

Freedom

Vol. XXXVII.—No. 413.

DECEMBER, 1923.

MONTHLY: TWO PENCE.

NOTES.

Labour Party and Liberals.

The gains of the Labour Party at the General Election have given some of its members an exaggerated idea of its possibilities as a Government in the near future. They claim to be in favour of majority rule, yet are now inclined to forget that for every vote cast in their favour two votes were cast against. Their leaders are talking of turning the Tories out when Parliament meets. They are to move an Amendment to the Address so framed that the Liberals must vote for it or risk losing the support of their own constituents. It is so simple! No compromise with Asquith or Lloyd George; Labour will stand on its own feet and take office. But the Liberals have let it be known that they will only vote for an Amendment they have helped to draft—and the castle in Spain vanished into thin air. Now the Liberals are to be allowed to see the Amendment beforehand “as an act of Parliamentary courtesy.” Of course; if the Liberals are to help the Labour Party, the price must be paid. The Liberals must have a little salve for a stricken conscience in supporting a party whose advent to office, they have said, would mean ruin to the country. Besides, Liberals are not in politics “for their health,” neither are all of the Labour Party; and before the latter are allowed to step into the £5,000 a year jobs they must agree to make some concessions to those whose assistance is so essential. It's a brutal world, and nowhere more brutal than in politics, as the young bloods of the Labour Party will learn before they are very much older.

The Unemployed in Russia.

Unemployed workers in Great Britain who still cherish the illusion that all their troubles would vanish if a “Dictatorship of the Proletariat” were established here should study the figures relating to unemployment in Russia published in *Russian Information and Review* (November 3 and 17), the official organ of the Russian Trade Delegation. After explaining that the New Economic Policy introduced in the spring of 1921 was the cause of large numbers of workers being discharged, it says that since the beginning of this year (1923) unemployment has continued to increase. On May 1 the number of unemployed in fifty-three provincial towns, including Moscow and Petrograd, was 448,290; on July 1 it had increased to 489,493; whilst on September 1 there were 600,000 registered at Labour Exchanges throughout Russia. On September 1 the unemployed in Petrograd alone numbered 111,117, one-third of whom are members of Trade Unions. “Only fifteen to sixteen per cent. of the unemployed receive relief.” How the others live we are not told. Remember, it was mainly the workers of Moscow and Petrograd who put the Bolsheviks in power. Now the town workers have been thrust aside, and the peasants are dictating the New Economic Policy. Trotsky told Senator King that this policy is “an absolute necessity” for the 90,000,000 peasants. “The very conditions of our internal life assure the absolute stability of the New Economic Policy.” So there is a very poor outlook for the unemployed “Proletariat of the Dictatorship.” We were amused to see the Communist Party, in their General Election manifesto, putting forward plans for dealing with unemployment here. We think they should send the plans to their friends in Moscow. The truth, of course, is that Monopoly and Privilege cause unemployment everywhere. It matters not whether private individuals or the State monopolise the means of life; if a man has to beg for permission to work, his life is at the mercy of those who can grant or refuse that permission. The Labour Party does not differ much from the Russian Dictators in claiming the right to control all the means of life, thereby controlling our lives also.

Canada's Experience.

As Anarchists, we naturally favour freedom in trade as well as in other things; but to have free trade you must have free production. We regard the fight on this matter as a struggle between rival manufacturing and commercial groups, some of whom think they could make larger profits under Protection, while the others trust to “Free Trade.” The unemployed are only counters in the game. We shall yet find a Liberal Ministry introducing protective tariffs, “for revenue purposes only”; and a good number of Trade Union leaders in the Labour Party are in favour of protecting their members against “the low-paid labour of the Continent.” We think that Protection is the most corrupting influence it is possible to introduce into the public life of a country. We recently picked up a little book entitled “The Revolt in Canada against the New Feudalism,” by Edward Porritt (Cassell and Co., 1911), which is an almost incredible story of the connection between Big Business and the political parties in that country. The Conservatives first introduced protective tariffs, which were denounced by every Liberal speaker and paper; but when the Liberals, under Sir Wilfrid Laurier, came into office they betrayed their followers and were most cynical in granting tariff concessions to those who could buy them. The Canadian Pacific Railway was specially favoured by the Conservative Government. It received in cash \$30,000,000, in completed railway \$35,000,000, and in grants of land 26,000,000 acres. As soon as the line was completed it raised its rates and squeezed many millions out of the farmers, who were compelled by the company to sell their grain to the elevator companies, who fixed their own price for it. Everything the farmer bought was taxed 15 to 30 per cent. The Parliament House at Ottawa is now merely an office where privileges to rob the people are sold to the highest bidder. This story of political corruption should be remembered when our Free Trade thieves oust the Protectionist thieves.

The Burdens of the Weak.

At the opening of the Imperial Conference Mr. Baldwin told the Premiers that “the British Empire cannot live for itself alone”; they must unite “to bear on their shoulders the burdens of those weaker than themselves.” It occurs to us that the weaker ones must find the Empire itself their principal burden. In Rhodesia last June two white men flogged a native to death. Their defence was that he died through “fear.” They were found guilty, but the judge merely fined them £25 and £5 respectively. Natives are not of much account in Rhodesia. In Kenya Colony, in August, a white man was charged with flogging a native employee to death. He and four of his employees flogged the man until he lost consciousness. On regaining consciousness he was tied to a post. He was in great agony and asked for a knife to kill himself to end his sufferings. He died a few hours later. The accused pleaded as a contributory cause of his victim's death that he had the “will to die,” as shown by his request for a knife to kill himself. The jury (white men, of course) amiably returned a verdict of “guilty of grievous hurt,” and a sentence of two years' imprisonment was imposed. These natives were rescued from the “brutal Germans” and handed over to the British Government under a mandate. From a copy of *Young India* we learn of the brutal treatment of political prisoners in Indian gaols. Some of them are given impossible tasks; when they fail to accomplish them they are given “bar fetters and handcuffs” for seven days at a time. The handcuffs are fastened to a post and the prisoner has to stand there for nine hours; in addition the iron bars cause abscesses. Penal diet which causes thirst and diarrhoea, and sometimes flogging, are other punishments for political prisoners—those who refuse to believe Providence ordained that Britishers should rule Indians.

Push the sale of “Freedom.”

WERE THEY EVER ANARCHISTS?

We have not been favoured with a copy of the manifesto issued recently by certain alleged Anarchists in Russia, in which they announce their conversion to that State Socialism of which the Russian dictatorship is now the classical example. In this respect, it appears, other Anarchist journals are in the same boat with us, and they also cannot give the names or number of the signers. That, however, does not matter greatly, for the document has been discussed so widely that its main contents may be regarded as beyond dispute. Briefly, these new Bolshevik recruits condemn their former philosophy as being such a hotch-potch of conflicting tendencies as to make it "incapable of fusion into one scientific whole."

With E. Armand, of *L'En Dehors*, we ask ourselves with astonishment of what intellectual stuff these gentlemen are made. Yesterday—with Stirner, Tolstoy, Bakunin, Kropotkin, and other noted Anarchist writers, whom they now indict as teachers of conflicting creeds—they supposedly were united in their condemnation of the State, as being everywhere the watch-dog of that Special Privilege which reduces the masses to poverty, and the incarnation of that imposed Authority which binds humanity in chains. To this monster to-day they bow the knee. Yesterday, as realists—which is what Anarchists are—they had their feet on earth and could see the State official as the armed lackey of the power that will starve you and imprison you, blow you up or shoot you down remorselessly, if you have the audacity to question its decrees. To-day they have soared into the clouds and lost themselves in the illusion that, somehow or other, Labour will march to freedom by placing its feet in the stocks and, with its own hands, riveting around its neck the collar of obedience to orders.

Of course, these "Ralliers," as they are called, either merely imagined that they were Anarchists, or have thrown up the sponge as cowards, and got their thirty pieces of silver as Judases. We prefer to assume that the former is the case, and we think it the more likely because Anarchists who have grasped the central truth of their philosophy rarely, if ever, recant. On the other hand, it is our misfortune to be inundated by State-worshippers in disguise; by men and women who flock to us because they have become disgusted with the futile twistings of political Socialism, yet welcome instantly any professedly benevolent despotism that promises to put bread into their mouths or money into their pockets. Such pseudo-rebels simply do not understand. They are spineless opportunists who, never having taken their bearings, are lost in the fog and cannot see the standard around which the battle rages.

How shallow all this opportunism is! How terrible the rack on which its dupes still stretch themselves! For generations they have been crucified by the delusion that they will profit by capturing and running this hated State-machine; and where, after all their self-inflicted sufferings, do they stand to-day? As realists, we Anarchists tell them that at this moment the State is infinitely more powerful than it ever was; that with all its serried forces it upholds the exploiters and, as policy dictates, crushes or befools the exploited with a callousness hitherto unparalleled. What is it doing, under Poincaré, in the Ruhr? What under Mussolini in Italy, or under Primo in Spain? What has been its course under the smooth-tongued Wilson, or the benevolent Harding, in that hot-bed of plutocracy, the United States, where "Freedom now so seldom speaks, the only sign she gives is when some heart indignant breaks, to show that still she lives"? And what is it doing here, throughout this far-flung British Empire, but maintaining, by the bludgeon and the bayonet, an oligarchy of wealth and privilege and power?

These are facts. They strike so deep, and wound so cruelly, that the life of the masses everywhere is becoming one long groan. Everywhere those who produce nothing dictate to those who keep mankind from starving. Having gathered into their clutches all the means of production, they have the worker at their mercy, and to them even the proudest of us must go, hat in hand, to sell our labour. On that helplessness exploiters prey, and the whole teaching of Labour's Socialistic opportunists

is that, under their judicious handling, the wolf will become more tender to the lamb. That teaching is a lie, and all the record shows it.

In rich and powerful England the life of the wage-worker is far more precarious than it ever was, and never have his personal liberties been so ruthlessly curtailed. In the United States, as in our own colonies, it is much the same; although there the opportunities, to-day cornered by State-protected Monopoly, are practically boundless. Everywhere the wage-worker holds his very existence on the tenure of finding a master who will, or can, employ him; and everywhere, with the growth of State-protected Monopoly, that tenure becomes more insecure. From this universal wreck one class of toiler alone has won his way to something worthy of the name of safety—the peasant. He is not standing in the bread-line. He is not holding out a servile hand for doles. He has had the common sense to put himself where he can be his own employer, and by his own labour keep, at least, food in his cupboard and a roof over his head. Nevertheless, though the landlord cannot touch him, and he is independent of the job-giving boss, Government gets at him—bleeds him through its taxes; conscripts him for its senseless, brutal wars. Every peasant, therefore, instinctively hates Government, and is, as a realist, an Anarchist at heart.

In Russia the peasants—fully nine-tenths of the population—endure the Bolshevik rule through fear of the Red Army, or because they think another revolution might usher in a White Terror which would deprive them of their lands. Lenin knows this well, and has acknowledged it quite frankly; but apparently these so-called "rallying" Anarchists have forgotten it, if they ever knew it. They find it convenient to ignore the fact that Lenin and his governing council—the smallest of oligarchies—are merely Czars without the title; that they, like their predecessors, rule by virtue of the hireling forces behind which all Governments entrench themselves; that rebellion against their authority is punishable with death, under a penal code as merciless as that of any Asiatic despotism; and that they maintain themselves in power by the systematic exercise of a Terrorism which has singled out Anarchists, as the natural enemies of autocracy, for its special victims. It was in the spring of 1918 that Mirbach, as the envoy of the Kaiser, advised Lenin to crush the Anarchist movement, and it was on the night of May 14th, 1918, that the crusade began with the bombardment and destruction of Moscow's Anarchist clubs. The policy then initiated has been pursued continuously, implacably. All this we might, as time rolls on, forget, if it brought with it some relief and hope of emancipation for the suffering masses. But it does not. State Socialism fails, and goes on failing, all along the line. Its aim is always official power, and such successes as it wins from time to time in various countries tend only to the elevation of the few, to an increase of the governing machinery and to further enslavement of the masses. Always the State Socialists seek to consolidate their position by combination with the ruling class, just as the so-called Soviet Government of Russia is now seeking to anchor itself by getting the endorsement which Italy has granted, but the United States and Great Britain still refuse. For the most part, however, these State Socialist successes, even from the office-seeker's standpoint, are mere flashes in the pan and have no lasting value. As a real force for the emancipation of the workers, what are all the Socialist parties actually worth in France or Germany, in Italy, Spain, or the United States? The straight and honest answer is—"absolutely nothing."

W. C. O.

Bolshevik "Amnesty."

The Russian Government some time ago declared an amnesty for the Kronstadt sailors who had participated in the heroic uprising of 1921, and who had succeeded in leaving Russia after Kronstadt had been brutally suppressed. According to the *Bulletin* (Nov.-Dec.) issued by the Joint Committee for the Defence of Revolutionists Imprisoned in Russia, a large number of these sailors, trusting the promises of the Bolsheviks, returned to Russia. But as soon as they entered the country they were all arrested and after a long imprisonment were sentenced (on September 20) to three years in a concentration camp in the far North. The *Bulletin* gives the names and brief biographic sketches of twenty of the sailors who have been tricked and sentenced by their unscrupulous Government.

What is Anarchism and Why are we Anarchists?

The Anarchist contention is that, though many of the evils existing in human society are grave and deplorable, those of them that result from the idea "government" and from the institution called by that name far outweigh in their disastrous effects on human happiness and prosperity all the others put together.

Now, of course, this contention, like all contentions not open to fairly simple demonstration or verification, may be right or it may be wrong. But it is, at least, a clear, plain, unambiguous, and comprehensible contention. What, then, are the grounds on which it is based? They are three—perhaps four.

Firstly, the temperamental. It is found in practice that in the lives of the individuals composing society, domination, self-assertiveness, the overbearing determination to "boss the show" are offensive, cause friction, give rise to opposition, and so grow cumulatively on themselves, and are not, except in special circumstances, justified by any superior knowledge or capacity on the part of those who are able to dominate. As a matter of fact—and this subdivision is the possible fourth basis of Anarchism—the only series of historical events which almost all parties agree to regard as *progress* is that which has consisted in reducing, limiting, or circumscribing the power of the powerful. That autocratic power was concentrated in few hands, or in the hands of a single person, may have made its destruction more easy, but many of its enactments were precisely similar in essential quality to those of democracies. The Anarchist contends that what is found to be true in smaller groups of human individuals must be and is true when applied on a larger scale. If domination of three persons by one saps the initiative and destroys the intelligence and resourcefulness of the three, if it undermines their self-reliance and debilitates their sense of responsibility, if it creates the spirit of revolt and the determination to dominate in turn, then so also must and does the same cause produce the same effects, regardless of the proportions or numbers of dominated and dominators. And this just because the temperament of human beings is what it is. If we were treating of bees, the facts would be different, and therefore the argument would be different. Bees, and very slavish slaves, LIKE TO BE DOMINATED.

Secondly, Anarchism is based on the experimental argument or the argument from history. On this head it is only necessary here to point out that in nine cases out of ten when a believer in government is asked to name some good thing that a Government has done, he alludes to the *repeal* of some law or the *removal* of some disability; that is, of course, to some bad thing done by a Government and (alas! all too tardily and after the infliction of incalculable injury) undone again. When he does not quote a *repeal* or a *removal* he often instances something which a Government is still doing, the good or bad effects of which have yet to be proved, the results of which are still matter of dispute, and all private agencies and enterprises for which have been destroyed, bought out, or made illegal or impossible, so that nothing in the nature of a comparison is available. The governmentalist will then declare the results of Government action to be good, forgetting that nothing is either good or bad except in comparison with something else.

The third argument in favour of the Anarchist contention may be called the logical or abstract. A. is held to have no moral right (and deems himself to have no moral right) to do the action X. B. has no right to do the action X. Similarly right through the alphabet, and, if necessary, fifty alphabets or five million. No single person in a given community is deemed to be morally entitled (according to the then and there existing instinctive moral code) to, let us say, compel his next-door neighbour to go and insure himself or to refrain from purchasing a certain beverage at a certain hour in the day, or from selling a certain commodity without making a certain payment other than that involved in the purchase itself, or to enter into a conflict in which he may lose his life, or to hand over a proportion of his possessions or earnings for other things than those which he himself desires to purchase. These and other actions (actions X) are held to be outside the range of duties which one human

being may morally and justifiably enforce upon another. It is held justifiable for one to endeavour to *persuade*, in fact, to go a very long way by the method of propaganda (example, the Salvation Army), but, so long as one cannot convince or persuade another, it is held that he must not coerce except where his own or other people's safety, security, comfort, or liberty is obviously and indisputably encroached upon. Now, says the Anarchist, by what method of election do you extract a certain right, the right which you imagine yourselves to hand over to the Parliamentary representative, from a number of voters, however large the number may be, *no one of whom has this right to give!* *Ex nihilo nihil fit.* If the governmental superstition were not, in the Anarchist view, productive of consequences too sad for mirth, one would almost feel inclined to joke at so palpable an absurdity. One would almost feel inclined to ask the believer in government, "How many cows, not in milk, would be necessary to obtain a bucket of milk?" Perhaps, following along a line which has neither breadth nor thickness, some metaphysician has arrived at an indivisible quantity with position but no parts where he is able to discern that zero multiplied by infinity equals unity, and so the "no moral right" of each individual man becomes the "some moral right" of a multitude of men. If this is so, *how much "some"?* Am I perfectly within my moral right in cutting off another man's head if I can get a sufficient number of persons to vote for me, or must I only steal his purse?

ROBERT HARDING.

THE SACCO-VANZETTI CASE.

Arguments on motions for a new trial are still being heard in this case, and the defence is engaged in proving perjury on the part of the witnesses for the prosecution and that the judge and jury had been deceived by some of the expert testimony on the question whether the fatal bullet had come from Sacco's gun. The new evidence leads the defence to believe they will be granted a new trial. We hope their confidence is not misplaced. But we remember the Mooney case, in which the defence has since proved perjury on the part of the most important witnesses for the prosecution. But, in spite of widespread publicity and agitation, the State still holds Mooney in its iron clutches. There is one factor in these cases that carries almost overwhelming weight against the defence. Release or new trials can only be brought about by proving that the prosecution—that is, the State and the police—have bought perjury to secure a conviction. Therefore, the State and the police will move heaven and earth—and hell also—to prevent such a decision, which would shatter the foundations of the impartiality and infallibility of the Law. That is the wall of steel that the defenders of Sacco and Vanzetti and Tom Mooney have to pierce.

VANZETTI'S STORY OF HIS LIFE.

The Sacco-Vanzetti Defence Committee (Boston, Mass.) have published "The Story of a Proletarian Life," by Bartolomeo Vanzetti. In this pamphlet of twenty pages this victim of the Law tells the principal facts of his life as a worker, from the day when, at the age of 13, he started work in a pastry shop in an Italian city, until, after migrating to the States, he was arrested with Sacco, on May 5th, 1920, on a charge of murder and robbery. Most people who have watched the progress of the case since that date are convinced that these two men are victims of a "frame-up," because of their activity in the Labour movement. Anyone who reads Vanzetti's simple story will be convinced of the impossibility of his guilt in the murder of which he was convicted. His whole life has been one of hard, unrelenting toil, with periods of unemployment in the States, when starvation was his portion. In Italy he read a few books, but it was after his arrival in the States that, despite all the brutalities of life, he managed to study Socialism, Anarchism, and Free-thought. He read Kropotkin, Malatesta, Reclus, Marx, Mazzini, Renan, Darwin, Spencer, Tolstoy, Zola, and many others. He admits that his mental powers were insufficient to assimilate all this material. "But I brought to the studies a cruel, continuous, and inexorable observation of men, animals, and plants—of everything, in a word, that surrounds man. The Book of Life: that is the Book of Books! All the others merely teach how to read this one." And he sums up his position thus: "I sought my liberty in the liberty of all; my happiness in the happiness of all. I realised that the equity of deeds, of rights, and of duties is the only moral basis upon which could be erected a just human society." This is the man whom the police of the United States wish to kill in order to protect the interests of their masters, Big Business.

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**

Election Day—and After.

Apart from Oxford University and the University of Wales, which at the time of writing are still to be heard from, 14,541,341 votes were cast in the recent General Election. Of these, the Conservatives secured 5,507,593, the Labour Party 4,506,935, and the Liberals 4,261,963. Independents managed to scrape together 239,097, and a Prohibitionist 25,758. The Conservatives still control 255 seats, but have lost no less than 90; Labour, with 192 seats, shows a gain of 49; the Liberals, with 156, a gain of 41. The Conservatives, therefore, registered over a million more votes than did their nearest competitor, the Labour Party, and still have the better of it by 63 seats. On the other hand, they are at the complete mercy of a Labour-Liberal combination. It may be noted further that only 71 per cent. of the total electorate voted, and only 60 per cent. in London.

Naturally there is consternation among the Conservatives, who, nailing their colours to Protection as the remedy for unemployment, have suffered a crushing defeat. On the other hand, the Liberals, whose two antagonistic wings composed their differences, congratulate themselves that they have greatly increased their strength by an uncompromising championship of Free Trade. As for the Labour Party, it finds itself more indisputably than ever the official Opposition, and apparently stands ready to accept the responsibility of office whenever the present Government shall have been overthrown.

These are the main facts. We desire to assess them, as nearly as possible, at their actual worth. First, as we think, the British public has no intention, at present, of harking back to Protective Tariff doctrines, and no belief in the banishing of unemployment by any such manœuvre. If we felt sure that such was its conviction we should be much elated; but we are by no means sure. We recognise that this nation exists solely as an international trader, and that hitherto the one effort of its rulers has been to make it the bargain counter of the world. We reflect that the sudden proposal to shut ourselves up within ourselves was well calculated to spread dismay among the millions of workers engaged in occupations so purely international as are the shipping, coal-mining, and cotton trades. We remember, further, that the case against Protection was presented with abounding eloquence, for Free Trade had practically all our most persuasive orators speaking for it. Nevertheless, and despite all this, a large section of the workers remained, as it would seem, entirely apathetic. In London itself, the world's greatest metropolis and essentially the centre of the Empire, almost half of the electors did not think it worth their while to vote.

Let us not flatter ourselves that they abstained for any of the reasons by which we Anarchists are actuated. Our objection to majority rule, as being every bit as bad as any other, is one to which these abstaining voters never give a thought. Government, in some shape, they accept as part of their natural existence, and they stayed away from the polls simply because they are still indifferent to social problems. All the pleadings hurled at them, all the tons of literature showered on them gratuitously, left them utterly unmoved. Furthermore, we doubt greatly whether many of those who voted for the Liberals will stand by their guns if the same issue comes up later. British Labour, as a whole, in our opinion, has no convictions on this issue. Indeed, we believe that its real leanings are

toward Paternalism; toward being taken care of by benevolent superiors who undertake the responsibility of guaranteeing work and wages. That, of course, is the corner-stone of the Protectionist philosophy.

At present the Socialists are jubilant; but, if their real object is to emancipate the masses, there seems to be little over which to jubilate. Thanks to an absurd, and most corrupt, electoral system, under which representation in Parliament does not correspond at all to the voting population of the districts, they have won a number of new seats. Nevertheless, the Conservatives have out-voted them by more than a million, and they have come out only a little over two hundred thousand ahead of the Liberals. However, we attach slight importance to numbers, the decisive question being—"How did you get your votes?" If over four and a half million voters had plumped straight for Socialism, we should regard it as an event of profound significance; but it is unspeakably dishonest to pretend that anything of that sort has happened. The Socialists made their campaign on various side issues which have little, if any, connection with Socialism; on the capital levy, which appeals to many workers who believe they can become rich by taxing others, and do not understand that all taxation comes out of the producer's pocket. They made lavish pension promises, increased-dole promises, and so forth, which are Paternalism of the rankest type. One of their successful woman candidates announced proudly that she had centred her fight on pensions and the housing question! This last she did not, in reality, even touch. Whoever does not advocate abolition of monopoly in the materials out of which houses are constructed, and in the sites on which they must be placed, side-steps the problem.

After all, the question is whether the spirit of revolt against existing conditions has been excited; whether revolutionary thought has been stirred; whether the determination of the workers to win a life worth living has been stiffened. As to this we have our melancholy doubts, for the recent history of Socialist agitation is pitifully monotonous; continuous compromises, as power and place apparently draw nearer, leading, first, to weakening all along the line, and, ultimately, to ignominious surrender. Of this, the once formidable Social Democratic Party in Germany is the classical example.

However, we are not pessimists. We believe the great debate, through which, as an educational process, we have to pass, is now fairly under way. We think the spirit of unrest is moving more stormily than ever above the waters. Unsettlement will grow, and the inevitable failure of the Labour Party's half-hearted panaceas will confront the masses with realities, and drive them to that hard thinking which is the parent of all fruitful action. The Party is bound to disappoint its followers, but out of disappointment wisdom comes, and economic developments will force the pace.

New Anarchist Periodicals.

We have received from Rome (Casella Postale, 411) a notice of the intended publication, early in January, of a fortnightly review to be entitled *Pensiero e Volontà* ("Thought and Will"). The announcement is from the pen of Malatesta, who writes on behalf of the editorial staff, and is itself a concise summary of the convulsion through which civilisation now is passing. With this, in its varied phases, the review will deal; and on this head Malatesta says: "As Anarchists we desire fraternity and liberty, justice and the fullest possible development—moral, intellectual, and material—for all. . . . And, knowing that abstract ideas and theoretical aspirations remain too greatly pious wishes if not translated into action, we shall seek the practical solution of the problems that will present themselves in the revolutions yet to come."

The Social Anarchist Union in Holland have decided to publish a new paper on January 1st. The paper will appear twice a week. The name is to be *De Vrije Samenleving* ("The New Society"). Address: Weesperplein 1, Amsterdam, Holland.

ANARCHISM VERSUS SOCIALISM.

By WM. C. OWEN.

32 pages, with Wrapper. Price, Threepence.

SPAIN UNDER THE DICTATORSHIP.

The Government of Spain has for many years been the most autocratic in Europe. In twentieth-century Spain the King still rules by Divine right, makes and unmakes ministries, appoints life senators, army officers, and church dignitaries, and creates *grandees* who, in mediæval style, are exempted from paying taxes. He relies on these parasites for support, and without his support they would lose their privileges. They and the bourgeoisie are selfish and ignorant. With few exceptions they look to the past, and even in the Middle Ages some of them would have been counted reactionaries. Educated by the Jesuits, they hate progress, and regard the workers as slaves. When Spain possessed colonies, these ignorant and immoral pleasure-seekers were sent there to fill official posts, where they enriched themselves at the expense of the natives, no crime being too bad for them in the pursuit of riches. Since the loss of the colonies, this class has been given Government posts, where they were not expected to work, but only to draw their salaries. Amongst thousands of other cases recently brought to light, it was found that the son of General Weyler (notorious for his cruelty in Cuba) was drawing a salary from a sinecure in the postal service. Others followed military careers, where one advances by influence and not by merit. Previous to 1885 nearly every insurrection was headed by officers of working-class origin. In that year the system was altered, and now officers are appointed only from the military school; the rank and file are only able to reach the grade of sergeant.

The defeat of the Spanish army in Morocco in 1921 was due to the fact that Abd-el-Krim had guns and munitions which had been sold to him by Spanish officers, who wanted the money for their pet vices—gambling and women. At first, the deceived people volunteered to avenge this defeat, but they soon got to know of this crime of the sons of the bourgeoisie and nobility. An officer of the depot at Larache was arrested because of the disappearance of several millions of pesetas. It was discovered that those millions were the result of the robbery of the soldiers' food and other supplies; and it was found that the War Minister received 100,000 pesetas monthly as his share of those robberies. Disgust spread, and the war in Morocco has now become so unpopular that when the soldiers revolted at Malaga and refused to embark, the authorities dare not shoot them. The *Athenee* of Madrid (the intellectuals' society) started a campaign to fix the responsibility for the blunders in Morocco, and Parliament was forced to appoint a Commission to investigate and report within twenty-one days. Before this period had elapsed, the insurrection under Primo de Rivera took place, and those most responsible for the disaster in Morocco are in power to-day.

Primo de Rivera, without intelligence, without talent of any kind, was not the initiator of the insurrection. He was put in power because, if the people rebelled and the soldiers disobeyed orders to shoot, he could rely on 100,000 *somatenistas*, a kind of civic guard. For that purpose they had first disarmed the population of Barcelona. A friend of the writer who was in Barcelona for two weeks was searched fourteen times. The insurrection of Primo de Rivera was made in agreement with the Government, the King, and the political leaders, to stop investigation into the question of responsibility for Morocco.

The organisations affiliated to the anti-political Confederation of Labour have dissolved themselves; the Syndicalist daily, *Solidaridad Obrera*, ceased publication on October 12th, and the remaining Syndicalist and Anarchist papers have been, or will be, compelled to do likewise. Only the Socialist organisations and papers that collaborate with the Dictatorship will remain.

To deal with the workers who will not submit, Martinez Amido has been appointed Home Secretary. When he was Governor of Barcelona he had hundreds of workers killed. General Arlegui has been appointed chief commissioner of police. When holding a similar office in Barcelona he directed the band of assassins paid by the employers to murder workers, was himself in the pay of the employers, and personally helped in torturing prisoners. The barbarities committed by the above-mentioned monsters were so notorious that the Conservative minister, Sanchez Guerra, had to dismiss them.

The trial of the two Syndicalists, Nicolau and Mateu, for the murder of President Dato has ended in a sentence of death for both of them. They were refused a trial by jury, and were tried by a bench of magistrates, who, in spite of the lack of evidence, found the two guilty. The correspondent of the *Temps*, who

was present throughout the trial, wrote that there was no proof of their guilt. But Primo de Rivera and the King decided on a death sentence, in spite of the fact that when Nicolau was extradited from Berlin it was stipulated that he should not be condemned to death.

La Libertad and *Justicia* (of Madrid) published declarations by Casanellas, now in Russia, that he committed the deed, with two accomplices, not yet arrested; and he asserts that this fact was known to Arlegui, Chief Commissioner of Police. But when a President is murdered, the police have to find someone to hang, and the gang that murdered Ferrer by forgery and vile perjury is quite capable of doing the same thing again. Many protests have been sent in from France and other countries, which may have some effect. It is significant that they were not shot within 24 hours, as decreed by martial law.

V. G.

REVOLUTIONARY MEXICO.

Recently our dailies carried a short despatch which announced the outbreak of another military insurrection in Mexico, a State Governor having risen in arms against the Federal Government. Only some thirteen years ago Porfirio Diaz, the Mussolini of his day, was driven into exile, and Obregon is the fourth President since that date. Two of his predecessors, Madero and Carranza, were assassinated. The third, Huerta, had to flee the country. Fed by the land-hunger of the famished masses and fanned to increasing fury by drastic suppression from above, the struggle goes on incessantly. In reality it is saturating all the vast Spanish-speaking area reaching from the United States border to Cape Horn. South America, and perhaps more particularly the Argentine Republic, is seething with it.

Private correspondence, corroborated by various Mexican papers which come to our exchange table, presents us with an extraordinary picture. The effervescence that preceded the Russian Revolution may have matched it. From time to time the Spanish revolutionary movement, for the moment prostrate once again beneath a military dictatorship, has borne a striking resemblance to it, as did the Italian upheaval which Fascism crushed; but we doubt if any country can show a greater volume of discontent than that which is smouldering unextinguishably in Mexico to-day. At some point or other it is always bursting into flame. In some form or other—State Socialism, Trade Unionism, Anarchist-Syndicalism, or Anarchist-Communism—it is battling untiringly to cross the border-line of theory and become accomplished fact. We take as illustrative a recent four-months' agitation tour by Enrique and Teresa Magón. It has been much discussed both in the Mexican daily and revolutionary Press.

These Anarchist comrades are deported from the United States, which brands them as criminal disturbers of the public peace. They cross the international bridge at El Paso, Texas, and the entire population of Ciudad Juarez turns out to greet them. The town is a blaze of red, and for ten days they are kept busy addressing crowded meetings. Invitations pour in from other cities, and they traverse six large States, making the capitals their headquarters and working thence through the rural districts, for Mexico is still mainly a land of agriculturists. At every railway station large bodies of workers meet them, each union or syndicate carrying its standard and red flags. They march to the public square, and the meeting begins. Repeatedly the authorities try to prevent its being held, but, according to our reports, the crowd is always too much for them. For example, in Coahuila they are expressly forbidden to visit Lujan, a great rural centre of exploitation. They insist on the visit, and men and women travel fifteen miles to support them, each carrying a red flag. The local judge, backed by the police, attempts to stop the meeting, but is compelled to give way. Similar experiences are registered at other points.

Mexico City, the national capital, gives them a great ovation. The streets are thronged by sympathisers, two big parades are held, red flags are everywhere in evidence, and the crowd, having stormed the cathedral, rings out welcome to Labour from the belfry. They make excursions into the surrounding country, and when they visit an industrial area the workers habitually desert the factories to attend the meetings. These latter go on day and night. Subsequently the Magóns go to El Moral, in Puebla, which is the headquarters of the Peasants' Social Federation, comprising sixty-seven syndicates. Prior to the revolution which

overthrew Diaz, these peasants were mere serfs, employed at starvation wages on the big estates. When the revolution came along they seized and subdivided those lands, and they hold them still, though Obregon's troops have made four attempts to drive them out. In El Moral they work the land in common, and from each crop they set aside one-eighth for machinery and town improvements. They have abolished the gaols, but they themselves patrol their roads nightly, to guard against Federal attacks. At El Moral a monster mass meeting was held, and the governmental troops failed in their attempt to break it up.

Veracruz is Mexico's chief port, and on their way thither Enrique Magón was arrested, at Puebla. The town and all the outlying districts revolted violently, and eventually, after repeated clashes between the soldiers and the masses, he was released. In Veracruz the Magóns stayed more than six weeks, and there were meetings every night. The city is the headquarters of the House-Tenants' Revolutionary Syndicate, in which some 46,000 heads of families, representing a large majority of the population, are enrolled. In this district the Federal soldiers were determined to break up meetings, but the masses were to some extent armed, and serious conflicts seem to have been averted.

As is inevitable everywhere, at the present stage of development, there is much internal friction as between the Direct Actionists and those who pin their faith to politics, as also between the conservative Trade Unionists, who represent the policies of Gompers and the American Federation of Labour, and the Left-wing revolutionists. There is a distinct Bolshevik element; but we gather that, though noisily aggressive, it has little influence, for the Mexicans have no liking for dictatorships. These differences Time will settle in its own way. Meanwhile, the picture presented is one that, as we conceive, can scarcely fail to impress the reflective reader. That the Spirit of Revolt is flamingly awake seems to us beyond dispute, but the masses are extremely poor, are generally unarmed, and the influences opposing them have great reserves of strength. In Mexico, as everywhere, this is the heart of the whole difficulty in which the exploited find themselves enmeshed. The will to power is there; but, as yet, the power to make the needed change is lacking.

We have lost count of the indictments issued against Magón, many containing charges which, under the Mexican penal code, are punishable with death. Between him and the shooting squad stands only a great public sympathy, which apparently the authorities think it injudicious to ignore.

W. C. O.

IDO-SPEAKING COLONIES.

(The following is from the translation of a letter written in Ido to one of our comrades who wrote for particulars of the colony section of the "Emancipanta Stelo," an international union of workers using the international language Ido.)

I now send you the basis of our organisation, which has lived and grown since November, 1918, in Berlin, later in Dusseldorf, and now also in Vienna. We have a completely Communist organisation, of which the ethical basis is consistently Anarchist-Communist. We earn money in the capitalist workshops, using the money saved by communal living to establish a little colony 40 kilometres from Berlin, where two comrades are maintained by the town group. These comrades earn no money but receive direct everything they need, food, implements, clothes, seeds, etc. Another group near Dusseldorf lives on rented land 6 hectares in extent, from which the men go into the factories to earn money. After their wage-earning labour, they work with the unemployed brothers on the land, also building a house from blocks made by ourselves out of cement and gravel. Now we have a third group in Vienna, where we are also hoping to find a piece of land and begin garden cultivation at the gates of the town. We are all united in one family, recognising no private property of the brothers, nor any personal gain. All money earned by the brothers in the capitalist factories flows into the common purse, from which the needs of each communist are met. The groups also exchange among themselves products, implements, members, and money, according to need, without any payment or other instrument of exchange whatsoever.

We hope that our organisation will grow into the world-society of the future by beginning to get together all elements that are in search of the new ethic, as Nietzsche-Zarathustra brings together in his cavern the nobler people in every group, who form the one great nationless* new family. We have not sufficient money to print pamphlets, but I will gladly send typewritten matter or personal replies to all questions in Ido or English. Address:—Filareto Kavernido, "La Kaverno di Zarathustra," Mulackstr. 21, Berlin N. 54, Germany.

* Nationless, not international—because we no longer recognise nations between which relations could exist.

"Freedom" Guarantee Fund.

We regret to note a considerable falling off in donations to this fund during the last few months. We hope, however, that our readers will try to make up for this during the coming New Year. May we suggest a Christmas or New Year's gift for the paper, and thus help to relieve our anxiety during a trying period?

The following sums have been received since our last issue: A. B. Howie 2s., Norwich Comrades 5s., G. P. 2s., B. Williams 2s. 6d., J. Bonatsos 4s. 4d., A. H. 1s. 6d., E. T. 4s. 4d., A. D. Moore 2s., Wm. C. Owen £1, Gateshead Sympathisers 5s., L. G. Wolfe £1, Elizabeth £1 2s.

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.

CASH RECEIVED (not otherwise acknowledged).

(November 11 to December 8.)

"FREEDOM" SUBSCRIPTIONS.—D. Caffodio, J. W. Maskell, G. Webster, R. B. Garcia, B. Williams, A. Kendall, E. T., B. Capes, L. P. C., W. N. Hayter, L. Organ, C. Taraboi, D. H. S., A. Banks.

BOOK PUBLISHING FUND.—E. R. £5.

RUSSIAN PRISONERS FUND.—D. H. S. 2s. 6d., T. K. 2s. 6d.

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.

PAMPHLET AND BOOK LIST.

ANARCHIST COMMUNISM: ITS BASIS AND PRINCIPLES. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3d.

THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 4d.

THE WAGE SYSTEM. By P. KROPOTKIN. 2d.

ANARCHY. By E. MALATESTA. 3d.

THE PLACE OF ANARCHISM IN SOCIALISTIC EVOLUTION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.

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. 2d.

AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.

THE CHICAGO MARTYRS. With Portraits. 2d.

ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. 1d.

FOR LIBERTY: An Anthology of Revolt. 6d.

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.

WHAT IS PROPERTY? By P. J. Proudhon. Cloth (1 vol.), 4s. 6d.; paper covers (in two vols.), 3s.; postage, 5d.

ECONOMICS OF LIBERTY. A statement of Proudhon's system of social organisation. By JOHN BEVERLEY ROBINSON. Cloth, 2s.; postage 3d.

ANARCHISM AND OTHER ESSAYS. By Emma Goldman. 6s. 6d.; postage 6d.

PRISON MEMOIRS OF AN ANARCHIST. By ALEXANDER BERKMAN. 11s. 6d., postage 8d.

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.