serious. Moreover, what a truly genial idea, that of basing international right on the bombardment of unarmed populations! Long live Mussolini!—(L. BERTONI in *Le Réveil*.)

LOGIC OR CONSISTENCY?

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

DEAR SIR,—Few or any of us are fully consistent or logical in our principles or conduct in life, though we ought to try to be so. To err is human. And I have always thought that Friends and others were inconsistent in their strong protests against all war whilst supporting the State or government. I never argued it out with any of them, but I have supposed them to take up that position because in the New Testament the Civil Magistrate is recognised as a power that should be respected and obeyed, that is, when he does well—which is the trouble.

But what about the Anarchists? They object to all Governments and their action, and say that everything between human beings should be arranged by mutual agreement. If, however, a neighbour or other person will not agree, but, on the contrary, attacks my life or property, what am I to do? I understand that the Anarchists, or some of them, think they would be justified in resisting the attacker by physical force or violence. It may be said that would be only self-defence. True. Yet it is still violence, and may lead to killing, wounding, and starving. But, besides, we know that for effectual defence aggression may be necessary. If so, there might be personal or individual conflicts, and a call made on friends and sympathisers for help, leading probably to the worst kinds of enmity, strife, revenge, and retaliation. Would it not, then, be better for a community to hand over the duty and task of defence to some central organised group of persons, who would devote themselves to it, and become skilled in the work, leaving the bulk of the people to pursue peaceful avocations. I am not advocating all this, but only pointing out the alternatives.

My own position is a moral one: Love, forgiveness, kindness are more effectual in subduing wrongdoers of all kinds. Of course, there are risks, but, I believe, not nearly so great as many persons suppose. I am not out for controversy, but merely to submit those things to your readers.—Yours truly,
W. DOUGLAS.

[Very few Anarchists are non-resisters, but they do not believe in looking for trouble. We hold that there is no inconsistency in being opposed to government and at the same time using such force as may be necessary to resist invasion of our personal liberty. We do not think Mr Douglas's suggestion of handing over the work of defence to a central organised group would be a way out of the difficulty, as such organisations have an unfortunate habit of becoming the masters rather than the servants of the community. Besides, if violence is such an evil thing, we should be degrading these folk in an attempt to keep ourselves unsoiled.—ED. FREEDOM.]

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

- "The Story of a Proletarian Life." By Bartolomeo Vanzetti. Boston, Mass.: Sacco-Vanzetti Defence Committee, P. O. Box 37, Hanover Street Station.
- "Public Opinion: Where Does it Stand on the Question of Amnesty of Political Prisoners?" Chicago, Ill.: General Defence Committee, 1001 W. Madison St.
- "A Sequel to Looking Backward; or, Looking Further Forward." By Richard Michaelis. 1s. 6d. London: W. Reeves, 83 Charing Cross Road, W.C. 2.
- "What Children Should be Told." By G. P. C. Claridge, M.B., B.S. Lond. 6d. London: Jarrolds, Warwick Lane, E.C. 4.
- "Rhine-land and Ruhr." By C. J. C. Street. 1s. London: Alfred Couldrey and Co., 103 Borough High Street, S.E. 1.
- "The Real Issues of the General Election." By J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P.
- "La Conquista del Pan." Por Pedro Kropotkin. \$1.20. Santiago de Chile: Luisa Soto, Correo 5, Casilla 6010.
- "Die Neuschöpfung der Gesellschaft durch den Kommunistischen Anarchismus." Von Pierre Ramus. Wien-Klosterneuburg: "Erkenntnis und Befreiung," Schiessstättegraben 237.
- "Dos Años en Rusia." Por Emma Goldman. 25c. New York: "Aurora," 700 Greenwich Street.
- "Dictadura y Revolucion." Por Luis Fabbri. Con un Prólogo de Enrique Malatesta. Traducción de Diego Abad de Santillan. \$2.00. Buenos Aires: Editorial Argonauta, Casilla de Correo 1940.
- "Cancionero Revolucionario." \$0.40. Santiago de Chile: Armando Trivino, Correo 5, Casilla 6010.
- "Ma Vie: Récit d'une Paysanne Russe." Revu et Corrigé par Léon Tolstoi. 6fr. 50c. Paris: Bernard Grasset, 61 Rue des Saint-Pères.
- "L'illégalisme Anarchiste." Par E. Armand. 30c. Orléans: "L'en Dehors," 22 Cité Saint-Joseph.

CASH RECEIVED (not otherwise acknowledged).
(October 12 to November 10.)

"FREEDOM" SUBSCRIPTIONS.—W. Benson, L. W. Sweet, H. Samuel, V. G., C. J. Protheroe, B. Williams, I. S. Blair, B. Reid, F. Wells, H. Combes, J. B. Robinson, L. E. D., T. S.

FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE "WORKERS' FRIEND."

A SOIREE AND DANCE.

CROWN HALL, 40 REDMANS ROAD, MILE END, E. 1.

On SATURDAY, DECEMBER 8th.

Good Band. Dancing from 7 p.m. to 1 a.m.

"Freedom" Guarantee Fund.

The following sums have been received since our last issue: T. S. 5s., G. P. 2s., V. G. 2s. 6d., San Francisco Self-Education Group 17s. 5d., A. Hazeland 10s., J. Petrovich 4s. 4d., A. D. Moore 2s., H. Combes 7s. 6d., L. G. Wolfe £1. We could do with much more.

Anarchist Discussion Circle.

The Anarchist Discussion Circle meets every Saturday, at 7.30, at the Minerva Café, 144 High Holborn, W.C. (entrance at rear of building). These meetings are open to the public, and all are free to take part in the discussions. Subject for discussion is advertised in the *Daily Herald* every Saturday.

East London Anarchist Group.

Open-air meetings every Sunday morning, at 11.30, at Osborn Street, Whitechapel, or Sidney Street, Mile End. Group meetings on Sunday evenings at Workers' Friend Club, 62 Fieldgate Street, Whitechapel. Secretary, E. Zaidman. Come and give a hand.

COMMONWEAL.—Bound Volume, No. 4, 1888. Official Journal of the Socialist League. Edited by William Morris. Very rare. Good condition. What offers?—Letters to *Workers' Dreadnought*, 152 Fleet Street, London, N.W. 1.

Publications on the Russian Revolution.

- Workers and Peasants in Russia: How they Live. By AUGUSTINE SOUCHY. 2s., post-free.
- Anarchism and the World Revolution. By FRED S. GRAHAM. 1s., post-free.
- The Crushing of the Russian Revolution. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 4d.; postage, 1d.
- The Russian Tragedy: A Review and an Outlook. By ALEXANDER BERKMAN. 6d., post-free.
- The Russian Revolution and the Communist Party. By FOUR WELL-KNOWN MOSCOW ANARCHISTS. 6d., post-free.
- The Kronstadt Rebellion. By ALEXANDER BERKMAN. 6d., post-free.

FREEDOM PRESS, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W. 1.

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. 4s.
- THE WAGE SYSTEM. By P. KROPOTKIN. 2s.
- ANARCHY. By E. MALATESTA. 3d.
- THE PLACE OF ANARCHISM IN SOCIALISTIC EVOLUTION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
- REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT. 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. 2s.
- 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.
- REFLECTIONS ON POLITICAL JUSTICE. (Selections from the Writings of William Godwin.) 4d.

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.
- GOD AND THE STATE. By Michael Bakunin. (American Edition.) Cloth, 4s.; paper, 2s. 6d.; postage, 2d.
- MAN VERSUS THE STATE. By Herbert Spencer. Paper, 6d.; post. 2d.
- THE EGO AND ITS OWN. By Max Stirner. 6s.; postage 4d.

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.