

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. XXVI.—No. 282.

OCTOBER, 1912.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

NOTES.

Crime and Punishment.

It is just beginning to dawn on the Prison Commissioners that punishment acts rather as a cause of crime than as a deterrent. The report published for the year ending March 31 last gives some interesting figures, proving conclusively that more humane treatment, amongst other things, has helped to reduce the number of criminals who return to prison a second time. "It is a matter for satisfaction," say the Commissioners, "that in a year marked by much social unrest, and in some places by disorder, fewer persons should come to prison relatively to population than in any year on record. The low prison population was maintained throughout the year, the daily average in local prisons being 1,000 less than in the preceding year." This should go far to convince people that there is some good ground for the Anarchist idea of the abolition of all punishment. But the Commissioners make another statement which confirms what has been argued by the majority of those holding revolutionary opinions, viz., that society manufactures its own criminals. We find, for instance, that over 50 per cent. of the total number committed to prison suffer in default of paying fines; and the report adds, "commitment to prison is not in many cases required in the public interests, either as an expiation of the offence or from the due protection of the community from acts of lawlessness." And this with a population of twelve millions living on the "poverty line." What need then for the law if all had decent means of existence?

Carson and Conscience.

It is, of course, useless to argue with opponents who are not sincere, but a few passing remarks on "Ulster's fight for liberty" may prove amusing and instructive at the same time. In the first place, in spite of the farcical doings of the gang who are stage-managing the Ulster show, the whole question of government begins to appear in a new light, even to the governed. Why should one set of people rule another set of people if the other set don't wish it? Where does the "consent of the governed" come in? And isn't it possible after all that government really creates disorder? It begins to look like it. However, when we hear of that "hero of two worlds," Sir E. Carson, martyring himself in the cause of liberty—well, who can but smile? This oracle spoke as follows: "He desired," he said, "to tell his critics that they [the Orangemen] did what they believed was right, because it was dictated by their consciences, and they could not alter the path which they had mapped out at the dictation of any man." If this talk was taken seriously, Carson would be regarded as supporting one of the first principles of Anarchism: to act according to conscience. But his challenge to Sir Rufus Isaacs touches the limit of political hypocrisy. "Dare he," he asks, "lay it down that free men must submit to any Act because it is passed by the Government of the day?" Very fine talk, Sir Edward; but where are your "free men" in the present society, and by what right do you, a Conservative coercionist, advocate rebellion against government? You are fooling the people, but your words may be remembered!

Towards Liberty.

In spite of the crimes of diplomacy, it is of the greatest interest to notice the direction political and social developments are taking the world over. In the international Socialist movement Syndicalism has brought about that division between the Parliamentarians and the Direct Actionists which was so necessary to free organised Labour from the trammels of the

politician. As a result, the gain to the Labour movement will in the near future be enormous. That much is certain. Side by side with this it is most encouraging to note the successful struggles of some of the most oppressed and "backward" nations to be rid of the worst forms of despotism. The tendency toward Republicanism and autonomy is a small matter perhaps from an Anarchist point of view, but a small matter that counts, especially the desire for autonomous administration. If we feel at the same time a hatred of things that still continue under Republican Governments—the brutality of American Labour struggles, the base sycophancy of Switzerland, the corrupt political and militarist methods in France, the unsolved problems still troubling Portugal—it must be remembered that no nation will be free from these till Capitalism and high finance have had their day. And let us not forget that these diseases of society are universal and rage in an exaggerated form in countries where Monarchy still holds its own.

Penny-a-Liner Panic.

In referring to the abrupt ending of the Army manœuvres, the *Liverpool Daily Post and Mercury* printed the following "intelligence" on September 21 last:—

"It is all very well to end the manœuvres thus suddenly. But is the reason given the truth? A rumour from an important source positively states that it was on representations of an urgent nature from the Secret Service police that the curtain was thus abruptly rung down. A curious new fact may for once be published—namely, the Anarchists are perceiving that Suffragettism may be a guise for them to get rid of their foes. Some time ago it was truthfully stated in this column that militant Suffragettes themselves said they might throw vitriol or bombs. The latter was noticed by a leading Anarchist group in Paris, and their recent efforts to get into touch with active Suffragettes in England is no secret to the international police. Some day someone may rush up to a prominent person, and when the bomb is thrown it will transpire that the pseudo-Suffragette is a devoted Anarchist."

Some of the wags of Scotland Yard (we suppose they exist) must have been "pulling the leg" of this correspondent while drinking the health of the Army, etc., etc. For although this "news" is described as "special," and is headed "From a London Club Window," the merest schoolboy will see at a glance that "Club" is a misprint for "Pub."

The Folly of the "Wise."

Wisdom, it is supposed, flows from our law-makers. It may have been so in the dim and distant past before law-making became a lucrative profession. To-day we know that he who would be wise avoids the law and those who manufacture it. Such reflections are forced upon us by the folly of such people as Mr. Philip Snowden, who has just written a book, "The Living Wage," which can only be regarded as a foolish attempt to confuse the real, vital issues involved in the class war. He has a chapter on "The Cost and Futility of Strikes," in which he attacks the "down tools" policy. Now strikes, like everything else, may fail or may succeed; when they succeed, the worker gains something, morally or materially, that helps him; when they fail—and that is often the fault of the Snowdens and the treacherous "leaders"—he also learns a lesson that guides him in the future, if it is only the lesson of not trusting those who are always betraying him. Mr. Snowden has his "living wage" (£400 and the pickings). It would be a blessing if he and his like could be pensioned, and the Labour movement left free from their meddling. It would be cheap at any price.

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

The Right to Ignore the State.

By HERBERT SPENCER.

(Conclusion)

§ 5. That a man is free to abandon the benefits and throw off the burdens of citizenship, may indeed be inferred from the admissions of existing authorities and of current opinion. Unprepared as they probably are for so extreme a doctrine as the one here maintained, the Radicals of our day yet unwittingly profess their belief in a maxim which obviously embodies this doctrine. Do we not continually hear them quote Blackstone's assertion that "no subject of England can be constrained to pay any aids or taxes even for the defence of the realm or the support of government, but such as are imposed by his own consent, or that of his representative in Parliament"? And what does this mean? It means, say they, that every man should have a vote. True: but it means much more. If there is any sense in words, it is a distinct enunciation of the very right now contended for. In affirming that a man may not be taxed unless he has directly or indirectly given his consent, it affirms that he may refuse to be so taxed; and to refuse to be taxed is to cut all connection with the State. Perhaps it will be said that this consent is not a specific, but a general, one, and that the citizen is understood to have assented to every thing his representative may do, when he voted for him. But suppose he did not vote for him; and on the contrary did all in his power to get elected some one holding opposite views—what then? The reply will probably be that by taking part in such an election, he tacitly agreed to abide by the decision of the majority. And how if he did not vote at all? Why then he cannot justly complain of any tax, seeing that he made no protest against its imposition. So, curiously enough, it seems that he gave his consent in whatever way he acted—whether he said "Yes," whether he said "No," or whether he remained neuter! A rather awkward doctrine, this. Here stands an unfortunate citizen who is asked if he will pay money for a certain proffered advantage; and, whether he employs the only means of expressing his refusal or does not employ it, we are told that he practically agrees, if only the number of others who agree is greater than the number of those who dissent. And thus we are introduced to the novel principle that A's consent to a thing is not determined by what A says, but by what B may happen to say!

It is for those who quote Blackstone to choose between this absurdity and the doctrine above set forth. Either his maxim implies the right to ignore the State, or it is sheer nonsense.

§ 6. There is a strange heterogeneity in our political faiths. Systems that have had their day, and are beginning here and there to let the daylight through, are patched with modern notions utterly unlike in quality and colour; and men gravely display these systems, wear them, and walk about in them, quite unconscious of their grotesqueness. This transition state of ours, partaking as it does equally of the past and the future, breeds hybrid theories exhibiting the oddest union of bygone despotism and coming freedom. Here are types of the old organisation curiously disguised by germs of the new—peculiarities showing adaptation to a preceding state modified by rudiments that prophesy of something to come—making altogether so chaotic a mixture of relationships that there is no saying to what class these births of the age should be referred.

As ideas must of necessity bear the stamp of the time, it is useless to lament the contentment with which these incongruous beliefs are held. Otherwise it would seem unfortunate that men do not pursue to the end the trains of reasoning which have led to these partial modifications. In the present case, for example, consistency would force them to admit that, on other points besides the one just noticed, they hold opinions and use arguments in which the right to ignore the State is involved.

For what is the meaning of Dissent? The time was when a man's faith and his mode of worship were as much determinable by law as his secular acts; and, according to provisions extant in our statute-book, are so still. Thanks to the growth of a Protestant spirit, however, we have ignored the State in this matter—wholly in theory, and partly in practice. But how have we done so? By assuming an attitude which, if consistently maintained, implies a right to ignore the State entirely. Observe the positions of the two parties. "This is your creed," says the legislator; "you must believe and openly profess what is here set down for you." "I shall not do anything of the kind," answers the Nonconformist; "I will go to prison rather." "Your religious ordinances," pursues the legislator, "shall be such as we have prescribed. You shall attend the churches we have endowed, and adopt the ceremonies used in them." "Nothing shall induce me to do so," is the reply; "I altogether deny your power to dictate to me in such matters, and mean to resist to the uttermost." "Lastly," adds the legislator, "we shall require you to pay such sums of money toward the support of these religious institutions as we may see fit to ask." "Not a farthing will you have from me," exclaims our sturdy Inde-

pendent; "even did I believe in the doctrines of your church (which I do not), I should still rebel against your interference; and, if you take my property, it shall be by force and under protest."

What now does this proceeding amount to when regarded in the abstract? It amounts to an assertion by the individual of the right to exercise one of his faculties—the religious sentiment—without let or hindrance, and with no limit save that set up by the equal claims of others. And what is meant by ignoring the State? Simply an assertion of the right similarly to exercise *all* the faculties. The one is just an expansion of the other—rests on the same footing with the other—must stand or fall with the other. Men do indeed speak of civil and religious liberty as different things: but the distinction is quite arbitrary. They are parts of the same whole, and cannot philosophically be separated.

"Yes they can," interposes an objector; "assertion of the one is imperative as being a religious duty. The liberty to worship God in the way that seems to him right, is a liberty without which a man cannot fulfil what he believes to be divine commands, and therefore conscience requires him to maintain it." True enough; but how if the same can be asserted of all other liberty? How if maintenance of this also turns out to be a matter of conscience? Have we not seen that human happiness is the divine will—that only by exercising our faculties is this happiness obtainable—and that it is impossible to exercise them without freedom? And, if this freedom for the exercise of faculties is a condition without which the divine will cannot be fulfilled, the preservation of it is, by our objector's own showing, a duty. Or, in other words, it appears not only that the maintenance of liberty of action *may* be a point of conscience, but that it *ought* to be one. And thus we are clearly shown that the claims to ignore the State in religious and in secular matters are in essence identical.

The other reason commonly assigned for nonconformity admits of similar treatment. Besides resisting State dictation in the abstract, the Dissenter resists it from disapprobation of the doctrines taught. No legislative injunction will make him adopt what he considers an erroneous belief; and, bearing in mind his duty toward his fellow-men, he refuses to help through the medium of his purse in disseminating this erroneous belief. The position is perfectly intelligible. But it is one which either commits its adherents to civil nonconformity also, or leaves them in a dilemma. For why do they refuse to be instrumental in spreading error? Because error is adverse to human happiness. And on what ground is any piece of secular legislation disapproved? For the same reason—because thought adverse to human happiness. How then can it be shown that the State ought to be resisted in the one case and not in the other? Will any one deliberately assert that, if a government demands money from us to aid in *teaching* what we think will produce evil, we ought to refuse it, but that, if the money is for the purpose of *doing* what we think will produce evil, we ought not to refuse it? Yet such is the hopeful proposition which those have to maintain who recognise the right to ignore the State in religious matters, but deny it in civil matters.

§ 7. The substance of this chapter once more reminds us of the incongruity between a perfect law and an imperfect State. The practicability of the principle here laid down varies directly as social morality. In a thoroughly vicious community its admission would be productive of anarchy.* In a completely virtuous one its admission will be both innocuous and inevitable. Progress toward a condition of social health—a condition, that is, in which the remedial measures of legislation will no longer be needed—is progress toward a condition in which those remedial measures will be cast aside, and the authority prescribing them disregarded. The two changes are of necessity co-ordinate. That moral sense whose supremacy will make society harmonious and government unnecessary is the same moral sense which will then make each man assert his freedom even to the extent of ignoring the State—is the same moral sense which, by deterring the majority from coercing the minority, will eventually render government impossible. And, as what are merely different manifestations of the same sentiment must bear a constant ratio to each other, the tendency to repudiate governments will increase only at the same rate that governments become needless.

Let not any be alarmed, therefore, at the promulgation of the foregoing doctrine. There are many changes yet to be passed through before it can begin to exercise much influence. Probably a long time will elapse before the right to ignore the State will be generally admitted, even in theory. It will be still longer before it receives legislative recognition. And even then there will be plenty of checks upon the premature exercise of it. A sharp experience will sufficiently instruct those who may too soon abandon legal protection. Whilst, in the majority of men, there is such a love of tried arrangements, and so great a dread of experiments, that they will probably not act upon this right until long after it is safe to do so.

* Mr. Spencer here uses the word "anarchy" in the sense of disorder.

LESSONS FROM HISTORY.

THE FIGHT FOR A FREE PRESS.

In a previous number (August, 1912) we gave some extracts from Collet's "History of the Taxes on Knowledge," with the object of showing how Government has systematically hindered progress, and whenever possible has made the enlightenment of the people a penal offence.

We will now put before our readers some more extracts from the same work proving that at the same time that Government tries to keep the people ignorant and enslaved, it adopts every possible means of robbing them.

In speaking of the prosecutions which followed the attempt of Henry Hetherington and others to fight the stamp duty, Collet truly says:—"Few Governments are willing to resign an authority which has once been conferred upon them, even when it is an authority for which they would not have asked." The truth of this was proved by the thirty years' strenuous agitation required to repeal this iniquitous tax on knowledge. But let us see what special inducement the Government had to stand in the light of the people. The following table explains this, and is also interesting as a chronicle of some important events:—

Revenue from Newspaper
Stamps.

Contemporaneous Events.

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 1815.—£383,695.—Treaty (Act of Congress) of Vienna—Battle | |
| 1816.—£367,505. | [of Waterloo. |
| 1817.—£382,366 (Including Ireland). | |
| 1818.—£388,155. | |
| 1819.—£405,547.—Manchester Massacre. | |
| 1820.—£403,106.—Trial of Queen Caroline. | |
| 1821.—£436,916.—Death of Queen Caroline. | |
| 1822.—£422,630. | |
| 1823.—£436,859. | |
| 1824.—£457,553. | |
| 1825.—£476,501.—Catholic Emancipation carried in the House | |
| 1826.—£477,128. | [of Commons. |
| 1827.—£484,398.—Mr. Canning Prime Minister. | |
| 1828.—£501,019.—O'Connell elected for County Clare. | |
| 1829.—£509,551.—Catholic Emancipation enacted. | |
| 1830.—£534,799.—Charles X. dethroned at Paris, July 27, 28, 29. | |
| 1831.—£586,635.—Reform Bill Agitation. | |
| 1832.—£574,430.—Reform Bill passed. | |
| 1833.—£541,149.—Unstamped Newspapers abundant. | |
| 1834.—£537,156.—Hetherington's <i>Poor Man's Guardian</i> acquitted | |
| —Sir Robert Peel Prime Minister. | |
| 1835.—£553,197.—Return of the Melbourne Ministry. | |

On October 9th, 1830, the fight against the Government by methods of direct action was commenced by William Carpenter, who on that date published the first of his "Political Letters," addressed to the Duke of Wellington. He was proceeded against, fined £120, and had to go to prison.

Then followed Henry Hetherington, a grand old fighter who would not compromise. The following account of him is interesting:—

"On July 9, 1831, eight weeks after the conviction of William Carpenter, he brought out the *Poor Man's Guardian*, a weekly newspaper for the people. Established contrary to Law, to try the power of "Might" against "Right." Price 1d. In the place of the Government red stamp was a black one inscribed 'Knowledge is Power,' with a printing press on which were the words 'Liberty of the Press.' His opening address began:—"No more evasion: we will not trespass, but deny the authority of our 'lords' to enclose the common against us; we will demand our right, nor treat but with contempt the despotic 'law' which would deprive us of it."

"Quoting the preamble of 60 George III. cap. 9, he declared his deliberate intention of setting it at defiance.

"Henry Hetherington was inferior in education and in good taste to William Carpenter, and much less qualified than he to edit a newspaper that would be allowed to be a good record of current events. He was one of those men who, while attempting to educate others and to reform the State, have the good fortune at least to educate themselves, and to reform their own methods of procedure. Such men, when they commence their work, display all their faults and all their incapacity to the public, and are debited with them long after they have revised their methods. But Henry Hetherington was well educated for the work he had undertaken. Of almost imperturbable temper, of unbounded energy, filled with indignation against every abuse, he conducted his newspaper with a constant regard to the rights of others; he never degraded it for the sake of profit. He was always ready to admit the reply of anyone who thought himself misrepresented by him, and he accepted and inserted without retort the censure of those who, like Mr. W. H. Ashurst under the *nom de plume* of Edward Search, censured him for violence—violence of language, that is; he always opposed violence of action, not only as criminal, but as foolish. But he would not give way to the officers of the law. He had twice to suffer six months' imprisonment. His presses were more than once seized and confiscated, the parcels of his *Poor Man's Guardian* were taken by the police, who were sometimes entrapped into seizing bogus parcels instead of the real ones. Hundreds of hawkers were imprisoned for obstructing the thoroughfares by selling it, while it appears that the thoroughfares would not

have been obstructed had anybody exposed in them for sale the *Penny Magazine*, which caricaturists sometimes represented Lord Brougham as thrusting down a reader's throat with a broomstick."

He next brought out the *People's Conservative*, in connection with which, we are told, he was subjected to two penalties: "£100 for not delivering the affidavit, and £20 for selling it unstamped. The Commissioners of Stamps, however, left the *Poor Man's Guardian* severely alone. On June 21, 1834, No. 159 appeared with the following under the title:—

"This paper (after sustaining a Government persecution of three years and a half duration, in which upwards of 500 persons were unjustly imprisoned and cruelly treated for vending it) was, on the trial of an *ex-officio* information filed by his Majesty's Attorney-General against Henry Hetherington in the Court of Exchequer, before Lord Lyndhurst and a special jury, declared to be a strictly legal publication."

"The *Poor Man's Guardian* closed its perturbed but triumphant career with its 238th number on Saturday, December 26, 1835. The Chief Baron, like the Editor, 'established' it 'contrary to law.'"

We are too apt to forget the work done for progress by people whose names are obscure or even entirely unknown to the present generation. The Commissioners of Inland Revenue issued in 1851 a "Return of Prosecutions in respect of Violations of the Newspaper Stamp Acts for three years ending September, 1836." In this return, Collet tells us:—

"John Cleave's name is down as convicted by the Court of Exchequer for £100 and costs in 1834, and for £620 and costs in 1836. Before the magistrates we have:—John Cleave, twice, for £5 each time; Henry Hetherington, once, for £40; Joshua Hobson, in 1835, once, for £20; in 1836, once, for £80; in both cases he was committed to prison. James Watson, once, in 1834, for £20; committed to prison for non-payment. Abel Heywood, in 1836, once, for £15; committed to prison for non-payment; he had been previously fined and committed to prison for selling the *Poor Man's Guardian*. Alderman Abel Heywood afterwards showed a constructive capacity in his politics. He was a valued member of the Manchester Corporation, twice filled the office of Mayor, and died in 1893 at the age of eighty-four highly respected."

To die in the odour of respectability after having been at one time a breaker of the law is a thing that has happened to others besides Heywood. It seems we must be thankful a man has been a rebel once in his life, and has made but one effort to turn the wheel of progress.

After the "forties" the struggle changed its character. Politicians began to enter the movement, and we have a long period of Parliamentary jugglery and legal quibbling. The Paper Duty was at last repealed in October, 1861, which proves that in governmental reforms it is surprising how you can keep the people waiting if you only know how to play the game.

DEATH OF ROSS WINN.

It was with regret that we heard of the death of our American comrade, Ross Winn, on August 8, at the early age of forty-one. Ever since he was a lad of sixteen he had been a contributor to the Anarchist press of America, and had published several papers himself out of his own scanty earnings. In 1894 he issued a little paper called the *Co-operative Commonwealth*; then again in 1898, the *Coming Era*; in 1899, *Winn's Freelance*. Pressed by adverse economic conditions at this time, our comrade was forced to suspend his publication, writing meanwhile for *Free Society*, published by the Isaac family. But in 1909 Winn resumed his own publication, *Winn's Firebrand*, which he subsequently called the *Advance*, and later the *Red Phalanx*.

In the September number of *Mother Earth*, Emma Goldman pays a warm tribute to Winn. She writes:—"Always his one supreme passion was a paper, to arouse, inspire, and educate the people to a higher conception of human worth. So intense was that passion, that we find our comrade preparing copy on the very last day before his death, for the August issue of his paper. I met our comrade in Chicago in 1901, and was deeply impressed with his fervour and complete abandonment to the cause—so unlike most American revolutionists, who love their ease and comfort too well to risk them for their ideals. Ross Winn was of the John Brown, Albert Parsons, and Voltairine de Cleyre type. He lived and worked only for his ideas, and would have gone to the gallows with the same fortitude."

Three years ago he contracted tuberculosis, and from then till the end his life was a constant struggle against the disease.

Ross Winn's writings were unorthodox in style. Humorous, satirical, and caustic by turns, his special forte was the use of slang terms and alliteration. Politicians, preachers, and prohibitionists were usually the subjects of his vitriolic scorn, although the "damphool" people did not escape his attention. Most assuredly, the movement could ill afford to lose such a man.

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

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

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

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

Wholesale price, 1s. 6d. per quire of 26 post-free in the United Kingdom.

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

THE MANAGER, 127 Ossulston Street, N.W.

The Editors are not necessarily in agreement with signed articles.

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

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

The Breakdown of Parliamentary Government.

The Home Rule controversy and the opposition of the Orange faction in Ulster to the Government measure have been productive of at least one good result: they have focussed attention upon the inefficiency of Parliament as a method of dealing with the manifold interests and aspirations of communities composed of many millions of people. Mr. Winston Churchill's recent advocacy of local Parliaments for areas such as Lancashire, Yorkshire, and the Southern and Northern portions of England, may be a political diversion intended to relieve the tension of the public mind upon such questions as State insurance, women's suffrage, Ulster, or the Labour unrest, or it may really be an indication of strong personal differences upon the details of the Home Rule Bill, similar to those entertained by Joseph Chamberlain previous to his secession from the Liberal Party. However that may be, his admission of the incompetency of Parliament as a means of dealing with matters affecting the varied interests of the people of the United Kingdom, and of England especially, is of serious importance. It is one of the great practical objections which Anarchists have for many years urged against Parliamentary Government.

It is astonishing that State Socialists (as Social Democrats really are in practice, in spite of all their Utopian imaginings) should be unable to perceive this vital practical defect in the Parliamentary institution. Mr. Churchill has confessed, as every honest man and woman with a grasp of political method must confess, that the constitution and procedure of Parliament render thorough and expeditious work impossible. We will pass by all the preliminary hindrances in the way before you gather together your supposed wiseacres to "legislate for the good of the community."

No Radical or Socialist critic would accuse the Governments of to-day of propounding revolutionary measures, although they possess that majority and power which our evolutionary and revolutionary Social Democrats vainly picture for their own party in the sweet by-and-by. And yet—even without any obstruction from the Lords, and less of the Crown—the number of important measures which can ever hope to find their way through the House of Commons is extremely small. And even when a measure such as the Insurance Act does get through, it is only by the application of coercive methods. Of course, the Social Democrat, with his inexperience of politics and his intellectual tendency to despotism, would suggest a very stringent time limit to speeches in Parliament, and approve of schemes hatched in private by an intolerant and narrow-minded clique being ruthlessly rushed through, practically without discussion, by the sheer weight of numbers. They would thus establish a worse Parliamentary tyranny than had existed before, besides making the name of Socialism stink in the nostrils of the people by such tactics.

The suggested methods would be no remedy. Indeed, present-day experience proves that the inefficiency of Parliament is largely due to the suppression of individual independence by the Cabinet autocracy and the dead weight of the stupid majority.

Parliament never has been capable of keeping pace with the requirements of the country. Putting aside for a moment the vast Labour problem, and regarding Parliament simply as a bourgeois institution, will any one dare to assert that it has given satisfaction to the middle class? The fact is that Parliament is inherently incapable of doing efficiently and at the

proper time the work demanded of it. So great and numerous are the calls made by a great modern community that its machinery inevitably becomes clogged, and it cannot respond. Schemes of "devolution" or "Home Rule all round," or grants of larger local government may be made, and may to some small extent relieve the pressure; but they are in reality a confession of the failure of that form of government which claims to represent the "will of the people."

That Parliamentary government has some advantages when compared with other and older forms from which it has descended; that it has had its uses, chiefly for the aristocratic and middle classes; and that some small crumbs from its table may have fallen to the social and political Lazarus, the poor—we may admit. But it has never proved itself capable of taking the place of the free association of free men and women in the management of common affairs. Yet it is to this hopeless piece of machinery that innumerable earnest men and women are looking for the redress of the people's grievances and for drastic and comprehensive remedies for social and economic evils.

Parliamentary Government is but a modification—more in appearance than in reality—of preceding tyrannous forms of rule of man over man for the purpose of gaining riches and power. Worst of all, it is destructive of practical direct effort on the part of the people themselves for the amelioration or readjustment of their social and economic conditions. The best part of the lives and energies of the reforming elements in the community has been wasted in the endeavour to secure political rights or changes in the political machine, which when obtained are of little value.

It is only too true that many voluntary experiments have failed, chiefly because of their weakness in numbers, extent, or influence. But if the community, or, rather, large sections of it, became imbued with the idea of helping themselves and working out their own salvation, it would be absurd to suggest that their own intelligence and organisation at first hand could not possess more power than any authority delegated from themselves.

Among politicians the lives and interests of the workers have been more the subject of talk than practical effort at remedy, until the evil results of that policy have accumulated to such an extent that it appears as though nothing but the complete demolition of existing institutions and privileges will suffice for even a commencement of just social and economic relations. One election campaign or political reform movement is but a repetition of the preceding one. The alleged "practical" programmes of candidates and parties have been and are of the most superficial character. And naturally so, because, as has been pointed out, the methods of Parliament do not permit of more radical steps.

If our friends of the Socialist and Labour movement were to devote their energies to a great campaign of education amongst the workers of the land, urging them to apply their mental and physical powers to the solving of the great problems which face them, they would do more in five years to bring about the downfall of capitalism and landlordism than by fifty years' participation in the game of Parliament. And incidentally, a general declaration of their disgust and independence of Parliament would do much to "speed up" that institution and frighten it into making concessions of which otherwise it would not dream. Happily, the growth of the idea of Direct Action in the ranks of Labour gives us hope of a newer and a more socially profitable era. Its foes are strong and numerous; they distort the facts and magnify the errors and failures of the method; but though minor reactions occur, the movement advances in strength and scope throughout the world.

As soon as it is generally realised that Parliamentary Government is but a new phase of an old evil which has in all ages stood in the way of the freedom and happiness of mankind, it will go the way its predecessors have gone. Believers in Representative Government have always declared that power and authority rest in the people: that Governments can or should exist only with the consent of the governed. If the people, or the "governed," find that the power and authority have been used to their detriment, then reason declares that they have a right to withhold it and to maintain their individual and social rights by free association, and thus to arrive at the more excellent way of liberty.

G.

THE CHICAGO MARTYRS.

Next month being the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Chicago tragedy, we shall publish an article on the subject specially contributed by Lucy E. Parsons, the wife of Albert Parsons, one of the victims.

RUSSIANISING LONDON.

A new "crime" has been created in London—and created by police order from that "holy of holies" of crime, Scotland Yard. In future, any Londoner who distributes a handbill or leaflet in the streets, either for business or political purposes, will be liable to fine or imprisonment. A recent "order" from Scotland Yard makes an action illegal or "criminal" which in all other parts of the country is regarded as quite proper and customary, and which, moreover, in London itself has been practised for a considerable period.

The first consequence of this order has been to deprive hundreds of men of an opportunity of earning a crust of bread and a night's shelter—for their remuneration could purchase little more—and this police order has presented them with the prospect of starvation, theft, or the workhouse. Perhaps the police business has been somewhat slack of late, and a few more victims were necessary to serve as an excuse for the expense of its maintenance. Be that as it may, the fact remains, a police official has the power to deprive hundreds of men of their livelihood without any public demand therefor, or any conference with citizens, and without any appeal for the victims of his action. Incidentally, many other people will suffer loss of work or business. These considerations are of no account to officials who are maintained out of the rates and taxes wrung by force from the very people who are now so unceremoniously injured or ruined by them.

But the question has an even more serious aspect in that it forms part of a deliberate and comprehensive attack on popular rights and freedom. What does this order really mean? An excuse is made that this prohibition is to lessen the "litter" about the streets. But every Londoner knows that the litter in the streets caused by handbills is extremely small. The curse of London streets is the dirt and mud; and the people who issued this order would have been far better occupied with a broom and shovel.

The real object of this attack on the distribution of leaflets is a political one. The leaflet is the free newspaper or journal, and it often wields a powerful influence on the public mind. The poor may use it, and may even countercheck the millionaire's newspaper by its aid. Within the last few years it has probably been of greater utility than ever before in London. Particularly has this been the case during the present year. And, what is more to the point, the evil deeds of Scotland Yard in connection with social and Labour matters have been trenchantly assailed and the criticism very widely circulated. Antimilitarist leaflets have also been distributed in very large quantities. All these leaflets constitute the "litter" which is so objectionable to the authorities.

This new police order is part of a general attack upon popular rights. Years ago it was possible to distribute literature in the parks, and to make collections for propaganda purposes. Then "permits" were imposed for these things, and in the course of time these "permits" were refused even to those who bowed their heads to "authority." Then speakers were prosecuted for "using language calculated," etc., and for "blasphemy," and were sent to gaol "to save them from the mob," and so on; and editors of journals were prosecuted. Now the ordinary Constitutional Socialist propagandist is harried, and collections for purely propaganda purposes are forbidden. Permits for speaking at all, anywhere, indoor or out, may soon be necessary; and those State Socialists who regard with complacency the persecution of a Freethinker or an Anarchist may yet feel the whip of tyranny more acutely themselves. In fact, unless the police are checked by public protests, they will try to suppress all outdoor meetings, with a view to stopping revolutionary and Freethought propaganda.

One painful comparison must be made. Twenty-five years ago and more, when political persecution and tyranny occurred, an appeal to the freedom-loving Radicals of that period generally met with their active sympathy, and often generous assistance. Individualists, Republicans, or Moderate Reformers, and Freethinkers, as many of them were, they did not hesitate to respond when popular rights were in danger, and placed freedom and justice above political differences. They fought nobly in the struggle for free speech in the early days of the Socialist movement in London as well as in public agitations. But, with some good exceptions, the Radicals and Socialists of to-day are so obsessed with their own sectional parties that they fail to recognise any common interest in matters of public freedom unless they are directly attacked. "My party, right or wrong!" seems to be their settled conviction. But it is time to shake off this ignoble condition of mind. The powers of tyranny are attacking the workers' movement piecemeal, and unless the generous spirit of liberty animates all popular movements the fetters will become stronger. Now is the time to awake to the danger. It is not merely a battle for the Freethinkers, the Syndicalists, or the Anarchists. They will discover new methods suitable to the circumstances, if necessary. But a united fight for freedom at the present moment would be educational and stimulating to all sections; and would maintain intact those few public rights won in days gone by at the expense of much sacrifice and suffering. It ought to be made impossible for a few police officials to exercise this unrestricted despotism over the millions of people in London.

Whatever one may think of the objects or methods of the militant Suffragists, it is to their credit that Scotland Yard dare not make any attack upon them; and perhaps it would be well to take a leaf out of

their book. At present they seem to exercise more liberty without votes than many men who enjoy those "blessings." In any case, we may be sure that unless a strong protest is raised against this prohibition of handbills, it will be the forerunner of further attacks on the public exercise of free speech and press.

G.

THE STERILISATION OF THE UNFIT.

The following speech by P. Kropotkin is taken from the Minute of the Eugenics Congress held in London in August last.

Permit me to make a few remarks: one concerning the papers read by Professor Loria and Professor Kellogg, and another of a more general character concerning the purposes and the limitations of Eugenics.

First of all I must express my gratitude to Professor Loria and to Professor Kellogg for having widened the discussion about the great question which we all have at heart—the prevention of the deterioration and the improvement of the human race by maintaining in purity the common stock of inheritance of mankind.

Granting the possibility of artificial selection in the human race, Professor Loria asks: "Upon which criterion are we going to make the selection?" Here we touch upon the most substantial point of Eugenics and of this Congress. I came this morning with the intention of expressing my deep regret to see the narrow point of view from which Eugenics has been treated up till now, excluding from our discussions all this vast domain where Eugenics comes in contact with social hygiene. This exclusion has already produced an unfavourable impression upon a number of thinking men in this country, and I fear that this impression may be reflected upon science altogether. Happily enough the two papers I just mentioned came to widen the field of our discussions.

Before science is enabled to give us any advice as to the measures to be taken for the improvement of the human race, it has to cover first with its researches a very wide field. Instead of that we have been asked to discuss not the foundations of a science which has still to be worked out, but a number of practical measures, some of which are of a legislative character. Conclusions were already drawn from a science before its very elements had been established.

Thus we have been asked to sanction, after a very rapid examination, marriage certificates, Malthusianism, the notification of certain contagious diseases, and especially the sterilisation of the individuals who may be considered as undesirables.

I do not lose sight of the words of our President, who indicated the necessity of concentrating our attention upon the *heredity* aspects of this portion of social hygiene; but I maintain that by systematically avoiding considerations about the influence of *surroundings* upon the soundness of what is transmitted by heredity, the Congress conveys an entirely false idea of both Genetics and Eugenics. To use the word *à la mode*, it risks the "sterilisation" of its own discussions. In fact, such a separation between surroundings and inheritance is impossible, as we just saw from Professor Kellogg's paper, which has shown us how futile it is to proceed with Eugenic measures when such immensely powerful agencies, like war and poverty, are at work to counteract them.

Another point of importance is this. Science, that is the sum total of scientific opinion, does not consider that all we have to do is to pay a compliment to that part of human nature which induces man to take the part of the weak ones, and then to act in the opposite direction. Charles Darwin *knew* that the birds which used to bring fish from a great distance to feed one of their blind fellows were also a part of Nature, and, as he told us in "Descent of Man," such facts of mutual support were the *chief element for the preservation of the race*; because, such facts of benevolence nurture the *social instinct*, and without that *instinct not one single race could survive in the struggle for life against the hostile forces of Nature*.

My time is short, so I take only one question out of those which we have discussed:—Have we had any serious discussion of the Report of the American Breeders' Association, which advocated sterilisation? Have we had any serious analysis of the vague statements of that Report about the physiological and mental effects of the sterilisation of the feeble-minded and prisoners? Were any objections raised when this sterilisation was represented as a powerful deterring means against certain sexual crimes?

In my opinion, Professor McDonnell was quite right when he made the remark that it was untimely to talk of such measures at the time when the criminologists themselves are coming to the conclusion that the criminal is "a manufactured product," a product of society itself. He stood on the firm ground of modern science. I have given in my book on Prisons some striking facts, taken from my own close observation of prison life from the inside, and I might produce still more striking facts to show how sexual aberrations described by Krafft Ebbing are often the results of *prison nurture*, and how the germs of that sort of criminality, if they were present in the prisoner, were always aggravated by imprisonment.

But to create or aggravate this sort of perversion in our prisons, and then to punish it by the measures advocated at this Congress, is surely one of the greatest crimes. It kills all faith in justice, it destroys all sense of mutual obligation between society and the

individual. It attacks the *race solidarity*—the best arm of the human race in its struggle for life.

Before granting to society the right of sterilisation of persons affected by disease, the feeble-minded, the unsuccessful in life, the epileptics (by the way, the Russian writer you so much admire at this moment, Dostoyevsky, was an epileptic), is it not our holy duty carefully to study the social roots and causes of these diseases?

When children sleep to the age of 12 and 15 in the same room as their parents, they will show the effects of early sexual awakenings with all its consequences. You cannot combat such widely spread effects by sterilisation. Just now 100,000 children have been in need of food in consequence of a social conflict. Is it not the duty of Eugenics to study the effects of a prolonged privation of food upon the generation that was submitted to such a calamity?

Destroy the slums, build healthy dwellings, abolish that promiscuity between children and full-grown people, and be not afraid, as you often are now, of "making Socialism"; remember that to pave the streets, to bring a supply of water to a city, is already what they call to "make Socialism"; and you will have improved the germ plasm of the next generation much more than you might have done by any amount of sterilisation.

And then, once these questions have been raised, don't you think that the question as to *who are the unfit* must necessarily come to the front? Who indeed? The workers or the idlers? The women of the people, who suckle their children themselves, or the ladies who are unfit for maternity because they cannot perform all the duties of a mother? Those who produce degenerates in the slums, or those who produce degenerates in palaces?

Labour a Virtue in the Poor Man.

This band of robbers, for whom the whole community toils, is powerfully organised. It has, in the first place, the making and administration of the laws in its own hands, as it has had for centuries. At every new law promulgated, we might exclaim with Molière: "Vous êtes orfèvre, Monsieur Josse!" "You are a capitalist, Mr. Lawmaker, or, at least, you hope to become such, and declare everything to be a crime that might hinder you in the pursuit, enjoyment, and possession of your capital." Everything that a man can get hold of in any way except by open, hand-to-hand violence is and remains his own. And even when the genealogy of a property can be traced to literal robbery or theft (such as conquest, seizure of church property, or political confiscation of others' goods), this crime becomes an unimpeachable title to possession, if the owner has been able to hold the property for a certain number of years.

The State law that calls out the police is not sufficient for the millionaire. He makes superstition an ally and gets from religion an extra padlock for his money chest, by smuggling into the catechism a sentence which asserts that property is sacred, and envy and covetousness for our neighbour's property a sin to be punished with the fires of hell. He distorts even the laws of morality, and furthers his selfish aims by inculcating upon the vast majority of the people, toiling for him, that labour is virtue, and that man was only created to labour as much as possible. How comes it that the best and truest intellects have believed in the reality of this fiction for thousands of years? Labour a virtue? According to what law of Nature? No living being in the whole organic world works for the pleasure of working, but only for the purpose of self and race preservation, and only so much as is necessary for this twofold purpose. People say that organs only remain sound and develop when exercised, and that they wither when they lie idle. The advocates of this system of capitalists' morality, who have found this argument in physiology, do not mention the fact that organs are much more rapidly destroyed by overwork than by no work. Rest, comfortable leisure, is infinitely more natural, pleasant, and desirable for man, as well as for all other animals, than work and exertion. The latter is only a painful necessity, required for the preservation of life. The inventor of the story of the Garden of Eden in the Bible showed that he appreciated this fact with honest naïveté, by placing his first human beings in a paradise where they could live without any necessity for exertion, and labour, the sweat of man's brow, was the terrible punishment for their disobedience. Natural, zoological morality proclaims that rest is the highest reward of labour, and that only so much work is desirable and commendable as is indispensable to prolong life. But the robber band do not accept this idea of the case. Their interests demand that the masses should work more than is necessary for them to support life, and should produce more than is required for their own consumption, so that their masters can take possession of this overproduction for their own use. Consequently, they have suppressed the morality of Nature and invented another, which they set their philosophers to tabulating, their parsons to praising, and their poets to singing. According to their system, idleness is the beginning of all crimes and labour a virtue, the most excellent of all virtues.

The robber band is, however, constantly contradicting itself with the most shortsighted policy. The robbers carefully avoid even the pretence of submitting to their own code of morality, and thus betray the small amount of respect they have for it in reality. Idleness is only a crime in the poor man. In the rich man it is an attribute of a higher type of humanity, the token of his exalted rank. And labour, which his double-faced morality asserts to be a virtue for the poor

man, is, from his point of view, a disgrace and a sign of social inferiority. . . . The rich man still considers his employé, who works for him and supplies him with his luxury, merely as a kind of domestic animal, as the nobleman centuries ago looked upon his vassal, neither of them recognising in him a complete human being, their equal in any way.

MAX NORDAU.

Antimilitarism Among the Russian People.

Antimilitarist propaganda, as carried on by our comrades in France and Western Europe, does not exist in Russia. As Russian Anarchists are relentlessly harried and persecuted, they are obliged to organise and act secretly; and yet during the last six years the most militant among them have been executed, and hundreds condemned to hard labour or deportation to Siberia. Anarchist literature published in Russia, though still comparatively scarce, is devoted to antimilitarism as to the other sides of Anarchist propaganda. The other Socialist parties in Russia, the Social Democrats and the Socialist Revolutionists, have not yet tackled the question, as their programmes always speak of "the substitution of the standing Army by a national militia."

Of more importance, perhaps, than a systematic antimilitarist propaganda is the existence of a deep hatred of military service by the people themselves. During the time of serfdom the worst punishment a master could inflict on a serf was to make him a soldier. And this dislike has not diminished since conscription was introduced. Many religious sects in Russia have even adopted antimilitarism as one of their doctrines. One of those sects, the Doukhobors, is well known in Europe for the absolute refusal of its members to serve as soldiers, and their consequent persecution by the Government, till foreign friends stepped in and assisted them to emigrate to Canada.

Another sect, much more numerous than the Doukhobors, is the "Fugitives" (Beguni), dating from the eighteenth century. They try by all means to escape military service, which is prohibited by their religious tenets. They are generally opposed to any State authority, and always try to evade legal papers and the payment of taxes. Their numerical strength has never been ascertained officially, but it is known that there are many Beguni among the peasants of Great Russia and in the regions of the Volga and Oka. They are scarcely ever betrayed by their neighbours, who are in any case passively on the side of their own class, as in no country is the division between the people and the official world deeper than in Russia.

A third sect, very little known, is the "Not Ours" (Nenashi), who refuse to recognise any State or Church organisation; it is "not ours," they say. A type of such a sectarian is admirably drawn in Tolstoy's "Resurrection"—the old man in the second part who defies all authority, even in prison; and, in spite of punishment, upholds his anti-authoritarian convictions.

The Government is quite aware of the fact that there is in the Russian people this deep and intense hatred of the official world and militarism, and it is from this point of view that it takes all measures, not shrinking from even the most brutal persecution to keep the peasants separated from those intellectuals who could give to this popular passive resistance a general and revolutionary character.

THE ETTOR AND GIOVANNITTI TRIAL.

At the time of writing, a jury is being selected to try these two victims of American plutocracy, and from the thoroughness with which possible sympathisers are being turned down, it seems as though a repetition of the Chicago tragedy of twenty-five years ago is contemplated. A great sensation has been caused by the arrest of "Bill" Haywood for his connection with other troubles arising out of the St. Lawrence strike. W. M. Wood, the president of the American Wool Company, was also arrested for his participation in the planting of dynamite during the strike, so as to prejudice the strikers in the eyes of the public; but as he was warned of his arrest beforehand, and was bailed out as soon as he reached the police station, it is evident that his arrest was stage-managed to show how "impartial" the police can be. Ettor and Giovannitti have been held in gaol since the day of their arrest. So much for impartiality.

As soon as the trial commenced, a protest strike took place at St. Lawrence. Though not so widespread as the previous one, it was likely to prove infectious, so the police have been doing all they can to drive the men back to work. According to a Press telegram, on October 1 a crowd of 300 strikers was driven into a corner by the police, who drew their long wooden clubs and hit every one they could reach. About 150 men had either their heads or arms broken, and the place resembled a battlefield. The mayor publicly stated that he would put down the "rioting" (another word for striking), even if he had to "break the head of every man in the town."

At the present time the American workers are getting excited as to whether they shall elect Taft, Wilson, Roosevelt, or Debs as their Chief Boss for the next four years. One day—perhaps—they may discover that all "bosses" use the whip; then they may decide to try to manage without them.

An international meeting to protest against the trial of Ettor,

Giovannitti, and Haywood was held in Trafalgar Square on Sunday, September 22. English, American, French, Italian, and German speakers addressed the audience, and their outspoken protests were heartily cheered. Malatesta, who spoke in Italian, commenced with a few words in English, saying that had it not been for their protests he would not have been there to address the meeting. A strongly worded resolution was carried without a dissentient.

It was expected that in consequence of the arrest of Haywood, the Socialist organisation which feted him when he was in London (the S.D.P., now known as the B.S.P.) would take a prominent part in the protest; but in reply to a request to co-operate, they said there was not time for them to consider it officially, and asked what organisations were affiliated to the Committee. Those damned Anarchists and Syndicalists!

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

France.

The agitation in favour of Rousset, which was started and worked up by our comrades in France with an indefatigable zeal, has at last borne fruit. This young soldier who had dared to denounce the murder of his comrade Aernoult by his brutal superiors, had been marked down for revenge by the military authorities in Algiers. The occasion soon presented itself. He was accused of having stabbed another man in a barrack quarrel, though he stoutly denied it. The lieutenant who was charged with the inquiry was his sworn enemy, and persuaded the witnesses to testify against Rousset, who was condemned to twenty years' imprisonment. His cry for help, however, reached his friends in France, and an energetic agitation has brought a new trial and liberation to this courageous young fellow. "Military justice" has been shown to be a terrible perversion of all ideas of fair play, and a simple upholding of the military superior over the men placed under him.

In no country perhaps is anti-militarism so strong as in France; and the revelations of the Rousset affair have made many an honest but ignorant French citizen shudder at the fate awaiting his sons perhaps if they do not bend quickly enough under an iron discipline. Though Rousset, broken in health, has been set at liberty, everywhere the demand is raised for an inquiry into the death of Aernoult, who was knocked down by his superior and left to die in the burning sands of the desert.

Such facts are not calculated to enhance the prospects of the compulsory military service which confronts every young Frenchman. No wonder that often they prefer to leave their country and lead a hard life in foreign countries rather than face a dog's existence in the African battalions, to which a high-spirited lad is nearly sure to be sent for insubordination or some other military "crime." The hard time of the young soldiers in the barracks is lightened as far as possible by the moral and financial help given by the "Sou de Soldat," a special branch of the French Confederation of Labour, which in this way keeps in touch with the young workers in the most perilous period of their lives. Naturally this work is detested by the authorities. When the Teachers' Union at their recent Congress adopted resolutions pledging themselves to support this anti-militarist work, affiliating themselves to the Confederation of Labour, and expressing sympathy for Rousset, the indignation of the Government knew no bounds, and the Union was promptly dissolved. But the teachers refuse to submit tamely to this illegal decision, and seem prepared for a general and long resistance. This puts the Government in a very difficult position, and it undoubtedly already wishes that it had left the teachers alone.

The organisation on which, however, the hatred of the Government is centred as the arch-enemy of law and order—Government and Capitalism—is the Confederation of Labour, which boldly stands for the abolition of the wage system and the conquest of full liberty for the workers. Though the Confederation contains revolutionary and reformist elements, its tendencies for years have been anti-Parliamentarian and Revolutionary Syndicalist. At the Congress held during the last week at Havre the two currents came in violent contact; but again it was clearly manifest that the great majority was decidedly anti-Parliamentary. The resolution reaffirming the principles of the Confederation, which, "outside any political party, organises the workers conscious of the struggle for the abolition of the wage system," was adopted by 1,057 votes against 35, with 11 abstentions. As is seen, it was in no hesitating way that the Congress showed its opinion of the luring speeches in favour of Centralisation and Socialist politicians. In spite of Governmental oppression and incessant calumny from the bourgeois and Socialist press, the C.G.T., as the Confederation is called by the French workers, has made good progress during the last eight years that the revolutionists have had the upper hand; its strength has doubled in that period, and the number of those paying contributions is at present 400,000, and those adhering 600,000. The existence of 38 Federal Labour papers shows that the propaganda in the provinces is actively carried on.

It was with deep regret that we learned the news of the death of Paul Robin. His name will always be remembered as that of the great champion of co-education in its most integral and full sense. Appointed director of the Cempuis School, he had a chance to apply his ideas of the physical, intellectual, and moral development of the child. All those interested in education should read his book and the pedagogical review he published afterwards. His methods, however, were too radical for the public, and he had to resign. Nevertheless, all

those who would reform the present system of education will benefit by his experiments, which were undoubtedly made in the right direction. In the latter years of his life he devoted his energy, which was always great and passionate, to the neo-Malthusian propaganda, believing that in the limitation of births the remedy was to be found for the economic misery of the workers. Old, tired, misjudged, and often calumniated, he decided that he had done his work and had the right to rest, and so ended his life. He leaves the memory of a man of deep convictions, fearlessly attacking prejudice, and never compromising in any way.

Russia.

Speaking of this country means speaking of oppression, misery, and despair. The latest news of the conditions in the Little Father's prisons reveals a terrible state of affairs. Our readers probably remember the revelations of the Pskov prison, where in a short period 130 political prisoners received between them 5,625 strokes of the lash; a four days' hunger strike was followed by more floggings. Though public indignation was great when this became known, the conditions have remained the same.

At Tobolsk a similar régime exists. Prisoners are kept chained hand and foot, and tortures and floggings are of daily occurrence; from Kovno, Nikolaievsk, Moscow, Saratov, Orel, Perm, Tiflis, and other places appalling disclosures of the unbearable treatment of prisoners is received. A new treatment of those condemned to penal servitude consists in packing prisoners together in damp cells that admit neither light nor air, to allow them a short walk in the prison yard once in six months, and to keep them all the year round in unrelieved idleness. The torture of this treatment can be imagined. Consumption, madness, and suicide are the outstanding features of Russian prison life.

Such is the martyrdom of the pioneers of Russian freedom, among them some of the foremost writers and scientists, deputies, and a host of less famous people of both sexes—all criminals in the eyes of the Government, as they have tried to help the people and to bring their country some sort of social and political freedom. And it is to such a Government that the English Liberal Ministry has allied itself! It is time that the English people showed its sympathy with the Russian people in their suffering and struggle.

THE SCOTTISH CONFERENCE.

The Conference is in the past, but its results, we hope, are in the present and future. It would be foolish to pretend that the affair was an unqualified success. For some time it has been clear that such could not possibly be the case, but nevertheless it has undoubtedly paved the way for complete harmony and success in the future.

The Musselburgh and Edinburgh comrades brought much encouragement with them, and have gone back to do great things. Musselburgh is going to attempt to arrange a big demonstration, and we do not doubt it will succeed. Glasgow, of course, will do its utmost to help. The two most important points discussed were the future Scottish Conference and the annual National Conference. In regard to the first it was decided to meet in Edinburgh in February; while, subject to the approval of English comrades, it has been decided to hold the National Conference at Newcastle at Easter. Comrade Robertson, of Edinburgh, has undertaken to act as secretary, and no doubt English comrades will be hearing from him in the near future. The Newcastle Conference—if English comrades agree to our suggestions—will be a much more important affair than our successful Conference at Leeds last February. We have trustworthy friends in Newcastle who can be relied upon to make local arrangements.

But now back to the Scottish Conference. The two comrades from Cowdenbeath gave an encouraging account of the way in which the red flag had been greeted by the Fife miners. Comrades who are making such good efforts at propaganda in their district seem confident that they have the right material to work upon.

The demonstration on the Green was sadly marred by the weather, and the crowd was distinctly disappointing in its size. Comrade Quigley, of Musselburgh, took the chair, and the speakers were A. Max, W. Gallagher, A. Porter, and G. Barrett. Comrade McAra, who was expected, was unable to turn up owing to an accident. Comrade Gallagher, who appeared in almost a new rôle as a speaker, surprised us all, and made an excellent little speech. Porter excited the wrath of an S.L.P.er, who, among other things, believed in "government from the bottom," "no authority," but who had to consult his executive committee before accepting a challenge for a debate. The crowd, except the detectives, was absolutely with us—if only it would become real live men!

The tea was eaten; we need say no more about it; the social programme was beyond all criticism. The persistence of the Scotsman is well proved by the fact that, after going through this, the conference was again resumed. We had a fairly hot discussion on the differences that have sprung up among us, and I am firmly convinced that the result will be a whole-hearted co-operation in the future. If this is so, I predict deliberately and with confidence that the Anarchist movement in Scotland will be in a very short time much stronger than the whole English movement. We have got a long way to go, but we have the will and the ability to go it. I predict that the Conference at Edinburgh will surprise even the most optimistic.

G. B.

BOOK NOTES.

Six Centuries of Work and Wages: The History of English Labour. By James E. Thorold Rogers. Eleventh Edition. 10s. 6d. net. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

Work and Wages. Eight Chapters from "Six Centuries of Work and Wages." Eighth Edition. 1s. net. Same publisher.

These books need no introduction to our readers, as we have on several occasions quoted largely from them. To the student of English economic history they are invaluable, and at the same time interesting to the general reader. The author's sympathy with the workers is apparent throughout.

Indicalismo y Socialismo, por José Prat; y *Sindicalismo y Anarquismo*, por Ricardo Mella. 20c. La Coruna (Spain): *Cultura Libertaria*, Cordeleria 23.

Réflexions sur l'Individualisme. Par Manuel Devaldès. 15c. Paris: *L'Anarchie*, 30 Rue des Amandiers.

La Procréation Volontaire. Par E. Armand. 10c. Paris: Same publishers.

L'Apologie du Crime. Par Mauricius. 10c. Paris: Same publishers.

Die Opfer und Märtyrer des Justizmordes von Chicago. Von Pierre Ramus. 2mk. Zurich: Rainer Trindler, Agnesstr. 22.

Francisco Ferrer. A Tragedy in Five Acts. By Julius Tietze. New York: 119 E. 88th Street. No price.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

(September 4—October 3.)

FREEDOM Guarantee Fund.—Anon. £2, J. Bedford 6d, S. Corio 1s 6d.

FREEDOM Subscriptions.—J. Paton 1s 6d, T. del Marmol 1s 6d, S. Nacht 1s 6d, S. C. Potter 1s 6d, A. Pratelle 1s 6d, C. Caves 1s 6d, A. de Noronha 1s 6d, G. H. Greensmith 1s 6d, J. Meyers 1s 8d, S. H. Muston 1s 6d, H. Varley 2s 3d.

NOW READY.

The Chicago Martyrs.

16 pages. With Portraits. Price One Penny.

A short sketch of the tragedy at Chicago in 1887 has long been wanted. This pamphlet deals with the events of that period, from the general strike for the eight-hour day, on May 1, 1886, to the final scene on the gallows, on November 11, 1887. It also contains excellent portraits of the eight men who were tried.

NEW EDITION READY SHORTLY.

Fields, Factories, and Workshops.

By P. KROPOTKIN.

Revised and Enlarged. Cloth, 1s. net.

The only edition now in print.

"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).

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

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

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

J. J. JACQUES, 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.

GOLUB, 10 Osborne Street, Whitechapel.

A. RAY, 49 Little Surrey Street, Blackfriars Road, S.E.

J. FLEET, 109 Upper Street, Islington, N.

SUGARMAN, 329A Mile End Road, E.

J. YATES, 114 High Road, Willesden Green, N.W.

H. ELLIOT, 329 Lillie Road, Fulham, S.W.

Birmingham.—NATIONAL LABOUR PRESS—100 John Bright Street.

Liverpool.—E. G. SMITH, 126 Tunnel Road (Wholesale).

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

STANLEY'S, 30 Lime Street.

Leeds.—B. Goldberg, 14 Millwright Street.

Manchester.—BRADY AND Co., 22-24 London Road.

FLANDERS, 15 Peter Street.

H. SEGALS, 99A Great Ducie Street, Strangeways (Wholesale).

W. WARBURTON, 1 Victoria Arch, Great Ducie Street.

L. BACKNER, 49 Bury New Road.

THOMAS, 93 Corporation Street.

S. BRIERLEY, 328 Hyde Road.

MARTIN, 32 Ardwick Green.

A. COLLINS, 326 Oldham Road, Newton Heath.

Oldham.—HYDE BROTHERS, Victoria Market.

Glasgow.—D. BAXTER, 32 Brunswick Street.

D. G. LINDSAY, 139 West Nile Street.

" " " 132 Gairraid Street, Maryhill.

Bristol.—J. FLYNN, Haymarket.

Dundee.—L. MACARTNEY, 203, Overgate.

Cardiff.—M. CLARK, 26 Wood Street.

L. D. GILLET, Market Gallery.

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

Belfast.—W. ROBINSON, 167 York Street.

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

Kiosque, Boulevard Sebastopol, corner of Rue Rambuteau.

U.S.A.—M. MAISEL, 422 Grand Street, New York, N.Y.

New Zealand.—P. JOSEPHS, Box 48, G.P.O., Wellington.

S. KINGSFORD, 136 Tuam Street, Christchurch.

E. A. BROWN, Pomona Road, Invercargill.

WM. MURDOCH, Queen's Chambers, Wellesley Street, Auckland.

FORTHCOMING MEETINGS.

Bristol.—On Sunday, October 6, James Tochatti will speak at Mill Lane, Bedminster, at 11 a.m.; subject, "When Love is Liberty and Nature Law"; and on Durdham Downs, at 6.30; "Life, Liberty, and Love."

On Monday, October 14, Mr. Bert Brown will lecture at 19 The Haymarket; subject, "Marx or Spencer—Which?"

Manchester.—On Sunday, October 13, at 7 o'clock, C. George will speak at 143 Moss Lane East, Moss Side; subject, "Anarchism v. Social Democracy."

THE ANARCHIST.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, 1d.; ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, 6s. 6d.

OFFICE: 74 BUCHANAN 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.

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 SOCIAL GENERAL STRIKE. By ARNOLD ROLLER. 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 J. B. CLARK. 1d.

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

THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONGRESS, 1907. 1d.

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

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

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

THE 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.

DIRECT ACTION. By VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE. 3d.

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. 4d.

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.

ANARCHY. By ANDRE GIRARD. 4d.

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. New and Revised Edition. Cloth, 1s. net.

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. Paper covers, 1s.; cloth, 2s.; postage 2d.

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

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

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

THE EGO AND HIS OWN. By MAX STIRNER. 2s. 6d. net.

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.