

Freedom

JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. XXV.—No. 272.

DECEMBER, 1911.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

NOTES.

Slums and "Solutions."

At a dinner given to Earl Grey by the Co-partnership Tenants, Ltd., the noble gentleman remarked that "in the wise application of co-partnership principles . . . lay the best means of rescuing the people from the degradation of the slums." He then added: "It should be the ambition of every lover of his country to support any movement the net result of which would be to reduce to the lowest possible minimum poverty, suffering, and distress." We like that remark, "any movement," because we happen to know of one. We can assure Earl Grey that Anarchist Communism will achieve the end he speaks of far better than any movement run by Vivian and Co. It would, for instance, throw out, neck and crop, another "noble" gentleman with the title of the Duke of Northumberland, who does (or did) own slums too abominable for pigs to live in. And there are others. However, we do not expect the noble Earl to convert the noble Duke, and, for our part, we think that if the whole noble lot would only get off the backs of the people, the problem of the slums would soon be solved.

A Note on H. Broadhurst.

Our comrade, F. Kitz, writes in reference to the fulsome eulogies of Broadhurst by the capitalist Press to point out how, for one thing, he muddled the strike of the masons at the Law Courts, the men being powerless under his guidance when the employers imported German labour. It was really the action of some members of the German Communist Society who, in spite of the police, got at the German masons and explained the situation, that really prevented their being used as blacklegs. When a note appeared in *Reynolds's* praising those members of the International who had gone to the assistance of the English masons, Broadhurst wrote and denied that the International had given help at all. "When 'Buckshot' Forster," Kitz continues, "placed Ireland under a cruel Coercion Act, Broadhurst was a champion and apologist of the infamous measure. And the German friends who had helped the masons were also persecuted by the Liberal Government, who seized the plant of the *Freiheit* and arrested the editor, John Most, for an article referring to the extinction of the Tsar. A member of the *Freiheit* Defence Committee, when in the lobby of the House of Commons seeking support for the defence, was induced by a well-known journalist to call out Broadhurst as one who would give moral support. But the response of this ex-working man was to hurry away, merely saying, 'Mind Inspector Denning don't see you!' (this was head of the House of Commons police). Broadhurst was one of a type who believe in the permanency of the wage-system, and who only aim at a seat for themselves in Parliament to beg for the workers some crumbs from the table of Dives."

William Morris and Anarchists.

H. Lowerison, reviewing "William Morris to Whistler" in the *Clarion* of November 10th, and referring to meetings held in the hall at Kelmscott House, says:—"The old lion (Morris) used to sit as chairman on the platform by the lecturer and run his paw through his great mane till the Anarchists interrupted, and then his big fearless eyes would leave their laughter and blaze and sparkle. His hand would leave his hair or the pen with which he used to scribble and sketch, and at last when his patience was exhausted he would jump up and roar, 'Now out that man goes!' And he went." This is a half-truth, more misleading than a lie. Morris had his quarrel with Anarchists, as he had with plenty of other people, and as he would have with Lowerison could he read the fulsome nonsense quoted above. The statement is wholly misleading, as it gives the impression of a bitter antagonism to Anarchism which Morris never had. He did not like the name, and he never would admit the logical

deductions as to government and authority upon which Anarchists insisted. But his ideas came very near to ours, and when he published "News from Nowhere," every one said it was a picture of Anarchist Communist society in all but name. Besides, we know personally how courteous and fair he was in letting the Socialist League Hall for our first meetings. One of his last public lectures was given for the benefit of FREEDOM with the utmost goodwill. Lowerison as a teacher of the young should guard against one of the worst offences against truth—the engendering of false impressions.

The Persecution of Harry Boulter.

It is nearly time that there was a great general protest against the persecution of Harry Boulter, an open-air Free-thought and Socialist lecturer. It is not enough that the prohibitive bail of £400 should be reduced to a sum which secures his release from three months' imprisonment on the condition that he is debarred from speaking on Streatham Common for twelve months to come. The truth seems to be that he has aroused the ire and the malice of a band of unscrupulous bigots, and the forces of the law as well as Christian judges and magistrates have joined in the "heresy hunt." On the double plea that it was to prevent future disturbance and for his own protection, Boulter was to all intents and purposes sentenced to three months' imprisonment after being suddenly dragged from the midst of his business affairs. This harsh and brutal treatment (to which Anarchists are by no means strangers) is a practical commentary upon the plea that the State and government afford protection to the weak.

The Truth about Poverty and Unemployment.

We hear a great deal about the "unity" of the Socialist forces in respect to organisation (as a matter of fact every "split" has resulted in expansion of the propaganda). But there are two questions on which Socialists of every kind may, and we hope will, be united in their efforts to the highest degree. Those are poverty and unemployment. Poverty is as dreadful a social evil now as ever it was. There are numerous deaths annually from sheer starvation. Hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children are being slowly starved, and "overcrowding" exists in all the districts where the poor live. In spite of "statistics," to which the facts give the lie, and the falsification of Distress Committees' reports, the unemployed exist in large numbers in all parts of the country, and their position is more hopeless than it has been in the past. Trade Unionists who denounce the "blackleg" so often should remember not merely that the out-of-work may be used against them by the employer, but that they are responsible for their neglect of the unemployed. Solidarity means not only loyalty to Trade Unionists on strike, but unity in action for all the victims of Capitalism.

A LETTER FROM JAPAN.

Near Shimbashi, Tokyo, October 17th, 1911.

DEAR FRIEND,—I have just received your kind letter and the money order amounting to £4 9s. Thank you with all my heart for your deep sympathy. I will distribute the money among the needy families of the executed and those comrades still in prison, according to circumstances.

Here in Japan the Saionji Ministry has succeeded the Katsura Ministry; but all the same, the people are falling from the frying-pan into the fire; and the telegrams of the great strikes and demonstrations in Europe are gradually awakening the eyes of the people from time to time.

We shall have a good time in the near future, I believe.—Yours fraternally,

T. KATO.

N.B.—*Freedom*, *Mother Earth*, *International Socialist Review*, and other papers are confiscated by the Government.

REPLY TO A SOCIALIST CRITIC.

During several months recently a series of articles has appeared in the *Socialist Standard*, the organ of the Socialist Party of Great Britain, purporting to give reasons why Socialists are opposed to Anarchism, and exposing the "fallacies" and "dangers" of our movement. Unfortunately, the chief impressions on our minds after reading the articles are provocative of disappointment and contempt. A series of misstatements, misquotations, and misrepresentations is very unconvincing, to say the least; and the evidence of unrestrained prejudice in almost every line is so prominent that no serious student of Anarchist Communism could regard such an attack otherwise than contemptuously. The articles would meet with the full approbation of the Anti-Socialist Union, being quite on their own level of discussion (see their "Case against Socialism"), and would arouse shrieks of joy amongst the "Enemies of the Red Flag."

The best reply to this alleged exposure of Anarchism would be for the many earnest students of Socialism among the members of the S.P.G.B. to read the books and pamphlets mentioned in these articles, most of which can be obtained at the office of FREEDOM. Kropotkin's "Conquest of Bread" and "Anarchist Communism," W. C. Owen's "Anarchy v. Socialism," Grave's "Moribund Society and Anarchy," the FREEDOM pamphlet "Anarchism and Outrage," Tcherkesoff's "Pages of Socialist History," and the "Report of the International Anarchist Congress, 1907," more than adequately deal with every point raised and provide a complete refutation of Mr. Kohn's assertions.

Amidst all the sound and fury of the attack, the failure of the assault is acknowledged even by the man who is sounding the charge. We are told that the supremacy of the working class will be "the death-knell of the State," and "when the toilers triumph the day of the State will be gone for ever." Also, "the State as we know it is but the final form of an institution"—though he claims that it "fulfilled a useful service in the social economy of the past." True, he contradicts himself in the very passage from which the above words are quoted, unless he regards the tool of the chattel-slave owner, the feudal nobility, and the industrial capitalist, and the means whereby a class is kept in subjection, as fulfilling "a useful service" to the proletariat.

So far as an attack upon Anarchism is concerned, there is merely a confused jumble of undigested ideas about the history of Anarchism, the social relations of the individual, and the questions of organisation and methods. Criticism is always welcome and generally beneficial; but what are we to say when we turn to Mr. Kohn's references and find that he has clipped and amputated the passages he quotes from Kropotkin, Owen, and others, so as to distort their meaning. This is neither fair nor intelligent criticism, yet it characterises the whole of the arguments in question. Neither is Anarchism—i.e., the abolition of government and the conduct of social affairs by the method of free agreement between individuals and groups (large and small, few or many)—seriously considered. Perhaps this reticence is politic, for we know that many of the most energetic workers and keenest students in his own party would soon be at variance with him were he to discuss the fundamental principles of Anarchism.

When a writer essays to criticise the opinions of another man, fair and accurate quotation is desirable. Mr. Kohn writes:—"Kropotkin's criticism of the Marxian surplus-value theory is remarkable. He says ('Conquest of Bread'): 'The evil of the present organisation is not that the "surplus-value" of production passes over to the capitalist—as Marx and Rodbertus had contended. Surplus-value itself is only a consequence of more profound causes. The evil is that there can be any kind of "surplus-value," instead of a surplus not consumed by each generation.' " Contrast that passage with this one (p. 126, Chapman and Hall's edition, London, 1906):—"The evil of the present system is therefore not that the 'surplus-value' of production goes to the capitalist, as Marx and Rodbertus said, thus narrowing the Socialist conception and the general view of the capitalist system; the surplus-value itself is but a consequence of deeper causes. The evil lies in the possibility of a surplus-value existing, instead of a simple surplus not consumed by each generation; for, that a surplus-value should exist, means that men, women, and children are compelled by hunger to sell their labour for a small part of what this labour produces, and, above all, of what their labour is capable of producing. But this evil will last as long as the instruments of production belong to a few. As long as men are compelled to pay tribute to property holders for the right of cultivating land or putting machinery into action, and the property holder is free to produce what bids fair to bring him in the largest profits, rather than the greatest amount of useful commodities—well-being can only be temporarily guaranteed to a very few, and is only to be bought by the poverty of a section of society."

Here it will be seen that Kropotkin merely makes a passing reference to surplus-value and its exponents; but our critic by judicious cutting and carving deprives it as much as possible of its force, and endeavours to make it appear as a piece of crude and partial reasoning instead of as it actually is, a powerful attack upon the capitalist mode of production, which, as Kropotkin goes on to show, cannot aim at "producing the greatest amount of goods necessary to the well-being of all, with the least possible waste of human energy."

This system of misquotation is continued throughout the articles. One issue of FREEDOM would be hardly sufficient to correct the misstatements. One in particular in large type says "Anarchism Ignores Evolution." If our critic were not so blinded by prejudice, he would

see that the quotations which follow the assertion give the lie direct to it. All Anarchist literature deals with man and his social and economic relations from the evolutionary point of view. Perhaps it may not be out of place to mention to our State Socialist friends that evolution comprises something more than the doings of Parliaments and Governments and the ideas of one or two dead economists. At any rate, some of them seem to be badly in need of the reminder—unnecessary as it may be to most people. Our high-minded critic is good enough to say that "the secrecy and underground working" of the Anarchist movement "make treachery possible." Then follows a lot of silly rigmarole about spies, worthy of a "penny blood" of the lowest character. And we are told that "the wild denunciations of the 'State' and 'government' and everybody vested with authority turn the heads of their ignorant followers. These uneducated worshippers of Anarchist fallacies, believing that this and that official is the real enemy, plan to make away with them, and they are inspired by the 'propaganda of deed' teaching." Then follows this assertion: "Of course, they receive direct incitement to do so from the fountain-heads of Anarchist 'philosophy.'" And a brazen misuse of a paragraph in Jean Grave's "Moribund Society and Anarchy" is added to support this contention.

Our critic does not even mention that the FREEDOM Group has ever since December, 1893, placed its views on these questions before the world explicitly and clearly in a pamphlet (still obtainable) entitled "Anarchism and Outrage." Why in the name of fairness is this fact concealed and the arguments ignored? That many men calling themselves Anarchists have been driven by oppression and misery to deeds of violence is quite true, though Anarchists are not the only section of mankind of which this can be said. What could be clearer or more definite than the statement in the pamphlet mentioned above that "homicidal outrages are neither the logical outcome of Anarchist principles nor a practical necessity of Anarchist action"?

As a matter of fact, all this nonsense received a timely rebuke in the *Socialist Standard* for September, 1911, in a short article entitled "Anti-Truth." The writer bought a book called "The Superstition called Socialism." He "turned to page 108 and read: 'With that glorious revolutionary enthusiasm which inflamed the souls of our ancestors, let them wish to stab all tyrants there and then.' This, from Kropotkin the meek, seemed, to say the least, curious, so I took an early opportunity of perusing his 'Appeal to the Young,'—the authority quoted—in order to verify. A careful perusal revealed the astonishing fact that the sentence quoted appears nowhere in Kropotkin's work, but is made up of two distinct fragments of sentences occurring pages apart. On page 15 (Kerr and Co.'s edition) Kropotkin reminds school-teachers that: 'This very day your favourite pupil... recited the story of William Tell with so much vigour! His eyes sparkled; he seemed to wish to stab all tyrants there and then; he gave with such fire the passionate lines of Schiller.' On page 23 Kropotkin invites poets, painters, and musicians to 'fire the hearts of our youth with that revolutionary enthusiasm which inflamed the souls of our ancestors.'"

The present writer is afraid that the editor of FREEDOM would not agree to the insertion of language like the following in reply to our critics, but as a quotation he may let it pass. "So the cunning Tunzelman has to resort to the filthy practice of piecing together separate and unconnected utterances, and trotting the resulting patch-work out as an authoritative statement. The mean and paltry shifts to which the 'Anties' have been reduced in order to manufacture their alleged arguments have been long known to us." We hope that it cannot be said of Mr. Kohn as of Tunzelman, that he is guilty of "the lie deliberate," but he must be careful lest the words of his own colleague "Paris" apply to him: "Blessed are they who handle truth very carelessly—apply for a job at the Anti-Socialist Union."

Our share of space is not enough to permit us to go through the whole catalogue of Anarchist delinquencies and enormities. As before mentioned, full and satisfactory explanation is to be found in the pages of FREEDOM and in the books and pamphlets of which a list is printed on the last page of this journal. There is, by the way, no "secrecy" and no need for sensational "exposures." The pages of FREEDOM have always been available for direct, bold, and intelligent criticism of Anarchist Communism. Surely our dogmatic Mr. Kohn ought not to leave the "ignorant and uneducated followers" to their terrible (and unnecessary) doom. Or did he merely come to save the righteous of the S.P.G.B. and not the Anarchistic sinners?

However, in concluding, we will answer a question he puts to us. He quotes FREEDOM of August last, when the "complete failure of the Labour Party to bring to the toilers any relief from the burdens of capitalistic exploitation" was mentioned; and he asks us: "Who expected the Labour leeches to advance the cause of the workers?" He asserts "only the Anarchists"—a self-evident falsehood. The real answer is: thousands of Social Democrats like himself, who, again like him, have falsely taught that the political machinery of bourgeois society is the suitable and necessary machinery for accomplishing the Social Revolution. Moreover, some of the members of the Labour Party in Parliament were, at least previous to election, as sincere and consistent Socialists as Mr. Kohn and his colleagues. Quite as well informed and able. Quite as Marxian and uncompromising. It is natural for men like Mr. Kohn, who are ignorant of the causes of failure, to assail the men who fail with abusive epithets and derision. Wisdom teaches that the institution and the method is at fault. There is no necessity or advantage in crippling the movement for social emancipation with the shackles of Parliamentaryism; and the

methods of masterdom and slavery are unsuitable for the realisation of a free society.

Once again a Social Democrat, Mr. Kohn, tells us that "the General Strike as a means of emancipation must surely fail." (Why does he denounce Ramsay MacDonald and Winston Churchill? They agree with their S.P.G.B. friend, and may lovingly embrace as a holy trinity in Socialist (?) unity.) Well, it will be found that a revolutionary proletariat will be capable of reconstructive as well as destructive effort when the teaching of revolutionary Socialism—i.e., Anarchist Communism—is more generally understood amongst them.

G.

THE MUTINY OF BRAZILIAN SAILORS.

Commander Marques da Rocha—the man who ordered eighteen sailors to be slowly done to death in prison by starvation—now stands for trial before a court-martial, and we think it would interest our readers to know a little more about this appalling action of the Brazilian Government.

As we have already stated in a previous issue of FREEDOM, the sailors of the Brazilian Navy mutinied in November, 1910. On the night of the revolt only two or three officers were to be found on board each battleship, all the others having gone ashore to a ball. The sailors, infuriated at the dog's treatment they were receiving at the hand of the officers (on that very day an officer had thrashed a sailor to within an inch of his life), resolved to stand it no longer, and taking advantage of the "dutiful" officers' absence, took possession of the battleships (three powerful Dreadnoughts and six destroyers), wiring the palace of the President of the Republic to the effect that they would only surrender on the Government's assurance that the birch would be abolished, that they would receive more humane treatment generally, and that each sailor would be amnestied.

Think what an undignified position the Government were in! They had to obey the orders of a few hundred sailors—nearly all men of colour, the majority of whom could neither read nor write—or they would be shot down like dogs. They dare not sink the mutineers with torpedoes, for they would thus not only lose a few million pounds, but would also shatter the simple-minded and easily deceived Brazilian people's patriotic dreams.* To give you an idea how absolutely powerless the Government were, let me say that during the four days of the mutiny they actually supplied the sailors with food and water from land. All the mutineers had to do was to signal for what they wanted (with a gentle reminder that in case of refusal they knew how to manipulate their guns), and immediately their wishes were complied with.

Each day the Government realised to a greater extent the ridiculous position they were in. The news had already circulated throughout all Europe and America, and the comments of the foreign Press were far from favourable. Affairs could go on like this no longer; some solution had to be arrived at; and so the Government gave in, promising to comply with the mutineers' demands, and *granting to each sailor a free pardon.*

This move on the part of the Government took the shape of a special decree which went through the Chamber of Deputies, was sanctioned by the President of the Republic, and was published the next day in the *Diario Official*, the Government's official organ. On the strength of this decree, and relying upon the Government's *bona fides*, the sailors surrendered.

But although the Government were formally obliged to recognise the weakness of their position, they resolved to take a mean and cowardly revenge on the sailors once they contrived to get them again in their power. Their opportunity arose only one week afterwards. They stirred to revolt a battalion of Naval Fusiliers, with headquarters on the Island of Cobras, thus having a pretext for proclaiming martial law, and then imprisoned all the sailors they had only a few days previously granted a free pardon. The heat at the time was terrific; but nevertheless Marques da Rocha did not hesitate to bundle five, six, and even seven sailors into a tiny cell hardly large enough for one man. He gave strict instructions to the warders—the sailors were imprisoned in the dungeons of the prisons on the Island of Cobras—that the prisoners were to be left in this condition, without being given either food or water. Shortly afterwards, driven to despair by the pangs of hunger and the agonies of thirst, and maddened by the heat, the poor wretches gnawed at each other's flesh like savage beasts. Before twenty-four hours had elapsed eighteen were found dead and were secretly buried. The news got abroad immediately, however, and was met with such a storm of protest from all classes of people all over the country that the surviving sailors were eventually removed to "better" prisons where at least they were allowed one ration per day. Not satisfied with the dire punishment already inflicted upon their victims,

* The three warships, "Sao Paulo," "Minas Geraes," and "Rio de Janeiro," had only arrived a few months previously, and the Brazilians were overjoyed. In their enthusiasm the people were subscribing large sums of money towards the construction of another Dreadnought, which was to have been called "Riachuelo." "Now that we have our Dreadnoughts," they would say, "we may have no fear, for no foreign country would think of attacking us, knowing that we have the finest battleships in the world." However, the knowledge that the Dreadnoughts which were made at their expense could also be used for their own destruction acted as a shower-bath upon their "patriotism," and so the idea of building a new warship was abandoned.

the Government ordered a great number to be sent to the far-off State of Matto Grosso "to work on the construction of the new railroads." Some of them, it afterwards leaked out, were shot *en route* "for insubordination"; the others have not since been heard of.

There is not much to be gathered from the Press reports of Marques da Rocha's trial. From the evidence of several sailors, particularly that of Joao Candido, the head of the revolt, we learn that the sailors who remained in prison have been continually ill-treated by the warders still at the orders of Rocha and his officers. In spite of all these charges, however, and judging from the way the trial is being conducted, there is not the slightest doubt that Rocha will be found "innocent." The Naval Club and several influential men in Rio have placed themselves at his disposal, and promised to do everything in their power to get him acquitted. We shall not at all be surprised if we hear that for murdering eighteen men in cold blood Rocha will be sent to enjoy himself for a while in Europe, as in the case of the late Prefect of Rio de Janeiro, whose reward for ordering his *capangas* (hired ruffians) to stab to death two medical students who had incurred his displeasure, was to be sent to Paris "on a mission," where he has been living in the lap of luxury at the expense of "his country."

M. FELDMAN.

CORRESPONDENCE.

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM OR ANARCHIST COMMUNISM?

DEAR COMRADE,—What I wish particularly to deal with is the idea of Industrial Unionism. What is there in this idea to attract Anarchists any more than there is in Trade Unionism? Do we as Anarchists become any more infused with the breath of solidarity and revolt by joining the Industrial Workers of the World than we do by joining an ordinary Trade or Labour Union? Can we better spread the idea of Anarchy by doing so? I feel that all these questions can be answered with a direct negative. It is urged by those who favour Industrial Unionism that it is a revolutionary organisation aiming at the overthrow of the capitalist form of society and the wages system, whilst the ordinary Trade and Labour Unions are only established to obtain better conditions under Capitalism. Even if we admit that this is quite true, it is only necessary for me to point out that the objects and constitutions of Trade and Labour Unions are not like the laws of Nature, but that they can be set aside or altered, and that as the ideas of the members develop and change, so will the organisations to which they belong. This could be said of all the objections which I have heard against Trade and Labour Unions, such as their scabbing one upon another, their being close corporations, thus making it very difficult to join them, all of which could be traced to their narrow-minded egoism and self-conceit, which is not by any means altered by our joining the revolutionary Industrial Union. And lest it should be interpreted that I feel it would be altered by our becoming members of an Anarchist Communist group, let me say that I do not entertain any such notion. On the contrary, I think it very probable that Industrial Unionist groups are doing more at present to broaden the minds of Trade Unionists than are the Anarchists. This is not, however, because of their better ideas, but because of their greater numbers and the tremendous amount of prejudice which Anarchists have to meet, and which prevents their doctrine being examined.

I have said that those who favour Industrial Unionism against Trade Unionism do so because it is a revolutionary organisation aiming at the overthrow of Capitalism and the establishment of the Industrial Commonwealth. Yes; but what is meant by the Industrial Commonwealth? Does it mean anything different from the Independent Labour Party's State-ownership of all the means of production and distribution? There is nothing in their literature, so far as I have been able to discover, to lead one to believe that they are in any way sympathetic towards a non-governmental form of society, for which Anarchists are fighting, whilst there is abundance of evidence to show that they do not favour Anarchy. This being so, and I feel that these statements are indisputable, is it not clear that the revolution for which they are fighting is one which would merely change our oppressors, still leaving us victims of the governmental superstition? What, then, can Anarchists have to do with such an organisation?

I should be glad if any comrades in Belfast interested in the propaganda of Anarchist Communism would communicate with me.

Yours fraternally,

R. STUBBS.

45 Killowen Street, Woodstock Road, Belfast.

CHICAGO MARTYRS MEETING.

On Monday, November 13th, an international meeting was held at the South Place, Moorgate Street, E.C., to commemorate the twenty-fourth anniversary of the judicial murder of the Chicago Anarchists. Comrades W. Ponder, Mrs. Baker, L. Withington, R. Rocker, G. A. Aldred, J. Tochatti, E. Malatesta, H. J. Jaxon, and Brant-Selo delivered inspiring addresses to a good audience. The comrades and friends present responded liberally to the appeal for a collection to defray expenses, and there was a fairly good sale of literature.

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.

Anarchist Organisation.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the thorny question of organisation has always been the stumbling-block within the Anarchist movement. It is therefore of the utmost importance that an earnest attempt be made to disentangle this question from all non-essentials, get to the core of it and see by what means the organisation of Anarchist effort could be made a moving force, able to make itself understood as a rational and practical basis for social reorganisation by the great masses of the people.

Let us, then, first examine the objections against any permanent Anarchist organisation. We need not dwell too long on the arguments of those Anarchists who are against organisation in any shape or form. It is only curious to note that these same comrades, although antagonistic to every attempt at united work, are the first to organise themselves, very often in strong groups, whenever they wish to publish a newspaper, to issue a leaflet, to arrange lectures, and generally to excite interest in their way of thinking.

But more important for us are those of our comrades who, although admitting in principle the importance of organisation, do not think that any good will come from any permanently established forms. They are of opinion that the only form under which Anarchist groups could live is that of a temporary activity for a specific purpose called forth by a certain momentary circumstance in one's daily struggle, and of its disappearance as soon as that circumstance had ceased to exist. It is nevertheless a fact that these meteoric apparitions, however interesting their presence, or however useful their temporary work, could never leave a lasting imprint on the movement of their period, for the simple reason that their personalities were unknown to the great mass of the people, and that their passing effort could not have made any impression upon it. And, after all, Anarchism will never bring about any serious upheaval amongst the workers unless its propagandists keep in constant touch with them, unless Anarchists give all their energies in planting within them the spirit of protest and revolt. So, then, the old adage, "L'union fait la force," still stands good. And without further impressing the absolute necessity of organisation, we will turn our eyes towards the practical objections against permanent Anarchist bodies.

There is, first and foremost, the objection of centralisation and of what the French individualists call *embrigadement*. It is the most serious of the objections, and should, therefore, be most carefully dissected.

What are the principles and form of a centralised organisation? The principles of such a body are the stifling of the individual initiative, the ruling of the more powerful (whether it be the majority or the minority), leading to the excommunication of all elements antagonistic to it, however honest and devoted; and finally, the setting up of a small clique which, either by its greater cunning or by sheer length of time, has been able to seize the power in its own hands and has become an autocratic band composed of once, perhaps, honest and well-meaning persons. The form of such an organisation is to be seen in its most brutal shape in the present Governments, and in its less tyrannical shape—through, perhaps, smaller possession of power—in all political and most Labour and Socialist organisations and societies all over the civilised world.

The fundamental principles of Anarchism are against any form of tyranny, whether coming from God, Government, group, or individual. But, of course, besides principles, we have to count on the conditions of the struggle. And very often—even

more often than otherwise—human nature goes against those principles which it has earlier set itself to follow. It is then of the greatest necessity to find out under which conditions and what forms an organisation can be built up so as to avoid the possibility of some persons taking the upper hand and destroying its fruitfulness. And the first danger, to our mind, lies in the setting up of large organisations composed, as they necessarily must be, of most heterogeneous elements, where disagreement on matters of tactics, and sometimes on questions of principle, are inevitable, and where such dissensions will always lead to the weakening of individual initiative which lies at the root of Anarchism, the splitting up into small circles of malcontents, and the resulting antagonism amongst members of the same organisation, leading either to the breaking up of the whole group or to the formation of a small body within the larger, capable of holding in their hands the rest, and which, by using the methods of the iron fist, strangles the protests of the minority. It may save the existence of that body, but its salvation has been won at the cost of transforming what might have been under other circumstances a strong, free, and effective movement into a large body, the power of which is centralised in the hands of a few. These few, however devoted to their ideal, will inevitably become, on a very small scale of course, the little "dictators" of a useless body.

But what are these "other circumstances" under which such a large body of adherents to a certain ideal could become a strong, free, and great movement? It is our wish, in the next few lines, to develop the idea of that form of organised movement in which the possibility of the upper hand and that of the development of "leaders" could be, if not totally obliterated, at least brought to a minimum.

We think that the present basis of organisation should be that of groupings by affinities, just as the basis of organisation in the future free society will be the "communes of affinities." Comrades with the same ideal may have characters with diametrically opposed temperaments; continual rubbing of these temperaments through constant discussions on, perhaps, points of secondary importance would inevitably lead to disruption, whereas if grouped by sympathies of work or sympathies of temperament, it could only lead to stronger activity and greater usefulness. In other words, it is the *great number of small groups*, rather than the *one single large group*, which is the future of Anarchist organisation.

To put the matter in a more concrete form, and under the shape of a suggestion, we think that the first step towards an organisation of this kind would be to call all comrades of a certain locality together—the initiative could be taken by any already existing group—and to come to an understanding as to the way in which propaganda could best be undertaken in that locality. This done, those present would then endeavour to form themselves into as many groups as there are duties to perform; the groupings would be by way of personal friendship, by way of special abilities, or by any way best suitable, according to the changing circumstances arising in different localities. Let us say, for instance, that the comrades of a certain locality found it necessary (1) to have their own journal; (2) to systematically arrange lectures and discussions; (3) to work within the Trade Unions and infuse therein the Anarchist spirit; (4) to undertake the formation of co-operative associations, etc., etc.; it would then be advisable to have as many groups, each one capable of undertaking any one of the points mentioned above.

The formation of such groups will in itself get rid of another dangerous element in our movement, forming the next serious objection of those who are against permanent organisations. It is the comparative ease with which spies or *agents-provocateurs* could live and prosper in large organisations. Where there is a great number of men meeting together there is always a very great difficulty in sifting characters and getting to know every one; it is therefore easier for the police agent to introduce himself without being unmasked. It is a more difficult thing to do when one has to deal with small groups. In these small groups, where friendship very soon replaces the ordinary propagandist relations, any serious comrade will soon find out who is of the "traitor" type. But even were a spy to introduce himself, the worst that could happen would be the disintegration of that one group, and no more; and however serious, it would have much graver effects on the *whole movement* if a traitor were to be found in a large group holding in its hands the whole propaganda of a locality.

The groups will not be able to develop any tendencies towards centralisation, the work of propaganda being distributed, instead of being kept within the limits of one single group. But it should be borne in mind that circumstances change in every

locality. It is therefore necessary that all these groups, working on autonomous principles, should meet at convenient intervals to report progress. There are cases in which joint action on the part of all Anarchists of a locality—or of a country as a whole—is of paramount importance. To take concrete examples: such international agitations as those for Kotoku and for Ferrer would have had a much greater importance—at least from the educational standpoint—had the comrades been organised in such a way as to simultaneously start the agitation, instead of the spasmodic way in which it has usually been done. Here in England the present general unrest might have given excellent possibilities for concerted action all over the country had we had groups in direct and constant communication. We repeat, therefore, that it is important that the groups of a locality should be federated,—i.e., that although the groups remain autonomous in their activities, they are ready to work hand-in-hand as far as the ordinary routine propaganda is concerned, as well as in cases of concerted action. This would bring about a more systematic activity amongst comrades, would develop individual initiative as well as action in common, would educate comrades to tolerate opinions and criticisms, and would lead Anarchism to become a recognised force ready to fight in the service of oppressed humanity.

A. S.

The Vanity of the Vote and the Reality of Direct Action.

Solomon, or the ancient who wrote the book ascribed to him, must have seen some vanity in his day which caused him to exclaim: "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity." It is questionable, however, if the author of Ecclesiasticus knew anything approaching in vanity the modern system of voting.

The propertyless worker, voting his master into the capitalist citadel of the vested interests, or sending his crude agitators to try a fall with him in his own citadel,—these constitute the superlative vanities. Every agitator of the people who enters Parliament has to be digested or spit out. It takes about three months to digest the average agitator. If at the end of this time Parliament has not succeeded in making him an asset on the side of the vested interests, and useless or dangerous to the common people who sent him there, word is given to the reptile press to discredit him, and Parliament prepares to take action with the view at the next Election to spit him out. No man, while private ownership and Capitalism hold the field, must be allowed to run against the vested interests of Parliament. He may make a show of doing it; he may make a very big show; he may have the revolutionary form, and may pose thus to such a degree that the uninitiated may back him as a revolutionary; but the astute politicians know that they have him all the time, that at bottom he is loyal to King and Constitution, is a safe man, or he would not be in Parliament.

Therefore we Anarchists affirm that no pressure against the vested interests can come from Parliament, but must come from the people outside. Parliament is the council of the vested interests of property. Here the exploiting horde fight each other for supremacy over the wealth produced by the workers. Here landlords fight capitalists; and these fight the people of petty property, while all unite to maintain the system which allows them to plunder the propertyless of their labour. At this point there is honour among the thieves. At no time do they change their fighting into common action to do something for the people unless forced by some tremendous upheaval from the people outside.

This is truth old and stale. It is truth so old and stale that the people are only just beginning to notice it after most terrible poverty and suffering. Wonderful are the blandishments of the political orator; marvellous are his powers of persuasion when these have behind them visions of a seat in Parliament or a seat upon the Woolsack for the orator. They have succeeded in making the worker see every beautiful lie before the plain truth. Hypnotised by political rhetoric, the worker has nearly exhausted every possibility of error. From voting his master into Parliament the worker has taken to voting his own agitators into Parliament. Here they have been translated into respectable commercial gentlemen as suddenly as Bottom of the "Midsummer Night's Dream" is translated into a donkey.

Marvellous is the power of the mother of Parliaments to make political orators forget the millions weltering in poverty and misery. Outside they call the oppressors vampires, blood-suckers, robbers; inside they call them right honourable gentlemen. They forget the cracked limbs and hollow frames that are toiling to keep these gentlemen sleek and fat. They frown a little, then smile, then shake hands, then put on the fine behaviour, and forget the hungry animalism and brute struggle upon which it is all built. The environment soon changes them from rugged men of sympathy into well-fed beasts. Before entering, these agitators swear loyalty to the King and Constitution, just like the Liberal and Tory. Once inside they vote Budgets to keep up the Army and Navy, just like the Liberal and Tory. The Government brings out its pabulum of reform, and

although they said they were out for Socialism, they now discuss the patching and mending of Capitalism, just like the Liberals and Tories. They say Capitalism is evil, and they want to end it; and yet they help to administer it that it may last as long as possible. There is danger of a general strike. One of these converted agitators rushes to the rescue with a Trade Disputes Bill to crush the wicked "right to strike." Others rush to remonstrate with the Trade Union leaders for daring to do such a rash thing as take direct action. Is not Parliament the sacred assembly of the vested interests, the body to settle such disputes? And are not they now Members of Parliament? If the workers turn their backs upon Parliament, and in their Guilds and Trade Unions organise to do these things for themselves, where will their jobs be? Already, like Othello, they feel their occupations gone. Perish the thought! Down with the strike! Down with direct action! These were the men who outside wanted to abolish Capitalism, and here we behold them more diligent than the capitalists themselves in their efforts to preserve it. Well may we repeat the saying of our shrewd, virile forefathers: "Put the beggar on horseback, and he'll ride to the devil." Put the Socialist into Parliament, and he will turn out the most intrepid supporter of the capitalist system.

If the worker votes in the Social Democrat he must expect to see the result exactly the same, and should a general strike come, he must see these Social Democrats standing by the vested interests, upholding law and order, and supporting the Government in shooting down the strikers who, sick at last of the sterility of political action, have embraced direct action. Do not the political Socialists candidly affirm that they do not advocate strikes or encourage direct action? If this then be their attitude outside Parliament, what have we to expect from them inside Parliament during a general strike? And if our thesis is right that no pressure against the vested interests can come from within Parliament, then it must come from without in a general strike. But some are saying at present: "If you are right in your view that no advantage can come from Parliament, unless it is moved by outside pressure, how do you account for the Insurance Bill of Mr. Lloyd George? Is not this a blow against the vested interests that has come without any outside agitation?" It is not a blow to the vested interests, we reply. True, a few of the least astute of the employers thought so at first, and prepared to kick. But Mr. Lloyd George took them aside and assured them that their profits would in no wise suffer, but, on the contrary, would be increased. So now they are quite reconciled that their Chancellor is no wild revolutionary, but a safe man. The worker will be mulcted a little more, but profits will increase. No; this is no blow to the vested interests, and our thesis stands.

But say others: "How do you meet Mr. Asquith's offer to give the people manhood suffrage? Would not this be a blow to the vested interests?" No, we reply; it would be propping them up, and that is what Mr. Asquith means it to be. Mr. Asquith as an astute politician, reading his political chart well, notices that the people are beginning to lose faith in political action, and that there is a strong tendency in the direction of direct action. How shall he revive the waning interest in political action and stem the threatening current? This is the problem. Mr. Asquith intends to solve it by giving more votes, knowing quite well that so long as the people can be kept voting the politicians can invent political nostrums for them, and keep them from the path of direct action. But mark! It is only the direct action of the seamen, dockers, and railwaymen, and the fear that this will grow, which has caused Mr. Asquith to throw out manhood suffrage as a check. If the people are really beginning to take things into their own hands, something must be done to stir the political machine and retrieve our reputations as legislators. Therefore, let us give all the people the vote, and hope for a new interest in politics. So reasons Mr. Asquith.

But manhood suffrage will not hit the vested interests so long as the politicians can dazzle the people with political moonshine. They have manhood suffrage in France, Germany, and America. Does it hit the vested interests? No! A million fools only vote their folly, and the grafters and politicians throw the bait for it. Manhood suffrage means more voting for political illusions, and heading back direct action and economic reality. Our thesis stands. Pressure must come not from Parliament but from outside. The worker must cease to expect leaders, delegates, and representatives to do it for him, and must begin to do it for himself. He must realise that when these men go from him they do not represent him. He whom you send to Parliament, my brother, is no longer he, but another. He changes with the environment. He mixes with landlord, capitalist, banker, brewer, stock-jobber, and railway magnate. He goes to garden parties, at homes, and levees. He is fêted, caressed, flattered by the enemy. He is no longer John Smith, your fellow-worker, and makes haste to forget you. There was once a Socialist agitator of Trafalgar Square fame. The people voted him into Parliament, and the capitalists in due season made him chief boss of the workhouse.

They all go that way. It is only a matter of time. They mix with them; they are merged into them; they become part and parcel of them. Therefore the worker must do it himself. He must know his own mind, know what he wants, and demand it.

Labour being at last awake, will realise many things and the way of doing them. Let the workers learn to take things into their own hands as much as possible. Experience will gradually teach them that government is useless to them, that it was useful only to the exploiting class; and when capitalism ends, government must end with it.

JOHN TAMLYN.

THE FERRER MEMORIAL AT BRUSSELS.

Words of protest are of small importance in our age of increasing brutality, when Governments cynically proclaim and practise their "right" to murder anybody who stands in their way, be they strikers in South Wales who might have delayed a train, or Arabs, women and children included, in Tripoli, who resent the burglarious invasion of their country. Here and there the people seem to be tired of this after all, as in China, Mexico, Portugal, and elsewhere; but in the main their silence makes them almost accomplices of all these outrages on humanity, which only a few years ago were believed to be things of the past, belonging to the dark ages of history. Words are of little use, I said, and monuments seem a mockery in this age of oppression, and yet we all like them; they give us some little comfort of feeling that we are not quite alone, that everywhere small minorities are roused, making their way by various paths towards intellectual and moral, social and political freedom. The more they see of each other and extend fraternal co-operation between them, the more are hope and energy kept alive and strengthened. In this sense we welcome the gathering of Freethinkers and friends of education who met at Brussels on November 5 to inaugurate the monument to Francisco Ferrer.

From the extensive report in *La Pensée* (the Belgian Freethought paper, edited by Eugène Hins, who in the later "sixties" was one of the foremost propagandists of the International in Belgium), we can only glean a few extracts of speeches here and there. An immense procession of Freethinkers, Socialists, Syndicalists, Young Socialists, and children went to the Place Sainte-Catherine in the centre of Brussels, where the Municipal Council, on October 31, 1909, authorised the monument to be erected, consisting of a genius lifting high a torch, the symbol of the triumph of Light over all the dark forces which still surround us. Paris possesses already the statues of Etienne Dolet and the Chevalier de la Barre, victims of Freethought burned in the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries; the Campo dei Fiori, at Rome, that of Giordano Bruno; Annemasse, near Geneva, and Vienne (Isère, France), that of Calvin's victim, Michael Servetus.

James Hocart, president of the committee, a former pastor of the Brussels Protestant Liberal Church, unveiled the monument. Among the speakers after the subsequent lunch, I may mention Lorenzo Portet, Ferrer's friend, who said: "Ferrer saw in the rational education of the child the guarantee of and first step towards the complete emancipation of mankind; by remodelling the school, he intended to obtain the remodelling of the whole of society in the direction of freedom and of justice." Ferrer's goods are still in the grip of the Spanish Government. Paul Janson, the old Radical and Belgium's most renowned lawyer and orator, said that whilst heresy no longer leads to the stake, clerical intolerance has not yet disarmed, and strove in a hypocritical and perfidious way, by specious pretexts, to bring about the death of Ferrer, the advocate of secular and scientific education, by handing him over to an exceptional tribunal.

After Mr. Frowein, of Amsterdam, who wanted a statue of Ferrer at Barcelona, where he was murdered, when clericalism and militarism have been dealt with, Charles Malato spoke. He knew Ferrer since 1895, and sketched his evolution. In 1907, when he was first tried, a general outburst of protestations saved him; in 1909 his enemies took their revenge. The Liberal Government of Canalejas maintains the confiscation of Ferrer's goods seized by Maura. To-day there are new victims in Spanish prisons, whose death or torture is being prepared. You have glorified the dead—save the living!

Otto Karmin, of the Swiss Freethought Federation and the Masonic Lodge Fraternité, at Geneva, reminded them that Servetus and Dolet had to wait three centuries for their monuments, but Ferrer got his within two years—a hopeful sign that the ideas of toleration and freedom gain ground and march quicker to-day. The liberation of Spain from monarchist domination and exploitation is bound to come, by the implacable logic of history.

Georges Lorand, Belgian Radical Deputy, the lawyer dealing with the restitution of Ferrer's property, told of the infinite vicissitudes of this affair, the final decision upon which lies with General Weyler, the Governor-General of Catalonia. Meanwhile, the mass of the publications of the Modern School, none of which was ever the object of any prosecution, is rotting away in damp rooms.

William Heaford, the delegate of the National Secular Society, Leon Furnemont, Belgian Socialist Deputy, Mrs. Phelps, for the Rationalist Press Association, Eugène Hins (replacing Hector Denis), and Tarrida del Marmol (in the name of Spanish revolutionists of Europe and America, and in that of English friends, Keir Hardie, Ramsay MacDonald, William Archer, Bert Ward, the Freedom Group, Sheffield Trade Unionists, etc.) also spoke. Tarrida said: "At this moment even we see, at Cullera and at Bilbao, a repetition of the horrors of Xérez [1892], of Figueras, of Montjuich, of Alcala del Valle, of San Miguel de los Reyes. More than ever we must continue to struggle."

Next spoke Emile Vinck, of the Federation of Belgian Socialist Municipal Councillors, and Eugène Monseur, secretary of the Œuvre Francisco Ferrer. The latter communicated letters sent by Ernest Haeckel, Hector Denis (another veteran of the Belgian Socialist movement of the "sixties"), A. Naquet, C. Laisant, C. Pelletan, Ramsay MacDonald, our old comrade Anselmo Lorenzo (who beginning propaganda in the earliest days of the International, in 1868 onward, is still

as active as ever), the secretary of the Sheffield Trades and Labour Council, Domela Nieuwenhuis, William Archer, Magalhaes Lima, the Freedom Group, and many, many others.

In Lorenzo's letter (Barcelona, October 27) the Anarchist ideas of Ferrer (which some still choose to doubt or to ignore) are recalled from intimate personal knowledge and also from Ferrer's articles, signed "Cero," in his paper, *La Huelga General* (the General Strike), published in 1901, more particulars of which and a reprint of some can be found in a pamphlet published by Lorenzo ("Ferrer y La Huelga General," Barcelona, 1910).

Thus the international meeting passed off very well and in the finest of spirits. All speakers, however, urged that commemorations of this kind are only moments of repose and rest to gather fresh hope and new strength, but that to work steadily and unceasingly for the ideas of which Ferrer was such a brilliant representative, the education of man and woman towards freedom and real humanity, was the principal thing to do, and we hope that this appeal, and that in favour of the present victims of Spanish persecution, will be followed more than ever.

CAN WE RUN A WEEKLY PAPER?

The unanimous opinion among comrades is that a weekly paper is essential; on that point we all agree. The difference arises, however, when the question is asked: "Can we run a weekly paper?" Some of the comrades have exclaimed with enthusiasm: "Yes! Certainly! With energy and spirit and co-operation we can make the paper a success. Hurrah for the weekly!" Others have predicted failure, but said they were willing to do their best to make failure a success. On the other hand, a large number of comrades have said nothing. They have not even intimated that they had ever heard or read of such a paper as an "Anarchist weekly." The inference to be drawn from the silence of these comrades is that we cannot run a weekly paper, and that it is worse than useless to try to do so.

It is to such comrades that we now address ourselves. We wish to say to them that if we do not succeed they will be entirely to blame. If the weekly paper is a failure, they will be the cause of that failure. Of course, they will exclaim: "Absurd; we took no part whatever in the matter." Quite so, and therein lies the fault. They have in no way tried to support the paper. If the paper fails, it will be for lack of support, and those who have not given that support will be the cause of the failure.

Now there are, we understand, about three thousand readers of FREEDOM. But we have not received three thousand promises of support. We have not received even one thousand. *Why is this?* With one thousand staunch supporters working enthusiastically and energetically, advertising and organising for the paper, we could surmount all barriers and emerge victorious.

Hurry up then you comrades who have not yet answered the call. The time is drawing near. We hope a conference to discuss affairs pertaining to the weekly will be held in Liverpool on December 24th and 25th. We want all subscribers to have their names sent in before then if possible; so, comrades, do not delay, but send along your names and addresses at once. The money can follow at any time between now and May 1st, 1912. Remember, the 10s. subscription allows you to have the paper sent to you post free for the first year, and also the advantage of obtaining it the second year at the reduced rate of 5s. All names and addresses to be sent to A. Mackay, Clarion Rooms, 7 Holland Street, Glasgow, and to be in if possible before December 20th. All postal and money orders should be made payable to A. Mackay.

Received for weekly paper, R. Gillingham, £1.

D. K.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

Mexico.

In acknowledging a small sum collected by FREEDOM for the Mexican Revolutionists, our comrade Wm. C. Owen (editor of the English section of *Regeneration*) writes as follows:—

One understands—perhaps I as an Englishman specially understand—the drain on your purses caused by recent events in England, events that I sincerely hope the Anarchists may be able to turn to good account, for it is disgusting that the "leaders" and politicians should have brought so promising a situation to so untimely an end. I thought *Le Libertaire*, or it may have been some other French paper, commented excellently. I know I reproduced the comment in the English section of *Regeneration*.

I know how conflicting the news from Mexico must seem to outsiders, but it must be remembered that the papers are not interested in giving our side, and also that revolutions do not work themselves out according to set programme. I can assure you that the Magons, etc., who know their country very well and are most clear-headed on the social question, feel more than satisfied with the progress being made; and I myself, from my reading of the Mexican dailies, am quite sure that the land question has been pushed to the front so remorselessly that no party—and there are many in the field—dare keep silent on it. What is much more to the point is that the peons

themselves have been taking possession of the land in countless instances. I try to give much information on that head.

Of course, we are having a desperate struggle, for we are active throughout Mexico, and the hand of all the powers that be is against us; but, even if they were to crush us, I am satisfied that an immense work has been done and that it will stick. The demand of the people for their land will not down.

Our hard task in this country is due to the really most malignant attitude of the Socialists and also of the Single Taxers, both of whom seem to be quite bitterly opposed to any nation getting back its land except in accordance with their set programme. It is miserable, but I suppose this was to be expected.

I room at the headquarters of this paper, and, although my daily work keeps me much away, I see a great deal of the Magons, etc., and believe I understand them most thoroughly. I am satisfied their one thought is that the Mexicans shall win economic liberty through the retaking of their land, and thereby set an example the rest of the world will follow. They are international Anarchists of the most unflinching type. Assuredly their cause should have the support of all international revolutionists, and in saying that I am not speaking of money support, for we are most unwilling beggars. As a matter of fact, it is the Mexican revolutionary groups that keep us going, and but for their loyal support we could not live a week. As it is, we send thousands of copies of *Regeneracion* weekly all over Mexico for which we never can expect to get a cent. We also distribute an immense amount of literature in this country.

913 Boston Street, Los Angeles, California.

Spain.

The prisons are being filled with working people supposed to be connected with the recent labour agitation. Amongst the prisoners in Bilbao are fifteen women, most of whom are accompanied by their children. In Barcelona, forty workers have been arrested, notwithstanding the fact that no strike took place in that town. Special reference must be made to the workers who have been arrested in Cullera, the majority of whom, the capitalist press states with delight, are to be sentenced to death. The workers all over Spain are protesting vehemently against this intended outrage on the part of the authorities.

Argentine Republic.

In Mar del Plata, during a recent demonstration several workers were shot down by the police and a great many arrested. As a protest against this brutal action, a general strike was declared next day, which lasted for ten days. Fortunately, the workers of Argentine are alive to their duty, and it is to be expected that, on account of their persistent agitation, the fifty-eight workers who are at present in prison will be speedily liberated.

New Paper on Russian Affairs.

As the diplomatic friendship between Russia, France, and England becomes closer, it is more difficult than ever to obtain reliable news on what really happens in Russia—all the political persecutions, the beginning famine, the doings of her police abroad (the latest of the unmentionable Azeff, etc.). Hence those who read French will welcome the publication of *L'Avenir* (The Future), a large weekly paper (in French and in Russian) which our friend V. Bourtzeff has edited in Paris since the end of September. The address is 50 Boulevard St. Jacques, Paris, XIV. Subscription abroad to the end of 1911, 1s. 3d.; single copies, 1½d.

FRENCH BOOKS ON SALE.

The following volumes of "Bibliothèque Sociologique" (Paris: P.-V. Stock), can be obtained from FREEDOM Office. Price 3s. post-free, except when otherwise stated:—

- C. ALBERT: "L'Amour Libre."
 BAKOUNINE: "Œuvres" (reprints of scarce early pamphlets and articles, first publication of unpublished manuscripts). 5 vols.
 CAFIERO: "Abrégé du 'Capital' de Karl Marx." (A resumé of Marx's "Capital" by Cafiero, the friend of Bakunin). 1s. 4d. post-free.
 C. CORNELISSEN: "En Marche vers la Société Nouvelle."
 CEURDEROY: "Jours d'Exil" (1849-1851): (Memoirs of an early French Anarchist). 3 vols.
 L. DESCAYES: "Soupes" (Nouvelles).
 SEBASTIEN FAURE: "Le Douleur universelle. Philosophie libertaire."
 G. FERRERO: "Le Militarisme et la Société Moderne."
 JEAN GRAVE: "L'Anarchie. Son but. Ses moyens."
 " " "L'Individu et la Société."
 " " "La Société Mourante et l'Anarchie."
 " " "Réformes, Révolution."
 " " "La Société future."
 A. HAMON: "Psychologie de l'Anarchiste Socialiste."
 G. C. HILL: "La Physiologie Morale."
 P. KROPOTKINE: "La Conquête du Pain."
 " " "Autour d'une Vie."
 " " "Le Grande Révolution." 3s. 6d. post-free.
 " " "Anarchie." 1s. post-free.
 CH. MALATO: "Philosophie de l'Anarchie."
 TARRIDA DEL MARMOL: "Les Inquisiteurs de l'Espagne. Montjuich—Cuba—Philippines."
 LOUISE MICHEL: "La Commune."
 D. NIEUWENHUIS: "Le Socialisme en Danger."

PROPAGANDA NOTES.

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

LIVERPOOL.—We had quite a livener here, due to Mat Kavanagh's visit. The first meeting was for some of the younger fry of the movement, and a right royal reception they gave him. The S.D.P. Socialist School threw its doors open to receive the homeless Modern School on the 12th. The hall was packed with the nippers. Mat addressed them on the Chicago Martyrs, pointing out that there is another history of the world beside the one dealt with in the day schools—viz., the industrial history of the people. The children maintained silence during Mat's short but concise speech. Fred George, a baritone of considerable repute, rendered "Annie Laurie" (the song of Albert Parsons) immediately after the speech. The reason of his singing this song was explained by the lecturer. Our Fleetwood comrade Will Hart was the pianist of the afternoon.

During the week the inclemency of the weather put a damper on the open-air work, of which we were hoping much. However, we managed to arrange dates with the B.S.P. of Walton on the 16th, and Tranmere B.S.P. on the 17th and 19th. On each occasion Kavanagh lectured on "Anarchism v. State Socialism." At each meeting there were a number who repudiated State Socialism root and branch, and took up the revolutionary attitude of the Anarchist. That laws were made for slaves, that an ideal state was "neither god nor master," and that majority or minority rule was equally unjust, was a position that greatly troubled our fellow slaves. Kavanagh endeavoured to make the matter clear, and I firmly believe he has at least set many thinking over their transition period. At Tranmere B.S.P., Mat made a good impression. They invited him over on the Sunday following, to thrash the business out. Comrade Webster was amongst us, and he sold many pamphlets to inquirers. There is a good field for propaganda at Tranmere. It is pleasing to note that our comrade has had an invitation to do a week's lecturing there at some future date.

On the Sunday afternoon (19th) the Kensington Socialist School invited the Modern School to their abode. Again we had a bumper meeting. Mat delivered a short lecture on "The Chinaman and the Pelican." Questions followed, questions which would put some of the older people at the other meetings to shame. We had a splendid musical programme. Fred George rendered two appropriate songs, "The Rebel" and "Son of Mine." Lively little George Kent, who never fails to bring smiles to the youngsters' faces, sang "Lindy Loo." Wm. Griffiths set the children all merry and bright with his descriptive song entitled "Wild Woodbines." Ella Dean recited "The Song of the Shirt." Jack Quayle was at the piano, and Geo. Davison "conducted" the meeting.

We firmly believe Mat Kavanagh's propaganda week has proved a success. We are anticipating a visit from our comrade Barrett, of Glasgow, to pave the way for the venture of the Anarchist weekly. It behoves all our comrades to rally round during his visit. A conference to deal with the weekly and the propaganda will be held in Liverpool on December 24-25. We need funds for comrade Barrett's tour.

Donations to defray expenses of Mat Kavanagh's visit—F. Goulding 1s., S. H. M. 5s., G. D. £1, "Surreptitious" £1, W. O'H. 2s. 6d., D. J. 2s. 6d.

DICK JAMES.

GLASGOW.—So far, our lectures have not been so well attended as was expected—perhaps on account of the weather. However, we hope that comrades in and near Glasgow will attend and advertise these meetings held in the Brassfinishers' Hall, 36 Main Street, Gorbals, on alternate Sundays. December 10, comrade Semple on "Tolstoy"; December 24, comrade Muirhead on "Dreams of Dreamers, Ancient and Modern."

We have had several social evenings and intend to continue holding these on the first Tuesday of every month, as they have been successful in raising funds for the new paper, as well as giving comrades an opportunity of knowing each other. The next, on December 5, will, we hope, be even better than the others.

We are looking forward to having the new paper published next May Day, but looking won't bring it. There's work to be done, so let not our comrade Kennedy's appeal this month be in vain.

Group meeting on Tuesdays at 7 Holland Street.

A. F.

LONDON.

VICTORIA PARK.—Last Sunday, Nov. 26, an excellent meeting was held here, Mrs. Baker being the speaker. A very vigorous address was given in racy style, which was greatly appreciated by a crowd of about four hundred, and this in spite of the fact that it was almost freezing. Later a short meeting was held outside to call attention to literature and to ask for a collection—the first time at this spot—to assist in defraying expenses of an indoor lecture to be given the same evening. Result: collection, 12s. 1d.; literature, 8s.

A very successful evening meeting was held at King's Hall, Commercial Road, E., Honore J. Jaxon being the speaker. His subject, "The Meaning and Purpose of the Struggle of Life," was splendidly dealt with, and a good discussion followed. Crowded meeting; comrades are trying to obtain a larger hall.

W. P.

SOUTHWARK.—On Sunday, Nov. 19, a debate took place between Walter Ponder and W. Burnett at Southwark S.D.P. Rooms, 131 Newington Causeway, subject, "Anarchy versus Democratic Socialism." Ponder opened by defining Anarchy and Communism, and affirmed that Anarchist Communism meant Free Socialism. Next, Democratic Socialism was defined as meaning compulsory Socialism. W. Burnett then replied, defending Democracy. Taking what he termed the materialistic conception of history, he defended centralisation and authority on the ground that control of capital was getting into fewer and fewer hands, and contended that it was necessary to get hold of the machinery of government to control the said capital. He argued that seeing capitalistic development tended towards centralisation, we ought not to oppose it, but go with it, and he maintained that State Collectivism would be the result. Ponder then pointed out that though there was a tendency towards centralisation and State control, there were other streams of thought and action directly opposed to it, which were striving for more freedom, asking whether it was necessary for man to remain an appanage of a machine as determined by the capitalist system, or whether happiness was not more

important than a certain rigid economic system as depicted by Burnett. The Democrat then said Anarchists were idealists and impractical, and quoted from Tcherkesoff's pamphlet, "Concentration of Capital," a number of figures with no remarks thereon except that "They carried their own refutation." Ponder then closed the debate, thanking his opponent for his courteous address, and hoping to meet again in the near future. W. P.

EDINBURGH.—November has not turned out such a good month for propaganda as we anticipated, chiefly through Barrett's meeting, which was to have been held on Nov. 5, having to be cancelled owing to a family bereavement. We have managed, however, to keep our Sunday night meetings going, Faulk, Armstrong, McGregor, and Robertson occupying the platform respectively. A very fair amount of discussion and many questions have been the rule at every meeting.

It is worth mentioning that our friends of the I.L.P. have just won two seats on the Town Council. Mr. Archibald, who is regarded as a very able Socialist, is one. He has signalled his election by advocating "the best site in the city" for the proposed statue of Gladstone; and as another sop for the well-to-do, the addition of railings to the parapet of Dean Bridge, "the feelings of the rich" having been outraged by the suicides of the poor at this particular spot! Mr. Archibald is no doubt a class-conscious Socialist, only one must not be too particular as to the class. G. R.

Anarchist Communist Meetings in London.

Brixton—Rushcroft Road, Sundays, 7.30.
Clerkenwell—Garnault Place, Mondays and Thursdays, 8.
East Ham—Cock Hotel, Thursdays, 7.30.
Fulham—Walham Green Church, Sundays, 11.30; Tuesdays, 8.
Hyde Park—Sundays, 7.
Mile End Waste—Saturdays, 8.
Regent's Park—Sundays, 11.30.
Tottenham—West Green Corner, Sundays, 7.30.
Upton Park—District Railway Station, Mondays, 7.30.
Victoria Park—Sundays, 11.30.
Woolwich—Beresford Square, Sundays, 11.30.

Speakers wishing to book up vacant dates, or willing to exchange dates, should write J. F. Tanner, 29 Beryl Road, Hammersmith, W.

Edinburgh Anarchist Communists.—Meet at 7 p.m. every Sunday, at 142 High Street.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

(November 3—November 29.)

FREEDOM Guarantee Fund.—G. D. £5, W. M. S. 6d, H. Glasse 5s.
FREEDOM Subscriptions.—T. Schroeder 2s, J. H. Greer 2s, W. M. S. 1s 6d, A. Zibelin 1s 6d, R. Barrett 1s 6d, A. Lilburn 1s 6d, G. H. Hill 3s, A. Ross 1s 6d, E. Kiely 4s 6d, R. Bennett 1s 6d, H. J. Bennett 2s, F. Ratz 5s, F. Miller 1s 6d, A. Wilbers 2s, G. Teltsch 2s, S. Scoffham 1s 6d.
Weekly Paper Fund.—G. G. 5s, A. Ross 6d, Essex 5s.

PROPAGANDA LEAFLETS.

Open Letter to a British Socialist.
What is Anarchism?
Anarchy and the Labour War.
Our Great Empire.

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

"FREEDOM" MAY BE OBTAINED of

London.—HENDERSONS, 66 Charing Cross Road, W.C. (Wholesale).
NATIONAL LABOUR PRESS, St. Bride's House, Salisbury Square, Fleet Street, E.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.
A. ROSE & Co., Clerkenwell Road (near Holborn Hall).
F. GOULDING, 10 Gordon Road, Manor Park, E.
ISENBURG, Cleveland Street, W.

F. BENDY, 270 York Road, Bridge End, Wandsworth, S.W.
A. TOLEMAN, 54 Battersea Rise, S.W.
STEVENS, 56 High Street, Islington.
GOLIP, Osborne Street, Whitechapel.

Liverpool.—E. G. SMITH, 126 Tunnel Road (Wholesale).
CHAS. J. GRANT AND SON, 8 and 9 Lord Street Arcade.
STANLEY'S, 30 Lime Street.
WM. MALCOLM, 70 Penton Street, Farnsworth Street.

Leeds.—B. Goldberg, 14 Millwright Street.

Manchester.—BRADY AND Co., 15 Peter Street.
W. WARBURTON, 1 Victoria Arch, Great Ducie Street.

Oldham.—HYDE BROTHERS, Victoria Market.

Glasgow.—D. BAXTER, 32 Brunswick Street.
D. G. LINDSAY, 139 West Nile Street.

" " 132 Gairbraid Street, Maryhill.

Newcastle-on-Tyne.—G. GEORGE, 18 Sandringham Road, South Gosforth.

Bolton.—JOSEPH LEACH, 72 Bridge Street.

Bristol.—J. FLYNN, Haymarket.

Burnley.—J. TAMLIN, 59 Rumley Road.

Sunderland.—G. BARKER, 126 Church Street, Monkwearmouth.

Dundee.—L. MACARTNEY, 203, Overgate.

Cardiff.—M. CLARK, 26 Wood Street.

L. D. GILLET, Market Gallery.

Rhondda (Glam.)—F. DAVIES, 64 Miskin Road, Trellaw.

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.

Canada.—S. J. ELKIN, 796 Main Street, Winnipeg.

New Zealand.—P. JOSEPHS, 43A Willis Street, Wellington

G. BARRETT'S LECTURE TOUR.

At the time of writing, only a few dates have been definitely fixed, but the following are the approximate dates for the towns named:—December, 1st to 4th, Edinburgh; 5th to 8th, Newcastle; 9th to 12th, Halifax and Bradford; 13th to 16th, Huddersfield; 17th to 20th, Manchester; 21st to 27th, Liverpool. Arrangements for January will be given in next month's FREEDOM. All letters to be sent to G. Barrett, 7 Holland Street, Glasgow.

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 AGITATOR.

A Worker's Semi-Monthly.

Advocate of the Modern School, Industrial Unionism and Individual Freedom.

Yearly, \$1; Quarterly, 25 cents. Sample free.

JAY FOX, Editor.

Home, Lake Bay, Washington, U.S.A.

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 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.

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

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

THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONGRESS, 1907. 1d.

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

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 PSYCHOLOGY OF VIOLENCE. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 2d.

THE CONCENTRATION OF CAPITAL: A MARXIAN FALLACY. By W. TCHERKESOFF. 1d.

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

THE MODERN SCHOOL. By FRANCISCO FERRER. 2d.

NON-GOVERNMENTAL SOCIETY. By EDWARD CARPENTER. 3d.

STATE SOCIALISM AND ANARCHISM. By BEN. R. TUCKER. 3d.

ON THE DUTY OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE. By H. THOREAU. 3d.

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.

TRADE UNIONISM AND ANARCHISM. By JAY FOX. 2d.

THE JAPANESE MARTYRS. With Portrait of Kotoku. 1d.

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

THE CONQUEST OF BREAD. By P. KROPOTKIN. (American edition). 5s.

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

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

FIELDS, FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS. By PETER KROPOTKIN.

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

GOD AND THE STATE. By MICHAEL BAKUNIN. Cloth 1s. net, paper 6d. net, postage 1d.

ANARCHISM AND OTHER ESSAYS. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 4s. 6d. net.

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

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

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

PAGES OF SOCIALIST HISTORY. By W. TCHERKESOFF. 1s. 3d.

FAMOUS SPEECHES OF THE EIGHT CHICAGO ANARCHISTS. 1s. 3d., postage 2d.

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.

FRANCISCO FERRER: His Life, Work, and Martyrdom. 1s. net.

All orders, with cash, should be sent to

FREEDOM PRESS, 127 OSSULSTON STREET, LONDON, N.W.

Printed and published by T. H. KEELL, 127 OSSULSTON STREET, LONDON, N.W.