

Freedom

JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM

VOL. XXIV.—No. 254.

JUNE, 1910.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY

NOTES.

Mourn for the Miners.

The terrible loss of miners' lives at Whitehaven is a glaring instance of the inhuman greed of the exploiters. And now that the snobs and the sycophants have nearly forgotten the dead king, perhaps some attention may be given to the tears of the women and children of Whitehaven, whose sorrow and suffering are the direct outcome of the capitalist lust for gold. With the sea above and a raging furnace below, these unfortunate victims were trapped and sacrificed, not only through the callousness of the employers, but also through the indifference of a people that permits tens of thousands of pounds to be wasted on the funeral of a king, while lives, the most useful to the community, are left unguarded. And how comes it that the blood-sucking instincts of the landlord can extend beneath the sea? Why is it that we even do not know of these things until a hundred and thirty men meet with this terrible death? And again, only when such a calamity happens does some one begin to find out how these poor fellows live, how they are "housed" on this earth of the landlords. Zola's "Germinal" contains nothing more appalling than the conditions of life and labour in Whitehaven. And the Labour Party are busy—in the House of Commons. Would it be too revolutionary to suggest that if they would only leave that legislative slum at Westminster, where so many undesirables congregate, and would form themselves into vigilance committees to help the workers by Direct Action to fight against these capitalist death-traps, they could not only save a great many lives, but could help the workers to help themselves in the battle with their relentless enemies.

The Morality of the Middle Classes.

A Mr. Fremlin, brewer, of Maidstone, has just died and left an estate of £117,692. He was, we are told, a philanthropist, active in religious work, and an earnest advocate of temperance. It sounds a little incongruous, though of course it is only of a piece with what is going on around us every day. Have not the Quakers shown us how they can run with the hare and hunt with the hounds in matters commercial? The Bible supported by beer is after all only another phase of that hypocrisy which builds a Bournville in England on the slave-labour of Africa, that makes spiritualism a cloak for the coarsest materialism, and induces revolutionary (?) Socialists to wear black ties for a dead king.

Railway Men's Risks.

The public that travels in its millions with such wonderful safety over the beautifully kept permanent ways of our railway systems cares little for the lives that are crushed out—dreadfully murdered, one might say—by the directors who cut down expenses at the cost of life. The slaughter of platelayers just recently has been awful enough to stir up the indifference even of a British public. But we hear no murmurs of protest. People are content to ride over the bones of dead men and make no sign. In France the railway workers show more spirit. The men on the Southern lines have declared a general strike because one of their comrades has been shifted as a punishment. In England four men are cut to pieces at one spot, and the railway servants haven't stopped a train.

The Bully and the "Big Stick."

The blatant rubbish talked by Roosevelt since he started his self-advertising campaign only proves the kind of man the governing classes will turn to as a saviour of their precious society. His policy of the "big stick," as the Americans call it, has, we fancy, been tried many a time in the past before Roosevelt poured forth his wisdom at the Guildhall. Indeed,

the poor Egyptians had an experience of it from a brutal quack of his own type some years ago at Denshawai. Sensible people quite understand that this inhuman outrage on a subject race was the principal cause of the present trouble. But Roosevelt understands nothing but shooting and killing. And we hope that when he returns to the United States for re-election as President, the Trade Unions will be prepared to withstand the man who will mow them down like grass if he gets the power.

A Strange Mixture.

The *Rifleshot* for May 17 contains some rather astonishing statements, considering the ostensible objects for which the paper is published. This strange mixture of Imperialism with the advocacy of Direct Action only proves how much keener are the dominating classes than those who are supposed to "lead" the workers. In an article entitled "'B.-P.' Scout Police," we read:—

"Police amongst boy scouts are unnecessary and harmful. They may be of use to the executive officials at headquarters, but if they are, the fact is eloquent testimony of the inefficiency of the movement, and indicates that the units are not imbued with the right spirit. Scouting is, or should be, based on the advantages to be derived from mutual aid, not depend upon police-enforced duties and regulations. No greater mistake has been made than this investiture of executive authority to scout policemen to sleuth their younger and either innocent or ignorant comrades who are intent upon finding some little joy and forgetfulness in pretending to be primitive."

If our readers will substitute the word "Socialists" for "boy scouts," they will have in this paragraph something approaching very closely to the Anarchist arguments against compulsory or State organisation. At any rate, the *Rifleshot* has hit the right nail to secure the best from the "Scouts"—which may be serious for the Socialists!

Direct Action.

But we must quote once more from the same publication, and this time at some length, as it forms such an excellent parable for political Socialists and Trade Unionists. The article is entitled "Direct Action":—

"Some years ago a party of Volunteers returning from practice at a range, which shall be nameless, took a short cut to the high road by a field footpath. The path led through a meadow in which a bull was grazing. The men halted at the stile; the bull was attracted by their appearance and became excited. Other returning Volunteers arrived, and joined in the debate as to the best course to be pursued. As soon as any one advanced into the field, the bull promptly chased him back to the stile, and the majority of the party kept the fence between themselves and the now infuriated animal. There was the usual talk. One declared that it was illegal to leave a bull at large in a field through which there was a public right of way; another said that the owner of the bull ought to be ashamed of himself; a third blamed the ground landlord for permitting his tenant to put the bull where it might injure the passer-by. They talked on in this strain for quite a while. All their talk did not move the bull, nor did it enable them to get one step nearer home. All sorts of legal remedies were proposed and discussed; also, as to the right parties to be approached in order to get the proper penalties imposed without delay. It was very interesting, but quite ineffective. The bull still remained on one side the fence and they on the other.

"Then a foreigner arrived, and inquired why the party had halted at the stile. He could not understand why a number of soldiers having rifles and ammunition were deterred from journeying further along the path, especially when, as they said, the path was a public road. They told him that the only difficulty was the bull—that animal before them with his tail up, head down, his fore feet pawing the sod, and his throat honking like a disappointed gallery god on a first night at a penny gaff. Thereupon the foreigner took a rifle, swung the butt on to the nose of the bull, settled him, and the party of Volunteers straightway went on homeward.

"This is a concrete instance of direct action and its effectiveness."

MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

VIII.

PLACE OF ANARCHISM IN MODERN SCIENCE.

What place, then, does Anarchism occupy in the great intellectual movement of the nineteenth century?

The answer to this question is already apparent in what has been said in the preceding articles. Anarchism is a conception of the Universe based on the mechanical* interpretation of phenomena, which comprises the whole of Nature, including the life of human societies and their economic, political, and moral problems. Its method is that of natural sciences, and every conclusion it comes to must be verified by this method if it pretends to be scientific. Its tendency is to work out a synthetic philosophy which will take in all facts in Nature, including the life of societies, without, however, falling into the errors of Comte and Spencer, due to reasons already pointed out.

It is evident that on this account Anarchism necessarily has to give its own answers to all questions put before us by modern life, and it unavoidably takes up an attitude with regard to them quite different from that of all political parties, as also, up to a certain point, of the Socialist parties, which have not yet freed themselves from old metaphysical fictions.

Of course, the elaboration of a complete mechanical conception of Nature and human societies is at present hardly begun in its sociological part, devoted to the life and evolution of societies. Nevertheless, the little that has been done, at times even unconsciously, already bears the character which we have indicated. In the philosophy of Law, in the theory of morals, in political economy, and in the historical study of nations and institutions, Anarchism has already proved that it would not content itself with the metaphysical conclusions of old, but would look for a naturalistic basis.

It refuses to be imposed upon by the metaphysics of Hegel, Schelling, and Kant, by the expositors of Roman or Canonical law, by learned professors of State law, or by the political economy of metaphysicians; and it endeavours to clearly understand all questions arising in these spheres, basing itself on a mass of work done from the naturalist's point of view during the last thirty or forty years.

In the same way as the metaphysical conceptions of a Mind of the Universe, a Creative Force of Nature, a Loving Attraction of Matter, an Incarnation of the Idea, an "Aim of Nature," a Reason for its Existence, the Unknowable, and so forth were gradually abandoned by the materialist (mechanical, or rather kinetic) philosophy, and the embryo of generalisations found hidden behind these words were translated in the concrete language of facts, so do we endeavour now to proceed when we approach the facts of life in societies.

When metaphysicians wish to persuade a naturalist that the intellectual and emotional life of man is unrolled "according to the inherent laws of the Spirit," the naturalist shrugs his shoulders and continues his patient study of the phenomena of life, of intelligence, and of emotions and passions, in order to prove that they may all be reduced to physical and chemical phenomena. He endeavours to discover their natural laws.

Likewise when an Anarchist is told that, according to Hegel, "every evolution represents a thesis, an antithesis, and a synthesis"; or that "the aim of Law is to establish Justice, which represents a materialisation of the Supreme Idea"; or yet again, when he is asked: "What is, then, according to you, the Aim of Life?" the Anarchist likewise shrugs his shoulders. And he asks himself: "How is it possible that with the present development of natural science there should still exist such antiquated beings who go on believing in this 'palaver'?" Men speaking still the language of the primitive savage, who used to anthropomorphise Nature by representing it as something governed by beings having human forms."

Anarchists are not to be deceived by such sonorous words, as they know that these words only serve to cover, either ignorance—that is to say, incomplete investigation—or, which is far worse, superstition. Therefore, when they are addressed in this language, they pass on without paying attention to it, and continue their study of social conceptions and institutions, past and present, always following the method of the naturalist.

And they find that the development of the life of society is in reality infinitely more complex (and far more interesting) than we should be led to believe if we judged by metaphysical formulas.

We have heard of late very much about the dialectic method, recommended to us by Social Democrats in order to elaborate the Socialist ideal. But we no more admit this method than would

* It would have been better to say "kinetic," but this expression is less known.

natural science. The dialectic method reminds the modern naturalist of something very antiquated that has had its day and is forgotten, happily long since forgotten by science. No discovery of the nineteenth century, in mechanics, astronomy, physics, chemistry, biology, psychology, or anthropology, has been done by the dialectic method. All the immense acquisitions of the century have been done by the inductive-deductive method—the only scientific method. And as man is a part of Nature, as his personal and social life is a natural phenomenon, just as the growth of a flower, or the evolution of life in societies of ants or bees—there is no reason why we should, when we pass from the flower to man, or from a village of beavers to a human city, abandon the method which till then has been so useful, and look for another method in the realms of metaphysics.

The inductive-deductive method which we employ in natural sciences has so well proved its efficacy that the nineteenth century has been able to advance science in a hundred years more than it had progressed before during two thousand years. And when men of science began in the second half of the century to apply it to the study of human societies, never did they stumble upon an obstacle which rendered its rejection necessary, or made advisable a return to the mediaeval scholasticism resuscitated by Hegel. Besides, when some naturalists, doing honour to their bourgeois education, and pretending to be followers of the scientific method of Darwin, told us: "Crush whoever is weaker than yourself: such is the law of Nature!" it was easy for us to prove, first, that this was *not* Darwin's conclusion, and, using the same scientific method, to show that these scientists were on the wrong path: that such a law does not exist, that Nature teaches us a very different lesson, and that their conclusions were in nowise scientific.

The same obtains as regards the assertion which they tried to make us believe that the inequality of fortunes is "a law of Nature," and that capitalistic exploitation represents the most advantageous form of social organisation. In fact, by applying the method of natural sciences, we are enabled to prove that the so-called "laws" of bourgeois social science, including present political economy, are not at all laws, but simple suppositions or affirmations that nobody has ever attempted to verify.

One word more. Scientific research is only fruitful on condition that it has a definite aim—that it was undertaken with the intention of finding an answer to a plain question well put. And every inquiry is the more fruitful the clearer we see the relation existing between the question and the fundamental lines of our general conception of the Universe. The better it fits in with this general conception, the easier is its solution.

Well then. The question put by Anarchism might be expressed in the following way: "Which social forms best guarantee in such and such societies, and in humanity at large, the greatest sum of happiness, and therefore the greatest sum of vitality?" "Which forms of society are most likely to allow this sum of happiness to increase and develop in quantity and quality—that is to say, will enable this happiness to become more complete and more varied?" (which, by the way, gives us the formula of progress).

The desire to help evolution in this direction determines the social, scientific, and artistic activity of the Anarchist. And this activity, in its turn, precisely on account of its falling in with the development of society in this direction, becomes a source of increased vitality, vigour, sense of oneness with mankind and its best vital forces—and consequently of increased vitality and happiness for the individual.

(To be continued.)

Pages of Socialist History.

By W. TCHERKESOFF.

CONCENTRATION OF CAPITAL.

III.

"In showing by figures that since 1845 the number of capitalists has tripled, you are giving an argument to the defenders of Capitalism, to the entire bourgeoisie, who are trying to prove that the capitalist mode of production has the effect of augmenting the general well-being and of diminishing the misery among the workers." This is the objection which is made to me sometimes by men very sincerely devoted to the Social Revolution.

They may reassure themselves; the same statistics pronounce the condemnation of Capitalism much more surely, much more severely, than the pretended law of concentration. I know well that the defenders of the iniquities of the capitalist system try to prove that our accusations against the State and exploitation are destitute of the least foundation or the least reason. An economist and statistician of renown, Sir R. Giffen, has already

used against us this growth in the number of exploiters. "Fifty-five thousand properties inherited per year," he says, "represent one and a half to two millions of individuals who possess property subject to probate duty (i.e., of value greater than £100)." Giffen believed that by this proof of the increase in the rich, he was showing diminution in the number of the poor. He forgot only the increase in the figure of the population.

Indeed, if we admit that since 1845 up till now the number of the rich in England has not only doubled, as Giffen tells us, but has quadrupled, bringing their number to four millions, the number of the disinherited presents itself before us much greater than in the times of our fathers.

In England we find:—

	1841-45.	1907.
Population.....	26,500,000	44,000,000
Possessorsless than	1,000,000	4,500,000*
Poor	25,500,000	39,500,000

* According to Giffen, two millions only.

By these figures we see that neither the supposed law of concentration, "expropriation of the larger number of capitalists by the few," nor the affirmation of the defenders of the bourgeoisie is confirmed. Contrary to the fatalist law of Marx, the number of capitalists (especially of small capitalists) has tripled itself; contrary to the affirmation of the bourgeois scientists, misery has increased.

It is very interesting to notice how class prejudices with Giffen, and those of metaphysics and dialectics with Marx, have led the two scientists to conclusions completely opposed to each other and equally erroneous. If Robert Owen, Thompson, Dickens, Kingsley, and so many others have had good reason for pleading the cause of the poor and for condemning the social and political order of the England of their time, how much more reason William Morris, Tom Mann, John Turner and others have had in advocating a struggle for the destruction of that enslaving organisation which triples the number of the parasites and oppressors, and which maintains in servitude a population of which the number has been increased by fourteen millions!

To free itself, the people have no need for other arguments than the misery and the cries of those 39,500,000 disinherited. They must understand, however, that no dialectical fantasies, no increase in the number of the rich, no paltry reforms of the Parliamentarians, will bring them anything but an aggravation of suffering and humiliation. Revolution only, not reforms, can put an end to the increase in the number of their exploiters, an end to their sufferings as slaves of the State and of capital.

"But," it will be said, "you cannot deny that capitals—social as well as private—agglomerate." Yes, they agglomerate, and even concentrate, if you like. Only, this concentration has nothing in common with the "expropriation of the larger number of capitalists by the few," of which Marx made a law. Instead of an expropriation, it is a flowing together, an association of capitalists, with a view to procuring the greatest possible profit for those participating in the company, in the enterprise. For the last fifteen years trusts in the United States have taken an unprecedented development; many branches of industry and trade have united. A few groups of financiers are controlling often milliards of capital, but that does not mean that Pierpont Morgan or Carnegie has ruined the small capitalists. Not only are these not ruined, but they are sharing in the profits of the trust as well as many thousands of its workers, those future pillars and supporters of a bourgeois society and private property. If a financial company is not a Panama—and we know hundreds of companies which take care of the interests of their shareholders—the participants, instead of being expropriated, are enriched. Take no matter what financial or industrial company, all are organised in order to make the fortunes of their shareholders.

One of my French critics pointed out to me that in that case it may happen that "the men who were formerly employers may become simply stockholders." Well, what then? Are stockholders people who have been expropriated? Or, is not rather the position of stockholder the ideal form of capitalist possession? A stockholder is a privileged person, a typical representative of social parasitism. A noble lives upon his land, cultivated by his peasants; an industrial employer lives upon the labour of his workmen; a stockholder lives upon the activity of the nation, and often of many nations. Are we to reckon "simple stockholders" among the expropriated? A proprietor, tired with the cares of administration, sells his property, and with the sum realised buys the shares of a shipping company, of a railway company, etc., or invests in State bonds, which guarantee him a revenue of 4 per cent. Are we to place him among the disinherited or among the privileged? And it is just these stockholders and parasites who are increasing in our time. In order

that the true character of this concentration of capital in modern industry and commerce may be understood, I give here the analysis of some enterprises based upon that principle.

First, in commerce. There exists in London a firm in the fur trade. It is a commission firm, and does business with every country in the world. It sells the skins and furs of the Polar regions, as well as those of Africa, Asia, and Central Australia. It counts its creditors and its agents by hundreds, and the number of furs sold each year was valued in thousands (£312,000 in 1895). Its quarterly public sales (January, March, June, and October) attract buyers from every country in Europe. A remarkable fact is that the buyers of the highest quality are in the Russian fur trade, who come to London from the country *par excellence* of fur hunting and manufacture, to make the most important purchases.

As may be seen, the firm is a typical company; commerce has been concentrated to the highest degree. Well, has it caused the ruin of many firms in the fur trade? No, their number has increased since this firm was founded. Has it ruined the manufacturers of furs or the collectors of them? No, it is upon their prosperity, upon their increasing number, that the prosperity of this very firm itself rests. It does all that is possible to diminish the cost of transport, of preservation, of storage, and of sale. Its customers know this well, so their number is always increasing. The firm prospers, its customers become rich at the expense of the producers. In this special case, at the expense of hunters and fishers. We need not believe that these are paid less than before; their remuneration has risen, and the prices of furs have fallen, yet the firm realises large profits.

Where does this profit come from? The explanation is very simple. The commission on each article has been diminished, but the number of articles, coming from every quarter of the world, is some hundreds of times greater. If forty or fifty years ago the firm selling £4,000 worth of furs per annum, with a commission of 10 per cent., realised only £400, in 1895 with a commission of merely 1 per cent. the firm would receive £3,120. In diminishing as much as possible the profit on each article, on each consumer, on each producer, but in handling as many articles as possible, in attracting the greatest number of consumers, in exploiting instead of ten or a hundred producers, one thousand or ten thousand of them—there you have the true source of the fabulous fortunes of these times.

In industry, in finance, in the public services, everywhere, we see the effect of this method.

Second, the public services. Fifty years ago the postal service, in England as everywhere else, was used only by the rich; the service was dear, the revenue of the State insignificant. But once the post was made cheap, the people also began to take advantage of it, and the annual revenues of the State have greatly increased, so that in 1907 the English Post Office had £22,000,000 gross revenue, and £4,500,000 net profit. Each customer is much less exploited, but the number of customers is so infinitely greater; in 1837 the post delivered 109,000,000 letters, in 1896 over 3,000,000,000 letters, and ten years later, in 1906, the post delivered letters, postcards, packets and parcels to the number of 4,862,900,000 ("Statesman's Year Book").

It is especially in the revenues of the railway companies that we can see the action of this tendency to the exploitation of the great masses.

(To be continued.)

THE GENERAL STRIKE IN PHILADELPHIA.

The strike in Philadelphia, which began so dramatically and attracted the world's attention by the sanguinary street fights between the tramway men and the police, the loss of life, and the destruction and burning of cars, has fizzled out in a sort of compromise between the two parties. Let us remind our readers that the strike of tramway men, later on supported by nearly all the Unions of the city, had been begun on the question: "Have the tramwaymen the right to organise as they like, or can the employers prevent them doing so?" This is what the tramway company intended by discharging the men whom they disliked for their organising activity. After eight weeks, the strike has now come to an end, and neither party can boast of having won. Both were glad at the termination of the struggle; the company was half bankrupt, and the strikers were also at the end of their resources.

The tramway men had the disadvantage that, being unskilled men for the most part, their posts were easily filled up. Nevertheless, they stood their ground; but it must be added that they were supported by most of the local Unionists, 10,000 of whom went out on a strike of sympathy and solidarity. This hearty support of the other workers is partially explained by the general conviction that if the tramway men were deprived of the right of union, the other organisations also would soon be attacked. This danger has been averted by the solidarity of the Unions, and the employers will think twice before beginning another conflict with organised Labour.

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.

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.

Money and Postal Orders should be made payable to T. H. Keell.

THE FUTURE OF THE LABOUR STRUGGLE.

The return of Tom Mann reminds us that he brings with him a knowledge and experience of the Labour movement in Australia from which we may all learn very much, and as a consequence of which, let us hope, the future of the Labour movement will be something more effective and sensible than mere political campaigning.

Tom Mann stands primarily for the principles of Industrial Unionism, and as these confine themselves almost exclusively to the economic struggle, it seems quite possible that Direct Action may be taken up by Trade Unionists and some real progress made in the organisation of the working class in a revolutionary sense.

In England we have at present a very sinister reaction of the governing class, and at the same time an ominous collapse of the Labour Party, with its narrow political Opportunism and self-seeking ambitions. It is a moment of real danger, and unless the position is realised and new tactics employed, we may be thrown fifty years back, so far, at least, as the Labour struggle is concerned. There have been many things happening of late to prove that Trade Unionism has still a battle to fight to ensure its effective existence. The capitalist, with his friend the law, is in reality doing to-day what was done in the "fifties" of the last century, when, as George Howell has written: "Trade Unions were no longer forbidden by the Statute Law, but there was a widespread design among employers to crush them out by the weight of their own combinations and length of purse, and of using, as far as might be, the strong arm of the law to cripple their action and resources, and thereby render them powerless for the advancement, or even defence, of Labour."

The result of this was, as we know, a period of strikes and lock-outs, the Sheffield "outrages," probably the work of paid agents, and a bitter struggle to maintain advantages already gained. At the present moment we seem to be face to face with a situation much resembling those times, and unless new methods with revolutionary aims are adopted, the time and money and energy of the Labour movement will be frittered away in a fruitless endeavour to stave off by political action the insidious attacks of the masters.

Now, Industrial Unionism is not Anarchism, but in so far as it is non-political it is quite in accord with Anarchist methods. Its first and most important principle is the *solidarity of Labour*, expressed in an industrial organisation which presents a solid front to the masters on the economic battlefield. It also strives for real international solidarity—a thing many Socialists have forgotten of late years. It would use the General Strike when necessary, and all forms of Direct Action would be the logical outcome of its existence. In many of its features it would answer to the Revolutionary Syndicalism of the French Trade Unions; and as these are not holding their ground so well as might be desired, it may be advisable to point out some of the difficulties that must almost certainly arise here in England, as elsewhere, in such an organisation as that aimed at.

Two serious dangers always attend working-class organisations. One is officialism, the other is the crushing of individual initiative. The first ought not to be an insuperable obstacle. Think for a moment of the immense amount of routine work that is done voluntarily by people devoted to various movements; some with a serious social or educational object, some merely for sports, pastimes, and the rest. Indeed, it can be truly said that much is done in Trade Unions themselves by "unofficial persons"—in other words, by the rank-and-file—which is certainly

helpful, which opposes no obstacle to individual initiative, but, on the contrary, encourages it, and which claims no pecuniary reward.

Admitted that at present the paid secretary, treasurer, and organiser cannot be dispensed with, yet it is quite obvious that far too much fuss is made of those who do this work, and a ridiculous importance attaches to the opinions expressed by these persons, who are generally *interested parties*. Hence the need for encouraging amongst the workers a greater spirit of independence and self-reliance—an object the Anarchists have always had in view. The fact is, the officialism of the Trade Unions and the Labour Party is only a reflex of the capitalist system—that obsession that makes so many believe we must always have some one at the top to direct us. H. M. Hyndman, speaking at the welcome to Tom Mann at St. James's Hall, pointed out how the skilled workers often look with contempt on the unskilled, and even exploit them. That may be true, but not so true as it was. Yet the S.D.P. has never done so much to remedy this evil as Industrial Unionism would do. And this Tom Mann made abundantly clear. So it is quite possible to *minimise* the evils of paid officialism.

In a word, the evils that may arise from the industrial organisation of the workers—which, be it understood, works *with* and not against Trade Unionism—are real, but not insuperable. As to those Anarchists who fear that such an organisation, if it could achieve the Revolution, would end in what may be called "the despotism of Labour," we can only say, preach Communism everywhere and always—Communism, if you like, without formulas, but never without freedom.

One thing more remains to be said. It is often asked: What do Anarchists who preach antimilitarism propose to do in case of war? Is Germany to be allowed to crush France, Austria the Balkan States, or England the rest of the world (we think that is the Jingo ideal), because we would have no military organisation? The problem is a tremendous one, greater even perhaps than Gustave Hervé realises. But while it would take too long to discuss the whole subject now, one answer, at any rate, is that the international organisation of the workers with a genuine ideal of real solidarity, and prepared to use the General Strike *spontaneously* in case of need, would do more to avert the possibilities of capitalistic wars than any one thing we can conceive of.

The Trade Unions have needed the breath of a new ideal to blow away the dry rot of Parliamentary action. Perhaps they may find it in Industrial Unionism. If so, Tom Mann will find plenty of good work to do outside the House of Commons.

THE REAL POWER OF ROYALTY.

Many persons who consider a king as a human being like all the rest, only more insignificant and less talented, who laugh at the preordained divine mission of the reigning dynasties, and admit that they are acting a lie when they testify to their submission, reverence and love of their monarchs and the royal families, are constantly trying to excuse their falsehood and lack of fidelity to their convictions, by maintaining that the accepted fraud of royalty is a harmless deception.

The monarchy, at least in honestly constitutional countries, is merely a bit of theatre scenery. The king has really less authority than the President of the United States of North America. England, Belgium and Italy are in reality republics with kings for the figure-heads, and the inherited external forms of submission by which the crown is surrounded are mostly matters of habit, and prevent in no way the free action of the will of the people, and of the will of the people alone. This is a grave mistake which will prove fatal in many cases to the destinies of nations.

The power of kings is still immense: their influence even in such countries as Belgium and Roumania, England and Norway, is all-powerful, even if it does not affect directly the form of government, but acts with and through it. We have the most reliable testimony of this fact. The right honourable Mr. Gladstone, who is certainly a competent authority, expressed his opinion most significantly on the influence of kings in an early number of the *Nineteenth Century*. Certain publications of recent times throw sufficient light upon this subject, especially Martin's Life of the Prince Consort, with the correspondence between Prince Albert and Prince Wilhelm of Prussia, afterwards King and Emperor, and the relations between Napoleon the Third and the English Court, Baron Stockmar's Notes and Reminiscences, and many reliable portions of Schneider's and Meding's Memoirs. We learn from them how the web-work of

intimate relations between the different sovereigns is spun over the heads of peoples, Parliaments, and ministers; how the kings consult with and advise each other direct; how they pass judgment on every political occurrence from the point of view of the interests of their dynasties; how they turn a solid and united front to the movements tending to arouse the people to a recognition of their strength and rights; and how they allow themselves to be influenced by petty whims, by personal friendships and dislikes, in the most important decisions, involving the destinies of millions. Public orators abound in phrases, the representatives of the people declaim in Parliament; the Cabinet ministers make public the result of their discussions with solemn gravity; they are all convinced that they alone have the power to guide the destiny of the nation; but in the meanwhile the king is smiling contemptuously and writing confidential notes to his royal friends across the border, concluding with them informally all sorts of alliances and exclusions, wars and treaties of peace, conquests and renunciations, limitations and concessions to freedom, and when the plan is all decided upon, it is carried out; the Parliaments can say what they please.

They experience no difficulty in finding plenty of tools to do their work in the correct, constitutional way; a hundred where they need but one, are at their disposal; and in case of necessity it does not require very much of an effort to change the currents of public opinion. Thus it happens that the sovereigns who are supposed to fill only an ornamental position in the State, limited by the constitution to a mere existence without any political significance, are the ones who cast the deciding votes in matters of State, at the present time as well as during the Middle Ages; at the present time even more than ever before, for never was the combination between the monarchs of Europe as firm as to-day, never before did they form such a solidarity, and never before were their natural supporters, the aristocracy and the clergy, so devoted to their authority as to-day. The cowardliness of men who accept the conventional lie of a monarchical form of government, against their convictions, reason, and comprehension of the universe, is revenged upon them, or rather upon human progress. The sly pseudo Liberalists who think they are deceiving the king by awarding him external honours and privileges, when, according to their opinion, the actual power does not go with them, are in reality the dupes of the king, who skilfully adapts himself to their views, but manages to get control of the real authority, so that the sham is after all not the monarchy, but the legislative representation of the people.

—Max Nordau.

POVERTY'S FESTIVAL OF MAY.

This year our slum children, not to profane Sunday, were celebrating the advent of May a day in advance. The city's streets were muddy, for heavy showers had fallen; all was drab and grey; even the sky, never very blue here, looked more grey than usual. Groups of half-fed tatterdemalion children struggled out of the lanes and by-streets into the busy thoroughfares, each group with its Queen, its triumphal arch, and its Maypole. (The Queen, by some unwritten law, is almost always the smallest child in the group.)

What a travesty the whole thing was! Stunted in growth, with souls stifled and bodies half-starved, these, the men and women of the future, were expressing their idea of a May Day festival. If there were any among them who had the smallest sense of beauty, poverty blighted the expression of it. What could they hope to know of beauty, of vitality, of joy; all that May Day should symbolise for children?

Theirs were sorry revels. A broomstick for a Maypole, and a piece of bent cane for an arch, each covered with bits of dirty tissue paper; other pieces were pinned to their ragged garments. And the colours—vivid purples, emerald greens, and bright yellows. This was the ghastly attempt of these disinherited ones to celebrate the birth of the Month of Flowers, the Month of Mary the Mother. As the piteous procession straggled by, singing with voices which are strangers to joy, one felt that the crowning touch was not the purple paper coronet above the pinched face of the little Queen, but the money-box rattled ceaselessly before the passers-by.

'Tis a long journey from the glad lads and lassies of the village green, and a yet longer one, maybe, to the happy Commonwealth of the future. Many Carpenters, many Walter Cranes are needed to bring back beauty and the joy of living into the souls of the people. To watch the faces of these city children, as they tramped through the cheerless streets, was to realise how they have been robbed and maimed. Wistful faces there were, faces cunning and sly, faces stupid and vacant, faces wearing every expression save that which one associates with children—the expression of innocent gladness.

That Maypole, with its one solitary ribbon for a grimy hand to clutch, is symbolic of the cramped and tortured souls of these mites—a silent witness to the tragedy of the lives of the children of the poor.

BESSIE WARD.

MENDELISM.

More and more does the sociologist realise the close connection that exists between the various branches of modern science: cosmology, physics, atomistic dynamics, chemistry, biology, the history of our planet, natural history, anthropology, ethics, and sociology. More and more precisely the Anarchist Communist ideal shows a tendency to strengthen its position as a scientific theory, as a fundamental branch of human knowledge, which pervades all the other branches as a logical and necessary conclusion which no genuine scientist can evade. In his remarkable work, "Modern Science and Anarchism," Comrade Kropotkin has given us a historical synopsis of that movement of thought unparalleled in the history of the human race. Owing to the improvement of the inductive and deductive methods in Natural Philosophy, all the recesses in science which remained in darkness up to the present day begin to appear in broad daylight. The sphinx begins to reveal its secrets, and no doubt in a few decades the territory of the unknown will be considerably reduced. I am confident that, one day or the other, some one among us will be enabled to build for Natural Philosophy some kind of popular cyclopaedia similar to that which Elisée Reclus succeeded in doing for our own planet.

While awaiting the day when that great synthetic monument will be raised, we notice here and there in some Radical and Rationalist periodicals a curious tendency to reject every philosophical idea based upon this logical and positive ground, while their leading writers do not hesitate to follow the wrong scents in their excursions through the field of modern science. In the *R.P.A. Annual* for 1909, Mr. McCabe dared write that each atom of hydrogen "is a spacious world in which 1,000 electrons spin round, at enormous distances relatively to their size, at a speed of over 100,000 miles a second." Is not this quite fanciful and irrational? Is not this as miraculous as the Christian miracles which are fought by that new church? Indeed, it is a great pity for us not to be able to have our say about it, for we strongly believe we have in store a quantity of truths quite sufficient to drive out that dreadful religious education with which the English and American brains are saturated.

It is a curious fact that the so-called "Socialists," who declare themselves to be so abhorrent of "Utopian dreams and Anarchistic speculation," show similar clumsiness while dealing with scientific theories. Wanting some principles corroborating his revolutionary views, the editor of *Wilshire's Magazine* has loudly advocated and patronised Mendel's theory, not only as the rational way to get "geniuses," but also as the biological analogies of the changes which happen to take place in human society. Of course, we proclaim as perfectly scientific and rational the idea that the coming change from capitalism to true Socialism, from slavery to freedom, will occur through some violent and revolutionary process which will alter from top to bottom the whole of our social structure, as well as our daily life and activities. We also duly recognise that similar phenomena can be noticed in the whole of organic life and in the geological metamorphoses which prevailed in the past on the surface of our planet. But, in the field of natural philosophy, as well as in that of history or any other branch of human knowledge, if we care to select only valuable and well-authenticated facts, we do so with the purpose of studying them with the acuteness and clear-sightedness of the true scientist. If we consider Anarchist Communism as the only scientific theory of human life, we affirm that we are led to think so through both inductive and deductive methods of reasoning. To us, then, the question runs like this: Is the Mendelian theory of Mutation, such as has been worked out by De Vries, destructive of the Darwinian theory of Evolution? Is Mendelism, such as has been lately spread abroad by R. C. Punnett and advocated by Gaylord Wilshire and others, a full, logical, satisfactory theory of the revolutions which take place in organic life?

* *

Indeed, it can be admitted that the work of Gregor Mendel has furnished the hybridisers with the very clue they wanted for their experiments. In Mr. Punnett's book on "Mendelism," tables are found which may be admitted as convenient "schemas" showing how forces or impulses starting from a couple of generators are transmitted and segregated from generation to generation. Possessing a definite number of seeds or fowls, we can foretell in what proportion some characters will reappear in each succeeding generation, how many recessives or dominants, pure or impure subjects, we will get in the offspring. Nevertheless, these tables have a dead, rigid, geometric appearance, and do not show the considerable differences in degree which are noticed in the multitudinous mutations which take place in the two realms of life. They do not enable us to foretell if a character which is not possessed by both parents must appear again in their offspring. After having studied Mendelism, we remain as ignorant as before regarding the very nature of Life. We are as much in the dark as ever as to the tendency of every living species or individual to adapt itself to its environment in order to survive and perpetuate itself in the future. As Mr. Punnett avows in his book, how and why these mutations arise is the great outstanding problem in Biology.

What can be advanced now regarding Mendelism is that it looks like an additional chapter to Darwin's "Origin of Species." Far from cancelling the work of Darwin, the experiments made by Mendel and De Vries are confirmative and complementary to it. With the help of these experiments, Professor L. Errera has been enabled to classify the

many variations to be perceived in organised life. Variations produced by crossings are called by him *alterations*. Those which are impressed upon an organism by the outer world, he calls *modifications*. The small differences in number or size which may be seen in the same organ in the many individuals of a species are labelled as *fluctuations*. And what he calls *mutations* are the recent and unexpected characters which appear suddenly in the offspring of an animal or plant. In fact, whatever may be the special name to be given a variation, it is always a mutation—that is to say, a sudden change, large or small, or an accumulation of small mutations through a certain length of time. Being above all a dynamic phenomenon, an always-moving and ever-changing concourse of forces, Life never remains alike in itself, and never does the new-born cell resemble exactly the parent cell from which it sprang. Always and everywhere there is change, mutation, revolutionary evolution in living substance. When the conditions of life are varying in the environment of a species, correlative alterations must occur in the form, character, and mode of life of that species, in order that it may victoriously support the change and adapt itself to its new existence. The individuals whose evolution is the most rapid and radical are those who have the best chances to survive and perpetuate themselves. Here we are led again towards the famous Darwinian principle which has been so much spoken of and discussed: the survival of the fittest; and of course, towards its complement, that instinctive sociability which has been noticed in a considerable number of animal or vegetable species, and to which Comrade Kropotkin has given the beautiful name of Mutual Aid.

* *

In conclusion, Professor Punnett hints that the Mendelian principle of gametic segregation must apply to Man, "the most complex of living forms," as it applies to numerous cases in the whole realm of life. And he goes on advancing that these matters must be taken into account by the human race for its own sake. For him, permanent progress is a question of breeding rather than of pedagogics. Seeing life only through his own theory and special branch of knowledge, he does not understand that permanent progress is something more than a mere question of mating. Like any other animal, the human being is a very complex frame, structure, and organism, slowly modelled by its natural environment through the course of the centuries; it is a brain also, a deep-thinking and reasoning being, whose psychic activities are infinitely diverse and varying. What is the fate of the Mendel law in the presence of these multitudinous ideas which are unceasingly generated by the brain of man? What will become of it when these exquisite feelings which naturally spring up from our human hearts will have the opportunity to expand unrestricted? When a society of Freedom and Solidarity will be reached, its members will, before all, care to unite with regard to their mutual affinities. For my own part, I dare say that I feel strongly repellant to submitting my "Ego" to any other law than that of my inward sympathies and preferences. When love and affection speak in the heart of man, the law of the breeder seems to him as oppressive and tyrannical as any law made by our Governments. Instead of wasting one's time in selecting beautiful human standards for mating, would it not be better and more advisable for everybody to modify radically the economic and social conditions around us, and pull down once for all that nefarious organisation which degrades and brings to an untimely end the best human units which come to life?

* *

Always and everywhere the process of Life presents itself as a considerable succession of revolutionary evolutions. It is not only the Mendelian theory and the experiments made by De Vries which show us unceasing changes in Nature. It is the whole of Transformism; it is the whole of Natural Philosophy. Starting from the notion of atoms as unequal units of substance, already endowed with a dull, rudimentary life, limiting themselves by their surfaces, and opposing their forces by constantly vying with one another, we clearly understand that Life is, before all, a dynamic phenomenon, in which the slowest and smallest variation is yet an atomistic or molecular revolution. From the "dead" mineral to the highest psychic qualities to be found in the human race, we recognise only one substance, which through an indefinite number of metamorphoses may transmute itself into the whole series of physical, biological, and psychical possible states.

ARISTIDE PRATELLE.

BJORNSTERNE BJORNSON.

Björnson died recently in Paris. A few years ago his two great countrymen, Grieg and Ibsen, preceded him, and now the last of the grand old men of the North has gone. Not only Norway, but the whole of Europe has lost in him one of its most advanced writers and daring fighters for liberty. Though taking an active part in international affairs, he remained always a thorough Norwegian; and once when it was reported that, tired of the political ferment in his country, for which he was largely responsible, he intended to go and live in Munich, he wrote: "I shall live right here in Norway, I shall thrash and be thrashed in Norway, I shall win and die in Norway—of this you may be sure." His life and work was a brilliant example of true internationalism, which does not mean the attempt to efface the characteristics, and even existence, of a nationality, however small, but

to respect and defend its right to peacefully develop along its own lines.

Björnson was born in 1832, the son of a pastor of a small church. In his earlier days he was mostly interested in moral and religious problems, but when abroad he became acquainted with the ideas of Darwin, Spencer, Mill, and Taine; and his activity broadened and took more a social and political character. He used his art in the service of his ideas, and produced some powerful moral dramas as "The Bankrupt," in which he exposed the lack of honour in the financial world; in "A Glove" he boldly pleaded for equal standards of morality of the sexes. For some time he was a manager of theatres in Bergen, Christiania, and proved the power of the drama for moral reform. Later he took a most active part in the life of his country as a social reformer; he led the national Radical Party, and strongly favoured the separation of Norway from Sweden.

He was born with the old Viking spirit of combat in his blood, and though in later years the sharp edges of his antagonism had somewhat worn off, till the last he remained in the foremost ranks of fighters for freedom.

George Brandes, the famous Danish critic, says of him:—"By nature Björnson is half chieftain, half poet, combining in his personality those two most striking figures of ancient Norway, the chief and the skald. By turn of thought he is half tribune, half lay preacher, his public utterances being distinguished by a combination of the political and the religious earnestness of his countrymen, and this in a more marked degree after than before his secession from orthodoxy. Since his apostasy he has been more markedly the missionary, the reformer. He was a leader of the people, forcible and masterly. He was a strong orator, full of appeal, stirring the people; one of them, side by side, sharing their own legendary lore and domestic traditions."

With Björnson passes away not only a great citizen of his country and of the world, but a great man and writer who never used his pen "from a trivial purpose or with a depressing idea."

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

France.

This year the First of May demonstrations have been much more numerous and better attended than usual, probably because the First fell on a Sunday. With the exception of France, where they tried to give the day its original character of a revolutionary and economic demonstration, it has everywhere degenerated into a political parade or a holiday.

In Paris, the Confederation of Labour had organised a monster demonstration in the Bois de Boulogne, with a procession home through the aristocratic streets and great boulevards. All seemed to run smoothly, when various rumours began to circulate among the workers that the Government intended to deal a definite blow at the Revolutionary Syndicalist movement by preparing a sanguinary meeting of the troops and demonstrators. Thirty thousand soldiers had been mobilised, supplied with ball cartridge, and ordered to occupy the Bois de Boulogne. Besides, the principal points of Paris and suburbs were kept by troops, and the whole of the police force was astir.

During the night of April 30, two of the mobilised soldiers climbed over the wall of their barracks and warned one of the editors of the *Guerre Sociale* that the troops had received the order to fire on the crowd without stopping once the command had been given. The officers had tried to convince the soldiers that they would have before them, not peaceful demonstrators, but Apaches armed with revolvers and prepared to shoot.

The same information was received from an official of a Ministry. Alarmed by these sinister preparations, the organisers of the demonstration decided to give up the plan. But first they sought an interview with Briand, the Prime Minister, who haughtily informed them that he prohibited the demonstration. It is difficult to judge whether the organisers did right or not in abandoning their plan. The *Guerre Sociale* in several articles speaks of a defeat and retreat, and thinks that all these Government preparations were only meant to frighten the workers from taking part in the demonstration. Anyhow, this prohibition of the Government once again has clearly shown what the workers may expect from a Socialist Minister.

In Paris various meetings were held in halls, at which over 80,000 workers assisted and protested against this new proof of Governmental oppression. In other French towns all passed off without accident. In Dunkirk after the First of May the factories and workshops remained deserted for three days, in spite of cavalry charges, arrests and threats.

The *Voix du Peuple* (May 22), speaking of these facts, says: "From all these events we must draw a lesson. We must intensify our anti-militarist propaganda if in future demonstrations we wish to see the Army, not against us, but with us." Commenting on the strike in the building trade in Dunkirk which preceded the First of May demonstration, the same paper adds: "The significant fact, announced officially, that the 33rd Regiment had to be removed from the scene of the strike because the soldiers fraternised with the population, shows that our antimilitarist propaganda begins to bear fruit."

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

MORE ABOUT BOYS' BRIGADES AND BOY SCOUTS.

I am in hot water. The leaflet on Boys' Brigades and Boy Scouts has caused a flutter amongst my young friends. They are highly indignant because I have dared to suggest that these precious organisations are for anything but good. They tell me that they have been instituted to promote Christianity, to develop manliness in lads, to give the fullest development of bodily energy generally, and not, as I say, to train boys to become soldiers.

Well, my young friends, as to promoting Christianity, there is not the shadow of a doubt that they will do so. Past history tells us that Christianity has developed by the aid of the sword and rifle, and incidentally by the thumbscrew and the stake; and I have no reason to believe that Christianity will materially develop by any other form in the future. But as for these organisations being in existence to develop manliness and not to encourage the martial spirit, with that I firmly disagree. You are taught to handle a rifle, to "prepare to receive cavalry," "form fours," and everything and anything that pertains to things military. You are only *playing* at soldiers, but in so doing you are receiving instructions, very often from soldiers, as to the best method to murder your fellow creatures, with whose comradeship you have all to gain and nothing to lose. You are trained in a silly Jingoism to glorify things tyrannical and bloody, which will deaden your sense of reasoning and justice.

That the whole thing stinks of militarism there is not the shadow of a doubt. It is the thing, *the thing itself*, that rams the answer down your throat. And you tell me that it is manly to be in these organisations. Is it manly to run hither and thither at the command of some silly chump of an officer? Is it manly to allow yourselves to be led by the nose by any animal who may be placed over you? Is it manly to train yourselves as machines of slaughter? Ye gods! do you call this manliness? By these methods they will soon crush the manliness out of you. They will school you in submission. They will bind you in straps and rag-tags with a thousand orders and obligations to obey. If you say this will teach you manliness, what do you mean by manliness? I have watched these Boy Scouts meandering about, I have seen the "bulldog" of the corps "bossing the show," and the whole affair struck me as being a training-school for hooligans and not the training-school for manly boys with independent thoughts and actions.

No, my young friends, you have not been overlooked in this mad rush for soldiers. England has not forgotten you. News comes to hand that Russia has approved of the Boy Scout movement, and is adopting the same method of arming her boys and girls. Russia, a country which one always associates with prisons, police, whips, and massacres; and her poverty-stricken workers are taking a lesson from our glorious (!) Empire. And so you are to be trained to obey the whims of any Government that may be in power for the moment. You are taught to hate the German, to hate the Frenchman, to hate the Spaniard, and; above all, to protect the interest of that class which will oppress you in your struggle for a living.

Let me impress upon you the necessity of remembering that you are the children of the workers. The greater number of you will know what it is to lack food, clothing, and shelter. You will know how hard it is for your parents to provide for household needs. You will know that the children of the French worker, the German worker, and the Spanish worker are comrades in a similar plight to yourselves. Why? Because a few rich men have the means of production and distribution of food and clothing in their hands. It is these men who wish you to be soldiers. It is these men who grind you down to the uttermost farthing, who sap the life-blood of thousands of workers in their factories and filthy slums before they reach manhood. This is the animal which is your enemy. If you say we must have war, then let us start with the oppressors in this country. Instead of fostering a hatred of your fellow slaves in other countries, make it your business to strike an effective blow at the gold-heaping monsters who oppress you here.

Just recently we celebrated May Day—the Workers' Day—the day when the workers of the world come together and loudly protest against all tyranny and oppression. Let us hope before many more May Days pass by that they will realise the power they have in waging war against their oppressors by means of a general strike. For there is nothing more terrifying to the smug, respectable parasites than a general rising of the workers. But what of the soldier's position in the event of such a crisis? He is the man who will dampen your ardour with a bullet. He is the man who will play the blackleg—the most contemptible situation to which an individual can sink. He is the man who has been hired to play the spy, the traitor, and all those disgusting emissaries which are quickly unmasked on the day of industrial warfare.

'Tis pity, 'tis true, that the workers feed the Army with their sons. 'Tis a pity, because the soldier's business is a dirty business; and the Boy Scouts and Brigade Boys are apprentices in the dirty business.

DICK JAMES.

PROPAGANDA NOTES.

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

BRADFORD.

On May Day a procession was formed in Rawson Square, with the usual bands and banners, and a circuitous route was taken to the waste ground at the bottom of Morley Street, where a large crowd assembled. The Bradford comrades determined to open a meeting to the waiting ones, and espouse the cause of Anarchism. So Comrade Drake opened on a pitch he had held for two years, a declivity on the ground making an excellent platform; and he thought it would be becoming to open once again, even on the First of May. But after a ten minutes' speech by this strenuous old fighter, whom the crowds always enjoy listening to, the bands and banners arrived, making on the whole a grotesque display entirely unfitted for serious men. Then it was that organised rushes were made three times on the Anarchists, at their back, making them, of course, scuttle down the declivity for a moment, but only to return each time and continue the meeting. The crowd finally resented this hooliganism and a fight commenced, but the Anarchists held their pitch. Yes, the feeble band, the few, commanded the respect of the people, and our speakers kept cool.

But we were to be luckier still that day, for after some time members of the Industrialist League approached, courteously inviting us to their waggon at the very top of the ground, enabling us to view the whole range of things, thus giving us the biggest meeting in Bradford on that May Day afternoon. (It appeared that the Industrialist League speakers had not turned up, so they utilised ours as kindred spirits.) All our FREEDOMS were sold, and the meeting was continued half an hour after all the others were over. Comrades Pollock and John Hoyle, from Halifax, did not forget, on this new vantage ground, to reproach the fakirs and their hooligan followers for their rudeness, in a manner that made some of them hang their heads in shame.

The evening meeting, though not so large, was serious; and after trenchant addresses from Drake and Pollock, Comrade Hoyle delivered a splendid speech on antimilitarism, the crowd being deeply interested in the actual experience of our comrade, who had been a soldier, and therefore knew what he was talking about. I am convinced that the movement will hear more of this young fellow later.

Altogether it was a First of May that will be remembered for a long time by Bradford comrades. We had a strong platform and brave speakers.

DAVE.

NORWICH.

We have had another visit from Comrade Turner which was, if possible, more successful than either of the two previous ones. The Labour Church was again at our disposal, its members sharing the expenses with us. A convivial was held on the Saturday evening, and a most enjoyable time was spent by members and friends. As the need of a room is so much felt, there is a desire on the part of the group to again have premises of their own, a matter we are now considering.

On Sunday afternoon Turner's subject was "The Revolt of Labour." He showed the fallacy of the concentration of capital theory and its consequent conclusion, namely, that the workers by their ever-increasing numbers would eventually be able to easily outvote their middle-class exploiters, who, through the supposed law of the concentration of capital into fewer and fewer hands, would soon be reduced to much smaller numbers. He then dealt with past revolts of the workers; how apparently failing at the time, they in the end succeed, as the masters, not caring to meet a second attempt by the workers, take care to remove the conditions that caused the first. He claimed that all our liberties, small as they are, have been obtained through revolt and the fighting spirit of the people. He concluded by comparing the gains that Labour had secured by Trade Union effort in the shape of strikes, etc., and the millions of pounds that had accrued to them in wages as a consequence. What, he asked, had they obtained from Parliament through their votes? Questions were put to him at the close, one friend affirming his belief in the concentration of capital theory, instancing Canada as evidence of its truth. Another asked whether Trade Unionism, through its raising of wages, induced employers to make use of more machinery and so cause unemployment. To the first Turner replied that he had not seen the facts re Canada, but would be pleased to do so; and if it was as our friend stated, then it would certainly be an isolated case, as it did not apply to the United States or Europe. To the second questioner he answered in the affirmative, but added that there was nothing to stop Trade Unionists from reducing the hours of labour and so reabsorbing their unemployed.

His subject in the evening was quite new. The lecture, "Woman: Past, Present, and Future," was one of those addresses which, unless reported verbatim, could not be done justice to. Suffice it to say that it concerned woman's position and her subservience to man and society from the earliest period to the present time. He did not think that woman's economic dependence was a sufficient reason to explain her enslavement to man, as many women who are economically independent of man are as much slaves as those women who are less fortunate. Tradition had much more to do with it. Neither did he think that extending the franchise to her would be a step nearer her freedom. He declared that whenever woman had freely associated with man and shared his ideas, she had become more intellectual and had been imbued with a more independent spirit. Unfortunately for herself, she often stands in the way of her own emancipation, as where man had sometimes endeavoured to raise her to a higher level by inducing her to take more interest in matters that concern the life and well-being of the people, she had discouraged the attempt. Further, that in most cases where a man had ceased to wish to be the lord of his wife, she had taken it as a sign of weakness on his part, and was inclined to take up the rod that he had laid down and herself become the ruler. There were many other points dealt with equally interesting, some of them of a delicate nature; but the lecturer handled these in a very able manner, and I think it safe to say that in an audience where the sexes were evenly balanced very few, if any, went home with their sense of modesty offended. He concluded with an extract from Grant Allen's "The Woman Who Did." It was a most courageous address and an intellectual treat, and well appreciated by the majority of the audience, one lady personally thanking him for the

WANTED.—Second-hand copy of "The Ego and Its Own," by Max Stirner.—Offers to be sent to F. C., care of T. Keell, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W.

address at the close. Coming from a woman of education and refinement, it was certainly a tribute to him and his subject. Questions and an interesting discussion followed. In answer to one question, the lecturer said the tie of two people's love was sufficient for them to mate, and any other tie was unnecessary; if love should end on the part of one or both, then they should no longer remain together.

John Turner has done us a deal of good by his last visit, as it has helped to destroy a lot of prejudice that existed concerning our principles. The Labour Church members were kind and courteous to us, for which we again tender them our sincere thanks and appreciation. A. B.

LIVERPOOL INTERNATIONAL MODERN SCHOOL.

The funeral of our late comrade William Jones took place at Smithdown Road cemetery on April 27. There was a great number of comrades, students, and teachers gathered at the graveside. Mat Kavanagh delivered a fitting oration on behalf of the Anarchist movement and the school.

During the month we have had a surprise visit from Comrade Jack McAra, of Edinburgh. On two successive Sundays Mac held meetings at Wellington Column. We had our comrade at school on May 8, and our young comrades were all attentive to the vivid contrasts of society drawn by Mac's artistic elocution. On May 15, at the Column, Mac discoursed upon the King's death from an Anarchist standpoint, much to the delight of a "grief-stricken" people. If Mac should ever visit your town, ask him to tell the story of the late King Edward VII. fighting fearful odds in a sham fight at Aldershot. Mac soon finds the grip of his audience, and has reduced his oratory to a fine art. To hold an audience for two or three hours at a stretch is one of his accomplishments.

McAra left us and travelled on to Belfast, where he arrived on May 19, and spoke on the Custom House Steps on the following Sunday. He had a good reception. He got a job the day he arrived, but when he went to start on Monday morning, he was told he could not do so. It appears that the police warned all the cork shops against starting him. That night (Monday) he had to leave Belfast, and he travelled to Glasgow, where he is now holding meetings with our comrade Barrett.

Owing to infectious disease in the neighbourhood of our school, we have thought it advisable to disband the young comrades until the summer months are over. In the meantime the elder of them intend to go rambling. We have a fine opportunity to distribute leaflets. If any comrade who has a supply lying idle will let us have them, we have willing hands. Our funds are low, and leaflet propaganda is at a premium. Donations: School 4s, B. Black 2s.

DICK JAMES.

International Club, Spekeld Buildings, 22 Canning Place.

LEEDS.

The First of May demonstration had favourable weather. Seven organisations with eleven banners marched through the streets, attended by two bands playing military and religious airs. On Woodhouse Moor there were five platforms for Parliamentary action and one for Direct Action and General Strike (commonly known as bomb-throwers). Our speakers stated their case very clearly, which so annoyed the members of the S.D.P. that they did their best to make a disturbance, one of them adopting Direct Action and threatening to use his fists against McAra, who was speaking for us. This may be a good method for hooligans, but I expected something more "scientific" from the S.D.P. Otherwise there is nothing particular to mention. They passed the usual resolution, but it is clear that it is a body without a soul. The so-called Socialists and Socialism have parted. Hooliganism will not mend the broken cord.

In conclusion, I may say that we have a very good field for propaganda. We are selling literature and distributing leaflets, but we are short of speakers; so, comrades, step forward and give us your assistance in our hard struggle.

D. M. F.

MAY DAY IN HYDE PARK.

As May Day fell on a Sunday, the demonstration was attended by many thousands, the procession from the Thames Embankment being the largest for some years. Numerous Anarchist speakers addressed very large crowds from two platforms provided by the "Workers' Friend" Club and the Federation of Jewish Trade Unions. The speakers were attentively listened to, the keen and witty criticism of the Parliamentary parties being much to the liking of the people. If the Labour Party had been a fighting party, it would have been fought tooth and nail by the Government, whether Liberal or Tory; but it had made itself so nice and pleasant in Parliament that the Government had been able to swallow it at one gulp, the only sign of it left being a slight swelling of the Liberal majority. Consequently, it was pointed out, Direct Action was the surest way of sweeping away the present system of exploitation and tyranny. We distributed 8,000 of our new leaflet, "What is Anarchism?" besides bundles of FREEDOM back numbers, and the increased demand for literature since shows that it has stimulated a study of Anarchism which will lead to a great increase in our ranks.

WALTHAMSTOW.

We have been well in the fight during the last two months, holding meetings at Edmonton Green on Sunday mornings, at West Green Corner, Tottenham, on Sunday evenings, and at Hoe Street Station on Wednesday evenings. Our comrade Ponder also went to Regent's Park one Sunday afternoon and gave a helping hand to that energetic fighter, comrade Greenbourn. Our comrade Baron has now developed into a good speaker, and comrade Crittal is following in his footsteps by taking the platform to get an audience together. On May 25 we had comrade Ray to speak for us at Hoe Street. Crittal and Ponder spoke first, and got a good audience so far as numbers went; but some of the crowd did not like the speakers' comparison of the life of a king and that of a wage-slave, and some of them objected so much that they talked about using Direct Action, but sang "God Save the King" instead. I am rather doubtful whether their request will be granted. The capitalist press has done its work so well that the crowd were unmoved by the picture which Ray by his eloquence placed before them of the agony of our fellow workers at Whitehaven bricked up in the burning mine, and of the terrible sufferings of their wives and children. But they were only working men and women, so the papers had no deep black lines, nor column after column, yard after yard of sympathy for them; they were only producers of wealth, only wage-slaves, not parasites or kings.

W. FANNER.

WALTHAMSTOW AND EDMONTON ANARCHIST GROUP.

Meetings are held every Sunday at Edmonton Green at 12 o'clock, at West Green Corner, Tottenham, every Sunday evening at 7 o'clock, and opposite Hoe Street Station, Walthamstow, every Wednesday evening at 8 o'clock.

NEWCASTLE ANARCHIST CLUB.

Meetings are held every Tuesday evening at 7 o'clock, in Hall's Café, 37 Pilgrim Street. Correspondence should be sent to Secretary, care of D. C. Thompson, 160 Conyers Road, Byker, Newcastle.

GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP.

Comrades Barrett and McAra are holding meetings on Sundays at Goel Square, at 7.30 p.m.; and on Wednesdays at Cathedral Square, at 8 p.m. Local comrades please note.

To Correspondents.

D. KENNEDY.—Too late; reports should reach us not later than the 25th.

Glad to hear of the good work being done.

BRISTOL SOCIALIST.—Too late. Will insert next month.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

(April 8—April 28.)

FREEDOM *Guarantee Fund*.—H. Glasse 10s 6d, F. C. 2s, S. S. 2s, A Friend 6d, B. Phelps 3s 6d, Essex 3s, A. McL. 1s, Leeds Anarchist Group 5s, Collected at Leeds by B. G.—H. Lipman 1s, S. Badansky 1s, Alexander 1s, S. G. 1s, D. M. Finburg 1s, J. Hiron 6d, M. C. 6d, N. C. 6d, G. B. 6d, Gavzy 3d, B. Kaufman 6d; total 7s 3d.

FREEDOM *Subscriptions*.—G. Ronner 1s 8d, J. Neil 1s 6d, G. Desser 1s 6d, S. Kaban 2s 6d, A. McL. 1s 6d, H. av Z. 1s 6d.

Frank Kitz *Fund*.—Gosling 1s 6d, F. Olson 1s, Anonymous 5s.

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. 1d.

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.

ANARCHISM AND MALTHUS. By C. L. JAMES. 2d.

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 GREAT FRENCH REVOLUTION, 1789—1793. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 6s. net.

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.