

Freedom

JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. XXIV.—No. 251.

MARCH, 1910.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY

AN INFAMY.

The Executive of the International Socialist Bureau at Brussels has issued a circular to its adherents asking for contributions towards a Spanish Social Democratic organ. The appeal is signed by Vandervelde, Anseele, Furnemont, and Huysmans. In order to arouse the generosity and zeal of international Social Democracy, they say: "By helping the Socialists of Catalonia you will contribute to the destruction of one of the greatest and oldest hotbeds of Anarchism in Europe."

It is difficult to find anything more infamous than this document. At a time when all honest and enlightened people in Europe and America proclaim their indignation and protest against the execution of Ferrer and other Anarchists, at a time when Montjuich is filled with the victims of oppression, these Social Democratic gentlemen are asking financial contributions in order to lend a helping hand to the Church and militarism in their effort to crush the Anarchists.

Shameless as this act is, it is not for the first time that the Social Democrats have sided with the oppressors of Spanish Anarchists. Forty years ago Engels and Lafargue published in a Belgian paper the names of the members of the secret Anarchist organisation in Spain. At that time, as now, Spanish Social Democracy was represented by insignificant groups of small bourgeois politicians, headed by Iglesias. Since the beginning of the International in 1868 the working-class movement and trade union organisation have always been Federalist, Autonomist and Anarchist.

But the infamy committed by Engels and Lafargue evidently has not been successful, because now, forty years later, Vandervelde and his friends again have to admit that Barcelona and Catalonia are hotbeds of Anarchism.

We are convinced that this disgraceful appeal by the rich bourgeois Vandervelde, a Jesuit by education, will also provoke only the contempt and indignation of all honest people, without distinction of party or nationality. Their appeal may find sympathy, but only among the servants of the Pope, King and Capitalism, and perhaps a contribution may be received from the blood-stained executioners of Ferrer.

ESKIMOS AND COMMUNISM.

Many travellers have given us a description of the good fellowship among the Eskimos living in their primitive community. Not only their family life, but also their hunting and fishing expeditions are based on Communism. It seems that the white man has attempted to bring his civilisation, including Christianity, private property and exploitation, amongst his heathen brethren in the Arctic. Commander Peary deals with this subject, and says:—

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

"I hope no efforts will ever be made to civilise them. Such efforts, if successful, would destroy their primitive Communism, which is necessary to preserve their existence. Once

give them an idea of real-estate interest and personal-property rights in houses and food, and they would become as selfish as civilised beings, whereas, now, any game larger than a seal is the common property of the tribe, and no man starves whilst his neighbours are gorging themselves. If a man has two sets of hunting implements, he gives one of them to the man who has none. It is this feeling of good fellowship which alone preserves the race. I have taught them some of the fundamental principles of sanitation and the care of themselves, the treatment of simple diseases, of wounds, and other accidents; but there I think their civilisation should stop. And my opinion is not based on theory or prejudice, but on eighteen years of intimate study and experience."

SOCIALISM AND SCIENTIFIC POSSIBILITIES.

Real science, that of the naturalists, opens up a perspective of abundance, freedom and happiness. Some ten years ago the great French chemist, Berthelot, stated that considering contemporary chemistry it would be possible in future to prepare quite easily in the chemical factories the food for the whole community.

Now Edison, in the *Independent* (New York), gives us a forecast of what life may be with the advance of natural science:—

"In 200 years, by the cheapening of commodities, the ordinary labourer will live as well as a man does now with 200,000 dols. annual income. Automatic machinery and scientific agriculture will bring about this result. Not individualism but social labour will dominate the future; you can't have individual machines and every man working by himself. Industry will constantly become more social and interdependent. There will be no manual labour in the factories of the future. The men in them will be merely superintendents watching the machinery to see that it works right. The work-day, I believe, will be eight hours. Every man needs that much work to keep him out of mischief and to keep him happy. But it will be work with the brain, something that men will be interested in, and done in wholesome, pleasant surroundings. Less and less man will be used as an engine, or as a horse, and his brain will be employed to benefit himself and his fellows."

But 200 years is rather a long wait for the millennium, and we think that in two generations, with a thoroughly scientific and technical education for everybody, the possibilities of contemporary natural science will be realised.

Edison's opinion of eight hours' obligatory work means, of course, not toiling in factories, but rather eight hours' activity distributed in school, workshop, garden, etc., according to the inclination of the individual.

This is what we Anarchist Communists have always propagated as the ideal of a social community.

DEATH OF MOSES HARMAN.

This brave old fighter in the cause of freedom passed away, after a short illness, on January 30, at Los Angeles, California. His free discussion of sex questions in his paper *Lucifer* brought him into frequent collision with the United States postal authorities, and he served several terms of imprisonment, the last only four years ago. But nothing daunted him, and in *Eugenics* (the successor of *Lucifer*) sex questions were handled as boldly as before. At a time when reaction is fighting hard to gain the upper hand, such a stalwart as Moses Harman will be sadly missed.

ANARCHY.—A social theory which regards the union of order with the absence of all direct government of man by man as the political ideal.—*Century Dictionary*.

Pages of Socialist History.

By W. TCHERKESOFF.

[As the American edition of this book has been exhausted, and demands for it constantly reach us, we have decided to publish a new edition, which we shall first run through FREEDOM and then issue as a series of pamphlets, each consisting of a self-contained chapter, as, for instance, "Concentration of Capital," "Plagiarism," "English and French Socialists before 1848," "The Origin of the Communist Manifesto," etc.—ED.]

INTRODUCTION.

"The enemies of the people, of their intellectual and social emancipation, are united in a supreme effort to impede, if not once for all to crush, the progress and development of the common welfare.

"The Clergy with the Nobility, once almost annihilated by the democracy during the great French Revolution, are again as numerous and powerful as before.

"The sovereigns with their ministers, the plutocracy and the military, once so profoundly humiliated by the people of the Continent during the revolutions of 1848, have recovered their self-confidence, their power and brutality.

"What is the cause of this change? Why, at the beginning of the twentieth century, are the people more oppressed and humiliated than in the middle of the nineteenth?

"The answer is obviously clear and simple. Because, during the last thirty years there has not been in existence any effective opposition to contend with this newly arisen Despotism and Oppression.

"Because, all the advanced and progressive political parties are in perpetual conflict among themselves, so that the Governments, the aristocracy, and the money-mongers have forgotten the salutary lessons of the great Revolution and of the year 1848.

"Because, the political and social reformers of to-day, instead of urging resistance and revolution, are preaching to the people the doctrine of petty reforms and submission.

"Because, every individual or popular revolutionary attempt is immediately discredited and censured by these same reformers, more fiercely even than was ever done before by any moderate supporters of the existing order.

"Such are the facts. And great is the responsibility attached to the disciples of these Parliamentary reformers, among whom certainly the first place belongs to Marx and Engels, together with their followers, now so numerous throughout Europe. Their teachings and tactics, their legal—always legal—action, their violent hatred of revolutionists, disheartened all honest and vigorous fighters."

These introductory lines were written "in 1902 for the American edition of my booklet, "Pages of Socialist History." Since then, political events, especially the Russian revolutionary movement, which by a triumphant general strike wrung from a cruel and obstinate despot a Constitution more democratic than any of the German States, have shown the working class of Europe what a powerful weapon a well-organised general strike can be in the fight for liberty. Even in Germany, where for forty years the Social Democratic teachings of Marx and Engels were regarded as Holy Scripture, the workers began to see the fallacy of their leaders' hatred of revolutionary tactics and of the general strike. The latter was adopted as a means of political emancipation, and the ordinary revolutionary tactics of street demonstrations were resorted to in order to obtain a democratic franchise.

The same change of opinion amongst Social Democrats may be observed on many points of their theoretical programme, as, for instance, the fatalistic conception of concentration of capital, the agrarian question, etc.

We can only rejoice at these first signs of an awakening of the critical and revolutionary spirit among the present generation of the German workers. Once doubt has arisen in the minds of the people, they will not fail sooner or later to see in the true light that the pompous edifice of so-called scientific Marxian Socialism has not a scientific but a metaphysical foundation; does not contain treasures of original research, but unscrupulous plagiarism; and does not rest on the pillars of equality and solidarity of Socialism, but on a barren State regulation with its hierarchy, discipline, and submission.

THE CONCENTRATION OF CAPITAL.

I.

Every historical epoch, every political party, has been stained by some erroneous, and often mischievous, idea, which was, nevertheless, at that time admitted by all the world as undoubted

fact, and accepted by men of capacity and talent, as well as by the commonplace persons who merely swallow the opinions of their neighbours. And when it has happened that a false appreciation has been set forth and formulated in "scientific" or "philosophic" style, its injurious domination has extended over generations.

Now we Socialists, without distinction of party or school, all share in just such an error. I speak of the law of the concentration of capital, definitely formulated by Marx, and repeated by Socialist writers or speakers the world over. Go into a Socialist meeting, take up the first Socialist publication you see, and you will hear or read that capital, according to the scientific law of its being, tends to concentrate in the hands of a smaller and smaller number of capitalists, that large fortunes are created at the expense of smaller fortunes—(One capitalist kills many others—*Ein Kapitalist schlägt viele tot*, says Marx)—and that great capitals are increased by the extinction of little ones. This widespread formula lies at the root of Parliamentary tactics of State Socialists. From this point of view, the solution of the social question, conceived by the great founders of modern Socialism as a complete regeneration of the individual, as well as of society, both economically and morally—becomes delightfully simple and easy. No need for an economic struggle day by day between exploiter and exploited;* no need to begin here and now endeavouring to practise brotherly relations between man and man; nothing of the sort. It is enough that the workers should vote for Members of Parliament who call themselves Socialists, that the number of these M.P.'s should increase to the extent of a majority in the House, that they should decree State Collectivism or Communism, and all exploiters will peaceably submit to the decision of Parliament. The capitalists will have no choice but submission, for, according to the law of the concentration of capital, they will have been reduced to an infinitely small number.

What a fine and easy prospect! Just think: without effort or suffering on our part, the inevitable law of the concentration of capital is preparing for us a future of bliss. It is so attractive to see the difficulties of a complicated problem through rose-tinted spectacles, especially when we are soothed by the genuine conviction that modern science and philosophy have taught us the consoling truth. And this so-called "law," as set forth by Marx, is coated with all the appearance of philosophy and science.

"The capitalist mode of appropriation, the result of the capitalist mode of production, produces capitalist private property. This is the first negation of individual private property, as founded on the labour of the proprietor. But capitalist production begets, with the inexorability of a law of Nature, its own negation. It is the negation of negation (the absurd triad of Hegelian metaphysical dialectics). . . . This expropriation [of many capitalists by few] is accomplished by the action of the imminent laws of capitalist production itself, by the centralization of capital. . . . Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital, who usurp and monopolize all advantages of this process of transformation, grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation." ("Capital," Vol. I., pp. 788-9, English ed.)

Yes, poverty grows, but not among the middle-class, not among the smaller capitalists; rather among the workers, the producers.

It is over forty years since the publication of "Capital"; over sixty have gone by since Marx formulated that law which must act "as the metamorphoses in Nature." It is, therefore, probable that the law should be demonstrated by at least some few economic phenomena. During this period production and exchange have received an unheard-of impetus, private fortunes amounting to millions have been accumulated, colossal companies have sprung into existence; according to the law, the number of small capitalists ought to have diminished; at least, *no increase ought to have taken place in their numbers*. Let us see what the statistics of England have to say in this matter. I limit myself to England, because this country is famed, above all things, as a land of capitalist production; because Marx himself based all his dialectical speculations on the analysis of English economic life.

(To be continued.)

MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM

Will be continued next month.

* Since 1873, when Engels in his calumnious pamphlet against the Spanish Revolution ridiculed the idea of a General Strike, the Social Democrats have systematically combatted the General Strike.

MUSIC AND WAR.

War
I abhor,
And yet how sweet
The sound along the marching street
Of drum and fife, and I forget
Broken old mothers, and the whole
Dark butchery without a soul.

Without a soul—save this bright drunk
Of heady music, sweet as hell;
And even my peace-abiding feet
Go marching with the marching feet,
For yonder goes the fife,
And what care I for human life!
The tears fill my astonished eyes
And my full heart is like to break,
And yet 'tis all embannered lies,
A dream those drummers make.

O it is wickedness to clothe
Yon hideous grinning thing that stalks
Hidden in music, like a queen
That in a garden of glory walks,
Till good men love the thing they loathe.

Art, thou hast many infamies,
But not an infamy like this.
O snap the fife and still the drum,
And show the monster as she is.

THE CASE FOR NON-RESISTANCE.

There are few subjects so likely to create opposition when placed before most people for their first consideration as the subject of non-resistance. To suggest even that it would be possible for us to live without our armies and navies, law courts, executioners and police, would seem to most people just about as possible, let alone reasonable, as it would be to live without food. In order, then, to give justice to the subject at hand, let all prejudice be strenuously avoided, so that the truth or the error herein stated may most easily be found. The term "non-resistance" being a negative, does not lend itself in definition to simplicity, as it involves a primary understanding of the term "resistance." Without entering, however, into any etymological definition, which would only confuse, let us arrive at its meaning by accepting those explanations given by those who have made non-resistance a vital point in their teaching. Unfortunately, this is not an easy matter, for considerable indefiniteness exists on the subject. This, it may be stated, is largely due to the various interpretations of the Biblical text, which is so closely related to non-resistance, and may be rightly called its very mainspring. It is as follows: "Ye have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth; but I say unto you, Resist not him that is evil; but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also."

Tolstoy, who has done more than all others to make non-resistance the kernel of his teaching, or, perhaps better, the Christian teaching, takes almost the most literal view of the text. He reads it thus: "Never employ force, never do what is contrary to love." Without entering at present into the pros and cons of this view, let us consider next what Adin Ballou, an American who wrote a booklet on non-resistance, unfortunately long out of print, has to say on the subject. Ballou, who is altogether more explicit on non-resistance than Tolstoy, takes a much broader meaning from Matt. v. 38. His rendering of the term "non-resistance" is best stated in his own words: "Resist not personal injury with personal injury." Unlike Tolstoy, he considers that it is only "injurious forces" that we are not to resist with. This difference between the two leading exponents of non-resistance was brought out very clearly in a correspondence between them published in the *Arena*, December, 1890. Here Tolstoy actually stated, "A true Christian will always prefer to be killed by a madman, than to deprive him of his liberty." Ballou, in reply, considered that a Christian who would act thus would not act wisely, and held that it was quite in accordance with non-resistance to use force, yea, physical force if necessary, to restrain a madman, a delirious patient, etc., as long as we do not use any injurious force in doing so. Of these two views, I think it is easily seen that Ballou's is altogether the more reasonable, and is more in keeping with the spiritual rendering of the text, "Resist not him that is evil." The error, indeed, of Tolstoy's view is caused by its being too rigid, not elastic enough for the progressive nature of human beings.

Let us revert once more to Matt. v. 38, for, after all, the doctrine of non-resistance is best stated as we find it in the Gospels. "Ye have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth; but I say unto you, Resist not him that is evil; but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy

cloak also. Ye have heard that it was said, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy; but I say unto you, Love your enemies.' It would be as well to mention here that some non-resisters, such as Ballou, take an authoritative, theological view of this text. With all such views I hold nothing in common, for the truth always carries with it its own authority. From a careful reading of the above it is clear that what Jesus meant was the abolition of the external Mosaic law of eye for eye, etc., and the substitution of an inner spiritual law of love. Note, too, that the doctrine of non-resistance has a positive as well as a negative side: to extend the law of love even to our enemies, which is to act like the Divine, who sends rain both to the just and to the unjust. It is not merely a passive resistance, but the active use of all righteous moral and physical forces.

To show further what is meant by non-resistance, let us consider some of its necessary applications. By a mere glance at society as constituted at the present day, it is evident that it is not based on non-resistance; indeed, it may be truly said to be almost entirely based on resistance, a fact, too, which shows the greatness of the task which we as non-resisters have before us. Beginning with the army and navy, judges, juries, down to the police, we have a large part of society set apart whose chief duty is to resist him that is evil, to inflict injury for injury, to take life for life, and, even worse, lives for a life. All such occupations, then, as the above, wherein the right to condemn and punish is held, are contrary to the teaching and practice of non-resistance. As to the question of Governments, it may be as well to add, there are different positions held with regard to this point among non-resisters. Tolstoy would have us abolish them. He says: "A Government, therefore, and specially a Government entrusted with military power, is the most dreadful, the most dangerous organisation possible." Ballou, on the other hand, considered that a non-resistant Government was not only possible, but desirable. He says: "Human Government in this sense would be an organisation of society 'constitutionally' deferential to the highest known law of God." My only disagreement with Ballou's view is that I dislike the term "Government," because if, as he says, "Man being ever a subject—not a governor," why then cling to the word "Government," for a Government implies governors? Tolstoy's view is much more in keeping with the principle of non-resistance.

It is not, however, to be supposed that the practice of non-resistance would necessarily involve the destruction of those organisations connected with Governments, such as the Post Office, etc., which are so beneficial to the public welfare. What we want to eliminate from the State is the use of violence, the right of a majority or minority to compel obedience, so that men may be ruled from within instead of from without, the fulfilment of which is so necessary for the spiritual development of the human race. Thoreau wrote it in this form: "That Government is best which governs least"—"that Government is best which governs not at all."

Having arrived, then, at a definite understanding of what is meant by non-resistance, let me now place before you some of the arguments that can be put forth in its favour. In considering any subject of reform, it is necessary that we show that the present condition is bad before we attempt to set up a better one in its place. While recognising, however, that it is easier to pull down than to build up, at the same time it is a fact that many people do not see clearly the evils existing at the present day. This is largely due to the fact that so much now is done by proxy. Take, for instance, the subject of war. In olden days rulers did not merely cause wars, but took part in them; but now those who cause wars need not take part in them, a fact, too, which does much to prevent wars ever becoming less. Many people besides do not seem even to consider war an evil, as was evident from the rejoicings of Britons during the late South African War over the slaughter of so many Boers. It is necessary, then, to impress upon all who take part in Governments, either by vote or occupation, their pledged responsibility; that by signing their name, say, at the ballot box they thereby authorise the whole machinery of violence, from the Navy to the executioner.

Taking for granted, then, that the principle upon which society chiefly rests at the present day, especially in civilised lands, is that of resistance as opposed to non-resistance, can it be concluded that there is no need for a better principle? Do we find, for instance, that by practising resistance, a state of peace is easy to maintain among nations? Granted even that wars are not so frequent as in earlier days, is it not strange that here in Britain, the centre of the supposed Christian civilised world, we have had a religion of peace to go by for about two thousand years, and yet we are as a nation armed to the teeth? Again, do we find that along with the practice of resistance, poverty and crime are but seldom found; that work, too, is always provided for those who are willing? The answer to these questions can only be in the negative. As to resistance preventing crime, let any one study the effect of the murderous laws of Henry VIII., and he or she will soon be convinced that such a contention is erroneous. Science says, "The more you punish, the more is punishment necessary." Agreeing then, as most will, that there is a pressing need for reform at the present day, that along with the practice of resistance many deplorable evils are in existence, can we look forward to the practice of non-resistance as tending towards a better state of affairs?

(To be concluded.)

The receipt of a free copy of this paper is an invitation to subscribe. 1s. 6d. per annum.

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. 6d. per quire of 26 post-free in the United Kingdom.

All communications, exchanges, &c., to be addressed to

THE MANAGER, 127 Ossulston Street, N.W.

LYING POLITICIANS.

We have just passed through one of those periods during which political discussion and action become part of the life of the community. The honourable gentlemen of Westminster have come down from on high and spoken with the people, while we have had presented to us the remarkable spectacle of richly upholstered and powerful motor-cars, produced by the workers, being for a few brief minutes used by the workers, used by them to sanction once more the power of the masters. The secret ballot, our much-boasted guarantee of *freedom*, has been again operative, operative to organise *government*. Briefly, the political silly season has been in full swing. Christmas brought us the pantomime of a General Election, as well as that of the older and more innocent fairy tales.

It is a superficial observer, however, who does not see that the comedy and pageantry of a pantomime depend for their existence directly upon the appalling tragedy of life. Similarly, though there is much humour in an election, it is a thoughtless man who does not at such times feel a deep sense of humiliation when he thinks in what these honourable gentlemen—"so are they all, all honourable men"—have traded to buy their comfortable positions as the guardians of society. There is no need for the Anarchist to prove the lies of the politicians, as fortunately the rogues invariably fall out and honest men then have ample opportunity to make a study of the methods adopted by them. So completely, indeed, have they exposed each other that a politician has become in the public mind as surely associated with the art of lying as the sun is connected with the light of day.

There may be honour among thieves, or even lawyers, bishops, or judges, but there is none among politicians. It seems that the man who seeks a seat in Parliament, or is bent on seeing his party get into power, will stop at nothing. Poverty and starvation, words which truly express the most depressing and deepest tragedy that the greatness of the human race has been able to create, a terrible reality to the people, are for him expressions only significant in so far as they are a means by which he can obtain the support of the people in his efforts to become a Member of Parliament and gain notoriety and fame.

Race hatred, the misery of the people, hungry women, starving children, homeless wrecks of humanity—these are the electioneering stage properties which the politicians use to gain public applause.

Such is government in the making. Let us now consider it as an accomplished fact.

We are told that if we took all the people of this world and murdered them, and then all the people of four or five similarly populated worlds and treated them in the same cordial manner, we might, upon surveying our work, get some idea of the slaughter which man has inflicted upon man under the guardianship of his political institutions. A glance at the Parliamentary debates or a walk in any of our streets will remind us that the Governments of to-day are busy training men who are sworn to murder to order without discussing the rights of the quarrel. Government is, in fact, essentially a bomb-thrower. It will reward with a fortune any man who can furnish it with an improved explosive or a new instrument of destruction.

These are some of the most obvious characteristics of Government and politicians, and yet it is a curious fact that it is still to this institution and these men that the people turn when they wish any wrong righted or any reform instituted. So strong an influence has the habit of servility over us that many even expect to gain freedom from some party whose sole object is to govern us. Hence the astonishing amount of energy expended in an election.

Let us now view the situation in the light of these facts. The Government of England to-day, fortunately for us, is weak; it is divided against itself. The capitalists of the Liberal Party,

with the hero of Featherstone at their head and the well-trained Labour Party kept strictly to heel, are interested in a different branch of this system of exploitation from that with which the noble lords and the landlord class are concerned. It is naturally irksome to the former, the "captains of industry," to be compelled to hand over to the landlords, as ground rents, royalties, etc., a large portion of the wealth produced for them by the workers; and hence we see the right honourable Lloyd George attempting to get a little back by the taxation schemes of the Budget, while on the other hand the struggle for existence urges these lords and landlords to strive to maintain the privileges granted them by the State in earlier days.

It does not need a political prophet to foretell that another General Election will take place before the world is much older, but nevertheless in the meantime we may grow wiser. We have seen and heard the campaign of lies carried on by these politicians seeking power until we have grown weary, and we have also seen that the power they seek, government, is the negation of freedom, and has been associated throughout history with organised scientific murder on a large scale, and at the same time with an artistic hypocrisy with which it always convinced the people that it was acting for their welfare. Understanding this, we are not deceived by any party of politicians claiming as of old to act in our interest, but say distinctly that we, the workers, the proletariat, the class without property, will not assist any man in his attempts to gain a seat in Parliament. We will find other means of action.

While the politicians are discussing the right to work, the housing, the feeding, and the clothing of the people, and whether this same "people" should be granted universal suffrage—i.e., the right to vote them into power—we, the people, will answer by our action:—

"Your State-enacted rights and privileges are meaningless; we will no longer discuss politics with you, we are going to stop supplying you with the means by which you oppress us. We have given you power, not by our votes, but by supplying you with food, building your mansions, and castles, and prisons, and universities; and by subjecting our reasons and our wills to the discipline of your blood-stained armies. We have kept you, and clothed you, and now you, *our dependents*, talk of granting us the right to work, dare to speak of housing us and feeding our children, insult us by sheltering our babies while their mothers are slaves in the factories we have built. We, the people, your masters, will no longer build Houses of Parliament in which you discuss the problem of permitting us to build hovels for ourselves. The houses we build shall be for those we love, not for those who mock and despise or pity us. The factories we have built shall be ours, for we will no longer keep you; and when you cowardly parasites, exploiters, politicians turn for aid, as you always do, to your hired traitors, the police and the army, they will be weak on your side and all power on ours, for the men of our future armies shall stand shoulder to shoulder with the miners of Featherstone and the strikers of Belfast."

The General Election is not an incident in the fight for the Social Revolution. The Labour struggle can be carried on only by direct action, the militant general strike, antimilitarism, and individual action.

G. Barnett

THAT SPLENDID DIRECT ACTION!

Numerous are the workers engaged in the factories and workshops of Choisy-le-Roi, a suburb of Paris.

Towards six o'clock, when work ceases, the workers fill the station waiting for one of those dirty suburban trains which the company considers good enough for the men. Waiting on the platforms, the tired workers, see the famous South Express pass through the station like a flash of lightning. In its restaurants, sleeping cars, saloons, etc., a few rich capitalists lounge, and scarcely throw a glance on the mass of toilers standing in the snow, looking out for their primitive slow train to bring them home.

But on February 9, last things went a little differently. The workers, numbering nearly a thousand, stood, not on the platform, but on the railroad; the engine-driver had to stop. In a moment the splendid cars, with their soft velvet seats, were invaded by the men, who only regretted that the dinner hour in the restaurant car had passed! They thoroughly enjoyed their escapade, and arrived home earlier and more pleasantly than if they had waited for their usual filthy train.

The indignation of the authorities was, of course, too great for words; besides, the fact could not be undone, and must have set many thinking on this object lesson in Direct Action.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

Russia—A Monster Trial of Anarchists.

Local papers announce that in South-East Russia, especially in the Caucasus and Trans-Caucasia, the authorities have collected from different provincial towns ninety-six Anarchists, who will be tried before the High Court of Tiflis. Among the accused are well-known doctors, teachers, workers, journalists, peasants, and pupils of high schools. All the accused have received their act of accusation, and the penalties to which they may be condemned vary from simple imprisonment to many years of hard labour.

Personally, we do not know any of the accused, but it is evident that Anarchism is spreading in Russia. During the two years of the revolutionary movement, the best Anarchist and Revolutionary Syndicalist books and pamphlets were translated into Russian from the French, English, and German; and though printed in thousands, always very soon sold out.

It must be observed that generally during the last three years among the workers and intellectuals great interest and sympathy with Syndicalism has been shown. In the beginning most of them were in favour of legal Trade Unionism, but as our despotic Government is stupidly prosecuting every peaceful workers' organisation which is not willing to lend itself to police service, honest people begin to turn to secret Revolutionary Syndicalism and Direct Action.

Errata.—In last month's "International Notes" the deficits of the Russian railways were given incorrectly. The figures should read as follows:—

1900	...	...	3,600,000 roubles.
1902	...	...	40,300,000 "
1905	...	...	89,500,000 "
1907	...	...	133,000,000 "

Germany.

We heartily welcome the awakening of the Prussian proletariat from the "scientific" slumber of Marxian Social Democracy, with its lullaby of legalism and Parliamentarianism. The old generation of Social Democrats, childishly delighted with the universal suffrage for the Imperial Reichstag, did not pay any attention to the fact that in reality the people in the various States were without any political rights. For nearly forty years the Social Democrats were soothing the people with the mirage of a coming majority in the Reichstag, and diverted the attention of the workers and peasants from their political slavery in their own States.

But the new generation, especially in Prussia and Saxony, a few years ago started an agitation for the rights of citizenship and of voting for the national Parliament. This time the people discarded Social Democratic tactics, and began street demonstrations. The Prussian Government was obliged to introduce a Reform Bill. This Bill not only did not give anything like universal suffrage, but did not even guarantee the secrecy of the ballot.

A storm of protest has broken out everywhere. Numerous demonstrations have been held in Berlin, Frankfurt, Neumunster, and other towns, where the demonstrators were shot and hacked at by the police in a truly Russian style. Hundreds were wounded and several killed.

We hope that the masses in Germany will see by these facts that all the parading with the millions of Social Democratic votes and the declamations of their leaders in the Reichstag are of no help to the workers and peasants, who must fight their own battles in order to obtain the full rights of citizenship in all States of the Empire.

France.

In Lorient, a port of Brittany, the gasworkers declared a strike for a daily wage of 5 to 6 francs, the majority amongst them earning only 4½ francs. The company refused this claim, and the naval authorities ordered stokers from the warships to take the strikers' places. But the honest seamen refused to be blacklegs, and six of them were promptly put into prison. However, thanks to this solidarity, the company surrendered and the strikers gained their point.

In view of the approaching elections, an anti-electoral campaign has been started by the Revolutionists and Anarchists of France. A committee of agitation has been formed, in which the "Libertaire," the "Guerre Sociale," the "Temps Nouveaux," and other groups are represented. Amongst the members are our friends Ardouin, Charles Albert, André Girard, Jean Grave, and Dr. Pierrot. In their appeal to the workers, they urge them to abandon futile Parliamentary tactics and to concentrate their activity on the economic struggle; to take part in the Syndicates, in order to propagate and introduce there revolutionary ideas and methods.

Gustave Hervé, the courageous antimilitarist editor of the *Guerre Sociale*, and Anroy, the manager, have been condemned by the tribunal to four years' imprisonment for insulting the Parisian police and urging revolutionists to resist their brutality and dishonesty. The witnesses for the defence, who in no measured terms denounced the falsehoods and savagery of the police, included old Rochefort and our comrades Yvetot and Sebastian Faure. Even in the darkest periods of the 19th century, as the Restoration and the Second Empire, such an infamous sentence was never given for a press offence. What a despotic

Government did not dare to accomplish, a bourgeois Radical President, as Fallières, and Socialist Ministers, as Briand, Millerand and others, have not shrunk from doing.

We must add that the *Germinal* of Amiens and the *Pioupiau de l'Yonne* have also been prosecuted for reproducing the article.

CORRESPONDENCE.

ANOTHER POINT OF VIEW.—A REPLY.

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

DEAR COMRADE,—The contradictory statements which "Anarchist Communist" points out in my January article ("A General Survey," see his letter in FREEDOM, February) may be due to my want of logic, and I stand open to be corrected; they may be contradictory in appearance only where I failed to make myself quite clear; they may also be reconciled by an explanation which gives the reasons of an unexpected divergence of development. I am looking out for such reasons, and when I shall have stated the case in a clearer way than I may have done, "Anarchist Communist" and others will help me to find these reasons.

I mentioned a number of "progressive" and a number of "reactionary" facts; both lists might be largely increased and intermediate degrees noticed. Where is the contradiction? The facts are there. To me it is an open question whether progress or reaction predominates; both of them have a large field and neither shows signs of definite decay. Broadly speaking, all that adds to the well-being of mankind is progress, all that reduces this well-being is reaction. The mechanical, industrial progress of mankind is enormous, but Nature's riches are being exhausted in a tremendous degree. Man is being perfected by education, hygiene, etc., in many ways, but physical degeneration nevertheless is on the increase. Socialism seems to spread everywhere; but looked at closer, each party, each leading man bear the germs of corruption and degeneration in themselves. So hard facts everywhere point to a two-fold development of mankind, part of it being able to realise progress and others being incapable of doing so, strive as they may. This makes me look for the reason of it, and I believe it is to be found in the natural diversity of man.

By this I mean that at each given moment, just as mankind consists of children and adults, of strong and weak, of gifted and less gifted, of people of different temperament, etc., it consists of people in whom the desire for freedom and solidarity is developed in a different degree, yet all manage to live side by side. Why should this be different in the case of varying personal appreciations of the quantity of personal and mutual freedom and solidarity? Or, to put it another way, can it be expected that on this particular field relative uniformity will be realised when it does not exist, and never existed, on any other field? Do I mean to say by this: "Whatever is right," or is reasonable? Certainly not; only I admit that I cannot help things being as they are, that I cannot change the balance of power.

I have too high an opinion of Anarchism to believe that it could be realised except by real Anarchists. I neither believe that it can be spread infinitely by a mechanical increase of propaganda, nor that it will automatically spring up under "equal opportunities for human development." I want it and others don't; they want State Socialism or capitalism and I don't; mere force or persuasion would make each of us but unwilling serfs of the other; we are different and we can't help it. Anarchism without Anarchists would be as impossible as State Socialism without people willing to submit to it. No other system is capable of generalisation; why should Anarchism at the very beginning be generalised, when everything in Nature reaches full development only at the height of its natural growth? Everything grows out of small beginnings; the very best men are the most modest. Why should Anarchism—that prime essence of freedom, common sense, and fairness—require that all should bow to it before it deigns to enter into operation? "All progress is initiated by minorities," I am told. Quite right; let us do this with regard to Anarchism. This statement of my opponent, which I accept, does not necessarily imply that these minorities are able to make the majorities follow them and equally realise progress, which would mean generalising it. In fact, up till now most progress remains limited to minorities. Art and Science, boldly defended by infinite minorities; Freethought the same; what part is the majority taking in these? Hardly any; only after stoning and burning the minorities on these fields, they just manage to let them alone unless egged on by their leaders to persecute them. Everything that is above a certain level of perfection (to use that dangerous term "level") seldom exceeds a limited sphere; economic demands even which for Anarchists and earlier Socialists mean complete mutual solidarity, for wider spheres mean only appropriation by limited groups or State property, or appropriation by new collectivities.

All I ask is: Why, by what mysterious process, should all this happen differently in the case of Anarchism? Therefore I said: Anarchism must begin at the beginning, must be modest and proportionate in its initial undertakings; and I used the image of an oasis, which seems to illustrate my meaning.

To explain this further, suppose an arid desert and a small, limited supply of grain, manure, fruit trees, tools, etc. To fertilise this desert, is it better to scatter these scanty grains all over the sand, where most of them will dry up, and only here and there by chance a thin covering

of green may rise, or is it preferable to unite all the materials to create a few real oases, which means no loss of materials, some real nuclei, and by and by, perhaps, the connecting of these oases by fertilised ground and the reclaiming of nearly the whole desert? I think the latter course is preferable. To the former I liken the usual broadcast propaganda, sowing into the wind, with here and there a few grains taking root. The latter would correspond to the efforts of realisation of Anarchism in present life which I have in mind, and which do not in the least mean "the life of a recluse." What I mean I explained in an article published in *Mother Earth*, December, 1907; it is, in short, resistance to the State by all possible means along the whole line of State interference, and the creation of economic resources by voluntary co-operation outside of capitalism.

If we were strong enough to destroy forthwith the State and capitalism, we should do so. To become sufficiently strong, we must not always rely upon others, expect others to do this work, *the workers* to destroy the State and capitalism; but we must show what we can do *ourselves*, and then only will others have confidence in our ideas and accept them more largely and be at one with us. Propaganda by *our own* direct action seems to me the best kind of propaganda, the only one containing solid, perceptible arguments; everything else is a matter of personal inclination, reasoning, persuasion, belief, not a real object-lesson.

I do not mean a rush to found Anarchist colonies; that would be almost running away from present society. I mean standing up where we are and making a stand of it as the early Freethinkers, the Quakers, and others did. Let those who must attack and fight do so; I feel free of all quietist, Tolstoyan leanings; but let others who are not inclined to fight, besides their verbal and literary propaganda, also give some example of Anarchism or *some part of it* in real life. Let them and their friends thus become themselves local "oases" of free and fair-minded people, and this may do more to attract people to examine Anarchism closer than continuous verbal or written assertions, which, if dealing with public matters, are less and less taken notice of by people of any value; even our anti-Parliamentary talk savours too much of politics to win the confidence of people who, even if they vote for what they believe to be the "lesser evil," have no esteem for any politician.

I do not pretend to give any advice how all this is to be done; I only wish to make clear that between "spreading our ideas" (the usual verbal and written propaganda, I take this to mean) and "the life of a recluse," there is this third way of acting, these *object-lessons in Anarchism or some part of it*, which may become a more recognised factor in our movement than, to my experience at least, it is at present.

What about Syndicalism? Help it along as much as possible, but beware of being merged in it. A Trade Union is necessarily one of the most primitive, least perfected forms of association, because it comprises men of every variety of personal character and opinions, brought together only by the identity of profession and local residence; it can properly serve only Trade Union purposes. If they were able to attack capitalism effectively by a general strike, etc., and overpower it, the spoils would belong to them—the materials and tools of each trade to the respective Union, and a new appropriation would follow, labour trusts succeeding capitalist trusts. As to the State, they would rearrange it under the name of an Administration or Executive, with Labour delegates, etc. Anarchism has not the ghost of a chance under all this.

But instead of all this happening, everything points already in another direction, to the *next* phase of economic evolution, which is likely to be a compromise between Labourism and Capitalism under the common protection of the State—a new lease for the present system by a readjustment of the claims of Capital and Labour. Anarchists should beware of being crushed by the coming downfall of Syndicalism. They kept clear of politics and witness its present degradation—Socialist and bourgeois politicians compromising everywhere for the price of a share in the spoils. The same will happen to Syndicalism—its larger aims will be bought off at the price of smaller concessions to Labour. Some irreconcilable Socialists and Syndicalists will remain, only to emphasise the tameness of the big majorities. All this will lead to a revulsion of feeling against politics and mere trade associations of strangers with strangers, and bring about a desire for *freedom and comradeship among men and women whom real affinity brings together*. Anarchism offers all this, and if in these coming days of disillusion its "oases" will be shining forth as bright green spots, the time will have come when these oases will increase, the surrounding ground be fertilised, and by and by the ultimate aim of fertilising the whole desert of barren modern society will be nearer completion.

I agree with the words of "Anarchist Communist": to "work for Anarchist Communism and take our full share in the economic struggle"; but I believe that this is *not all*, and if what can be done besides is perhaps only dimly visible to my mind and difficult for me to make clear, others may grasp what I mean, express it better and fuller, and by practical work by and by set it going. We want to see something of Anarchism in real life, and can achieve this if we only work for it, just as Art and Science, Freethought and whatever there exists of humane ideas and feelings won their place at the table of life, not by words nor hopes nor the help of others, but by their own deeds. These, *Art, Science, and Freethought*, are leading examples for me, whilst Christianity and Socialism are warning examples of what ought not to happen to Anarchism.

For Socialism was originally conceived as realisable only by Socialists, outside of the present system, but not necessarily on the ruins of it; Utopian islands, phalansteries, etc., might exist side by side with the ordinary system. Blanqui, Marx, and others, however, struck the bold blow of identifying Socialism with the aspirations of the proletariat, and it merged into political Radicalism and the Labour struggle. They simply imitated the ambitious heads among the early Christians, who transformed the voluntary groups of real believers in a better mode of life into organised Churches, and soon managed to make Christianity the compulsory State religion. We all know that whatever there may have been humanitarian in the aspirations of the early Christians, got lost on the way; and with Christianity triumphant everywhere *nominally*, its spirit was all along dead and gone. The same happens to Socialism; Socialists are counted by millions, Socialism is on the way to become a State institution, but its spirit is gone.

Anarchism is courting the same danger of evaporating and vanishing by the ambition to extend its sphere over all the ordinary Labour struggle, Syndicalism. The failure of the two other schemes of *wholesale* world reform is palpable; I grieve to see Anarchism, which I love, ready to follow them on the road leading to nominal, purely formal realisation, and in reality the extinction of the real spirit of our ideas.

N.

February 20, 1910.

LAW AND EXPERIENCE.

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

DEAR COMRADE,—I thank you for your courteous reply to my query, although your reasoning has not weakened my opinion. I know that experience is often at variance with law, equally true is it that experience is often in agreement with it. The operation of a particular law adds to the experience of the race, and strengthens or weakens confidence in its efficacy. And from this point of view even bad law has its uses. State law has been framed by a privileged class in its own interests, consequently I do not defend it as inherently good; conversely, I claim that law is not inherently bad. Laws governing games are good, though experience is often at variance with them. The leather thong of a whip can inflict much pain;—used as a boot-lace, it is of real use.

Yes, as a means to an end, I favour majority rule. So do you. See the editorial article in the January number of FREEDOM: "the right of Trade Unionists to use their money as they like." That is, the right of the majority to tax the minority. Trade Union law is at present in conflict with State law, and the former becomes invalid. You say that experience, and not law, should be the agency to put that right. I claim that experience and law will supply the particular need. The exigencies of the moment demand fresh law. Trade Union machinery is now in operation to get it enacted. The concession demanded will probably be granted during the life of the present Parliament, to the satisfaction of Trade Unionists. That other contingencies will arise requiring further law amendments, I know—but that is another story.

We must look at things as they are. Trade Unionists have experienced that law is the only reliable defence at present. Consequently, the forces operating in Trade Unions induce political action. Even if Direct Action were practical, the State political machinery would be required to make such action of permanent value.

Natural law is harsh enough to the unfit, beneficent to the fit. Human law is natural, surely. And because there has evolved a condition of things which enables the conscious minority to prey upon the unconscious majority, I see no logical reason for condemning law.

The Anarchist belief, that just as the atoms forming the human organism each performs its functions to the good of all, so, once free and unfettered by human law, will each unit of society function to the good of the social organism, is, to me, no argument against political action or human law. I may as well refuse to travel by train because I know that at some distant date the means of transport will be entirely changed.

I wish to go forward to a scientific form of society, reasoned out by perfected human intellect, not backward to primitive tribal existence. I know that you will say that yours is the only scientific form of society. Can you tell me how free association will supply the organisation required by the sub-division of labour, and whether Nature gives any example of it among the lower animals?—Yours fraternally,

A BRISTOL SOCIALIST.

REPLY.

Perhaps if we define our terms, it may help a little toward our comrade "strengthening" his opinion about law—statute law—against it, let us hope.

Statute law is the written expression of the desires and wishes of the predominant section in society at any given period. It is the paramount function of government to enforce the law. Thus, while the theory of government is said to be to protect the weak against the strong, the practice always is, and must be, to make the strong stronger, and reduce the weak to absolute impotence.

Experience, on the other hand, is the ascertained result of a series of trials or experiments; the observation of a fact, or of the same facts or events happening under like circumstances; what one has learned by enjoying or suffering; in fact, knowledge derived from trials, use, practice, or a series of observations.

Does our comrade now see the essential difference between law and experience? If law is in accord with experience, there is no necessity for it; if it is against it, or, as generally happens, prevents further experiment, then it is bad and harmful.

Our comrade confuses State government and statute law—the imposition of the will of the predominant section on *all* those who live on a given territory—with the voluntary personal association of a Trade Union and its rules. The principles underlying the two are quite different. The fact that the majority of Trade Unionists are believers in government, and would often like to have the powers of one, does not make it so. An individual *joins* a Trade Union; he is *born* into the State. He has the choice of accepting or rejecting the advantages of a Trade Union, the power to secede if he is dissatisfied. He has no choice in accepting the statute laws of any State, or if he exercises one, must take the risk of severe penalties. He cannot secede from it; at best, he can only migrate from one to the other, but is always subject to the predominant section. In fact, States and statute laws are feudal in conception, based on territory. A Trade Union is industrial, and its foundation is personal association. Modern political democracy is at best but a clumsy attempt to numb the tyrannical powers of feudalism, and plays into the hands of every new tyranny that fresh economic developments create.

The question of minority rule (aristocracy), majority rule (democracy), or free agreement between the different sections in society (Anarchism) is another matter, and does not affect the above argument as to statute law and experience. It is really surprising that any thoughtful person could confuse them. Only with one who was obsessed with modern political institutions would it be possible. If this little reasoning together should in ever such a small degree bring other ideas into play, and lead to the desire for fresh social experiment, some new experience will probably result, and statute law be less revered.

Finally, Anarchism is just the principle in association which will make the sub-division of labour possible without submerging the individual. Ants and bees and beavers, not to mention others, are instances among the animals other than man.

THE WRITER OF THE ARTICLE.

TRUE EDUCATION.

Flaubert says that life ought to be an incessant education, that "from speaking to dying" everything has to be learned. Left to chance, this long education is every moment deviating. Even parents, in most cases, have not the slightest idea of the aim of education, especially when the children are still very young. What is the moral idea set before most children in a family? Not to be too noisy, not to put the fingers in the nose or mouth, not to use the hands at table, not to step into puddles when it rains, etc. A reasonable being! In the eyes of many parents the reasonable child is a marionette, which is not to stir unless the strings are pulled; he is supposed to have hands which are meant to touch nothing, eyes which are never to sparkle with desire for what he sees, little feet which must never trot noisily on the floor, and a silent tongue.

Many parents bring up their children, not for their children's sake, but for their own. I have known parents who did not wish their daughter to marry, because it would involve separation from her; others who did not want their son to take up this or that profession (that of a veterinary surgeon, for instance), because it was displeasing to *them*, etc. The same rules dominated their whole course of conduct towards their children. That is egoistic education. There is another kind of education which has as its object, not the *pleasure* of the parents, but the *pleasure* of the child as estimated by the parents. Thus a peasant, whose whole life has been spent in the open air, will consider it his duty to spare his son the labour of tilling the soil; he will bring him up to make him a government clerk, a poor official stifled in his office, who, cooped up in a town, will sooner or later die of consumption. True education is disinterested: it brings up the child for its own sake; it also and especially brings it up for its country and for the human race as a whole. In the various works I have published I have had a single end in view: the linking together of ethics, æsthetics, and religion, with the idea of *life*—life in its most intensive, extensive, and therefore most fruitful form; it is this idea, therefore, which will supply us in this volume with the object of education, the fundamental formula of pedagogy. Pedagogy might be defined as the art of adapting new generations to those conditions of life which are the most intensive and fruitful for the individual and the species. It has been asked if the object of education is individual or social; it is simultaneously individual and social: it is, to speak accurately, the search for means to bring the most intensive individual existence into harmony with the most extensive social life. Besides, in my opinion, there is a profound harmony underlying the antinomies between individual existence and collective

existence; whatever is really conformable to the *summum bonum* of individual life (moral and physical) is *ipso facto* useful to the whole race. Education ought, therefore, to have a triple end in view:—1st. The harmonious development in the human individual of *all* the capacities proper to the human race and useful to it, according to their relative importance. 2nd. The more particular development in the individual of those capacities which seem peculiar to him, *in so far as they cannot disturb the general equilibrium of the organism*. 3rd. To arrest and check those tendencies and instincts which may disturb that equilibrium—in other words, to aid heredity in proportion as it tends to create permanent superiority within the race, and to resist its influence when it tends to accumulate causes pernicious to the race itself. Thus education becomes the pursuit of the means of bringing up the largest number of individuals in perfect health, endowed with physical or moral faculties as well developed as possible, and thereby capable of contributing to the progress of the human race.—J. M. GUYAU, *Preface to "Education and Heredity."*

FOR THE YOUNG FOLK.

"Boys will be boys," so the old adage reads; but nowadays boys are becoming more spirited, more independent, and the trouble is that "boys will be *men*." I have nothing but admiration for the boy who displays courage and independence, but to find an outlet for this character in Boy Scouts and Boys' Brigades is to me painful in the extreme.

The men of the Christian Church who started this idea of arming boys with toy guns make large claims for it. They say it has discovered, or rediscovered, *the boy*; but we think it could be shown that it has discovered little about the boy that was not known before.

It is not surprising that this movement is popular amongst the young folk. Just look at the attractions of "playing at soldiers." There is the semi-uniform, the toy guns, drill, marching-out parades, and other things which attract the young folk very quickly. But I want my young comrades to consider well the objects and uses of the Army and Navy before they enter the ranks of such brigades, instituted by the Christian Church to deliberately prepare youths to be hired as assassins for the benefit of men of power and wealth.

Where is the difference between the man who kills his fellow being in a passionate moment to gratify some particular desire, and the man who lends himself to a Government and kills his fellow man because he is paid to do it? You will say that these brigades do not prepare you for the Army, but that you should lead a manly life. I know they often tell us that, but whenever there is a demonstration of Boys' Brigades these unguarded statements are always made. I will pick out one among many. Speaking at a demonstration at Glasgow, the then Lord Provost of Edinburgh is reported to have said:—"To me, one of the good points of the Boys' Brigade was that it *did* encourage a *military* spirit. The country that had not that amount of military spirit and of patriotism that was required for its own protection and defence would go down, and deserve to go down. I have no doubt that the *military* spirit that the boys gained in the Brigade would be for their own future good and for the future good of the country."

My young comrades, remember you are the sons and daughters of the workers. The workers have never yet had the support of the Army and Navy when they have endeavoured to better their condition by strikes and suchlike methods. Your teacher will point to the map of the world and show you the red patches that belong to England, and your breast will swell with pride at the thought of England's greatness! But how do you feel, comrades, when you probe into those dark corners and slums where English boys and girls are crawling from "crib to death's door"?

Once upon a time kings set their armies at war to avenge some pettifogging insult, and these foolish men obeyed the trumpery whims of these pampered fools. Now it is different. The wealthy merchant desires colonies in which to sell his merchandise, and the workers who feed the Army with their sons loudly support the imposition.

Time after time this institution of destruction has mercilessly shot down the workers to gain the ends of the master class. A monarch is reported to have said to his soldiers:—"Only one enemy can exist for you—MY ENEMY. With the present Socialist machinations, it may happen that I shall order you to shoot your own relatives, your brothers, or your parents—which God forbid—and then you are bound in duty implicitly to obey my orders!" Boys, while you are boys, think before you join these schools to prepare you for such as that. It may come to your turn to fight against your own father and brother. There may be a strike, and these men are, in many such cases, let out like a pack of hounds seeking whom they might devour.

Every time I see a corps of Scouts or Brigade Boys pass before me I think that it is another mark of shame upon the workers. Here are boys led like so many sheep, being taught the use of weapons of human slaughter, ever ready to submit to the orders of a well-fed officer, who looks like a well-dressed doll or pantomime artiste. "Playing at soldiers," you say; but if my young comrades would only consider the dirty business for which the Army is intended, surely they would decry every link that is made for it.

DICK JAMES.

PROPAGANDA NOTES.

[Reports of the Movement are specially invited, and should be sent in not later than the 25th of each month.]

LIVERPOOL INTERNATIONAL MODERN SCHOOL.

The School still maintains its good attendance, in spite of bad weather and the illness of one or two of our young comrades. Every one seems satisfied with the class idea, especially the young folk.

There is no one more proud of his class of boys than Mat Kavanagh. Here is a group of lads about to leave day school, who will soon be hobnobbing with their workmates at their respective trades, anxiously and intently listening to Mat's deliberations on Dennis Hird's "Easy Outline of Evolution," comparing also the Creation theory as depicted in the Bible. The wonderful progress Mat makes with these lads furnishes an answer to those comrades whose criticism of lads and their capabilities was not of the best. During our comrade's varied career as a propagandist he has never as yet found greater satisfaction in addressing an audience than this particular class of lads produces.

Fred Bower has decided to address the elder girls each Sunday. We are glad of his help, and only wish that he was able to give a similar verdict in respect to the girls as has been said of the boys.

Will Jones has a class of girls and boys of ten years of age or thereabouts. Our comrade never fails to interest these children whose minds are beginning to inquire as to the wonders of life.

The responsibility of the little ones falls to me, and the precocious youngsters tell me stories of "Once upon a time." They seem greatly concerned to find words to express their ideas about pictures and other things. And so our school goes on.

On February 6 we had an open Sunday. Mat Kavanagh addressed the school on "Our Object." His speech was short and to the point, and well appreciated by the children. On Thursday, February 11, we had our annual social for the School. All thoroughly enjoyed themselves. The children acquitted themselves remarkably well in their part of the affair by supplying the programme. I beg to thank the kind friends who helped us to bring the catering to a successful issue.

Donations (Jan. 25—Feb. 25): B. 9d, F. B. 1s, I. C. 1s.

DICK JAMES.

The Newcastle Communist Club

Will in future be known as the Newcastle Anarchist Club. Meetings will be held every Saturday evening at 7.30, in Hall's Café, 37 Pilgrim Street. Correspondence should be sent to Secretary, care of D. C. Thompson, 160 Conyers Road, Byker, Newcastle.

Correspondence Received.

A. Kohn, A. Pratelle, D. Sempile.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

(February 9—March 9.)

FREEDOM *Guarantee Fund*.—E. Rhodes 2s, H. Taylor 8d, R. Avis 10s.
FREEDOM *Subscriptions*.—R. F. M. 2s, J. B. 1s 6d, Dr. E. D. 1s 6d, R. Chiba 1s 6d, R. Clarke 1s 6d, W. Gilchrist 1s 6d, C. S. R. 2s, E. E. R. 1s 6d.
ALDRED FUND.—R. Avis 10s, Comp. 6d.

Commune Meetings.

WORKERS' FRIEND CLUB, 163 JUBILEE ST., MILE END, E.

FRIDAY, MARCH 18, at 8.30 p.m.

Well-known Speakers will address the Meeting.

COMMUNIST CLUB, 107 CHARLOTTE STREET, W.

FRIDAY, MARCH 18, at 8.30 p.m.

Speeches will be made in English, German, and French.

A Grand Concert and Ball

In aid of the "WORKERS' FRIEND" will take place

On Easter Monday, March 28th,
AT THE

CAVENDISH ROOMS, 51 MORTIMER STREET, W.

Doors open at 8 p.m. sharp. Ball till 3 a.m.

Tickets of Admission—Single 1s. 6d., Double 2s. 6d.

MOTHER EARTH.

Published by EMMA GOLDMAN.

Offices: 210 East 13th Street, New York City, U.S.A.

Can be obtained from FREEDOM Office. 6d. monthly, post-free 7d.
Back numbers supplied.

THE FIREBRAND.

To Burn Away the Cobwebs of Ignorance and Superstition.

Published Fortnightly.

One year \$1, 3 months 25 cts., single copies 5 cts.

All communications to THE FIREBRAND, MOUNT JULIET, TENN., U.S.A.

GOD AND THE STATE.

By MICHAEL BAKUNIN.

A new edition, revised from the original Manuscript.

With a new Portrait.

Paper cover, 6d. net; cloth, 1s. net. Postage 1d.

FREEDOM Office, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W.

The Great French Revolution, 1789—1793.

By P. A. KROPOTKIN.

610 pages 8vo, cloth, 6s. net, postage 5d.

KROPOTKIN'S MOST FASCINATING WORK.

MEMOIRS of a REVOLUTIONIST

2s., postage 4d.

500 pages, well bound in cloth, with Portrait.

THE MARTYRDOM OF FRANCISCO FERRER.

Price One Penny. At FREEDOM Office.

"New Age" Photos, 1s., postage 2d.

Post Cards 1d. each, 1½d. post free.

PROPAGANDA LEAFLETS.

Our Great Empire.

What Anarchists Fight For.

Do Not Vote.

6d. per 100 post free; 4s. per 1,000.

PAMPHLET AND BOOK LIST.

ANARCHIST COMMUNISM: ITS BASIS AND PRINCIPLES. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

ANARCHISM: ITS PHILOSOPHY AND IDEAL. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.

ANARCHIST MORALITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

ANARCHY. By E. MALATESTA. 1d.

THE WAGE SYSTEM. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.

A TALK ABOUT ANARCHIST COMMUNISM BETWEEN TWO WORKERS. By E. MALATESTA. 1d.

THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.

EXPROPRIATION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

DIRECT ACTION v. LEGISLATION. By J. BLAIR SMITH. 1d.

THE PYRAMID OF TYRANNY. By F. DOMELA NIEUWENHUIS. 1d.

LAW AND AUTHORITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.

THE SOCIAL GENERAL STRIKE. By ARNOLD ROLLER. 2d.

THE PLACE OF ANARCHISM IN SOCIALISTIC EVOLUTION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

THE COMMUNE OF PARIS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. ½d.

THE BASIS OF TRADE UNIONISM. By EMILE POUGET. 1d.

AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

WAR. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

SOCIALISM THE REMEDY. By HENRY GLASSE. 1d.

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. By ELISEE RECLUS. 1d.

THE KING AND THE ANARCHIST. 1d.

MONOPOLY; OR, HOW LABOUR IS ROBBED. WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.

USEFUL WORK VERSUS USELESS TOIL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.

THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONGRESS, 1907. 1d.

ANARCHY v. SOCIALISM. By W. C. OWEN. 2d., post-free 2½d.

WHAT I BELIEVE. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 2d., post-free 2½d.

PATRIOTISM. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 2d., post-free 2½d.

THE TRAGEDY OF WOMAN'S EMANCIPATION. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 2d., post-free 2½d.

THE MASTERS OF LIFE. By MAXIM GORKY. 2d., post-free 2½d.

THE GOD PESTILENCE. By JOHN MOST. 1½d.

SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN GERMANY. By GUSTAV LANDAUER. ½d.

ANARCHISTS AND ESPERANTO. 1d.

KROPOTKIN: THE MAN AND HIS MESSAGE. By T. SWAN. 1d.

THE TERROR IN RUSSIA. By P. KROPOTKIN. 2d., postage 1½d.

GOD AND THE STATE. By MICHAEL BAKUNIN. Cloth 1s. net, paper

6d. net, postage 1d.

THE CONQUEST OF BREAD. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3s. 6d. post-free.

ANARCHISM. By Dr. PAUL ELTZBACHER. 6s. 6d.; postage 4d.

MUTUAL AID. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3s. 6d. post-free.

FIELDS, FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS. By PETER KROPOTKIN.

Paper cover 6d, post-free 9d.; cloth 1s., post-free 1s. 3d.

MEMOIRS OF A REVOLUTIONIST. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2s.

MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1s.

NEWS FROM NOWHERE. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1s. 6d.; postage 4d.

A DREAM OF JOHN BALL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 2s., postage 3d.

WHAT IS PROPERTY? By P. J. PROUDHON. 2 vols. 2s., postage 4d.

PRISONS, POLICE AND PUNISHMENT. By E. CARPENTER. Paper 1s., cloth 2s., postage 3d.

ENGLAND'S IDEAL. By EDWARD CARPENTER. 2s. 6d. and 1s., post. 3d.

A VINDICATION OF NATURAL SOCIETY. By EDMUND BURKE. 1s. and 6d., postage 2d. and 1d.

WALDEN. By H. THOREAU. 1s. and 6d., postage 2d. and 1d.

All orders, with cash, should be sent to

Manager, "Freedom" Office, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W.

Printed and published by T. H. KEELL, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W.