

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. XXI.—No. 223.

NOVEMBER, 1907.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

Anarchism and Syndicalism.

The question of the position to be taken in relation to the Labour movement is certainly one of the greatest importance to Anarchists.

In spite of lengthy discussions and of varied experiences, a complete accord has not yet been reached—perhaps because the question does not admit of a complete and permanent solution, owing to the different conditions and changing circumstances in which we carry on the struggle.

I believe, however, that our aim may suggest to us a criterion of conduct applicable to the different contingencies.

We desire the moral and material elevation of all men; we wish to achieve a revolution which will give to all liberty and well-being, and we are convinced that this cannot be done from above by force of law and decrees, but must be done by the conscious will and the direct action of those who desire it.

We need, then, more than any the conscious and voluntary co-operation of those who, suffering the most by the present social organisation, have the greatest interest in the Revolution.

It does not suffice for us—though it is certainly useful and necessary—to elaborate an ideal as perfect as possible, and to form groups for propaganda and for revolutionary action. We must convert as far as possible the mass of the workers, because without them we can neither overthrow the existing society nor reconstitute a new one. And since to rise from the submissive state in which the great majority of the proletarians now vegetate, to a conception of Anarchism and a desire for its realisation, is required an evolution which generally is not passed through under the sole influence of the propaganda; since the lessons derived from the facts of daily life are more efficacious than all doctrinaire preaching, it is for us to take an active part in the life of the masses, and to use all the means which circumstances permit to gradually awaken the spirit of revolt, and to show by these facts the path which leads to emancipation.

Amongst these means the Labour movement stands first, and we should be wrong to neglect it. In this movement we find numbers of workers who struggle for the amelioration of their conditions. They may be mistaken as to the aim they have in view and as to the means of attaining it, and in our view they generally are. But at least they no longer resign themselves to oppression nor regard it as just—they hope and they struggle. We can more easily arouse in them that feeling of solidarity towards their exploited fellow-workers and of hatred against exploitation which must lead to a definitive struggle for the abolition of all domination of man over man. We can induce them to claim more and more, and by means more and more energetic; and so we can train ourselves and others to the struggle, profiting by victories in order to exalt the power of union and of direct action, and bring forward greater claims, and profiting also by reverses in order to learn the necessity for more powerful means and for more radical solutions.

Again—and this is not its least advantage—the Labour movement can prepare those groups of technical workers who in the revolution will take upon themselves the organisation of production and exchange for the advantage of all, beyond and against all governmental power.

But with all these advantages the Labour movement has its drawbacks and its dangers, of which we ought to take account when it is a question of the position that we as Anarchists should take in it.

Constant experience in all countries shows that Labour movements, which always commence as movements of protest and revolt, and are animated at the beginning by a broad spirit of progress and human fraternity, tend very soon to degenerate; and in proportion as they acquire strength, they become egoistic, conservative, occupied exclusively with interests immediate and

restricted, and develop within themselves a bureaucracy which, as in all such cases, has no other object than to strengthen and aggrandise itself.

It is this condition of things that has induced many comrades to withdraw from the Trade Union movement, and even to combat it as something reactionary and injurious. But the result has been that our influence diminished accordingly, and the field was left free to those who wished to exploit the movement for personal or party interests that had nothing in common with the cause of the workers' emancipation. Very soon there were only organisations with a narrow spirit and fundamentally conservative, of which the English Trade Unions are a type; or else Syndicates which, under the influence of politicians, most often "Socialist," were only electoral machines for the elevation into power of particular individuals.

Happily, other comrades thought that the Labour movement always held in itself a sound principle, and that rather than abandon it to the politicians, it would be well to undertake the task of bringing them once more to the work of achieving their original aims, and of gaining from them all the advantages they offer to the Anarchist cause. And they have succeeded in creating, chiefly in France, a new movement which, under the name of "Revolutionary Syndicalism," seeks to organise the workers, independently of all bourgeois and political influence, to win their emancipation by the direct action of the wage-slaves against the masters.

That is a great step in advance; but we must not exaggerate its reach and imagine, as some comrades seem to do, that we shall realise Anarchism, as a matter of course, by the progressive development of Syndicalism.

Every institution has a tendency to extend its functions, to perpetuate itself, and to become an end in itself. It is not surprising, then, if those who have initiated the movement, and take the most prominent part therein, fall into the habit of regarding Syndicalism as the equivalent of Anarchism, or at least as the supreme means, that in itself replaces all other means, for its realisation. But that makes it the more necessary to avoid the danger and to define well our position.

Syndicalism, in spite of all the declarations of its most ardent supporters, contains in itself, by the very nature of its function, all the elements of degeneration which have corrupted Labour movements in the past. In effect, being a movement which proposes to defend the present interests of the workers, it must necessarily adapt itself to existing conditions, and take into consideration interests which come to the fore in society as it exists to-day.

Now, in so far as the interests of a section of the workers coincide with the interests of the whole class, Syndicalism is in itself a good school of solidarity; in so far as the interests of the workers of one country are the same as those of the workers in other countries, Syndicalism is a good means of furthering international brotherhood; in so far as the interests of the moment are not in contradiction with the interests of the future, Syndicalism is in itself a good preparation for the Revolution. But unfortunately this is not always so.

Harmony of interests, solidarity amongst all men, is the ideal to which we aspire, is the aim for which we struggle; but that is not the actual condition, no more between men of the same class than between those of different classes. The rule to-day is the antagonism and the interdependence of interests at the same time: the struggle of each against all and of all against each. And there can be no other condition in a society where, in consequence of the capitalist system of production—that is to say, production founded on monopoly of the means of production and organised internationally for the profit of individual employers—there are, as a rule, more hands than work to be done, and more mouths than bread to fill them.

It is impossible to isolate oneself, whether as an individual, as a class, or as a nation, since the condition of each one depends more or less directly on the general conditions of the whole of

humanity; and it is impossible to live in a true state of peace, because it is necessary to defend oneself, often even to attack, or perish.

The interest of each one is to secure employment, and as a consequence one finds himself in antagonism—i.e., in competition—with the unemployed of one's country and the immigrants from other countries. Each one desires to keep or to secure the best place against workers in the same trade; it is the interest of each one to sell dear and buy cheap, and consequently as a producer he finds himself in conflict with all consumers, and again as consumer finds himself in conflict with all producers.

Union, agreement, the solidary struggle against the exploiters,—these things can only obtain to-day in so far as the workers, animated by the conception of a superior ideal, learn to sacrifice exclusive and personal interests to the common interest of all, the interests of the moment to the interests of the future; and this ideal of a society of solidarity, of justice, of brotherhood, can only be realised by the destruction, done in defiance of all legality, of existing institutions.

To offer to the workers this ideal; to put the broader interests of the future before those narrower and immediate; to render the adaptation to present conditions impossible; to work always for the propaganda and for action that will lead to and will accomplish the Revolution—these are the objects we as Anarchists should strive for both in and out of the Unions.

Trade Unionism cannot do this, or can do but little of it; it has to reckon with present interests, and these interests are not always, alas! those of the Revolution. It must not too far exceed legal bounds, and it must at given moments treat with the masters and the authorities. It must concern itself with the interests of sections of the workers rather than the interests of the public, the interests of the Unions rather than the interests of the mass of the workers and the unemployed. If it does not do this, it has no specific reason for existence; it would then only include the Anarchists, or at most the Socialists, and would so lose its principal utility, which is to educate and habituate to the struggle the masses that lag behind.

Besides, since the Unions must remain open to all those who desire to win from the masters better conditions of life, whatever their opinions may be on the general constitution of society, they are naturally led to moderate their aspirations, first so that they should not frighten away those they wish to have with them, and next because, in proportion as numbers increase, those with ideas who have initiated the movement remain buried in a majority that is only occupied with the petty interests of the moment.

Thus one can see developing in all Unions, that have reached a certain position of influence, a tendency to assure, in accord with rather than against the masters, a privileged situation for themselves, and so create difficulties of entrance for new members, and for the admission of apprentices in the factories; a tendency to amass large funds that afterwards they are afraid of compromising; to seek the favour of public powers; to be absorbed, above all, in co-operation and mutual benefit schemes; and to become at last conservative elements in society.

After having stated this, it seems clear to me that the Syndicalist movement cannot replace the Anarchist movement, and that it can serve as a means of education and of revolutionary preparation only if it is acted on by the Anarchistic impulse, action, and criticism.

Anarchists, then, ought to abstain from identifying themselves with the Syndicalist movement, and to consider as an aim that which is but one of the means of propaganda and of action that they can utilise. They should remain in the Syndicates as elements giving an onward impulse, and strive to make of them as much as possible instruments of combat in view of the Social Revolution. They should work to develop in the Syndicates all that which can augment its educative influence and its combativeness,—the propaganda of ideas, the forcible strike, the spirit of proselytism, the distrust and hatred of the authorities and of the politicians, the practice of solidarity towards individuals and groups in conflict with the masters. They should combat all that which tends to render them egoistic, pacific, conservative,—professional pride and the narrow spirit of the corporate body, heavy contributions and the accumulation of invested capital, the service of benefits and of assurance, confidence in the good offices of the State, good relationship with masters, the appointment of bureaucratic officials, paid and permanent.

On these conditions the participation of Anarchists in the Labour movement will have good results, but only on these conditions.

These tactics will sometimes appear to be, and even may really be, hurtful to the immediate interests of some groups; but that does not matter when it is a question of the Anarchist

cause,—that is to say, of the general and permanent interests of humanity. We certainly wish, while waiting for the Revolution, to wrest from Governments and from employers as much liberty and wellbeing as possible; but we would not compromise the future for some momentary advantages, which besides are often illusory or gained at the expense of other workers.

Let us beware of ourselves. The error of having abandoned the Labour movement has done an immense injury to Anarchism, but at least it leaves unaltered the distinctive character.

The error of confounding the Anarchist movement with Trade Unionism would be still more grave. That will happen to us which happened to the Social Democrats as soon as they went into the Parliamentary struggle. They gained in numerical force, but by becoming each day less Socialistic. We also would become more numerous, but we should cease to be Anarchist.

E. MALATESTA.

Special Notice.

In our next issue will appear the first instalment of a translation of Emile Pouget's pamphlet, "THE BASES OF TRADE UNIONISM," at the present moment a subject of great interest to English readers.

Anarchists and Syndicalists v. Socialists and the State.

In Italy, at any rate, the politicians are losing their hold on the people, and the general outlines of revolution are beginning to show themselves. The events of the past month deserve close examination; this cannot be given here, but the most important points can be noted, and a general idea of the situation given.

But first it must be recalled that at the last Socialist Congress the gulf between the Centre and the Left yawned so deep that the Centre (headed by Ferri) shrank in confusion into the open arms of the Right, or Reformists, leaving a minority to call itself Revolutionist, Socialist, or Syndicalist, as it thought fit. The party—that is, the majority—would have nothing to do with the Revolutionary aspirations of the Syndicalists, and tried to ignore the Syndicalist Congress held soon after, at which secession from the party was decided on. It did not need much insight to foresee that in thus insisting on the absorbing importance of Parliamentary action the Socialist Party was losing its only driving energy. Then the Junior Socialist Party seceded from the parent organisation, and the only hope of the latter was left in the Labour Confederation, a centralisation of Trade Unions brought about by the arbitrary action of Union officials in league with the Socialist Party. Let us watch the part played by the Confederation and the party in the events of last month.

A strike of gasworkers was just over at Milan, and nothing remained to be done but pay off the blacklegs and smuggle them out of the city. As it happened, however, the paying off took so long that instead of getting the trainload of them away while everybody was busy at work, it was discovered by employees of the neighbouring factories as it came out of the gasworks during their dinner-hour. It was at once made the subject of a hostile demonstration, a few windows being smashed. An irate officer of Carabineers who was in charge of the train (they were not State gasworks, but somehow the proprietors and the State got mixed) alighted at a safe distance, took charge of a squad near the line, and the end of it was that between them they managed to fire over a hundred shots on the unprepared crowd, seven men falling seriously wounded.

And now notice what happened, for it was the occasion of many subsequent lies. The people of Milan stopped work, and only after the city was obviously and incorrigibly on strike did the Labour authorities allow a general strike to be declared. Next day, indeed, Turati took part in a mass meeting and tried to win credit for the party, but he was chased home through the streets. The Confederation in its own heavy way announced that now the strike had been successful, everybody should go back to work and leave the rest to the politicians. It also advised other cities not to follow the rash example of Milan. Nevertheless, most of the cities of North Italy did follow that example, Turin, indeed, starting a definite struggle with her capitalists, replying with a second forty-eight hour strike to their twenty-four hour lock-out.

But the whole interest of the country soon became concentrated on the railway men. It must be remembered that the

railways in Italy are State-owned and State-managed, and that, under a recent law against which the railway men made a noble but ineffective protest, any man voluntarily quitting work for over twenty-four hours has to consider himself dismissed without further notice, and is liable to other punishments. In the Milan section alone 4,000 men went out in sympathy with the city; in all, some 7,000 men defied the law. They returned to work at their convenience, thus defying the law a second time. Then the country realised that it was facing a crisis. Many thought that a revolution was imminent, and it is not overrating the influence of the Socialist Party to say that their action alone averted it. Their attitude was almost too farcical to be taken seriously. They maintained that because the men had been allowed to return to work no legal action could be taken against them, and implored the Government to be lenient to the impulsiveness of thoughtless working men (*lavoratori incoscenti*). The railway men's sections in all parts of the country declared themselves ready for energetic action; but the power of the party and the Confederation and the Socialist Press prevailed, and by 7 votes to 2 (with 2 abstentions) their executive declared that the time was not ripe to precipitate such a revolutionary movement as a general strike at that moment would inevitably have been. In the same resolution they declared that the weakness of their decision was due to the betrayal of the workers by the Confederation and the party, and suggested that the sections should consider the advisability of quitting the Confederation. The actual question now being considered by the sections, however, includes the desirability of a stronger executive.

Before the Government took any action there were extreme expressions of political feeling from all quarters. The party of order naturally demanded a military dictatorship and the militarisation of the railway men; some Socialist societies declared for an armed general strike; while the Socialist Party was for leaving all to the leniency of the Government, and issued furious articles against general strikes, and railway strikes in particular. The Government finally acted on the advice of the Socialists and ordered the dismissal of sixteen men. The Socialists jumped on these men as martyrs, and offered their gratuitous services for legal proceedings against the State; the railway men's Union offered them posts as organisers for a strike to be declared at the first opportunity; and so, for the moment, the affair fizzled out.

But, like the truly dramatic action it has been, it leaves all concerned in a very altered state of mind. It has shown the workers what to expect from the Socialist Party and the Confederation, and, more clearly than ever before, that they do not require orders from above when there is anything to be done. It has also proved that the railway men are to be depended on, that the "Revolution" of the Socialists is a worn-out phrase, and that the Anarchists and Syndicalists are the only men of action in the country. For their part, they must have realised more clearly than ever that the spirit of the people is rising above the ballot-boxes of a discredited party, and that 7,000 men do not defy the powers of the State (and that simply to show their solidarity with their fellow-workers) without there being a corresponding readiness for such action throughout the country.

K. W.

A VISION OF SACRIFICE.

We selected the tallest of the bluffs, and climbed to its edge to view the sunrise. The air about us was thick and moist, the gaunt old trees stood out like ragged giants, while the bluff itself on which we stood seemed but one of the many vapouring clouds which floated about its edge.

Suddenly from the east there swept upon us a white light, and we sprang to our feet, all but one, who, exhausted by the long climb, lay stretched full length on the trunk of a fallen tree. The light swept up and about us, casting the shadows of all things white, so that we three became six, the shadows gaunt and distorted as to seem three others facing us.

We gazed on the shadows, then at each other, and laughed nervously, while one remarked that we might be the spirits of some ancient priests about to offer sacrifice, "And I the victim," chimed the frail one, who indeed was one of the many victims of a disordered social system. It was all too appropriate. The fallen tree might easily be the altar-stone at Stonehenge, the greater gaunt old tree on the edge of the bluff, whose branches were long since rotted away or shattered by lightning, which had likewise struck out a knot-hole near its top, through which the sun could strike the heart of one lying prostrate on the tree.

And those clouds below the edge—are they vapour or human forms, the figures of people gathered to witness the offering?

Slowly along the heaven the sun creeps up until it lies aslant of the knot-hole, and one of the ghostly, white-robed things has raised its arm, the sun glints along a knife in its hand, the victim's eyes widen with terror and suspense, the silence is laden with an ominous chill, closer and closer creeps the tiny ray of light, the face of the victim whitens with suffering under the eyes of the priest narrowing with fanaticism, while from below comes the chant of the multitude, low and uncertain at first, but gathering in volume until it drowns all else, then ceases. The stillness is unbearable; the spot of sun rests on the heart of the victim, the priest's arm descends; I close my eyes, to open them suddenly, for a thick blackness envelops everything, and the false dawn has passed.

The voices of my companions complaining of the thickness of the fog seem faint and far off as I all unconsciously voice my thanksgiving that we no longer demand human sacrifice. "Do we not?" I turn sharply and face one of the shadow figures; but this is a man, and there were no men in our party. This, too, is smaller than the shadows and unlike them, having wide cheek-bones, square chin, and straight, determined lips. "Do we not?" he repeated. "Perhaps not in just that form: but look you!" He pointed to the mass of vapour below, which seemed to separate and take form.

The great walls of a prison loomed before us; groups of roughly-clad men and women clustered here and there about the walls, while others, uniformed and swinging clubs, went from group to group dispersing them. About the gates through which we passed more uniforms clustered, and a greater number still in the open court. But in the long corridors leading to the cells a stillness as of death pervaded; down these corridors we passed, and before us went a group of black-robed figures, one bearing a crucifix, one a book, and one with its face masked. Cell-doors open and more uniformed men bring forth three others, and the procession moves onward, turning now to right, now to left, until they reach the door leading to the back courtyard.

"These are the high priests and their victims," my guide murmured.

"And their god," I asked, "who is he?"

"Their god is Mammon," he answered, "and in his name many are maimed and more murdered. See!"

I looked through the doorway; the place of sacrifice was a gallows, its arm stretched over the crowd below, as though but too willing to welcome all; while the black-robed figure with masked face fondled the rope, whose free end dangled a noose.

But the procession stops, the uniformed figures rush forward, the prisoners are pushed back, the priests' faces whiten with quick concern, for to our ears is borne the sound of struggle and sharp blows, the courtyard fills with rough-clad figures, the same I saw without the walls.

Men, women, and children fill the yard, men with crippled limbs or limbs entirely missing, crooked and distorted bodies, scarred faces, and some blind; the women with wide, hungry eyes, carrying pinched little babies, while wolf-like children cling to their skirts. And they fill the courtyard, blocking the way to the gallows, and deny the victims demanded; and at length the judges are forced to close the heavy doors lest they fill the corridors too. And while they clamour outside, the high priests face each other and decide to return the victims to their cells and wait, for they say: "Some of this rabble will die off, others will forget, and we can then hang these three!"

"Dare they do it?" I asked of the figure beside me.

"They have done it," he answered. "Look!"

The courtyard had cleared; we walked forth; the rope on the gallows swung as though it had been well occupied. Men in couples crossed and recrossed the yard, each time bearing heavy burdens, which they laid in a row near the wall and covered with a canvas cloth.

"What are they?"

"See!" answered my guide, and raised the cloth. Beneath lay four men, their visages purple and distorted, but still bearing the likeness to those I have seen on the picture of a monument at Waldheim—and memory flashed a fifth who should have been there, he who had died of his own hand and was now of the dead who cannot rest.

I turned to speak to the guide, but he had vanished, and even as I gazed the others melted away and the prison crumbled, for over the edge of the bluff the sun was rising white and clear, while before it hurried the misshapen clouds, even as the superstitions of a dead civilisation shall one day scurry before the clear light of reason in a world based on human justice.

MARY HANSEN.

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

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

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

Wholesale Price, 1s. 4d. per quire of 27, carriage free to all parts.

All communications, exchanges, &c., for "FREEDOM" to be addressed to

THE MANAGER, 127 Ossulston Street, N.W.

The Editors are not necessarily in agreement with signed articles.

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

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

NOTES.

A LESSON FROM "LEGALITY."

In the Melbourne *Socialist* for September 14 Tom Mann puts the last nail in the coffin of compulsory arbitration. He points out how legal methods keep the workers waiting years for a decision, and after a decision is given how an "appeal" by the masters will entirely reverse it, and, to quote his words, "in five minutes the efforts of years are utterly destroyed, and the bosses have the men again 'by the wool,' who become a laughing-stock and a byword of reproach." So much for the legally appointed Wages Board. But Mann admits that at one time he was favourably inclined towards compulsory arbitration. Now he admits its failure:—

"Genuine fighting virility seems to have disappeared, and given place to smuggy, feeble respectability, manifesting little or no concern about the settlement of the industrial and social problem, until in New South Wales the Arbitration Act is now treated as an incubus and dead weight—a hindrance to progress. In Victoria the Wages Boards' decisions when favourable in any degree to the workers can be and are entirely upset by the Industrial Appeal Court. Thus we are compelled to declare that these legal means, whether of Arbitration Courts or Wages Boards, are not a success."

In the end, Mann comes to conclusions in favour of Direct Action:—

"By the ruthless logic of experience must we turn to more active and effective organisation. No more of the old-time sectional fights lasting any time up to five or six years, but definite, clear-cut, straight-out Universal Unionism—now more generally known as the Industrial Organisation of the Workers of the World, where engineer and carpenter, tailor and hatter, baker and butcher, and the general mass of labourers too, shall treat each other as true comrades in the great fight for Industrial Freedom."

"WATCH YOUR LEADERS."

The railway crisis must have shown very clearly that if the men had but the will, they have the power to bring about at any time a revolutionary situation in the struggle of Labour against Capital. Some day they will have to do this, for the conditions of the conflict will leave them no choice. They will perhaps learn also that the glorification of a man like Bell—whose fooling of their cause is his method of advertisement—means putting powers into one man's hands that no man ought to possess. Nothing could be more absurd than the prolongation of this "crisis," which has been done so that one man might have the centre of the stage, while hundreds of thousands of men toil on in suspense. Bell is everything: the workers are mere cyphers. Yet this man is mistrusted by many; and everyone knows how on occasion he can join the feast of the directors and be one of them. And if generalship were needed, what an ass this would be to attempt to lead the men to victory! Successful strikes are never made by the farcical tactics of a Bell. Recognition forsooth! They'll recognise you when you strike. Workers, watch your leaders!

THE GREAT BRITISH PUBLIC.

An outcry has been raised on behalf of the "great British public," whose lives and comfort would be imperilled by a railway strike. Let us be fair and admit that if we lived in a society where equality existed, where the idea of brotherhood between men was something more than a mere phrase, this spirit of mutual consideration would not only be essential, but would be a natural and spontaneous outcome of a healthy social life. But what are the rights of the British public to-day as against those of the railway men? There is an army of some 326,000 men, we are told, "exposed to danger from the movement of railway vehicles." Every year these men are killed in

hundreds and mutilated in thousands, while their work entails a nervous and physical strain which is rewarded by wages that in many cases are shameful, and in the best of cases are inadequate, as wages always are. The great British public has been told of all this year after year. Has it cared? Not much. Has it called indignation meetings against the conduct of the directors? Not once. It has simply been indifferent. Very well, then, no public in the world, British or other, has any right to consideration from men who slave under such conditions. So let them learn by hard experience how much they owe to those who day by day risk life and limb for their convenience.

EMMA GOLDMAN'S LECTURE.

An eager, expectant audience filled the Holborn Town Hall on October 7 to hear our comrade Emma Goldman lecture on "The Labour Struggle in America." A charge of sixpence for admission did not deter them. The gallery, which was free, was filled some time before the lecture was to begin. At the Press table quite a crowd of reporters were waiting. Prompt as the clock chimed 8.30 the chairman, John Turner, led the way on to the platform, followed by our comrade. A word or two of introduction, in which it was pointed out that few people were better qualified to speak on the subject of the American Labour Movement than our comrade, as she had just completed a tour of the States before leaving for the Anarchist Congress at Amsterdam, and the lecturer was on her feet. For about an hour she held her audience interested. Starting by saying that America no longer attracted the emigrants from Europe who desired political freedom, but almost entirely those who went there for material gain, she pointed out that almost the entire outlook was a sordid one. The only exception was the Russian refugee fleeing from the Black Hundreds, the pogroms, and all the tortures of the cowardly and bloody Czarism.

The growth of the American Federation of Labour was dealt with, and the recent unholy alliance of it with the Trust bosses, through the Civic Federation, touched on. Then the more robust spirit of the Western States was pointed out, and the revolutionary attitude of the Western Federation of Miners portrayed. The explanation of the recent acquittal of Haywood was forcible and startling. "It was not," she said, "that the State authorities had not got the human creatures ready to carry out the wishes of the mining and other capitalists of that part of America. They had the judges, the lawyers, the policemen, the gaolers, the executioners, all ready to do their bidding, just as they did it in Chicago in 1887. The reason Haywood was acquitted was that the jury knew right well that the Western Miners thoroughly understood how to handle and use dynamite."

The American workers, who were very quick, were beginning to show dissatisfaction with the tactics of Gompers and Mitchell. If the Industrial Workers of the World had kept out of politics, it might have become a powerful body. Any new organisation to succeed must certainly do so. Once the real solidarity of Labour was understood, and the General Strike made a principle of economic warfare, the Labour Struggle in America would sweep everything before it.

At the close of the lecture a large number of questions were asked, and splendidly answered by our comrade. It is very satisfactory to report that there was a surplus after paying all expenses.

As it was announced that other lectures would probably be given by Emma Goldman in London and the provinces, a word of explanation is necessary to the many applicants for her services. It seems that the publication of *Mother Earth*, and other matters in America, made it imperative for her to return after a few days' rest. This was not known till the receipt of the U.S. mail. Disappointment at this is tempered by the pleasure at the success of the Amsterdam Congress, and the anticipation of the revival of Anarchist propaganda.

**COMMUNIST CLUB, 107 CHARLOTTE STREET,
FITZROY SQUARE, W.**

A MASS MEETING

In Memory of the

The Chicago Martyrs

Will be held at the above Hall on

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 12,

At 8.30 p.m.

Speakers: F. KITZ, J. TURNER, A. RAY, GUY ALDRED,
R. ROCKER, S. NACHT, and others.

Admission Free.

The Amsterdam Congress.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 28th. THIRD DAY.

LANGE presiding.

ANARCHISM AND ORGANISATION (continued).

MALATESTA.—The misunderstanding about Individualism and Collectivism is entirely one of terms. Some of us mean one thing by these words, and some another; and we do not always use them in the same way. For himself, he would define two kinds of Individualism. There is that of the individual who thinks of nobody but himself, of developing his individuality without consideration of others, or else at their expense; that is the Individualism of the capitalist and of all oppressors,—bourgeois Individualism. And there is the Individualism of others who, for their own happiness, must be assured of the happiness of others,—who desire the well-being and integral development of *all* individuals; that is the Individualism of the Anarchists. And in order to realise this, organisation is necessary. True freedom is only in voluntary organisation. The very reason that we are not free is because we are not organised and the capitalists are. How can a single individual peasant free himself? He can only do it by organising with his fellows.

As to the desirability of organisation in the Anarchist movement itself, the lack of it is a constant reproach to us. Take only as an instance what happens when one of us is threatened with imprisonment. Is it the Anarchists who organise those monster demonstrations which by sheer weight of public opinion force the authorities to withhold the sentence? No; we left it to the Freethinkers and the Socialists to liberate Ferrer. What is wanting among us is primarily the spirit of action. When that comes we shall organise, and no fear of authority creeping into our organisations will daunt us. While we do nothing it is only natural that our organisations fade, but when we see what there is to be done, and set out to do it, then the International will become a reality. It is not for propaganda that it is wanted—with or without international organisation the propaganda grows—but we need it for action. Whenever there is a revolutionary movement anywhere in the world, international organisation becomes necessary.

(At this point various telegrams of greeting were read, and a letter from a Chinese delegate expressing his regrets for his enforced absence through sudden illness.)

RAMUS, though entirely in agreement with those who had spoken in favour of the principle of organisation, felt more in sympathy with the viewpoint of Croiset than with that of Dunois. We must not say that only *now* do we begin to understand Anarchism; we are simply utilising the inheritance of the pioneers. An Anarchist International must be a voluntary association of groups and federations founded on the basis of freedom for the individual. He wished to protest against the idea that it should learn and teach "technical means" for the benefit of the Syndicalist movement. It must be the means of furthering the propaganda of Anarchist ideas, for only inasmuch as the Syndicalist movement is a means to this end does Anarchism concern itself with Syndicalism.

BAGINSKY held it absurd to imagine that individual liberty and organisation are antagonistic. We do not want Kropotkin only, or Stirner only, but both at once. We must unite them and Ibsen too. On the other hand, we cannot regard the State as an organisation; in every manifestation of itself it proves to be simply an institution for the application of blind Force. An Anarchist organisation would naturally be without that force, authority. Nor do we want similarity in our organisation, but, on the contrary, the greatest possible variety, so that it may respond to the needs of the greatest possible number of different individualities.

CORNELISSEN felt strongly that all Anarchist organisations must be independent of all other organisations. He felt that we had heard too much of Individualism, and that some comrades carried it so far that the strongest individual Anarchist would end by becoming a moral despot. The despotism of personality is a thing we must guard against. We have still to discover the form of organisation that would leave the individual free while at the same time safeguarding us against this.

BROUTCHOUX was not so sure of the necessity of isolating Anarchist organisations. He was proud to say that he was attending the Congress as delegate of an Anarchist group and a Miners' Union, which had combined for that purpose. He did not see why there should have been so much talk about Individualism and freedom. The liberty of the individual is only limited by the liberty of others. When two individuals begin to interfere with each other, there is no liberty for either.

CHAPELIER rose to reply to what Cornelissen had said regarding the despotism of personality. It was obvious that while there existed men eminently more active, more intelligent, and more capable than others, this moral authority would continue. The only way to abolish that authority is to educate all so that each one may find his special sphere of activity and freely develop his personal capacities.

SAMSON did not see that the question was so much one of finding a suitable form of organisation. There would always be discontented individuals in any form of organisation, but if the organisation is really busy their discontent will not upset it. Besides, they are always as free to leave as they were to join.

It was then agreed to close the discussion as the afternoon was

required for a private sitting at which the same question would be treated from the practical side. The above resolution (Dunois) was carried unanimously together with the following addition suggested by Vohryzek and Malatesta:—

"An Anarchist federation is an association of groups or individuals in which no one can impose his will or limit the initiative of others. It has for object to change all the moral and economic conditions of present society, and to this end it employs all adequate means."

Afternoon (Private).

As a result of the afternoon sitting, the following resolution was handed to the Press:—

"The Anarchists (individuals and delegates of groups and federations) assembled at Amsterdam declare that:

"The Anarchist International is constituted.

"It is composed of existing organisations, and of individuals, groups, and federations who shall adhere.

"Individuals, groups, and federations shall remain autonomous.

"An International Bureau is constituted, composed of five delegates.

"The Bureau will found international Anarchist archives, accessible to all comrades.

"It will put itself into communication with Anarchists in all countries, either directly or through three comrades chosen by the groups or federations of those countries.

"For individual affiliation to the International, the individual must be identified by an organisation, by the Bureau, or by comrades known to the Bureau.

"The expenses of the Bureau and archives will be covered by the affiliated federations, groups, and individuals."

Evening.

ANARCHISM AND SYNDICALISM.

MONATTE.—Before dealing with the general question of the relations between Anarchism and Syndicalism, let us see what is meant by the latter in France. The revolutionary Syndicates are composed of men who, while they are by no means all Anarchists, are all anti-Parliamentarians. The basis of Syndicalist organisation is one Union for each trade in each locality. These Unions, or Syndicates, are grouped together locally by the Bourses du Travail, which are unfortunately sometimes subsidised by the municipality. The Syndicates are also federated nationally by trades, these federations at present numbering sixty-four, with headquarters usually in Paris. Out of these and the Bourses du Travail is formed the Confederation—that is, one delegate from each Bourse and each national Syndicate. This dual organisation has been found most effective, and it now remains only to strengthen it by supplementing the Bourses du Travail by about seventy regional organisations, thus linking up the whole country. The whole history of the movement shows the mistrust of the workers for Parliamentary action. Over and over again the politicians have tried to win them, and for this reason they were for a long time shunned by Anarchists. But with the political success of Millerand the atmosphere cleared. Then came the union of all revolutionists, and the Anarchists showed that they were organisers. There are still a few Syndicates outside the Confederation—the Miners, for example—but they will soon join. The Syndicalist movement is the workers' movement, and for that reason alone all Anarchists should join their Syndicates.

Direct Action is the one principle of Syndicalism, and the strike is the most important form of action in the Syndicates. Some Anarchists might say to him: We do not want strikes; we want revolution. But he would ask them: How is the revolution to come before the workers know their power? Every strike is a lesson in revolutionary action. A strike is also the best means of propaganda. Until a great strike aroused that province, Brittany was the most backward part of France. Since the strike the number of Syndicates there has grown to over a hundred. To have taken part in a serious strike brings to each man a total change of mentality. He must clear up one popular misunderstanding about the movement in France. It was often imagined that the business of the Confederation was to order strikes, and that Syndicates could not strike without referring the question first to the Confederation. This is entirely a mistake. The Syndicates and their sections are absolutely autonomous and strike when they think fit, simply advising the Confederation of the fact.

In putting the case for Syndicalism he would point out that the General Strike, to have any permanent effect, is obviously more complicated an affair than any merely political revolution. It would have to be carried out with a clear understanding of what was wanted, and with an absolute confidence in the organisations. Anarchists had begun to lose confidence in the coming revolution in France, Syndicalists had restored it. He would not deny that there were serious dangers in the movement, besides that most serious one of the subsidising of the Bourses du Travail. There was the danger of centralisation, which naturally chokes individual initiative to a certain extent. Here was work for Anarchists—and in fighting against this they would find many Socialists with them. Then there was the danger of officialism. It was inevitable that the man who had been sitting in a secretary's armchair year after year should begin to take a different view of the movement to what he did when he was working in the mine or the shop. Every Anarchist in the Syndicates would naturally oppose this dangerous principle of re-electing officials. Finally, he would warn Anarchists against joining Syndicates simply to use them

as fields of propaganda. Let them join as exploited workers pure and simple first, as men of noble opinions after.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 29th. FOURTH DAY.

LANGE presiding.

ANARCHISM AND SYNDICALISM (continued).

LANGE, in declaring the sitting open, pointed out that while several of the Dutch daily newspapers were giving good long reports of the Congress, the current number of *Vorwärts* just received had no mention of it.

A FRENCH COMRADE.—Nor has *Humanité*!

A BELGIAN COMRADE.—Nor *Le Peuple*!

Amidst much laughter MALATESTA rose to congratulate the Social Democrats on having adopted a policy of silence in place of their old one of misrepresentation.

LANGE reminded the Congress that before noon of next day the three questions, Syndicalism, the General Strike, and Anti-Militarism, had to be disposed of.

It was unanimously agreed to take the first two together. The discussion on Syndicalism and the General Strike was then declared open.

ROGDAEFF was in favour of Anarchists entering their Syndicates. Where the conditions of the people were different, the movement was naturally different. It was to be expected, therefore, that strikes would be fiercer in Russia than in France. The recognition of the class war is the basis of Syndicalist propaganda in Russia, and the real basis of all the great strike movements—even of those supposed to be political—was economic. The famous revolt of the 'Potemkin' was in reality a sympathy strike carried to its logical conclusion of expropriation. The Anarchist position in the Syndicalist movement should be simply that the workers' movement should be cleared of all politicians. At the present time practically all the Syndicates in Russia are anti-Parliamentarian. The Government had started the formation of some Syndicates for its own end, but in the strikes of 1903 things went so far that it had to act against its own pet organisation. There were very few Anarchists in Russia who did not sympathise with the Syndicalist movement.

CORNELISSEN felt that Monatte had not spoken as an Anarchist, but as a Syndicalist. At the same time he agreed with him that there was good work to be done inside the Syndicates. Besides the dangers already mentioned, there was that of the Syndicates becoming merely co-operative and an authority in their trade. Another evil of the movement was shown in America, where the patriotic influence of the Union was used in exciting hatred of the Japanese.

OBERSLAGEN said that Anarchists had been very active in the Syndicalist movement in Holland, and consequently the movement was in a very hopeful condition.

Afternoon.

MALATESTA expected some comrades would be surprised to hear him speak against Syndicalism and the General Strike, against a certain conception of the General Strike, a pacifist conception that seems to be growing popular among Syndicalists. But first he desired to make it quite clear that he as much as any one regretted the isolation that is the fate of Anarchists who do not participate in the Labour movement. In the propaganda of Anarchist ideas we must, of course, support the mass movement. He was so far entirely in agreement with previous speakers. But he felt that the other side of the question had not been fairly put, so he would limit himself to bringing out what he considered the essential differences of opinion between Anarchists and Anarchist-Syndicalists. He had himself been such a strong advocate of entering the Syndicates that he had even been accused of being a Syndicate-maker. That was all very well at one time, but now we are confronted with "Syndicalism," the doctrine. He would have nothing to say against it if he could believe that Syndicalism alone could, as was claimed for it, destroy Capitalism. But who could expect to overthrow Capitalism while remaining a servant of capitalist production? Together with a solution of the unemployed problem, they might do it; but the fact of the matter was that as the Syndicalist organisation grew nearer and nearer to perfection, the number of unemployed grew greater and greater. Certainly, Syndicalism in this way can emancipate a part of the workers, but not all. It is only too obvious that the Syndicates make a serious division of the workers, and often enough without doing any harm to the capitalists.

Do not let us make any mistake about what we mean by "solidarity of the workers." It is often used as if there existed some natural economic solidarity among the exploited workers. But this class solidarity even is only an abstraction. The material fact of life under existing conditions is the personal antagonism between all workers. Solidarity is an aspiration, and in that alone lies its importance to the workers. It is an aspiration that is capable of transforming the economic conditions of a nation, for the differences of economic conditions are not due to financial causes, but to the varying spirit of the people in the different countries. Indeed we may as well confess at once that the purely economic struggle is not sufficient; it must be based on an intense moral struggle, for changes in economic conditions soon readjusted themselves where the moral conditions of the people remained unaffected.

Of one point about Anarchists in Syndicates he was quite certain,—that no Anarchist could take an official position in a Syndicate without

placing himself in a false position. Indeed, he was not sure whether even the plain Anarchist member of a Syndicate would not before many years find himself in a false position, for he was only accepted until the Syndicates became really strong, and then he would be asked to go. He did not see why France should consider herself in a novel condition; English Trade Unionism began in just the same revolutionary tone, and look at it now!

He should like, in passing, to clear up a misunderstanding of terms. He often heard political action referred to as if it involved Parliamentarism. This was a great mistake. What, for example, was Bresci's act? Was it economic? No; it was political. Marx was responsible for this confusion. He approached the whole question from the economic viewpoint, and sometimes almost takes it for granted that the peasant enjoys paying rent to his landlord. This is manifestly absurd. No peasant—and no other worker for that matter—likes paying rent; he does so simply because of the force—the political force—that is behind the landlord.

He now came to the General Strike. What he objected to was the idea, so freely propagated by some Syndicalists, that the General Strike can replace insurrection. Some people fondly cherish the idea that we are going to starve the bourgeoisie. We should starve ourselves first. Or else they go so far as to admit that the General Strike involves expropriation. But then the soldiers come. Are we to let ourselves be shot down? Of course not. We should stand up to them, and that would mean Revolution. So why not say Revolution at once instead of General Strike? This might seem only a question of words, but it goes deeper than that. The advocates of the General Strike make people think they can do things without fighting, and thus actually spoil the revolutionary spirit of the people. It was propaganda of this kind that brought about such illogical positions as that taken up by the strikers recently at Barcelona, where they did fight the soldiers, but at the same time treated with the State. This was because they were under the delusion that it was only an economic question.

He considered that some of the pamphlets published on the General Strike did nothing but harm. In the first place, it was a fallacy to base their arguments, as some of them do, on a supposed superabundance of production. Not being much of a hand at statistics himself, he once asked Kropotkin what was the real position of England in this respect, and he was told that England produces enough for three months in the year only, and that if importations were stopped for four weeks everybody in the country would die of starvation. The modern possibilities of transport make it undesirable for capitalists to accumulate food. It was estimated that London was never provisioned for much over three days, in spite of all her warehouses.

In dealing with this question of the General Strike we *must* begin by considering the necessity of food. This is a more or less new basis for the conception. A peasant strike, for instance, appeared to him as the greatest absurdity. Their only tactics were immediate expropriation, and wherever we find them setting to work on those lines it is our business to go and help them against the soldiers. And then he had read somewhere that we ought to go and smash the railway bridges! He wondered whether the advocates of such foolishness ever realised that corn has to come the same way the cannons come. To adopt the policy of neither cannons nor corn is to make all revolutionists the enemies of the people. We must face the cannons if we want the corn.

Let us realise that the General Strike is only one means of fighting the capitalists, and let us find out how it works in practice, how really to use it. If the Governments have perfected the arms of repression, we must set to work to perfect those of revolution. We need more knowledge; we want new methods of fighting; we need a *technique militaire*. In his own early days when they talked about the General Strike for the first time, every man had his own rifle and revolver, his plan of the town, of the forts, arsenals, prisons, Government buildings, and so forth. Nowadays nobody thinks of these things, and yet they talk on glibly about revolution. Look at what happened in South Italy. The Government shot down peasants by the hundred, and the only soldier that was hurt fell off his horse by accident. (It was this massacre that made Bresci take extreme action. He believed a telegram which was sent him from Rome saying that the King himself had ordered the soldiers to shoot without mercy.)

If we talk about revolution, then, let us at least be prepared for it. Unfortunately, the fight must be brutal. He would like to think otherwise—but how could it be? We cannot let ourselves be killed. These are a few of the things he would recommend the comrades to ponder and discuss.

(To be concluded in our next issue.)

An Appeal for "Freedom."

The difficulty of printing *Freedom* in these times of depression compels us to ask all friends and sympathisers to render what financial assistance they can to enable us to appear regularly.

Much voluntary work must always be given to help the paper along, but as we are only workers ourselves, our pockets will not meet the deficit on each number.

Any subscriptions will be thankfully received, and should be sent to J. TURNER, 127, Ossulston Street, Euston Road London, N.W.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

Germany.

If report be true, Karl Liebknecht's incarceration in a fortress will not be the severe punishment it sounds. Apparently, a political prisoner in Germany enjoys greater privileges than one in any other country, which is strange, considering the rigorous treatment meted out to the ordinary German prisoner. He will be allowed to name his own date for entering the fortress, will be comfortably housed while there, and permitted to transact business as if at home. He will not, however, be given the opportunity to make speeches on anti-militarism, though that will matter little; new ideas spread from behind prison-bars with greater force and speed than from anywhere else. Liebknecht's trial and sentence will propagate anti-militarism in a manner that the military authorities and his judges little dream of. Leaflets and pamphlets will circulate more secretly and surely among the young soldiers and fledgling recruits than they ever did before. The time may not as yet be ripe for every unit of a standing army to lay down his rifle—but every soldier throughout the universe has now got the Idea packed inside his knapsack, and some day it will burst the knapsack and play some queer pranks on Government-ordered battle-grounds. The Anarchists were the first to broach anti-militarism in Germany, and Liebknecht, although in some points less a Marxist than his father, therefore a man of more liberal views, denounces the Anarchist conception in a somewhat rabid style in his suppressed work, when contrasting it with the Socialist views on the same subject. Still, his book is suggestive, and as such will force anti-militarism ahead, while the imprisonment of one of the most popular Socialist leaders in the country will put a seal on the idea as little else would have done in Germany. Other anti-militarists suffered before him, but they were mere Anarchists or humble folk unknown to the Social Democratic world; their trials made no stir. The editor of *Revolutionär* (Fraübose) was tried in September last, but acquitted owing to insufficient evidence. The editor of *Freie Arbeiter* was less fortunate, being sentenced to six months' imprisonment.

Sixteen Berlin spies (probably more) have been sent to London to work conjointly with the English detectives for the safety of the little Kaiser—London Anarchists being renowned for their bloodthirstiness. But William will die in his bed, much as that may be against the grain of so ardent a fire-eater.

The programme of the Free Union of German Syndicates (Trade Unions) points to the formation of a young party or nucleus imbued with Federalist and revolutionary tendencies. This Union consists of fifteen trade federations and sixteen local organisations, comprising some 15,000 members. Its chief exponent is *Die Einigkeit*, with a circulation of about 17,000. These young people believe thoroughly in the efficacy of the General Strike, and stand for anti-militarism, decentralisation, and liberty and equality among trade organisations. The programme states emphatically that the class war should be waged in a social-revolutionary sense, and that a Socialist conception of the world and of life must embrace the idea of the General Strike. The only Unions to be refused federation are such as deny the class war and preach conciliation between Capital and Labour. On the other hand, individual unorganised wage-earners will be admitted with pleasure. Each Union entering the Federation will retain its autonomy and statutes, and the federated body is looked upon in the light of an organ for revolutionary education and action. So here as elsewhere the Anarchist ideal of Direct Action makes its power felt.

After an interesting discussion, the International Congress of Miners, which met at Salzburg (Austria), decided that on a threat of war the International Committee of Miners should meet, and if necessary convoke a Congress of the miners of the world, with a view to preventing an outbreak of hostilities. A million and a half of miners were represented at the late Congress. What could the war loans of the Rothschilds effect if the miners and arsenal workers of the world threw down their tools at the first howl of the dogs of war? Meanwhile, Germany, in common with every other military-ruled nation, is doing its best to sicken its soldiers with the "noble profession of arms." Only lately at Hamburg a Reservist was sentenced to two months' imprisonment for daring to attend a Trade Union meeting while absent on a day's leave. Such petty tyrannies are sure in the long run to make a soldier think.

Portugal.

It will be remembered that some months ago when the Minister dictator, Franco, was setting Lisbon and the country generally aflame by his reactionary speeches and measures, what was called a bomb exploded in the room of a worker, maiming him and two of his friends. The men happened to belong to a Freemasons' lodge, the result being that 300 persons—many being members of affiliated lodges—were indiscriminately arrested. One half of these still remain in prison without having yet been brought to trial or even told of what crime they are accused. Comrade Nemo Vasco, editor of *Terra Livre*, makes an eloquent appeal to *Freedom* on behalf of his suffering countrymen, giving an insight into the working of the Portuguese *loi scélérate*, drafted ten years ago to overawe Anarchist and other rebels. No Minister, apparently, except its originator, Franco, has dared to make frequent use of this drastic measure, such is the public outcry on the occasions it has been put into force. But whenever Franco reigns,

and he reigns now, it becomes his favourite weapon for repressing progressive ideas and men. "Under this law," says our comrade, "no matter what the provocation, acts against the person or private property, even if followed by no ill effects, are punishable with six months' imprisonment. At its conclusion the culprit is handed over to the Government, and, if it so chooses, then transported to the Oceanic island of Timor, a veritable inferno for Europeans. Here he is placed under supervision of the local authorities, and not allowed to return to Europe without permission of the home Government." Meanwhile, another clause of this special law muzzles the Press, which is forbidden to report upon Anarchist acts or attempts, to notice police investigations following these, or to publish reports of Anarchist trials. Some twenty of those now in prison, he adds, expect to be transported without trial. Yet the Press dare not allude to this iniquity, being forced into silence by a recent and special order forbidding the merest allusion to such or kindred matters. Two dailies which dared to insert a few words on "Anarchist deeds" have been suspended for a month. Tyranny succeeds tyranny under the triumvirate, the King, his Minister, and Judge Veiga, in a silence grim as death. The police do what they like—arrest innocent persons, confiscate their papers and books, and by terrifying their employers keep them out of work. Portugal, as our comrade reminds us, is a country little known to foreign nations. The horrors of Montjuich appealed to international solidarity, but Portugal remains isolated, and its rulers may oppress the people as they will without fear of outside criticism. How is the world to learn the truth when the Press is not only gagged, but it is made penal to name certain facts? The grim silence, as now, of a nation like Russia under oppression is eloquent; but the moan of an inarticulate country like little Portugal remains unnoticed because unheard. So Comrade Vasco pleads for his countrymen. He promises facts and information to lay before the general public, and begs that all comrades will voice them and do their utmost to free the imprisoned men of Lisbon, and present torture and suffering as at Montjuich.

Brazil.

A story of militarism appears in *Terra Livre* which, though atrocious, is believable, for such cases were known in European armies in the early part of the last century. A young soldier, aged only 18, committed some trifling breach of discipline when in barracks at Villegaignon. For this he was ordered 200 lashes. (In the British army punishment up to 300 lashes and more used to be frequent.) After 90 strokes of the whip it was noticed that the poor fellow's head had sunk to his breast and that he seemed dead. The man wielding the whip asked the commanding officer whether the punishment should not cease. "Not at all!" was the brute's answer. So the remainder of the sentence was inflicted on the boy's dead body. We hope his comrades will remember that officer.

Australia.

From Melbourne, Comrade Fleming writes:—

"I am sending a clipping of a trial and imprisonment I have recently faced for using what the police termed profane language. The sentence was fourteen days or £3, so I resolved not to submit. This makes the third time. The first was for claiming the right of free speech on the Queen's Wharf in Melbourne; that was seven days. The second was a month for endeavouring to get the public library opened on Sundays, by holding what the police described as an illegal procession; but I got the library opened all the same. The case was taken to a higher Court, and the judge decided in my favour against the police. But I had to do my month, and the judge would not allow any costs for illegal imprisonment, though he stated it was the most absurd case he ever heard of. We have gained the right to hold a procession through the streets as a result, but I regret to say that the people through their apathy have allowed the library to be closed, though it was opened for several years. In my recent case I had to appear before a Catholic magistrate named Dwyer, who would have roasted me if he only had the power. The Churches are behind the whole business; they want to put down free speech."

PROPAGANDA NOTES.

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

LONDON.—The meetings at the Bath House have been continued during the past month, but the attendance has not been so large as was expected. Our comrade Guy Aldred gave four lectures on the evolution of Anarchism, his last lecture producing opposition from an Individualist, H. Meulen, who agreed to speak on the following Wednesday (October 23) on Individualism. The commercial spirit ran through the whole of his discourse, free banking, in his opinion, being the panacea for all our evils. After hearing the lecture one would be inclined to think that our only object in life was the production of merchandise at the cheapest possible rate. The lecturer said that free competition would bring out the best in mankind, and that with a free currency trade would be so stimulated that employers would have to compete with each other for the services of the workers, thereby solving the unemployed problem. Questions were freely hurled at the lecturer, and in the discussion that followed our comrades pointed out that so long as masters and employees existed there could be no peace.

The movement in London is gradually gaining strength, the group at Deptford being especially active, Comrades Carter, Aldred, Ray, and Aldridge having had large and attentive audiences at the Broadway. The sale of *Freedom* and pamphlets has increased, and altogether good work is being done.

At Plaistow and Barking Town the meetings have been well attended,

Comrades Mowbray, Monk, Goulding, and others keeping the flag flying; but owing to the great number of unemployed in the neighbourhood, the sales of FREEDOM and pamphlets have not been very large. Any comrade desirous of helping by speaking will be heartily welcomed.

Our comrade Guy Aldred has been active during the past month, his Saturday evening meetings in Hyde Park attracting good audiences. Plenty of opposition has been encountered and effectively dealt with.

MANCHESTER.—We of the Manchester Progressive Group have awoke to the necessity of doing more active work, which we are now better enabled to do. Owing to the presence of many new comrades, we have held some very effective meetings. On Saturday, October 12, Comrade Franks gave us a splendid lecture, entitled "The Five Senses and the Soul." Being determined that the English side shall not lack, owing to a feeling that there must be many English comrades here who merely want rousing up, we invited Comrade Despres from Liverpool, who held a very successful meeting in Stevenson Square. We would like all comrades to rally round us and support us in the fight for liberty, equality, and fraternity.

Our meetings are held at 57 Bury New Road on Saturday and Sunday nights, at 8 o'clock. We also mean to hold open-air meetings in Stevenson Square at 3 o'clock on Sundays as long as the weather permits. All are cordially invited to indoor and outdoor meetings. All correspondence to be sent to Bertha Isenberg, Secretary, 71 Choir Street, Lower Broughton, Manchester.

LIVERPOOL.—Our group is still vigorous, but owing to the suspension of the *Voice of Labour* it has not been quite as prominent. During the past month Kavanagh, Despres, and myself have held good meetings at the Wellington Column. At one time we were brutally attacked by the Roman Catholics because of our attitude to the Church, but we stood our ground and came out triumphant. Another feature of our work is the indoor meeting. We have rented a room in the centre of the town, and lectures are given every Tuesday evening by comrades. On October 29 Despres lectured on "Tactics that Tell," and outlined an admirable programme for Direct Actionists. We have booked lectures for a month ahead, and splendid discussions are anticipated. We are pleased to report that comrades are constantly being invited out to lecture. Comrades Despres and Kavanagh have visited Manchester and brought back excellent accounts of the Jewish group there. Despres visited Leeds on Sunday, November 3, on the invitation of the Leeds group.

This is all very encouraging, but still the Liverpool group is far behind what it should be. We want more enthusiastic comrades who really understand the principles of Anarchist Communism and their necessary antagonism to State Socialist activity. We want comrades to recognise also that group meetings are things to attend to, so that they may keep in touch with the business transacted. Our efforts to get a hall for the Chicago Martyrs demonstration have been futile, so comrades are holding it at the Wellington Column on Sunday, November 10, at 8 p.m. Mention should be made of a splendid lecture on Direct Action given by Comrade Metcalf on Thursday, October 31, at a branch of the Shop Assistants' Union. Metcalf is one of our promising young men, and judging by his lecture he not only understands the Direct Action position, but is also prepared to advocate it strenuously.

We appeal to all local comrades and sympathisers to support our meetings, which at present are held at the Cocoa Rooms, Computation Row, every Tuesday evening at 8.30 p.m. T. G. BEAVAN, Secretary.

LIBERTY OF OPINION IN FRANCE.

Georges Clemenceau the Unnecessary is still going on in France. In awaiting the happy time when the conscious workers will rise in a general revolt throughout the world, the Reign of Terror continues here just as before, and becomes an ever-increasing menace to our dearest liberties.

Heavy sentences have been pronounced against nine courageous boys who raised their voices against the bourgeoisie just after the slaughter of workers at Raon l'Etape. "Against strength be strong!" they had written. "Be violent against violence! The number of police being insufficient to defeat the working class, the Government will mobilise the Army. To the workers, other workers in the livery of soldiers will be opposed. Then, soldiers, you will decline the function of police-dogs! You will remember that our cause is yours—that of all the oppressed! You will refuse to fire on your revolted brothers! In the same way as your comrades of the 17th Regiment of the Line, you will rebel against the assassins!"

The jury, composed of tradesmen, manufacturers, and wealthy people, showed itself abominably ferocious. Three of the ten accused were sentenced to three years' imprisonment, one to two years, three others to fifteen months. Even the two youngest boys, being under the age required to be sent to jail, will be confined during four whole years in that den of immorality called "House of Correction." The poor little ones will spend their prime of life in a dreadful promiscuousness with vicious and degenerate youths. How hypocritical are these men of justice! And how stricken with fright!

Here we are all now in free France at the mercy of a gang of rascals who, after having used the ideas of liberty and justice as a springboard to jump over the social barricade, are more and more a terrible menace to our long-established Rights of Man, which were proclaimed in burning words more than a hundred years ago by our fathers of the French Revolution. Were Thiers, Dupuy, and Galliffet more harmful and mischievous than Clemenceau, Briand, and Picquart?

A new group of defence, *La Liberté d'Opinion*, has been formed in Paris. In its manifesto, the group declares its intention to fight arbitrary attacks with all its power. Its double task will be to make public opinion aware of such crimes, and to help by every means the prisoners and their families.

It is especially to all the comrades who can help us by agitation or financially that this urgent appeal is addressed. As said Henriette Roussel, one of the ten comrades included in the above-mentioned trial: "We must act promptly and work together until the day when all the prisons will be abolished."

A. PR.

All donations to the relief fund to be addressed to the Manager of *Les Temps Nouveaux*, 4 Rue Broca, Paris V., stating inside "For the Group *La Liberté d'Opinion*."

THE "VOICE OF LABOUR" RAFFLE.

The Winning Ticket is No. 175. Immediate application must be made to T. H. Keell at 127 Ossulston Street, N.W.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

(October 6—November 8.)

FREEDOM Guarantee Fund.—Mrs. H. 2s., K. W. 5s., A. M. 10s., N. £1.

FREEDOM Subscriptions.—R. Neft 1s. 6d., Heiman 2s., W. M. S. 2s., J. Turner 1s. 6d., G. P. Ballard 1s. 6d., Mrs. W. 9d., B. Cheh 1s. 6d., H. Orr 1s. 6d., J. Bedford 1s. 6d., R. Moore 1s. 6d., G. Ronner 1s. 8d., A. E. P. 1s. 6d.

Sales of FREEDOM.—A. Bird 1s., B. Greenblatt 6s., K. W. 1s., S. Carter 3s., D. Wormald 1s. 4d., A. Marlaw 2s., D. Malingier 1s., Reeves 2s. 6d., E. Lechmere 1s. 6d., Essex 2s. 8d., W. Underwood 1s. 4d., A. Foner 1s. 6d., B. Capes 2s., J. McCara 2s. 8d., —. Curry 1s. 4d.

Pamphlet and Book Sales.—R. Neft 2s., B. Faltelson 2s., "Mother Earth" £4, B. 2s. 4d., A. Pollock 1s. 3d., A. Marlaw 3s., W. F. 1s., J. Morgan 2s. 4d., G. V. Aldridge 2s. 7d., W. L. 13s., A. M. 2s. 9d., J. Scarcieriaux 2s., G. Ballard 8s., Henderson 13s., D. Malingier 3s. 3d., K. W. 1s. 6d., E. L. 1s. 6d., A. K. B. 3s. 6d., B. Greenblatt 6s., A. Foner 11s. 2d., M. Silverman 2s. 6d., Lahr 1s. 6d., A. E. P. 1s.

"VOICE OF LABOUR" FUND.

Essex 6d., B. C. (Bristol) 1s., J. S. R. 1s., W. F. (Dundee) 1s., J. Morgan 1s., C. Hoggett 1s., D. 9d., P. Goodman 1s. 6d., S. G. 3s. 6d., Jersey Lill 2s. 6d., Harrogate Comrades £1, C. Lewis 6d.

WORKERS' FRIEND CLUB AND INSTITUTE,

163 JUBILEE STREET, MILE END, E.

A

Chicago Martyrs Meeting

Will be held at the above Hall on

Sunday, November 10, at 8.30 p.m.

Well-known speakers will take part in the proceedings.

THE BATH HOUSE, 96 DEAN STREET, OXFORD STREET, W.

Wednesday, November 13, at 8.30 p.m.

"The General Strike and Direct Action."

J. SPIZUOCO.

Lectures are given at the above hall every Wednesday evening. Comrades are requested to bring them to the notice of all friends and sympathisers.

Just Reprinted.

Anarchism: its Philosophy and Ideal.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

Useful Work and Useless Toil.

Monopoly; or, How Labour is Robbed.

By WILLIAM MORRIS.

Price 1d. each, post-free 1½d.; 24 for 1s. 6d.

HENDERSONS,

66 CHARING CROSS ROAD, LONDON, W.C.,

Also at 15A PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.,

For Revolutionary Literature,

Socialist, Labour, Rationalist, and all Advanced Thought Books and Periodicals.

Publishing Office of "The Deadly Parallel," Price 1d.

THE DEADLY PARALLEL.

Edited by W. B. NORTHROP.

Photos of Rich and Poor side by side in Deadly Contrast.
The Cry of the Children and Pampered Pets of Millionaires.
Living Photographs of Social Evils.
Facts and Pictures on Wage Slavery.
The Unemployed (East and West).
Land Monopoly and its Terrible Consequences.
The Deadly Parallel holds the Mirror up to Humanity.
The only Paper of its kind in the World.

8 pages, monthly, 1d.; by post, 1½d.

Published at HENDERSONS, 66 Charing Cross Road, W.C., and Paternoster Row, E.C.

Pamphlet and Book List.

THE WAGE SYSTEM. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

THE COMMUNE OF PARIS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

A TALK ABOUT ANARCHIST COMMUNISM BETWEEN TWO WORKERS. By E. MALATESTA. 1d.

ANARCHISM: ITS PHILOSOPHY AND IDEAL. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.

RESPONSIBILITY AND SOLIDARITY IN THE LABOR STRUGGLE. 1d.

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

LAW AND AUTHORITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.

SOCIALISM THE REMEDY. By HENRY GLASSE. 1d.

SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN GERMANY. By GUSTAV LANDAUER. ½d.

ORGANISED VENGEANCE—CALLED "JUSTICE." By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

WAR. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. By E. RECLUS. 1d.

THE KING AND THE ANARCHIST. 2d.

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

THE MASTERS OF LIFE. By MAXIM GORKY. 4d. post-free.

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