

Coat

THE SUPREME TASK
OF
INTERNATIONAL
PACIFISM

AS VIEWED BY AN ANARCHIST

Price Two Pence

Printed and published by J. Humphrey,
2, Malden Crescent, Chalk Farm, London, N. W. 1.

THE SUPREME TASK OF INTERNATIONAL PACIFISM AS VIEWED BY AN ANARCHIST

“ Thus peace has once more been conquered. It will not be definitely achieved, unless we arrive by the education of the masses so make to them the horror of war and its imbecility of collective massacre absolutely tangible, and unless we arrive at it at least to reduce to utter impotency all the manufacturers of murderous machinery and all the profiteers of death ”

(Victor Margueritte, the great French novelist and pacifist, in a letter, dated Paris, October 10th, 1938, to our excellent anarchist — anti-militarist comrade George Pioch).

Some fundamental deductions are to be drawn out of the historical events of September 1938; when the hideous spectre of war appeared to be imminently near and the peoples as also the entire human culture of Europe seemed inevitably to become a prey of governmental wrangling and prorogatory interests. These deductions have to be drawn because the international movement of pacifism and humanity as such, has absolutely no guarantee that the next war-danger will also pass away so smoothly.

Was The Danger Real?

Let us assume that the danger of war was real. Although it is contended by a very weighty authority.

The General Secretary of the Dutch Ministry for foreign affairs, Mynheer R. J. H. Patijn, the brother of the present Minister of the same department, writing in the “Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant” as follows:

“There is a presumption, which appears at first sight strange but which is able to clear up many of the otherwise insoluble problems. As far as the writer can fathom it, it covers all the facts until now discovered. It is the presumption that there has not been any actual danger of war, but that the whole world has been duped by a very carefully prepared, and magnificently carried through, comedy. . . . There was a certain distribution of roles. . . . All the known facts fit excellently, and could be exemplified much clearer, in all the features of this hypothetical picture! (Oct. 6th.)

While all this is true — secret diplomacy nowadays is being practised much more than before 1914, — nevertheless it is not known, how far these secret mutual agreements on the part of all the governments concerned have gone, and to what point exactly

it might have been agreed NOT to let war become a reality. Anyhow, it is undeniable that the GENERAL MOBILISATION of the main states of Europe brought war dangerously near.

WHAT THE MOBILISATION HAS ACTUALLY SHOWN

Whether a real war, or not, was planned, we do not know. The fact is, all preparations for a war was made on all sides.

This meant that the governments had a great—and very costly opportunity of observing how their mobilisation affected the peoples, and whether these very peoples, being the cattle for the slaughter-field, can be brought willingly and submissively upon it.

In this respect it can be emphatically asserted that the mobilisation has shown that in no country were the people wilfully for the war.

Counteraction Of Mass In Italy And Germany

There was no war-frenzy, no imperialist greed for conquest to be seen anywhere—the least in Germany and Italy, where the peoples remained ignorant and uninformed about the war-danger. It was only on the 27th of September that they learnt what their rulers evidently were preparing for them.

From this day on peace was ascertained; not by the Munich-conference, but by the effect the dawning knowledge had in Italy and Germany. It is not generally known, was purposely suppressed by the large press, that in Milano, Turin and divers other cities of Italy, spontaneously very large demonstrations against war took place, the masses singing the French "Marseillaise", cheering for France, thereby manifesting their feelings for the sister people.

As to Germany the attitude against war showed itself even more outspoken. Huge masses in Berlin and other towns have greeted the motorised soldiery, led to the boundary, with the hateful shouts: "Down with war". More than anything else the reports of these clear symptoms induced Hitler to renounce his original intention, before any other militaristic power was even able to come to the assistance of Czecho-Slovakia, to destroy Prague with one thousand aeroplanes, over-running the entire country with his huge military apparatus.

The Only "Enthusiasts"

But even in Czecho-Slovakia there were no outbreaks of a real popular enthusiasm for war, very much unlike 1914. There was nowhere a united front for war.

Only the extreme anti-fascist bolshevists feigned a wilfulness for war. But the people did not heed them, knowing instinctively that the problems at stake were purely governmental and imperialistic ones, feeling that the outcome of the strife of either governmental side, was immaterial in comparison to the unspeakable horror which war would have wrought for practically the whole of

Europe, and comprehending very clearly that a war would not hurt personally so much the leaders of fascism as it would annihilate the, by them oppressed, unfortunate masses, but also the anti-fascist populaces.

It must never be overlooked that one of the aims of fascism is the annihilation of large, anti-fascist masses of the peoples, opposed to fascism. This purpose is best served by war.

A STRANGE PHENOMENA

While thus the peoples were not in favour of war, while it was actually for the first time in modern history, in compensation to the propaganda of real pacifism, impossible for either side of governmental groups to incite any war-fever—there was one stupefying phenomena.

In spite of great inner aversion, and hate against war, fully understanding its uselessness, yet, the people went to war. It obeyed the order of mobilisation, the men, who were mobilised, left their wives and children, allowing themselves to be mobilised and to be shipped to the boundaries or railroaded like cattle to the mutual mass-execution of capital punishment . . . to the very purposes they all, on all sides, abhorred.

This is one of the greatest points for international pacifism, not to be overseen, but reckoned with henceforth. It proved that only that propaganda contains real enlightenment which teaches the people to understand government and its role in war. The elements of government, as already shown by Burke and Godwin for England, and Proudhon for France, and Chelnicky for Bohemia, and Leo Tolstoy for the whole of mankind—these elements must be taught to be understood by the people, because only then can the inner fortitude to withstand the otherwise awful pressure upon it.

LORD HALIFAX SPEAKS OUT

Subconsciously the peoples feel already these elements in all they are worth . . . There were great signs for this. And if we are to believe as high an authority, like that of Lord Halifax, the situation which mostly evaded war, were in his words rendered by him as follows:

"The UNANIMOUS REVOLT of the small people in all the countries against and before the idea that their leaders could possibly again lead them into a route bringing them to the abyss (of war)—this is undoubtedly, the most remarkable that has resulted from the recent events, (spoken on October 24, according to "L' Oeuvre" Paris.)

In spite of the suppression, or falsification, of the real news-facts during those eventful days, the words of Lord Halifax prove that not all went so smooth as "the powers that be" like to make it appear.

There is no doubt that in the large, unknown mass of the

people there must have been exceedingly many who were firmly decided *not* to place the interests of government higher than those of mankind, of humanity. They, I am sure, had decided unto themselves, to heed the highest Christian, and ethical principle: "Thou shalt not kill . . ." There must have been many of those who did NOT believe that the order of government is equivalent to the divine commandment.

THE NEW DAWN

Let us not be mistaken about one thing: If we pacifists know how to utilise the event, then a new epoch is setting in with the Munich settlement.

However one may be—mostly, naively—judging the duty of governmental obligations and pacts towards other governments, one thing is certain; that the settlement in Munich, if the other alternative was really war, was positively more wholesome to the peoples at large, than the reverse could ever be. This is vividly shown by the very remarkable words of M. Daladier, the French premier-minister, spoken at the Congress of his party, in Marseille, on October, 27th:

"That what I hold that I may once more affirm before you, with all the force I am capable of, is, that for the entire European civilisation, for our ideal of liberty, for our own country, nay even for Czecho-Slovakia itself, the situation which results from the treaties of Munich is preferable to that situation which would exist today if one would not have avoided war."

For every reasonable man it is sure as anything, that, with a combined military front of England, France, Russia and, most likely also the U.S.A; against it, Germany, even to-day much smaller and innerly less united than the belligerent forces against the Entente at 1914, and, would, in the case of war, have become defeated in the end. And yet, M. Daladier has to admit that the AVOIDANCE of war is today better than a victory by war. This admission is the bankruptcy of the whole philosophy of war.

And why is M. Daladier right? Because war annihilating firstly always just that country for whose alleged interests and assumed warfare a war is being waged. War is annihilating in all the belligerent countries so much in lives of the inhabitants, in stocks and wealth, that the final victory becomes a mockery, in comparison to that what was at stake, and has, ultimately, been "achieved".

Victory in war is, nowadays, equivalent with defeat. The cost of the military apparatus of Germany, its three months lasting mobilisation, the necessity of upholding its "victory", is so horribly expensive for the German people that it can never gain as much as the Sudeten districts continually will cost.

The only victorious party in a war is always the international

armory industry, in which all belligerent governments are peaceably and mutually united, and that government—not its people, mark well—that is finally victorious. Its victory is gained by the equal sacrifice of life and wealth and health of the victorious and the defeated people.

And for what result? Here again let M. Daladier give the answer "Whatever may be the differences of their political regimes, those ... nations which have been so often at grips with each other they at last ought to comprehend, that in modern times WAR CAN NEVER OFFER ANY SOLUTION and that by a loyal mutual understanding of the peoples it is possible to regulate all these problems."

Let us hold tightly to those words of M. Daladier that "in modern times war cannot offer any solution."

WAR IS ALWAYS THE GREATER EVIL

The Standpoint of M. Daladier Is Absolutely Correct.

Terribly sad, as it is, in comparison to war the present plight of the victims of governmental policy of the Chechoslovakian and German, as well as the English and French state, is immaterial, even if the conditions for the Chechoslovakian people has become worse than it had been before. Whether the boundries have become narrower; whether the injustice and violation of all principles of truth and right by Hitler are most infamous—in view of the fact that military strategists have ascertained, that an only three weeks lasting war against Chechoslovakia—so long it would have lasted until Russia could have come to render effective aid—would have cost the lives of about 500,000 Chechoslovakian soldiers alone, not counting the lives of non-combatants and also those on the side of Germany, the German people, under a dictatorship, not being responsible for the misdeeds of the dictators.

Who, with common sense, can maintain that the upholding of a state is worth the lives of half a million of men etc., etc.? It is the height of frenzy to affirm that question.

Even the direct suffering of the Jews, anti-nazi-German and so forth, of different denominations, is not to be compared to the horrible sufferings, which the outbreak of war would have entailed. The more so as all those elements suffering now would not have been spared the suffering also, but by far more innocent victims than now would have suffered with them—for no use whatsoever, because war as such demolishes all the "noble" aims of war.

ONLY CLARITY CREATES UNITY AND ENSURES PEACE

In order to overcome war, we must be clear about the way war alone can be overcome.

Unfortunately, not all those elements whom one is entitled to expect that, like us, the pacifists pure and simple, then will draw the proper lessons out of the recent events, are really clear about them. Thus, for instance, we witness in France that the Social Democratic Federation there, is by no means learning the proper lesson out of the very instructive lessons of the times.

This federation of Social democracy (S. D. I. O.), led by Leon Blum, assents to the policy of rearmament. Instead of rejecting war, as impotent to right any wrong — I have shown that even statesmen must confess it—this party, which assumes to represent the interests of the workers foremostly, affirms the ultimate necessity of war.

In consequence of this standpoint Leon Blum writes in the main party organ in Paris, "Le Populaire", quite outspoken for the development of the production of war-bombers, which means that he is directly promoting this most cowardly and most homicidal method of mass-assassination. He writes (October. 24th,) as follows:

"REGARDING OUR WAR-AVIATION An industrial mobilisation is necessary. I have explained, how in order to ensure the execution, sufficiently rapidly, of the programme for 1938, that is to say, the construction of 200 avions per month, from the spring of the coming year on, it is necessary to triple or quadruple our capacity of industrial production What has one done for this, to achieve it?"

And M. L. Blum finishes with this advice:

"Be it said with one word; one must utilise the whole ensemble of productive resources of the nation (in order to achieve at least 200 aeroplanes per month) All this must be done according to our vital necessities. Such formulae and methods cannot have anything astonishing for the time in which we live. They are formulae of progress they are formulae, before anything else salutary."

This social democracy is repeating the treason against peace which it has perpetrated against the vital interests of the workers and all the peoples in 1914.

What Is Socialist Pacifism?

The terrible sad and anti-social standpoint of Mr. Leon Blum becomes somewhat comprehensible, if we follow his reasoning as to the alleged inevitability of war for the workers, when a certain point is reached. Thus he writes extremely memorable and truly historical words in an article, entitled "The Socialist Pacifism" "Le Populaire, October, 29th,)

"I have formulated the Central Problem which is posing itself before the party. When it puts before the working-class as its main line of action: "Nothing should be saved in order to save peace"—

Does this mean "Yes" upon all demands, upon all ultimatums, that they will never be imperilled by war. Does the party accept it that one is deducing out of its will to uphold peace, out of its policy of peace, this extreme consequence? The Party Does Not Accept This Consequence

"The formulae 'avoid nothing in order to save peace'—this cannot for us imply, for instance, the passive submission in face of an invasion against our national soil, or in face of a dismembering of the state, or in face of an enslavement of the people." Thus French Socialism—As Also International Socialism Excludes Integral Pacifism.

"Integral Pacifism wishes unconditionally, and supposes, the abolition, out of the presence and for the individual, of all distinctions between the nations and fatherlands. It prescribes for the individual as a moral duty, as a human duty, Never To Place The Hatred of War, The Horror Of war, into the balance with any other mobile factor, with any other sentiment.

I can, in an abstract way, recognise the greatness of this doctrine. I know that it has, as a matter of fact, adherents outside our party. But I believe to be in the position to state emphatically that within our party it does not COUNT at all

Thus there are circumstances and situations in which a nation, or the proletariat, can see itself in the position to admit the risk of war Without any differences of opinion, in all cases, and at once, in all those which I have already quoted, as for instance, in the case of an aggression characterised as aimed against the national soil, or of a menace of such an aggression, putting totally in danger either the integrity of the territory, or the independence of the State, or the liberties of the citizens."

It is a well-known fact that, when governments want to start a war, at the behest of the international war-industry, and in order to rid themselves of certain internal problems, or in order to uphold their power, internally as externally, they always give and will give, all these causes for a war, as being invoked as very useful to pretend, in order that the leaders can make the bulk of the people ready to be led to the mutual slaughter.

Does it pay for workers to countenance these arguments of Mr. Blum in favour of war and to submit to them? As an integral pacifist I deny this emphatically.

PRODUCTION OF AEROPLANES

While Mr. Blum is satisfied with the production of 22 aeroplanes during a month, in order to safeguard France, a friend of his,

M. Frossard, maintains that 500 would be necessary. No doubt, for the manufacturers of them a ten times as this given quantity appears a still better defense. But the problem is this:

Do they really believe, or do they only make believe, that while France is going to produce aeroplanes at a pace of swiftness as they believe possible, the other countries, Italy and Germany, are not going to do the same? Where remains then the advantage for France?

Is not the production, the overproduction, of such an amount of aeroplane-bombers tantamount with a total destruction of our civilisation and culture, on both sides of the belligerents, if a war breaks out? Where is then the possibility of a "victory" for any side, wherein does it consist?

Does Mr. Blum not observe in the Spanish-German-Italian war that the bombs thrown by the pilots of the aeroplanes mostly murdered women, children, non-combatants? How can he, as a presumed socialist, advise the mass-production of just such instruments of warfare?

Where does the principle of "solidarity" remain with these Marxian preachers of the "class-struggle" when they justify the mass-slaughtering of proletarians in war? Is war, the mutual annihilation of the workers of different nations, not a direct refutation of the "class-struggle" and of all proletarian solidarity?

These very pertinent questions are evaded by the apologists of war, like Mr. Blum.

Foremost they evade the main question: OF WHAT USE IS ALL THIS? Let us examine whether it is of any use, in the light of recent facts or whether the "integral pacifists" — this name, coined by Mr. Blum is excellent, should be preserved — are not, after all, the only ones who are in the right. Especially when they state, more consistently than M. Daladier inconsistently, but very impressive, that war does not settle anything.

Unfortunately for the cause of mankind the international socialist movement has not as yet come so far as to understand this fact.

WHEN IS WAR JUSTIFIABLE?

We have heard that for the socialist movement and for the workpeople at large, war is absolutely justifiable.

- a). in the case of an aggression against the national soil;
- b). in the case of a menace of such aggression;
- c). when the integrity of the national territory is at stake;
- d). when the independence of the state, viz, the government is endangered;
- e). when the liberties of the citizens are endangered.

In all these cases the leader of French socialism recognises

war as an inevitable necessity to which the workers, especially his party, has to abide. It is for him self-evident that then mutual nomicide en masse is justifiable.

Not Only The "Integral Pacifists" Think Differently.

Mark well, Mr. Blum has written his articles, out of which I quoted above, after the downfall of Czechoslovakia, after its conquest by Germany.

This is very important because it proves his blindfoldedness and that of all apologists of war, if justified by the workers, or their leaders, but also if justified by the conservatives and usual bourgeois defenders of war. *They all do not perceive that their arguments in favour of war become sheerest nonsense in the light of the Munich settlement.*

What The Munich Settlement Historically Teaches

With most glaring clarity the Munich Settlement shows:

1. Neither Mr. Chamberlain, nor Mr. Daladier, and neither Mr. Benes or Stalin, none of them has put the actual case of an aggression against the national soil; the menace of such aggression; the integrity of the national territory; the independence of the state, viz: the government; the liberties of the citizens higher and above the elements of PEACE.

They have thereby commonly defeated entirely the case of war, for every country. The principles of PEACE were to them higher and dearer than anything else. *The first three have expressly stated that the case of peace was for them more important than any other consideration. And Mr. Stalin, by his silent non-action, has tacitly stated the same.*

We here have before us a historical example of far-reaching dimensions. In all those cases for which the socialist Blum declares war as absolutely necessary for a people, in all these two non-socialist and one social democratic statesman have by words and deeds negated war as justifiable, as an eligible solution.

If even statesmen reject war in the most pertinent cases, why should the workers accept war in these cases?

2. Mr. Benes has rather accepted the invasion of his fatherland, his nation, the dismembering of the national soil, of the government, before declaring war. He rather accepted his own deposition, the loss of half of the industry, the most important one of his country, rather than declaring war against Germany. Out of what motives he has thus acted, is immaterial. The fact remains that war was no solution to him, and he rather accepted everything before declaring war.

And should socialists and the workers consider it a solution?

3. The whole work-people of the Czechoslovakian Republic has acted absolutely contrary — but wisely — to the solely possible advices and assumptions of M. Blum, although the Czechoslo-

vackian working-class consists mainly out of socialistically and "communistically" inclined elements. They have NOT fulfilled the peremptorily decreed, "self-evident" duties of M. Blum.

In contradistinction to his ideas the Czechoslovakian workers took upon themselves rather invasion of the national soil, its dismembering, the greatest possible humiliation of its state and of their national statesmen, the surrendering of their arms and fortifications, first to Germany, then to Poland and Hungary, instead of "defending" their government thereby starting in and accepting war. They stood the most brutal conquest against their own government, smashing of its military power, before they would have taken recourse to weapons and war. Out of their own initiative nothing was done to this effect and it is today already quite clear that it was the smartest and most humanitarian standpoint they could take.

The Czechoslovakian people, especially the workers, have given to the world, THE MOST MAGNIFICENT EXAMPLE of the fact that the interests of a government are by no means tantamount to those of a people. THE UPHOLDING OF PEACE, in case a governmental provocation to war, IS THE GREATEST VICTORY to be achieved by any people. Because war is always the attempt of government to save itself and its interests at the expense of the bleeding people, ruined and murdered when succumbing to war.

Thus we see that the workers of the Czechoslovakian Republic have acted as INTEGRAL PACIFISTS. Have they thereby not acted in consonance with the highest principles of socialism, humanitarianism?

4 The General Staff of the Czechoslovakian army has rather accepted defeat without war, advising the people to submit to everything demanded, instead of war with its chances of victory. Just those representatives of war being responsible for the defense of the nation, the country, the national soil and its integrity. For government and its independency, for the technical apparatus of military action—just they have kept the people back from war and surrendered without any battle. Having sworn the most solemn oath to "defend" the country till the last breath, allowed the "enemy"—always only a temporary term—to transgress the boundary. Their logic was quite correct. Better the invasion, occupation, dismemberment of the country, before war, a never-to-be-healed evil. This way they thought, spoke and acted accordingly.

5 Czechoslovakia was a militaristically, formidably equipped state; it had tremendous armaments and fortifications, and yet the "Powers that be" did not rely upon them. They, by full right, thought it better to suffer a tremendous limitation of their power, rather than engaging in war.

6. The Munich—agreement is the tacit recognition of the fact that war has become mutual suicide. That it was better to agree according to a new grouping of their interests, than to take recourse to war, against each other. Rather succumb to new limitation of power, than risk a war. Thus we see that the basic justifications for war have become shams, no more recognised by those who once-upon-a-time maintained them. And just for the workers alone they should still and always have the justification for leading them into the abyss.

THE PROOF OF ANARCHISM

In all this is also to be recognised the absolute truth of the contention of Anarchism, which, in its alone *absolute negation of all violence*, is the real means and aim of a logical pacifism. All the above facts have proven that the negation of governmental interests, the total negation of militarism as arbiter, that this alone is the real safeguard of peace. Drastically it is thereby demonstrated that Government and its needs spell War. *While the disregard of government, the Negation of Government, spells Peace.*

It is for this reason that the anarchists proclaim this profound truth.

As the governmental principle per se needs war for its preservation, it thereby proves its anti-social being. Let mankind commend this, that either it must abolish this anti-social institution within society, because it is based upon anti-sociability of violence, or mankind will be annihilated by government. The whole history of mankind shows; Governments, their wars and devastations and annihilations, have caused the downfall of all past civilisations. The present epoch has to decide:

Either mankind will overcome all forms of government and reorganise society upon the basis of non-violence—or mankind will be destroyed and buried by government.

The supreme task:— INTEGRAL PACIFISM

As integral pacifists, we can hail the events as they have passed within, and about, Czechoslovakia. They are a positive DEFEAT OF THE THEORY OF WEAPONS. they are a victory over their alleged power.

For the first time after the First World War one saw five tremendously armed, military powers mobilised for war—and, at last, the recognition piercing through that peace is better, safer, more reasonable than war. Or victory for any side. THIS BE-SPEAKS THE UTTER USELESSNESS OF MILITARISM, standing condemned as unable to achieve its own aims. The impossibility each side to start in war without signing its own self-annihilation, culminating in the Munich-agreements, is the smashing of all claims of militarism, its justification, if valued correctly, from

the standpoint of integral pacifism, as Mr. Chamberlain very rightly put it on November, 1st:

"We had to choose between HARD ALTERNATIVES, and when you find fault with the solution, which has, in fact, been carried out, *do not forget what the alternative was*, and what the effect of the other alternative would have been for Czechoslovakia."

These words must be a guiding line for international pacifism. They must be upheld at all times, at all war-occasions, in all countries. That the latter consideration should always win the upper hand, this is the supreme task of pacifism, nationally and internationally. Because in the words of Mr. Chamberlain lays the entire justification of *integral pacifism*, its triumph.

CONTRADICTORY CONCEPTIONS

It is a most unfortunate circumstance that, while our ideas of integral pacifism are finding recognition by some veritable actions on the part of those who have, until now, bitterly opposed them, just in quarters least expected to be for militarism and war, in the ranks of socialism; they find the least understanding.

In "Le Populaire" of November, 14th, I find a report of a very important session of the National Council of the French Socialist Party (S. F. I. C.) deciding upon the standpoint the party has to take towards the foreign policy of the French government. The tune of the debate is easily to be guessed, when I state that these words of Louis Levy are characteristic of the whole discussion:

"Our party must not have anything in common with conscientious objectors. What we need is to realise an entente with all those countries which are willing to resist the aggressor." . . .

While the final lectures by the most important speakers were rendered, submitting the decisive resolutions, THE PRESS WAS EXCLUDED, so as not to be able to report extensively. Out of that what was still published, there were hardly any great distinctions between the two speakers: Faure, the Gen. Secretary of the party, L. Blum, its chairman. Faure said:

"You all know me, I am and I remain a man in favour of disarmament. But in the present moment, WE STAND BEFORE A NEW STATE OF FACTS. . . .

Still more outspoken is the quintessence of Blum's speech reported as follows:

"France can and should stick to its language of disarmament. *But for today, for all that, it is necessary that it should arm itself. It is necessary that it should appear as a strong nation. In order to avoid the war, it is necessary to be able to run the risk of war.*"

No one will assume that these are the words of men who are willing to place everything above war, on the contrary, they are

ready to submit everything to it and its needs, in the first place, the principle of socialism, which is one of integral pacifism, if interpreted in a non-partisan sense, in the sense of humanitarianism. How dangerous for the true interests of labour these words of politicians are, becomes the more clear when we read that even the Church of England and the Free Churches have, at their recent conference (Oct. 28th. 1938), spoken quite a different language. In their memorable "message to the nation" one reads:

"*Christian duty demands that in the settlement of international disputes the method of reason, conference and conciliation, must be substituted for the method of violence.*"

Surely, these are very conflicting views. They all prove that we, the *integral pacifists*, have a supreme, solemn duty. To prove continually the truth, that there is no evil so vile as that of war, which, therefore, is inadmissible for mankind.

OUR SUPREME TASK

In a letter, out of which a profound spirit of pacifism and fraternity speaks, some comrades of the People's Pledge Union write me:

"Some of us feel that our hour of tribulation may be at hand and we look for the light"

Yes, these hours might be drawing nearer than we can imagine, and our highest duty is to be clear about the standpoint to be taken in order to avoid the otherwise inevitable Armageddon—which can be prevented if the integral pacifists succeed to convince the broad masses of the people to understand.

The standpoint taken by all the statesmen in the case of the Czechoslovakian conflict is the standpoint to be taken by the people towards every other conflict too? concerning each people respectively and singly.

We, the integral pacifists, must not fail to heed the lesson, given to us by the leading statesmen in all problems, confronting us, regarding war.

The Munich-Conference has taught the whole world a never-to-be-forgotten lesson that there are *higher things* than nationalism, patriotism, national honour, integrity of the territory, humiliation of one's own government, etc. etc.—namely, *Peace*, and *The lives of human beings*. That conference has proven: *It is a greater honour to live for peace, than to die for war.* The former outweighs the latter. Internationally integral pacifism has to proclaim:

When we have witnessed once that rulers and statesmen have manifested enough reason to place peace higher than their own cherished principles and war—can there henceforth be for the men and women of the people anything higher than peace?

Thus, the greatest task before the international working-people and all well-meaning men and women, loving liberty more than

power, the power of government, loving the life of the peoples more than the trust into war, must be. When the supreme hour comes, let us all remember the *living examples* which were given to us, and be resolved, united, firmly therein.

Not to put anything higher than peace — and not even in the darkest hours of seduction and tribulation.

OUR METHODS

Let no one say that this means giving free vent and way to the reactionary governments against the more liberal ones. This is nonsense. Because the negation of war and militarism, and also civil war, does not mean the submission to any new or old rulership. *There are other and, for authority, government and violence more destructive means than war, or militarism, which are continually replacing them by their likes.*

As anarchists we are absolute pacifists. Our methods against oppression and exploitation are *economical, social and anti-authoritarian in the widest sense of these words.* But they are always only such which realise the aims of integral pacifism, i. e. *a society of non-violence.* All other means are suicidal for this cause, therefore perpetuation of violence, viz. oppression and exploitation.

WHY HAS CIVILISED MAN FALLEN SOCIALLY BENEATH THE SAVAGE?

They (the tribes of the north) are savages, but they are not savage; they are without GOVERNMENT, but they are not lawless; they are utterly uneducated according to our standard, yet they exhibit a remarkable degree of intelligence. In temperament like children with all a child's delight in little things, they are nevertheless enduring as the most matured of civilised men and women, and the best of them are faithful unto death. Without religion and having no idea of GOD they will share their last meal with anyone who is hungry, while the aged and helpless among them are taken care of as a matter of course. They are healthy and pure blooded, they have no vices, no intoxicants, no bad habits —not even gambling. Altogether they are a people unique upon the face of the earth. A friend of mine calls them philosophic Anarchists of the north.

Commander Peary.



READ

COMMUNITY LIFE

THE MONTHLY JOURNAL OF THE MOVEMENT
FOR COMMUNAL LIVING

Price One Penny, 12 Months 1/6 Post Free

Publishing Office

2, Malden Crescent, Chalk Farm, London N. W. 1.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

Anarchist Communism	By	Peter Kropotkin	3d
Anarchism in Socialistic Evolution		"	2d
An Appeal to the Young		"	2d
The Wage System		"	2d
Revolutionary Government		"	2d
Useful Work -V- Useless Toil	By	William Morris	2d
Anarchy	"	Errico Mallatesta	3d
A Talk Between Workers	"	"	3d
Objections to Anarchism	"	George Barratt	2d
The Truth about Spain	"	Rudolf Roeker	2½d
The Tragic Week in May	"	Augustin Souchy	3d

Postage on above pamphlets ¼ extra

Modern Science and Anarchism	By Kropotkin	1/-	Postage	1d
Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist	" A. Berkman	4/6	"	4d
A. B. C. of Anarchist Communism	"	3/6	"	4d
Anarcho-Syndicalism	By Rudolf Roeker	"	"	3d
The Tragedy of Spain	"	6d	"	1d
Living My Life	" Emma Goldman	7/6	"	6d
My Disillusionment in Russia	"	3/-	"	4d
Pamphlet by Durruti		4d	"	½d
Photograph of Durruti woven in silk		1/-	"	1½d

From E. Michaels,

163, Jubilee Street, Mile End, E. 1.