

Freedom

VOL. XII.—No. 443.

JUNE, 1927.

MONTHLY: TWO PENCE.

NOTES.

The Break with Russia.

The police raid on the offices of Arcos and the Russian Trade Delegation has been followed by the breaking off of diplomatic relations with Russia. The contempt for the Soviet régime often expressed by Winston Churchill, Lord Birkenhead, and other prominent Conservatives prepared the way for this rupture, which was hastened by the knowledge that the Midland Bank was ready to back the credit of British manufacturers to the extent of £10,000,000. The breaking-off of diplomatic relations is usually the prelude to war; but we do not expect that to happen just yet. In fact, one can hardly imagine the people of this country being willing for war to-day; but, unless we are greatly mistaken, the clue to the British Government's action will be found in China, where the Soviet Government's active sympathy with the Nationalists against the Imperialists may bring British and Russian antagonism to a head, and the guns may go off before we know anything about it. The White Paper on the discoveries made during the raid, which was issued by the Government before the debate on Russia, contains nothing that could justify a rupture. Every Government spies on every other Government, and a raid on any other Embassy here would bring similar results. Some of the material published in the White Paper was obtained by British spies. The truth is that the Government wanted to break with Russia, and any excuse would suit them and their supporters. Those who uphold Things as They Are can never work willingly with people who have smashed all they hold dear. The Soviet Government have tried to ride two horses at once, and did not seem capable of making up their minds which was the best. While trying hard to make friends with foreign finance, they allowed members of the Russian Communist Party to make speeches which would hinder such friendship. The result of the conflict between the Die-Hards on both sides is that the peoples of Great Britain and Russia have been led to believe that they are enemies when there is no reason whatever why they should be anything but friends. Once again they are being used as pawns by their rulers.

The Race of Armaments.

While the League of Nations is discussing the reduction of armaments, its members are increasing them as fast as they can. Our own naval authorities are building cruisers which have a far greater armament than ever they had, and the United States is doing the same. The French naval estimates for next year will be the largest since the War, amounting to 2,550,000,000 francs, as compared with 1,800,000,000 francs for the present year. Mussolini naturally takes up the same attitude. "The spirit of Locarno," he told the Italian Chamber recently, "has evaporated. Everybody is arming. Italy must arm. Its military equipment must be brought to a state of perfection. Italy must have arms for five million men, and enough aeroplanes to obscure the sun." Mussolini only says outright what the rulers of other countries keep to themselves. The spirit of fear which drove them all into the tragedy of 1914 dominates them still, and unless we all wake up to the dangers which threaten every nation, that tragedy will be repeated, and on a scale more horrible and devastating than before. We shall not prevent war by merely agitating against it. The ruling class in every country are the exploiting class. We allow them to rob us, and with the wealth we produce they maintain armies and navies, which are used for exploiting and robbing other nations. When the exploiters quarrel as to who shall exploit certain races or as to how the plunder is to be divided, we are used as cannon fodder. Therefore to stop war, we must stop exploitation of ourselves as well as others.

MacDonald on Landlordism.

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald has written a pamphlet, "A Prosperous Countryside" (published by the Labour Party), in which he outlines the Labour Party's policy for dealing with the land. He says the present system has failed. "The area under crops in this country, during the past fifty years, has been reduced by three and a half million acres, though the area used for sport during that period has greatly increased. The rural population has fallen; its general standard of life is admittedly disgracefully low; housing accommodation has deteriorated; wages have not been adequate." So he puts forward the three cardinal points of Labour's scheme: "Higher cultivation of the land; increasingly higher wages; and good and independent houses for the farm workers." The houses—not the farm workers—are to be independent. But the landlords stand in the way. At present they do little but take the rents. At one time they performed civic and military duties, for which rent and ownership were their wages. Now they take their wages, but do not do their work. Therefore, says MacDonald, under Labour's policy, the State will step in and say to the landlord, "I cannot afford to keep you any longer." When we read this we imagined, of course, that the landlord was to be expropriated. Not a bit of it. Although we cannot afford to keep landlords, he is going to compensate them for the loss of their jobs where they take their wages but don't do the work. He proposes to pay the landlord for the land that the nation takes over. "It is purely a business question," he says. All we can say is that if MacDonald or anyone else had a man in his employ who did nothing for his wages he would sack him very quickly, and he certainly would not compensate him for having done nothing for so long. Why he should compensate the landlord, whom he cannot afford to keep, passes our comprehension. But then we are not politicians.

"Bread and Circuses."

The exploiters of the workers realise thoroughly the value of the policy of the rulers of ancient Rome in providing bread and circuses as a method of keeping the people quiet. The papers with the widest circulation devote pages every day to sport. Racing, football, cricket, and boxing are spread all over these daily and evening sheets; and the gambling mania is fostered to such an extent that very few escape its influence. The placards of these sheets would lead one to imagine that nothing else of importance ever happens; if it does, it is treated with a levity that prevents serious consideration. The value of games as a distraction from more serious things is also realised by firms and organisations employing large numbers, more especially the so-called "black-coated" brigade. Tennis courts, cricket and football grounds abound everywhere on the outer fringe of our great cities, and the eternal topic of conversation amongst the young people is sport. They know the names and records of all the prominent players, but are completely ignorant regarding the great questions of the day. When the raid on the Russian Trade Delegation took place, the cry of "Clear out the Reds!" and the contemptible cartoons of the evening papers gave them no idea of the great issues involved in the affair, which may be a matter of life and death to many of them should hostilities ever break out between this country and Russia. This degradation of journalism is leading to a degeneration in the thinking capacity of the masses, and is the greatest hindrance to the serious study of social questions to-day. Even politics is treated as a sort of football match, and we are under no illusions as to the depth of intelligence of the millions who voted Labour at the last General Election. "After us the deluge" is the thought of our rulers, and the deluge will come unless the people are capable of considering social questions with intelligence.

“Proletarian Dictatorship” and Counter-Revolution.

Those who have been carefully and without prejudice observing the inner development of the Soviet Government of Russia have realised long ago that the Communist Parties abroad were being used by the Russian Government merely as a means to further its foreign policies. The Communist membership at large did not understand this, of course, and many of them refuse to believe it even to-day, blinded by their unthinking fanaticism, no matter how evident the situation has become through recent events. It is just this blind faith of the masses that is the most tragic part of the whole matter.

Some time ago the *Manchester Guardian* published sensational exposures concerning the secret relations between the Soviet Government and the German Army—exposures that produced the effect of a bomb in Germany and threw a glaring light upon a situation the worst of which could not even be imagined.

The *Manchester Guardian* asserted at the time that the German Junker combine had built a flying machine factory in Russia where military aeroplanes were to be manufactured for German and Russian use; that representatives of the Russian and German armies had agreed to build poison-gas factories in Russia; that this work had begun five years ago and was being continued; that officers of the German Army frequently travelled to Russia and back, provided with false passports which the Soviet Government was supplying with visa for them; that the Commander-in-Chief of the German Army, General von Seeckt, stood on the best terms with high officers of the Red Army in Russia; and that a number of Russian ships, laden with arms and munitions for the German Army, arrived in the German harbour of Stettin and were unloaded there.

These statements of the *Manchester Guardian* were so definite and detailed that they necessarily attracted immediate attention, the more so as the German Army is admittedly thoroughly monarchistic and its chiefs closely connected with militant reactionary organisations, as has repeatedly been proven in various trials. A secret alliance of such elements—the German Army and the reactionary Putsch bodies—with the Russian dictators, who pretend to be the champions of the proletarian world-revolution—that was certainly a most peculiar and interesting situation.

The German Government at first attempted a very weak and vague denial. Thereupon the *Manchester Guardian* came out with additional evidence, which brought still more confusion to those involved. If it had been the *Daily Mail* instead of the *Manchester Guardian*, the whole matter could have been dismissed as mere Chauvinistic humbug. But the *Manchester Guardian* had always favoured a friendly attitude toward Germany; in its exposures it also sought to shield the German Government, speaking of the secret agreement between Moscow and the German Army as having been made without the knowledge of the German Government.

The entire Nationalistic and Communistic press of Germany at first denounced the statements of the *Manchester Guardian* as a conscious, deliberate lie.

But the official organs of Russia were silent: they tried to ignore the matter, though public opinion everywhere was greatly aroused over it. Yet, soon compelled to speak up, the Soviet newspapers avoided an open statement, resorting instead to verbal quibbling and half-admissions which only served to make the *Guardian* charges more credible.

Thus Bukharin declared to the session of the Communist Party in Moscow:—

“We don’t make a secret of it, and we never did, that we have entered into an agreement with the Junkers’ firm, that aeroplanes are being manufactured, and have been manufactured for some time. We say frankly that we shall not refuse an order from any Government to build aeroplanes in Russia for it, or to supply it with other ammunition necessary for the defence of its country, provided it pays us for the work.”

Bukharin made an effort to be very careful in his speech, but for all that his confession was enough to open the eyes of any intelligent man. Bukharin ignored the intimate relationship between General von Seeckt and high officers of the Red Army; likewise he did not refer to the false passports, visaed by Russia, used by officers of the German Army to travel back and forth to Russia in order to hold consultations with Soviet Army chiefs. But he admitted that the Russian Government was supplying the German Army with arms and ammunition, according to the contracts the Soviet régime had made with the Junkers firm.

These contracts began in 1921-1922, at the very time when

the Communist Party of Germany was organising armed uprisings in Saxony, Thüringen, Hamburg, and other places. All those uprisings were crushed in the blood of the German workers by the German Army, to whom the Bolshevik Government was supplying arms and ammunition at the time. What terrible treachery, the like of which history does not record! Proletarians shot by German soldiers with bullets supplied by the “Proletarian Dictatorship” of Soviet Russia! Many of the workers maimed and arrested during those uprisings are still languishing in German prisons, while Bukharin assures his followers that his Government will continue to give arms and bullets to the Germany Army.

When the truth of the *Manchester Guardian* exposures became quite evident, the *Rote Fahne*, the central organ of the Communist Party of Germany, still continued to deny the facts. Thereupon the Berlin *Vorwärts* printed a facsimile of a document from the files of the ammunitions bureau of the German Army Ministry. That official document was an order on the Darmstadt National Bank to remit \$50,000 by wire to the Prombank in Moscow, through the medium of the New York Equitable Trust Company. The important document, duly signed and sealed, was dated November 9, 1926, and its genuineness was never called in question.

More: the Socialist Künstler published statements from German workingmen employed in the Bersol factory, in the city of Troitzk, Russia, testifying to the fact that they had been manufacturing there poison gas for the German Army. Künstler followed this with the publication of a facsimile of a pass-card written in Russian and signed by Ushakov, director of the poison-gas factory. That pass-card was given to every worker in that factory, and without it one could neither enter nor leave.

Interviews with those workers brought to light all the details of the situation, also establishing the fact that the Bersol poison-gas factory in Troitzk (on the River Volga, near Samara) was managed by the German firm of Stolzenberg, of Hamburg; that Mr. Stolzenberg is a member of the reactionary National-Socialist Party of Germany, and that the Stolzenberg firm transacted business with Russia for the German Army, namely, for the so-called “Gefu” department of the latter (“Gefu” indicating by its initials the “Society for the Advancement of Industrial Undertakings”).

This concerned a second “undertaking” of the German Army on Russian territory, namely, the manufacture of poison gas. These charges have never been denied by either side, nor even an attempt made to do so. The evidence was too clear and convincing. But the German Communist Party still kept denying that Russian ships were landing munitions in Stettin. The Socialist member of the Reichstag, Franz Künstler, put an end to those denials by publishing the statements of the Stettin harbour longshoremen who had unloaded the Russian munition ships as recently as October, 1926. The workers received for that work wages that were exceptionally high for German conditions—40 marks per day—and were compelled to sleep on the ships.

Those statements proved, among other things, that from the ship “Artushof” alone 250 tons of grenades, calibre 7.7 centimeter, were transferred to the boat “John Brinkmann,” to be shipped to Kiel. As each grenade weighed 15 pounds, the 250 tons contained 66,000 grenades. In Stettin 350,000 grenades were unloaded. The evidence given by the longshoremen was so definite and detailed that it left no room whatever for further denials. Moreover, the German Minister of War, Herr Gessler, in reply to the Socialists in the German Parliament, declared on March 29 that the German Army had received munitions from Russia and had paid for them, the War Minister adding that the payments were not made from State funds, but otherwise covered.

The Soviet grenades in Germany have created a great furore in the latter country and have proven a terrific blow to the Communist Party. During the discussion of the matter in the Reichstag, one of the Communist representatives, Dr. Schwarz, bitterly attacked his own party and added new revelations to those already known concerning the activities of the “Proletarian Dictatorship” in Moscow. He denounced the Soviet Government as guilty of the worst treachery against the German proletariat, and his words have no doubt exerted a great influence upon thousands of his comrades.

In view of all these terrible exposures we are now enabled to see many things in their proper light, which seemed incomprehensible before.

When during the so-called Ruhr war which the German Government waged against France the German Communist Party suddenly became enthusiastic over the reactionary Nationalists, this new Communist attitude was hard to understand. When the Nationalist Schlageter exploded an infernal machine on the Duisburg bridge (on the Rhine), as a result of which a number of Belgian soldiers were killed, it was no

other than Karl Radek who eulogised Schlageter, and all the German Communists echoed him.

It was just at that time that the Communists got in contact with reactionary officers of the German Army, and Count von Reventlow—one of the super-reactionaries—became a contributor to the *Rote Fahne*, the central organ of the Communist Party of Germany, where he advocated fusion between the Communists and the "Völkische" Party (reactionary Nationalist). To please the reactionaries, Ruth Fischer—then the most influential leader of the German Communist Party—addressed the anti-Semitic students of Berlin, calling upon them to "hang the Jewish capitalists." Considering the fact that Ruth Fischer is herself a Jewess, her appeal must have been very piquant indeed.

Then the celebrated speech of Clara Zetkin in the German Reichstag (on November 28), which roused the greatest enthusiasm among the reactionary and Nationalist elements of the whole of Germany. Having just returned from Russia, Zetkin declared upon that occasion: "The future of Germany depends on her mutual interests with Soviet Russia, in an industrial and political direction, and—if need be—also in a military way." And then she added: "Contrary to Herr Wells (Social-Democratic member of the Reichstag), I even believe that it is not so improbable as he seems to think that the German Army and the Soviet Red Army may co-operate some day."

Clara Zetkin was certainly well instructed in Moscow about the offer she made the Hindenburg Republic of a military alliance with Soviet Russia. Of what nature that alliance was to be is sufficiently clear now from the proven relations of the German Army with the representatives of the "Proletarian Dictatorship."

Now it also becomes clear why Moscow has compelled the Communist Party of Germany to sacrifice its most influential leaders, in spite of the fact that the latter were elected at their Congress by a large majority. The rulers in the Kremlin could not entrust everyone with their secrets. But they could not demand of the old German Communist leaders that they suddenly change their attitude to the German Army and the reactionaries; that would have aroused suspicion. As long as this attitude of the German Communist leaders did not handicap the foreign policy of Moscow, those leaders were tolerated. But when the Soviet Government decided on the advisability of joining hands with the German Army, and as the German Government apparently looked toward France and England for allies, Moscow began to conspire with the reactionary elements in the German Army which were inimical to the policies of Stresemann. The new Russian plan, however, necessitated the elimination of the old leaders of the Communist Party of Germany, that Moscow's hands be free.

That is the explanation of recent events, about which the last word has not yet been said.

Berlin.

RUDOLF ROCKER.

WAR AS EXTERMINATION

Another war in Europe would necessarily aim at mass-destruction amongst the civil populations on both sides. The former distinction between combatants and non-combatants would not exist. The old-fashioned immunity of open towns would be abolished. Bombs would crash on the cities and shatter the streets. Fire and poison gas would rage and stifle. From the blind cruelty of this promiscuous doom neither woman nor babe would be exempt. Human pity would disappear because human hope in the better forces of the world would be dead for centuries, and each nation would dread as never before the savage penalties of defeat. After such things as would have happened no cry for mercy to a beaten people would be heard. The object would be to reduce permanently the population and resources of any conquered country and to prevent it by force from ever being a danger again. Next time there would be no faith in peace or humanity. Were it once proved that the peace-movement after the Great War of 1914-18 had failed in spite of the League, there could be no rational belief whatever that any new peace-movement could succeed.

Yet armies, navies, air-fleets are being organised all over the world on the assumption that such a "war of the future" as we have just described is a possibility of the world in which we live. Nor can any thinking man yet deny that the possibility exists.—J. L. GARVIN, in the *Observer*.

The Road to Freedom.

A Periodical of Anarchist Thought, Work, and Literature.
Subscription, \$1.00 (4s.) a year.

ROAD TO FREEDOM, P.O. Box 486, MADISON SQUARE STATION,
NEW YORK CITY, U.S.A.

EMMA GOLDMAN'S TOUR

After leaving Toronto, Emma Goldman went on to Winnipeg and met a number of old comrades whom she had known in her previous visits in 1907 and 1908. It was not possible to obtain the use of the Liberty Temple, the central hall of the Labour movement, owing to the manoeuvres of the Communists, who have stuck at nothing in their efforts to prevent Emma being heard. Although our Jewish Anarchist comrades had expended a good deal of time and money in the building of Liberty Temple, the Communists worked overtime in barring them from using it. Thirteen English meetings were held in the city in five weeks, the most successful being the Sunday evening lectures, held in theatres, with an average attendance of 700 people. There were also a number of Jewish meetings, including one arranged by the women of the Peretz Schule and another by the mothers' section of the Arbeiter Ring.

Besides the lectures, there was a small banquet held at the home of comrades, where Emma Goldman spoke on the condition of the political prisoners in Russia. The sum of \$100.00 was collected. At a Jewish meeting \$18.00 was collected, and \$22.00 at an English meeting; this with smaller sums made a total of \$143.00.

The next town visited was Edmonton, Alberta, where two Jewish and two English meetings had been arranged. The interest in her visit was so great that she spoke fifteen times in one week. Among those she addressed were the Labour Church, the Trades and Labour Council, several hundred women and girls at a garment factory, the Hod Carriers' Union, and the Arbeiter Ring. She also spoke at a meeting attended by the Alberta Faculty of the University and the College on the subject of "Modern Tendencies in Education." At a banquet here the condition of the political prisoners was again dealt with, and a total sum of \$143.00 was collected for them at this and other gatherings. Although there were few active Anarchists in Edmonton, there were many who showed great interest in our ideas, and helped to make the meetings a success.

Emma Goldman returned to Winnipeg for more meetings, and discovered that our Anarchist comrades there had at last gained their point that they should hold meetings at the Labour Temple.

Our comrade has decided to stay in Canada, and make another tour in the winter months, when far better results may be expected. Patience and postage stamps have prevailed.

Uniformity Impossible.

I believe in Socialism for Socialists just as I believe in Anarchism for Anarchists. I believe that all the other systems or points of view have been made or taken in accordance with the tastes of those whose natural dispositions so disposed them. It is physically impossible for all human beings to attain the same degree of development at the same time. One universal system there can never be. . . . The idea that all will accept a given system is, therefore, necessarily *authoritarian*, and Anarchists ought to be the first to rid themselves of it. Diversity of development there will always be, and the more so as the human race frees itself from the gregariousness of the earlier ages—a gregariousness still latent among so many.

MAX NETTLAU, in "Observations d'Actualité."

Abolish the State.

There is but one way of emancipating the people, economically and politically; of giving them both prosperity and liberty. That way is to abolish the State, all the States, and thereby to kill, once and for all, what has been known hitherto as politics; for politics is simply nothing else than the functioning, the manifestation, alike at home and abroad, of the State's activities; that is to say, the practice, art, and science of ruling and exploiting the masses for the benefit of the privileged classes.

It is, therefore, not true to say that we have made politics an abstraction. We do not treat it as an abstraction, for we positively wish to kill it. And here is the precise point at which we separate ourselves absolutely from the Socialist bourgeois-radicals. Their policy is to utilise, reform, and transform politics and the State, while our policy, the only one we recognise, is the total abolition of the State, and of politics, which is its necessary manifestation.

BAKUNIN, "Oeuvres," vol. 6, p. 39.

FREEDOM.

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF ANARCHISM.

Price, 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 Editor is not necessarily in agreement with signed articles.

Notice to Subscribers.—A blue mark against this notice signifies your subscription is due, and must be sent before next month to ensure receipt of paper.

Money and Postal Orders to be made payable to FREEDOM PRESS.

The Trade Unions Bill.

Almost before we know it the Trade Unions Bill, unchanged in essentials, will have become a law; for the guillotine works smoothly and the Tory majority is a Dictatorship more absolute than Mussolini's. The Tories are Realists who know what they want, have the power to get it, and mean to do so. Back of them is an also highly-realistic crowd whose God is Business; and to all these people, as to the lackey mob dependent on them, strikes that threaten their security and comfort are unpardonable crimes. They intend, at least, to hedge them round with penalties so drastic that only the most desperate or heroic will venture on them. These are the forces Labour has to face, and this is the programme they are now bent on putting through. What is to stop them?

Nothing at present; nothing whatever. Arrayed against them there stands a mob of innocents who imagine that, having parted with their natural heritage of economic freedom, they can win it back by shaking empty fists and vomiting big words. Bluster as boisterously as he may, the British workman is a helpless slave, dependent for the right to earn a living on masters and markets over which he has not a particle of control; a tool inferior to the machine at which he toils, and, like it, destined to be tossed contemptuously on the scrap-heap when he no longer serves his owner's turn.

This grim, irrefutable, and patent truth the workers will not face, and marvellous are the mental distortions by which they manage to evade it. They know, for example, that they fought by millions for what was called "their" country, but they take no steps to make it such, although it should be clear that, being barred from developing for their own benefit its natural resources, they are compelled to buy from some monopolist the right to work and live. They curse the unproductive drones who live in luxury while they themselves are starving, but to the task of abolishing them they never set their hands; when they have been beaten to their knees the only lesson it appears to teach them is that they must organise afresh, both nationally and internationally, it being possible, as they opine, to act effectively only when Russia, China, and all the four corners of the earth have been woven into one gigantic web and coaxed or driven into one combine. This is the teaching of Labour's Socialist advisers.

Self-evidently such a programme is one of well-nigh infinite delay; and while that grass is being grown the steed of Labour starves. The classes back of this Trade Unions Bill are a thousand times more practical, and to schemes so visionary they would not give a moment's hearing. They confine their attention to the spot at which there is trouble, and do not waste generations in attempts to create an artificial solidarity that exists for the most part only on paper, and breaks down whenever serious pressure is put on it. The mutual bond of caste and self-interest is good enough for them, and when they decide to act, they act promptly. Their present intention is to free the business world from further disturbances by strikes, and no one should rely on their assurance that only such strikes as attack the welfare of the general public will be illegal. By every labour struggle some outsider suffers, and it is not from our magistrates, drawn almost exclusively from the landed aristocracy, that we may expect any lenient construction of the Act. Indeed, they will be legally justified in construing it by the avowed intention of those who passed it, and they will hold that it was enacted for the preservation of the public peace and the elimination of all danger of disorder. No country is so completely policed as this, and henceforth it will be more than ever so. The Authorities will not call it a Dictatorship, for those who run this country avoid as much as possible exasperating terms, but that is what is coming. Under this Act many an honest worker, goaded into protest by the manifest injustice of our social institutions, will find himself in gaol.

In reality we live under a Dictatorship of the most ruthless type, for it is by the whip of hunger that our workers are scourged to toil—not for themselves but for their masters. We should stand amazed at the hypocrisy of Tory orators who raise shocked hands to heaven when denouncing the coercive methods of Trade Unionism, but with even greater amazement should we have observed, in following the Parliamentary debates upon this measure, that the Labour Party did not take up instantly the gauntlet and hurl it into the attackers' teeth. Had none of these Socialist or Labour leaders anything to say about the innumerable methods of coercion by which the poor and helpless are cowed into submission? Can any one honestly believe that the agricultural labourer on Milord's estate is a free man? Do the children of the slums, forced almost from infancy to earn the pennies needed to eke out the family income pick and choose their jobs? Is there nobody to point out that the workers, born into a social system founded on usurpation by violence, and living from the cradle to the grave under the shadow of an economic sword that at any moment may cut off their opportunity to make a living, are themselves coerced into coercion? Quite recently I myself used this argument when addressing a middle-class audience in one of our most conservative provincial towns, and to my surprise there came instantly a round of applause. When I added that, as compared with the pressure perpetually brought to bear on them, such coercion as the Unions can exercise is but a drop in the bucket, the applause redoubled.

Labour's strength lies in the plain, unvarnished statement of its whole case; but the Socialists, who are its leading spokesmen, are not in a position to make that statement. For decades past they have been going up and down the country telling the workers that when State Control shall have taken the place of Private Enterprise the millennium will have come. On the other hand eager for the Trade Unions' moral and financial support, they find themselves compelled to stand by Labour in its industrial battles; and, twist it as you will, Labour's industrial battles are, at bottom, always against the State. It is the State that guards the present system against attack. It is the State that furnishes the laws, the judges, the magistrates, the gaolers, the policemen, and, in the last resort, the soldiery that crush the worker at the first symptom of threatening revolt; and in this the Ruling Raj has the backing of the public because the Socialists have taught it to look to the State as the Redeemer. In England that delusion is well-nigh universal, and still the Socialists are straining every nerve to foster it. Inevitably, therefore, the Government turns against them their own sword, for its entire argument is that in upholding strikes they are attacking the public whose guardian, according to their own teaching, is the State.

For party and financial reasons MacDonald and Snowden, Thomas and Clynes, together with all their Parliamentary supporters, are posturing as Labour's allies in its struggle to preserve the right to strike; but it is only a posturing. Their eyes are set in quite an opposite direction, and if there was one thing they must have deplored most cordially it was the outbreak of the General Strike. Even more bitterly will they oppose any similar upheaval in the future; and this fact Labour, organised or unorganised, has now to face. It is up against a most powerful landed aristocracy which means to keep the masses down. It is up against a huge bureaucracy which is pledged to loyalty to the Government and, for the sake of its own bread and butter, will stand by it to the last ditch. It is up against an enormous middle class which views all social problems solely through the spectacles of trade, and has the backing of an even larger public that is economically dependent on it, is also saturated with commercial thought, and dreads, above all else, any disturbances that threaten the safety of its own small individual investments. These are the forces on which the Government can reckon confidently, and against them Labour stands alone.

Thus far one can see distinctly, but when we look into the future heavy mists shut out the view. It may be that large sections of the middle class, driven to the wall by gigantic capitalist combinations, will be forced into the proletariat ranks and supply them with a revolutionary outlook that, as yet, is pitifully lacking. It may be that the workers, hemmed in at every turn, despairing of relief from Parliament, and rendered reckless by the increasing insecurity of a position that is, at best, always hideously precarious, will take the bit between their teeth and kick over the traces. These things may be, but none of us can be certain that they will be, and on mere possibilities we should not build vain hopes. Our business is to analyse to the best of our ability the present position, that we may turn our own revolutionary efforts to good account. A great struggle has begun, and for the moment the odds are all in favour of the possessing class. To that stern truth we have all to brace ourselves.

W. C. O.

World-Reformation by Monetary Revolution.

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

DEAR SIR,—Kindly accept my heartiest thanks for your candid criticism and review of my little book—"World Reformation by Monetary Revolution"—as published in the March issue of FREEDOM.

You say: "We have no faith in any financial reform or revolution which would leave the land monopoly untouched." Also: "If we were to nationalise banking in this country to-day, with Mr. Baldwin and his friends in control of the new system, should we be any better off?"

My shortest reply to your objections and fears is this. With Governments in control and operation of banking, the case for Socialism and the ideals it represents would virtually be won, and that Socialism would become established as fast as the people could digest its proposals, no matter what political party was in Government control. The great obstacle to all the reforms we are seeking is "Money." With Governments in control of banking, this one great obstacle would be removed. In other words, the money question would be settled for all time, and would soon become a question of virtually no importance to Governments. Whereas to-day it is the all-important question with us all.

I know of nothing relating to world, social, and industrial reform more lamentable than the prevailing lack of knowledge of the money question existing among leaders of the Anarchist, Communist, and Socialist movements. However, things seem to be brightening up a little in that direction, and I am beginning to have hope that they will soon see the light.

After a thirty-year hunt for the "nigger" in the wood-pile of world troubles, I am thoroughly convinced that with the money question rightly settled, all such fears and doubts as you have expressed would have no cause for existence. Government control and operation of all monetary powers and functions will be found to be the *Great Panacea* for virtually all the troubles which beset the world to-day. The *private* control of money and banking is the obstacle barring the road to world reform. Government control and operation of banking represents the *shortest possible road to Socialism and to the ideals which you yourself advocate.*

The problem of world peace is a money problem. The great fight to come—the one that is drawing nearer and nearer every day—will be fought over the money question. Governments to-day are owned by bankers. What I am striving for is for Governments to own themselves. The trinity of Isars who are running the world to-day are Montague Norman, J. P. Morgan, and Benjamin Strong of U.S. Federal Reserve. —Very truly yours,

Providence, R.I., U.S.A.

SAMUEL BOTTOMLEY.

[Mr. Bottomley should know that the vital point of difference between Anarchists and Socialists is on the question of Government. Socialists wish to extend the power of the State until it controls all our activities. Anarchists wish to abolish all the powers of the State. We are absolutely opposed to the rule of man by man, which really means the exploitation of man by man.—ED. FREEDOM.]

"FREEDOM" GUARANTEE FUND.

The following sums have been received to date (May 31) since our last issue:—M. A. Cohn £5 2s. 3d., C. Blandy 2s. 6d., G. P. 6s. 4d., H. Sakai 2s. 10d., A. J. R. 10s., A. E. Lavers 2s., P. Incampo £1 0s. 7d., M. Slutzky 12s. 4d., Ellen Winsor £1 16s., C. Pritchard 8s., L. G. Wolfe 5s.

CASH RECEIVED (not otherwise acknowledged).

(April 21 to May 31.)

"FREEDOM" SUBSCRIPTIONS.—A. Hazeland, J. Sellar, Ella Twynam, H. Sakai, H. Matsui, E. J. Hale, P. O'Connor, W. Benson, E. Winsor, P. Aitken, J. Carter.

West London Anarchist Communist Group.—Open-air Meetings at The Grove, Hammersmith. Wednesdays, 8 p.m. Sundays, 7.30 p.m. Other meetings announced from platform. Speakers welcome.

Leeds.—G. Frost, 31 Windsor Street, Leeds, is willing to speak at meetings within a reasonable distance. FREEDOM and Anarchist literature on sale or to order.

The Mutualist.

Mutualism—The Doctrine of Individual Liberty, Political and Economic Justice.

Edited by EDWARD H. FULTON.

Bi-Monthly. Single copy, 20 cents. Subscription, \$1.00 per year. 1227, PROSPECT AVENUE, CLINTON, IOWA, U.S.A.

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. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 3d.
ANARCHISM AND DEMOCRACY. By JOHN WAKEMAN. 1d.
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.
THE CRUSHING OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 2d.; postage, 1d.

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 PETER KROPOTKIN. Cloth, 2s. 6d.; postage 3d.
MUTUAL AID. By P. KROPOTKIN. Paper, 2s. net; postage 3d.
ETHICS: ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 12s. 6d.; postage 6d.
GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By P. J. PROUDHON. Paper, 2s. 6d.; Cloth, 5s.; postage 3d.
GOD AND THE STATE. By MICHAEL BAKUNIN. (American Edition). Cloth, 3s. 6d.; paper 1s. 6d.; postage 2d.
PRISON MEMOIRS OF AN ANARCHIST. By ALEXANDER BERKMAN. 10s. 6d.; postage 6d.
THE BOLSHEVIK MYTH. By ALEXANDER BERKMAN. 10s. 6d.; postage 6d.
ANARCHISM AND OTHER ESSAYS. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 6s. 6d.; postage 4d.
MY DISILLUSIONMENT IN RUSSIA. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 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.
INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY. By BENJAMIN R. TUCKER. Selected and Edited by C.L.S. Cloth, 2s. 6d.; postage 3d.
MAN VERSUS THE STATE. By HERBERT SPENCER. Paper, 6d.; postage 2d.
THE EGO AND ITS OWN. By MAX STIRNER. 6s.; postage 4d.
AN ENQUIRY CONCERNING POLITICAL JUSTICE. By WILLIAM GODWIN. 2 vols., 16s.; postage 9d.
THE ORIGIN AND IDEALS OF THE MODERN SCHOOL. By FRANCISCO FERRER. Cloth, 1s.; postage 2d.
ON PROPERTY: ESSAY FROM "POLITICAL JUSTICE." By WILLIAM GODWIN. Cloth, 3s. 6d.; postage 3d.
SHELLEY, GODWIN, AND THEIR CIRCLE. By H. N. BRAILSFORD. 2s.; postage 3d.
JOSHIAH WARREN: THE FIRST AMERICAN ANARCHIST. By WILLIAM BAILIE. 4s.; postage 3d.
A HISTORY OF FREEDOM OF THOUGHT. By PROF. J. B. BURY. 2s.; postage 3d.
LOVE'S COMING OF AGE. By EDWARD CARPENTER. 2s.; postage 3d.
NEWS FROM NOWHERE. By WILLIAM MORRIS. Cloth, 3s. 6d.; paper, 1s. 6d.; postage 3d.
A DREAM OF JOHN BALL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. Cloth, 3s. 6d.; paper, 1s. 6d.; postage 3d.
FREEDOM AND ITS FUNDAMENTALS. By CHARLES T. SPRADING. Cloth, 6s. 6d.; postage 4d.
SCIENCE VERSUS DOGMA. By CHARLES T. SPRADING. 6s.; postage 4d.
A VINDICATION OF NATURAL SOCIETY. By EDMUND BURKE. 8d.; postage 1d.
THE SPEECHES OF THE CHICAGO MARTYRS. 2s.; postage 2d.
LIFE OF ALBERT PARSONS. By LUCY E. PARSONS. 12s.; postage 6d.
THE SOUL OF MAN UNDER SOCIALISM. By OSCAR WILDE. Limp cloth, 2s. 6d.; postage 2d.
SYNDICALISM AND THE CO-OPERATIVE COMMONWEALTH. By E. PATAUD and E. POUGET. Paper covers, 2s. 6d.; postage 3d.
THE SPIRIT OF FREEDOM IN EDUCATION. By ELIZABETH BYRNE FERM. 1s. 3d., post free.
THE MODERN SCHOOL OF STELTON. By JOSEPH J. COHEN and ALEXIS C. FERM. 4s.; postage 4d.
WALDEN. By HENRY THOREAU. 2s.; postage 3d.
ALBUM OF THE FUNERAL OF PETER KROPOTKIN IN MOSCOW. With 30 Photographs. 1s., post free.

Orders, with cash, to be sent to
FREEDOM PRESS, 127, OSSULSTON STREET, LONDON, N.W.1.

Printed by the UTOPIA PRESS and Published by the FREEDOM PRESS,
127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W.1.

INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY.*

Under the title "Individual Liberty" (by Benjamin R. Tucker, selected and edited by C. L. S.), the Vanguard Press, of New York City, presents to the public what is virtually an abbreviated edition of Tucker's noted work, "Instead of a Book." It was, not for the Anarchist movement alone, but for the cause of general intelligence, a veritable tragedy when, in 1908, Tucker's wholesale stock of publications, manuscripts, etc., was destroyed by fire, for in the conflagration there perished much Individual Anarchist literature that has not been replaced. Indeed, what study should be more important to every one of us than that of our relation as individuals to the collective structure of which we are a part, and on what subject is ignorance so dense and universal?

"Instead of a Book," to which was added the sub-title "By a man too busy to write one," was a reproduction of Tucker's articles in *Liberty*, a paper he owned and edited for nearly thirty years. It prided itself on being the unswerving, "plumb-line" champion of the Free Individual as opposed to Authoritarianism, no matter what its specious form or philanthropic label. It fought the Communist Socialism of Kropotkin and Most as uncompromisingly as it opposed State Socialism, and in a long series of controversies, conducted invariably with marked ability and extraordinary vigour, it explored the never-ending quarrel between the non-invasive Individual and the invasive State. Its great value lay in the fact that it taught its readers to examine and reflect; for, as Ruskin has pointed out, there are hundreds who can feel for one who can think, and any number who think logically but erroneously because they have observed inaccurately. It is these last who become the slaves of theories founded on premises that are unsound; and over the fallacies in which they thus enmesh themselves they fight fanatically, keeping the world at war. The history of all the world's religious systems is proof enough of that.

Tucker was the very man to conduct a publication of the kind described. He was an untiring student, and he delighted in measuring swords with those who differed from him. He wielded a pen that cut like a razor, and called a spade a spade. Invariably he singled out for attack the men and things that were worth attacking, and he presented his own views with all the assurance of a man firmly and unalterably convinced that he was right. I myself believe that he was often wrong; notably in his analysis of the land question and his declaration that Anarchists rank as first, in the order of importance, the money question. In that thousands of Anarchists would disagree with him, and for my part I should say that Henry George was far nearer to the truth when he declared that the first thing to be settled was mankind's relation to the planet into which it has been born and by the natural resources of which it has to live.

We need most urgently a treatise which shall compare Tucker's land theories with those of Herbert Spencer and Henry George.

Controversy is the best of all remedies for mental fog, and I know that the discussions in *Liberty*—subsequently embodied in "Instead of a Book"—cured me of many a delusion begotten by an earlier apprenticeship to State Socialism. They cleared my mind as to the true nature of the State; revealed to me the Dictatorship lurking beneath majority rule, on which all modern politics is based; gave me an insight into the working of our money system, with the gold standard as its foundation; taught me that every form of monopoly is an invasion of the non-invasive individual, and therefore an exploitation of the masses; in a word, drove firmly home much that I had only partially absorbed from other writers. Whatever else Tucker may or may not be, he is never sentimental. He faces problems, states them clearly, and tries to solve them logically. You may differ from him after you have talked the matter out, but you will find that you have a better understanding of social institutions than you had before. These are not so simple as to party fanatics they seem to be. They demand, above all else, impartial investigation, and from the politicians that is precisely what they never get.

We owe much to Tucker, who has been one of those cold enthusiasts who keep their goal steadily in view, march directly toward it, and care nothing for popular applause or pecuniary gain. He has done an immense amount of heavy and unremunerative work, such as the translation of Proudhon's leading works, the publication of Stirner's "Ego and

Its Own," the rendering from the French of Tchernechfsky's "What's to be Done?" Tolstoy's "Kreutzer Sonata," "My Uncle Benjamin," and probably others that escape my memory. All calculated to bring the public to our way of thinking, and part of his Anarchist propaganda.

Tucker's work is never sensational, but it is sincere, and it will live. Sooner or later humanity is bound to revolt against the Imperialistic tendencies now dominant, and tear itself loose from the straitjacket in which the State, hand in glove with all the invasive monopolies, is strangling it. Then will come Tucker's turn and that of the many he has influenced and still is influencing. In foreign publications he is now quoted frequently, but in England, still deaf to everything outside party politics, his name is practically unknown. We should rectify that.

W. C. O.

SACCO AND VANZETTI.

Governor Fuller, of Massachusetts, in whose hands lays the decision of life or death for our two comrades, is still being flooded with protests and appeals, which have come from every country and from every class. No case has ever excited such world-wide interest, and we feel certain that the State of Massachusetts dare not send them to the electric chair. But we hope that this agitation will not be satisfied with imprisonment for life for these innocent victims of the law, but will insist on their release. Seven years under sentence of death! Imagine that long-drawn-out agony, and ask yourselves what animal but man would ever torture so a fellow-creature. The conduct of their trial has done more to convince people of the corruption of the State and its agents than all the Anarchist pamphlets or books ever written. Seven years under sentence of death! Release them!

Liberty in the United States.

What do I primarily and immovably believe in, as a Puritan believes in hell? I believe in liberty. And when I say liberty, I mean the thing in its widest imaginable sense—liberty up to the extreme limits of the feasible and tolerable. I am against forbidding anybody to do anything, or say anything, or think anything so long as it is at all possible to imagine a habitable world in which he would be free to do, say, and think it. The burden of proof, as I see it, is always upon the policeman, which is to say, upon the lawmaker, the theologian, the right-thinker. He must prove his case doubly, triply, quadruply, and then he must start all over and prove it again. The eye through which I view him is watery and jaundiced. I do not pretend to be "just" to him—any more than a Christian pretends to be just to the devil. He is the enemy of everything I admire and respect in this world—of everything that makes it various and amusing and charming. He impedes every honest search for the truth. He stands against every sort of good-will and common decency. His ideal is that of an animal trainer, an archbishop, a major-general in the army. I am against him until the last galoot's ashore.

This simple and childlike faith in the freedom and dignity of man—here, perhaps, stated with undue rhetoric—should be obvious, I should think, to every critic above the mental backwardness of a Federal judge. Nevertheless, very few of them, anatomising my books, have ever showed any sign of detecting it. But all the same even the dullest of them has, in his fashion, sensed it; it colours unconsciously all the diatribes about myself that I have ever read. It is responsible for the fact that in England and Germany (and to the extent that I have ever been heard of at all, in France and Italy) I am regarded as a highly typical American—in truth, as almost the archetype of the American. And it is responsible equally for the fact that here at home I am often denounced as the worst American unhung. The paradox is only apparent. The explanation of it lies in this: that to most Europeans the United States is still regarded naively as the land of liberty *par excellence*, whereas to most Americans the thing itself has long ceased to have any significance, and to large numbers of them, indeed, it has of late taken on an extreme obnoxiousness.

I know of no civilised country, indeed, in which liberty is less esteemed than it is in the United States to-day; certainly there is none in which more persistent efforts are made to limit it and put it down.—H. L. MENCKEN (in N.Y. *Nation*).

The next issue of "Freedom" will be published in the first week in August.

* "Individual Liberty." By Benjamin R. Tucker. Selected and Edited by C. L. S. 50 cents. New York City: Vanguard Press, 80 Fifth Avenue.