

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. XXIX.—No. 317.

SEPTEMBER, 1915.

MONTHLY: ONE PENNY.

NOTES.

The Triumph of Action.

The settlement reached in the South Wales coalfield in July by the agency of Lloyd George and Co. was not of a long duration. For as soon as the awards were published it was obvious that the terms upon which the men had been induced to go back were not going to be fulfilled. Whilst the award was given to the major portion of the coal workers, the engineers, banksmen, pumpmen, and stokers, all members of the Federation, were excluded from benefit. "Divide and conquer" is a good maxim, and might have had some influence in drawing up these terms; but we are glad to note it was not the easy coup that Runciman imagined, for without awaiting any instructions from headquarters, and despite the Munitions Act, eight hundred men left one pit immediately the trickery was known. They were quickly followed by the men at other pits. Thus the leaders were compelled to take action, and, confident in their own strength, the men put forward their claim for the award all round. This they have had conceded to them, and the miners can rest content, confident in the knowledge that the power they possess is greater than all the forces of law and authority, and rightly used can be a valuable asset in the fight for freedom.

The "Labour Leader" Raid.

Much ado about nothing has been made over the recent raid by the police on the offices of the *Labour Leader* in Manchester and London. We fully expected that the editor and printer would be sent to the Tower, to be shot at dawn; but when all was said and done it amounted to a summons to show cause why certain papers, pamphlets, and type should not be destroyed as they "contain statements likely to prejudice his Majesty's relation with Foreign Powers, and the recruiting and discipline of his Majesty's forces." In other words, free expression of opinion in the press is not allowed in Britain since the war started; and the *Labour Leader's* offence was in maintaining its anti-militarist propaganda, its international ideals, and its criticism of the policies of the Foreign Offices responsible for the war. The *Labour Leader* thus stood out in vivid contrast to the Jingo vapourings of the Socialist organs generally, and this attempt at suppression is proof that their words have struck home. The worst feature was hearing the case *in camera*, which is a revival of Star Chamber methods. We do not think the raid will act as a deterrent to those who are determined to carry on the propaganda which they think good; but at the same time it gives a good insight into the fear of criticism and light which pervades the official mind. Perhaps the love of Governments, the special virtue of State Socialists, will receive a rude shock which may be for their good in their conception of a future society. Anyway, the real character and purpose of Governments and authority is once more revealed.

Stifling Critics.

The *Daily Express* is enjoying itself in a facetious style with a daily paragraph on "Peace Cranks." In this paragraph the meetings and doings of those bodies opposed to war and to conscription are recorded for the consumption of its highly intelligent and civilised readers. It is a compliment at times to be called a crank, especially when it distinguishes the appellant from the shrieking horde of small-minded patriots who misguidedly imagine that the acme of civilisation has been reached, and freedom will be obtained by the slaughter of our fellow men in other countries. Their methods, however, are on a par with their conception of justice, for they ask for particulars of meetings of these bodies, and urge their readers to go, as they say, "in order that the case for Great Britain and those who are fighting for her may be heard." There is never any fear of open discussion, but by inference these noble patriots are invited to smash up the meetings. Don't argue; throw a brick!

Tsar "Honours" British Soldiers.

Notices of awards for distinguished conduct in the field appear so regularly and so frequently that for the greater part they are unnoticed. But a recently published list was followed by an announcement of more than usual interest. Following upon the list of awards of D.S.O.'s, military crosses, and other gewgaws, was the striking announcement that "His Imperial Majesty the Tsar" had conferred certain honours upon British officers and men, "with the approval of his Majesty the King." We wonder how many of those who read it remembered that his Imperial Majesty also decorated members of the "Black Hundred," the gangs of murderers whom he employed to crush the revolutionary movement. The *Daily Telegraph* says: "The conferment of such a multitude of honours is a very notable and unprecedented mark of the closeness of the friendship between the two Allied nations." That is a lie. These decorations are a token of the friendship that exists between the British Government and the Government of the Tsar, the man whose brutal and bloodthirsty treatment of his own people has made his name stink in the nostrils of every lover of freedom. It is a sign of degradation for any man to be "decorated" by such a scoundrel.

Striking a Criminal Offence.

We commented last month upon the working of the Munitions Act, and we give below an extract from a report in *Forward* of a prosecution under the Act of forty workers at Paisley for leaving work. This is but one of many cases reported in the same paper. One or two of the men convicted had actually been "paid off":—

"Not only have these forty Trade Unionists been convicted of having struck while employed on Government work, and sentenced to pay a fine of 5s. each; but, and mark this, should the fines not be paid within seven days from the date of imposition, each defaulter can be sent to prison for five days. That means that a Trade Unionist who withholds his labour for the highest price, or for better conditions, is a criminal in the eyes of the law, and may be sent to prison along with thieves and other gentlemen of anti-social tendencies. Yet the Labour Party, Heaven help us, blessed the Munitions Act with both hands! As Norman Angell would say—'The Prussian is really in our midst!' and heartily welcomed by some who ought to be throttling him."

The Labour Party are too busy helping to carry on their masters' war to worry about the workers' war.

Why Jaures Died.

Some remarkable information has just been going the rounds concerning a conversation by Jean Jaures, the French Socialist Deputy who was murdered upon the outbreak of the war. This information gives a different complexion to the assassination, and shows in whose interest it was that he should be removed. The conversation took place on July 31, the day of his death, with Charles Rappoport, and the most important part is published in the *Berner Tagwacht* (Swiss):—

"To the journalists who had gathered round him, Jaures said: 'Are we going to be drawn into war only because Aerenthal (the Austrian Foreign Minister) has not paid the bribe of 40,000,000 francs which he had promised to Isvolsky (the Russian Foreign Minister) as a recognition for services rendered in connection with the Bosnia-Herzegovina affair? Are we going to shed the blood of the nations of Europe because Isvolsky sold his country, because in the end Aerenthal did not pay the blood money?'"

Jaures knew enough of the dirty business of international politics to be dangerous, and maybe time will prove that he was right, and that the whole campaign of murder and rapine will be found to be the result, as we have often said before, of the rapacious ambitions of the governing cliques.

SIDELIGHTS ON SOCIAL SUBJECTS.

There is a rift in the lute of the Conscriptionists, for some British patriots are discovering that the Allies are all dependent upon Britain's ability to produce:—"The stored power of the Allies is the machine of British industry. And from that machine we have already withdrawn the labour of nearly four million men. We have enormously increased the numbers of the Allies, but we have impoverished their effective strength. It is as though we had built Dreadnoughts, and forgotten the boilers." As a remedy for this, the *Daily News*—so expressive of the hereditary shopkeeping spirit with which Nature has endowed all true Britons—unburdens itself by insisting that "we must cut down our consumption to the barest limits. We must look at every personal extravagance as criminal, at every interruption of labour as a blow struck for Germany, at every obstructive claim of capital, such as the private control of coal mines, as a thing to be brushed out of our path. For it is clear as noonday that the war of the trenches is only the visible expression of the war of the nations. The real war is being fought in the field of industry, and it is against the industrial power of the country—that power on which the motive force of the Alliance depends—that the Conscriptionists are directing their fatal attacks." Although as anti-Conscriptionists we have always opposed any interference with the few liberties still remaining with us, we can have no sympathy with the capitalist position here presented. We hold that a real war should be fought between Capital and Labour in the fields of industry, but that the war being waged in the trenches concerns the Government, and not ourselves. Should the Germans invade England, the worker can shoulder all his possessions and march away—the landlord, employer, and capitalist are forced into hoodwinking the propertyless into defending them. The *Daily News* may succeed in making Labour see the futility of building "Dreadnoughts without boilers," but surely Labour should recognise the greater futility of building Dreadnoughts at all—the outward and visible signs of that force by which all vested interests are protected.

Out of 108 resolutions appearing in the agenda of the Trade Union Congress, five are in connection with the war. One standing in the name of the Parliamentary Committee commences by expressing its opposition to all systems of militarism as a danger to human progress; considers the present action of Great Britain and her Allies as completely justified, and ends by pledging itself to assist the Government, as far as possible, in the successful prosecution of the war. In contrast to this mighty outpouring of the official mind stands a resolution in the name of the Amalgamated Labourers' Union, urging the desirability of effecting a cessation of hostilities consistent with national freedom and national honour, and calls on the Parliamentary Committee to formulate and advocate terms of peace satisfactory to the working class. These two resolutions give some indication of the difference in outlook which has been growing for years between official Labour and the workers. The latter, despite their failure to understand the political ideal of their leaders, have allowed themselves to be steadily dragooned by them. So great has been the power possessed by the officials composing the Parliamentary Committee that this body has actually felt itself competent to speak for Labour. At the outbreak of the European war, no special Congress was summoned, and since that time these men have not hesitated to give the Government promises for the docility of Labour. That hard-won Trade Union rules and regulations were abolished, that Labour was fettered as never before, was nothing to them so long as these self-righteous officials could boast of being citizens first and Trade Unionists afterwards. But the rank-and-file are beginning to realise that the Labour leaders of Europe have more than made this awful war possible—have, in fact, been as guilty as the Governments they cringe to. Happily there are indications that the workers are beginning to grasp the truth that whoever wins this war, they lose. Let them insist on a speedy peace, and on the ruins of the old Trade Unionism—rendered finally impotent by the action of their own officials—build up a greater and stronger Unionism that shall finally give them control of the means of life. But we fear the 108 resolutions will not go very far towards achieving this revolution. Get ready to act, and leave talking to leaders and officials.

The recalcitrant South Wales miners are again planting the proverbial thorn in the Governmental side. As we anticipated, the Government being forced into unwilling capitulation on July 20, is now endeavouring to deprive the miners of some of the fruits of victory. Once the principle of arbitration is

accepted, and Conciliation Boards set up, there exists the whole complex machinery of the law to aid the governing powers to entrap those whose claims are considered. The South Wales miners may not be well versed in the man-made law of the land, but they are fortunate in knowing just what they want. Moreover, they have spirit and tenacity. The Press, as usual, describes the men as disloyal, perverse, and traitorous; but keeps silence about the trickery which has been practised in the past to deprive them of the fruits of their labour, and make subjection doubly sure. Let the men exhibit the same dauntless attitude, and refuse to be cowed by the bullies, who are in their hearts mortally afraid of the new spirit now being manifested. The Government may find it expedient to nationalise the coal mines, but the men will know enough to realise that this would not end their grievances. As State servants, they may conceivably enjoy less liberty and be no better off. Industrial conscription is becoming a very real factor in the life of the British workman; and though we have found capitalists who have in their own interests opposed Conscription for military purposes, we have not found any willing to raise their voices against the greatest danger at present threatening the working community. Let us beware of such high thinking as "the curtailment of our liberty is necessary for national survival." The disinherited have no country—only class warfare need concern them.

The doctors of divinity are at it again, endeavouring to reconcile the apparently irreconcilable. President John Grier Hibben, of Princeton University, declares the present war does not prove Christianity to be a failure, but rather it is giving Christianity its supreme test. Is that why we read in the daily press that "a £5 bond (War Loan) represents the cost of a thousand cartridges, the bullets of which should kill at least ten Germans at the hands of our soldiers? Is not that worth saving for?" We prefer to say that both Christianity and Civilisation have been weighed in the balance and found wanting.

The latest device for the chloroforming of Labour appears in the War Loan bonus. The workers in Vickers and Co. have only to be diligent, efficient, thrifty, punctual, and subscribe to the War Loan, and behold a generous, paternal management decides that to him that hath shall be given more. Thus by subscribing 1s. or more per pound of wages, the worker gets 6d. per pound from the firm. Other employers have followed this wise example, so it would seem to be only a matter of time before each really deserving workman becomes a capitalist. We need waste no more sympathy upon the needy and the poor, hard-working though they be. The Trade Unions have invested various sums in War Loan. The Boilermakers' Society holds £80,000 of stock, and the Council of the General Federation of Trade Unions possess £20,000 worth. But the old Trade Unions are doomed. Why, therefore, should we criticise such wisdom?

M. B. HOPE.

"THEN—WHAT?"

Being a very ignorant person, or, perhaps, very simple, I have been much bothered lately by a word which has been frequently used in connection with the present crisis. It is the word "economics." So, naturally, I have had recourse to a dictionary to enlighten my darkness. There I find that economics means "that branch of political economy which treats of exchangeable things, and of the laws which regulate their exchange." Dear, dear, is that all? So that the economic crisis, with which we and Germany, and most of the civilised world, are faced is simply some bother about exchanging things. So no longer will I grumble that we are at war, that thousands of men are losing their lives and limbs, that thousands of homes are being rendered desolate, that the major part of Europe is a great welter of blood and horror and outrage—it is all quite worth while, for if nations did not exchange exchangeable things, where on earth—or in hell—would be our capitalists? If they were destroyed—then, what? Nothing much, except to them!

After all, this war is simply a matter of commerce, that is to say of profit making—the exchanging of manufactured and other products. The world is fighting for markets, that's all. And, of course, it is quite right and proper that thousands of workers should be slain in this employers' war. Employers must be preserved; without them where would the workers be? We must protect our protectors. We must support the capitalists who employ at the lowest possible wages and for the longest

possible hours the workers who produce exchangeable things. Everything is for the best; and will be better than best when the war is over, and the richer-than-ever capitalists out of the kindness of their good hearts return to the workers all they have lost during the strife, and also raise their wages and reduce their hours of labour.

Economics are just as false a product of our civilisation as are the many other things—property, for example—which are used to keep the workers in their place—at the bottom. As usual, false conditions cannot stand any strain; they break down when tested out. There is no need for England to exchange goods with any other country, except for a few articles such as tobacco and, possibly, wine. Even those we could produce if needs be. Tea, coffee, cocoa, and many other articles which we are apt to look upon as necessities we could get along without quite well. But, without urging this point, the fact is that we could, working much shorter hours than at present, easily produce all the necessities of life, and all the comforts, too, in our own country. That is to say, if the landlords and other privileged robbers would allow us to do so. But then that would put an end to economics. For in order to be able to exchange products, you must produce *more than is necessary*. That is precisely what our capitalists force us to do in regard to those things that it *pays* them to exchange with other countries. That is the rock bottom of all economic crises. The capitalist does not care a damn what he turns out—or, rather, what his workers turn out—so long as he can exchange it to his profit. The welfare of his neighbour is nothing to him. He denies the fact that the only work which a man is truly called on to do is just as much and no more than is absolutely necessary as his contribution to the production of the necessities and essential comforts of life. Men are not meant to be beasts of burden to the profit-mongers. For what end are profits made? Simply in order that a small section of mankind may live in unnecessary and injurious luxury. If it were not for economics the world could live at peace. But as long as there is competition for markets on which to unload *surplus* products, so long will there be war.

W. T. SHORE.

FREE CHOICE OR COMPULSION?

Writing in the *Daily Chronicle* of Aug. 12, Edward Carpenter puts forward a strong plea for the Voluntary principle as opposed to Compulsion. After pointing out that the Army has been raised to its present enormous size without Conscription, he says (the italics are ours):—

"In the face of this great object-lesson in the value and power of the Voluntary principle when the heart of a nation is once roused, it is more than probable that the outcry in favour of Conscription which we are hearing in some quarters is really an anti-democratic political move, having in view the scotching of the rising power of the masses...."

"It is hardly possible to exaggerate the danger which Conscription brings with it—the danger of putting into Governmental hands a weapon which at any future time may be easily used not only for carrying on an iniquitous war abroad, but for repressing the democracy at home. In view of the notorious way in which private cliques in the modern nations are able to 'collar' Governments, and run them for their own ends, this danger is of the most serious order; and no institution which would tend to increase it should be allowed."

"This argument seems to me final. Whatever may be said for Conscription in France or Germany, or elsewhere, or might be said in the case of our having a true citizen Army under a thoroughly democratic régime, cannot well be held to be applicable here and now in this country, where Government is still so much a matter of class, and the democratic principle—especially in our foreign policy—is still so little assured. Let us, then, resist the Conscription idea to the last, and hope, indeed, by standing out to dissuade the other nations of the world from it."

The writer, while acknowledging a moral duty "to help his country in its hour of need," insists on the condition of "each person retaining a free choice as to what his particular activity should be.... What we want is the general acknowledgment of duty and the general insistence on free choice." Edward Carpenter then goes on to point out a wider application of this principle than merely for war service:—

"So far the acknowledgment of duty of this kind has been a thing utterly neglected in our social life. Indeed, one may almost say that the evasion of such duty has been one of the chief objects of life. However it may have been in the old feudal organisation of society, in the modern commercial order the sense of solidarity and communal duty has been broken up, and nations have resolved themselves into whirlpools of individuals, each seeking to 'get on' and succeed at the expense of the other individuals. The whole system of the employment of labour, the payment of dividends, the production of 'goods,' and the current ideals of 'respectability' and 'success,' have been founded on

the principle of evasion, and have gone to create a society of parasites, in which each member, instead of actively contributing to the welfare of the others, makes it his chief business and object to live by preying upon the others. It is obvious that such a 'society' cannot possibly hold together very long. It is like a swarm of bees when the queen has departed from among them."

"It would seem that now, even possibly in the present crisis, there must come a complete volte-face and reversal of our current ideals; and the call for National Service, if rightly understood, may lead to this, and to the regeneration of our social life."

The writer, however, will have nothing to do with Compulsion, and concludes his article by saying:—

"Happy would it be...if, instead of hard-and-fast laws and learned wranglings over them, and set punishments for their infraction, we had a simple system of obstacles and inducements, by which the path of wrongdoing in a perfectly natural way was made difficult (though not, of course, impossible), and the path of the public welfare and advantage easy and attractive. In that way much could be done, and without the irritation and resistance which Law and Compulsion in general excite."

CROSS-CHANNEL CENSORCRAFT.

Au dessus de la Mêlée. Par Romain Rolland. 25c. (Paris.)

A flagrant instance of the methods employed by Governments in the War against Words is afforded by the fate of the above-mentioned fine pamphlet—a reprint of an article contributed to the *Journal de Genève* last autumn by one of the most distinguished literary artists of France. The pamphlet has recently been issued (with the author's approval) by Amédée Dunois, who contributed a preface—of which about half has survived the censorial ministrations. Notes are appended by the publisher, explaining that the issue of the pamphlet was delayed by the censorship as long as possible—in fact, until the publication of a *Nationalist* brochure by one M. Massis, who had received the Censor's permission to quote in full certain passages of which he had forbidden the reproduction in the *Mêlée* pamphlet, though he had previously allowed them to appear in the French Press. This partiality is seriously aggravated by the fact that the worthy Massis was evidently allowed to handle the proof-sheets of the censored pamphlet, since in his own brochure he quotes a footnote which did not appear in Rolland's original article, and which Rolland added to the proof before it was forwarded to the Censor. Assured of the loyalty of the printers (*L'Emancipatrice*, 3 rue de Pondichéry, Paris), our comrade very pertinently asks how (except by favour of the Censor) this propagandist of Nationalism could have obtained access to a pamphlet not yet issued. Verily, "for ways that are dark" the Censor of enlightened France bids fair to become a formidable rival of Bret Harte's "Heathen Chinees."

The censored passages are comments on the responsibility of rulers for the present horror; the absurdity of the prevalent idea that "love of country" involves hatred of every other country; and the equivocal position of modern "Christians" with regard to the racial question. The greatest triumph of censorial surgery, however, is exhibited by the following extract—in which the italicised words represent the words removed from the original:—

"You Socialists on both sides claim to be defending liberty against tyranny—French liberty against the Kaiser, German liberty against the Tsar. Would you defend one despotism against another? Unite, and make war on both."

"There was no reason for war between our Western nations. Despite the repeated pronouncements of a Press envenomed by a minority that is interested in maintaining these hatreds, we French, English, and German brothers do not hate each other. I know your people and our own. Our peoples asked only for peace and liberty. The tragedy of the war, for one placed in the midst of the struggle, and able to gaze down from the high plateaus of Switzerland into all the hostile camps, is that each of the nations is really menaced in its dearest possessions—its independence, its honour, and its life. But who has sent these plagues upon them? Who has forced them to face the desperate necessity of crushing the enemy or perishing? Who but their Governments, and primarily (in my opinion) the three great criminals, the three rapacious eagles, the three Empires, the crooked policy of the Austrian dynasty, the ravenous greed of Russia, and brutal Prussia. The worst enemy is not beyond the frontiers, but within each nation; and no nation has the courage to resist it. It is that hundred-headed monster known as Imperialism, that Will to Pride and Domination, seeking to absorb, to subdue, to crush all, absolutely intolerant of greatness other than its own."

No words need be wasted here in praise of the pamphlet. Portions of a translation of Rolland's article were quoted in the *VOICE OF LABOUR* for December, 1914. A full English version (apparently uncensored; but the British Censor leaves no traces of his handiwork) is published at sixpence net by Macmillan and Co., under the title of "Above the Battlefield."

It should be mentioned that the French pamphlet includes another article by Romain Rolland, entitled "Inter Arma Caritas" (Love amid War)—treating of the sufferings of civilian prisoners on both sides, and outlining the ameliorative efforts made on their behalf by the *Agence Internationale des Prisonniers de Guerre*, which is located in Geneva.

T. S.

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., 40c.; France, 2fr.
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 to ensure receipt of paper.

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

Our Rulers Look Ahead.

When the war comes to an end, the peoples of Europe will have a terrible account to settle with their rulers. At present the struggle absorbs all their energies; but when it is over, and the fearful cost in blood and wealth is reckoned up, a stern and menacing "Why?" will be heard from the horror-stricken and suffering people. It is safe to say that every Government in Europe looks to the coming of "peace" with fear and trembling. They know that the cloud of lies with which they excuse themselves now will be swept aside, and an outraged world will raise a cry for vengeance which will not be easily stayed. It is fear of the peoples which brings the politicians together in "Coalition Cabinets," and this same fear will prevent the "crushing" of any one Government by the others. They know that revolution is infectious, and if it starts in one country it would be as impossible to "localise" it as was the war. We all know that England and France lent money to the Russian Government, which helped it to put down the revolution in 1905-6, and that Russia assisted the Austrian Government to crush the revolution in 1848; and we may be sure that the Governments of Europe will help each other in case of a social revolution in any of the countries.

At the same time, each Government will prepare to deal with its own subjects in its own way, and any one who has studied the subject knows that the special war legislation passed by our own Parliament has been carefully designed for any eventualities after the war. The Defence of the Realm Act, the Munitions Act, the Registration Act, and the numerous Orders in Council have put such powers into the hands of the Government that it is no exaggeration to say that the liberties which the people have gained by many bitter fights in the past have been entirely swept away, and they are now entirely at the mercy of the military and naval authorities. Unfortunately, the workers have never recognised the true character of Government, and usually look upon it as a sort of benevolent despot, frequently seeking its assistance when on strike or locked-out by their employers. But as a matter of fact, Governments are the deadly enemies of the workers, and have always sought to fetter them and prevent them gaining their liberty.

At the present moment, the patriotic workers think that the new restrictions of their liberty are imposed purely for the purpose of carrying on the war to a successful issue, and that when the war is over the Government will voluntarily sweep away all these restrictions, and the conditions which prevailed previous to the war will be resumed without any effort on their part. But, if the workers had not such short memories, they would know that what liberties they have gained have only been obtained by fiercely fighting Governments, who are always seeking opportunities of refastening the chains on their necks. While our rulers are in their present difficulties, they will try to keep on the best of terms with the workers, and persuade them that it is for their mutual benefit that the Defence of the Realm and other Acts have been passed; but when the war is over, and the disillusioned workers come back from the battlefield, the real purpose of these Acts will be seen.

A great deal of damage has already been done to the workers' movement, but if they once become alive to the

danger, they may be able to remedy it. Labour M.P.'s and Trade Union officials are like putty in the hands of the astute governing class; many of them are corrupt, but many more are ignorant of the methods by which the ruling class maintain their power. For the workers to rely on these "leaders" to get them their liberty would be foolish, and they must learn to think for themselves and act for themselves. The defeat of the Government and their precious Munitions Act by the Welsh miners teaches us that once the workers are confident of their strength, and know how to use it, nothing can prevent them gaining their liberty and sweeping away the rotten society which has existed up to now.

With the conclusion of the war, a revolutionary situation is almost certain to arise in more than one country in Europe, and by taking a leaf out of their rulers' book, and preparing to take advantage of it, the workers of this country will get a chance of striking a blow for freedom which may not occur again for many years.

Who is Winning the War?

The war has now lasted for more than twelve months, and the various politicians and diplomats among the belligerents have been recently expressing their views at considerable length as to the outcome of the blackest year Europe has ever experienced. It is important to notice at the outset that, with a very few exceptions, a remarkable unanimity pervades these utterances, English and German alike. In both countries the speakers have voiced their entire satisfaction with the present state of affairs, and all seem to be perfectly confident that the ultimate victory is assured to their side no less by the justice of their cause and the bravery of their forces, than by the positive conviction that "the Lord God of Hosts, mighty in battle," is assisting them by every means in his (apparently limited) power.

Tutored by a muzzled Press, and inspired by the real and decisive victories achieved by Hindenburg and his colleagues in Poland, the average German cannot conceive of defeat as being in any way possible. To the average Englishman the outlook is much the same. The mysterious inactivity of the English Fleet in the North Sea, and the even more astonishing delay of the long-promised "great offensive in the West," even when combined with the monotonous tale of repeated Russian defeats, entirely fail to shake his confidence in the oft-repeated assertion that "Germany cannot hold out for ever." National prejudice thus blinds the man in the street to the real facts of the position. To any really impartial observer it is at once perfectly apparent that, after twelve months of the most tremendous fighting the world has ever seen, the military and political situation is entirely unsatisfactory, and must be a source of the deepest disappointment to the leaders on both sides.

Look at the facts. In proportion to the stupendous efforts made, the results are paltry in the extreme. Indeed, quite the most unexpected and extraordinary feature of the great war is the astonishing succession of failures which have been achieved by the most powerful forces on both sides. The Russian "steam roller"—a phrase little used just now—is engaged in flattening out the road of retreat into the heart of its own country. The mighty German Army, which was to have crushed France, seized Paris, and to have long since invaded England, has accomplished no more than the subjugation of Belgium and Poland—and not that in its entirety. The invincible British Navy has won three small actions by opposing an overwhelming force to an inferior number of enemy ships—but of an attack upon the German naval bases, such as the Japanese carried out so successfully at Port Arthur, there has been no serious attempt made. The British Navy remains, notwithstanding its numerical superiority, strictly on the defensive. Of the expedition to the Dardanelles it is quite unnecessary to write at length. It is enough to refer to it as the crowning blunder of all the inefficiency and mismanagement that crowd the pages of British militarism. In short, after twelve months of the most prodigal expenditure of human life, money, and material, the position may justly be described as one of stalemate all round.

Who, then, is winning the war? For a true answer to this question we must examine more closely those optimistic speeches referred to at the beginning of this article. The fact that the Kaiser should now be congratulating the Crown Prince on the "victory of Longwy," twelve months after that comparatively insignificant action was fought, is a clear indication that the German Emperor is desperately hard up for victories to celebrate. That Balfour should have pointed with pride to the achievement of the British Navy in sweeping the seas clear of the German

mercantile flag, whilst the German High Sea Fleet remains practically untouched, shows that England's politico-naval philosopher has little to boast about. It is surely quite obvious that these apologists are only shouting to keep up the courage of their respective nations. The plain fact is that they have all failed to achieve their various objectives. Neither side can now gain any definite superiority over the other, and so be in a position to dictate terms of peace. Hence the problem of who is to win the war resolves itself into a question of which group of nations will bleed to death the quickest. There is no fresh external factor that can materially affect the situation. Either side may buy the aid of a few Balkan States at a high price; but where the greater Powers have failed these few thousand mercenaries can hardly be expected to succeed.

Then why do the Great Powers continue the hellish conflict? Simply because they are the Great Powers. For any one of them to admit defeat would mean for that Power loss of all prestige and to sink at once to the position of a fifth-rate Power. The present situation is the natural result of the foreign policies of the Governments engaged in this war. Hence national defeat means diplomatic defeat as well. It means eternal disgrace for the statesmen of the vanquished country. It is for this reason that these same statesmen shout so loud to keep up the courage of their peoples. As long as the people believe they are winning, they will support the war; and so there remains the chance that the enemy may be forced to admit defeat through sheer exhaustion. But once let the people realise that victory is for them an impossibility, and their enthusiastic support for a war policy will melt away as quickly as snow in the sunlight. And that is a possibility which our statesmen would avoid at any cost. And terrible will be the cost. Appalling will be the slaughter. To-day, upon the altar of militarist nationalism and diplomatic scheming are being sacrificed the mangled, blood-stained bodies of millions of the workers of Europe.

Truly we are offering our sons and our daughters unto devils! But they are devils of our own making. The people have given the State absolute power over them. It only requires the people to realise the insane folly of thus entrusting their destinies to the tender mercies of a few incapable, blundering mediocrities for the power of the State to cease, and for the people to be free. Were the ideals of Communist Anarchy as prevalent in England and Germany to-day as are the delusions propagated by a hireling Press, war would cease to exist, wage slavery would go, and the State would only be remembered as an instrument of thralldom used in past ages to enslave the workers. International Communist Anarchy, the uniting of the peoples of all nations as a band of brothers, is an ideal which must never be lost sight of amid the blood and fire and smoke of the world-war. Rather must its flickering flame be kept alight until it blaze out again like a beacon light illuminating the hearts and minds of the people with its truth. But before Anarchist principles can be sympathetically received, the false idea of the need for the State, and of the so-called "rights" of the State, must be destroyed. Hence the need for as vigorous anti-State propaganda as present-day conditions may allow. And these "conditions" may become even more restricted than they are at present.

To attack the State in times of peace is not easy, to-day it is at least—difficult! For the war has resulted in a rapid and enormous increase in the power of the State, and it is perfectly clear that these will be widely extended in the near future. It is certainly an irony of fate that the advocates of State Socialism, both in this country and in Germany, should be among the first to suffer from the increasing activities of the State. That they should have been attacked on account of their courageous anti-militarism, in no way affects the point at issue. For years these same Socialists have clamoured for an increase in the powers of the State. And the greatest act of aggression on the part of the State at the present time is to attack the journals of these sections of the Socialist movement. For in Germany, as in England, it is the State that is winning the war! The prosecution of the *Labour Leader* should certainly be a valuable object-lesson to those I.L.P.'ers who still regard State action as a panacea for all evils. Then there is the Registration Act. A more typical example of Prussian bureaucratic methods could not have been adopted—by a Government that professes to be "fighting Prussianism"! But there are signs of unrest among the workers, and as the problematical victory recedes further into the distant future, weariness at the long-protracted nature of the struggle is manifested on all hands. If it was "a long way to Tipperary" last August, a year of war has at least taught the average Britisher that it is a longer way still—to Berlin!

OTTO LEROY.

Fight to a Finish—or Finish the Fight?

[We have much pleasure in publishing the following article by the Chairman of the British "Stop-the-War" Committee, as we know there is a conspiracy on the part of the Press to prevent the publication of articles written by members of the Committee.]

There is no record of the original quarrel between the Kilkenny Cats. We only know their fate. They fought until a piece of claw and the tip of a tail were the only bits left. They "fought to a finish" in the most literal sense. Evenly matched, determined to win, with no thought of compromise, they destroyed one another in their mutual rage. *This is what the Great Powers of Europe are doing to-day?* Kingdoms and Empires are fighting like Kilkenny Cats. They will fight, say their statesmen, to the very last gasp.

But why? Why should they do this? Do they *really* want to fight until every home is bereaved, and every country bankrupt? Do they *really* wish nothing short of the extermination of their opponents—the slaughter of every man, woman, and child on the opposing side? Of course not, these platform declarations are only platform rhetoric. They are fighting for *terms*—good terms for the victors: bad terms for the vanquished.

But supposing there are no decisive victors, and none utterly vanquished? Then, again, it is merely a *question of terms*—the terms on which it is better to settle than to go on with the fight.

So that sooner or later it all comes down to a question of terms—the terms on which all parties can make the best adjustment—the terms it is better for all to accept.

Then why not get to this stage at once? Why have all these millions of men tearing at each other's throats, why permit these unspeakable barbarities, this colossal and insane waste of money and life, why permit a *single day* of this futile and unnecessary strife?

The war has gone on long enough for us to see that the Allies cannot "crush Germany," and Germany cannot conquer the Allies. The original causes are so involved and obscured by denials and recrimination that the people in every country will for a long time go on believing that their statesmen are absolutely blameless, and everything on their side is absolutely just and correct. Shells and bayonets may convince them that it is useless to argue, but they will never convince them that their opponents are right. Peace will come when they see it is no use prolonging the contest.

Have we not come to that point already? Is it not better to try to make an immediate settlement? How shall we be in any way nearer a lasting peace if the fighting continues for another twelve months? Our opponents will sustain great losses in the meantime, but so shall we. Our Allies will be suffering. Anguish and ruin will be all over Europe.

If our rulers had to settle this themselves, would they personally fight? If our King and his cousin the Kaiser were put in a room together, would they share the fate of the Kilkenny Cats? Would our Prime Minister fly at the throat of the German Chancellor, or Mr. Balfour stab Von Tirpitz? Of course not. They might discuss and argue, and bluff and wrangle, but it would only be a question of the *terms* which they could induce the others to accept.

In every country the interests and wishes of the great mass of the people are for peace—not "peace at any price," but peace on the best terms they can get. Let our rulers find these out at once. "Stop-the-War" movements are developing in France and Germany. In Italy a large minority has always favoured peace. Brave men and women in Russia have suffered things we cannot conceive. The only way we can help these people with their Governments is not by abusing the "enemy," but by opposing the militarist spirit in our midst.

Let us make a real and genuine effort to bring Britain's part in the war to an *immediate, honourable, and righteous finish*.

J. SCOTT DUCKERS.

The British "Stop-the-War" Committee has just issued a new leaflet, entitled "Some Reasons Why the War Should be Stopped." Copies can be obtained from the Committee, 66 Charing Cross Road, London, W.C.

BETWEEN OURSELVES.

Where We Have Failed and How We Might Succeed.

The war which still rages, devastating the world, is teaching many a lesson of which we Anarchists ought to take advantage in carrying on our struggle against Privilege.

When this orgy of carnage began, the Anarchists, in contrast with the well-to-do classes who feigned a holy horror of the war which had been provoked by themselves, did not exhibit or feel any surprise, having always considered war a normal condition in a society based on economic and political antagonism. What they rather felt was disappointment (of short duration, however) on seeing how easily the masses were persuaded to answer the call to arms made by the various Governments. Anarchists had in fact been dreaming that their propaganda of so many years must have taught the working classes not to place themselves in the hands of the State, at least to the extent of being pushed into a war against one another.

Of course, the Anarchists were far from believing that the workers were ready to make a revolution; but they thought they would have made such a stand as to impress upon the responsible powers that they were playing a dangerous game. It was not so. It sufficed for the rulers, in co-operation with an unscrupulous Press and a few renegade revolutionists, to proclaim that the war was necessary to save the soil of the various "Fatherlands" from invasion or to safeguard the rights and principles of nationality, civilisation, etc., to arouse the old patriotic prejudices and, above all, the reverence for the State, stifling other sentiments such as working-class solidarity; and the masses allowed themselves—still as ever a flock of sheep—to be led, with scarcely a protest, to the horrible slaughter.

But after the first disappointment we had to acknowledge that the responsibility for the recrudescence of such prejudices among the workers rested with the forward parties, which had failed, in spite of fifty years of propaganda, to forge a weapon with which to combat the deleterious influence of the reactionary elements of society. Consider, for instance, the tactics of the Socialists in Germany, England, France, and Italy—all over Europe, in fact—and you cannot help thinking that they are responsible for the lack of resistance on the part of the working classes when the various Governments ordered mobilisation. For over fifty years the official Socialist parties had taught the workers that to bring about the revolution which should change the present society into the one dreamt of by all sections of Socialists (Anarchists included) it was necessary first to get hold of the public powers by Parliamentary means, which, of course, meant collaboration with the classes and political powers which they claim to intend to overthrow. What could be expected from ironbound organisations formed merely for the purpose of obtaining seats in Parliament, which implies the surrender of free initiative to political representatives, which, in time, turns the people into a collection of automatons by checking their spirit of revolt?

It has been said that in Germany, the people threw in their lot with the Government because they believed in the news that the "barbarian Russian" had invaded the Fatherland. Granted that was so, and that it formed an excuse for participation in the war, it still does not justify the tactics which had fostered the patriotic spirit instead of changing that spirit into the sentiment of international solidarity. In fact, the majority of the German Social Democracy has for years preached, and continues to preach, that the destiny of the German working class is bound up with the development of German industry.

Anarchists have pointed out all this since they severed connection with the Socialists. As a matter of fact, it was on account of the authoritarian tactics of the Socialists that Anarchists have taken an opposite path, pointing out that mechanical conceptions of discipline would create a spirit of submission and passivity, and sap the source of action among the workers.

In spite of the opposition of the Socialist parties which expelled the "mad" Anarchists from their congresses, and in spite of persecution by the Governments, Anarchists tried to spread their ideal amongst the people by individual or collective action. But their efforts were isolated and not followed by any important work of co-ordination among the people. For years, indeed, we seemed to disdain contact with the masses: we preached our ideal of their redemption, but failed to lead their daily life, to take an interest in their immediate economic claims, though such contact with them would have enabled us to permeate them with our ideals. In fact, Syndicalism should be the rock on which we should build Anarchism. If Syndicalism has not yet come up to our expectations, it is just because we have failed to vivify it with our idealism. Instead, we left this work of permeation to the Socialists, and the Socialists transformed the workers into a flock of electors.

We Anarchists have called ourselves atheists, but what have we done to uproot religious sentiments among the peasantry? We have called ourselves anti-militarists and anti-Parliamentarians, but what have we done anti-militaristic or anti-Parliamentarian in all these years, with the exception of a few manifestoes and pamphlets? We are against the State, and the State continues to control everything—the shaping, in the schools, of the minds of the young into a condition of submission and respect for the very institutions (property, law, police, army, and magistracy) which we intend to overthrow. We have spoken

and written continually more for the initiated than for the masses, and have wasted in philosophic and scientific disquisitions, which nobody understands, time which we should have devoted to carrying our voice and our action amongst the industrial workers and the peasantry, in order to uproot the prejudices on which the ruling classes worked and on which they reckoned when they declared war—a declaration which consequently found us unprepared and powerless.

And now, in France the Anarchists have either taken part openly in the "sacred union" of all parties to defend the "patrie" and the Republican institutions, or have retired into a corner, saying they are powerless to do anything—not even an individual deed of revolt.

In Italy, for nine months the Anarchists had declared themselves against the war, and two or three weekly papers wrote, and wrote again, against militarism, patriotism, nationalism, etc. Our comrades also took part in some public meetings against the war, but for lack of organisation were unable to prevent it. Yet years ago the Anarchists were tearing up the rails to prevent trains taking soldiers to the Abyssinian campaign.

But what is the use of complaining now that the mischief is done, or, rather, now that we have failed to do any mischief? Well, my remarks, especially those concerning my own comrades (which, of course, concern my humble self, too) are intended to draw attention to the errors of the past in order to avoid them in our future action.

We cannot give up our aspirations towards freedom; we cannot forget our love for those who have suffered under the tyranny of privilege—although at times, in this grey hour of discomfort there may come a fleeting thought of the vanity of our efforts; we cannot renounce the ideal of justice which nurtured us in our younger days; nor can we abandon our brothers who, under the spell of old and inherited prejudices, are fighting in a cause which is not theirs. While the storm lasts we must see to our weapons in preparation for the fight which is truly ours.

I will not prophesy what will happen after the war, nor how it will end; but if I cannot say who will be the winners, I can easily point out the losers—the people. They will lose not only in the sense of the lives sacrificed to the militaristic Moloch, and from the material misery which will follow the tragic event, but also—and above all—from the added prestige which in all countries the State will have gained; and our task will be harder than ever.

We must, therefore, unite all our efforts in forming the new consciousness of the masses, not neglecting any means which may lead to success without going contrary to our revolutionary method. If it is found necessary to co-operate with other sections of the revolutionists, we must do it without perpetually being afraid of being inconsistent.

From all parts come signs which indicate that even the very Socialists who were for war, voting the war credits and collaborating with their Governments, are coming to their senses. From Russia, Poland, Bulgaria, Roumania, and Servia come voices of the possibility of peace and of adherence to the old principles of international solidarity. The German Social Democratic Party of Austria has just issued a manifesto to the working classes expressing the "hope, growing from day to day, to see the war over," and "the members of the International, purified by experience, using all their power in the service of peace." But what is more impressive than all is the repentance of some of the best-known leaders of German Social Democracy, on whom there seems to have dawned a new light. The same thing is occurring in France.

This scission is being accentuated every day, and a great division in the Socialist parties of Europe, as well as in the working-class organisations, is inevitable. On the one side there will be those who will advocate the continuation of the "sacred union" with the Liberal and Democratic parties and with the State. There will be a Radical party of reform in Germany, and so in France, and in Italy especially, where to this new party there will join Republicans, Reformist Socialists, and some Syndicalists. On the other hand, there will be those who will continue to fight Capitalism on the old basis of the *lutte de classe*, or "class-consciousness"; but as their Parliamentary and legal action has proved a failure now more than ever, they will (together with the trade organisations, which will in all countries turn to revolutionary Syndicalism, if we act quickly), if they are really *bona fide*, change towards direct action their line in their struggle, that is, towards the Anarchist method, the very method they have for many years opposed.

Well, if the Socialists who have at heart the interests of the working classes, recognising at last the fallacy of the old method, will abandon Parliamentary action, and will approach us, we Anarchists must in our turn lean towards them and join hands in all those agitations which will create the spirit of revolt amongst the working classes. Many occasions suitable for combined action will occur to readers of this article. Why, for instance, should we not unite in agitations for conquering freedom of speech and public meeting, and liberty of the Press, which are not yet our heritage? It is easy to foretell, for instance, that after the war many things that have been promised by the Governments to lure the people to war will remain dead letters. Then the expenditure made by the Governments will cause such a state of utter misery among the workers as to give rise to reflections which have never yet occurred to them. Then, too, the war, while it will have made large fortunes for those engaged in "high finance," will have created a new class—small capitalists (manufacturers, merchants, and shopkeepers) ruined and reduced to proletarians. In co-operation with the Socialists just mentioned, can we not explain to

these sufferers from the war the interest they have in collaborating with us to change the present form of society?

Would not an agitation against armaments have a chance of success when, the war fever having subsided, the working classes come to see that they have fought for abstractions and interests which are not theirs? There is, indeed, something quite definite which we might do in this direction. In Italy, it is rumoured that a Steel Trust press is to be formed to check, with its influence, the anti-militaristic and anti-armament propaganda from the revolutionary parties which one may foresee as soon as the war is over. Why should we not try to start a movement all over Europe in conjunction with the Socialists and Syndicalists, to propagate among the workers' organisations the idea of boycotting the manufacture of armaments and munitions?

We could set on foot these and many other agitations, the idea of which, now briefly formulated, I leave to comrades to develop. But if it should not be possible to come to an understanding with the Socialists and Syndicalists, and the latter should choose to collaborate with the State and the Liberal and Democratic parties, as they do now under the spell of patriotic and nationalistic ideology, the Anarchists must by all means do the work themselves, and save the proletariat and workers' organisations from such renegades. In doing so, and studying between ourselves the various points to which I have alluded, we shall be able to take advantage of the opportunity which will very soon present itself of reconstituting on a libertarian basis the Working-Class International.

E. RECCHIONI.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL.

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

DEAR COMRADE,—In the August issue of FREEDOM, "T. S." refers to Internationalism as a "pseudo-ideal." Under a system in which ideas and functions relating to nationality are absolute essentials for the perpetuation of Capitalism, the modern wage-slave has no choice other than to exist under national laws. He may rebel, but these same inexorable laws provide for his punishment. He may submit and imagine that he is in every sense an individual, not of a nation, but of the world; yet his materialistic existence is national. Day after day the bread the worker eats is under a tax, the clothes he buys are taxed, the fruits of his labour are taxed. The laws made by Government or some corresponding tyrannical institution rule to a great extent the life of the individual. In fact, under the prevalent system of society all are national. The ideals of the Anarchist may soar to world-wide freedom; but he must remember that he does not dwell under Anarchism. Although in his thoughts the Anarchist wipes out the nationalist ideal, he cannot disregard the grim reality of national Government. Therefore, being national in all except our ideals, we must co-operate with the workers of other nations towards our never-faltering intention—revolution. When that day dawns, and Government and Capitalism are fading nightmares, then we shall erase and forget Nationalism and Internationalism. There will then be no necessity for titles. For the present, however, we must organise internationally, whether we call the movement Universal or International.

May I suggest that the various readers of FREEDOM discuss in these columns the formation of a suitable preamble towards the reorganisation of the world-wide Anarchist Communist movement? In numbers we are few, yet our philosophy is mighty. On every hand ignorance and delusion confront us; truth is lost in the darkness of Capitalism and political intrigue, but dimly outlined against the mists of futurity; Liberty calls us on unceasingly. Are you impatient, Comrade Hamilton? Economic salvation is a myth until Capitalism is overthrown. At present our masters hold the economic power, and the terrible slaughter on the Continent is a typical instance as to how they wield it. Besides, all implements of production are taxed, directly or indirectly; and even the production itself is often taxed. Then, think of the land tax. Our masters hold the monopoly, and we must take it from them. The application of our rights of expropriation by direct action will have better consequences than endeavouring to set up communes under Government taxation. Rather let us swell our numbers and prepare diligently for revolution, for whose coming we look, not two hundred years hence, but soon, very soon, as Kropotkin remarks in his "Conquest of Bread." Even now the politicians are hastening their own destruction. They are treading on dangerous ground and they may slip—soon. It is our business to propel them still faster to their doom. When the workers realise that Government, Capitalism, and Nationality are the main factors of the exploitation of labour, they will object—they will rise, and then we will hail the revolution.

As a reform, the Socialist Co-operative store experiment is good from an economic standpoint; but the expansion of the idea would not mean economic salvation, and it is unlikely it would prove a valuable instrument of revolution—and we must remember that must come internationally. Hitherto we have relied on some vague organisation designated the "Socialist International." What it really was few of us had any definite idea, until the outbreak of war, when our faith in it was rudely shattered. We had an International Anarchist Congress at Amsterdam in 1907, but it was mainly a review of Anarchist progress in the different countries. At the same time these things show that the desire for international co-operative action is apparent and real.

Every day the reactionaries of the warring countries are tightening

the chains of slavery upon the workers. Here we had first the Munitions Act, and now the Introduction to Slavery Act (Registration Act), and so on. We may impede them, but at present we cannot stop them. It is the workers themselves who must act collectively to stop it all. They do not object because they do not understand. Ours is a voice in the wilderness, but ever and anon we progress towards our ideal. The darkening clouds herald the coming storm, and when the storm breaks we will play our part in the fight for freedom. With harmony amongst Anarchists and Communists, something will be really accomplished; but while dissension pervades the revolutionary atmosphere, we can hope for little. The peoples grow weary of war—they will yet shudder at the awful aftermath. They begin to long for something better, and this is our opportunity. Upon the smoking carnage let us raise a new and mightier standard for Liberty. Perhaps this dark hour is but the forerunner of the dawn of the grand millennium.—Yours fraternally,

R. S. WOOD.

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

DEAR COMRADE,—In the August number of FREEDOM, Comrade Hamilton writes asking us to start the Co-operative movement over again under the name of "The New International." Now, this letter is not written with any desire to throw cold water on the scheme—no scheme earnestly entered into deserves to be so treated, in my opinion—but merely to place before him certain considerations which possibly have not occurred to him, but which, I believe, strike at the roots of the principles which underlie our whole propaganda, using the term in its widest sense.

Now, the aims of the Glasgow venture are precisely the aims of the Co-operative movement all over the country. "Divi" is recognised by all responsible and conscious Co-operators as merely an incident; and that so many are members merely for "divi" is no fault inherent in the rule or spirit of the societies, but results through lack of understanding among the members thereof. This is practically inevitable when a movement becomes as popular as the Co-operative movement; and Comrade Hamilton's society will undoubtedly show the same defects when it becomes of an unmanageable size, such unmanageableness being precisely shown by the existence of the disadvantages. Now, since to be effective in the way Comrade Hamilton desires, the society must be of a size, if not unmanageable, at the least of a size that would be unmanageable if not inspired by the right spirit, and since to attain that size it would have to draw on for its membership precisely those people who already are (or are not) in a Co-operative society, my plan simply is, let us, as Anarchists, join the Co-operative movement, which is, if nothing else, a non-Governmental association of people united for a common end; and so work through the various guilds and educational leagues that the members come round to our way of looking at things, surely a vital viewpoint for a voluntary movement like the Co-operative movement. This idea—permeation—is as old as the working-class movement, but I really believe it is the only course having within it the seeds of success; that is why I am a Syndicalist—but that is another story.

This work is already being done in a large measure, but for a somewhat different object, by the Shillito League. In an article by "John Smith of Oldham," in the *Co-operative News* of July 17, are several quotations from Kropotkin's "Conquest of Bread" and "Fields, Factories, and Workshops." It is true in the same issue is a report of a strike of the employees of the Todmorden Society; but surely that is our work—to point out that there should be no employees or shareholders, but that all should be Co-operators.—Yours fraternally,

ALFRED CORUM.

Glasgow Police and Anti-Conscriptionists.

The Glasgow police are evidently anxious to emulate the deeds of their fellows in London and Manchester who raided the *Labour Leader* offices. On Sunday, August 22, our comrade Duncan Cameron attended an outdoor meeting of the British Socialist Party, held in Bath Street, Glasgow, and distributed some of the leaflets, "Are you a Pro-Prussian?" reprinted from last month's FREEDOM, and issued by the Anti-Conscription League. A special constable, who is also an anti-Socialist speaker and president of the Scottish Conservative Labour Federation, asked Cameron for his name and address. On Saturday, the 28th, three detectives called at his house during his absence, and took all the leaflets they could find, leaving word that he was to attend at the Central Police Court on Sunday. When Cameron called, he was told that the case was in the hands of the Procurator Fiscal.

This action of the police and the Conscriptors shows how much they believe in freedom—for which they want the workers to fight. Northcliffe's *Daily Gramophones* are to bray out the message for Conscription, but all arguments against it are to be suppressed. As Conscription is not yet the law of the land, and as most of the Liberal journals are opposing its introduction, it is surely no crime for Anarchists to oppose it; and our Glasgow comrades intend to continue their work, in spite of out-of-work anti-Socialists and the police. Copies of the leaflet seized can be obtained free from FREEDOM Office.

Our comrade John McAra, who speaks on the Mound in Edinburgh, has roused the ire of a local paper, which called on the authorities to suppress him, and when they failed to do so, asked to

incite the crowd against him. But the only result so far has been a great increase in the size of his audiences and also in the sales of FREEDOM and pamphlets. We hope the local paper will continue its free advertisement.

"Defending the Realm" in Australia.

Under the heading of "Thou Shalt not Think," the *Labour Call* (official organ of the Australian Labour Party in the State of Victoria) levels this serious charge against the Federal Labour Government:—

"Ministers of the Crown have now gone beyond threatening incarceration to men who refuse to think in the 'proper' manner. Men of British birth and extraction are now in Langwarrin who are not permitted to even know the cause of their imprisonment. They are found guilty and imprisoned without trial, without seeing the accuser, or knowing the accusation. The order of the day in Australia, under a Labour Ministry, is secret denunciation—a method that takes us back to the darkest days of religious bigotry. The right of recantation is prohibited. The plea of 'not guilty' is not permitted."

The Melbourne *Socialist*, commenting on this extraordinary policy of the Government, says:—

"We confess that words almost fail us in describing such a state of affairs. To think that, in free and democratic Australia, things have come to this pass! . . . We are assured on good authority that there are a number of Britishers at Langwarrin who have been interned because of secret information supplied by others. It would seem that all a man has to do who has a 'set' on another is to make a report to the Defence Department, and charge the man upon whom he has a 'set' with disloyalty or want of patriotism, and straightaway the marked man can be quietly and effectually got out of the road. . . . We are also informed (on good authority) that our Labour Government has instituted a Secret Service, and that imps and spies are everywhere at hand to catch the unwary."

Frank Anstey, the Labour Member whose splendid fight for freedom against overwhelming odds has thrilled working-class Australia, says:—

"Under the Commonwealth criminal code, made by the War Precautions Act, an officer of the Army or Navy may arrest without warrant any person 'whose behaviour is of such a nature as to give ground for suspicion that he had acted, was acting, or was about to act in a manner prejudicial to the public safety.' The man so arrested is not brought to trial, is not charged with an offence, and cannot appeal. *He is merely held on suspicion, and is held as long as the military chiefs think fit.* That is the 'justice' operating in Australia just now."

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

(August 6—September 2.)

FREEDOM Guarantee Fund.—A. Smith 6d, W. Gardner 1s, H. A. Bertoli 2s, Vulcan 1s, J. Hoffman 1s, J. Hose 6d, H. W. Journet 2s, S. Corio 1s 6d. *Marsh House* (socials and sale of refreshments and literature), week ending July 24, 3s 8d; July 31, 2s 5½d; August 7, 6s 0½d; August 14, 9s 5d. Garden Party, £4 14s.

FREEDOM Subscriptions.—A. H. Wells 1s, A. Smith 2s, M. Newman 1s 6d, A. G. Barker 1s 6d, A. E. S. 6d, R. H. T. 7½d, J. Hoffman 1s 6d, J. Hose 1s 6d, G. Prokofiew 1s 6d, K. Riedel 6s 2d, C. E. Corrin 1s 6d, H. Termeer 1s 6d.

Marsh House.

Library—Open every evening to comrades.
Thursdays—Discussion, 8.30 p.m.
Saturdays and Sundays—Social Evenings, 8.30 p.m.
Saturday, September 11—Social and Whist Drive, 6d., in aid of FREEDOM and VOICE OF LABOUR.

"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.
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.
ISENBURG, Cleveland Street, W.
F. BENDY, 270 York Road, Bridge End, Wandsworth, S.W.
STEVENS, 56 High Street, Islington.
GOLUB, 10 Osborne Street, Whitechapel.
SUGARMAN, 329A Mile End Road, E.
J. YATES, 114 High Road, Willesden Green, N.W.
H. ELLIOT, 329 Lillie Road, Fulham, S.W.
J. WINTERS, 196 Church Road, Willesden, N.W.
J. FLEET, 109 Upper Street, Islington, N.
F. Hahn, 450 Harrow Road, N.W.

Leicester.—Socialist Society, 1 Churchgate.

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

Manchester.—H. SEGALS, 99A Great Ducie Street, Strangeways (Wholesale).
HEWKIN, 14A Cannon Street.
M. Robert, 86 Grosvenor Street, Corner of Brook 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.

VOICE OF LABOUR.

MONTHLY (15TH), ONE HALFPENNY.

127 OSSULSTON STREET, LONDON, N.W.

Back Numbers of "Freedom."

We can supply a few complete sets of FREEDOM from 1906 to 1913, all in good condition for binding. Prices:—

1911 to 1914 ... 1s. 6d. per year; two years for 2s. 6d.

1906 to 1910 ... 2s. " five years for 8s. 6d.

Prices include postage in the United Kingdom.

PAMPHLET AND BOOK LIST.

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

ANARCHIST MORALITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

THE WAGE SYSTEM. By P. KROPOTKIN. 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 COMMUNE OF PARIS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. ½d.

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

WAR. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

A TALK BETWEEN TWO WORKERS. By E. MALATESTA. 1d.

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. By ELISEE RECLUS. 1d.

USEFUL WORK v. USELESS TOIL. By WM. MORRIS. 1d.

THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONGRESS, 1907. 1d.

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

ANARCHISTS AND ESPERANTO. 1d.

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

ANARCHY. By ANDRE GIRARD. ½d.

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

DUTY OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE. By H. Thoreau. 3d.

THE CHICAGO MARTYRS. With Portraits. 1d.

ANTIMILITARISM FROM THE WORKERS' POINT OF VIEW. By Dora B. Montefiore. 1d.

RIGHT TO IGNORE THE STATE. By Herbert Spencer. 1d.

LAND AND LIBERTY: MEXICO'S BATTLE FOR ECONOMIC FREEDOM. 4d.; postage, 1d.

FOR LIBERTY: An Anthology of Revolt. Cloth 7d., paper 3d.

WOMAN'S FREEDOM. By Lily Gair Wilkinson. 1d.

WARS AND CAPITALISM. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

THE ANARCHIST REVOLUTION. By George Barrett. 1d.

THE LAST WAR. By George Barrett. 1d.

MUTUAL AID. By P. Kropotkin. 1s. net; postage 2d.

MEMOIRS OF A REVOLUTIONIST. By P. KROPOTKIN. (American Edition). 8s. 6d. net.

FIELDS, FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. New and Revised Edition. Cloth, 1s. net.

THE CONQUEST OF BREAD. By P. KROPOTKIN. Cloth 1s. net.

MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM. By PETER KROPOTKIN. A New Translation. Paper 6d., Cloth 1s. 6d.; postage 1½d. and 3d.

GOD AND THE STATE. By MICHAEL BAKUNIN. Cloth 1s. net., postage 1d. (6d. edition out of print.)

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

PRISON MEMOIRS OF AN ANARCHIST. By A. BERKMAN. 6s. 6d. net, postage 4d.

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

NEWS FROM NOWHERE. By WILLIAM MORRIS. Paper covers, 1s. 1-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.

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

CIVILIZATION: ITS CAUSE AND CURE. By E. Carpenter. Cloth 2s. 6d. net, paper 1s., postage 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.

THE ORIGIN AND IDEALS OF THE MODERN SCHOOL. By FRANCISCO FERRER. Cloth 9d. net, paper 6d. net, postage 2d.

FREE POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS. By L. SPOONER. 1s. net.

LIBERTY AND THE GREAT LIBERTARIANS. Compiled by C. T. SPRADING. 6s. 6d. net, postage 4d.

THE SCIENCE OF SOCIETY. By Stephen Pearl Andrews. 5s. net.

SELECTED WORKS OF VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE. 4s. 6d. net; postage 4d.

THE SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MODERN DRAMA. By Emma Goldman. 4s. 6d. net; postage 4d.

SYNDICALISM AND THE CO-OPERATIVE COMMONWEALTH. By E. PATAUD and E. POUGET. Paper 2s. 6d., cloth 3s. 6d., post-free.

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.