

War—
Patriotism—
Peace

Lev Nikolaevich
By LEO TOLSTOI

Edited and Introduction by
SCOTT NEARING



NEW YORK
VANGUARD PRESS
MCMXXVI

UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO LIBRARIE

Gift of Allen D. Grigsby

Copyright, 1926, by
VANGUARD PRESS, INC.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA



JX
1949
.T6

FOREWORD

TOLSTOI AS AN ANTI-WAR AGITATOR

MANY voices were raised against war during those recent years when the preparations for war were so widespread, and so threatening to peace and human happiness. Among these voices none sounded more clearly and none was more vigorous than that of Leo Tolstoi.

Tolstoi was a member of the Russian ruling class. His parents were landed aristocrats. He grew up surrounded by the ease, luxury, frivolity and dissipation that were taken for granted by people in his social position. Like many other Russian gentlemen he entered the army, assisted in the siege of Silistri and took part in the defense of Sebastopol in 1854. Tolstoi was then 26 years old.

Military life made a deep impression on Tolstoi's mind. The routine and coercion, as well as the sheer brutality of military activities offended and outraged him. While he was thrilled by the dramatic qualities of war, as pictured in his "Tales from Sebastopol," he was fiercely resentful of its inhumanities.

This resentment grew as Tolstoi became more familiar with the forces operating behind the war-making machine. Time after time he laid aside his other work to pen some letter or some protest or to write some article or essay condemning war, and so effective were his efforts that toward the end of his life (he died in 1910) Tolstoi was looked upon as one of the world's outstanding agitators against war.

Tolstoi spent his mature years in a Europe that was arming and preparing for the War of 1914. He foresaw the war; predicted it; and spent much time and energy trying to create anti-war public opinion.

71502

His propaganda against war was far more than an emotional opposition to mass-murder. Tolstoi felt that opposition, of course. He had been a soldier. He had seen war and had taken part in it. His great novel, "War and Peace," tells how atrocious war really is.

But Tolstoi understood that war was not an accident. He recognized it as a logical product of competition and exploitation. Behind the whole system of landlordism and capitalism, he saw violence and armed force. It was to this cause that he traced war, and it was against this exploitation and this violence that he hurled his denunciations.

"The ownership of the land," he writes in "Need it Be So?" "having originated in violence (through conquest people appropriated the land, and then gave it away and sold it), has remained, in spite of every effort at turning it into a right, nothing but an act of violence of the strong and armed against the weak and unarmed."

Having secured the land by force, the rich "gather in one place and settle near other rich people, where the gratification of all kinds of luxurious tastes is cautiously guarded by a numerous police force." ("What Shall We Do Then?" Ch. 13.) When the poor resent this appropriation of the good things of life by the rich, they are jailed or executed for the protection of property and of property rights. Under such a system, "there will always be wars for markets, for gold fields, and so forth, which we need in order to maintain our exclusive wealth." ("Who is to Blame?")

Thus the police and the army become the tools of the rich and powerful, to protect their riches and power against the poor, and to help them add more riches and power to those they already possess. The source of the war motive thus lies in the economic struggle between men.

But the actual propaganda in favor of war takes the form of an appeal to patriotism. In the name of religion; in the name of their national traditions; in the names of their ancestors; in the name of justice and liberty, the workers and farmers of one country are urged to "protect" themselves

against the workers and farmers of other countries. Thus patriotism becomes one of the leading instruments for the making of wars. Therefore Tolstoi appeals, not only to the soldiers and officers, in his efforts to create sentiment against war. He also directs his attack against the whole system of nationalism out of which wars grow.

Finally, he insists that men must refuse to do violence, whether as soldiers or magistrates or as citizens. Only then will violence be abolished. Only then will intelligence reign. Only then can we build "a free and loving union of men."

Tolstoi is dead. Wars go on.

The World War was not the last war—it was the First World War. The causes which brought it about are still operating. The preparations for the Second World War are now being made by all the great powers, and unless some miracle intervenes, the Second World War will take place in the not distant future. And when it does occur it will be far more terrible than the First World War, because the weapons of destruction are far more numerous and efficient today than they were in 1914.

This is a time when every man and woman who is against mass-murder should bend his efforts to the task of removing the causes of war. After the war begins, it is already too late.

Tolstoi presents one powerful line of argument against war. This argument should be studied and understood. The essays and letters printed in this volume furnish an invaluable fund of information and provide a real insight into the causes that are driving the world toward another ghastly orgy of blood-letting.

SCOTT NEARING.

our so-called Christian nations are guided. And so the salvation of Europe and of the Christian world at large does not consist in this, that, bedecking themselves with swords, as William has represented them, they should, like robbers, cast themselves upon their brothers beyond the sea, in order to kill them, but, on the contrary, they should renounce the survival of barbarous times,—patriotism,—and, having renounced it, should take off their arms and show the Eastern nations, not an example of savage patriotism and beastliness, but an example of brotherly love, which Christ has taught us.

Moscow, January 2, 1896.

PATRIOTISM AND GOVERNMENT

(1900)

I

I HAVE several times had occasion to express the idea that patriotism is in our time an unnatural, irrational, harmful sentiment, which causes the greater part of those calamities from which humanity suffers, and that, therefore, this sentiment ought not to be cultivated, as it now is, but, on the contrary, ought to be repressed and destroyed with all means that sensible people can command. But, strange to say, in spite of the evident and incontestable relation of the universal armaments and destructive wars, which ruin the nations, to this exclusive sentiment, all my arguments as to the obsolescence, untimeliness, and harm of patriotism have been met either with silence or with intentional misunderstanding, or, again, with the same strange retort: "What is said is that there is harm in the bad patriotism, jingoism, chauvinism, but the real, good patriotism is a very elevated, moral sentiment, which it is not only senseless, but even criminal to condemn." But as to what this real, good patriotism consists in, either nothing is said, or, instead of an explanation, they utter pompous, highfalutin phrases, or something which has nothing in common with patriotism is put in the place of this patriotism, which we all know and from which we suffer so cruelly.

They generally say that the true, good patriotism consists in wishing the real good for one's nation or state, the good which does not impair that of the other nations.

The other day, while speaking with an Englishman about

the present war, I told him that the real cause was not any selfish aims, as is generally assumed, but patriotism, as was evident from the mood of all English society. The Englishman did not agree with me, and said that if that was true, it was due to the fact that the patriotism which was now animating the English was a false patriotism, but that the good patriotism, with which he was permeated, consisted in this, that the English, his fellow citizens, should not act badly.

"Do you wish that only the English should not act badly?"

I asked.

"I wish this to all!" he answered, showing plainly by this answer that the properties of benefits—be they moral, scientific, or even applied, practical—are by their nature such that they extend over all men, and so the desire for such benefits for any one is not only no patriotism, but even excludes it.

Similarly the peculiarities of every nation, which some other defenders of patriotism intentionally substitute for this concept, are no patriotism. They say that the peculiarities of each nation constitute an indispensable condition for the progress of humanity, and so patriotism, which strives after the retention of these peculiarities, is a good and useful sentiment. But is it not obvious that if at some time the peculiarities of each nation, its customs, beliefs, language formed an indispensable condition of the life of humanity, these same peculiarities serve in our time as the chief impediment to the realization of the ideal of the brotherly union of the nations, which is already cognized by men? And so the maintenance and preservation of the peculiarities of any nationality, Russian, German, French, Anglo-Saxon, provoking a similar maintenance and preservation not only on the part of the Hungarian, Polish, Irish nationalities, but also on the part of the Basque, Provençal, Mordvinian, Chuvash, and a mass of other nationalities, does not make for the closer friendship and union of men, but for their greater and ever greater estrangement and division.

Thus it is not the imaginary, but the real patriotism, the

one which we all know, under the influence of which the majority of the men of our time are, and from which humanity is suffering so cruelly, that is, not a desire for spiritual benefits for one's nation (it is impossible to wish for spiritual benefits for only one's own nation), and not the peculiarities of national individualities (that is a quality, and by no means a sentiment), but a very definite feeling of preferring one's own nation or state to all the other nations and states, and so it is a desire that this nation or state enjoy the greatest welfare and greatness, which can be obtained and always are obtained only at the expense of the welfare and greatness of other nations and states.

It would seem to be obvious that patriotism as a sentiment is bad and harmful; as a doctrine it is stupid, since it is clear that if every nation and state shall consider itself the best of nations and states, all of them will find themselves in a gross and harmful error.

2

One would think that the harmfulness and irrationality of patriotism ought to be obvious to men. But, strange to say, enlightened, learned men not only fail to see this, but also with the greatest persistency and fervour, though without any rational foundations, refute every indication of the harmfulness and irrationality of patriotism, and continue to laud its beneficence and exalted condition.

What does that mean?

Only one explanation of this remarkable phenomenon presents itself to me. The whole history of humanity, from the most remote times to the present, may be viewed as the motion of the consciousness of separate individuals and of homogeneous aggregates of them from lower to higher ideas.

The whole path traversed both by each individual person and the homogeneous groups of men may be considered as a consecutive series of steps, from the lowest, which is on a level with the animal life, to the highest, which at a given historical moment may be reached by the consciousness of man.

Every man, like the separate homogeneous groups,—the nations, the states,—has always walked, as it were, over the steps of ideas. Some parts of humanity march on, others fall far behind, and others again, the majority, move in the middle. But all of them, no matter on what step they may be standing, having behind them the obsolete recollections of the past, and ahead of them the ideals of the future, are always in a process of struggling between the obsolete ideas of the past and the ideas of the future, which are just entering into life. What generally takes place is this, that when an idea, which in the past was useful and even indispensable, becomes superfluous, this idea, after a more or less prolonged struggle, gives way to a new idea, which heretofore was an ideal, but now becomes the idea of the present.

But it also happens that the obsolete idea, which in the consciousness of men has already given way to the higher idea, is such that the maintenance of this obsolete idea is advantageous for some people, who have the greatest influence in society. And then it happens that this obsolete idea, in spite of its sharp contradiction to the whole structure of life, which is changed in the other relations, continues to influence men and to guide them in their acts. Such a retardation of an obsolete idea has always taken place in the sphere of religion. The reason of it is this, that the priests, whose advantageous position is connected with the obsolete religious idea, making use of their power, intentionally retain the obsolete idea in the minds of men.

The same takes place, and for the same reason, in the political sphere, in relation to the idea of patriotism, on which every state structure is based. Men who profit by it artificially maintain this idea, which no longer has any sense or use. They are able to do so, since they are in possession of the most powerful means for influencing men.

In this do I find an explanation of the strange contradiction between the obsolete idea of patriotism and the whole contrary train of ideas, which in our time have already passed into the consciousness of the Christian world.

Patriotism, as a sentiment of exclusive love for one's nation and as a doctrine about the virtuous sacrifice of one's peace, property, and even life for the defense of the weak against the murderousness and violence of their enemies, was the highest idea of a time when every nation considered it possible and just, for the sake of its own good and greatness, to subject the men of another nation to murder and pillage; but as far back as two thousand years ago, the highest representatives of the wisdom of humanity began to recognize the higher idea of the brotherhood of men, and this idea, entering the consciousness more and more, has in our time received the most varied realization. Thanks to the greater ease of intercommunication, the unification of industry, commerce, the arts and the sciences, the men of our time are so united among themselves that the danger of conquests, slaughter, and violence on the part of neighbouring nations has entirely disappeared, and all the nations (the nations, not the governments) live among themselves in peaceful, mutually advantageous, amicable, industrial, commercial, mental relations, which they have no reason and no need to violate. And so it would seem that the obsolete feeling of patriotism ought to be destroyed more and more and to vanish completely, as superfluous and incompatible with the vitalized consciousness of the brotherhood of the men of the various nationalities. However, the reverse takes place: this harmful and obsolete sentiment not only continues to exist, but is even fanned more and more.

The nations without any rational foundation, contrary to their consciousness and their advantages, not only sympathize with the governments in their attacks upon other nations, in their seizures of the possessions of others, and in the use of violence in defending what has already been seized,—but themselves demand these attacks, seizures, and defenses, and rejoice in them and are proud of them. The minor oppressed nationalities, which have fallen into the power of the larger states,—the Poles, the Irish, the Bohemians, the Finns,

the Armenians,—reacting against the patriotism of the conquerors, which is crushing them, have to such an extent become infected by the oppressing nations with the obsolete, useless, senseless, and harmful sentiment of patriotism, that their whole activity is centred upon it, and they themselves, suffering from the patriotism of the powerful nations, are prepared out of the same patriotism to do to the other nations the same that the nations which have conquered them have been doing to them.

This is due to the fact that the ruling classes (meaning by this not merely the governments with their officials, but also all the classes which enjoy an exclusive, advantageous position,—the capitalists, journalists, the majority of artists and scholars) are able to retain their exclusive and advantageous position, as compared with the popular masses, only thanks to the political structure which is supported by means of patriotism. By having in their hands all the most powerful means for influencing the masses, they always unswervingly maintain the patriotic feelings in themselves and in others, the more so, since these sentiments, which support the power of the state, are more than any other rewarded by that power.

Every official succeeds in his service in proportion to his patriotism; even so a military man can advance in his career only in a war, which is provoked by patriotism.

Patriotism and its consequences, the wars, give a good income to the newspaper men and advantages to the majority of merchants. Every author, teacher, professor, will make his position the more secure, the more he preaches patriotism. Every emperor and king gains glory in proportion to his devotion to patriotism.

The army, the money, the school, the religion, the press, is in the hands of the ruling classes. In the schools they fan patriotism in the children by means of history, by describing their nation as the best of all the nations and always in the right; in the adults the same sentiment is roused by means of spectacles, celebrations, monuments, and a patriotic, lying

press; but patriotism is chiefly roused in them by this, that, committing all kinds of unjust acts and cruelties against other nations, they provoke in these nations a hatred for their own nation, and then use this hatred for provoking such a hatred in their own nation.

The fanning of this terrible sentiment of patriotism has proceeded in the European nations in a rapidly increasing progression, and in our time has reached a stage beyond which it cannot go.

4

Within the memory of all, not merely old men of our time, there took place an event which in the most obvious manner showed the striking stupefaction to which the men of the Christian world were brought by means of patriotism.

The German ruling classes fanned the patriotism of their popular masses to such an extent that in the second half of the century a law was proposed to the people, according to which all men without exception were to become soldiers; all sons, husbands, fathers, were to study murder and to become submissive slaves of the first highest rank, and to be prepared for the murder of those whom they would be ordered to kill,—the men of the oppressed nationalities and their own labourers who should defend their rights,—their fathers and brothers, as the most impudent of all rulers, William II., publicly announced.

This terrible measure, which in the rudest way offends all the best sentiments of men, has, under the influence of patriotism, been accepted without a murmur by the nation of Germany.

The consequence of this was the victory over the French. This victory still more fanned the patriotism of Germany, and later of France, Russia, and other powers, and all the people of the Continental powers without a murmur submitted to the introduction of a universal military service, that is, to slavery, which for the degree of degradation and loss of will cannot be compared with any of the ancient conditions of

slavery. After that, the slavish submission of the masses in the name of patriotism, and the impudence, cruelty, and madness of the governments knew no bounds. There began a mad race, provoked partly by lust, partly by vanity, and partly by greed, for the seizure of foreign lands in Asia, Africa, and America, and a greater and ever greater mistrust and fury of the governments against one another.

The destruction of nations on seized lands was taken as something self-evident. The only question was as to who was going to be the first to seize the land and to destroy its inhabitants. All the rulers have not only in the most obvious manner violated the most primitive demands of justice against the vanquished nations and against one another, but have also practiced all kinds of deceptions, rascalities, bribes, forgeries, espionage, pillage, and murder, and the nations have not only failed to sympathize with all that, but have even rejoiced, because their states, and not foreign states, have been committing these evil deeds. The mutual enmity of the nations and states has of late reached such wonderful dimensions that, although there is no reason why one state should attack other states, all know that all the states are all the time standing opposite one another extending their claws and showing their teeth, and just waiting for some one to fall into misfortune and grow feeble, in order to be able with the least danger to attack him and tear him to pieces.

All the nations of the so-called Christian world have been brought by patriotism to such a degree of bestialization that not only the men who are put to the necessity of killing or being killed, wish for and rejoice at murder, but also the men who calmly live in their houses in Europe, who are not threatened by any one, thanks to the rapid and easy means of communication and to the press,—all men in Europe and in America,—during any war are in the position of spectators in a Roman circus, and just like them rejoice at the slaughter, and just as bloodthirstily cry, "*Pollice verso!*"

Not only the adults, but also the children, the pure, wise children, according to the nationality to which they belong,

rejoice, when they hear that not seven hundred, but one thousand Englishmen or Boers were killed and torn to pieces by lyddite shells. And the parents, I know such, encourage their children in such bestiality.

But more than that. Every increase of the army of one state (and every state, being on account of patriotism in danger, wishes to increase it) compels the neighbouring state to increase its army also for the sake of patriotism, which again calls forth a new increase of the first.

The same is true of the fortresses and fleets: one state builds ten ironclads, so the neighbouring ones build eleven; then the first builds twelve, and so on in an endless progression.

"I'll pinch you."—"And I'll strike you with my fist."—"I'll whip you."—"And I'll club you."—"I'll shoot you." Thus quarrel and fight only bad children, drunken men, or animals, and yet it is this that is taking place in the midst of the highest representatives of the most enlightened states, the same that are guiding the education and morality of their subjects.

5

The state of affairs is getting worse and worse, and there is no possibility whatever of arresting this degeneration, which is leading to certain ruin. The only way out from this situation, as credulous people thought, is now closed by the events of recent times: I am speaking of The Hague conference, and the war between England and the Transvaal, which followed immediately after.

If people who think little or only superficially were able to console themselves with the idea that international tribunals can remove the calamities of war and the evergrowing armaments, The Hague conference, with the war which followed upon its heels, in the most obvious manner showed the impossibility of solving the question in this manner. After The Hague conference it became obvious that so long as there shall exist governments with armies, the cessation of armaments and wars is impossible. For an agreement to be possible, it is

necessary for the persons agreeing to believe one another. But for the powers to believe one another, they must lay down their arms, as do bearers of truce, when they come together for a consultation.

But so long as governments do not believe one another, not only do not destroy or diminish, but, on the contrary, keep increasing their armies, in conformity with the increase among their neighbours, and unswervingly through spies watch every movement of the armies, knowing that every power will attack the neighbouring one as soon as it shall have a chance to do so, no agreement is possible, and every conference is either a piece of stupidity, or a plaything, or a deception, or a piece of impudence, or all these things taken together.

It behooved the Russian government, more than any other, to become the *enfant terrible* of this conference. The Russian government is so spoiled by the fact that at home no one retorts to all those obviously lying manifestoes and rescripts, that, having without the least scruples ruined its own nation by means of armaments, having choked Poland, robbed Turkestan and China, and strangled Finland with particular fury, it proposed to the governments to disarm themselves, with the full conviction that it would be believed.

But, no matter how strange, how unexpected, and how indecent this proposition was, especially at a time when orders had been given to increase the armies, the words, enunciated in the hearing of all, were such that the governments of the other powers could not before their nations decline to participate in the comical, patently deceptive consultations, and the delegates came together, knowing in advance that nothing could come of it, and in the course of several months, during which they received good salaries, though they laughed in their sleeves, all of them good-naturedly pretended that they were busy establishing peace among the nations.

The Hague conference, which ended in terrible bloodshed,—the Transvaal war,—which no one has tried to stop, was

none the less useful, though in a different way from what was expected from it: it was useful in that it showed in the most obvious manner that the evil from which the nations suffer cannot be mended by the governments, and that the governments, even if they wished to do so, are unable to abolish either armaments or wars. In order to be able to exist, the governments must defend their nations against attacks from other nations, but no nation wants to attack another, or ever does attack another, and so the governments not only do not wish for peace, but even make efforts to rouse the hatred of the other nations toward their own. Having roused the hatred of the other nations toward their own, and patriotism in their own nations, the governments assure their people that they are in danger and must defend themselves.

Having the power in their hands, the governments are able to irritate the other nations and to evoke patriotism in their own, and they use every effort to do both, nor can they themselves help doing so, because upon this is their existence based.

If the governments were needed before to defend their people against attacks from other nations, now, on the contrary, the governments artificially violate the peace which exists among the nations, and provoke hostilities among them.

When it is necessary to plough, in order to be able to sow, ploughing was a sensible thing; but it is evident that it is senseless and harmful to plough, after the crops have grown up. And yet it is precisely this that the governments make their nations do,—destroy that union which exists and would not be impaired by anything, if there were no governments.

6

Indeed, what are in our time those governments, without which it seems impossible for men to be able to exist?

If there was a time when the governments were a necessary and lesser evil than the one which resulted from defenselessness in relation to organized neighbours, the govern-

ments have now become an unnecessary and much greater evil than all that with which they frighten their nations.

The governments, not only the military ones, but the governments in general, could be, I do not say useful, but harmless, only in case they consisted of infallible, holy people, as is assumed to be the case in China. But the governments, by dint of their very activity, which consists in the practice of violence, are always composed of elements which are the very opposite of holy,—of the most impudent, coarse, and corrupted men.

For this reason every government, and especially every government to which the military power is delegated, is a most dangerous institution in the world.

The government, in its broadest sense, with the inclusion of capitalists and the press, is nothing but an organization such that the great majority of men are in the power of the minority, which stands above them; but this minority submits itself to the power of a still more restricted minority, and this again to a still more restricted minority, and so forth, reaching at last one man or a few men, who by means of military violence gain the power over all the rest. Thus this whole structure is like a cone, all the parts of which are in the full power of the few persons, or the person, at the apex of the cone.

But the apex of this cone is seized by those men, or by that man, who is more cunning, more bold, and more unscrupulous than the rest, or an accidental heir of those who were bolder and more unscrupulous.

To-day it is Borís Godunóv, to-morrow—Grigóri Otrépev; to-day—the harlot Catherine, who with her paramours strangled her husband, to-morrow—Pugachév, the day after—mad Paul, Nicholas, Alexander III.

To-day—Napoleon, to-morrow—Bourbon or Orleans, Boulanger, or a company of Panamaists; to-day—Gladstone, to-morrow—Salisbury, Chamberlain, Rhodes.

And it is such governments that are invested with full power, not only over property and life, but also over the

spiritual and moral development, over the education, the religious guidance of all men.

Men produce this terrible machine of power, letting any one who pleases seize this power (and all the chances are that it will be seized by the one who is morally worst), and slavishly submit to it, and marvel that they are faring badly. They are afraid of mines, of anarchists, and are not afraid of that terrible structure, which threatens them any minute with the greatest calamities.

Men found that, to defend themselves against enemies, it is useful for them to tie themselves together, as the Circassians do, when defending themselves. But there is no danger, and men still continue to tie themselves.

They carefully tie themselves in such a way that one man is enabled to do with them what he pleases; then they allow the end of the rope which binds them to dangle about, leaving it to the first rascal or fool to take it up and do with them what he wants.

Is it not precisely what the nations are doing, when they submit, and establish and support a government which is organized with military power?

7

To free people from those terrible calamities of armaments and wars, which they suffer now, and which keep growing greater and greater, we do not need congresses, nor conferences, nor treaties and tribunals, but the abolition of that implement of violence which is called the governments, and from which originate all the greatest calamities of men.

To abolish the governments only one thing is needed: it is necessary that men should understand that the sentiment of patriotism, which alone maintains this implement of violence, is a coarse, harmful, disgraceful, and bad, and above all, immoral sentiment. It is coarse, because it is characteristic of only such men as stand on the lowest stage of morality and who expect from other nations the same acts of violence that

they want to practice themselves; it is harmful, because it violates the advantageous and joyous peaceful relations with other nations, and, above all, produces that organization of the governments, in which the worst man can acquire and always acquires the power; it is disgraceful, because it transforms the man not only into a slave, but also into a fighting cock, bull, gladiator, who ruins his forces and his life, not for his own purposes, but for those of his government; it is immoral, because, instead of recognizing himself as the son of God, as Christianity teaches us, or at least as a free man, who is guided by his reason,—every man, under the influence of patriotism, recognizes himself as the son of his country, the slave of his government, and commits acts which are contrary to his reason and to his conscience.

Men need but understand this, and the terrible concatenation of men, called the government, will fall of its own accord, without any struggle, and with it will fall that terrible, useless evil which is caused by it to the nations.

Men are beginning to see this. This is, for example, what a citizen of the United States writes:

"The one thing which we all, farmers, mechanics, merchants, manufacturers, teachers, ask is the right to attend to our own business. We have our homes, love our friends, are devoted to our families, and do not interfere in the affairs of our neighbours,—we have our work, and we want to work.

"Leave us alone!

"But the politicians will not leave us alone. They impose taxes upon us, eat up our sustenance, keep a census of us, call our youths to their wars.

"Whole myriads of those who live at the expense of the government are maintained by them, in order to impose taxes upon us; but to tax us successfully, permanent armies are maintained. The argument that the army is needed for the defense of the country is an obvious deception. The French government frightens the people by saying that the Germans are about to attack them; the Russians are afraid of the English; the English are afraid of everybody else; and now

we are told in America that it is necessary to increase the fleet and to add to the army, because Europe may at any moment unite against us. That is a deception and a lie. The common people in France, in Germany, in England, and in America are against war. All we wish is to be left alone. The men who have wives, parents, children, homes, have no desire to go away to fight with anybody. We are peaceable and fear war,—we hate it.

"All we want is not to do to others what we do not want others to do to us.

"War is a direct consequence of the existence of armed men. A country which maintains a large permanent army will fight sooner or later. A man who is proud of his strength in a wrestling match will some day meet a man who considers himself a champion wrestler, and they will fight. Germany and France are only waiting for a chance to try their strength. They have fought several times and will fight again. Not that the masses wish for war, but that the upper classes fan in them their mutual hatred and compel people to think that they must fight in order to defend themselves.

"Men who would like to follow Christ's teaching are taxed, insulted, deceived, and drawn into the army.

"Christ taught meekness, humility, forgiveness of sins, and that it is bad to kill. Scripture teaches people not to swear, but the 'upper classes' compel us to swear on the Scripture, in which they do not believe.

"How can we be freed from these spendthrifts, who do not work, but who are dressed in fine cloth with brass buttons and costly ornaments, who are supported by our labours, for whom we till the soil?

"Shall we fight with them?

"But we do not recognize bloodshed, and, besides, they have the arms and the money, and they can stand it longer than we.

"But who composes the army that will fight us?

"This army is formed by us, our deceived neighbours and brothers, who have been made to believe that they are serv-

ing God, when they defend their country from the enemy. In reality our country has no enemies except the upper classes, who have taken upon themselves to guard our interests, if only we shall consent to pay the imposts. They consume our sustenance and rouse our true brothers against us, in order to enslave and degrade us.

"You cannot send a telegram to your wife, or your friend, or your commission dealer, unless you first pay a revenue, which is being collected for the maintenance of armed men, who may be used for the purpose of killing you, and who will unquestionably put you in jail, if you do not pay it.

"The only means consists in impressing people with the idea that it is bad to kill, in teaching them that the whole law and the prophets demand that we should not do to others what we do not wish that others should do to us. Silently disregard these upper classes, and refuse to bow before their martial idol. Stop supporting preachers who preach war and put forward patriotism as something important.

"Let them go and work, as we do.

"We believe in Christ, but they do not. Christ said what he thought; they say what they think will please the men in power,—the upper class."

"We will not enter military service. We will not shoot at their command. We will not arm ourselves with bayonets against the good and meek masses. We will not at the suggestion of Cecil Rhodes shoot at shepherds and agriculturists, who are defending their hearths.

"Your deceptive cry 'Wolf, wolf!' does not frighten us. We pay our imposts only because we are compelled to do so. We will pay them only so long as we are compelled to do so. We will not pay any church tribute to the hypocrites, nor our tithes for your hypocritical philanthropy, and we will on every occasion express our opinion.

"We will educate the men.

"And all the time our silent influence will grow; even the soldiers who have been drafted into the army will waver before fighting. We will preach the idea that the Christian

life in peace and good-will is better than a life of struggle, bloodshed, and war.

"Peace on earth will come only when men shall separate themselves from the armies and will wish to do to others what they wish that others should do to them."

Thus writes a citizen of the United States of North America, and on all sides and in all forms similar voices are heard.

Here is what a German soldier writes:

"I have taken part in two expeditions of the Prussian Guard (1866, 1870), and I hate war from the depth of my heart, since it has made me inexpressibly unhappy. We, the wounded warriors, receive for the most part such miserable rewards, that we really have to be ashamed of having ever been patriots. I, for example, receive daily eighty pfennigs for my disabled arm, which was shot through at the storming of Saint Privas, on August 18, 1870. Many a hunting dog needs more for its maintenance. I have suffered for years from my disabled right arm. As early as 1866 I took part in the war against the Austrians, fighting at Trautenau and Königgrätz, and I have seen a lot of horrors. In 1870 I, being in the reserve, was again called out, and, as I have already said, I was wounded at the storming of Saint Privas: my right arm was twice shot down its whole length. I lost a good place (I was then a beer brewer), and after that I could not get it back. Since then I have never been able to get on my legs again. The intoxication has passed away, and the invalid warrior has nothing to live on but a beggar's pittance and alms. . . .

"In a world in which men run about like trained animals and are not capable of any other idea than that of outwitting one another for the sake of mammon, I may be considered an odd person, but I none the less feel in myself the divine idea of peace, which is so beautifully expressed in the Sermon on the Mount. According to my innermost conviction war is nothing but commerce on a large scale,—a commerce of the ambitious and mighty in the happiness of the nations.

"What horrors one passes through in connection with it!

I shall never forget them, those pitiful groans, which penetrate me to the marrow of my bones.

"Men who have never done any evil to one another slay one another like wild animals, and petty souls of slaves draw the good God into it as an accomplice in these acts.

"My neighbour in the ranks had his jaws shattered by a bullet. The unfortunate man was insane from pain. He ran about like a madman, and in the burning summer heat was unable to find some water with which to cool his terrible wound. Our commander, Crown Prince Frederick (later the noble Emperor Frederick) at that time wrote in his diary, 'War is an irony on the Gospel.' . . ."

Men are beginning to understand the deception of patriotism, in which all the governments are trying so zealously to maintain them.

8

"But what will happen when there shall be no more governments?" people generally ask.

There will be nothing; what will happen will be this, that which long ago ceased to be useful and now is superfluous and bad will be destroyed; what will be destroyed is the organ which, having become useless, has grown to be harmful.

"But if there shall be no governments, people will violate and kill one another," people generally say.

Why? Why will the abolition of an organization, which arose as the result of violence and which has been transmitted from generation to generation for the purpose of exerting violence,—why will the abolition of such an obsolete organization cause people to violate and kill one another? It would seem, on the contrary, that the destruction of the organ of violence would have the effect that people would stop practicing violence and killing one another.

There now are people who are specially educated and prepared for killing and violating men,—people to whom the right to commit acts of violence is delegated, and who make use of

an organization which is established for the purpose; and such violence and murder is considered to be a good and virtuous act. Then people will not be educated for the purpose, no one will have the right to do violence to others, there will be no organization of violence, and as is not the case with the men of our time, violence and murder will always and by all men be considered to be a bad thing.

If after the destruction of the governments acts of violence shall be committed, it is evident that they will be less than those at the present time, when there exist organizations specially established for the production of violence, and when there are conditions when violence and murder are considered good and useful.

The abolition of the governments will only destroy the traditional, useless organization of violence and its justification.

"There will be no laws, no property, no courts, no police, no popular education," people generally say, intentionally confusing the violence of the power with the different activities of society.

The abolition of the organization of governments, which are established for the purpose of exerting violence against people, does not bring with it the destruction of what is rational and good, and so what is non-violating in the laws, the courts, the property, the police defense, the financial institutions, the popular education. On the contrary, the absence of the rude power of the governments, whose only purpose is to support themselves, will contribute to a more rational and just public organization, which is in no need of violence. Courts, public affairs, and popular education, all that will exist to the extent to which the nations shall need them, and in a form which will not contain any evil that is connected with the present governmental organization; only that will be destroyed which was bad and interfered with the free manifestation of the will of the nations.

But even if we admit that with the absence of the governments there will occur disturbances and inner conflicts, the state of affairs would even in that case be better than what it

I shall never forget them, those pitiful groans, which penetrate me to the marrow of my bones.

"Men who have never done any evil to one another slay one another like wild animals, and petty souls of slaves draw the good God into it as an accomplice in these acts.

"My neighbour in the ranks had his jaws shattered by a bullet. The unfortunate man was insane from pain. He ran about like a madman, and in the burning summer heat was unable to find some water with which to cool his terrible wound. Our commander, Crown Prince Frederick (later the noble Emperor Frederick) at that time wrote in his diary, 'War is an irony on the Gospel.' . . ."

Men are beginning to understand the deception of patriotism, in which all the governments are trying so zealously to maintain them.

8

"But what will happen when there shall be no more governments?" people generally ask.

There will be nothing; what will happen will be this, that which long ago ceased to be useful and now is superfluous and bad will be destroyed; what will be destroyed is the organ which, having become useless, has grown to be harmful.

"But if there shall be no governments, people will violate and kill one another," people generally say.

Why? Why will the abolition of an organization, which arose as the result of violence and which has been transmitted from generation to generation for the purpose of exerting violence,—why will the abolition of such an obsolete organization cause people to violate and kill one another? It would seem, on the contrary, that the destruction of the organ of violence would have the effect that people would stop practicing violence and killing one another.

There now are people who are specially educated and prepared for killing and violating men,—people to whom the right to commit acts of violence is delegated, and who make use of

an organization which is established for the purpose; and such violence and murder is considered to be a good and virtuous act. Then people will not be educated for the purpose, no one will have the right to do violence to others, there will be no organization of violence, and as is not the case with the men of our time, violence and murder will always and by all men be considered to be a bad thing.

If after the destruction of the governments acts of violence shall be committed, it is evident that they will be less than those at the present time, when there exist organizations specially established for the production of violence, and when there are conditions when violence and murder are considered good and useful.

The abolition of the governments will only destroy the traditional, useless organization of violence and its justification.

"There will be no laws, no property, no courts, no police, no popular education," people generally say, intentionally confusing the violence of the power with the different activities of society.

The abolition of the organization of governments, which are established for the purpose of exerting violence against people, does not bring with it the destruction of what is rational and good, and so what is non-violating in the laws, the courts, the property, the police defense, the financial institutions, the popular education. On the contrary, the absence of the rude power of the governments, whose only purpose is to support themselves, will contribute to a more rational and just public organization, which is in no need of violence. Courts, public affairs, and popular education, all that will exist to the extent to which the nations shall need them, and in a form which will not contain any evil that is connected with the present governmental organization; only that will be destroyed which was bad and interfered with the free manifestation of the will of the nations.

But even if we admit that with the absence of the governments there will occur disturbances and inner conflicts, the state of affairs would even in that case be better than what it

is now. The present condition of the nations is such that it is hard to imagine it worse. The masses are all ruined, and the ruin must inevitably keep growing greater. All the men are turned into military slaves and must at any moment await the command to go out and kill and be killed. For what else shall they wait? That the ruined nations shall starve to death? That, indeed, is now taking place in Russia, Italy, and India. Or that not only the men, but also the women shall be drafted into the army? In the Transvaal they are beginning to do so.

Thus, even if the absence of government should actually mean anarchy in the negative, disorderly sense of the word (which it does not at all mean), no disorders of anarchy could be worse than the condition to which the governments have already brought their nations and toward which they are leading them.

And so the liberation from patriotism and the destruction of the despotism of the governments which is based upon it cannot help but be useful to people.

9

Bethink yourselves, people, and, for the sake of your bodily and spiritual good, and for the same good of your brothers and sisters, stop, think, reflect on what you are doing!

Bethink yourselves and understand that not the Boers, English, French, Germans, Bohemians, Finns, Russians are your enemies, but that the only enemies are you yourselves, who with your patriotism support the governments, which oppress you and cause your misfortunes.

They undertook to defend you against dangers, and have carried this condition of defense to such an extent that you have all become soldiers and slaves, that you are all ruined, that you are being ruined more and more, and may and must expect at any moment the breaking of the strained string and the terrible slaughter of you and your children.

No matter how great the slaughter may be and how it

may end, the condition will remain the same. Even so and with still greater tension will the governments arm and destroy and corrupt you and your children, and no one will help you to stop it all, if you are not going to help yourselves.

There is but one help, and that is to destroy that terrible concatenation of the cone of violence, with which those who succeed in getting to the apex of the cone dominate the whole nation, and dominate the more surely, the more cruel and inhuman they are, as we know from the case of Napoleon, Nicholas I., Bismarck, Chamberlain, Rhodes, and our dictators who rule the nation in the name of the Tsar.

There is but one means for destroying this concatenation, and that is, to awaken from the hypnosis of patriotism.

You must understand that all the evil from which you suffer you are causing yourselves, in that you submit to those suggestions by means of which you are deceived by the emperors, kings, members of parliaments, rulers, military men, capitalists, clergy, authors, artists,—by all those who need this deception of patriotism in order to be able to live by your labours.

Whoever you may be,—a Frenchman, Russian, Pole, Englishman, Irishman, German, Bohemian,—you must understand that all our real human interests, whatever they be,—agricultural, industrial, commercial, artistic, or scientific,—all these interests, like all the pleasures and joys, in no way oppose the interests of the other nations and states, and that you are, by means of a mutual interaction, exchange of services, the joy of a broad brotherly communion, of an exchange not only of wares, but also of sentiments, united with the men of the other nations.

You must understand that the questions as to who succeeds in seizing Wei-hai-wei, Port Arthur, or Cuba—whether it is your government or another—are by no means a matter of indifference to you, but that every seizure made by your government is detrimental to you, because it inevitably brings with it all kinds of influences, which your government will exert against you, in order to compel you to take part

in robberies and acts of violence, which are necessary for the seizures and for the retention of what has been seized. You must understand that your life can in no way be improved by this, that Alsace will be German or French, and that Ireland and Poland are free or enslaved: no matter whose they may be, you can live wherever you please; even if you were an Alsatian, an Irishman, or a Pole,—you must understand that every fanning of patriotism will only make your position worse, because the enslavement of your nation has resulted only from the struggle of patriotisms, and that every manifestation of patriotism in one nation increases the reaction against it in another. You must understand that you can save yourselves from all your calamities only when you free yourselves from the obsolete idea of patriotism and from the obedience to the governments which is based upon it, and when you shall boldly enter into the sphere of that higher idea of the brotherly union of the nations, which has long ago entered into life and is calling you to itself from all sides.

Let men understand that they are not the sons of any countries or governments, but the sons of God, and that, therefore, they cannot be slaves, nor enemies of other men, and all those senseless, now quite useless, pernicious institutions, bequeathed by antiquity, which are called governments, and all those sufferings, acts of violence, degradations, crimes, which they bring with them, will disappear of their own accord.

Pirógovo, May 10, 1900.

SHAME!

(1895)

IN the twenties of the nineteenth century the officers of the Seménovski Regiment, the flower of the youths of that day, for the most part Masons and subsequently Decembrists, decided not to use any corporal punishment in their regiment, and, in spite of the strict demands of military service at that time, the regiment continued to be a model one, even without the application of corporal punishment.

One of the commanders of a company of the Seménovski Regiment, upon meeting one day Sergyéy Ivánovich Muravév, one of the best men of that, and indeed of any, time, told him about one of his soldiers, a thief and drunkard, saying that such a soldier could not be brought to his senses in any other way than by means of the rod. Sergyéy Muravév did not agree with him and offered to take the soldier in his company.

The transfer was made, and the soldier in the very first days stole a pair of boots from his comrade, and with the proceeds from the sale of them got drunk, and acted riotously. Sergyéy Ivánovich called together the company and, calling the soldier to the front, said to him: "You know that in my company soldiers are not beaten or flogged, and I will not have you punished. For the boots which you stole I will pay with my own money, and I beg of you, not for my sake, but for your own sake, to reflect upon your life and to change it." And, having given the soldier friendly instructions, Sergyéy Ivánovich dismissed him.

The soldier again got drunk and had a fight. And again he was not punished, but only admonished: "You will only