

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. XV.—No. 163.

DECEMBER, 1901.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

To the People.

FELLOW CITIZENS.—Our most sacred right of free speech and meeting is in great danger—in fact, is abolished by the present government for every honest Englishman and Englishwoman who dares to confess that extermination of defenceless women and children is a cowardly and dishonest barbarity.

This practical work of abolishing free speech has been going on for the last two years, and is carried on in the following way: Some newspapers politically and morally corrupt, especially the *Daily Chronicle*, the *Globe* and the *Pall Mall Gazette*, announce the day before the meeting that a "Pro-Boer" meeting will be held. Immediately, the police authorities, with the paper in hand, approach the owner of the hall threatening that disorder will take place and that they, the police, will not be able to protect the hall against the aggressors. The frightened hall proprietor mostly refuses the hall, and the meeting is put off.

This hypocritical and (in reality) despotic suppression was done with Miss Hobhouse in her humanitarian crusade against the war atrocities. The same trick was repeated twice with our meetings; twice the halls were refused the last day before the meeting—organised and advertized long before in papers, by posters and handbills.

This is one of the darkest conspiracies of the government against our public rights, conquered by our courageous forefathers by incessant fighting against despotism and oppression.

Our government, stained with the blood of innocent children, is capable of any violation of popular rights.

Are they not attempting to crush our trade unions and the right of combination? Are they not trying to abolish the Board School instruction?

Did they not impose new burdens on the working classes?

And do you think they will stop in their course if not energetically opposed from our side?

At their head stands Salisbury, the man who encouraged the Sultan to abolish the Turkish liberal constitution of 1876—77; who encouraged the same Sultan in his assassination and extermination of the Armenian nation.

At his side we see the very embodiment of a Herod and a Judas of modern times: a Herod by cruelty to the thousands of murdered children, a Judas by his systematic betrayal of all principles and parties. Do you know the name of this cabinet minister whose honor is also unstained as the honor of a Cesar's wife (Messalina, for instance)? Well, this unstained man is J. Chamberlain.

Salisbury with his sons and nephews is busy dishonoring the dignity of your Parliament, curtailing your charters of liberties. At the same time Chamberlain, Milner and Kitchener are doing their utmost to exterminate a whole nation of heroic and peaceful farmers. These titled and empowered murderers squandered 250 millions of your money and sacrificed 20,000 of your brothers and sons "For the glory of England!" they say.

For the benefit of Rhodesian money grubbers; for the introduction of serfdom under the British flag among the natives; for the abolition of the rights and liberties of our fellow citizens in Cape Colony.

Never were such crimes committed as now take place in your name, in the name of England, once the champion of liberty and progress. Chamberlain maintains that Russia, Germany, Austria and Turkey have committed worse atrocities. It is not our business to defend the governments of despots and autocrats; it is not for us to defend any authority. But history tells us that never an Alva in the Netherlands, a Tilly in Madgeburg, a Muravieff, the hangman, in Poland, nor a barbarous and sanguinary Omar Pasha in Crete had butchered women and children in many thousands as in South Africa.

No, none of them was equal to our rulers. History contains only one name, that of Herod, as exterminator of children. At his side are now inscribed those of Chamberlain, Cecils, Milner and Kitchener.

Such are our rulers, who begin now to exercise at home the

same politics which they practice in South Africa. They are suppressing, by all means in their power, Liberals, Democrats, Anarchists—all of whatever shade of opinion who oppose and denounce their crime in South Africa. They will turn us into the street. Well, in the street, at public places we shall carry on our propaganda against their barbarities, against their policy of national ruin and oppression. And we appeal to every honest and liberty loving English man and woman to raise their voices in defence of popular rights, to fight this government of reaction and atrocities.

If you are a sincere believer in Christianity, you must fight this Herodian government; Christ and the New Testament oblige you to do so.

As an honest man you must fight them because they appropriate England and her riches, her productivity, to themselves and their families.

As trade unionists, you must fight them because they employ every means to deprive you of the right of combination.

As a father who loves his children and does not wish to have them brought up without education, you must fight this government which destroyed our School Board instruction.

As a lover of your mother country, you must fight this government which, by its barbarities, has rendered the name of England odious among the nations.

FREEDOM GROUP.

REVIEW OF THE YEAR.

The year 1901 seems to me to have been a year of rather indistinct stir and movements which bear evidence of the widespread dissatisfaction with existing economical and political arrangements and also with the prevailing parliamentary methods of action; but which also show, unfortunately, how little Anarchist ideas have as yet penetrated the masses. I refer to the chief events of the year: the spring revolts in Russia and in Spain, the General Strike movement in France, the attitude of the American people over the death of McKinley by the hand of Czolgosz, and the proposed boycott of British shipping by the dockers in Continental ports. The breakdown of parliamentarism is noticeable everywhere; but that kind of mass action which takes its place is as yet so full of mistakes and prejudices of the old parliamentary system that it cannot satisfy us. Labor parliaments are but a poor exchange for political parliaments. Much more effort seems to me to be needed to display and explain the ideas of Anarchism to their fullest extent in the presence of all these vague movements, than to take part in them immediately; I do not mean to exclude active participation, but I feel that the masses are yet so little advanced that a real hold can only be got on them by compromise and voluntary suppression of part of our principles—an opportunist method which we ought not to follow.

The spring of 1901 began well enough. The stirring news from Russia and Spain, for some weeks, seemed to forebode a new 1848, a new "peoples' spring." But Italy and France who might have been expected to join the general rise—the rest of Europe is more asleep than ever—did not stir. The movements were directed against infamous autocracy in Russia and equally infamous priest rule in Spain. We saw that there is strength left in movements which are not of a purely economic character like strikes, and we were reminded of the great variety of ways by which rapid changes may take place and which are often somewhat lost sight of. We welcome, above all, the rise of the anti-clerical spirit in Spain and in France, to some extent also in Austria; whilst elsewhere, by hypocritical recognition of some tenets of the State Socialist creed, the Church, that eternal enemy of mankind, managed to lengthen and strengthen its hold on the people. We welcome also the participation to such an extent of the Russian students and (to use this expression) better educated classes in the movement, which strongly contrasts with the reactionary attitude of these classes in all other countries, small sections in France and in Italy excepted. These

(Continued on page 3.)

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

Monthly, One Penny; post free, 1½d.; U.S.A., 3 Cents; France, 15 Centimes.

Annual Subscription, post free, 1s. 6d.; U.S.A., 36 Cents; France, 1fr. 80c.
Foreign subscriptions should be sent by International Money Order.

Wholesale Price, 1s. 4d. per quire of 27, carriage free to all parts.

All communications, exchanges, &c., for "FREEDOM" to be addressed to

THE MANAGER, 127 Ossulston Street, N.W.

The Editors are not necessarily in agreement with signed articles.

Notice to Subscribers.—If there is a blue mark against this notice your subscription is due, and must be sent before next month if you wish to go on receiving the paper.

Brevities.

Lord Rosebery, in a speech delivered in Edinburgh, emphasised in a jocularly cynical manner the necessity which exists in this country for a government composed exclusively of business men, who, he believes, would effect far-reaching reforms in administration. There is no doubt, from a middle class or "successful person" point of view, matters could be done a good deal better and, what is more to the point, with greater economy. But Lord Rosebery, after all, is but voicing the demand of that particular class, and it is one more illustration of how the money grabbing spirit of the age has permeated all classes—even those who at other times pose as the cultured and educated classes.

THE BRITISH EMPIRE, Limited!

I suppose, if it has not really arrived at that, it will some day. So far as the bulk of the workers are concerned, it seems immaterial to them whether their country is run as a huge money-making concern, where all the profits go to the directing and shareholding class and all the work, hunger and hardship goes to them, or whether the directors get cleared out and an attempt made to run the business on the basis of liberty and free access to all.

And yet, perhaps Lord Rosebery, who also poses occasionally as a bit of a humorist in his way, was merely speaking with his tongue in his cheek again, and our omniscient journalists are all laughing at the wrong time and the wrong place. Perhaps Rosebery had in his mind that eminently successful business man, the screw-maker of Birmingham who turned his attention to the national business with such disastrous and far-reaching results. Or perhaps he wanted to have done with the hypocrisy of the age, the fictions and the make-believe of the present day, and stand out naked and unashamed what we are: a nation of money-grabbers, a nation which has sold its honor and bartered its conscience; whose hands are stained with the blood of women and children—and all for a little gold.

Yes, after all, the nation is run on business principles, for the men who compose the Cabinet are mere figure heads. The real rulers of this empire are behind the scenes, strongly entrenched behind their piles of wealth. They issue their orders and the government must obey, and it all depends upon their prospects in the money-grabbing line whether there shall be war or peace, happiness or misery, widows and orphans and wrecked homes, or pleasant homesteads set amid smiling fields.

Yes they over reach themselves, these business men, as all Shylocks do. Take this South African business, for instance. No one dreamed two years ago that the Boers would still be in the field at the end of 1901. No one thought for a moment upon the vast expenditure of money required to subdue a people struggling for freedom. And yet all that for which the country has been plunged into a disastrous war—cheap labor on the Rand—might have been obtained by a few years patient waiting. The old Boers of the Kruger type were dying off; the young Boers, many of them educated in England, were rapidly assimilating the commercial ideas prevalent in this country. Many of them had deserted the farm for commercial or professional pursuits, and in a few years, at most, the country would have been ripe to enter upon an era of commercialism which would have commended itself to the heart of almost any financier who has shouted for war. The dominant class then would have been the trading class—not the farmers; and of course they would make the conditions suit themselves, which as a matter of course would also suit the money-mongers of this and other countries.

But the war has put back the clock. In their haste to be rich, the capitalists, who do not shrink from the murder of women and children, have lost all which with a little patient waiting might have been theirs. Now we see the rough, ignorant farmer from the veldt side by side with the young man fresh from an English university, old grey-haired men and boys, each of them animated by a principle and an idea for which they are prepared to give their lives.

Yet there is something grand and noble in this struggle of the Boers against overwhelming odds. In a sordid world given over almost entirely to the sausage manufacturer and the manure merchant, the spectacle of a people treating wealth, ease, comfort, even life itself as nought

compared to the principle which is the guiding impulse of their lives, comes like a ray of light, a harbinger of hope for the future when the chaffering of hucksters will give place to ideals and principles.

This war will also be a lesson to the discontented peoples of Europe. For it teaches that disciplined armies are not so formidable as we once thought; that against men fighting for a cause, animated by an idea, they are not so effective as supposed. Men who fight for a principle, who are united by love of a common ideal require no discipline, and the more freedom they possess and the more initiative, the more effective will be the means which they adopt. Discipline is necessary for robbers and plunderers. History has again and again shown that wherever the people at any time have risen to support a cause with their lives the disciplined armies have been swept away like leaves in an October gale.

What of the workers of Britain? May they too wake out of the horrible nightmare of the last two years, and recognise that the enemies of the Boers are their enemies as well. With increased taxation, with increased cost of living, with depression of trade looming in the near future, soon—too soon for most of them—they will be compelled to give some attention to their own economic condition. Perhaps then they will realise that the real enemies of the worker in every land are Government and Monopoly. The recognition of this would be half the battle; for, once the workers decide to no longer fight in the interests of their rulers and masters, war will become impossible. Besides, if they still want to fight, why not do so for the realisation of happier conditions for all, instead of on behalf of a cosmopolitan gang of swindlers whose interests will ever be diametrically opposed to theirs?

NORTHMAN.

PARIS CONGRESS REPORTS, 1900.

THE COMMUNIST ANARCHISTS & WOMAN.

Report (condensed) of the Group of International Revolutionary Socialist Students of Paris.

Some of our comrades attach so much importance to the Woman's Question as to devote themselves almost exclusively to the propaganda of their ideas upon it. We are far from agreeing with them in regard to the necessity of this, believing that most of the difficulties connected with the subject have already been solved. Not accepting any distinction of sex, race or nationality ourselves, we would gladly abstain from taking up this question, were it not that we often meet with complaints from propagandists that woman as woman is an obstacle to propaganda. She it is who often prevents men from taking an active part in the movement; it is she who working at the side of man often excludes him from the industry, lowers wages and causes a surplus of labor. Trade-union workers and Socialists' congresses have therefore found themselves obliged to give full attention to the question, and have often carried resolutions which cause us great and sad astonishment, being in entire contradiction to Communist Anarchist principles: resolutions which consider the family as one and indivisible, a social atom of which man is the representative and woman a species of special creation, a domestic slave. On the other hand, some revolutionists thought to solve one of the most difficult and delicate questions very easily, and proudly starting from individualist and scientific principles arrived at the most pitiable conclusions, to something like primitive promiscuousness, sexualism, or love without restraint. Without giving too great prominence to it, we think for the abovementioned reasons that a discussion on the question may help to clear up some of the nebulous ideas upon it or prove how much less easy is the solution of some difficulties than is generally supposed.

We believe the theory that a division of labor in the family is necessary—that woman within and man outside the family should labor—to be impracticable and reactionary. To prohibit woman from working in the varied industries of today is impossible, as the surplus of labor caused by the access of women and children is a necessary outcome of the present industrial system.

But if we place ourselves on the Communist standpoint it is reactionary to consider the family as an indivisible social unit of which man shall be the sole representative. This idea was the foundation of the ancient oriental and of the Christian family, and lowers woman into the position of a domestic slave who receives maintenance in exchange for the utility or satisfaction which her keeper is enabled to extract from her. It checks the wellbeing of the community to prevent the majority of its members from laboring; whereas, to encourage this ensures an increase in the sum of production, and consequently the necessary production of each individual could be lowered.

The chief point, however, is the question of salary, which for women as yet is lower than man's. In opposition to those comrades who believe woman's work inferior to man's and consequently argue that her wages should be less, we contend that wages should be equal because the two factors which determine the value of work are duration and quality. The last will increase inasmuch as the progress of mechanism renders muscular force less and less necessary and opens professions which for want of strength were before closed to women; while an equal technical education will enable her in certain trades to become, if not the superior, certainly the equal of man. That the wages of women are as a rule lower than those of men is largely due to custom, as it is understood

that she will be provided with what may be lacking by the head of the family. If this principle is extended to a Communist society, what then becomes of the liberty and independence of woman if by marriage only she is entitled to comfort and competence? So long as woman's activity is limited to procreation and education she is not free, however gilded the cage may be in which she is kept. The female slave of the harem and the woman who (according to the Western chivalrous idea) is a specialised being, too tender for the rough wear and tear of life and whose sphere for that reason must be restricted to home and hearth, are one and the same however contradictory their positions may appear; for in neither case is free development by their own choice possible. For the task of housekeeping and that of the children's education which is graciously left to her, she is only partly prepared. The first she can always do more or less; but for the latter, the most important duty of any, she certainly is not. On every side it is admitted that woman must have a better education than so far has been accorded her, but some there are who argue that her increased knowledge should be utilised only for her family. This is in practice impossible, as every woman receiving a thorough and liberal education at once strives for a broader field of action than that of her home; she will continually attempt to gain entire intellectual, moral and material independence. To place the entire education of the children in the hands of the mother is also under present conditions somewhat unwise; for man by his education and participation in life in its varying forms is certainly more capable to satisfy the inquiring minds of children than is she.

Another consideration must not be forgotten. The more a woman is confined to her home the more she will take its interests to heart and oppose her husband's taking part in movements directed against the existing order of things, as this implies material suffering and sacrifice. Not only are revolutionary movements in this way deprived of the assistance of women, but much energy is wasted in family disputes.

Another outcome of the inferior position to which women are decreed is the "feminist movement." Here on one side we see advanced women forming themselves into a solidarity in the sense of sex only and using their precious energy merely for their own emancipation, instead of aiding the great social struggle; and, on the other wearying themselves in fruitless discussion upon the theory of *free love* as a means of liberation. Seeing what a heavy burden the family institution has become, it is easy to understand that woman desires to free herself especially from that yoke. As this question sooner or later confronts every propagandist it is necessary to be able to answer it clearly and satisfactorily. Two points at once arise: what the woman of the future should and will be under favorable conditions, and what would be the form of family life for which we should strive.

The question of *legal marriage* is of little importance and depends upon circumstances. It is understood that the principle of freedom in love is accepted, and this depends greatly on the *economic* and *intellectual* condition of woman. Therefore we claim for woman the right to develop all her faculties, to be primarily a perfect human being, sharing in every aspect of life, social, scientific, etc., of her era; thus alone can her sentiments expand and grow. To recognise *free love* exclusively as the starting point of female emancipation does not seem to us of great use. That family life will undergo great changes we are convinced; but in what direction? We believe that under new social conditions love will become more complete, more stable; that women, knowing more and living in a larger and closer comradeship, will not mate the first who presents himself but have the chance of choice. The result will be greater happiness and more established relations. The greater the mutual development of men and women, the fuller becomes their psychical life and their intellectual and moral union is strengthened. Their ties in future will be solidified. This is so self-evident that we repeat such truths almost with shame, but it is our response to some comrades who make the instability of family life their ideal and accept as natural law the frequent change of sentiment. We would ask them simply this: you admit evolution in intellectual, moral, social and other spheres of human life, why not therefore in this sentiment of love? Why do you believe that in love only man instead of developing his psychical life is more likely to debase it to that of an animal—since it cannot be denied that the faculty to change so lightly from one to another must reduce love almost entirely to a physical element? We refuse entirely to accept this point of view; it seems to us false and in practice harmful. The propaganda of *free love* in this sense does not incite woman to intellectual and moral development, gives her no character or independence, but contents itself with clearing away some acquired ideas upon marriage and family, after which many consider nothing more to be needed for her emancipation.

To sum up, we submit that it is not upon *free love* that we must insist so much as on the necessity of an economic, intellectual and moral development for woman, as the means that shall bring her complete freedom.

REVIEW OF THE YEAR (continued).

movements in France and in Spain were not crushed and could not be crushed; but rather subsided in face of a deceitful temporary moderation on the part of the governments, who were thoroughly frightened—a new policy of cowardice which the revolted masses will have to learn to meet better another time. The smouldering fire in these countries is sure to flare up again.

The General Strike movement in France is to me, up till now, disappointing. Of course, its very existence is a triumph over

past years, when it was but little spoken of and slowly propagated little by little. But, as it extends, it necessarily embraces masses of non-revolutionary workers, reduces and minimises its immediate program, demands discipline above all, is forced to deal with politicians and governments, leaves little scope for initiative and individual action—and, in short, more closely resembles politics and excludes Anarchism. That I should not be considered as a pessimist onlooker merely, I translate here what P. Delesalle (the comrade who each week discusses the French labor movement in *Les Temps Nouveaux*, and who is an active trade unionist himself) wrote in the issue of Nov. 10.

"The first of November is past and the [miners' general] strike has not taken place. This was foreseen and the successive postponements had made it more and more improbable. Discounting the success of the strike effort till the last day—and that effort had been made—we did not wish to counteract by criticism which might not have been opportune, the tactics adopted by the miners. The position is different today, when everything can be discussed and the strike has been adjourned to an indefinite date, as we are told by the federal secretary. For a moment we had believed that date to be nearer to hand than others had thought; but this last hope like others has gone, and the miners are not more advanced to day than eight months ago when, adopting the general strike idea subject to the vote of the miners themselves, the Congress of Lens met."

"Playing at politics—pernicious politics—trade unionist on one side, parliamentary on the other side, once more killed a movement happily inaugurated whose consequences—hardly forestalled—might have been of incalculable importance for the whole proletariat."

"By the method of politics the decision of the Lens Congress was taken which ordered a referendum on the question of the general strike. Again: relegating the strike to a date fixed eight months in advance. Politics again resolving to leave it to the seven members of the Federal Committee to decide ultimately whether the strike was to take place or not. Finally, all these letters, reclamations and dealings with 'public powers.'—All this is the political method."

"The miners, the slaves of their exploiters, have fallen into worse slavery, perhaps: that of the politicians who lead them. The miners are not ripe for freedom and their failure in this case was certain."

"For many years they have handed over their fate to politicians who make use of them with cool impudence; these men who are in frequent relations with the Ministers, the direct representatives of the capitalist mine owners, give their orders to the army of miners who meekly obey. The result is seen today."

"...The general strike, even that of one trade, is not prepared for a fixed date, neither by a referendum, nor by any other means; its only successful method is to blaze up like a lightning flash. The miners, who did not recognise this, were doomed to failure; and politics and politicians did the rest."

The strictures of P. Delesalle on the politicians in the miners' movement refer principally to those of the Pas-de-Calais, where Basly and Lamendin, the types of labor politicians, hold the miners under their sway. But the miners of more advanced districts like Montceau, uphold them in this matter by co-operating with them in this matter and submitting questions of vital importance to their joint vote.

When I read that the organised miners had abdicated their power into the hands of the seven members of their federal committee and that, if three were for and three against, the ultimate decision of the question, affecting the whole French proletariat, rested with Mr. So-and-so the seventh member whose vote made the majority, I felt that this method of absolute centralisation was a very funny outcome indeed of so many years propaganda by Anarchists in trade union ranks. This utterly absurd system which brings us back to the days of February 1848, when the Paris people who had fought the battle of the barricades abdicated their power into the hands of the Provisional Government, a similar number of people, who, of course, soon became as corrupt as all governments are and had their constituents, the people of Paris, massacred in June 1848; I expected to see this held up to ridicule and torn to pieces by the anti-parliamentary trade unionists. If the *Pere Peinard* were alive now his vigorous language would have given short shrift to these seven new authorities, who—different to 1848—are set up already, *before* and not *after* the victory! But I see the *Voix du Peuple*, the acknowledged organ of the anti-parliamentary trade unionists, reproduce with the greatest satisfaction the ignorant and interested praise which the chief bourgeois paper (*Les Temps*) and a chief of the political Socialists and friend of Millerand, R. Viviani, heap on this new system of these seven omnipotent men, the "new power" (Nov. 3). The same organ says: "Organised workers, you must before all maintain severe discipline

if you will not cease to be an army and become a horde which astute adversaries will soon annihilate" (Nov. 3). And when it became the organ of the new General Confederation of Labor (founded at the Lyons Congress, end of September), it stated that according to the decision of the committee of that organisation, "No article or resolution which is of a nature to lead to polemics with trade-unionist comrades will be inserted" (Nov. 10). All this is said and written with the excellent intention to have a strong and united trade union movement; but it rather seems to us that trade unionists and Social Democrats knew and practised that all along for a century past and that those Anarchists who countenance this anti-political trade unionist movement in France, gradually and independently rediscover—not freedom—but the oldest worn-out commonplaces of ordinary trade unionism and reactionary Socialism; because, whilst thinking they march forward, they march in nearly the opposite direction.

Since the above was written the decline of the miners' movement proceeded further. The workers themselves are in many places furious over the way the famous committee of seven played with them, and tried to restart the movement by independent local strikes. These, however, met with no support in other districts; and at present, by the proposal of the Loire Federation to lay the whole matter before another Miners' Congress, the general strike question seems to have been definitely shelved for some months to come,—unless, as at other times, the UNEXPECTED happens!

(To be continued.)

THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN HOLLAND.

(Continued from No. 162.)

If the reform current, the parliamentary current, has not been able to get hold of the workers' movement in Holland, nevertheless it has deeply marked its influence. In the real Socialist movement it has dealt heavy blows at reciprocal confidence among the workers.

Just now profound discouragement reigns among the Dutch Communists, a discouragement which coincides with the present period of reaction which is felt internationally.

Mixed with the original Communism, the social doctrines of three great nations have found defenders in Holland: the State Socialism of the German Social Democracy, the Anarchism of France and the practical struggle of the English trade unions against the employer. It must be observed that, in the country, especially, the Dutch workers read much. Otherwise it would be difficult to imagine the agitation which was roused in 1893 and 1894 in the Dutch Socialist circles when the government began a general persecution of propagandists of Socialism. Judicial proceedings against the party as a whole began anew after the Congress of Groningen (25 & 26 December, 1893), and they ended in the condemnation of the Federation as a "prohibited society" having as object "the overthrow of the established social order."

Then the old energy awoke once more and, notwithstanding the opposition of the government, a congress was held during Christmas, 1894, at the Hague, and then was founded the organisation known from that time under the name of "Federation of Socialists" (Socialistenbond).

But discord was already shown, and in the same year (1894) the first elements of the parliamentary reform spirit had separated themselves from the party. Disillusion undermined this Dutch Socialist Party, which had set out with such high enthusiasm and which, towards the middle of 1893, could send this message to the International Congress of Zurich: "If the Federation counted 56 sections—in 56 communes of the country—at the time of the International Congress of Brussels, 1891, at present it is composed of sections in 118 communes. And each day in some corner of the country new sections are formed." At that time, the organisation counted 5,000 affiliated members, paying their dues; but the influence which the Federation exercised was much greater than its numerical force seems to indicate.

The first collision of ideas and interests took place at the Congress of Groningen, 1893. From the sections which the Federation then counted in 126 communes of the country, 86 sections were represented (some communes, like Amsterdam, had more than one vote). Only three sections had sent parliamentary Socialists; but these owed some of their strength to the adhesion of some undecided delegates. The great majority of the Congress wishing to finally decide the war of opinions proposed the following resolution:

"The Congress decides under no pretext whatever to participate in elections—even for the purpose of agitation."

There discord began! Who was not to participate in the elections? The party as a whole? the Federation? or also the sections of the party? But did not the latter thereby injure the autonomy of the section; and did not such a note threaten the liberty of the individuals? From both sides the fight began: on the right the parliamentarians, on the left the Anarchists. The section of Sint-Anna-Parochie, for instance, where the Anarchists were in the majority, separated itself from the Federation immediately after the Congress, and that because the liberty of the individual was violated. On the other hand, the reforming elements did not wait until the Hague Congress at which it was declared

that members of the party, as individuals, were free to participate in elections or not. A dozen parliamentary Socialist propagandists called a meeting at Zwolle, towards the middle of the year, to form "a new Social Democratic party." The new group placed itself entirely on the standpoint of the German Social Democracy, and was morally and financially sustained by that organisation.

At the following elections (in the summer of 1897) the twelve, among whom were some good orators, obtained more votes than anybody had expected—perhaps even more than they had hoped for themselves.

Then a new schism took place, this time at the Congress of the Federation itself, held in Rotterdam, 25 and 26 December 1897. On this occasion it was among the sections that a division took place, the first having been only a prelude.

The actual crisis was thus prepared by the elections in June 1897. There existed also in the Federation of Socialists a minority, who—though belonging to that anti-parliamentarian federation and approving of its principles—wanted, however, to take part in elections for the purpose of agitation as understood in France by the Allemanists.

This minority, which, if it interfered in the elections, did not do it in a systematic way, nevertheless succeeded in electing as Deputy a member of the Federation, Gurt L. van der Zwaag. Van der Zwaag himself had declared during the election period that he expected nothing from parliamentarism, from parliamentary reforms, and that if he could earn his £160 yearly (the salary of members of the Dutch Parliament) by "breaking stones" he preferred this honest work to that of a deputy of Parliament.

But the young Social Democratic Party had also tasted poison. It had obtained two seats in Parliament, though under suspicious circumstances. It had drawn up an "election program," in which the small farmers were led to hope for "a better regulation of farm leases," and the agricultural laborers who were not yet farmers "the regulation of the right of the communes to devote as much land and capital to the use of the working inhabitants as is necessary to enable them to live from their work on the soil." That would mean something in a program of clericals or liberal conservatives. To the industrial workers the orators of the Social Democratic Party lent the hope of a *workingmen's pension from the State*, and in their circulars they claimed as a general reform for the country: *land for all*—a slight variation on *the land for all*. Here and there the Socialist doctrine was quite abjured.

The results of the elections threw the Federation in confusion and agitated the sections before the Congress of Rotterdam. If a part of the "central council" showed itself a partisan of the ideas which we have mentioned, Anarchism rose up from the other side. T. Luitjes, editor of the Anarchist journal, *De Volksvriend* (Friend of the People), and delegate for the section Velp, tried to show that it was the fault of the organisation itself, of the Federation, if these discussions about parliamentarism repeated themselves every year; because, said he, we have parliamentarism in our own midst by recognising the system of delegation—he was himself a delegate—and voting, etc.

In my opinion, there were three currents represented: 1. A Right fraction in favor of participation in elections for the purpose of agitation, called "Anti-parliamentarist parliamentarians." 2. A Central majority composed of Revolutionary Communists, absolutely anti-parliamentarian but who wanted to maintain the Federation under the existing form. 3. A Left wing, the Anarchist Communists or Individualists.

(To be Concluded.)

A CONFERENCE OF SCOTTISH ANARCHISTS

will be held in Glasgow on January 1st, 1902. The arrangements are in the hands of the Glasgow Group. Communications to J. Blair Smith, 15 Sunnybank Street, Glasgow.

"FREEDOM" MAY BE OBTAINED OF

W. Reeves, 83 Charing Cross Road, London, W.
O. Mathias, 20 Little Pultney Street, London, W.
Heiligenstein, 39 Charlotte Street, London, W.
"New Order" office, 26 Paternoster Square, E.C.
B. Ruderman, 71 Hanbury St., Spitalfields, London, E.
Blair Smith, 15 Sunnybank St., Dalmarnock, Glasgow.
W. MacQueen, 30 Ganton View, Woodhouse St., Leeds.
A. Barton, 12 Olive Terrace, Owlerton, Sheffield.
A. Gorrie 18 Princess Street, Leicester.
N. Notkin, 242 N. 2nd Street, Philadelphia, Pa. U.S.A.
K. A. Snellenberg, 54 Haskins St., Roxbury, Mass., U.S.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

FREEDOM Guarantee Fund.—N. 5s., Kampf Meyer 5s., T. del M. 5s., A. M. 5s., N. W. T. 10s., Spanish Group 1s., F. C. 6/6.
Annual Subscriptions.—Pyburn 1/6, Goebel 1/6.

THE PYRAMID OF TYRANNY.

BY F. DOMELA NIEUWENHUIS.

NOW READY, PRICE 1d.

Published by J. TURNER at 127 Ossulston Street, N. W.