

Freedom

JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM

VOL. XXIV.—No. 255.

JULY, 1910.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

NOTES.

The Commune and the Children.

It is often asked: "Who would care for the children in a free or Anarchist commune? What would you do with those mothers who are callous or indifferent about their babies?" It must be admitted that such women exist, but of all the follies under the sun the worst would be to try to compel a woman to be "loving and devoted" to children—her own or others. Such a thing is not possible. If it were, the result for the children would be disastrous. Fortunately, the world has always had people with hearts big enough to care for the little ones, even while Governments (as was the case in England a hundred years ago) were sacrificing them, body and soul, to the greed of the capitalist with a barbarity unparalleled. But to come back to the present day. One answer to the above comes from Wakefield, where an organisation known as the "Babies' Welcome" has been doing—quite voluntarily—splendid work for the children. It has been initiated by Miss Boileau, who had the good sense to understand that the feeding of the mother both before and after childbirth had momentous results for the child's chance of living and growing strong. This little society of voluntary workers has very limited means, so it works on co-operative lines rather than philanthropic. And what has it been able to achieve? Well, in 1900 infantile mortality in Wakefield stood at 200 per 1,000; for the last five years it has been reduced to 119.6 per 1,000. And it is publicly admitted that this voluntary organisation has had the greatest share in bringing about this result. All this, too, in the midst of a vicious capitalist system. What could not be done when that system is removed, and human energy is free to work for the common good?

A Magistrate on Marriage.

"The people who said that marriage was indissoluble were both pious and cruel, and he did not want to have anything to do with them. Human nature could not stand it and would not stand it, and laws ought to be made to suit human nature as it was and not as we wanted it to be." Not bad for a magistrate! Mr. Cecil Chapman spoke thus to the Women's Freedom League at Caxton Hall, and we hope the ladies thought the matter over. It would be more useful exercise than fighting for the vote. But what sounds so very odd in Mr. Chapman's method of reasoning is the idea that laws are to be made to "suit human nature." If a law could possibly be made to suit human nature, it would be unnecessary, because human nature as it is only needs to be free to be a "law unto itself," and the matter is settled. Law—that is to say, statute law—is, however, something quite different. It is a thing made by some people to be forced upon others. Hence the trouble in the world.

"Civilised" Barbarians.

There are many stupendous contradictions in the present day that "need investigating," so probably the following incident may not arouse more than the average amount of astonishment. The facts were given in the *Westminster Gazette* of June 18, and are to the effect that in Mississippi a "coloured" man named Curl having sent an insulting note to a white woman, one Miller went at the head of a posse to arrest him, and was shot by Curl. Thereupon the friends and neighbours of Miller arrested the negro and asked the brother of the dead man to state his wishes with regard to his punishment. The brother expressed himself as follows: "I told them I did not believe in brutality, nor did I approve of the mutilation of bodies by torture or slow burning, but I'd like to have the privilege accorded me of making the first pull on the rope after the negro was ready for hanging to a tree." The good man was permitted this act of grace, and he wrote to various Southern newspapers to say: "I wish you would please state that the lynching of Elmo Curl, at Mastodon,

Mississippi, was a most orderly affair, conducted by the bankers, lawyers, farmers, and merchants of that county. The best people of the county—as good as the best anywhere—simply met and hanged Curl without a sign of rowdyism." Observe that the bankers, lawyers, and merchants were the ringleaders in this "lawless" act of lynching, and they must be constantly prosecuting and punishing people for "breaking the law." And they were surely Christians: they always are. Moreover, they seem to have followed the gospel according to Roosevelt; and in spite of their "lawlessness," he will no doubt regard them—being middle-class people, and not Trade Unionists—as very desirable citizens. But what is it all leading to? Is Rooseveltism, now so popular, going to turn the whole world into an armed camp?

A Forlorn Hope.

Our old comrade Domela Nieuwenhuis writes to us from Amsterdam in reference to the strike of masons and builders in that city. When the strike had lasted twenty-five weeks, and it was felt that some financial help would turn the scales in the strikers' favour, a letter was sent by the leaders to Mr. John Burns asking for help now that his salary had reached £5,000 per annum, and reminding him of his old-time sympathy with strike movements. Of course, our friends in Amsterdam were only joking with Burns, and never expected any result—in which they were not disappointed, since no answer was received. It seems really beside the mark to attack Burns over his salary, especially on the part of those here in England who would gladly follow in his steps. No, the evil of the whole business does not lie in the fact that he absorbs so much money from the State, but that he should have deserted the revolutionary cause for the political lie which inevitably means the betrayal of the workers. It is the first step that costs; all else follows quite logically. At the same time we may recall what Plimsoll said years ago of the rich helping the poor: "Riches seem in so many cases to smother the manliness of their possessors, and their sympathies become, not so much narrowed as—so to speak—stratified." Yes, stratified, then fossilised, and then the class distinction is complete.

The Worker and his "Duty."

Is the wage system just? Does the worker only give that amount of labour force which is accounted for in pounds, shillings, and pence? Ridiculous! He is always giving more—even his life. Henry Rowden, aged 18, messenger at Queen Street Station, Exeter, was recently so terribly injured by some trucks that he died a few hours after. When he was picked up in a dying condition, he could only say: "Look after that message, it's very important." We are not told what his wages were, but probably even an Anti-Socialist would admit that he "earned his money."

Anarchist Newspaper Offices Destroyed.

The *Temps Nouveaux* for June 25 gives the latest details of the fighting that has taken place in Buenos Ayres during the celebration of the centenary of the Argentine Republic. It was begun by the sons of the capitalist and middle classes, aided by students and police. They attacked and burned the offices of the *Protesta*, the *Batalla*, and the *Vanguardia*. All presses and machines were destroyed, and the pamphlets and papers burned, except those saved by some young people, even children, who distributed them amongst the crowd with cries of "Long live Anarchy!" Some groups of workers soon arrived armed with revolvers, and many skirmishes took place, ending in the flight of the well-to-do rowdies, who lost some killed and many wounded. After this a general strike was declared, 95 per cent. of the workers coming out. In spite of 30,000 soldiers, everything is at a standstill; and the authorities in their rage are passing all sorts of ridiculous laws which will do nothing to end the trouble. The *Protesta* is now being printed at Montevideo.

MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

IX.

THE ANARCHIST IDEAL AND THE PRECEDING REVOLUTIONS.

Anarchism, as we have already said, arises from the course taken by practical life.

Godwin, contemporary of the Great Revolution of 1789-93, had seen with his own eyes how the authority of the Government, created during the Revolution and by the Revolution itself, had in its turn become an obstacle to the development of the revolutionary movement. He was also aware of what went on in England under cover of Parliament: the pillage of communal lands, the sale of advantageous posts, the hunting of the children of the poor and their removal from workhouses, by agents who travelled all over England for the purpose, to the factories of Lancashire, where masses of them soon perished. And Godwin soon understood that a Government, were it even that of the Jacobin "One and Indivisible Republic," would never be able to accomplish the necessary Social, Communistic Revolution; that a Revolutionary Government, by virtue of its being a guardian of the State, and of the privileges every State has to defend, soon becomes a hindrance to the Revolution. He understood and openly proclaimed the idea that for the triumph of the Revolution men must first get rid of their faith in Law, Authority, Unity, Order, Property, and other institutions inherited from past times when their forefathers were slaves.

The second Anarchist theorist, Proudhon, who came after Godwin, lived through the Revolution of 1848. He was able to see with his own eyes the crimes committed by the Republican Government, and at the same time convince himself of the impotence of Louis Blanc's State Socialism. Under the recent impression of what he had seen during the Revolution of 1848, he wrote his powerful work, "General Idea on the Revolution," in which he boldly proclaimed Anarchism and the abolition of the State.

And lastly, in the International Working Men's Association the Anarchist conception also asserted itself after a Revolution—that is, after the Paris Commune of 1871. The complete revolutionary impotence of the Council of the Commune, although it contained, in a very just proportion, representatives of all the revolutionary parties of that time: Jacobins, Blanquists, and Internationalists; and the incapacity of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association, which was sitting in London, and its silly, harmful pretensions to govern the Parisian movement by orders issued from England; both these lessons opened the eyes of a great number. They led several Federations of the International, and several of its prominent members, including Bakunin, to meditate on the harmfulness of every kind of authority, even when it is elected with as much freedom as that of the Commune or that of the Workers' International.

Some months later, the decision taken by the General Council of the International at a private meeting convened in London in 1871, instead of an annual Congress, made the dangers of a Government in the International still more evident. By this baneful resolution the forces of the Association, which up till then gathered together for an economic, revolutionary struggle, for the direct action of the Labour Unions against the Capitalism of employers, were to engage in an electoral, political, and Parliamentary movement, which could but waste and destroy their real forces.

This resolution brought about open rebellion among the Latin Federations of the Association—Spanish, Italian, Jurassic, and partly Belgian—against the General Council; and from this rebellion dates the Anarchist movement which we see going on.

We thus see that the Anarchist movement was renewed each time it received an impression from some great practical lesson: it derived its origin from the teachings of life itself. But no sooner had it sprung up than it began to work out a general expression of its principles, and the theoretical and scientific basis of its teachings. Scientific—not in the sense of adopting an incomprehensible slang, or clinging to ancient metaphysics, but in the sense of finding a basis for its principles in the natural sciences of the time, and of becoming one of their departments.

* *

At the same time it worked out its own ideal.

No struggle can be successful if it is unconscious, if it has no definite and concrete aim. No destruction of existing things is possible if men have not already settled for themselves during the struggles that lead to the destruction, and during the period of destruction itself, what is going to take the place of that which is to be destroyed. Even a theoretical criticism of what exists is not possible without one picturing to oneself a more or less exact image of that which he desires to see in its place. Consciously or unconsciously, the *ideal*, the conception of some-

thing better, always grows in the mind of whoever criticises existing institutions.

It is the more so with men of action. To tell men: "Let us first destroy Capitalism and Autocracy, and then we shall see what we shall put in their stead," is but to deceive oneself and to deceive others. *Never has a real force been created by deception.* In fact, even the one who deprecates ideals and sneers at them always has, nevertheless, some conception of what he would like to see in lieu of what he is attacking. For example, while working to destroy Autocracy, some imagine an English or a German Constitution in the near future; others dream of a Republic subject perhaps to a powerful dictatorship of their party, or of a Monarchical Republic as in France, or a Federative Republic as in the United States; while there is now a third party which conceives a still greater limitation of State power, a still greater liberty for the cities, for the Communes, for the workers' Unions, and for all sorts of groups united among themselves by free, temporary federation, than can be obtained in any Republic.

And when people attack Capitalism, they always have a certain conception, a vague or definite idea, of what they hope to see in the place of Capitalism: State Capitalism, or some sort of State Communism, or a federation of free Communist associations for the production, the exchange, and the consumption of commodities.

Each party has thus its own conception of the future—its ideal which enables it to pronounce its own judgment on all facts occurring in the political and economic life of nations, and inspires it in its search for suitable means of action, in order the better to march towards its aim. It is, therefore, natural that Anarchism, although it has originated in every-day struggles, has also worked to elaborate its ideal. And this ideal, this aim, these plans, soon separated the Anarchists, in their means of action, from all political parties, as also, in a very great measure, from the Socialist parties which have thought it possible to keep the ancient Roman and Canonical idea of the State and to transport it into the future society of their dreams.

(To be continued.)

Pages of Socialist History.

By W. TCHERKESOFF.

CONCENTRATION OF CAPITAL.

III. (Continuation).

We repeat that the huge fortunes and profits of our time are not made by "the killing of small capitalists," but by cheapening the commodities and public services to such an extent that they come within the reach of everybody.

"Exploit each individual as little as possible, but increase their number as much as possible," is the motto of modern production and consumption.

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

In 1837 there were in England 2,000 miles of railway which carried 20,000,000 passengers; in 1906 there were 23,063 miles of railway carrying 1,286,883,341 passengers. The gross receipts from the passenger traffic in 1906 were £49,882,776, and the net profit was £18,955,426, which means that the average profit on each passenger was 3.4d. In order to have made the same profit in 1837, the average net profit on each passenger ought to have been 17s. 6d.

The tramways particularly demonstrate that a public service accessible to everybody requires an infinitely small amount from each passenger above the working expenses of the service in order to make a huge total profit. In 1906 there were in the United Kingdom 2,240 miles of tramway lines, with a gross receipt of £10,643,000 and a net profit of £3,807,425. The number of passengers was 2,236,012,777, which means that each passenger paid only 1.63 farthings above the actual cost of his travel. Pennies and farthings from each of the huge mass of passengers create the millions of pounds profit distributed among a few thousands of capitalists.

We see the same phenomenon in every branch of modern industry. Above all, the inventions in typography, which have given fabulous development to the daily press and to the book trade, give us evidence that the concentration, "the expropriation of the greater number of capitalists by the few," has not taken place in real life. Everybody knows that the number of booksellers is increasing, that the great newspapers are enriching their proprietors; but very few people understand the true reason of these things. The journals existing were in—

	England.	United States.	France.	Germany.	Entire World.
1840	439	1,210	776	305	4,016
1891	1,840	15,392	4,100	5,500	38,036

These 38,036 journals had an incredible circulation :—

England	issued monthly.....	150 millions.
United States	" "	230 "
France	" "	120 "
Germany	" "	140 "

The progress which the press has made since may be judged from the figures for the United States, which are the only ones to hand. In 1905 the newspapers and periodicals numbered 21,400 compared with 15,392 in 1891; the monthly issue of those journals has increased from 230 million to 647 million copies.

The proprietors are almost ten times more numerous, the writers receive higher remuneration, the compositors and all employees receive better wages, the price of the journals has diminished, and yet we know many journals which bring more profit than gold mines. A clever publisher, a fashionable writer, an artist, a popular musician, thanks to the number of copies of a cheap edition, becomes rich. For instance, in 1893 an English paper, the *Daily News*, said that the young composer Mascagni was already twice a millionaire. Sixty years ago the great Beethoven was dying of hunger in a garret. To-day millions of people play the melodies of "Cavalleria Rusticana," while the sonatas and symphonies of that great musical genius, Beethoven, were, during his lifetime, bought only by a few thousand connoisseurs who loved those divine pages.

What takes place in commerce and in the public services, in the book trade and in the daily press, takes place also in finance and in industry. If capitals are associated in some undertaking, it is not to deprive the capitalists of their capital, nor is it in order that "one capitalist should kill off many others." On the contrary, they unite to exploit the producers better, to realise a larger share of profit for each participant. We have seen also that the number of proprietors, of parasitical annuitants, has increased, and even tripled, in the last fifty years.

As regards finance and banking, I will confine myself to citing the statistics for the United States. My reason for this is that, as everybody knows, with the Americans banking and financial enterprises start up and disappear like mushrooms; besides, private fortunes, difficult to calculate, are created there more rapidly than in Europe. If the so-called "inevitable" law of the "expropriation of the greater number of capitalists by the few" were to show its effects, the United States would present the most favourable conditions. Yet the number of banks and the amount of their capitals are growing without cessation.

Here are the figures; they are eloquent :—

Year.	Number of Banks.	Capitals in Pounds Sterling.	Deposits in Pounds Sterling.
1801	33	7,000,000	—
1830	330	30,200,000	11,600,000
1860	1,526	87,000,000	52,800,000
1876	6,611	149,000,000	132,000,000
1889	6,721	180,000,000	759,000,000
1905	13,317	353,435,362	1,791,174,730

The metaphysicians will tell you that this increase is due to European immigration. Certainly the immigration was enormous, but the greater part of the immigrants were poor devils of workers. This immense accumulation of capital is due, as in all branches of contemporary social activity, to the progress of the inductive sciences, to their discoveries and marvellous inventions, in no way to Capitalism. The latter confines itself to appropriating them, just as they are seized upon also by Militarism, by Clericalism, and by all the privileged who group themselves round the State—supreme instrument for the oppression and exploitation of the people.

It is not correct, as stated by one of my critics, that these banks concentrate "the smallest savings." The economies of the poor people are accumulated, not in ordinary banks, but in savings banks. Their number and their capitals also increase as rapidly as those of the financial banks.

In the savings banks of all the European States the increase, in round figures, was :—

Year.	Deposits in Pounds Sterling.	Number of Depositors.
1850	52,700,000	2,748,000
1870	127,100,000	10,428,000
1889	648,800,000	19,875,000
1906	1,514,250,000	33,284,000*

* Postal savings banks only.

This sum of £1,514,250,000 represents the accumulated savings, or say rather the privations, of the producing classes. In order to have some small resources for the evil days of illness

and old age—those nightmares in a worker's life—they and their families are obliged to live in a continuous state of privation, which in the end results in the degeneration of the race.

IV.

In order to finish with this fatalistic and fundamental law of the Marxian creed, let us see if this concentration does not show itself in the principal industry of humanity—agriculture. I must say that Marx never emphasised the application of this formula to the land question, except in his Address to the International. The doctrine of the expropriation of the small landowners and the concentration of the land in the hands of a few large proprietors, belongs to Frederick Engels and other followers of Marx.

According to Engels and his school, not only should concentration, "the expropriation of the greater number by the few," take place in the possession of the soil; but until the peasants lose their land and become proletarians, Socialism could not develop itself in any country. During the last forty years this doctrine was preached with ardour and became a commonplace in the speeches and press of Social Democracy all over the world, especially in Germany and Russia. But if one inquires on what facts Engels based his doctrine, we find only one indication, viz., the modern history of England. But if these would-be scientists were even superficially acquainted with the history of England, they would know that it was not by any law of concentration but by violence and fraud that the land was stolen from the people by the landlords, who afterwards legalised their robbery by Acts of Parliament.

Macaulay, in his "History of England," vol. I., chap. 3, says: "The number of Enclosure Acts passed since George the Second came to the throne exceeds four thousand. The area enclosed under the authority of these Acts exceeds on a moderate calculation, ten thousand square miles."

"Between 1710 and 1760, for instance, 334,974 acres were enclosed; and between 1760 and 1843 the number rose to 7,000,000."—(H. de B. Gibbins, "The Industrial History of England," p. 116.)

Towards the second part of last century public opinion began to be alarmed with this legalised land-grabbing, and a series of Acts of Parliament, the last of which was passed in 1903 (the Act against Unlawful Enclosure), tried to put an end to this shameful practice. Timid and insignificant as these Acts were, nevertheless before the end of the century the number of small landholders in England began to increase, as may be seen from the following table :—

Area of Possessions.	Number of Possessors.		Increase.
	1885.	1889.	
From $\frac{1}{4}$ to 1 acre ...	23,512	28,652	5,140
" 1 " 5 acres ...	135,736	144,185	8,449
" 5 " 20 " ...	148,806	151,372	2,566
" 20 " 50 " ...	84,149	85,213	1,064
Total	392,203	409,422	17,219

("Statesman's Year Book," 1895, pp. 69-71.)

Unfortunately, reliable figures for later years are not obtainable.

In Ireland particularly we see the increase in the number of landowners. In conformity with different Land Acts from 1869 till 1903, £45,000,000 was advanced to 134,311 tenants for land purchase, and the number of landowners rose from 524,000 in 1890 to 597,000 in 1906. ("Statesman's Year Book," 1908, p. 75.) As is seen from these figures, England and Ireland still give a solemn contradiction to the scientific basis.

(To be continued.)

FOR PEACEFUL REFORMERS.

It would be interesting to calculate—as we arrive at the better only through the bad—if the evils of a sudden radical and sanguinary revolution would be greater than the evils perpetuated in a slow evolution. It would be useful to ask ourselves if it would not be better to act as quickly as possible; if, after all, the silent suffering of those who are waiting in injustice is not greater than that which the privileged of the present will have to bear during some weeks or months. It is so willingly forgotten that the executioners of misery and poverty are less noisy, less showy, but infinitely more numerous, more cruel, and more active than those of the most ferocious revolution.—MAURICE MAETERLINCK ("The Intelligence of Flowers").

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.

CHANGING PLACES.

It must have often occurred to the masses of mankind who have to endure the hardships and dangers involved in the struggle for bread under present conditions, that those who enjoy the wealth that they create, who make the laws for them to obey, would be the first to protest and revolt if they had to suffer, even for a brief while, the lot of the wage-worker. And yet the majority of persons who do the governing of mankind know simply nothing of the life-conditions they propose to "reform"; and even if they are sincere—as sometimes happens—their lack of first-hand experience, combined with the stone-wall officialism that surrounds them, renders it a matter of impossibility for them to understand, still less to grapple with, the social problems they are always expecting to solve.

The upshot of it all is failure, discontent, repression. For if these people cannot, by the fact of their own position in life, enter into the life of the worker, with all its miseries and uncertainties, still less can they understand the fierce outbreaks of revolt that, in one place and another, are constantly giving the lie to their own platitudes about "all being done that is possible," and "steps have been taken to remedy," etc., etc.—the sort of official cant that solaces the bureaucratic mind. So the inevitable happens, and the forces of the State are used to shed the blood of the ingrates, who, far from appreciating the efforts of this or that Minister, who is (of course) devoted to their cause, find their hopes of reform once more dashed to the ground, and rise in anger and discontent against the authorities who enforce oppressive conditions.

At the present moment these things are happening both in Egypt and in India. The outburst of Rooseveltism at the Guildhall—which, if it had fallen from the lips of an Anarchist, would have been regarded as an incitement to outrage and murder—called forth a well-timed rebuke from Bernard Shaw. In the *New York American* he points out that even Roosevelt's term of Presidency has not enlightened him in the matter of democratic ideals, still less of a people's political and economic condition. He does not understand even the moral of the "Denshaw horror," as Shaw rightly calls it, any more than does Morley, the "intellectual," surrounded by his fine books and his new political "honours."

Nothing would ever put understanding into these people's minds but the light of hard experience. If it were possible for Morley to suffer the life of the Indian ryot, for Roosevelt the existence of the Egyptian fellaheen, we should soon hear an outcry against injustice and despotism—if they had the same courage in adversity that they boast of in their power and affluence. But as such a change of places is out of the question, there is nothing for it but the brutal blundering of Ministers and officials, tempered by such revolt of public opinion and awakening of the people as is possible in these times of a corrupt and servile Press.

The same would hold good of all those "palliatives" the Labour Party are trying to obtain. If the workers will revolt against dangerous conditions, something may be done; and the advantage of this is that they may then learn to revolt against the whole capitalist system later on. If the impossible could happen, if the mineowners could be induced to take their "shift" with the men, with all its dangers; if railway directors could be turned into shunters or platelayers, with the average chance of being cut to pieces, we should soon have the reforms that political action fails to secure. And perhaps, after all, this is not more impossible than a beneficent Act of Parliament. Only recently Lord Lonsdale, the owner of the mine, went

down the shaft at Whitehaven—after the fire had been bricked up. It would be an excellent thing if all mineowners would do the same. They might experience something that would enlighten them. And this reminds us of the young parson who wrote a pamphlet and said to Douglas Jerrold, "Have you seen my 'Descent into Hell'?" "No," he replied, "but I should very much like to." We should very much like to see the exploiters descend for a while into that hell they have created for the workers.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

Australia.

I am sending a brief report of May Day in Melbourne. As usual, the priest-ridden slaves came thoroughly organised to attack and break up our Anarchist meeting, but we held the fort and kept the Red Flag of Anarchy flying for two hours. I spoke for an hour and obtained a good hearing. A lady comrade, Mrs. Barnes, followed. She made a strong attack on property and authority, which ought to have called forth loud cheers and applause; but she was speaking to superstitious Catholic slaves, not free men, so it had the opposite effect. By this time there were about 7,000 people round our platform, and a rush was made to upset it; but I had reckoned on that, and made the platform as firm as the Rock of Gibraltar. When they failed in their attempt, the stones commenced to fly, and two ladies climbed on the platform. The police, seeing the danger, interfered. Then these godly Popish serfs, feeling they were helpless, contented themselves by singing and howling like hyenas. An old comrade, Montague Miller, who is seventy-six years old, gave a revolutionary speech, making a strong attack on religion and superstition. But the fat little priest had sent his Pope's lambs, or wolves rather, to rend us if possible. They howled and groaned and shook their fists like lunatics. I told them I pitied them, but not the black slugs of priests who had made them their dupes. By this time a number of our comrades had formed a cordon round the platform to keep off any who attempted to interfere with us, so we continued until five o'clock, when three mounted troopers came and made way for us and escorted us through the principal streets, followed by a flock of maniacs anxious to have the scalps of two helpless women and myself. This is what the priests are doing for Australia, they are trying to make it another Spain.

The Labour politicians, flushed with their victory, withdrew from the May Day demonstration the night before, their excuse being that the May Day Committee had withdrawn the compulsory arbitration clause from the platform. But the true reason was that the cowards were afraid of being connected with antimilitarism. The election was decided on what the Labour Party calls "New Protection." They received the support of the *Melbourne Age*, which is a strong Protectionist paper. This, coupled with the help of the priests, gave them their jobs in Parliament. The workers appear jubilant because they do not reason, but their joy will shortly turn to deep regret, and experience will teach them that to rely on Parliament is courting failure every time. I am advocating Direct Action, the General Strike and the Social Revolution, and will continue doing so as long as possible. One hopeful sign is the increasing number of ladies who are commencing to take up Anarchism in Australia. We have been trying to obtain a hall for Sunday night lectures, but the managers are afraid to let us one. However, we shall continue to work for Anarchy and the Revolution.

J. W. FLEMING.

To the above interesting letter we add the following, headed "Labour Party and Respectability," taken from the *Melbourne Age* for May 2:—

"The Labour Party again came in for scathing denunciation at a meeting of Socialists held in the Gaiety Theatre, Bourke Street, in the evening. There was a large assembly, and the business of the evening consisted of consideration of the same resolutions as had been passed at the Yarra Bank in the afternoon. Mr. Ross, secretary of the Socialist Party, was in the chair.—Mr. E. J. Price said that one question he would wish to ask was whether the Labour Party which formed the majority in Parliament really stood in the interests of the working classes. He had recently received a letter from one of the imprisoned workers who took part in the Red Flag demonstration to the effect that he could get out of gaol in August if he gave a surety for future good conduct. He would not give it. Labour, the speaker continued, did not understand true Socialism. They claimed that they would represent all classes. They were going to represent equally the large colliery proprietor and Peter Bowling, the miners' imprisoned leader. He appealed to the workers not to be led astray. The Labour Party had taken up the attitude of being too respectable.—Mr. J. W. Fleming followed in similar strain, and denounced the Labour Party because it intended to carry out a defence policy. Did they ever know the military on the side of the workers? (Voices: Never.) Or on the side of the strikers? (Never.) Or on the side of the unemployed? (Never.) The workers saw the first act of treachery that very day by the Members of the new Parliament. They had not taken part in the May Day celebration."

In all countries—in France by Millerand and his friends, in England by some Labour men—a belief in the blessings of compulsory arbitration is often shown. Attempts are even made to obtain this "reform" in those countries where the workers prefer to settle their

differences with the employers themselves. Australia gives us, amongst other lessons, this one also, that compulsory arbitration has become a powerful weapon in the hands of the capitalists. In the *International Socialist* of Sydney a list is given of the sentences on militant Socialists who refused to bow before the decisions of the Arbitration Boards. Peter Bowling was sentenced to two and a half years' hard labour for having organised a strike against the award of the arbitrators. Eight workers were condemned to eighteen months' hard labour. Further in the list come sentences of eight months' hard labour, and recently one of two years, after the miners' strike. This is the reform which was to benefit society and save the workers from the "barbarous system of strikes."

Germany.

In Halle a Congress of the Anarchist Federation of Germany was held from May 15 to 17. Twenty-three towns were represented by forty-five delegates. On the second day a private meeting was held to discuss the private affairs of the Federation, but nevertheless a dozen policemen penetrated into the hall and declared that they intended to stay or to prohibit the meeting altogether. Amongst the subjects on the agenda were "Anarchism and Organisation" and "The Attitude of the Anarchist Federation towards the Free Syndicalist Organisations." The subject "The Press and Propaganda" led to an animated discussion. It was stated that during the past year the *Freie Arbeiter* was confiscated nine times, and four trials took place, which ended in three cases with the condemnation of the editor and collaborator. The trial of two comrades for high treason ended in their acquittal after they had spent thirteen weeks in prison. The sentences against the *Freie Arbeiter* comrades were two years, eight months, and six months' imprisonment. The raiding of the homes of comrades and their compulsory photographing were frequent. As far as is known, thirty-seven "objectionable foreigners" were expelled. As may be seen from these facts, Germany is not yet a country of free speech, press, and meeting. Our comrades have a hard fight, and it is all the more to their honour that in those circumstances they do not allow themselves to be discouraged, but continue to propagate Anarchist ideals.

The lock-out in the building trade is ended. The Arbitration Commission which had been accepted by the employers and the men has come to the following decision:—With regard to the hours of work, in all parts of Germany where the working day was over 10½ hours it will be fixed at 10½ hours from April 1, 1911, till April 1, 1912, when it will be reduced to 10 hours. In those places where not more than 10½ hours are worked they will be reduced to 10 hours from April 1, 1911. At Frankfurt and some other towns from April 1, 1911, 9½ hours will be worked. In all other towns and districts a diminution of the hours of work has been refused. A slight increase in wages has been accorded, mostly to start during the next few years. This increase was only made in view of the higher cost of living; a demand for higher wages on any other ground was rejected by the Commission. We are glad to say that the workers have not in every case submitted to the contemptuous treatment of their claims. At Dresden, in a noisy meeting, the masons rejected nearly unanimously the decision of the Commission. At Carlsruhe, Cassel, Mannheim, and other towns work was not started, as the men consider themselves unable to submit to the award, which would bind them for several years.

North America.

The strike of the sailors and boatmen on the great lakes in North America, which was carried on through the whole season of last year, still continues. The shipowners have been unable to break down the workers' resistance; they cannot find enough blacklegs to man their boats, and numerous accidents have taken place in consequence. So at last the shipowners have called a conference in Chicago to discuss the situation. In the meantime the men's Union is energetically carrying on the fight for their claims, which are the recognition of the Union and the abolition of the ill-famed labour books, a sort of worker's passport, without which he will not be taken on by an employer. Let it be said in passing that these labour passports are also causing the greatest embitterment among the miners of Westphalia.

CORRESPONDENCE.

LAW AND EXPERIENCE.

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

DEAR COMRADE,—Your self-claimed victory is premature and undeserved, and I much regret the spirit shown in your last reply. I started this correspondence with the hope that an exchange of views might be of—I was about to say, of mutual instruction, but that would be too presumptuous on my part—at any rate, help me to strengthen my present beliefs or throw them over; for I can assure you I am conscientious in my desire for truth. Your final admonition please take to heart yourself, a piece of advice not undeserved, for honesty of purpose is quite the least conspicuous characteristic of your replies to me. Thus in self-defence I am compelled to retrace my ground.

In my first communication I referred to an editorial article in which appeared a sentence (quoted) containing the words "law" and "experience." You claimed that experience would do that which law would not. Being hazy as to your meaning, I queried why differentiate

between "law" and "experience," because to me law, whether it governs games or peoples, whether good or bad, is the outcome of experience. In reply, you stated that law was constantly at variance with experience; amendment Acts proved it, and so on.

In my second communication I admitted that experience is often at variance with law, but equally true is it that experience is often in agreement with it. Some believe in a particular law, some don't. The contention that majority rule is wrong has nothing to do with the case. The point was and is, will law put the matter right from the Trade Unionist point of view? The Trade Unions, guided by experience, are demanding fresh law. They will get it. And whether the law when passed will eventually require fresh amendment, is beside the mark. Instead of meeting this statement fairly, you took the two words from their context and gave the literal meaning of them; and when in reply I admitted they were not synonymous terms, you charged me with shifting. It is really too bad. I like to know what others are thinking about, even though I cannot agree; and I read FREEDOM with interest. Therefore I regret that a man of your ability should studiously avoid meeting me fairly. It has taken two letters to make you admit that "experience may be responsible for statute law." In each reply to me you have dished up wholesale the evils of capitalist law and government. It is too ludicrous to badger a Socialist about such iniquities. If the theory of government is to protect the weak against the strong, and the practice is to make the strong more powerful, why charge me when I stand for an administration the antithesis of the present one?

The remainder of the paragraph I agree to except the inference that in a society of equals the function of government will cease—delegated administration will take its place.

There is just one other point I wish to draw attention to. The great mass of the people desire government, believe in it. Particular laws are objected to by interested parties, and *vice versa*. It is hardly correct to say that government and law are the expression of the minds of our masters only. I am not defending, only stating the fact.

You are also unjust to me concerning my remarks re compulsory free education. Your condemnation of our system of so-called education is deserved, but please don't evade the issue. Compared with no education (if that be possible), the present curriculum is good. Take away the compulsory clause and thousands of children would suffer accordingly. I deplore that such is the case, but I must face the facts of life. Under present conditions compulsory free education is useful and necessary for the capitalists, the proletarians, and for society. If useful, law cannot be inherently bad; if necessary to-day, who dare forecast when it will be unnecessary.

If games are Anarchist in conception (and I agree), you must surely blush for their present plutocratic state. The constitutions of the M.C.C., Rugby Union, and Football Association are counterparts of the present State government. They are each formed by a few individuals almost entirely disconnected with the great mass of players under each code of rules, and the spectators who financially support the games. Seeing that these growths are independent of State laws, it is fair to assume they would show similar development under Anarchy. One is not bound to play, freedom of choice, say you. What a bogey this "freedom" is!

A boy takes to games like a fish to water. The hereditary forces within him have grown side by side with the ones that have moulded the constitution of and set up the governing authorities of his games. He has had no share in framing the laws he obeys. His inborn love for games is sufficient. In fact, his nature decides for him, and he had no freedom of choice in nature. So you condemn the evils of State laws and yet shut your eyes to similar evils in national games. The mere fact that you think the games are voluntary does not exonerate you. You are morally bound to condemn any evil in the society you form a part of. If I show the cloven hoof of authority, what devilry underlies your reasoning?

The same arguments apply to Trade Unions, Co-operative and Friendly Societies. They are growths caused by economic conditions, and aptly illustrate a form of "compulsory" free association too Gilbertian for serious thought. Co-operative Societies are capitalist in theory and practice.

We are all born Christians, Liberals, or Tories. During the early portion of our lives our characters are moulded, our very opinions determined by heredity and the influences around us. It is these pre-determined, hidebound prejudices which make it so very difficult for us to become conscious of the truth later in life. Freedom of choice is ever of varying quantities, and always hovering round the vanishing-point.

This precious so-called "free association" is also the guiding principle of our present chaotic industries, gambling dens, and other evils. I state the fact only to point out that free association does not bring with it all the virtues of true living. Trade Unions, Co-operative and Friendly Societies all testify how very weak is your case. They are all rigorously governed; democratic in principle, undemocratic in practice. Their executive bodies have almost unlimited power, and the rule of the majority decides. They are selfish in their interests, and merciless to any opposing weaker power.

Don't advance as argument such statements as "in a society of equals such and such could not happen," and "in an Anarchist community," etc., etc. They are not convincing; besides, the same claims can justly be made for Socialism.

With your much-vaunted "triumph" fresh in my mind, I cannot understand why my "subsequent faulty reasoning" was left to the

readers, unless it be that you found prudence the better part of valour.

I do not confuse "State" with "society," and I have read Paine's "Rights of Man." Had you read my letters carefully, you would have been spared the pain of appealing to "old-time Radicals" to support you. I have already defined the State to be the mind of society. It expresses the collective mind of the people, and always reflects their economic, mental, and moral condition. The Anarchist contention that it is something outside and not from within seems to me to be poor logic. How can a thing be outside of that of which it is a part? Nature even recognises a distinctly different organism such as the mistletoe to be part of the tree which gives it nourishment. In other words, the State can bloodsuck the people just as long as the people submit. Nature does not recognise the rebellious few until they are strong enough to make that power felt. The predominant forces in human society are political, and the political battle has to be fought to a finish. Why are you not with us in the fight? Why your hostile inactivity? We can settle our differences when the common enemy is dead.

Are you really serious when you state the "results of free association in the religious world entirely refute you"? How can slaves to superstition be free? Identity of interests, desires, and beliefs, you mean. I suppose "freedom" of choice is operating when birds of a feather flock together. What a farce, and how Dame Nature must laugh. All such argument can be used logically to justify brutal Governments, brothels, everything. At least this is certain, the governing constitutions of religious sects refute your theory. Rooks inflict ostracism for unsocial conduct, and the "rogue" elephant affords a similar illustration of punishment upon a recalcitrant. Man acts in like manner, and although I do not defend our present laws, I certainly do repudiate the claim that free association among the lower animals is any argument for Anarchism. The rook can live outside, man cannot. True. But it is a moot point whether banishment is less cruel than confinement. Natural laws do not enforce themselves directly upon every individual in society. Any dereliction of duty by the individual is, of course, directly or indirectly, in little or great measure felt by the whole community. But individuals living communally can evade natural laws by imposing their obligations upon others, or by the help of tools. Therefore, whilst I would give you freedom to invent a mechanical slave to satisfy the demands of the law of gravity, I should strongly protest against your using a human slave to supply you with the needs of life. Thus we find that it is incumbent upon society to see that certain natural laws operate upon every unit forming it. That was my reason for saying "certain natural laws must be obeyed." You again avoided the argument by substituting "all" for "certain." If natural laws "always enforce themselves," how is it that the cuckoo imposes its parental responsibilities upon other birds?

Man has lifted himself upwards from the brutes by co-operation and the use of tools. Each change in the form of human society has been determined by corresponding changes in the tools—improvements in machinery. Man's power is getting more determinate in its character, and, comparatively, the blind, instinctive, unconscious efforts of the lower animals cannot be classed with the prescient, tentative endeavours of man. I have not read Kropotkin's "Mutual Aid," but I know the limitations of the lower organisms. Neither Kropotkin nor any other student of natural history claims for the brute world that sub-division of labour as we understand it. True, there is evidence of co-operation and mutual aid, but not the dividing-up of the commodities and necessities of life into many parts, each part claiming its share of workers. It is just this new factor in human production which has increased so extraordinarily man's power over Nature; and it entails directive ability, organisation. I have already admitted that Anarchism is possible, *i.e.*, primitive tribal existence; but it is quite incompatible with a scientific form of society. Any cohesion or understanding among the various groups would immediately bring into existence a body with a new function, independent of any particular group, yet related to the whole. We thus see that Collectivist principle is essentially State principle, the only alternative being mere aggregations of units without any unified purpose.

And now, in conclusion. We see that the use of tools has been chiefly instrumental in the advance of mankind upwards from the brutes. The sub-division of labour has made possible the introduction of machinery otherwise valueless. Or rather, the invention of new machinery has transformed craftsmanship into a complicated sub-division of industry, thereby making a controlling authority a necessity. With Socialism, the only rational system of human society yet conceived, all authority will be subservient to the will of the people, and for the first time in the history of man secure for the whole of the people the freedom which the inventive genius of the race has made possible. Nature's thralldom—brutality—will then end, human nature will begin.—Yours fraternally,

A BRISTOL SOCIALIST.

REPLY.

DEAR COMRADE,—Somehow I cannot help feeling you were hardly in the frame of mind for sober argument when you wrote your last reply. It would seem that your previous pose of humility was mere simulation, and in this you throw off the mask. I will leave the readers to judge as to my "honesty of purpose."

There is little to be served in following you again over the ground we have already trodden. But when you say the Trade Unions are guided by experience in demanding fresh law, I disagree. I contend

it is their unwillingness to be taught by it, and their superstitious belief in the very means of their enslavement being used to liberate them, that guides them so unfortunately in this matter.

As to my "fairness in meeting you," that, like my "honesty of purpose," I will not discuss, but leave to the readers.

What an extraordinary thing it is, however, that one who charges me with lack of "honesty of purpose" and "fairness in meeting" him should deliberately try to twist what I write by saying it took two letters to make me admit "experience may be responsible for statute law." I did nothing of the kind, and you, like the readers, know it quite well. I will not give the half-lie quotation of Tennyson, but add what you wilfully left out:—"Experience may be responsible for *statute* law, for the strong and cunning—the predominant section in society at any given period—putting into writing their desires and wishes, and using the power of social institutions to enforce them. Yes, the experience of *some*; but what of it?" You do your best to deceive the reader as to what I said, but do not attempt to reply to the query? It was probably much easier.

The evils I have tried to indicate are inherent in State government and statute law, apart altogether from the form they take. If Socialism is to bring in equality and social justice, it must be accompanied by new political principles and conceptions. To try to put the new wine of Socialism into the old bottles of State government is either to spoil the wine or burst the bottles. Anarchist Communists actively work all the time for a new bottle for the new wine.

Unfortunately, it is only too true that to-day many of the wage-earners do believe in State government; they do not wish to get rid entirely of the present wrongs, they only desire, if possible, to become masters themselves. But they possess the mind which believes in slavery, since it is impossible to be a master without servants. So too, unfortunately, with State Socialists; they do not necessarily wish to get rid of all exploitation, but only the capitalist form of it. They wish to transfer the government of both men and things from the privileged class of to-day to a class of elected persons *plus* permanent paid officials; in short, merely to change the exploiters, or more often, *a la* Briand and Burns, become one of them to-day.

If I am in any way unjust, I regret it. But on the point of compulsory education I must again point out that the belief in and obedience to statute law led to material monopoly of all kinds, and its resultant social misery. If we can destroy this stupid social superstition of statute law, brought into existence to subvert the open violence of feudalism, we remove at the same time all semblance of excuse for compulsory education of infants, paid for out of taxation. The mutual education of free men and women would take its place. A hint of this may be gleaned from the "free" men of ancient Greece. But inherently bad things are *sometimes* useful, as poisons in medicine.

What twaddle you indulge in when you try to discuss the Anarchism of games! It is true children are born into certain conditions, even as to playing games. But if they care to alter or vary the way of playing, to introduce rules of their own for old games, to start fresh ones altogether, or not play games at all, they are not punished by fine or imprisonment. In this case the rebellious few need *not* bow to the others who prefer the old forms. Neither are they compelled to become members of the old clubs and pay the contribution (taxation) towards a game they no longer desire to play. Is there some fresh devilry in this argument of mine, I wonder? Or is it obsession in our comrade which makes him like a modern Pharaoh?

Certainly you would seem to know little of those free associations, economic, fraternal, and trading (Trade Unions, Friendly Societies, and Co-operative Societies), or you would not blunder as you do. The Co-operative Societies are not "capitalist" in theory or practice. Interest upon capital is limited to 4 or 5 per cent. The rest of the net profit which would be given to capital, if "capitalist in theory and practice," is distributed to the members *in proportion to purchases made*. Why not try to learn something about the subjects you wish to discuss? It might be beneficial to both you and the readers.

I do not expect free association (Anarchism) to eliminate all evil in society. But it will not compel me to subscribe to those things experience has taught me to look upon as bad. To-day government and law do this, or else punish me if I refuse to support what I believe to be the very essence of evil. I am willing to trust to freedom and experience to teach the rest in time. As government—Socialist or any other—must always inflict this injustice upon those who have developed differently to the rest, or cease to exist, Anarchists are against it as a principle of social organisation.

Your faulty reasoning was left to the readers because it seemed so apparent. If on re-reading your letter it was not plain, I will only say Ferrer was not free to leave his country after he was arrested, or I doubt if he would have been shot. When he was free to leave, he often did so. I had the pleasure of meeting him in London in May last year. Again, you admit that "an individual born into the Anarchist community in Gloucestershire can choose one of two courses: leave the colony to be sweated or remain to be bored"; but he has no choice in accepting the statute laws of any State. So while you were trying to show the futility of choice, you admitted there was some in certain directions, but none as to statute laws. This was all I contended. It is the extension of choice I stand for. The freedom of choice as to religious belief or no religious belief has not always brought happiness; but it has given opportunity to every one who cares to test them for himself, and destroyed the old faith in dogmatic and infallible religious authority. It has swept away the "rigorous" tortures inflicted on "rebellious members" when that authority professed to

"reflect the mind of society." In this direction the principles of Anarchism have worked well, and they are likely to be equally beneficial in social and political affairs in the future.

I may say I read your letters carefully, and have suffered more pain at the thought of the injury which would follow the application of your reactionary political principles to Socialism than in appealing to old-time Radicalism for support of mine. If only most State Socialists had as clear an insight into political principles as some of the philosophical Radicals had, it would be a good thing for Socialism.

State Governments by no means represent the mind of society, only a section of it.

Anarchists cannot fight side by side with those who they are convinced would perpetuate, under another form, the evils they combat to-day. It is not hostile inactivity, but active hostility to every form of the common enemy—belief in State government, the foundation and abetter of capitalist and every other form of exploitation—that animates the Anarchists everywhere.

I have already dealt with freedom of choice in religion, and have nothing to add. But when you bracket brutal Governments and brothels together, I must point out that base as brothels are for sex enjoyment, they are in principle much more moral than Governments. They do not inflict punishment on those who refuse to support them. Government and statute law are the great social prostitutes, raised by superstition to the position of being able to levy blackmail on all.

Your long rigmarole as to natural law, again, does not help you. Nature knows nothing of parental responsibility, only of parental instinct. Thus the foster parents seem just as happy to feed the young cuckoo as if it was their own. If not, there is no statute law to compel them to go on.

You are entirely wrong and quite capitalist in saying that it is the sub-division of labour which has increased so extraordinarily *man's power over Nature*. It has little or nothing to do with that. It is even doubtful if it has increased the power of production anything like as much as is claimed by some economists. But in any case it has no bearing on the relative merits of State government or free association as the political basis for society. The sub-division of labour is just as easy of application in either. Obsessed with State (territorial) government, and statute law, its child, you are blinded to the fact that production is carried on by "mere aggregations of units," who, apart from and independent of "State principles," often throughout various hostile political States, in many industries, even to-day, show a "unified purpose." They would do so still more if State Governments and capitalists disappeared altogether, and would rapidly develop greater unity with the absence of these restrictive and unnatural agencies.

In conclusion, it would be interesting to learn what your conception of a "State" really is. To-day the modern State is only that portion of territory and its people over which a certain Government enforces its statute laws. It is no longer based on race or religion or language; only on the power of taxation to maintain the institutions to enforce the laws? Is the United Kingdom to be a unit? If so, what about Ireland? Or is the whole British Empire to be a unit? Is little Denmark, with one-third the population of Greater London, to be a unit? Or Holland or Belgium? And what of Russia, or Germany, or, more mixed still, Austria? Let us know where we are.

You say "the predominant forces in human society are political, and the political battle has to be fought to a finish." Well, Anarchism is a political ideal: the "mere aggregations" of free individuals with a united purpose, independent of territory.

Socialism, on the other hand, is "an economic theory," as yet untried, without any definite political principles at all. You may have some as a Socialist; to my mind, brutal, anti-social, coercive, authoritarian, reactionary; but it is idle to claim such for Socialism. They are only yours as an individual Socialist, or those of some party of Socialists.

Between your State-cum-Catholic Church conception of society and that of the Anarchists are all shades and degrees. Yours would logically lead back to feudalism in industry, and probably to final slavery.

The Anarchist's political ideas are in line with all human progress. He learns from experience, but mistrusts statute law. He knows that what is given by law can be taken away by law. The Trade Unions will, nay, are already beginning to learn this. Those who asked for legal protection, and registered under the Trade Union Act, must now submit to legal injunctions. But those who remained unregistered, as nearly one-third did, can still use their funds as they desire, without let or hindrance by the institutions of their masters. These are some of the facts which are helping the Anarchists in their ever-active propaganda.

Finally, may I courteously remind you that when you are in the right, there is no need to get annoyed and call me names; when in the wrong, you can hardly afford to.—Yours fraternally,

THE WRITER OF THE ARTICLE.

[If "A Bristol Socialist" wishes to reply, he must be brief in his remarks.—ED. FREEDOM.]

ANARCHISM AND MALTHUS.

By C. L. JAMES.

Price Twopence; by post, Twopence-Halfpenny.

The Author says: "The Malthusian Theory is the strongest possible argument for that kind of Socialism or Anarchism which proposes, through complete emancipation of women, to abolish the fundamental tyranny from whence all others spring."

PRINTED PAGES.

French Gardening. By Thos. Smith, F.R.H.S. Price not stated. London: Joseph Fels, 39 Wilson Street, Finsbury, E.C.

There must be a growing demand for such a book as this, and although several have appeared, probably this would stand first in its practical utility. The introduction tells us how much has been accomplished on the Mayland farm, which is the outcome of Mr. Fels's good sense in showing what can be done by those who work together in solidarity and goodwill. It also proves how hopeless it is to expect anything but disaster in calling in the help of the State. The author deplores the action of Mr. John Burns, who destroyed the usefulness of the Hollesley Bay experiment; and he adds: "Since the work cannot go forward, it goes backward; and Hollesley Bay, after its splendid inception and fine promise, threatens to degenerate into another work-house, or something little better." As to the book itself, it seems complete in all needful details, and it ought to encourage the people to turn to a consideration of the land question. Here, at any rate, the "practical" Englishman can see that he gets something for his money and labour. Kropotkin writes some "Forewords," and few have done more than he to popularise the idea of intensive culture in England.

An Irish Industrial Revival. By R. B. Cunningham Graham. 1d. Can be obtained of W. Robinson, 167 York Street, Belfast.

This is a little picture, given in Cunningham Graham's best style, of how a quiet, peaceful little village in the North of Ireland was transformed into a miniature Manchester by the advent of a capitalist with his capital, who came and built a mill. The concluding lines are sad, but true of so many beautiful spots on the face of this earth:—

"Perhaps they liked the change from being awakened by the lowing of the kine, to the 'steam-hooter's' call to work on the dark winter mornings—calling them out to toil on pain of loss of work and bread, and seeming, indeed, to say:—'Work, brother! Up and to work; it is more blessed far to work than sleep. Up! leave your beds; rise up; get to your daily task of making wealth for others, or else starve; for Capital has come!'"

Bernard Shaw as Artist-Philosopher: an Exposition of Shavianism. By Renée M. Deacon. 1s. net. London: A. C. Fifield, 13 Clifford's Inn, E.C.

Réflexions sur L'Individualisme. Par Manuel Devaldès. 1 fr. Paris: Le Libéraire, 15 Rue D'Orsel.

Histoire Prochaine: Roman Socialiste. Par Albert Quantin. Paris: Bibliothèque-Charpentier, 11 Rue de Grenelle.

PROPAGANDA NOTES.

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

GLASGOW.

During the last two months meetings have been held at Goel Square almost every Sunday. Good audiences have been the rule. Our comrade Barrett has frequently spoken for over two hours at a stretch, and his exposition of Anarchist Communism has been lucid and full of vigour, its revolutionary side being especially emphasised. This has stimulated a spirit of inquiry which has been shown by the steady sale of literature. It is characteristic of all the meetings that keen interest was manifested in the sharp opposition offered and questions asked by different members of the audience. At all the meetings our platform has been occupied by opponents, whose opposition Barrett has easily replied to.

On the First of May, on which evening we held our first meeting, several comrades were present assisting in the sale of literature, etc. At the following meetings no comrades have been present to assist in any way, and Barrett and I have had to run the meetings ourselves, Barrett doing practically all the speaking, which entails an enormous amount of work on our comrade. Local comrades and those in sympathy with us are requested to attend the meetings, which are held at Goel Square every Sunday evening at 7.30. Letters should be addressed to G. Barrett, care of D. Baxter, 32 Brunswick Street.

D. KESNEDY.

LIVERPOOL INTERNATIONAL MODERN SCHOOL.

We hope to reopen the school the first Sunday in August. In the meantime we are endeavouring to raise funds towards an outing for the youngsters on August 6. If the necessary subscription is not forthcoming, it is feared that the little ones will be denied their annual outing.

We had a good meeting at Wellington Column on June 18. Mat Kavanagh and a comrade from Brighton held the fort in good style. Our newly arrived comrade has decided to take up his abode in Liverpool. He is the secretary of a group of enthusiasts who name themselves Revolutionary Industrialists and attack all superstitions *en bloc*. Why do we not hear of them in FREEDOM? The interchange of ideas assuredly makes for progress.

DICK.

WALTHAMSTOW.

Good meetings have been held at Edmonton and at West Green, Tottenham, especially at the latter place; plenty of questions and discussion, and what is more important, a good sale of literature. I mentioned last month about a rowdy meeting we had when Comrade Ray was speaking at Hoe Street, Walthamstow. The following Wednesday it came to a climax and unfortunately only three comrades turned up. I opened the meeting

and Comrade Ponder followed. We had a small but attentive audience. The subject of Ponder's address was the wage system, which he ably dealt with, clearly showing to his audience how the workers are robbed, and the uselessness of the vote in getting rid of the robber class. But towards the end of his speech there came what was to all appearances a well-organised force of gentlemen in plain clothes, who immediately began to interrupt the meeting and attempted to rush the platform, but they were only successful in pushing Ponder off the stool. He immediately jumped up again, but no sooner was he on the platform than there was another rush, our comrade being bodily carried away. The meeting was broken up and we lost our stool, but that we have replaced. It is to be hoped the crowd will learn in the near future to use direct action, not on their fellow workers, but against their enemies, the capitalist class and their hirelings.

Comrade Ray was the speaker at West Green Corner on Sunday, June 5. On the 12th, at the same place, Ponder gave a good address on the concentration of capital, and was opposed by the only Socialist Party (so they tell us), the Socialist Party of Great Britain. Ponder has challenged them to a debate. On the 19th our comrade Baron gave a very interesting address. He had a good deal of opposition, and dealt with it in a very satisfactory manner.

W. FANNER.

REGENTS' PARK.

We have been having some good meetings here on Sundays, morning and afternoon. Our comrade Greenbourn is the moving spirit. Comrade Ray has spoken a good many times and is always highly appreciated for his open style and fair treatment of opponents. We had a debate on the 12th between Greenbourn and Mr. Lawson, State Socialist, on "Direct Action versus Legislation." Mr. Lawson thinks we must have authority to prevent dogs barking at night and to prevent the marigolds in Regent's Park being picked in the daytime. The debate, however, was very interesting, was conducted in the most courteous manner, and was listened to by a large and intelligent audience. We have the audience here, we want more speakers. The public have had just about enough of milk-and-water Socialism, and are now ready for a stronger diet.

T. P.

SOUTHWARK.

We continue to have good gatherings at St. George's Circus on Thursday evenings. We have lately secured a new speaker, a very young man, but who promises to give a good account of himself in the future. Comrade Ray is our mainstay, however, and has been doing fine work. Some amusement was caused at one of our meetings some time ago by one of the inhabitants rushing out of his shop and denouncing the speaker. He thought he had only to shout "Bomb-thrower!" to raise hostility, which he did—against himself. After raving and fuming for a few minutes, he retired amidst laughter. They are a very lively lot here, and speakers who like being heckled had better come and have a go.

T. P.

Guy A. Aldred was released from Brixton Prison on July 2, and intends to carry on propaganda as usual. On Friday, July 8, at 8 p.m., he will lecture at the Lambeth Liberal and Radical Club, 28A Wincott Street, Kennington; and on Sunday, July 10, at Brockwell Park, at 3.15 and 6.15.

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.

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.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

(June 1—July 6.)

FREEDOM Guarantee Fund.—R. Clarke 1s, C. M. Stoycoff 4s, Fred 6d, T. S. 5s, Ormonde, Leeds, 6d.

FREEDOM Subscriptions.—Y. Hemmi 4s, A. H. Holt 2s 6d, R. Stubbs 1s 6d, A. Storey 1s 6d, T. P. Lehan 4s, A. Heys 1s 6d, A. Wilbers 3s, G. Teltsch 1s 6d.

Frank Kitz Fund.—R. N. R. 6d, E. Carpenter 5s.

A NEW EDITION.

The Famous Speeches

OF THE

EIGHT CHICAGO ANARCHISTS.

Price 1s., Postage 2d.

"FREEDOM" OFFICE, 127 OSSULSTON STREET, N.W.

A Fine Reproduction of a

PHOTO OF M. BAKUNIN.

Price 2d., post-free 3d.; 1s. 6d. per dozen.

NEW PROPAGANDA LEAFLET.

What is Anarchism?

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

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 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.

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.

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

THE GOD PESTILENCE. By JOHN MOST. 1d.

SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN GERMANY. By GUSTAV LANDAUER. 1d.

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.

"FREEDOM" MAY BE OBTAINED OF

London.—HENDERSONS, 66 Charing Cross Road, W.C. (Wholesale).

HENDERSONS, 26 The Pavement, Clapham Common, S.W.

W. REEVES, 83, Charing Cross Road, W.

O. MATHIAS, 20, Little Pulteney Street, W.

B. RUDERMAN, 71 Hanbury Street, Spitalfields, E.

J. J. JAKES, 191 Old Street, City Road, E.C.

QUICKFALLS, 238 York Road, and 61 High Street, Battersea, S.W.

E. H. JOHNSON, 23 Bride Lane, Ludgate Circus, E.C.

Liverpool.—E. G. SMITH, 126 Tunnel Road.

CHAS. J. GRANT AND SON, 8 and 9 Lord Street Arcade.

Leeds.—A. Goldberg, 14 Millwright Street.

Manchester.—J. BURGESS AND CO., 15 Peter Street.

Glasgow.—D. BAXTER, 32 Brunswick Street.

D. G. LINDSAY, 139 West Nile Street.

Dundee.—L. MACARTNEY, 203, Overgate.

Belfast.—W. ROBINSON, 167 York Street.

Paris.—Kiosque, Boulevard Bonne Nouvelle, opposite La Menagère.

Kiosque, Boulevard Sebastopol, corner of Rue Rambuteau.

U.S.A.—N. NOTKIN, 1332 S. 6th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

M. MAISEL, 422 Grand Street, New York, N.Y.

New Zealand.—P. JOSEPHS, 32 Cuba Street, Wellington.

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