

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. XXII.—No. 226.

FEBRUARY, 1908.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

NOTES.

Nemesis!

The assassination of Dom Carlos and his son has come as no surprise to those time-servers who pretend to be grief-stricken at the end of a selfish tyrant who deliberately worked for his own doom. After all, even the rake's progress comes to an end; and although Carlos tried to shelter himself behind his political bully, Franco, every one knew who was really swallowing up the substance of the nation and ruthlessly destroying every shred of the people's rights. Even the capitalist Press has had to publish his crimes against the Portuguese people, whose poverty and sufferings never troubled him for one moment. What has, however, upset the calculations of editors and journalists is the fact that they have been unable to bring the deed home to the Anarchists. In fact, it looks more than probable that it will prove to be the work of some Liberals with Republican tendencies. After all, how fallible we all are! Fancy the principles advocated by the *Daily News* leading to tyrannicide!

How the King and Franco Economised (!)

We were told that the King appointed Franco as Dictator to put a stop to the corruption of the two political parties and to effect economies in the national finances. The following extracts from an article in the *Standard* of December 3 last give one a very good idea of what they meant by "economies":—

"The most remarkable of the Premier's acts has been the treatment of the monetary advances made to King Carlos, which were the chief bone of contention of the Opposition. To put matters clearly, King Carlos owed the Government something like £180,000, which the Republican party were demanding should be refunded to the State. Senhor Franco, by an adroit move, arranged that his Majesty should nominally transfer to the Government his private yacht the *Amelia*, together with the free use of various buildings previously rented from him by the Government, and thus extinguished the King's indebtedness at one stroke. Nor is this all, for his Majesty's income of £200 a day having long been found to be insufficient to meet the royal expenses, was increased by Senhor Franco to £350 a day."

Rude people would call this a barefaced robbery, but in polite circles it is termed "increasing the Civil List"! In the same article we read:—

"Several hundreds of arrests have been made, mainly amongst the Republicans, the charge being that of conspiring against the State. What becomes of these individuals it is difficult to ascertain."

Well, if people are foolish enough to sit on the safety-valve, they must not be surprised if there is an explosion.

What is Socialism?

It is not surprising that Comrade Macdonald, in an article we print in this issue, should take Mr. Hyndman to task for his assertion that Socialism does not mean equality. Was he afraid that the assembly of capitalists he was addressing would have their tenderest corns touched if he should maintain the claim of the poorest worker to at least as full and fair a life as these parasites assured for themselves? Or did he fear their dull intelligences would confuse the equality of Socialism with the stupid idea of all men being alike? In that case it would have been well for Mr. Hyndman to have made himself clear. It is too patently evident nowadays that all sorts of nonsense is being paraded as Socialism, from the feeding of hungry children to the pensioning of the survivors of the economic struggle—few enough, indeed—on a miserable few shillings a week. Whereas Socialism means, and true Socialists assert, that there shall be no hungry children; and that pensions of all kinds are an abomination, and to the workers at least a cruel insult. Time was, however, when Hyndman declared himself

a Communist. How does he reconcile inequality with that principle of social organisation? Is it political compromise that is taming his revolutionary ardour? Or is he content that finally it must be understood that the Anarchist Communists are the true Socialists?

The Government and the Unemployed.

The ghastly and humiliating farce of making political capital out of the hopeless misery of the unemployed has once more been gone through. And once more the Government has shown, as every one knew it would, an utter indifference to the fate of these victims of the capitalist system. But no doubt every one enjoyed the debate, and none more so than Baron Munchausen Burns, who did not fail to seize on this fine opportunity for self-advertisement. Thereupon he gave the House the benefit of some of those fairy tales for which he has long been notorious, and very quickly dispelled any shadow of hope that might have arisen in the hearts of those workless and starving crowds to be found in every city of this the wealthiest nation in the world. It is easier to get blood from a stone than help from a politician, and the unemployed may continue their living death so long as they keep quiet.

Voluntary Organisation Succeeds.

It is a scathing commentary on the "awe-inspiring imbecility," as Mark Twain would say, of impotent Cabinet Ministers that voluntary effort should have shown what can be done for the unemployed under most adverse conditions. It appears that in Philadelphia some well-disposed persons decided to help the "out-o'-works" to cultivate such vacant spaces, and even building plots, as could be obtained. Such land was often of the roughest and most unpromising character. But as there was no Local Government Board to interfere, the voluntary system worked splendidly, and for every penny expended a return of eight-pennyworth of produce was assured. We are not quoting this as a solution of the social problem, but as an excellent example of the voluntary spirit which Anarchists uphold as against State coercion. It was well this example came to hand at the same moment that the great Battersea showman was mouthing his own impotence to an admiring assembly of imbeciles.

The Struggle in America.

America's economic and social condition is such that anything may happen at any moment. Whole populations are there crowded together in a state bordering upon famine, and the brutal methods of the Trusts offer no palliatives for the present and no hope for the future. The struggle there between wage-slave and exploiter is seen in all its inhuman ugliness, and it is evident that when the storm does break the fight will be long and bitter. An encouraging sign of the spirit that is awakening in the American people is the way they organised against the rack-renters of New York. And they won the day in spite of the law and the police. And yet there is not one Labour representative at Washington. The battle was won in the only possible way such things can be won—by the direct action of the people themselves. Such action will surely be followed in other cities.

What Does He Mean?

On Sunday, February 2, the Rev. R. J. Campbell said: "I feel certain that no Socialist killed the King of Portugal. Socialism and Anarchism are wide as the poles apart." On the following Thursday, speaking at the City Temple, he said: "If the ideal of Jesus were carried out there would be no grades of society. If we practised Christ's teaching we should all be Socialists and Anarchists." So if we practise Christ's teachings we should be "wide as the poles apart." Is this the New Theology?

INDIVIDUAL SOVEREIGNTY.

"Hence the State honors and blesses marriage, and frowns upon all other sexual relations,"—that is to say, each State honors and blesses some sort of marriage relations, and frowns upon some other sort, the difference in different ages and nations embracing almost every conceivable variety which could come of the entire freedom of individuals. Since States are left free to vary and differ as they please, and do vary and differ accordingly, why not extend the same privilege to the individuals of the same State? If any better philosophical reason can be given against it than mere prejudice, undevelopment, and superstition, let us have it at once, and put an end to the discussion.

You say it is nonsense to talk of my views of individual sovereignty as a modern discovery, and of the antagonist views as moss-grown with antiquity. You conceive of individual sovereignty as being synonymous with egotism and about as old as sin. All this simply indicates that my views are as yet so modern and so novel that even Mr. Greeley has hitherto attained to no adequate conception of them. Please to endeavor to understand, then, that the sovereignty of the individual which I talk about is the sovereignty of every individual; that it teaches me and every one who accepts it the most scrupulous deference for the absolute freedom of every human being, prohibiting me and them from arrogating any control or government over others (except when we have to assume the cost of their actions, as in the case of children, and become thereby entitled to the deciding power). It demands of me that I permit every man and every woman to think, speak, and do whatsoever seemeth good to them in their own eyes, laying down the least shadow of claim to the right on my part to suppress them, either directly or through the power of the State, the Church, public odium, or otherwise,—only limited by the line that they do not throw the burdensome consequences of their conduct on me, and that they leave me the same amount of freedom. All this I hold as the essential principle of order and harmony, and growth in purity and intelligence, and rational happiness among men. Please to inform me what you discover either unlovably egotistic or at all antique in this doctrine. Are you able to illustrate its workings by quotations from ancient history so profuse as you intimate?

Probably you will perceive that you have mistaken the assertion of one's own sovereignty over others (which is your own doctrine, and which has been common enough in the world) for a doctrine which affirms and sedulously guards that of all other men, while it is confessedly so egotistic as to claim the right of the individual to himself. So long as it rests in the phase of mere protest against encroachment, it is just as egotistic, it is true, as it is to request a gentleman to stand on his own toes and not on yours.

Can you suppose that you are treating my doctrine of the freedom of woman and her right to herself with any fairness, when you confound it with the polygamy which has existed in barbarous countries, and which is the entire confiscation, not of one woman, as among us, but of many to one man?

My doctrine is simply that it is an intolerable impertinence for me to thrust myself into your affairs of the heart, to determine for you what woman (or women) you love well enough or purely enough to live with, or how many you are capable of loving. I demand that you simply let me alone to settle the most intimate and delicate and sacred affairs of my private life in the same manner. You publicly notify me that you won't. Another generation will judge between us as to the barbarism and the culture of these two positions. At present it is enough to say that my course leads to peace and yours to war. Judge which is best.

You misconceive a little my method of getting rid of murder. I have the same personal prejudice that you have "to being knocked down with a slung shot, or a paving stone, dragged up a blind alley, and there finished"; nor do I hope to get rid of such acts, as you say I do, "by simply ceasing to visit them with a penalty, or to regard them as crimes." I apply that remedy only to acts which are no crimes except as they are made so by law.

Still, there is no human action without a cause. A given murder is not a solitary fact, standing in the midst of the universe, without antecedents or consequences. The philosopher looks into causes. The scientific reformer would apply his remedies there. If a man attempts to murder me, that act has a cause; perhaps a state of feeling on his part, induced by the suspicion that a certain woman whom he calls, or hopes to call, his wife, has experienced a magnetism of attraction, over which

she has no possible control, toward me, and by the belief, inculcated by you and others, that that woman *belongs*, not to herself, but to him. Hence he is deluded into the notion that I have inflicted a heinous wrong upon him, although, probably, I have never seen him in my life, and possibly may never have seen the woman either. Looking at the effect alone, as I, in common with the rest of mankind, may be compelled to do in the emergency, the remedy may be to knock the man on the head, or to commit him, as you recommend, to Sing-Sing! The true remedy, nevertheless, is a public sentiment, based on the recognition of the sovereignty of the individual. Let the idea be completely repudiated from the man's mind that that woman, or any woman, could, by possibility, belong to him, or was to be true to him, or owed him anything, farther than as she might choose to bestow herself, as far as he could inspire her with affection and no farther; and from that hour the sentiment of jealousy dies out, and the motive to one kind of murder is removed.

Perhaps, in another case, the poor wretch was born with a mind poisoned from conception, imbued, as the lawyers have it, with "malice toward all mankind," because he was begotten in hatred from a woman forced by the law into the repulsive embraces of a man she loathed, and so "marked" as a monster, in every lineament of body and soul, by the horrid impression to which, as is well known, the susceptible imagination of a mother gives form in the character of her offspring. The evil in this case is that your prospective murderer was the child of abhorrence and despair. The remedy is to restore to outraged woman the right to choose freely, at all times, the father of her own child. Till that be granted, all the rest of your "Woman's Rights" are not worth contending for. It is pitiable to see the advocates of this *ism* compelled to disguise their real want, fearing to utter it, and to make a false issue about the franchise, or something of no comparative value to them. The sovereignty of the individual is what they do demand, in common with the rest of mankind. *No child healthfully and lovingly engendered, and never subsequently oppressed and outraged by false social relations, will ever be a murderer.* Let the world learn that.

—STEPHEN PEARL ANDREWS in reply to Horace Greeley, 1853.

DOMESTIC SLAVES.

People have no idea of all the annoyances to which domestics are subjected, or of the fierce and eternal exploitation under which they suffer. Now the masters, now the keepers of employment bureaus, now the charitable institutions, to say nothing of the comrades, some of whom are capable of terrible meanness. And nobody takes any interest in anybody else. Each one lives, grows fat, and is entertained by the misery of someone poorer than himself. Scenes change, settings are shifted, you traverse social surroundings that are different and even hostile, but everywhere you find the same appetites and passions. In the cramped apartments of the bourgeois and in the elegant mansion of the banker you meet the same filth, and come in contact with the inexorable. The result of it all, for a girl like me, is that she is conquered in advance, wherever she may go and whatever she may do. The poor are the human manure in which grow the harvests of life, the harvests of joy which the rich reap, and which they misuse so cruelly against us. They pretend that there is no more slavery. Oh, what nonsense! And what are domestics, then, if not slaves? Slaves in fact, with all that slavery involves of moral vileness, inevitable corruption, and hate-engendering rebellion. Servants learn vice in the houses of their masters. Entering upon their duties pure and innocent—some of them—they are quickly made rotten by contact with habits of depravity. They see nothing but vice, they breathe nothing but vice, they touch nothing but vice. Consequently, from day to day, from minute to minute, they get more and more used to it, being defenceless against it, being obliged, on the contrary, to serve it, to care for it, to respect it. And their revolt arises from the fact that they are powerless to satisfy it, and to break down all the obstacles in the way of its natural expansion. Oh, it is extraordinary! They demand of us all the virtues, complete resignation, all the sacrifices, all the heroisms, and only those vices that flatter the vanity of the masters, and which yield them a profit. And all this in return for contempt and wages ranging from thirty-five to ninety francs a month. No, it is too much! Add that we live in perpetual distress of mind, in a perpetual struggle between the ephemeral semi-luxury of the places that we fill, and the anguish which the loss of these places causes us. Add that we are continually conscious of the wounding suspicions

that follow us everywhere—bolting doors, padlocking drawers, marking bottles, numbering cakes and prunes, and continually putting us to shame by invasive examination of our hands, our pockets, and our trunks. For there is not a door, not a closet, not a drawer, not a bottle, not an article, that does not cry out to us "Thief! thief! thief!" Add also the continuous vexation caused by that terrible inequality, that frightful disproportion in our destinies, which, in spite of familiarities, smiles, and presents, places between our mistresses and ourselves an impassable abyss, a whole world of sullen hatreds, suppressed desires, and future vengeance—a disproportion which is rendered every minute more perceptible, more humiliating, more disgracing by the caprices, and even by the kindnesses, of those beings that know no justice and feel no love—the rich. Did you ever think for a moment of the mortal and legitimate hatred, of the murderous—yes, murderous—desires with which we must be filled when we hear one of our masters, in trying to describe something base and ignoble, cry out in our presence, with a disgust that casts us so violently outside the pale of humanity: "He has the soul of a domestic: that is, the sentiment of a domestic." Then what do you expect us to become in these hells? Do these mistresses really imagine that I should not like to wear fine dresses, ride in fine carriages, have a gay time with lovers, and have servants of my own? They talk to us of devotion, of honesty, of fidelity. Why, but it would choke you to death, my little chippies!

Once, in the Rue Cambon . . . how many of these places I have had! . . . the masters were marrying their daughter. They gave a grand reception in the evening, at which the wedding presents were exhibited—enough of them to fill a furniture van. By way of jest I asked Baptiste, the *valet de chambre*:

"Well, Baptiste, and you? What is your present?"

"My present?" exclaimed Baptiste, with a shrug of his shoulders.

"Yes, tell me, what is it?"

"A can of petroleum lighted under their bed. That is my present."

It was a smart answer. Moreover, this Baptiste was an astonishing man in politics.

"And yours, Célestine?" he asked, in his turn.

"Mine?"

I contracted my two hands into the shape of talons, and, pretending to claw a face ferociously, I answered:

"My nails, in their eyes!"

The butler, without being asked, remarked quietly, while arranging flowers and fruits in a glass dish with his fastidious fingers:

"I would be satisfied to sprinkle their faces in church with a bottle of good vitriol."

And he stuck a rose between two pears.

Oh! yes, how we love them! The extraordinary thing is that these revenges are not taken more frequently. When I think that a cook, for instance, holds her masters' lives in her hands every day: a pinch of arsenic instead of salt, a little dash of strychnine instead of vinegar, and the thing is done. Well, no, it must be that we have servitude in our very blood!

I have no education, and I write what I think and what I have seen. Well, I say that all this is not beautiful. I say that from the moment when anyone installs another under his roof, though he were the last of poor devils, or the lowest of disreputable girls, he owes them protection, he owes them happiness. I say also that, if the master does not give it to us, we have a right to take it, even from his strong-box, even from his blood.—*A Chambermaid's Diary*, by Octave Mirbeau.

Books, &c., Received.

Riches and Poverty. By L. G. Chiozza Money, M.P. "People's Edition." 1s. net. Methuen and Co.

We heartily welcome this cheap edition of an intensely interesting book. The tremendous wealth of the few rich, and the blighting poverty of the many poor, are shown here in statistics and diagrams that can be easily grasped. Those who remember the author's articles in the *Daily News* two or three years ago will be glad that this book is now published at a price more suitable to scantily lined pockets.

Essays in Socialism—New and Old. By Belfort Bax. 6d. London: Grant Richards.

Un Anarchiste devant les Tribunaux: Déclarations de Georges Etievant. 10c. 22 Rue du Chevalier-de-la-Barre, Paris.

Resolutions passed at the Anarchist Congress held at Amsterdam, August 24-31, 1907. 1d. Published by the International Bureau.

Terre Libre (Les Pionniers). Par Jean Grave. Illustré par M. H. T. 3 fr. 50 c. Paris: Les Temps Nouveaux, 4 Rue Broca.

UPPER-CLASS-CONSCIOUSNESS.

"Class-consciousness" is not a popular term among English Socialists, because the Fabian Society believes in class co-operation, and is too light-hearted to entertain any serious generalisations of such an unpleasant nature. English Socialists, like all loyal Englishmen, believe in the "tact" of King Edward, and in practice, if not in theory, uphold the Constitution of "the King, the Lords and the Commons." Nevertheless, class-consciousness, that essential preliminary to the abolition of class, does exist in England. Among the wage-earners it is made plain in every serious action they undertake; but the present intention is to signalise it in a more unlikely quarter. *Human Justice for Those at the Bottom* is written for "Those at the Top" by one of them, C. C. Cotterill (Smith, Elder and Co.) It is written with a true feeling for the "evilness and criticalness" of our social conditions; and whatever we may think of the writer's chances of success in his appeal to the upper class to recognise its terrible responsibility, we must welcome it as a sign of a dawning "upper-class-consciousness."

He begins by asking, "When and by whom shall the work be done?" And to answer this would immediately estrange us from his argument. For he sticks to his appeal to his own class throughout, that being the intention of the whole book, as advertised on the first page. Instead, let us see in what he differs from the merely benevolent-minded of the upper class. "Under the present system of party politics the poor of this country . . . have a very poor chance. The more I know about the condition of the poor, and the more I reflect on it, and the more I know about the system of party politics, and the more I reflect on it, the more convinced I am that one of the main reasons why these poor people have such a bad chance is the existence of the present system of party politics." With this we are in perfect sympathy, as well as with his denunciation of "the old, used-up, stifling and poisonous stuff which too often composes the atmosphere of the House of Commons." After this it is somewhat surprising to us to find him appealing for legislative action. It is true that his appeal for this is purely tentative, however, as he makes it quite clear that his faith in representative action is none of the strongest.

Briefly, he appeals to the well-to-do for direct action; he demands not only the sacrifice of their wealth in the cause of justice, but for their individual action. No amount of charity will suffice. "The test of the right spirit . . . is to live near them,"—that is, the poor. "The whole system of modern society is false, because it is falsely based. We know it, and we are therefore dissatisfied, uneasy in our conscience." "Of one thing we may be quite sure—things cannot remain as they are." "Yes, in so far as it is bad, the old system of society is coming to an end, and we know it and are thankful for it. And one bad portion of the old system is the class system, and this too is coming to an end, and we know it and are thankful for it. My appeal to the upper classes is to use what may still be useful in the old class system *for the last time*; let it at least do a great thing before it ceases to be, and so bring it to an end."

Ah, might it so be! Could but a fraction of the wealth and energy now devoted to party ends and well-advertised charities be diverted into the channels of enlightenment, what ultimate sufferings and agonies of society might be avoided! Mr. Cotterill foresees a revolutionary change in society. Does he fail to see that the longer it is postponed the more bitter will be the action; that injustice is cumulative, and the fruit of injustice, hatred? Does he not see that to fearlessly advance the cause of emancipation, of revolution, is the only way to ultimately alleviate that bitterness and hatred? We wish him well in his appeal to "those at the top," for, whatever his conclusions, we are thankful for his outspoken expression of class-consciousness.

K. W.

All society is divided in opinion on the subject of the State. Nobody loves it, and the only defence set up is the fear of doing worse by disorganising.—Emerson.

NEW EDITION NOW READY.

MUTUAL AID.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

Price 3s. 6d. post-free in the United Kingdom.

"Freedom" Office, 127 Ossulston Street, N.W.

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

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

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

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

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

THE MANAGER, 127 Ossulston Street, N.W.

The Editors are not necessarily in agreement with signed articles.

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

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

AN APPEAL FOR "FREEDOM."

All comrades interested in the Anarchist propaganda in this country realise how difficult it is to maintain a paper like FREEDOM and to spread our literature amongst the masses.

For some considerable time we have been able to issue FREEDOM as an 8-page paper. But this involved an expenditure far above our income, and only by special efforts of sympathising comrades has the deficit been met.

The winter months are our hardest time, and our position at the present moment compels us to make a strong appeal to all who have any interest in our work to give what they can, not only in support of our paper, but also to enable us to reprint without delay several of our pamphlets for which we are frequently receiving orders, but our stock of which is now exhausted.

We would ask friends specially to remember how necessary it is that Anarchist ideas should be explained to the workers. On every hand we see the disastrous consequences of the mania for political action evinced by the Socialist and Labour leaders, turning the workers into patient, law-abiding voting cattle. They are being misled as to the true issue, and every effort is made to prevent them recognising and using their economic power.

But to those who have a mind of their own, and are disgusted with the failure of political methods, our ideas are welcome and inspiring. We want to reach as many of these—a growing number—as possible, and we need the means to do it with. The circulation of FREEDOM has increased nearly 50 per cent. during the past twelve months, the demand for literature is also greater than ever, and on all hands we hear of discontent with the old methods, and of a brighter future for Anarchism. Let us take full advantage of our increased opportunities.

All who can help should send their donations to T. H. Keell, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W.

ANARCHISM IN BRISTOL.

Anarchism has been the cause of some trouble in the Bristol Socialist Society of late, and on January 29th G. Ballard, who, we fear, bears the heavy responsibility of having disturbed the otherwise peaceful routine of that highly successful political organisation, gave a lecture on "Anarchy and Socialism."

It is perhaps well to admit at the outset that the lecture was not so convincing or clear as it might have been with such a subject in hand, while there was a certain hesitation in delivery which implied that our comrade did not quite feel the strength and logic of the position which he was occupying. Of this, however, the speaker was clearly aware, and we hope to hear him in better form at some future date.

Several points raised were well worthy of notice, and the object throughout seems to have been to preach a pure doctrine of revolution and to put forward those truths which are the essence of all revolutionary thought. Thus it was shown that State ownership of the means of life was opposed to the ideas of liberty and freedom. The ethical and practical value (or rather uselessness) of the vote was convincingly dealt with, while it was shown that this vote was the only means by which the orthodox Socialist intends to convert the power of the State from its attitude of opposition to the people (which it has always occupied since its existence) into a means of controlling for the people's benefit the "production, distribution, and exchange" of the necessities of life.

The philosophy of Jesus and of his great disciple Tolstoy having been referred to and a tribute paid to it, the half-bred

doctrine of peaceful reform so prevalent among the political parties was dealt with, and it was pointed out that the tragedy of human existence lies not in an occasional murder or in any violent shock which our social system may sustain, but rather in the uninterrupted course of oppression and tyranny, which we only endure because our familiarity with it has made us callous and indifferent to the greater tragedies which every day of its existence involves. Further, that the deeds of terrorists (who, by the way, are always Anarchists when convenient) are only remembered because they are blows struck at the most vital part of a system which all who profess revolution have to admit is damnable.

Such remarks, it may readily be understood, were not entirely pleasing to the audience, but arguments against the position were scarce, as also were those who had been loud in their denunciation of our comrade's attitude, these showing the better side of their valour by their discreet absence.

In conclusion, let us express a hope that some at least in Bristol will recognise that to socialise the means of life is indeed a different thing from placing them in the hands of a Government, and realising this, will cease to allow themselves to be lost in the great political game which is absorbing the energy of would-be reformers; and will help to raise on high the Red Flag of a real revolution which shall finally overthrow tyranny, and by which the human race shall find its freedom.

H. M. HYNDMAN ON SOCIALISM.

Socialism in its relation to trade and commerce formed the subject of an after-dinner debate at the Imperial Industries Club the other night, where, in Conservative capitalists and Social Democratic leaders, political extremes met on friendly terms. From scanty reports of the function in the daily Press, we gather only a few points of what must have been an interesting discussion.

In the hands of the Social Democrats, according to Mr. Hyndman's exposition of the doctrine, Socialism has narrowed down to mere State ownership of the means of production, distribution, and exchange. And further, as to the ethical side of the question, "Socialism does not mean equality," say now, openly, the exponents of Social Democracy.

In effect, then, State ownership, with retention of the idea and practice of social inequalities, forms the conception of Social Democratic Socialism in Great Britain, just as it does in Australia and America, and doubtless in other countries where the ideas of Karl Marx have been boiled down to suit the convenience of political parties, for the most part posing and masquerading under the Red Flag and the name of Revolutionary Socialism.

State ownership and social inequality are to be the fundamental principles of the new social system which is to make "wealth flow like water." We might supplement Mr. Hyndman's statement by pointing out that blood also under such a system will in all probability flow like water, for in it all the abominations of the present system will be intensified, in so far as an aristocracy of Labour, of democratic caste, would replace the aristocracy of birth and money!

It is a bold stroke on the part of Social Democrats to escape the problem of how to equalise the distribution of wealth by repudiating the very principle of social equality. But let them clearly understand that in repudiating "equality" they repudiate Socialism! And let the world know them in their true light, as nothing more, in essence, than a subtle form of Conservative political party.

The matter is too serious, the issue too momentous to the welfare of the true Labour movement, to be passed over in silence.

Mr. Hyndman is too honourable a comrade and too keen a logician to play upon the double meaning of social and physical equality; and therefore, pending his explanation of the curious position, we are driven to assume that he is no longer a Socialist.

If there is no equality of the sexes, no equality of comrades, no equality anywhere, why alter the present system? Crimes of the present system are its failure to recognise the truth of social equality, and brutality towards the victims of its ignorance.

The fallacy of the Social Democratic conception of inequality arises from perpetual attempts to classify individuals upon their economic abilities, while ignoring all the other qualities which go to make the complete biological unit—the moral, the mental, and the physical man. Who can name the potentialities of any single individual? At any moment a touch of love, of light, of

art, science, or philosophy, may convert an apparently commonplace individual into an inspired prophet, poet, or philosopher. Once lose sense of the sacredness of individuality, which gives the idea of equality, and all becomes darkness and chaos where beauty and truth and love were wont to be.

The wounded comrade on the battlefield has not surely lost his equality in the eyes of his fellows; not, most surely, in the eyes of the faithful women who tend the hospital bed. What is the meaning of burial with honour, civil or military, if not that equality is being expressed? The bullet in the brain, or the pathogenic germ in the blood, has not destroyed the love of comrades. Why therefore should accidents of place and time and environment be assumed to destroy equality because they injure the individual.

Let us rather recognise the science and philosophy, and cultivate the art of equality, for the great truth behind the word is as a central sun in the whole astronomy of social ideas, providing at once a light for the mind and heat for the human heart, a force of gravitation which will gather up the scattered movements of men, and bind them in one grand harmonic solidarity.

The idea of equality furnishes a key to the understanding of all social problems, whether in the practical economic fields or in the abstract regions of ethical thought. Take, for example, the question of unemployment. The unemployed are our brothers and sisters wounded in the common battle of life; they are our equals, our other selves, part of our larger lives, which it were suicidal to neglect. The workless in this the present system are the homeless, the foodless, the suffering, the victims of our common ignorance. If we consider them the "unfit," we betray our foolishness; and their physical suffering makes those of us who can feel woefully unhappy, and those who cannot feel for others are woefully depraved. To rescue the unemployed by wise measures will help to restore the balance of our complete selves. It is not enough that we preserve our physical lives; our mental and moral beings are equally precious. To preserve our moral selves we must preserve the race as far as in us lies. By saving others we save ourselves, and we learn these truths by perception of the idea of equality.

Moral philosophy is summed up in the one idea, social equality and how to maintain it. Why do we make so much of men who rescue their fellows from danger? We instinctively feel the force of equality. Why are we so callous as to the fact of millions of suffering human lives? Our conscience, or instincts, or ideas, are not awake to the truth of equality. As soon as they are awake we become men of action, and our line of action lies in the endeavour to restore the lost balance of equality; we become Socialists—that is, we become allies fighting a common fight, helping each other.

A sense of equality is the active principle of children's psychology. It requires years of adult domination to suppress the spirit of revolt, of preservation, of equality, in a child's mind. Cowed in the home by ignorant parental authority, drilled in school, and exploited everywhere, humanity from its cradle days is broken by immoral (because destructive) interference on the part of the physically strong, who prosper for a time upon the false doctrines and perverted instincts of inequality.

If children were treated according to their natural rights, in terms of equality, there would be no need of old-age pensions. The old suffer because of their cruel treatment of children in the days of power. More and more as the conception of equality of all social units sinks into the minds of men, young children, old people, the halt, lame, and blind will receive all that attention to their needs which humanity demands.

The Social Democrats in discarding equality part with Socialism and ideals of morality, and find themselves confronted with the impossible tasks of attempting to square social circles, to reconcile antagonisms, to create a moral society upon immoral principles.

The position of Social Democracy would be ridiculous were it not so tragic. How is it possible to abolish the competitive system while retaining the principle of inequalities? Inequality can only express itself by competition. Differences of abilities imply differences in rewards and privileges; and what force will prevent exploitation of the physically weak by the physically strong if all moral force be destroyed?

Two thousand years of beautiful Christian ethics have failed to moralise the world because of the abandonment of the principle of equality. In the first division of humanity into saints and sinners a fatal error is committed. In the new society to be based upon the shifting sand of inequality the saints will be the strong and the sinners the rebels—those who are not strong enough to assert their equality. They may be

too weak to revolt, but they will form political parties doubtless; and society, acting upon the supposed *justice of inequality*, will develop the competitive spirit more than ever, since down to the present time equality has at least been the ideal, if not the practice, of all religions.

For many years the Social Democratic forces have failed to produce any new thought. Even Mr. Hyndman, when asked a straightforward question by business men as to what form of trade and commerce Socialism proposed to substitute for the present commercial and trade principles and practice, could only answer in vague generalities which are far from satisfactory to men who are versed in analytical methods, whose lives depend upon correct estimates and mature judgment, and complete sifting of details.

Commercial men desirous of information upon Socialistic commerce should study the commerce of the earlier years of the mediaeval cities; they should become familiar with the communal purchase and communal carriage of goods from abroad. Ships, markets, and means of land transit were all owned, at the outset, for a certain time, by the free cities. Details may be studied in Kropotkin's "Mutual Aid," where illustrations are given as to how distribution of trade and commerce were arranged in mediaeval cities from Thurso to Plymouth.

Of course, the mediaeval cities were not absolute communes. The doctrine of inequality had sapped the foundations of social philosophy handed down from the tribes and village communities. Still, enough of the old spirit of solidarity obtained to colour most of the city functions, while some of the functions were wholly communal in their nature.

The elements of scientific communal commerce obtain in our society to-day. Shipping companies are often vast organisations whose roots interpenetrate the whole country. A few expert managers and directors do all the directive work, and if such organisations were communally owned, the same staff of management could conduct affairs as they do now.

We must separate the essential from the non essential elements in considering questions of communistic ownership. Vessels at sea are in command of expert seafaring officers; there must be a trade reason for their existence; they must be of useful size and up to date in engines and hygiene. All these are essential elements; but the question as to who owns the ship is not essential to trade and commerce. The vessel may be owned by a single merchant, by a company, by a commune, by a nation, or by a communised humanity.

It is inconceivable that a fleet like the British Navy could be owned by an individual capitalist, yet on the whole the Navy as a Navy works well under national ownership. Under communal ownership no essential principle need be altered.

In reality, Communism, Socialism, is coming to the rescue of the trials and troubles of sorely vexed Chambers of Commerce. Commercial men are to learn that Socialism is to simplify commercial and trade problems on what would be called business lines. Already the great majority of inland merchants feel that shipping companies levy blackmail to a prohibitive extent. They are ripe for a communised merchant navy, and communised ports, docks, and railways.

Along these lines of thought the business minds of to-day must be led until the sublimity of a complete Communistic society appeals to them, not only in its business simplicity, but in its social beauty.

As to talking about co-operation in general terms to business men, it is like speaking Christianity to a Turk. "A going concern" is the everyday experience of commercial life; therefore we must expect drastic criticism of any proposed new order, and we should be prepared to meet it.

We, as Communists, can have nothing whatever to do with any principle of revolution or reform which implies inequality. We stand or fall by the noble doctrine of equality, and we invite business men and others with expert knowledge of trade and commerce to help us with their experience and commercial wisdom to formulate detailed schemes of distribution and exchange based upon the principle, as upon gravitation, the principle of social equality of all.

There is only room for two grand divisions of society, viz., Socialists and Anti-Socialists. Socialists are those who believe in Equality. Anti-Socialists are those like the Conservative, Liberal, Radical, and Social Democratic parties, who stand for Inequality.

T. F. MACDONALD.

LABURNHAM HOUSE, 134 HIGH STREET, BATTERSEA.

On SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 23, at 7.30 p.m.,

A Debate on "**Anarchism**" will take place.

In Favour: N. WALTER. Against: J. FITZGERALD, S.P.G.B.

The Basis of Trade Unionism.

By EMILE POUGET.

Member of the French General Confederation of Labour.

(Conclusion.)

The want of coherence in Parliaments, their ignorance of popular aspirations and also their powerlessness, are facts that have been sifted so carefully that it is useless to dwell upon them. The result is no better when we examine the consequences of universal suffrage in municipal districts. A few examples briefly described will demonstrate this.

During the last quarter of a century rural municipalities have been for the most part in the hands of peasants. Wealthy landowners were not opposed to this conquest, knowing that, owing to the invincible necessities of present society and the obstacles put in the way by a central authority, nothing efficacious could be attempted against them.

By Socialist push, the same conquest of municipalities has been realised in working-class districts; the benefit to the worker has been small. The municipalities annihilated by the Government have not been able to realise their programme, and disillusion has been the consequence. Yet another danger. Proletarians have turned from their Union to political effort, all their energy has gone in this direction and they have neglected economic organisation, so that bad employers, whose exploiting ferocity has no limits, have benefited by not finding an active and vigorous Trade Union group to oppose them.

In the North of France—Roubaix, Armentières, etc.—where municipalities are or have been Socialistic, wages are frightfully low. In the Ardennes the same obtains. There numerous Trade Unions had been formed, but the members having allowed themselves to be completely absorbed by politics, the Unions have lost the power of opposing their employers.

To all these defects Democracy adds, if possible, yet a greater mistake. Progress, as demonstrated by the whole of our historic past, is the consequence of revolutionary efforts of conscious minorities. Now Democracy organises the stifling of minorities to the profit of sheepish and conservative majorities.

* * *

The work of deviating the economic movement attempted by the middle class could only be momentary. The corporative group is not the result of artificial growth. It springs up and develops spontaneously and inevitably in all surroundings. It is to be found in ancient times, in the Middle Ages, and to-day; and we can show that at all times its development has been obstructed by the possessor of privileges, who, fearing the power of expansion of this method of grouping, took up the cudgels against it, without, however, succeeding in destroying it.

It is not astonishing that corporative groups have such an intense vitality. Their absolute annihilation is impossible of realisation, for the reason that in order to succeed it would be necessary to destroy society itself. Indeed the corporate group has its roots in the existing form of production, and normally proceeds from it. Now, as association for production is an inevitable necessity, how could it be possible for workers gathered together for this purpose to limit their co-operation to matters only useful to their employers, who benefit by exploitation in common? In order to satisfy capitalist interests, producers were brought together in economic groups; and they would have but the intelligence of molluscs had they not sufficient judgment to overstep the boundaries imposed upon them by their exploiters.

Workmen possessing a little bit of common sense were inevitably brought to see the flagrant antagonism that makes them, the producers, the irreconcilable foes of their employers: they are the robbed, their employers are the robbers.

Therefore, for them the discord is so radical that only politicians or employers' menials can spout about "harmony between Capital and Labour."

Besides, wage-earners would not be long in recognising that the employers' rapacity is the more exacting the weaker is working-class resistance. Now it is easy to prove that the isolation of the wage-earner constitutes his maximum of weakness. Consequently, co-operation for production having already taught the exploited to appreciate the benefits of association, they only needed will and initiative to create a group for proletarian self-defence.

They soon learned its value. The middle classes who had no fear of the "People as electors" were compelled by the people as a "Trade Union" to recognise the right of combination and Trade Union liberty.

In consideration of these first results, repeated attempts have been made to divert the working class from the Trade Union. In spite of such manoeuvres, the part played by the Trade Union has grown clearer and more precise, so much so that in future it can be thus defined:—

In present surroundings the permanent mission of the Trade Union is to defend itself against any diminution of vitality—that is to say, against any reduction of wages and any increase of working hours. Besides resisting attack, it must play the part of aggressor and strive to increase the well-being of the Union, which can only be realised by trespassing on capitalist privileges, and constitutes a sort of partial expropriation.

Besides this task of incessant skirmishes, the Union is engaged in

the work of integral emancipation of which it will be the efficacious agent. It will consist in taking possession of social wealth, now in the hands of the middle class, and in reorganising society on a Communist basis, so that with a minimum of productive effort the maximum of well-being will be obtained.

THE RIGHT OF TRADE UNIONISM.

Let us examine how Trade Unionism is constituted. Forming part of a certain corporation, an infinitesimal minority of bold men, possessing sufficient character, create a group in order to resist and to fight capitalists.

What will be the attitude taken by this handful of militant men? Shall they wait to state their claims till they have won over, if not the whole, at least the majority of their fellow-workers belonging to the corporation?

They would act thus if they introduced into the economic struggle the political prejudices held by the majority.

But as the exigencies of the struggle are more urgent than democratic sophisms, the logic of life impels them to action, towards new ideas opposed to the political formulas with which they have been surfeited. To obtain this result it is not necessary for the combatants to possess a great quantity of judgment if only they be not paralysed by formulas and abstractions.

We have even witnessed, in a very important circumstance, the politician Basly respect Trade Union principles and demand that they be put into practice. It is almost superfluous to add that this manoeuvre on his part was unalloyed cunning, in order to discredit revolutionary tendencies. It was at the Miners' Congress held at Lens in 1901, when the question of a general strike was being discussed, that Basly endeavoured to impede the movement by proposing a referendum; and, contrary to democratic theories, he caused the Congress to decide that the number of non-voters should be added to the total of the majority.

This politician who thought himself so cunning would have been much astonished had it been pointed out to him that, instead of having tricked the Congress, he had acted as a revolutionist and had been inspired by Trade Union principles. Indeed in this particular circumstance Basly paid no heed to the opinion of men without judgment; he looked upon them as human zeros, only fit to be added to thinking units, as inert beings whose latent powers could only be put into motion by contact with energetic and bold men. This way of looking at things is the negation of democratic theories that proclaim equality of rights for all men, and teach that the sovereign will of the people is fully carried out by means of universal suffrage. Basly was not clear on this point, and for a while, forgetting his political theories, he was easily influenced by the economic doctrines of his surroundings.

Let us also remark that democracy has never been in vogue among corporate groups. Face to face with social needs, combatants in the ranks of Trade Unionism solved problems as their common sense taught them. Their deeds, therefore, preceded the declaration of Trade Union principles.

Trade Unionists have never believed that they must consult the whole corporation according to rule, and suit their action to please the majority. As many as were of one mind formed a group, and put forth their claim without heeding non-thinkers.

Could anything be more natural! Let us distinguish between the theoretical and abstract right that democracy dangles before our eyes and the true and tangible right that represents the whole of our interests, and the starting-point of which is an act of conscious individuality.

The right of every individual to rise against oppression and exploitation cannot be denied. The right of a man who stands alone to protest and rebel against all remains inalienable. Should it please the masses to bend their backs beneath the yoke and lick the boots of their masters, what matters it to him? The man who abhors cringing, and, not willing to submit, rises and rebels, such a man has right on his side against all. His right is clear and unquestionable, and the right of downtrodden masses, so long as it is restricted to the *Right of Slavery*, is unworthy of notice and cannot be compared to it. The right of these masses will only take shape and be worthy of respect when men, tired of obedience and of working for others, dream of rebellion.

Therefore when a group is formed in which men of judgment come into contact with one another, they need not take the apathy of the masses into account. It is enough for Trade Unionists to regret that non-thinkers lay aside their rights; they cannot allow them the strange privilege of impeding the proclamation and realisation of the right of a thinking minority.

Without any theory having been elaborated beforehand, Trade Unionists were inspired and guided by these ideas when they constituted groups. They acted, and still act, in harmony with them.

From this we gather that Trade Union right has nothing in common with democratic right.

The one is the expression of unthinking majorities who form a compact mass that would stifle thinking minorities. By virtue of the dogma "Sovereignty of the people," which teaches that all men are brothers and equals, this democratic right ends by sanctioning economic slavery and oppressing men of initiative, progress, science, and liberty.

Trade Union right is the exact opposite. Starting from individual sovereignty and the autonomy of human beings, it ends in agreement

in order to live: in solidarity. So that its logical, unquestionable consequence is the realisation of social liberty and equality.

Thus we can understand that by virtue of their individual sovereignty Trade Unionists have grown strong by coming into contact with other identical sovereignties; they do not wait to manifest their will till the nation assents; they think and they act in the name of all, as if their group were really composed of the masses as a whole. Logic leads them to think and act as if they were the whole of the working class; in fact, the entire nation.

Besides, what proves to us that militant Trade Unionists are justified in considering themselves exponents of the aspirations and the will of all is that when circumstances require it—for example, in a case of strife with their employers—non-Unionists follow the Trade Union lead and spontaneously group themselves, fighting side by side with their comrades who with patience and energy have organised the movement.

The non-Unionists, the unthinking, need therefore not be offended by this sort of moral guardianship assumed by those with judgment. Militant Trade Unionists refuse none who come with goodwill, and those who are hurt at being treated as unworthy of notice need only withdraw from their inferior position, leave their isolation, shake off their inertia, and enter a Trade Union.

More than this, laggards have no right to complain, as they profit by results gained by their comrades who think and fight, and benefit without having had to suffer in the struggle.

Thus the benefits gained by a few are extended to all, which proves the superiority of the Trade Union right over democratic right. How far Trade Union principles are removed from middle-class platitudes, which teach that every worker is master of his destiny! In the working class every worker has the conviction that when fighting for himself he is fighting for all, and it never enters his head to find in this a motive for recrimination or inaction.

The workers disdain the narrowness and the pettiness of middle-class egoism that under the cloak of individual expansion breeds poverty and disease, and dries up the springs of life. Convinced that mutual aid in order to live is the condition of all social progress, Trade Unionists identify their interest with the common interest. That is why when they do act it is not in their own name, but in the name of the people whose destiny they shape. By further logic they do not limit their activity to their Association, but, stating general claims, they extend it to the whole of the working class. Thus, when they have wrung an improvement from Capitalism, they expect all to benefit by it—all! non-Unionists! the unthinking, even blacklegs!

This feeling of broad-minded fraternity, this profoundly human understanding of social harmony, raises Trade Unionism to a plane of excellence. Its superiority to democratic principles, which only breed shabby tricks, fratricidal struggles, and social discord, is unquestionable. Therefore Trade Union right is the expression of the new profoundly human right that rouses men's consciences and opposes ancient dogmas by preparing social regeneration: a society in which the oppressive system of law will be replaced by a system of free contracts consented to by parties concerned, improvable or revocable at will; in which capitalist production will give way to economic federation, brought about by the cohesion of producing groups, whose members will assure to human beings the maximum of well-being and liberty.

CONCLUSION.

It would be more to the point to say "Introduction." In these articles I have endeavoured to define the ideas that guide Trade Unions. The most important is still to follow. It is to show the harmony of Trade Union action with Trade Union theories, and by an accumulation of facts and examples prove that, even sometimes unconsciously, Trade Unions are inspired by these ideas.

They demonstrate that the application of these guiding ideas greatly influences present society, and that face to face with ancient organisms overtaken by old age there are being developed germs of a new society in which human beings will evolve without hindrance in the midst of autonomous groups.

[This series of articles will shortly be republished in pamphlet form.]

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

Spain.

Dear Comrades of FREEDOM,

We are at the present moment in a period of brutal reaction. The Spanish Government has suspended the Constitutional guarantees in Barcelona. The inquisitorial police of this country are determined without doubt to use all disgraceful forms of repression. The offices of *Tierra y Libertad* are besieged at all hours by a gang of miserable police spies. On the occasion of an Anarchist reunion at Barcelona, all the writers of *Tierra y Libertad* were arrested. The Governor, Ossorio y Gallardo, has closed the Social Studies Club. At the second search made in this club the police arrested our dear friend Julia Iborra. The number imprisoned is nearly thirty. The comrades of the "4 de Mayo" Group of Barcelona came out of prison recently. Several comrades have been expelled. Julia Iborra and Manuela E. Ballbona have been roughly handled by the police. Julia's

young son was violently torn away from her, and Manuela had a miscarriage in consequence of bad treatment by her gaolers. The Anarchist papers, *Tierra y Libertad*, *El Rebelde*, and *Tramontana*, are confiscated every week. On January 19 a protest meeting was held in Madrid. Others have been organised in several places. We ask you to join us in our protest.

Fraternal greetings.

GRUPO 4 DE MAYO.

Note.—The cause of these repressive measures is the frequent explosion of dynamite bombs thrown by the reactionaries in the streets of Barcelona.

Japan.

We take the following interesting paragraphs from the *Heiminshimbun*, a Japanese Socialist semi-monthly:—

Manoeuvres begin from the end of October to November. Everywhere army divisions stand. Local authorities where they take place persuade people to spend a great deal of money to welcome and to feast soldiers, putting them to much trouble. They give holidays to the school children to let the soldiers lodge in the school houses. Authorities give much inconvenience and trouble to the people in the name of "Patriotism." There is arising a thought against "Militarism" among people.

The general meeting of the Social Policy Association, which is composed of the professors of the universities, will be opened by a discussion on "Factory Ordinance." Greedy and ignorant capitalists are invited, but not the representatives of labourers. Professor Dr. S. Kawadzu, who distinguished himself by criticising Socialism from a point quite beside the mark, not having read any chapter from "Capital," by Karl Marx, explains with all his might that "Socialism will be prevented by social policy."

Two comrades arrested for offending against the Press Law have been released, leaving two others in prison, Comrades Ishikawa and Yamaguchi.

PROPAGANDA NOTES.

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

The International Anarchist Federation of the English Provinces.

The first month in the new year has gone, but it has proved that, in spite of all drawbacks, the general awakening which occurred in the last three months of the old year is still with us, for the general signs of activity all round denote an earnestness and sincerity that must give courage and faith to each and all of us.

LEEDS.

The secretary of the Leeds Group, E. Fox, 1 Fieldhead Terrace, Camp Road, writes *re* the publishing of free literature, that all Anarchists should do their utmost to help this form of propaganda, justly remarking that the books of any great writer to-day are, owing to the high prices charged for them by the publishers, outside the purchasing power of the average worker. Thus it is our duty to print and publish these works in such form that they can be within the reach of and known to all. Hence in the name of the Federation he asks all Anarchists to do their utmost to help the Federation in its work, for, as he says, we do not want to make money, but Anarchists.

The group have taken over a hall in which weekly meetings will be held, and have decided upon the following plan (which might be copied with good results by other groups). Each comrade shall do his best to convert as many as possible to Anarchism, and at every alternate group meeting give a report of his work, the best methods and means to be discussed of furthering this form of propaganda.

MANCHESTER.

The group have indeed had an unfortunate month, for they have had the greatest difficulty in finding a suitable meeting-place. But firm determination won the day, and I am more than pleased to record that they have not only secured a place, but have already furnished it, and hold their first public meeting on Saturday, February 22.

An educational class is held weekly under the care of Comrade Clark.

SOUTHPORT.

Although few in numbers, this group have resolved to give the residents and visitors of this sea-side resort the fullest opportunity of hearing what Anarchism means. They intend taking a hall and holding weekly public lectures in it for the next quarter as a means of arousing sufficient public sympathy to enable them to carry on their propaganda on the sands during the summer months.

LIVERPOOL.

The Freedom Group have held weekly lectures and discussions during the last month. As they have now secured the Cabinet Makers' Hall, Islington, they intend each fourth Sunday having a

lecturer from another town. Last week Comrade Levy, of Manchester, was the lecturer. In the afternoon he dealt with Anarchism and Science, giving a well-reasoned and carefully thought out exposition, which gave rise to a healthy discussion, allowing full opportunity to the lecturer to display his thorough grip of the subject. In the evening he gave a literary address on Heine and Spinoza, which was constantly interrupted by the applause of his audience. This was followed by a concert undertaken by Mr. Fishman and company, of Manchester, to whom all comrades' thanks are due, and brought to its close a day long to be remembered by the Liverpool Freedom Group.

The Direct Action Group have not been in strong evidence this month, partly due to the holidays and partly due to the illness of several of the most active comrades. But I hear that once more they have entered the fray, determined to give a better account of themselves this year than ever.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

The Freedom Group are working steadily, holding group meetings at which they discuss the principles of Anarchism, and last week they held a public meeting, which was well attended and gave the local comrades much courage.

CARDIFF.

The secretary of the group writes that they are not dead, but very much alive. With the assistance of a few progressive spirits, they have now formed a library, and invite all sympathisers to help them to spread the gospel of discontent. They declare that though they are in the midst of darkness, they have resolved to enlighten the workers by teaching them the principles of Anarchism.

SWANSEA.

This group is the latest addition to the Federation, and we feel proud, for has not the group's coming into existence through the Federation once more proved the necessity of organised effort? Yes, Swansea has arrived, and though they are young, still they evince a strong desire to make their principles known in this home of superstitious bigotry, and with energy and grit they may pull through.

GLASGOW.

The Anarchist Communist Group commenced the month with a tea party and literary evening, which proved a social and financial success, concluding the month by holding a very successful literary evening, at which several comrades rendered revolutionary songs, and an address was given in Russian by Comrade Rollin.

During the last month I have received the following sums for the printing of free literature—Southport 7s., Glasgow 10s., Cardiff 2s. 6d., total 19s. 6d. Towards Federation expenses—Leeds 2s. 6d., Manchester 3s. 6d., Newcastle-on-Tyne (Freedom) 2s., Southport 7s., Glasgow 2s. 6d., total 17s. 6d. The total expense for postage, etc., up to date is £1 13s. 9d., leaving a deficit of 16s. 3d. All groups are asked to help in clearing off this small amount.

Comrades, you can materially help the Federation in its work with your financial assistance, as we need money badly to go on with the printing of literature for free distribution. Every little mite for this purpose will be acceptable. But we especially appeal to the federated groups to see to it that we do not fail in our efforts for lack of their material support. Have we no comrades in Derby, Sheffield, Burnley, Hull, and other provincial towns? If there are any, will they kindly communicate with me by letter at 41 Rutherglen Road, S.S., Glasgow?

A. DESPRES.

BATTERSEA.

The debate on Anarchism between our comrade W. Underwood and J. Fitzgerald, of the S.P.G.B., took place at Laburnham House on January 12, Mr. Chandler presiding. The hall was full. J. Fitzgerald in opening read extracts from a book, quoting Max Stirner, Tucker, Kropotkin, and Proudhon. He said Stirner was the most logical, and if he was right, all the rest were wrong; that Proudhon advocated voting, the suffrage, etc.; and that free organisation was a myth. Underwood said debates as a rule were like prize-fights, but he hoped this one would be an exception. As his opponent had only attacked Anarchists, not Anarchism, he would tell them what Anarchism was. He then explained that Anarchism meant freedom; that freedom meant the absence of law and authority in the economic, social, and affectional life of the individual; that all our misery was the consequence of unnatural laws made by man. If laws are good, why alter them? If bad, why enforce them? Idiots make laws, and asses administer them. The very policeman in the street is our master. Yet there's only one policeman to look after 500 people. Didn't they think the 500 could look after themselves better than the policeman could. So we must organise ourselves in solidarity, and end law and authority. Free organisation, it was said, is a myth; but as a matter of fact we had examples of it every day, when men and women organised without compulsion.

The time allotted to the debate being passed, the discussion became general, and so much interest was evinced that Mr. Fitzgerald accepted another offer to debate, and it will take place at the same address (134 High Street, Battersea) on Sunday, January 23, when our comrade N. Walter will uphold Anarchism.

JACK CADE.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

A few brief lines to show that our International Anarchist Communist Group is still moving. Next March we hope to have John

Turner with us, so that Newcastle State Socialists may have a clear exposition of what Anarchism really is. On Wednesday, January 22, at the group's room, a paper entitled "Anarchism v. Social Democracy" was given by R. Stuart, and discussion followed. Comrade T. L. Heron, a member of the group, will shortly give a paper on "Mutual Aid," to which we look forward with much interest.

H. RUBIN.

BELFAST.

We have received very encouraging letters from our comrade McAra, who has left the Meadows of Edinburgh and taken up his old rôle of agitator and literature seller on the Custom House Steps here. He holds forth every Sunday. FREEDOM and pamphlets go off like hot cakes, and there is evidently a splendid opening for Anarchist propaganda in the Emerald Isle, which has so long been the happy hunting ground of the priest and politician. McAra, good luck to you!

Group Notice.

The Newcastle-on-Tyne International Anarchist Communist Group hold their meetings and lectures every Wednesday at 8 p.m. in 71 Cookson Street.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

(January 9—February 8.)

FREEDOM *Guarantee Fund*—B. Faitson 1s., C. Grinling 2s. 6d., A. G. 6d., R. O. 6d., G. E. 1s., N. £1 10s.
FREEDOM *Subscriptions*—C. C. Cotterill 1s. 6d., J. Hellum 1s. 6d., G. Glass 1s. 6d., M. Olsen 1s. 6d.
Sales of FREEDOM—F. Goulding 6s. 4d., W. Underwood 9s., A. Goldberg 5s., Goodman 1s. 5d., B. Faitson 1s. 6d., S. Carter 1s. 6d., M. Silverman 2s., Meetings 5s., D. Wormald 1s. 6d., S. Vermont 1s. 6d., Henderson 3s. 6d., R. Gundersen 2s., J. McAra 2s. 8d., B. Greenblatt 3s., A. Foner 1s. 6d.
Pamphlet and Book Sales—"Mother Earth" £3 2s. 6d., W. Underwood 3s. 4d., J. Scarceriaux 2s., J. Hose 1s., G. Mollett 3s. 6d., A. Goldberg 6s. 2d., T. S. 6s. 6d., B. Faitson 3s., M. Silverman 2s. 6d., A. R. S. 2s. 3d., J. McAra 3s., B. Greenblatt 2s., A. Foner 2s. 3d.

HENDERSONS,

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

**For Revolutionary Literature,
Socialist, Labour, Rationalist, and all Advanced
Thought Books and Periodicals.**

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

MOTHER EARTH.

Published by EMMA GOLDMAN.

Offices: 210 East 13th Street, New York City, U.S.A.

Can be obtained from FREEDOM Office. 6d. monthly, post-free 7d.

Back numbers supplied.

Specimen copy sent on receipt of 1d. stamp.

Pamphlet and Book List.

ANARCHIST COMMUNISM: ITS BASIS AND PRINCIPLES. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
ANARCHISM: ITS PHILOSOPHY AND IDEAL. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.
THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
WAR. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
LAW AND AUTHORITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
ORGANISED VENGEANCE—CALLED "JUSTICE." By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
RESPONSIBILITY AND SOLIDARITY IN THE LABOR STRUGGLE. 1d.
SOCIALISM THE REMEDY. By HENRY GLASSE. 1d.
SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN GERMANY. By GUSTAV LANDAUER. 1d.
EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. By E. RECLUS. 1d.
THE KING AND THE ANARCHIST. 2d.
MONOPOLY; OR, HOW LABOUR IS ROBBED. WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
USEFUL WORK VERSUS USELESS TOIL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONGRESS, 1907. 1d.
THE SOCIAL GENERAL STRIKE. By ARNOLD ROLLER. 2d.
THE TRAGEDY OF WOMAN'S EMANCIPATION. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 3d. post-free.
THE CRIMINAL ANARCHY LAW. By T. SCHROEDER. 3d. post-free.
THE MASTERS OF LIFE. By MAXIM GORKY. 3d. post-free.

THE CONQUEST OF BREAD. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 10s. 6d.
CONQUET DU PAIN. By P. KROPOTKIN. (In French.) 3s. 6d. post-free.
MEMOIRS OF A REVOLUTIONIST. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 5s. 6d. post-free.
FIELDS, FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS. By P. KROPOTKIN. Paper cover 6d., post-free 9d.; cloth 1s., post-free 1s. 3d.
NEWS FROM NOWHERE. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1s. 6d.; postage 4d.
A DREAM OF JOHN BAIL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 2s., postage 3d.
GOD AND THE STATE. By M. BAKOUNINE. 8d. post-free.
A VINDICATION OF NATURAL SOCIETY. By EDMUND BURKE. 1s. and 6d., postage 2d. and 1d.
WALDEN. By H. THOREAU. 1s. and 6d., postage 2d. and 1d.
THE FRENCH REVOLUTION. By C. L. JAMES. 2s. 6d. post-free.
ENGLAND'S IDEAL. By EDWARD CARPENTER. 2s. 6d. and 1s., post. 3d.
CIVILISATION: ITS CAUSE AND CURE. By EDWARD CARPENTER. 2s. 6d. and 1s., postage 3d.
LOVE'S COMING OF AGE. A Series of Papers on the Relations of the Sexes. By EDWARD CARPENTER. 3s. 6d., postage 4d.

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