

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM

VOL. XXXI.—No. 337.

JUNE, 1917.

MONTHLY: ONE PENNY.

NOTES.

Government Losing Ground.

The record contained in the daily press of the various repressive acts committed by the Government reminds us of the time-honoured saying that those whom the gods wish to destroy they first drive mad. The Government having found that militarism could only be maintained by depriving the people of all the liberty they ever possessed, has been driven (logically enough from its point of view) from one repressive act to another. The downward path has been strewn with very many "scraps of paper" torn into many fragments. It has broken one pledge after another, only allowed *ex parte* statements to appear in print, and then thrown into prison those courageous enough to defy it. From the standpoint of the workers there is at least some ground for hope. The recklessness at present exhibited by the Government is one of the surest signs of its growing impotence. The Government has lost prestige on all sides, for it has destroyed the belief of its subjects that Government is a beneficent sort of institution.

Workers Kick Again.

The symptoms of industrial unrest have grown alarmingly during the past month. Spasmodic strikes have broken out all over the country, and have proved a certain indication of the volcano awaiting eruption below. It is not mere accident that, despite the efforts of the Union leaders, the engineers, the munition workers, dockers and busmen have downed tools. Defiance of centralised authority continues to actuate the workers. Compacts drawn up between the Government and the Union officials have been protested against by those who, having no voice in the agreement, have yet to pay the penalty when such an agreement constitutes real hardship to them. On all sides is seen evidence that the Union and Labour leaders have conspired with the Government for the betrayal of Labour. One notable fact stands out. The Labour Minister, Mr. Hodge, declined to meet the strike leaders, and described them as "irresponsibles of about 25." The executive committees rose to the occasion in their usual bureaucratic fashion. Being duly elected representatives of the workers, they could not, of course, tolerate any authority but their own. Yet it appeared the shop stewards committees had even greater claim to being considered representative. The arrest of eight of the shop stewards only increased the area of the strike, and the Government promptly withdrew the charges. Now they have decided to form Industrial Committees in seven areas to investigate the causes of industrial unrest. If they dig deep enough, they may find it is due to increasing knowledge of what Capitalism means for the workers, and their determination to substitute a state of Society in which freedom and well-being for all will be possible.

Russia's Revolution.

The glamour of freedom which has for so long a period of time duped the British into the belief that they really possessed liberties of a unique character, has strangely enough been dispelled by the Russian people. At the very time when we are reported to be fighting for democracy and the freedom of little nations, they make the astounding discovery that "Germany is probably the most reactionary country, but Britain is not far behind." It is more than clear that Britain as the land of the free has lost her popularity, seeing that the Russians now possess the actual substance. One of the most significant facts in connection with the Russian bid for freedom has been the absence of definite leaders. This fact surprises a writer in the *Daily News*, who comes to the convincing conclusion that "the only revolutionist was the people itself." Let the people only continue to refuse to be tricked by leaders and politicians, and their path towards social reconstruction should be fraught with few dangers, but the entry of certain representatives into the Coalition Government

suggests the old wangling and trickery of the people. Fortunately, the Russian traditions of modern communal life are all to the good, and may yet save them from the experience we have had in Britain.

Ireland in Labour.

The Irish scandal has at last impressed the Government, not with the necessity for a just settlement of the Irish claims, but with the need for acting in accordance with the decrees of political expediency. Pressure from America, Australia, and Canada, on the one hand, and the rapid growth of the revolutionary Sinn Fein ideals on the other, have at last convinced our reactionary Government that the Irish possess grievances. The return of the Sinn Fein candidate for South Longford, coming so soon after the election of Count Plunkett, showed even the densest politician that the Nationalist cause was not only dead, but damned. The more modest demand for Home Rule has given place to the Republican ideal. The spirit of the Sinn Fein leaders murdered a year ago by order of the military has animated the people of Ireland, and produced a unity of feeling unknown for generations. The crushing of the rebellion and the Maxwell régime have had precisely the effects we prophesied a year ago. The Dublin rebellion, even though it was brutally stamped out, has caused the re-birth of a nation—a nation virile, tenacious of purpose, and spirited.

An Irish Convention.

The acceptance by the Irish Nationalists of the Convention proposal is quite easily understandable, but what political miracle has caused the conversion of Lord Lansdowne and other opponents to the principle of the freedom of little nations? We do not make the mistake of supposing that those magic words "justice" and "liberty" have had anything to do with it. It is very much more likely that they discerned the writing on the wall, and read there the doom of the Government, unless at least the most insistent people within the Empire were placated. The decision to invite to the Convention representatives embracing all shades of political, economic, and religious opinion is a decidedly subtle move. As far as the Sinn Feiners are concerned, representation would tend to rob them of their present power and bring them under the heel of constituted authority. The Government dreads the revolutionary idealist, but knows how to manage a Trade Union official, or any other so-called representative, once he abides by all the rules of the political game, and bows down to authority. The granting of such a Convention by the Government has for the time being saved them, though fairly deeply covered with ignominy; but the Irish workers if they recognise such a body will stand to lose all, unless they are in the position to dictate terms to the whole gathering. The Convention proposal is a clever ruse, and we hope that the keen-witted Irish will be quick enough to see through this last decidedly picturesque piece of window-dressing on the part of the Government.

Much Cry, Little Wool.

The scandal of the multiplicity of Government Departments has been emphasised by the publication of figures in connection with the working of the National Service Scheme. These suggest that it cost over £100,000 to make use of 9,000 volunteers. The actual figures up to April 30 are:

Cost of advertising	£78,000
Total cost of scheme	£104,000
Persons enrolled	307,000
Persons placed	9,092

This fresh proof of the costliness of the Government's pet remedy should do much to show the worker the absolute wastefulness of bureaucracy. Once it is realised that the creation of every new State department decreases his prosperity and adds a fresh burden to his back something might be done to sweep away the whole fabric of rottenness. But the British worker seems peculiarly adapted to "grin and bear."

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, etc., to be addressed to

THE MANAGER, 127, Ossulston Street, N.W. 1.

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 to be made payable to **FREEDOM Press.**

THE ENGINEERS' STRIKE.

The almost national strike of engineers has been the cause of much anxiety to the Government and the Press. There were many questions involved, but the main points of the men's revolt were the withdrawal of the "trade card" scheme and the introduction of "dilution of labour" on private work. Under the trade card scheme, members of certain Trade Unions were exempt from military service; but the pressure of the Army authorities compelled the Government to withdraw this arrangement, and the engineers became liable to military service. In a statement issued to the Press, on behalf of the men, a prominent member of the Engineers' Society says:

"What has happened with the trade card agreement? This agreement was duly signed by representatives of the Government, the War Minister, the Ministry of Munitions, the President of the Board of Trade, and the Labour Adviser of the Government on the one hand, and by representatives of the Engineers' Executive Council, organisers, and workmen's delegates on the other. Without any intimation that anything was wrong, or any discussion with the parties who were signatories to the agreement, it was ruthlessly scrapped."

The other question, the dilution of labour on private work, is also a matter of broken pledges on the part of the Government. The engineers agreed to dilution of labour on munitions after having received a definite promise from the then Minister of Munitions—Mr. Lloyd George—that the surrender of their rules and principles would not be applied to private work. This promise has now been broken by the Prime Minister, and coming at the same time as the withdrawal of the trade card agreement, the men decided to strike. The working of the Munitions Act also added fuel to the flame.

All these questions are bound up in the continuance of the war, which the Government are determined to carry on to what they consider a successful conclusion; and if the engineers are still "patriotic" and support the Government's war policy, they must be prepared to throw overboard all the rules and regulations by which they protected themselves against their masters. The Government, in this case, broke pledges which were never considered binding. One of the best known laws regulating the actions of statesmen is that anything and everything is justified in the interests of the State. Consequently, when the Government found that the engineers would not agree to surrender their rules and regulations in the making of munitions unless they received a promise that it would not apply to private work, the promise was immediately forthcoming, Lloyd George knowing very well that it would not be binding. Similarly with regard to the trade card agreement, the men were treated in exactly the same way as the married men were treated under the Derby scheme. The Government wanted to use the engineers to train those men and women who are not put into the firing line, so for the time being they agreed to exempt them from military service; but as soon as their object was served, and the substitutes had been trained, they proceeded to take the able-bodied ones for the Army.

The Government's action in this matter is simply a repetition of what has happened many times during the war, and the engineers must be simpletons indeed if they thought that pledges which had been broken so often to other workers would be binding in their case. Government itself is founded on a lie, and will and must be supported by lies. It presumes that there are special virtues in the governors which are not possessed by the governed, whereas the truth is that they possess special vices which enable them to hide the fraud and violence of government from those they govern. So far from government being for the

benefit of the governed, it is really an institution founded for the protection of the interests of the wealthy and strong. Sometimes the members of the governing class disagree among themselves as to how they shall divide the plunder taken from the workers, the productive class; but when it comes to trouble between the workers and the governors, the latter always stick together. The strongest card played by the ruling class is to set one section of the workers against another section. See how the married men were played off against the single men under the Derby scheme, and yet in the end the married men were also forced into the Army. In the same way, under the trade card scheme, the engineers, the miners, the railwaymen, and others were played off against those not included in the agreement. They thought they would be safe from military service themselves if they allowed the other workers to be forced into the Army. Now they find their turn has come for the trenches, and as long as the war lasts no man is safe. The age limit has been raised before, and will and must be raised again if the war continues.

The workers have put power into the hands of their rulers, who will use it unscrupulously when it suits their purpose. Their leaders have joined hands with their masters, and have proved to be rotten reeds to rely on in time of trouble. It is just what might have been expected. They all—workers as well—think government necessary, so they must abide by the consequences; but it is only a necessity under capitalism. If the workers will but recognise the true function of government and capitalism, they will soon see their rottenness; and in the place of government and capitalism they must put freedom and co-operation. All the horrors of the past three years are due to capitalism and its twin-evil, government; and to prevent a repetition of these horrors they must be abolished. If the war teaches the workers this lesson, then it will have been worth the price they have paid for it. But it will be by Anarchism alone that they will be set free, and not by new forms of government, however "revolutionary" they may be.

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION.

It is still very difficult to find out what is happening in Russia. Nearly all of the telegrams speak of events in Petrograd, but leave us in the dark as to the rest of the country. It seems certain, however, that the peasants are continuing to seize the land and cultivate it for themselves, an action much resented by the landlords in the Provisional Government. It is also certain that this internal trouble is the principal reason why the commercial classes are anxious for peace, as whilst they were glad of the assistance of the workers in sweeping away the rotten and incompetent autocracy, they are in no humour for great social changes which would endanger their profits. A letter in the *Manchester Guardian* from its Petrograd correspondent shows that, even if the Government desired to carry on the war, the Army is in such a disorganised condition that it will be useless for effective action for some time to come. The writer, Michael Farberman, says in his letter of May 19:

"Russian democracy has no illusions concerning the real state of the Russian Army, and deems it criminal to hide the truth from the Allies. The Russian Army is in a grave condition. The fact must be faced equally by Russia and her Allies. There has been an attempt to shift responsibility for the fact on to the democratic peace programme, yet in reality this programme is to a great extent determined by the condition of the Army. The Russian peace programme is based not on principles alone but on sad realities, and whoever criticises principles alone dangerously misconceives the truth. The Allies ought not to inflict on Russia a task which is not only impossible, but bound to lead to the ruin of Russia. On the contrary, the Allies should put their aims in accord with the forces and possibilities of each single ally."

This state of the Russian Army may possibly bring about peace, and as every Government is now saying very loudly that they seek no conquests it is probable they are trying to find a way out by means of a formula that will allow them to persuade their peoples that they have attained the object of defending their respective countries from the enemy. Russia's necessity will be the peace-makers' opportunity.

The decision of the Committee of Workmen and Soldiers' Delegates to take part in the Government is quite logical. As they insisted on formulating a policy for the Government they could not decline the responsibility of helping to carry it out. Their positions will help to moderate their revolutionary fervour, as they will now sit side by side with Conservative and Liberal politicians, and must compromise if they are to work harmoniously together. While we have every confidence that the Russian people will emerge successfully from the ordeal, we know that they have a long and bitter struggle in front of them.

"TOWARDS REVOLUTION."

The article in our April issue, under the above heading, by the present writer, has brought a letter from a Comrade Maurice. The main point of his argument is that I have taken sides with the "sudden cataclysm" and am a hopeless Utopian, since even if we presented the people to-morrow with a cut-and-dried Anarchist Communism they would not know what to do with it. "If," says he, "I have to wait till the day comes. . . I may have to wait a long time." Note the French irony in the points of suspension. "Do you think it would not be a wasted time? And, after all, are you sure, if the day comes, that we shall all be happy? What is the meaning of Revolution to-day? Is it not a change of government—as in Russia? Then if you recognise this fact you must not mix the Anarchist ideal with the common idea of revolution. Anarchism does not mean a sudden change. An Anarchist cannot believe that a cataclysm will bring about the society of his dreams, because he knows that deep transformation is only brought about by evolution. Therefore, instead of waiting until the day comes, he does his best every day to acquire more knowledge which will give him more freedom. It is true that this requires a daily effort, and is not so easy as waiting until the day comes. Now do you think that Revolution will give us more chance to realise our ideal? How can you imagine an Anarchist helping to bring about a new kind of government just to have the pleasure of destroying it afterwards?"

I will try and answer these questions in their logical order. In the first place, he accuses me of accepting the popular idea of revolution, that is, a political revolution, whereas I distinctly mentioned the social or Anarchist revolution in my article. Consequently his reproach of my mixing these two ideals or definitions loses its force. He insists, however, that *any* revolution *per se* would leave us little better off, if at all. This point has evidently not been well thought out by my correspondent.

A revolution of any sort cannot come unless the popular ideas and opinions have undergone some kind of transformation. When a people forces a Government to make a peace owing to its fear of famine, it does not mean that this people is of the same mind as when the war started. Its opinions have changed regarding the benefits of war. In the same way, should the people revolt against the profiteers, it implies that their view of the present system has changed. It implies their doubt as to the benefits of capitalism or governmentalism. It implies their willingness to co-operate in a new scheme of things. I admit, however, that this does not necessarily imply that they are ready for a full and complete state of Anarchy; but that will merely be because they are individually limited in their capabilities. In any case, what are the basic requirements of Anarchy?

The bases of Anarchy are the completest possible freedom for individual development. Now, if the individual requires development, it implies that some are more developed or advanced than others, and this must always be so, no matter what state of things surrounds us. We do not pretend that a revolution of itself will at once transform and advance individual development in such a fashion that the majority of people are as advanced as the most advanced Anarchist. What we insist upon is that the present system does not give room for the right sort of development.

The main deterrents to individual development are the laws under which we live. When we are born into this world, the hands of the innumerable dead have set out the course we shall pursue, the limits within which we may develop—unless we revolt. The second class of deterrents are the economic laws that bind us. If we are born into the working class, dark forces have already shaped our destinies within that class. We must develop within that class, we cannot get outside the limits set us, owing to the economic struggle for a living.

That is why Anarchists are against Governments as well as against capitalists. It is, therefore, absurd to talk of Anarchists fighting in a revolution just to overthrow a specified form of government and set up another in its place, only to knock that down in its turn.

Anarchists fight against government to overthrow the State, not by violent means or by legal means alone, but by *any* means. Experience has shown that the best means are appeals to the reason and direct action. The appeals to the reason include the theoretical as well as the practical. And now I come to the second part of my correspondent's letter.

He insists that example is better than precept, and to use his own words, "Better an every-day evolution than one future day Revolution." And further, "Then I believe it is best for the people not to deceive themselves by preparing a more or less social revolution."

My correspondent is carrying coals to Newcastle. Anarchists are agreed that every-day evolution bears the best fruit, and it is

the fact that they attempt to carry out their ideals in every-day life that marks the line of difference between Anarchists and Socialists. It is because the Anarchist carries out his ideas of free love, starts self-supporting colonies within capitalist States, and ignores laws "made for the well-being of the community," that he is regarded as a Utopian, a dreamer of dreams, an unpractical man, and a danger to the State.

But, because he believes in the immediately practicable side of the Anarchist theory, it does not invalidate his preaching or supporting the revolution. The history of the peoples shows that revolution is the necessary result of a quickened evolution. There is a point at which evolution has so ripened that something must give way. There is a boiling point of evolution. There is a point at which the throttle must be thrown open.

It is because the Anarchist sees this, because he is conscious that evolution may so quicken that it must have room at a given point to fulfil its process, that he prepares for revolution. And since revolution is almost always economic, the Anarchist must look at it from a bread-and-butter point of view. He is not concerned mainly with manifestoes, but combines the material with the spiritual. In the thunder of revolution the workers have little time to listen to the niceties of theories. What they want is something to be going on with.

Here I am brought to a point in my correspondent's argument where he implies that the establishment of colonies is a practical way of changing things without recourse to a cataclysm of some sort. This aspect of the question I may deal with in another article.

L.A.M.

THE CONSCIENCE OF M. ROUX-COSTADAU.

There have been some rather tumultuous scenes in the French Chamber of Deputies, and a deputy made an onslaught on the French Censorship and the conduct of the war in general. Some of his remarks are as follows:—

"Gentlemen, for two years we have been told that in order to deliver our country it was necessary to keep silent. Frenchmen have obeyed this injunction. . . . And the Germans have not budged from Noyon. One might therefore conclude that this solemn silence can lead to nothing. On the contrary, we have been told to be more silent than ever. The foundations of democracy have been undermined. We no longer possess liberty of thought; we no longer possess liberty of the press. The slightest criticism of responsible Ministers is forbidden. The Censorship watches over these, who hold themselves aloof from the people as if they were demi-gods. . . . The press bows down at their feet; they lie about us in the press with an incredibly cynical sang-froid; they lie to order and for the sake of gain. The surveillance set upon questions touching military matters is but a cloak to hide the grossest blunders. It hides contract scandals, staff favouritisms, wastage, cowardice, and weaknesses. . . . The President of the Council has given me evasive answers. Music will not do away with facts. Gentlemen, what has been done? They have butchered, they have sacrificed without number, in a demented and savage manner, thousands upon thousands of human lives. On the Yser we are at a standstill; at Verdun we are at a standstill; in the East after each retreat we have consolidation, after the consolidation the retreat, then consolidation again, and so on, until all the Germans are prisoners of the Russians . . . and all the Russians prisoners of the Germans. As to the dead, I will no longer try to count them: of what use is it for me to accompany you in these avenues of death-mounds? I refuse to vote for your credits. I have interrogated my conscience. My conscience says 'Keep on!' That is enough for me. I keep on."

It should be understood, however, that the peculiarity of the conscience of M. Roux-Costadau is that it refuses a vote for the war credits mainly because, to use his own words, the French Cabinet has drifted at the mercy of the tide and made war by the month, by the day, by the hour. M. Roux-Costadau approves of the war if it brings speedy victory with the least losses; otherwise his conscience is uneasy. We quote his remarks, however, to show that France is in much the same plight as we are, and all his criticisms can be as effectively levelled at our own military caste. Heaven-sent rulers are a curse the world over, and the much-belauded "directive ability" of the upper classes is a myth.

Insurance Robbers.

A question recently asked in the House led to the information that some 7,000,000 policies issued by industrial insurance companies had lapsed. It appears that companies in 1913-14 received £35,000,000, and paid out £15,000,000 for claims and surrenders. Let those concerned do a little mental arithmetic, and they will see how easily the law assists in robbing the poor.

TRUST THE POLITICIANS.

It would be idle to pretend that our movement has not suffered from the effects of the war. It has. Not indeed as regards our principles. On the contrary, those principles—the principles of liberty, justice, equality—have never been so popular, never so much in people's mouths, never so loudly and sonorously proclaimed as in these days. It is in the matter of tactics rather that our movement has been affected. Yes, our belief, our faith in the efficacy of education and peaceful propaganda, on which we mostly relied in our struggle for our ideal, has suffered a severe set-back. For the Governments whom, it seems, we have hitherto mistakenly considered as the enemies of liberty and justice, are now demonstrating to us in unmistakable terms that by force, and force alone, can these principles be attained.

Of course, although this policy may be new to us, it cannot be said to be altogether new to them. Force has always been the Governments' chief article of faith, their principal stay and support in all their projects and activities. Only, as regards its value in the struggle for liberty, they have been for nearly three years demonstrating it to us more forcefully than ever, and with what success is clearly apparent to all—although the real effects and benefits of the struggle will only be fully tasted and appreciated by the masses, and by mankind in general, after the war is over.

Yet there are many who maintain a sceptical attitude, and refuse to believe in the good intentions and unselfishness of our rulers and politicians. They cling to their old beliefs, and obstinately persist in regarding all organised government as the arch enemy of freedom. And if, in the face of the accumulating evidence (too numerous to mention) of the beneficent results and advantages already accruing from this great war of liberation, they are forced to accede to the benevolent and altruistic aim of our rulers and masters, they yet entertain great fears as to whether their passion for the high principles of justice and liberty will not spend itself in the struggle on the Continent, and leave the people of these islands in the same, if not in a worse state of slavery than before.

All this goes to show how truly conservative even the most extreme idealists may sometimes prove to be. They simply will not part with their old conceptions, and refuse to recognise a fight for freedom in any other shape than a fight of the people against their rulers.

But rest at ease, comrades. There is surely no ground for anxiety. For, judging by the innumerable laws, measures, rules, and regulations which they have so unsparingly framed and formulated in our behalf (and which still continue to multiply *ad libitum*) we have every reason to think that the condition of the people at home concerns our masters even more than the freeing of the peoples abroad.

Of course, it would be quite an easy matter to find fault with the Government, to accuse them of slowness, slackness, negligence. But, in view of the immensity of their task, it would surely be unwise to do so.

Unfortunately, certain sections of the people—and more particularly their press—do not seem to exercise the virtue of patience. They would like the Government to brush aside all scruples, and act firmly, boldly, unhesitatingly. However, we must do them justice for showing, at least, some moderation. For what they actually demand at the present moment is the realisation of one single principle—that of Equality.

The crying injustice of people eating exactly what they like, and as much as they like, will at last be done away with. Voluntary appeals are of no avail with people that have no conscience (for those that have are happily under lock and key.) The only means, therefore, of establishing absolute equality (in the matter of food, of course) is compulsion.

And compulsion we shall have. For according to one of the papers referred to, the people are clamouring for it, praying for it, sighing for it. They see in compulsion the only chance of vindicating their rights and establishing justice; and the Government, which proved itself to be the true guardian of the people's rights and liberties, will no doubt hasten to execute its will in this as it did in so many other respects.

It is doubtful, however, if even this will satisfy the ardent and devoted champions of the people. Recognising compulsion as the "best and only means," they would like to see it applied to the whole social fabric. For eating is not the only important concern in the life of the people. There are also, it is pointed out, such things as breathing, sleeping, talking, thinking.

True, we do not deny the justice of the demand. But, considering the gigantic task which the Government have before them, we again appeal for patience, feeling sure that the questions indicated above will receive their most careful attention, and they will not fail to carry through the necessary reforms with as little delay as possible. S.

NOT PRINTED PAGES.

With Ireland so much in evidence just now, we are pleased to see "Labour in Ireland," by James Connolly (Maunsell and Co., 4s. net). This is a reprint in one volume of Connolly's "Labour in Irish History" and "The Reconquest of Ireland." An excellent introduction is contributed by Robert Lynd, who says Connolly is "Ireland's first Socialist martyr." We reviewed "Labour in Irish History" when first published in 1914, so will merely say that it deals with the question from the workers' side, which is usually ignored by historians. The author shows how the development of the Irish people has been hindered at every step by the English Government, and the work easily explains why he could never believe the statesmen who said the present war is being fought on behalf of small nationalities. In the "Re-Conquest of Ireland" Connolly says: "The conquest of Ireland had meant the social and political servitude of the Irish masses, and, therefore, the reconquest of Ireland must mean the social, as well as the political independence from servitude, of every man, woman, and child in Ireland. In other words, the common ownership of all Ireland by the Irish." In this aim he was opposed by Irish capitalists, as well as by the English garrison, whose execution of him while a wounded prisoner in their hands is but one more item in the history of their criminal treatment of the Irish people.

Now that our own edition of Bakunin's "God and the State" is temporarily out of print, it is timely to receive copies of a new edition, published by "Mother Earth," of New York (cloth, 75 cents; paper, 50 cents). But how comes it that "First American Edition" appears on the title-page? Benjamin Tucker published his translation in 1892 or 1893, and the present edition is a reprint of the FREEDOM PRESS edition of 1910, which our comrade Nettlau states therein is based on Tucker's translation.

In forwarding us a copy of No. 1 of "The Young Rebel," the editor, James Stewart, says the Bristol and Wallsend Socialist Schools supporting this paper are in no way attached to any political party, their desire being to place before working-class children literature free from the domination of any party. The first number is written in simple and direct language, and promises well for the future. It is published monthly by the editor at 15, Woodbine Avenue, Wallsend-on-Tyne; price, 1½d. post free.

Glasgow Anarchist Group.

On Sunday, May 6, the Labour Day Demonstration took place in Glasgow. There was a record turn-out of nearly 100,000, and glorious weather. We had one of the seventeen platforms on the Glasgow Green, and, although we had no "stars" on our lorry, Comrades Birrell, Kennedy, and Mrs. Dunn helped to keep the flag flying. Numerically, we were not very strong as we marched down behind the Anarchist flag, but each did his or her best, and we managed to sell £9 7s. worth of literature. After the demonstration we had a social in the rooms at 10, Windsor Street, when we spent an enjoyable evening with several comrades who had come in from the surrounding districts. As a result of some discussion that evening, we have started a Sunday School, named after Wm. Morris, for children and grown-ups, which will take the form of a ramble in fine weather, when the children will be taught botany, biology, etc. On wet Sundays we shall meet in the rooms.

It was suggested during the evening that an Anarchist Conference be held in Scotland. Glasgow, being central, was proposed as the meeting place. The object of the Conference is to discuss the Anarchist attitude towards Organisation, Industrial Unionism, and the various other present-day problems. Comrades interested are requested to write the Secretary of the Glasgow Anarchist Group—J. Patterson, c/o Patrick, 166, West Graham Street, Glasgow, with a view to linking up the various Anarchist Groups in Scotland.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS (not otherwise acknowledged).

(April 26—May 21.)

FREEDOM *Guarantee Fund*.—R. Peary, 1s.; H. Hayter, 1s.; Sympathisers (per G. Tindale), 5s.; J. Foster, 5s.; H. W. Journet, 2s.; K. Barham, 6d.; E. Michaels, 5s.; E. Archer, 6d.; R. Black, £1; per G. Frost, 7s.; A. Cuttill, 6d.; Bristol Group, 5s.; W. H. Thresh, 2s. 6d.
FREEDOM *Subscriptions*.—G. Wallace, W. Stroud, G. Marin, J. W. Hayes, E. Plimmer, A. C. Cullen, J. Webster, A. Petersen, C. Moxon, J. Gough, J. Halliwell, J. Smith, A. Reynolds, W. Stevens, T. Foxall, W. H. Thresh.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

(List sent post free on application.)

"SATIRE,"

AN ILLUSTRATED PAPER OF SOCIAL CRITICISM.

MONTHLY, 8pp. ONE PENNY.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, 1/6 PER ANNUM.

Send cash with order to Manager, "Satire," 127, Ossulston St., London, N.W.1.

Printed by the BLACKFRIARS PRESS, LTD., 5, Parsonage Buildings, Blackfriars Street, Manchester, and Published by FREEDOM PRESS, 127, Ossulston Street, London, N.W.