

Freedom

JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. XXIII.—No. 237.

JANUARY, 1909.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

NOTES.

The Weapons of Reaction.

For the second time in a brief period of a few years the Trade Unions have been severely bitten by those watch-dogs of the capitalists' interests, the minions of the law. Why reaction in England differs so much from that of other countries is because of the multiplicity of the methods it employs. On the Continent it employs police and military, and as a rule little else. Here we also have police and military, but "held in reserve," while our good Liberals and Radicals use other and very efficacious means of harassing the enemy. The most cunning of all these is the law. Legality is such a fetich with the English worker that he will go cap in hand to the judges and ask for justice. That is what the Trade Unions have been doing for years, and now they are so entangled in legal forms and Acts of Parliament that they never cease from stumbling over the obstacles purposely placed in their way. The decision against the right of the Unions to enforce a levy for political purposes is a striking instance of how the law holds them in its hands. To make the levy compulsory was, of course, a gross infringement of the individual liberty of the members. It is not for this reason, however, that the Judges have given their adverse decision, but simply to keep them occupied with their own internal affairs rather than they should be busy with social problems. The Labour Party want political action. Well, the reactionaries will provide them with plenty of it, not of the kind that threatens the capitalist, but of the kind that concerns their own "legal" existence.

Who is Responsible?

English hypocrisy is nowhere more apparent than in its conventional attitude on the sex question. Anarchism, which upholds the liberty, dignity, and independence of woman equally with that of man, is, of course, outside the pale of civilisation in this matter. Knowing "civilisation," we regard that as a distinct advantage. But we decline to be held responsible for all the crime and misery which bourgeois morality inflicts on those who are unfortunate in their love relations. On the other hand, we distinctly accuse this so-called morality of being responsible at least for one crime, with all its terrible consequences, that has recently happened. The confession of Collins, who has been hanged for murdering the girl he "loved," throws some light on the mentality of people imbued with the conventional notions of love and its right of ownership of woman, body and soul. Here are his words:—

"I proved as much as I could to Dorothy that I worshipped her. It grieved me deeply when Dorothy told me she wouldn't marry me in time to come. I am not sorry that I killed Dorothy Lawrence. Girls that get tired of a man after promising to marry him are better dead than alive."

That last sentence explains a whole history of crime and misery which has yet to be written. It is only a frank and brutal statement of the feelings that in many cases underlie the attitude of the "average sensual man" towards the woman. It springs entirely from the ideas inculcated by those who denounce "free love." And so we have this egotist killing the object he "loves" because it cannot be *his*. Then the "law" is called upon to try him, finds him guilty, and to uphold its dignity indulges in a little murder on its own account. Finally, to put the finishing touch to this mockery of justice, the priest gives the victim of the law a passport into heaven. And again we ask—Who is responsible?

Mutual Aid.

Kropotkin has taken pains to show how much humanity owes to the principle of mutual aid. We all know that the spirit animating mankind to work in this direction has a

constant and daily expression. But it is only when a catastrophe such as recently fell upon Messina and Reggio shocks the world that the real significance of the Communist and mutual aid positions are realised. We not only see and hear of deeds of superhuman heroism—generally achieved by common mortals who are supposed to need rulers to teach them what is right—but we find the strongest supporters of capitalistic individualism loosening the purse-strings to aid their fellow mortals. Now in this connection something very true has been observed, for once in a way, by the Rev. J. Scott Lidgett. Speaking of unemployment and the suffering in the slums, he said, referring to the recent earthquake: "He was not quite sure whether the greater sufferers were not those whose long-drawn agony from week to week, from month to month, and from year to year was the disgrace and almost the despair of our so-called Christian civilisation." This is only too true. But must we have a social cataclysm before the blind selfishness of this society can give place to human solidarity and the communal life which means plenty for all?

The Wicked Stepmother.

People seldom or never stop to think how much good work is done by voluntary organisations of men and women who not only initiate reforms, but keep a watchful eye on State-controlled institutions. How much this latter function is needed may be understood from a letter that appeared in the *Times* (January 8). It is from Mrs. Henrietta Barnett, honorary secretary of the State Children's Association, and it practically condemns in every detail the administration of the State pauper schools. Years ago Dickens described the fate of those unhappy little beings who fell under the curse of the State and its officials. Things have not improved much. Children may be better fed, but the letter describes "rows and rows of fat, clean, and well-shod infants, sitting bored and listless, listening with praiseworthy patience to deadly details about some plant or animal they were never likely to see or hear of again, or reciting in unison what they did not understand, or reading—again in unison—some simple primer for the third or fourth time." They have no joy in their play, we are told; no individuality, no initiative. All is order, rule, and discipline, till even the *Daily News* has to remark that "at the root of the evil lies the negation of freedom." It is a sad picture! But what a folly and a crime it is in those who would throw the whole of the destinies of the people into the hands of the State. For this is only a miniature of what the wicked stepmother produces in *all* her works.

Two Pictures.

The *Star* gives some account of the recent entrance of Miss Gould into "New York society." The function, it is said, cost £20,000; and the sickening details of the expenditure and of the imbeciles who lavished it on their own useless bodies are better left out. But as the guests left in the early morning hours, another picture, and an inevitable one in capitalist society, presented itself to the passer-by. The *New York Evening Sun* says:—"Last night's cold wave is causing intense suffering. The municipal lodging-houses overflowed before midnight, and every relief station was full. Long lines of hungry men waited for bread and coffee. Many collapsed with cold and were taken to hospital." If these are not the conditions that foretell the coming of a social revolution, it would be difficult to say what are. It is the callous indifference of the wealthy, their cruel greed and heartless selfishness, that make one dread to think what their fate might be if the starving army of the disinherited held them in its power.

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

DIRECT ACTION versus LEGISLATION.

By J. BLAIR SMITH.

CHAPTER II. (continued).

What respect can we give to an institution which, as every one will know who cares to study, owes its inception to the murder and robbery of the people; its perpetuation to the slavery and ignorance of the people? It may have changed its name and form; its administrators may now be many where formerly they were few; it may no longer be the caprice of an individual, but the joint opinion of a number; still in every essential it is the same. The institution of monopoly in land and capital, and the enslavement of the people, gave rise to the necessity for law. For the safeguarding of a minority monopolising all the means of life, it has existed all through the ages; in defence of the same minority it exists to-day.

Of course, I am aware that some philosophers contend that government and law arose from the desire among men to maintain the equilibrium between individuals, to avoid strife and disputes, and to promote peace and harmony. Each individual, we are told, sacrificed to a certain extent his liberty of action, agreed to maintain and abide by the law, in exchange for the guarantee of life, freedom to labour and to pursue happiness within certain well-defined limits.

Now, while this contention may be advanced with some appearance of truth in regard to countries such as the United States or France since the Revolution, it certainly cannot suffer analysis nor the light of historical research in regard to this country; and even in the United States and France, or in other Republican countries where Republicanism is a comparatively recent growth, it is far more apparent than real. An analysis and criticism of the conditions existing in these countries when Republicanism was instituted will prove that, after all, law and government owe their inception to practically the same causes as they do in this country. But even if this were so, even if law were the outcome of the people's desire to live in peace and harmony, and even if they had agreed to maintain the law and abide by it in order to produce this desired result, there surely ought to be reciprocal obligations and reciprocal duties. Are we not entitled to say that a bargain ought not to be one-sided? If one of the parties fails to fulfil his agreement, it is time for the other to withdraw. Is it the case to-day that law, in return for our acquiescence and unhesitating obedience, offers us life, freedom to labour and to pursue happiness? We know it does not. Have we not dozens of parties protesting, agitating against some part of the law which deprives some portion of the people of those fundamental conditions which law is supposed to exist to guarantee? If the law were fulfilling the obligations with which those theorists have endowed it, the widespread misery and the consequent discontent and unrest of to-day would not exist. But theory and practice often vary, and thus it is that while theoretically and collectively all the law officers and the organised forces of the Government are our servants, individually and practically the meanest policeman that walks the streets is our master and can compel our obedience to his behests. One look around any of our cities, a glance at the slums and all the horrors they contain, are surely proof sufficient that the law has failed to fulfil its obligations.

Why should we stand by ours?

If, as these theorists maintain, the well-being of the community gave rise to law; if the primary object of all rules and regulations was the protection of the life and property of all members of society, within a certain well-defined area, the well-being of the community must be above law, of more importance than law—not of less, as so many of us are apt to consider to-day. This is the whole point. The life, happiness, and well-being of a community, being of more importance than law, ought never to be sacrificed to this savage and barbarous fetish worship of law.

But let us leave the theorists to the enjoyment of their theory. Enough has been written, even from their standpoint, to question the right of the law to impose itself upon us and to demand the religious awe and implicit obedience which it receives from the great bulk of the people. We know that the law had not such a peaceful origin as these individuals would maintain. It began in the Dark Ages, and ever since then Church and State, for reasons of their own, have both conspired to keep the people in leading-strings, to darken their minds and fetter their reason by teachings, from early childhood, of the majesty, the invincibility, and infallibility of the law. But the human race is awakening once more from its sleep of centuries.

Last century, which was so rich in inventions and discoveries, submitted every institution to the test of keen examination. No theory, either of religion or of government, social or economic, was too sacred to escape pitiless criticism, and we may be sure that the law was compelled to stand this ordeal as well. It has evolved shattered and broken. Like the divine right of kings and the idol worship of savages, it is all-powerful until you question its *raison d'être*, its right to impose itself upon you, its origin; then, like the superstitions which have preceded it, it falls to the ground. With the disappearance of its divinity, people will recognise it for what it is—a collection of rules and regulations promulgated by men who are long since dead, and who were considerably less informed on many things than the child at the board school to-day; that these rules and regulations are only man-made, based upon the opinions of men (very fallible and interested), and are no more worthy the awe and reverence they inspire than the

opinions of any other fairly intelligent man. Even if we grant that these rules and regulations may have been necessary and beneficial in the age in which they were promulgated, that is no reason that they are necessary and beneficial to-day. Stage-coaches were necessary and beneficial in the eighteenth century, but to revert to them to-day would mean the complete paralysis of the country.

We must remember that progress and expansion is the law of evolution; that we have no right to bind the future, nor has the past had any right to bind us. Conditions and circumstances are always changing with the spread of education and the development of intelligence, necessitating the continual readjustment of social relations. Laws prevent this readjustment by erecting a hard and fast barrier, past which we must not travel. Well, you may attempt to dam up a river, but sooner or later it will reach the sea by breaking your barrier and possibly flooding the surrounding country as well. The human race, like a river, is always wending its way, now tortuously and turbid, now impetuously and straight toward its ideal, dim and undefined, perhaps, yet still its ideal—happiness for all. You may attempt to bar its progress, but your barriers will be broken and you yourself will be swept away by the stream which you are foolish enough to imagine you can divert from its course. The French Revolution is an example of the result of attempting to dam for ever the stream of human progress. Its lessons are surely apparent to everyone; its repetition is too horrible to contemplate. Has not Carlyle asked:—"Is one French Revolution not enough? You will have two; you will have just as many as are necessary." Let us hope not. Let us learn from the mistakes of the past, and no longer pile up laws to block the march to the future. It is not more laws which are desired, but less; and if we consider how existing laws operate on the people, and that there are upwards of 400,000 laws on the statute book—enough to keep a man studying for the next few hundred years if he wished to become acquainted with them all—it is surely apparent to all that the law is impotent for good, and is only necessary because of the propertied interests behind it. Look at it in operation to-day and you find this the case: that it has not changed its character one iota during a progress of centuries.

Take every dispute which has been waged between employer and employed during the last hundred years, and in every case you find the law ranged on the side of the employer. In many cases all the armed forces of the Government are placed at the disposal of the employing classes to terrorise the men back to their employment at their old rates or at a reduction. Again and again workmen on strike have been bayoneted and shot, as at Featherstone and Belfast, because they have had the audacity to protest against the conditions imposed upon them by the employers.

The whole machinery of the law has been utilised during strikes to send men to prison for offences that were absolutely trivial and scarcely worth the attention of any serious man, even if the men were guilty of such offences, which in many cases was extremely doubtful. To look at a blackleg, according to many magistrates, is a very heinous crime and punished with severity, "without the option of a fine."

If, after having been on strike for some time, during which you discovered that the law afforded you no protection from the rapaciousness and cruelty of your employers—that, in fact, all its strength and power were used against you—or, being laid up by a long and severe illness, your rent has fallen into arrears, your landlord or his agent hands you an ultimatum that unless a certain sum be forthcoming on a certain date, you will be compelled to leave the house. In vain you protest against his conditions; in vain you point out that it is impossible for you to go outside for a few weeks yet; you plead with him to grant you time and you will pay up every penny when you get back to work. All is in vain; he is inexorable, and he has the law at his back. If you refuse to quit, the law officers, in the shape of policemen, will enforce the landlord's commands. If you are unable to walk, they will carry you out and deposit you on the street with your starving wife and children. Without a home or shelter, your thoughts will be bitter on the subjects of law and landlord, and "man's inhumanity to man"; but your troubles are not over yet. If unable to find shelter, either from your friends or by securing another house, you will probably be arrested for attempting to sleep outside, and sent to prison as a vagabond "without any visible means of support." Thus it is the law may degrade an honest workman into a vagabond. You thought the law existed for your protection! Ah, no, my friends; the law exists for the protection of the powerful and great, but not for you. If, in your starving condition, in which, with the assistance of the law, your employer and landlord have placed you, you steal or attempt to steal a loaf, you will probably be sent to prison for some time. On emerging, you will find it almost impossible to obtain employment, and gradually you will drift into the ranks of the criminal classes. The law which you respected has made you a criminal—for without its assistance your landlord and employer would be absolutely powerless.

If, on the other hand, you had been born in a higher rank of society, you might have become a company promoter. Under these circumstances you could steal—not a loaf, or a shilling or two, but thousands and millions, and the law would take you by the hand, smile upon you, admire you; you would be its ideal of what a great man should be. It would be immaterial to the law that in acquiring your wealth you had sacrificed the lives and happiness of thousands; that the corner in wheat which made your "pile" brought starvation, misery, and suffering upon innocent women and hapless children. You have made it, by what means it matters little, and the law will respect you, protect you, even though you bestow upon it the contempt which it so

well deserves. Steal a loaf, and you will earn for yourself the title of "low scoundrel"; steal a million, and you are a "highly respected gentleman, of undoubted respectability," and the front pews of our churches and the front benches of our legislature will be opened to you. If you desire a deer forest, the law is at your beck and call. For you it will depopulate a part of the Highlands of Scotland; deport the people to Canada or elsewhere; tear down their homes, so that your pleasure may not be interfered with by the huts and cots of the crofters. If you be wealthy, the law exists for you; for, after all, the Government which enforces it is merely the executive arm of the capitalist and wealthy classes. The protection of a class—a minority of the people—was the cause of its inception; to protect the same class in its enjoyment of the wealth stolen from the people, it lives to-day; with the abolition of monopoly in the means of life it will disappear.

There are, of course, sincere and honest men who, thoroughly alive to the origin and development of law and to its evil effects to-day, yet believe it is necessary for the well-being of society; that without it conditions would become too awful to contemplate. To claim that without law crimes of almost every description against persons would become rampant, is to show a very superficial knowledge of human nature. To give law credit for the general good feeling which exists among the masses of men, and, taking the population into consideration, the remarkably small number of crimes of violence committed, is to exhibit a woeful ignorance of human evolution and development. It is an axiom that every society has the criminals it deserves, and, as Kropotkin observes, society, which shares in the glory of its geniuses, must also share in the shame of its criminals. When one takes into consideration the many agencies combining to degrade and demoralise the people; when one considers the privations and sufferings endured by the majority of the workers; when one thinks that after a life of toil, scandalously inadequately remunerated, the remaining few years of life may be passed within a Bastille which the people look upon with even more horror than prison itself—the wonder is, not that crimes are so many, but that they are so few. When the reward for long hours at arduous labour is so small and uncertain; when often honest labour means the contracting of foul diseases, as in our chemical factories; when it means the early death or the premature decay of a man, is it any wonder that some of our workers prefer a life of crime to this so-called honest employment? Take away the horrible economic conditions which drive men to crime, take away your lawyers, judges, and policemen, who live upon crime, and crime will almost disappear.

The law does not prevent crime. It may punish the individual who commits a criminal act by sending him to prison, but that is all. This punishment is supposed to act as a deterrent upon the individual concerned and upon others, but it is very rarely that a man who once has spent a year or two in prison leads an honest life when he is free; he invariably returns sooner or later to prison. The prison discipline and the prison life reduce the man to a mere automaton, devoid of all will, self-control, and self-reliance; and thus when he quits prison helpless, despised by the "respectable," dogged by detectives, driven out of any honest employment he may have secured, he falls back upon the old associates, who, after all, are the only people who do not look upon him with suspicion; and till death, probably in some prison, he is a criminal. Society has made him what he is, and punishes him for its own folly. That punishment is not a deterrent, nor does prison reform a man, can be proved in any court, where the majority of prisoners tried have already spent one, two, three, five, and ten years of their lives in prison. It is also a fact that in any city there are more murders committed within a few months after an execution than within the same time preceding it. The report of an execution, with all its ghastly and barbarous formalities, is read with avidity by some in whose brains the dividing line between sanity and insanity is very faintly delineated. All their morbid instincts are pandered to as they gloat over the horrible details; and is it any wonder when the law has so little respect for human life, that these people, mentally unhinged, should have as little? No; punishment is no deterrent from crime, and we must look for some other cause than law for the remarkable absence of crime on the part of the masses.

We find it here. In primeval times, owing to his weakness and helplessness, face to face with Nature and wilder and stronger animals, the closest possible association was imperative for man in the struggle for existence. Actions, at first voluntary, after constant repetition became involuntary; that is, they became habits. These habits transmitted to offspring, and constantly repeated by them, and so on to each new generation, are so deeply impressed upon the brain as to become ineradicable.

If to-day we consider instinctively that certain actions are moral, and if we possess certain moral habits, it is because thousands of our ancestors found they were necessary for the welfare of the race and the preservation of the species, and accordingly practised them. We are the product of the past, and have inherited those feelings whose expression in actions, once voluntary and laboured, now involuntary and spontaneous, were necessary to our ancestors for the survival and development of the race. Thus this close association of primeval days, carried on probably for thousands of years, during which mutual aid was a stern necessity, has developed within us the feeling of solidarity, which has become an instinct. During the long period when co-operative thought and effort were imperative there evolved the idea—never defined perhaps, yet existing, prompting many deeds from those early ages till now—that an injury inflicted upon one was an injury inflicted upon all.

Even to-day, in the twentieth century, with its "devil take the hindmost" philosophy, we find many examples of mutual help, of sacrifices made on behalf of others, which testify to the endurance of this principle within the minds of men. The Christian religion, prostituted as it is, owes its vitality and influence to its affirmation of these principles of equality and solidarity, practised so long by the race. In the slums, in the street, we find them practised daily by men who never ask the reason for acting in this way, but simply act thus because they cannot act otherwise.

The man who jumps into the river to rescue a drowning person feels at once the necessity for the act, and having the power, he acts spontaneously. This feeling of necessity was born ages back, when society was far less complex, and man saw clearly how indissolubly the individual was linked with his fellows. This feeling of solidarity, of mutual aid, the desire to save people from pain, to bestow happiness, exists to-day, weakened a little perhaps—owing to our commercial system—but still strong; and it is to this, and not to law, that we must ascribe the fact that so comparatively few crimes are committed; and on law, on our social and economic conditions, we must lay the responsibility for these. Without this feeling of solidarity society would be impossible. To imagine that without policemen, judges, and gaolers all order would vanish, and murder and rapine would become general, is to make a very false estimate of human nature. If human nature were so despicable and wicked as some people imagine, one policeman would scarcely be a restraint upon a thousand people (which is about the proportion in cities); and even they themselves, actuated by the same feelings, would be as likely to run amuck as the rest of the people. Even granting the policemen were a restraint, still they could not compel the many kindnesses rendered by strangers to strangers spontaneously, without any hope of reward. No, it is not to law and policemen that we owe the (taking the economic conditions into consideration) surprisingly good feeling which exists to-day among the people, and whose existence necessitates so few policemen in comparison to the population. The very acquiescence of the people to laws and conditions which are crushing them is sufficient to prove the intense desire among mankind to live in peace and harmony with their fellows rather than in strife. This feeling will always exist among men. The desire for mutual help and mutual sympathy has always been a part of human nature, and will always endure; without it, no matter how many laws were in force, society would have perished long ago. It is this, not law, which welds human society together. With the abolition of our commercial system this feeling of solidarity will be developed and strengthened, and the law will be seen in its true light as the enforced mandates of interested men who have wrongfully acquired the wealth that should be free to all.

Looked at in this light, stripped of all its divinity, a superstition dissipated, why should we fall down and worship it still? Let us be men, and decide for ourselves the morality or immorality (never mind the legality or illegality) of any action as our reason, intelligence, and experience dictate; and having decided, be prepared to act or abide by that decision.

(To be continued.)

ANARCHY.

(Translated from the German by HARRY LYMAN KOOPMAN.)

Ever reviled, accursed,—ne'er understood,

Thou art the grisly terror of our age.

"Wreck of all order," cry the multitude,

"Art thou, and war and murder's endless rage."

O, let them cry. To them that ne'er have striven

The truth that lies behind a word to find,

To them the word's right meaning was not given.

They shall continue blind among the blind.

But thou, O word, so clear, so strong, so pure,

That sayest all which I for goal have taken,

I give thee to the future!—Thine secure

When each at least unto himself shall waken.

Comes it in sunshine? In the tempest's thrill?

I cannot tell . . . but it the earth shall see!

I am an Anarchist! Wherefore I will

Not rule, and also ruled I will not be!

John Henry Mackay.

ANARCHISM.

By DR. PAUL ELTZBACHER. Translated by S. T. BYINGTON.

An impartial and unbiassed study and analysis of the doctrines of the leading Anarchists of the world from Godwin downwards, with extensive extracts from their works. This is perhaps the best survey of the subject yet written. The contents embrace:—1. The Problem. 2. Law, the State, and Property. 3. Godwin's Teaching. 4. Proudhon's Teaching. 5. Stirner's Teaching. 6. Bakunin's Teaching. 7. Kropotkin's Teaching. 8. Tucker's Teaching. 9. Tolstoy's Teaching. 10. The Anarchistic Teachings.

6s. 6d. net; postage 4d. extra.

FREEDOM Office, 127 Ossulston Street, London, 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.

THE AWAKENING OF THE ORIENT.

1908 was not a dull year. Many events out of the common happened which showed great masses of the people tired of the present system or some features of it, and groping for a way out of it. If we compare the reactionary forces at work among them, political Social Democracy included, to the small numbers of those who work for freedom, the results are surprisingly satisfactory. For the idea held only by Anarchists a few years ago, that the people themselves must attend to their own affairs (Direct Action) is underlying many movements now, though often frustrated in their later stages. There is a general desire for freedom which makes people reject the beneficial schemes which even Socialism, the latest disguise of paternal Government, proposes for their guidance.

The generous attitude of the Fabian Society during the South African War looked for theoretical justification to the dogma that civilised peoples are the born leaders and masters of less civilised peoples. How far away these times seem to be in our days when, from Morocco to Japan, the Orient is awakening, and the chances of keeping all these peoples under Europe's thumb are simply vanishing into thin air! The time when it was considered sufficient to have these people dominated by the "great administrators," the Cromers and Milners, has gone for ever; the "great warriors," the Kitcheners and d'Amades, may for a while yet triumph within the range of their machine guns; but the coming independence of all these countries is as well on the way as was that of Italy when Mazzini and Garibaldi worked for it. Morocco arranged her internal affairs in face of a European Conference and a French occupation. At the very moment when Czar and King at Reval settled how to govern Macedonia, Turkey took her destiny in her own hands by a single stroke. Persia has risen and defies her own Cossacks and those of Russia on her frontier. Japan vanquished Russia; and China, eight years ago invaded by all the great Powers of Europe, is to-day a country which no one dares to touch. Even the small people of the Philippines resisted the whole of the United States, and, if conquered, did not lose their hopes. India is to such a degree tired of being the playground of European officialdom and the record country for famine and plague that the Indian Nationalists who stand up for her independence begin to lose patience, and may yet redeem the name of Anarchists which Lord Morley's Government generously bestowed on them. Egypt, again, does not dream of remaining forgotten when all awake; nor will Arabs tolerate further European encroachments, and so on. We are only at the beginning of this awakening of the slumbering Orient.

The variety of weapons which are used in these struggles is wonderful. Whilst Japan used the most perfect tools of war which European civilisation produced, and the Filipinos revived guerilla warfare, the Turks practised to perfection, without a hitch, the Spanish method of military *Pronunciamentos*, followed up by an enthusiastic period of fraternisation, reminding one of the best scenes of the French Revolution. Immediately after, they bring the new idea of national trade boycott to hitherto unknown perfection. The Indian struggle reminds one of Ireland. The Persians of Satar Khan carry on bold, open revolutionary war. In Morocco, fighting and Oriental diplomacy baffle the European efforts; in Egypt, at present, public opinion is stirred; and so on. This is not a series of fanatical outbursts of decaying nationalities, but the struggle for freedom of awakening young peoples, who with perfect ease wield all the weapons which were and are being used in Europe in the

same cause, and which were believed to be for ever out of the reach of those who have been termed the unspeakable Turk, the Japanese monkey, the Indian rabble, the Moorish barbarians, etc.

It may be said that Anarchism has nothing to do with these events; that all efforts are aiming at the establishment of strong national Parliaments and Governments. But we welcome every blow struck against the prevailing system of colonial conquest, which, if not checked, would reduce the inhabitants of all continents to the position of serfs to a few gigantic European and American Powers. As the English and French Revolutions of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were necessary to clear the ground for further social progress, all parts of the globe will have to free themselves from the fetters which ages of brutal and stupid conquest imposed upon them. This will at the same time weaken the European States, one of the functions of which—that of being, so to speak, slaveholders on a large scale—will disappear.

The Turkish Revolution calls for comparison with that of Russia since 1905; it looks so altogether different. It resembles in a striking way the beginning of the Spanish Revolution of January, 1820. At that time at San Juan, far away from Madrid, Lieutenant-Colonel Riego proclaimed the liberal Constitution of 1812, which the King had suspended in favour of absolutism and the Inquisition. The whole Army, many officers of which belonged to secret societies, joined the *Pronunciamiento*; and the King, though treacherously minded, publicly accepted the Constitution of Cadiz. Spain was the most liberal country of Europe for the next three years, but the treachery of the King and the priests undermined the liberal régime; they thrust themselves upon the Holy Alliance, and France acted as its executioner. The French army, vainly opposed at the Bidassoa by a few French Republicans—the anti-patriots of the time—made war against the liberal Spanish Government, and re-established absolutism. A reign of terror followed, and Riego was hanged on high gallows, specially erected. In the same way the Revolutions of Naples (1820) and Piedmont (1821) were betrayed by the respective Kings—just as the Czar and the Shah are betraying the Constitutional movements of Russia and Persia. Time will show whether the Turks keep a firmer grip on the Sultan; as they had already so many surprises in store for us, it is just possible that they will. Except for this, the difference from Russia is striking. Fulllest concentration on one question, the Constitution, and not a Constitution still to be elaborated, about which all parties have different opinions, but the Constitution of 1876, which existed, and with which all parties were content for the moment. After this a rigorous change of the personnel of the Government, and, before all, continuation of the state of efficiency of the revolutionary society which had brought about the movement. This was Turkey, and up till now everything has happened with the precision of a Japanese siege or battle, one might say. On the other hand, the Russian Revolution reminds one, unfortunately, too often of the aimless, straggling tactics of Russian armies during the Japanese War. Just as generals there seemed to disagree among themselves instead of co-operating, in Russia each one of the revolutionary parties went its own way, unheeding the necessity of co-operation against the enemy, Czarism.

After the general strike of October, 1905, had given a splendid example of the irresistible force of co-operation, this method was given up almost instantly without obtaining anything tangible but a lying Constitution, half revoked since in practice; an incomplete amnesty, which seemed only to make room for the tens of thousands crowding the prisons since that time; and a treacherous minister, Count Witte, who seems to come forward once more to repeat the old game of deceiving everybody. From that time—November, 1905—all parties, Constitutionalist and Socialist, seemed to work exclusively for themselves and against all others, with the result of being beaten singly, all of them, by absolutism and by the systematic weeding out of all who continue the struggle, by thousands of hangings and hundreds of thousands of imprisonments and deportations. It seems not to be possible to follow the Persian tactics, to rise in open revolt and try to make a bold stand and hold out. Lives are frittered away in thousands of isolated struggles, while some combined resistance, like the Persians at Tabriz, might form the nucleus of a really successful revolution. How shall this end? Russia resembles Continental Europe in the "fifties," when all the rebels of 1848-49 were crushed and all seemed dead, until acts of revolt like Garibaldi's raid on Sicily and Naples resuscitated the spirit of opposition, a pale and feeble echo of the spirit of 1848, but nearly all that we have seen over there of signs of awakening from that time onward—

the International, the Paris Commune, and the Revolutionary Socialist and Anarchist movements excepted. However, Russia may reconquer the lost ground by a *single* stroke, a new tidal wave of spontaneous co-operation against Czarism, and a little more cohesion after the first victory.

I shall be told again, as I said before, that Constitutional gains are of no value to Socialists, and that further co-operation in Russia was impossible because all classes disagree about the land and labour question. Of course this will always be the case; but there are moments when nearly everybody is moved before all by indignation against the existing system, which, as history shows, is so firmly rooted that it yields only to such unanimous pressure. Such moments were the great historic days of the French Revolution; July, 1830; a few days in 1848 in nearly every European country; the 18th of March, 1871, in Paris; October, 1905, in Russia; and some weeks last summer in Turkey. These are the few happy days of humanity, when the old Government is crushed and the relative weakness of the new Government, which people up to now are foolish enough always to re-erect, creates for a short time the illusion of real freedom, happiness, and fraternity. This shows how all long for such a state of things, which Anarchists see clearest and work for at all times—only the proportion of conscious and unconscious Anarchists to those whom long servitude has made unfit for any real effort for freedom is still such that politicians again get the upper hand, as in the French Convention, in the Paris Commune, in the Russian Duma, in the new Turkish Parliament. But there is nothing more conducive to spreading the love for freedom than these short intervals after the downfall of a system—the only holidays which people enjoy after ages of oppression.

In Russia the dream of liberty was short—in Turkey it lasts remarkably longer. Up to the present, the Revolution there has not disarmed in favour of Government and Parliament, and by the immense trade boycott against Austrian goods it has again become solidary with the whole people; there is direct action, determined and unremitting, lasting for months now. What was vainly proposed by a few Dutch dockers and French Anarchists during the Boer and Japanese Wars—the boycott by dockers of English and Russian shipping—in Turkey, where there is no Socialism and no Syndicalism, it was carried into full effect at a moment's notice, and what is more, it has lasted for months now, and is going to last until the required effect is obtained. The military power of Austria is helpless against it; for the first time we see economic action successfully check an army and prevent a war which is considered hopeless, as the reply to it, strict economic boycott, is given already beforehand; and a war, even if successful, could only perpetuate but never break it. The limits of military and State power were never more clearly shown. Before the deliberate will of individuals, each exercising but a little direct economic action, they are powerless.

Why do I dwell so much on these outlying events and not consider what 1908 brought in countries nearer home? In these older countries the well-known habits of politics and capitalism have really produced a state of callousness which soon deprives even revolutionary movements of their purity, energy, and clearness. We have all seen so much of everything that we are sceptical beforehand of anything new coming. We saw during the last twenty years political Socialism completely absorbed by routine politics; instead of conquering the State, the State conquered them and assimilated them fully. We begin to see the limits of Syndicalism: it can be revolutionary only in proportion to the number of revolutionists existing; if further extended, it reaches those who lack the revolutionary temperament, and whose indifference and weakness weigh down the revolutionary energy of the minority. I see even that Anarchism is less deeply rooted with many than they imagine; and too many consider it a system once for all discovered and perfected, and not a conception and way of action which by reasoning and practice is kept in permanent evolution. In these circumstances we are eager to see real action at work wherever it be; and the older and more complicated Western movements may profit by the numerous examples of energy and enthusiasm which the awakened Orient presents.

Direct Action has a field of application infinitely wider than Syndicalism. Syndicalism is a method of defence forced upon the working classes by capitalism, whilst *Direct Action* is really practical Anarchism on a large scale, and calls for application in *all* spheres of human activity. To understand and to practise it is to advance from the present state of submission and indifference towards freedom. How natural, easy, and self-evident is this way of proceeding is shown by the example of Turkey, where it was put in practice almost overnight, with such good

results. We also know how almost everywhere the ground is ripe for rapid general strikes. A few sections of workers—railway men and electricians almost immediately, miners and dockers after a few weeks—can bring the capitalist organisation of distribution first, production afterwards, to a standstill. If that calm and serene unity of purpose and action which only great days bring about were realised, we might yet live to see great changes. The Orient has had its turn in 1908—will the turn of the West come next? N.

The Russian Crisis.

III.

As we have said before, during the weeks following the triumphant General Strike the revolutionists left untouched all political and administrative institutions of the old order. In Russia, after 40 years of conspiracy and revolt, the revolutionists never thought of doing what the Young Turks made it their first duty to accomplish after their uprising: to remove every Governor and official known as reactionary, and to fill their places with men of the new régime.

The explanation of this political blunder may be found in the character of the dominating parties which existed at the moment of the struggle. They were the Constitutional Democrats, the Social Democrats, and the Revolutionary Socialists.

The first were from the beginning simply a party of political and peaceful Constitutional reformers. The second are Marxists. In Russia as well as in Europe these pseudo-revolutionists in reality are fighting for Constitutional reforms. Russian Marxists were so zealous to preserve this reputation that at each act of terrorism during the last ten years their papers at home as well as abroad have untiringly condemned the party and the heroic youth who had adopted these fighting methods.

With regard to Socialism, which the Social Democrats claim as the exclusive feature of their party, in their programme of action their Socialistic claims were limited to an eight-hour day and protective labour laws modelled on the English capitalistic legislation. On the land question, the Social Democrats, under the fallacious conception of the concentration of capital, were always the declared enemies of the Russian *Mir* with its communal possession of land. Their leader Plehkanoff and his followers, armed with Engels' pamphlets, were preaching that for the sake of the peasants themselves, for the progress of humanity and the triumph of Socialism, the peasants must lose their land; and the sooner this happens, the better it will be. Only a year before the outbreak, under the pressure of the peasants' agitation, the Social Democrats made some concessions in their programme, by adding, for instance, the claim for the restitution to the peasants of portions of the land fraudulently appropriated by the landowners at the time of the abolition of serfdom. But the connection of the Social Democrats with the peasants remained very slight, and it was chiefly among the factory workers that they developed their activity, preaching Constitutional reforms, but condemning general strikes and revolutionary action.

The third party, the Revolutionary Socialists, distinguished itself by a very energetic and systematic fight against autocracy. The execution of Ministers like Plehve, of high officials like the Grand Duke Sergius, were the work of this party. By theoretical conceptions they also were Marxian, but in their programme of action they distinguished themselves from the Social Democrats by a very large agrarian platform. In the agrarian disorders which took place in many provinces the members of this party were very active; but being in reality Marxists, they were political rather than revolutionary Socialists. This was quite openly acknowledged in their French manifesto published on the occasion of Plehve's execution: "Once that in Russia a representative Government based on universal suffrage will be established, we shall discontinue our revolutionary tactics."

Certainly, no Revolutionary Socialist would say that once Constitutional order is gained, he will cease his Revolutionary Socialist activity. A Socialist will be satisfied only when he has gained social and economic concessions. The members of this party also—like the Social Democrats, great admirers of Engels—were no partisans of the preaching of the general strike. For them, too, the idea of the general strike was an Anarchist heresy, ridiculed and abused by Engels in his dishonest pamphlet against the Spanish Federalist and Communist revolution of 1873.

Such were the three organised parties. Like the other parties, the Constitutional Democrats, under the growing

influence of the peasants' agitation, understood quite well that simple reforms of a political and administrative nature would not be sufficient; that with the introduction of political rights (liberty of conscience, meetings, etc.) there must be a solution of the agrarian question in the sense of increasing the peasants' possession of the land and emancipating the village community and Zemstvo from the despotic tutelage of police and Ministers. As regards other political reforms, the programme of the Constitutional Democrats was identical with that of the two Socialist parties. It was for this reason that at the election of the first Duma Russia gave such an overwhelming majority to the Constitutional Democrats, who, as I indicated in my first article, honestly put forward a project for agrarian reform based on the transfer to the peasant communities of the land of the State domains, and, if necessary, the compulsory expropriation of large landowners, the Imperial Cabinet, and monasteries, with State redemption. Just for this project the first Duma was dissolved, the Constitutional Democrats prosecuted, and the Zemstvos, the real backbone of their party, cleansed of all advanced elements by the Government.

Noting the character of these three great parties, the question naturally arises: Who organised the powerful, triumphant general strike? The Constitutional Democrats, as the Liberal bourgeoisie, could not have been responsible; neither the Revolutionary Socialists and the Social Democrats, who were opposed to the idea. Certainly not these parties.

It was the result of the revolt of the public conscience.

During the period of war, the Government, humiliated and dishonoured by the numerous disasters in the Far East, had been obliged to make concessions to public opinion, and to be more tolerant in social life. In less than eighteen months over the whole of Russia numerous non-political professional Unions, as of teachers, Zemstvo employees, engineers, railway men, journalists, doctors, telegraphists, etc., spread with incredible rapidity. These Unions began to hold their Congresses in St. Petersburg and Moscow. At last even a Union of Unions was organised in St. Petersburg. Among the new Unions was the Union of the peasants, which soon was to be one of the most important and powerful in Russian life. Afterwards it gave the best revolutionary Deputies in the first and second Dumas, and even in the third Duma, chiefly nominated by the police and administration, the members of this Union are the best defenders of the peasants' interests.

A few weeks before the general strike the peasants' Union held a Congress in Moscow, and without declaring itself Socialist or Revolutionist, ruled that the land ought to belong to those who work it; that the land must be held, not in private, but in communal ownership; that the commune must be autonomous in its internal administrative life; that Zemstvo, Municipality, and Parliament must be elected by universal suffrage; that education must be compulsory and free; that elective justices of the peace be re-established. Everybody saw at once that a really national programme had been formulated by this peasants' Union.

The Constitutional Democrats expressed full approval of the peasants' Union; the Social Democrats were obliged to accommodate their theories to the peasants' claims; while the Maximalists, the advanced section of the Revolutionary Socialist party, who uphold Socialism to its full extent, entered the Union, and together with its members began those agrarian disorders which followed on the dissolution of the first Duma.

These Unions were the real organised supporters of the triumphant general strike of 1905. But being newly organised, and having no revolutionary traditions, they never even thought of seizing the administrative institutions and offices, and at the moment of their triumph they contented themselves with promises of a Constitution. Seeing this state of parties and Unions, it is natural that no organised resistance was ready to meet the ascendancy of the reaction, which, finding the old order unchanged, began the unprecedented persecutions which up till the present continue with unabated fury and cruelty.

W. TCHERKESOFF.

(To be continued.)

Books Received.

- A Free Man's Creed.* Discussion of Love in Freedom as opposed to Institutional Marriage. By Moses Harman. New edition. 5 cents. Los Angeles, Cal.: Eugenics Office, 649 S. Main Street.
- The Logic and Economics of the Class Struggle.* By Guy A. Aldred. Revised edition. 1d. London: Bakunin Press, 103 Thorpebank Road, Shepherd's Bush, W.
- Sexual Life.* Nos. 31, 32. 30 cents per annum. J. Herbert Foster, Tula de los Tuxtlas, Ver., Mexico.

ANARCHISM AND PARASITES.

While on a propaganda tour through the Midlands last autumn, it was my lot to meet many people to whom Anarchism and Communism were quite new ideas. The subject-matter for this article mainly arose or was called out through conversing with a young man who, from reading Kropotkin and Tolstoy, was convinced of the correctness of the Anarchist position. Like so many earnest and sincere young people one meets, he, being keenly conscious of the contradictions in our lives—how people for the most part live in abject misery and want, and how they could live in happiness and comfort—desired to abandon everything, leave home, and go out into the world and put things straight. Truly a modern Don Quixote.

Besides, one must do some useful labour; it is unfair, unmanly, to go on living a useless life. This contradiction in our mind—the reality of our present life, and how we really should live—is very, very painful; and with the hope that my views may be helpful to many who have thought on this matter, and with the desire to open up thought in those who have not, let me state the case as it appears to me.

A certain Dr. E—some years ago resigned his position as a doctor, and with his capital bought a piece of land in Essex, declaring the land free. Exactly the same thing was done by a group of people, often called the Whiteway Anarchists, at Stroud, Gloucester. All were more or less people of the professional class, and in fairly comfortable circumstances. I take it that their act was called forth because they disagreed with modern capitalism, commercialism, and competition. They knew they were non-producers, and therefore parasites, and took the shortest cut to what they considered a consistent and productive life. Many of them refused to use money, and some managed to rub along without it for several years. Their earliest efforts were of a Communistic nature. Because they now use money, and have returned to Individualist methods of life and are engaged in commercialism, there are those who claim that Anarchism and Communism are illusions and unworkable. In a later article I may deal with these objections.

What I want now to show is that at a certain stage of development it becomes painful for some to go on with their capitalist activity and non-productive life, and they fly to some haven of refuge, colony or otherwise, where they can engage in productive labour. Of course, some fail altogether, and from various reasons return to town life. Now, what happens in the case of those who return to town? They are unfitted to be capitalists and speculators, and probably could not be now if they wanted to. One course only is open to them—to become wage-slaves. But their desire to be useful producers, and their objection to entering into the competitive struggle which exists for every situation vacant, again stand in their way. They neither want to start with the usual elbowing-out process, nor take advantage of any personal quality they possess. There seems nothing for it but to enter the fight with one's feelings, go in the teeth of those principles which have hitherto been so real to one, or stand aside and stare. Is there no middle course? Let us see.

All human beings eat food, most of them wear clothes and live in some sort of shelter; therefore all beings should take part in the production of these things. Any one who shirks this prime necessity must impose his share of labour on another. So all non-producers consciously or unconsciously impose such labour on those who do produce, and we will call them what they are—parasites.

Let us deal with the conscious parasites. Firstly, those who, if they have the opportunity, make some effort to produce. Secondly, those who contend: "So long as the idiots produce and are fools enough to keep us, we have a right to impose on them because we can; and we the better survive the more callous and indifferent we are to the sufferings of others." Lastly, those who desire to produce, but find society such a network of lies and sophistry that they are practically compelled to go on consuming, and remain non-producers.

Now, the first of these conscious parasites—those who make an immediate effort to produce—use their capital, land, tools, or money, and begin producing, some forming themselves into groups, like the Whiteway Colonists in England, the Shakers in America, and the Doukhobors in Canada. These are comparatively successful communities; but for the most part they fail, not always because the aspirants are dreamers or failures, but because the surrounding conditions are one too many for them. Besides, many of them have been in a business or profession, and are totally unsuited to the kind of life they must necessarily lead. Years of town life have left their mark, and one cannot in a day undo the errors of years.

Money, the amount of capital one has, also plays an important part, for without it you have not the ghost of a chance. Money is, as Nietzsche says, "the crowbar of power," and Tolstoy says, "the means by which he who has, has the advantage of he who has not." And to get money, each and every one has to wade through the old mud-pond of "as long as we swim, damn who sinks." There is no other way. So the idealists who are now non-producers and desirous of getting on the land, etc., should be careful to nurse no illusions or pat themselves on the back.

Those who have the opportunity and advantage (money, etc.), and can get on the land or at some useful industry, are to a certain extent fortunate. The seizing of such opportunity undoubtedly relieves the pressure, and, where successful, demonstrates the possibility of a saner life in a practical way. Care should be taken, of course, not to invent

new codes of morality for those less fortunate comrades who may see eye to eye but lack the necessary opportunity, advantage, resource, concentration, and adaptability.

Now we come to the class of conscious parasites who say: "So long as the idiots produce and support us, we have a right to the same, because we can squeeze it out of them." Ruskin says: "We keep a certain number of idiots digging and ditching, making and mending, and generally stupefied, in order that we, being fed gratis, may have all the thinking, feeling, and pleasure to ourselves." Leaving aside the fact that an ever-increasing number of these so-called idiots are objecting as strongly as circumstances will allow, and an ever-increasing number of Socialists, who, unfortunately, can see no farther than constitutional methods, and will have the wage system in some form or other—leaving these facts aside, let us confine ourselves to the "having-the-right-because-we-can" idea, which, sad to say, really obtains to-day. I take exception to the word "right," and deal with the fact, "they can."

The landowner can and does own the land. The capitalist can and does own the mines, tools, workshops, and their products; and will own them as long as the minds of men are so diseased as to believe in the illusion of private property. The wealthy non-producers own the life, body, and soul, as it were, of most of the producers, and non-producers as well; and they will continue to hold the same as long as those who are so owned allow it. As long as people believe in the present system of society, as long as people do not investigate every proposition for themselves, so long will they be slaves, so long will the mighty say, "We can, therefore we will."

Now as to the third class—those who see the sophistry of to-day and yet go on. To my mind, they should always be perfectly honest on the subject. So here goes, let me start, as I am one of this class. For some time I have not produced a single thing useful to mankind, and all the time my debit account goes on. Yes, and many are in exactly the same position, and it is no use going about complaining. No; excusing, complaining, or accusing does not alter things. Here we are, non-producers, anxious to be producers, but that does not make us producers; and some are engaged in useless occupations to boot, and some, maybe, even engaged in harmful and pernicious activities. Here are a few cases to point. Quite recently I met a superintendent of the police who is a theoretical Anarchist. He told me he had listened to several of my lectures and was in perfect agreement. "But," he said, "what am I to do? Throw up the police, and fall in line at the rear of the unemployed?" At Leeds the comrades brought up the subject at a group meeting, *re* objecting to a master tailor joining their group because he was a capitalist. I pointed out that if it was a moral question with them, surely it was also immoral to work for a capitalist. I know a school teacher who sees quite clearly that the instruction given in the school is actually perpetuating this wretched system; also a manager or head salesman in a swell concern, which absolutely thrives on sweated labour and all sorts of sharp practices. These and several others I know are theoretical Anarchists. The fact is, we cannot change our lives from conscious parasites to useful producers as easily as we can change a dress or a coat. What we can do is to be quite frank about the matter. Cease to intrench the position by attempts at justification, and refrain from the endeavour to invent new ethics, moralities, and sophistries to persuade ourselves that all that is, is good and just.

What can be said of the unconscious parasites, that large body of people who, with every good intention and a firm belief in their activity, spend their whole lives bossing, coercing, doling out charity, and doing what they call good actions; all the while living on the labour of others, never doing a really useful action?

What about the clergy of the "great lying Church," as Morrison Davidson says, who toil not, neither do they spin? The thousands of professional men, lawyers, solicitors, bankers, insurance brokers, etc., whose activity is ludicrous; those thousands of men and women who for ever write in books and add up figures, who would be much better employed mending boots or helping mother at home. The waste of time and energy spent in unproductive, useless labour is appalling.

It may be said that I am deciding who are parasites and who are not. Let us see. Each person who eats, wears clothes and boots, and lives in a house is a consumer; and the fact that he does not produce decides he is a drone and a parasite. The final court of appeal is universal application.

The best paid to-day are those who engage in unproductive labour, and it is looked forward to as a good end and aim to get to a position of property and money owning, when one will be relieved from all labour, and become what is misnamed independent (which really is dependent). This struggle to do nothing, to live without doing any useful labour, as Tolstoy says, "climb on others backs," is a very undesirable state of affairs. Fortunately, we are not all independent, or who the dickens would produce the necessary food, clothing, and shelter? So this would not bear universal application. Whereas if each and every one of us were engaged in some useful activity, there would be plenty for all; no scarcity, no sweating, no poverty; crime would disappear, and each and every one would then have leisure to develop the latent qualities so much hidden and crushed to-day.

In my next article I shall deal with "Anarchism and Production."

C. H. KEAN.

ELISÉE RECLUS, EDUCATOR.

The complete works of him who so greatly loved the human family will for ever remain a clear wellspring of light, a glowing centre, around which all who would guide the rising generations will throng in order to renew their energy and ardour. I do not think that in the whole of our Celtic-Latin literature there exist works so able to elevate the mind, to purify the taste, to rule the play of every faculty, and to uplift the heart of man above the petty meanness and egoisms of the present epoch. Nothing is so beautiful, with the simple, serene beauty of the great landscapes of virgin Nature, as these pages, so complete that one can neither add nor subtract a word without disfiguring the whole. The crystal purity of the style; the smooth, even cadence which flows on like some joyous, limpid stream; the harmonious rhythm of the well-linked phrases, all concurring to illustrate the logical deduction by which their construction will finally be crowned; those newly coined words gushing forth spontaneously, expressive of the subject or idea, which are so much treasure-trove added to our language; those thrilling illustrations which here and there illumine the text and seize the mind by the force of their striking majesty; that supreme perfection in detail, as in the mass, which assures for all time the duration of this solid and stable architecture; this wide comprehension of Nature and life, of the cycle of the peoples and the evolution of societies; above all, the sympathy, ardour, youthfulness which breathe through every page written by Elisée; that indomitable perseverance which enabled him to achieve a colossal enterprise requiring the efforts and researches of more than half a century—all these admirable qualities, when united, make of this unique writer a sage, a thinker, an artist, a poet, an educator, and—whatever may be said to the contrary—a man of action of the first rank.

Contrast for a moment a fragment from these unequalled works with any page from one of the most famous of our contemporary authors. Will you not easily discover in the latter many passages in which the style needs retouching; many lapses and superfluities; a swarm of parasitical weeds which the writer has not had the good taste to extirpate; a certain clumsiness in the juxtaposition of phrases—those gems of thought—and here and there some false ideas which disfigure the best chapters? Read afterwards a page of Elisée's. You at once feel yourself in the presence of a more winning science, of a smoother, a more natural style, of a truer friend, of a mind more logical and just. Led by such a guide, you will travel without weariness through all times and through all lands. Read and re-read the sublime descriptions of terrestrial phenomena; the pages of ethnography, replete with documentary evidence, in his great encyclopædia of geography; and above all, his innumerable articles in reviews and the literature of ideas, where, side by side with his aversion for all dogmas and despotisms, appear his ardent craving for a free and fraternal humanity and his profound belief in an approaching revolutionary evolution. Examine and study slowly that pagan monument erected in honour of man and his planet. And tell me finally if you do not feel yourself better, transfigured, more humane, more generous, more fully prepared for the task of a sower of ideas, of a communicator of the enthusiasm which you feel.—A. PRATELLE, *L'Ecole Rénovée*, October 15.

PROPAGANDA NOTES.

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

CAMBERWELL.

On December 22 I gave a paper at the Camberwell branch of the I.L.P. on "Anarchist Socialism *versus* Political Socialism," which was followed by a lively discussion, in which another comrade participated. An Industrial Unionist and a member of the S.P.G.B. joined us in pointing out the futility of the I.L.P. and the S.D.P. in Parliament. Altogether we had decidedly the best of it. The branch gave us a very cordial welcome, and showed us every fairness and courtesy. Unfortunately, only about eighty were present. Leaflets were given to all, and literature sold to some.

S. CARLYLE POTTER.

DEPTFORD.

Unemployment is still demanding the interest of the people who assemble on the Broadway. On a recent Sunday morning the young revolutionary Stewart addressed an audience on this most pressing subject, other speakers following. The platform being a free one, many were the suggestions put forward. Our comrade Carter supported the idea of a National Convention as a means whereby the people might

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

come to some definite conclusion as to the best methods of dealing with this terrible scourge, which is still on the increase.

Some of the leaders are propagating direct action with a vengeance, and another demonstration is suggested. Previous demonstrations have each time ended with police interference and arrests, the last one throwing the whole borough into a state verging on panic, twenty-two arrests being made.

E. GOULDING.

LIVERPOOL.

The Liverpool Communist Sunday School has been a marked success during the last three months. We have at present twenty-six members on the books. It was rather unfortunate that we had to quit the rooms at Toxteth Co-operative Hall, which for a moment disorganised our little band; but now we are housed again at Tagus Street I.L.P. rooms, the young comrades are rallying round.

We have various speakers each Sunday, but the most surprising speaker gave an address on December 13; no other than one of our young comrades, Gladys Jones, whose delivery and matter were excellent. The young comrades on this particular Sunday practically ran the meeting, and we look to them for many more Sundays of this character. I could give a goodly supply of incidents which have happened at our Sunday School, but space forbids. When shall we have a "Children's Column"?

JAS. H. DICK.

Tooting Libertarian Socialist Society.

The above Society has been formed with a view of propagating Anarchist principles in the South-West districts of London. J. J. Richmond, 3 Mafeking Villas, Robinson Road, Tooting, who has been appointed secretary, and to whom all communications should be addressed, would be pleased to give dates and subjects of several comrades who would be willing to lecture on Anarchist philosophy.

Liverpool Communist Sunday School.

Please note change of address—I.L.P. Rooms, Tagus Street (corner of Lodge Lane), every Sunday at 3 p.m. Music, songs, recitations, and short speeches. Donations are needed.—JAS. H. DICK, Secretary, 15 Boswell Street, Liverpool S.

The East London Anarchist-Socialist Sunday School meets at 3.30 every Sunday at the Workers' Friend Club and Institute, 163 Jubilee Street, Mile End. Children in the district invited. An Esperanto class for adults and children is specially conducted by Comrade Dusa.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

(December 9—January 9.)

FREEDOM Guarantee Fund—E. L. Gillett 3s 6d, R. Kleinstein 1s, Anon £1, R. Clarke 6d, H. Glasse 10s, Spotter 1s, E. Rhodes 2s, N. £1.

Pamphlet Fund.—N. £1.

FREEDOM Subscriptions—W. M. Stroud 2s, F. Telaat 2s, G. A. S. 2s, E. B. 1s 6d, T. H. 1s 6d, B. O. D. 1s 6d, F. H. 1s, K. N. 1s 6d, S. Coates 1s 6d, C. E. 1s 6d, J. A. S. 1s 6d, G. Glass 1s 6d, G. E. S. 3s, E. P. Honicke 7s 6d, A. V. S. 1s 6d, J. H. 1s 6d, A. C. Z. 1s 6d, J. T. S. 1s 6d, N. Lazarovitz 4s.

Sales of FREEDOM.—E. L. Gillett 1s 6d, L. Kavanagh 3s, Hendersons 3s 6d, Goodman 1s, C. Lipsitz 3s, Essex 1s, R. Kleinstein 4s 2d, N. 6d, Holtz 10d, A. Goldberg 4s, J. McAra 9s, F. Olson 9d, A. Howie 2s 6d, S. Carter 2s, T. S. 1s, F. Baker 9d, E. Trenham 1s 6d.

Pamphlet and Book Sales.—E. L. Gillett 7s, G. H. G. 1s, L. Kavanagh 3s, F. P. 4s 8d, Hendersons 3s 6d, G. Rosenzweig 2s 6d, N. 3s 3d, A. M. 9s, F. Olson 4s 2d, C. Kean 6s, T. S. 1s, A. S. 3s 2d, S. C. P. 3s 10d, E. Fox 5s, E. P. H. 2s 6d, F. Baker 3s 10d, A. V. S. 1s 8d, R. C. F. D. 3s 2d.

Back Numbers of "Commonweal."

Wanted, Nos. 20 and 25 (1886).—Letters, stating price, to be sent to Manager, FREEDOM Office, 127 Ossulston Street, N.W.

To Readers in Paris.

FREEDOM and MOTHER EARTH can be obtained at Kiosk No. 214, Boulevard Bonne Nouvelle (opposite No. 26). Orders taken for English and American publications.

Group Notice.

The Newcastle-on-Tyne International Anarchist Communist Group hold their meetings and lectures every Wednesday at 8 p.m. in 51 Douglas Terrace.

DO YOU BELIEVE

That We Humans are as important as Pigs, Potatoes, and Pups?
Do you believe that we "grown-ups," and even the Children, should know as much about ourselves as we know about Fishes, Flowers, and Frogs?
Do you believe in Better Progeny, a More Elevated Race, anyway?
If so, send \$1.25 for a year's subscription to the

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS,

and be in the Van of Human Progress.

Published monthly at 649 South Main St., Los Angeles, California, U.S.A. Samples 10 cents. Trial 3 months, with pamphlet "Institutional Marriage," 30 cents stamps.

WILLIAM MORRIS SOCIALIST CLUB, WALTHAMSTOW.

GREENLEAF ROAD, HOE STREET.

On SUNDAY, JANUARY 24, at 7.30 p.m.

S. Carlyle Potter.

Subject—"The Futility of Political Socialism."

GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY—110 BRUNSWICK ROAD.

SUNDAY, JANUARY 31, at 12 and 6.30.

John Turner.

12 noon—"An Appreciation of Peter Kropotkin."

6.30—"God and the State."

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.

ANARCHISM v. SOCIALISM.

By WM. C. OWEN.

Price 2d., post-free 2½d., from FREEDOM Office, London, N.W.

PAMPHLET AND BOOK LIST.

ANARCHISM: ITS PHILOSOPHY AND IDEAL. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.
THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
LAW AND AUTHORITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
THE SOCIAL GENERAL STRIKE. By ARNOLD ROLLER. 2d.
THE BASIS OF TRADE UNIONISM. By EMILE POUGET. 1d.
WAR. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. 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. ½d.
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.
ANARCHISTS AND ESPERANTO. 1d.

ANARCHISM. By Dr. PAUL ELTZBACHER. 6s. 6d.; postage 4d.
MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1s.
THE CONQUEST OF BREAD. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 10s. 6d.
MEMOIRS OF A REVOLUTIONIST. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3s. 6d. post-free.

MUTUAL AID: A FACTOR OF EVOLUTION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3s. 6d. post-free.

FIELDS, FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS. By P. KROPOTKIN. Paper cover 6d., post-free 9d.; cloth 1s., post-free 1s. 3d.

WHAT IS PROPERTY? By P. J. PROUDHON. 2 vols. 2s., postage 4d.
NEWS FROM NOWHERE. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1s. 6d.; postage 4d.

A DREAM OF JOHN BALL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 2s., postage 3d.
PRISONS, POLICE AND PUNISHMENT. By E. CARPENTER. Paper 1s., cloth 2s., postage 3d.

A VINDICATION OF NATURAL SOCIETY. By EDMUND BURKE. 1s. and 6d., postage 2d. and 1d.

THE TRAGEDY OF WOMAN'S EMANCIPATION. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 2d., post-free 2½d.

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

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

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

WAR PICTURES by EMILE HOLAREK. 1d., post-free 2d.

THE MASTERS OF LIFE. By MAXIM GORKY. 3d. post-free.

WALDEN. By H. THOREAU. 1s. and 6d., postage 2d. and 1d.

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.

THE RIGHTS OF MAN. By THOMAS PAINE. 6d., postage 3d.

All orders, with cash, should be sent to

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

"FREEDOM" MAY BE OBTAINED of

London.—HENDERSON, 66 Charing Cross Road, W.C. (Wholesale).

London and Suburban Publishing Co., Bride Lane, Fleet Street.

A. RITCHIE, Pemberton Row, Fleet Street, E.C.

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

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

B. RUDERMAN, 71, Hanbury Street, Spitalfields, E. (also Pamphlets).

J. J. JAMES, 191, Old Street, City Road, E.C. " "

Liverpool.—E. G. SMITH, 126 Tunnel Road.

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

Leeds.—A. Goldberg, 14 Millwright Street.

Leicester.—A. GORRIE, 2, Brazil Street.

Manchester.—J. ISENBOM, 5 Sagar Street, Bury New Road.

J. BURGESS AND CO., 15 Peter Street.

Newcastle-on-Tyne.—R. STUART, 51 Douglas Terrace.

H. KARPIN, 11 Ravensworth Terrace.

Glasgow.—D. BAXTER, 32 Brunswick Street.

Dundee.—L. MACARTNEY, 181, Overgate.

U.S.A.—N. NOTKIN, 1332 S. 6th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

M. MAISEL, 422 Grand Street, New York, N.Y.

New Zealand.—P. JOSEPHS, 64 Taranaki Street, Wellington.

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