

Freedom

JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. XXIV.—No. 256.

AUGUST, 1910.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

NOTES.

The Public and the Strike.

In the recent railway strike much comment was made by the Press over the possibility of the strikers losing public sympathy through striking at such an "inopportune moment." This cry has often been raised, but in answer the question may be asked: When is the moment not "inopportune" for, at any rate, some sections of the public? But if the capitalist Press wish to raise the point—of course, in the interest of the governing classes and not of the great mass of the people, about whose welfare they, at other times, are not generally as solicitous—it can be met. And to begin with, the workers can very well retort that if the public knew its own interests it would demand of the directors and their head officials the employment of a little more tact and intelligence, not to speak of humanity, in their management of the lines. Otherwise, it might argue, let them clear out and make way for the men themselves to reorganise them. "Ridiculous!" cries the capitalist Press. But wait a minute. *Do not the men themselves in reality constitute the organisations which we call our railway systems?* Take them away, and what remains? Well, the strike has just shown us. A helpless group of "directing" officials with nothing to "direct"! And if they want to reorganise, they must have men to work with to form it again. But let the men have the opportunity of shortening their hours and lengthening their purses—both "reforms" long overdue—and we should see the public convenience much better served without the sacrifice of the lives and limbs of the workers that we have to-day.

Street Trading.

We have just had another instance of that superficial trifling with social evils which is really hypocrisy, in the report of the Departmental Committee on Children's Street Trading. They speak of its "disastrous effect upon character." They tell us it "in no way helps to a future career," forgetting to enlighten the poor worker as to what *does* lead that way under present conditions. Again, street trading is said to expose girls to "a life of immorality," as if the factory system, sweated industries, and unemployment had not already achieved all that could be imagined in that direction. And then comes a most flagrant piece of humbug in the cry of "the danger to health." This is particularly noticeable owing to the fact that almost at the same time another "Committee of Inquiry" had come to the conclusion that no further steps could be taken to protect the lives of the lead-glaze workers in the Potteries, *owing to competition*. Now, if anything is terrible it is lead poisoning. And women are often victims, and hand down to their children the awful consequences resulting from their own poisoned blood. And as to "morality"—we have been told what life in the Potteries means for women. But when the capitalist has to sacrifice morality for competition, he generally does it with a light heart. And in the case of the poor street hawkers who don't work for him, well, he can afford to whitewash his conscience a bit on their account, especially as they come under the public view, and what goes on in factories is not so easily seen. What a world of hypocrisy!

Crime and Punishment.

With Mr. Winston Churchill's proposed attempts at prison reform, the question of crime and punishment comes once more to the front. That we have had an epidemic of murders lately is only too evident; but we have had such things before, and all the punishment that has been inflicted since the last manifestation of this kind has not abated the evil one jot. In fact, if one had noted carefully how events had happened in this direction during the past month, it would have appeared something like this: murder—execution—murder—execution; a sickening pageant of crime, in which the machinery of the law works with

more brutal effect on the public mind than the murders for which its wretched victims have suffered. Is it not time an effort was made to abolish capital punishment altogether? If Mr. Winston Churchill thinks it a good thing—as it certainly is—to as far as possible prevent people from entering prison at all, and so avoid its indelible stain, is it not also necessary that the law should cease from brutalising the public mind with those legal murders called executions? This perpetuation of the feelings of revenge against the criminal is, as scientists and reformers have constantly told us, one of the most potent factors in arousing that morbidity in weak-willed persons that under certain aggravating conditions may end in the taking of human life. It should long ago have ceased to disgrace our social life.

Politicians Get Biggest Share.

A writer in the *Yorkshire Telegraph and Star* points to the fact that Parliamentary action is seriously depleting the funds of the Unions and giving nothing in return. He quotes from the balance-sheet of the United Textile Factory Workers Association for the year ending May 31, 1910. "Out of a total expenditure of £6,702 0s. 9½d., £943 6s. 9d. is expenses, £3,998 14s. is for election and political expenses, and £1,760 only has been paid into any dispute fund." "The balance with the treasurer," he adds, "is also interesting. £199 15s. 5d. Ordinary Fund; £1,094 16s. 6d. Parliamentary Fund." These figures look like a miniature of a Governmental Budget, where all the big amounts are swallowed up in wasteful and useless expenditure, and miserably insufficient doles are applied to the people's welfare.

G. K. C. on Woman's Suffrage.

In a contribution to the *Daily News* of July 16 last, G. K. Chesterton says some very true things about the voting business. He quotes Lord Hugh Cecil as saying that making a cross on a piece of paper was "quite a ladylike action." We should say "childlike," in its absurdity. But we cannot agree with G. K. C. that the female vote is "merely harmless—as harmless as the male vote." The evil fruit of the whole business is that voting is nearly always powerful for harm and powerless for good; and the thoughtless emotionalism of a woman's vote, like the ignorant stupidity of a man's vote, can and will be used by reaction for all its evil ends. G. K. C. is nearer the truth when he says: "Writing counts for something, rioting for much more, walking in processions for a certain effect, but voting for almost nothing."

THE INDUSTRIAL SYNDICALIST.

This is the title of a new little monthly that has just appeared, with Guy Bowman as publisher and Tom Mann as principal contributor. It advocates Industrial Unionism, and makes a strong appeal to the General Federation, and indeed to all Trade Unions, to unite for a common end independently of Parliamentary action. It is really a call for Direct Action and the General Strike, for which Mann drives home the need in a very forcible manner. Like our friends of the *Industrialist*, he does not cut himself quite clear of the political octopus, which, to our mind, is a danger. But nevertheless he speaks the truth when he says the future here, as it must be in all capitalist-ruled countries, is with the *economic* struggle. The *Industrial Syndicalist* is published at one penny, and we wish for it a wide circulation.

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*.

MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

X.

ANARCHISM.

It is seen from the foregoing that a variety of considerations, historical, ethnological, and economical, have brought the Anarchists to conceive a society, very different from what is considered as its ideal by the authoritarian political parties. The Anarchists conceive a society in which all the mutual relations of its members are regulated, not by laws, not by authorities, whether self-imposed or elected, but by mutual agreements between the members of that society, and by a sum of social customs and habits—not petrified by law, routine, or superstition, but continually developing and continually readjusted, in accordance with the ever-growing requirements of a free life, stimulated by the progress of science, invention, and the steady growth of higher ideals.

No ruling authorities, then. No government of man by man; no crystallisation and immobility, but a continual evolution—such as we see in Nature. Free play for the individual, for the full development of his individual gifts—for his individualisation. In other words, no actions are imposed upon the individual by a fear of punishment; none is required from him by society, but those which receive his free acceptance. In a society of equals this would be quite sufficient for preventing those unsociable actions that might be harmful to other individuals and to society itself, and for favouring the steady moral growth of that society.

This is the conception developed and advocated by the Anarchists.

* *

Of course, up till now no society has existed which would have realised these principles in full, although the striving towards a partial realisation of such principles has always been at work in mankind. We may say, therefore, that Anarchism is a certain ideal of society, and that this ideal is different from the ideal of society which has hitherto been advocated by most philosophers, scientists, and leaders of political parties, who pretended to rule mankind and to govern men.

But it would not be fair to describe such a conception as a *Utopia*, because the word "*Utopia*" in our current language conveys the idea of something that cannot be realised.

Taken in its usual current sense, therefore, the word "*Utopia*" ought to be limited to those conceptions only which are based on merely theoretical reasonings as to what is desirable from the writer's point of view, but not on what is already developing in human agglomerations. Such were, for instance, the *Utopias* of the Catholic Empire of the Popes, the Napoleonic Empire, the Messianism of Mickiewicz, and so on. But it cannot be applied to a conception of society which is based, as Anarchism is, on an analysis of tendencies of an evolution that is already going on in society, and on inductions therefrom as to the future—those tendencies which have been, as we saw, for thousands of years the mainspring for the growth of sociable habits and customs, known in science under the name of Customary Law, and which affirm themselves more and more definitely in modern society.

With regard to such inductive conceptions of the further stages of evolution, let us remember that not further than at the end of the eighteenth century—at the very time when the United States had started in life—a society of a somewhat larger size without a monarch was considered a foolish *Utopia*. But the North and the South American Republics, the Swiss Republic and France have proved since, as we know, that the "*Utopians*" were not the Republicans but the admirers of monarchy.

* *

When we look into the origin of the Anarchist conception of society, we see that it has had a double origin: the criticism, on the one side, of all the authoritarian hierarchical organisations and conceptions of society; and on the other side, the analysis of the tendencies that are seen in the progressive movements of mankind, both in the past, and still more so at the present time.

From the remotest, Stone-age antiquity, men must have realised the evils that resulted from letting some of them acquire personal authority—even if they were the most intelligent, the bravest, or the wisest. Consequently, they developed, in the primitive clan, the village community, the mediaeval guild (neighbours' guilds, arts and crafts' guilds, traders', hunters', and so on), and finally in the free mediaeval city, such institutions as enabled them to resist the encroachments upon their life and fortunes both of those strangers who conquered them, and those clansmen of their own who endeavoured to establish their personal authority. The same popular tendency was self-evident in the religious movements of the masses in Europe during the earlier portions of the Reform movement and its Hussite and Anabaptist forerunners. At a much later period, namely, in 1793, the same current of thought and of action found its expression in the strikingly independent, freely federative activity

of the "Sections" of Paris and all great cities and many small "Communes" during the French Revolution.* And later still, the Labour combinations which developed in England and France, notwithstanding Draconic laws, as soon as the factory system began to grow up, were an outcome of the same popular resistance to the growing power of the few—the capitalists in this case.

These were the main popular Anarchist currents which we know of in history, and it is self-evident that these movements could not but find their expression in literature. So they did, beginning with Lao-tse in China, and some of the earliest Greek philosophers (Aristippus and the Cynics; Zeno and some of the Stoics). However, being born in the masses, and not in the Universities or other centres of learning, these popular movements, both when they were revolutionary and when they were deeply constructive, found little sympathy among the learned men—far less than the authoritarian hierarchical tendencies.

The Greek Stoic, Zeno, already advocated a free community, without any government, which he opposed to the State *Utopia* of Plato. He already brought into evidence the instinct of sociability, which Nature had developed in opposition to the egotism of the self-preservation instinct. He foresaw a time when men would unite across the frontiers and constitute the Cosmos, and would have no need of laws, law-courts, or temples—and no need either of money for their exchanges of mutual services. His very wording seems to have been strikingly similar to the one which is now in use amongst Anarchists.†

The Bishop of Alba, Marco Girolamo Vida, developed, in 1553, similar ideas against the State, its laws, and its "supreme injustice"; as also did the early precursors of Rationalism in Armenia (in the ninth century), the Hussites (especially Chojecki, in the fifteenth century), and the early Anabaptists.

Rabelais in the first half of the sixteenth century, Fénelon at the end of it, and especially the Encyclopaedist Diderot at the end of the eighteenth century, developed the same ideas, which found, as has just been mentioned, some practical expression during the French Revolution.

But it was Godwin, in his "Enquiry Concerning Political Justice," who stated in 1793 in a quite definite form the political and economic principles of Anarchism. He did not use the word "Anarchy" itself, but he very forcibly laid down its principles, boldly attacking the laws, proving the uselessness of the State, and maintaining that only with the abolition of Courts true Justice—the only real foundation of all society—would become possible. As regards property, he openly advocated Communism.‡

Proudhon was the first to use the word "Anarchy" (No-Government) and to submit to a powerful criticism the fruitless efforts of men to give themselves such a Government as would prevent the rich ones from dominating the poor, and at the same time always remain under the control of the governed ones. The repeated attempts of France, since 1793, at giving herself such a Constitution, and the failure of the Revolution of 1848, gave him rich material for his criticism.

Being an enemy of all forms of State Socialism, of which the Communists of those years (the "forties" and "fifties" of the nineteenth century) represented a mere sub-division, Proudhon fiercely attacked all such attempts; and taking Robert Owen's system of labour cheques representing hours of labour, he developed a conception of *Mutualism*, in which any sort of political Government would be useless.

The values of all the commodities being measured by the amount of labour necessary to produce them, all the exchanges between the producers could be carried on by means of a national bank, which would accept payment in labour cheques—a Clearing House establishing the daily balance of exchanges between the thousands of branches of this bank.

The services exchanged by different men would thus be equivalent; and as the bank would be able to lend the labour cheques' money without interest, and every association would be able to borrow it on payment of only 1 per cent. or less to cover the administration costs, Capital would lose its pernicious power; it could be used no more as an instrument of exploitation.

Proudhon gave to the system of Mutualism a very full development in connection with his anti-Government and anti-State ideas; but it must be said that the Mutualist portion of his programme had been developed in England already by William Thompson (he was a Mutualist prior to his becoming a Communist) and the English followers of Thompson—John Gray (1825, 1831) and J. F. Bray (1839).

* *

In the United States, the same direction was represented by Josiah Warren, who, after having taken part in Robert Owen's colony, "New Harmony," turned against Communism, and in 1827 founded, in Cincinnati, a "store" in which goods were

* See "The Great French Revolution" (London: Heinemann, 1909).

† See article, "Anarchism," in the forthcoming (eleventh) edition of the "Encyclopaedia Britannica."

‡ It is all in the first edition of 1793, made in two quarto volumes. In the second edition, published in two octavo volumes in 1796, after the prosecution of his Republican friends, he withdrew his views on Communism, and mitigated his views on government.

exchanged on the principle of time-value and labour cheques. Such institutions remained in existence up till 1865 under the names of "Equity Stores," "Equity Village," and "House of Equity."

The same ideas of labour-value and exchange at labour-cost were advocated in Germany, in 1843 and 1845, by Moses Hess and Karl Grün; and in Switzerland by Wilhelm Marr, who opposed the authoritarian Communist teachings of Weitling.

On the other side, in opposition to the strongly authoritarian Communism of Weitling, which had found a great number of adherents among working men in Germany, there appeared in 1845 the work of a German Hegelian, Max Stirner (Johann Kaspar Schmidt was his real name), "The Ego and His Own," which has lately been rediscovered, so to say, by J. H. Mackay, and very much spoken of in Anarchist circles as a sort of manifesto of the Individualist Anarchists.*

Stirner's work is a revolt against both the State and the new tyranny which would have been imposed upon man if authoritarian Communism were introduced. Reasoning on Hegelian metaphysical lines, Stirner preaches therefore the rehabilitation of the "I" and the supremacy of the individual; and he comes in this way to advocate complete "a-moralism" (no morality) and an "association of egoists."

It is easy to see, however—as has been indicated more than once by Anarchist writers, and lately by the French professor, V. Basch, in an interesting work, "Anarchist Individualism: Max Stirner" (1904, in French)—that this sort of Individualism, aiming as it does at the "full development," not of all members of society, but of those only who would be considered as the most gifted ones, without caring for the right of full development for all—is merely a disguised return towards the now-existing education monopoly of the few. It simply means a "right to their full development" for the privileged minorities. But, as such monopolies cannot be maintained otherwise than under the protection of a monopolist legislation and an organised coercion by the State, the claims of these Individualists necessarily end in a return to the State idea and to that same coercion which they so fiercely attack themselves. Their position is thus the same as that of Spencer, and of all the so-called "Manchester school" of economists, who also begin by a severe criticism of the State and end in its full recognition in order to maintain the property monopolies, of which the State is the necessary stronghold.

(To be continued.)

ORIGIN OF SYNDICALISM.

The following extracts from C. Cornelissen's article in the *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft*, January, 1910, are quoted from the *Spokane Industrial Worker* of June 18:—

Very many false ideas are in circulation concerning modern Syndicalism, due in the first instance to the international Socialist press, that, in general, fails to report objectively about the young and competing movement. . . . In 1897 Pouget and Delesalle submitted a report to the Congress of the Confédération Générale du Travail, held in Toulouse, an interesting report about "The Boycott and Sabotage," the contents of which alone sufficiently prove that the tactics of French Syndicalism were already at this time firmly established. Syndicalist literature undoubtedly goes back to the beginning of the last decade of the nineteenth century, and at the International Socialist Congress in Brussels (1891), Zurich (1893), and London (1896), the Revolutionary Unionists held several meetings and discussions. We have the right to establish here the fact that writers on Syndicalism who appeared later, like Sorel, Lagardelle, Berth, and others of the *Mouvement Socialiste* in France, and Labriola, Leone, and others of the *Divernire Sociale* in Italy, have not added a single new idea to the theory of Revolutionary Syndicalism, and have generally, even at present, not the least influence upon the movement. . . .

Above all, then, we must declare that the Revolutionary Syndicalist movement, especially in France, sprang into being as a movement of the people, as a movement in the working class itself; and its historical origin must be traced to the beginning of the last decade of the nineteenth century, or even to the old International. And further, we must state that on the whole the present principles and tactics of French Syndicalism do not differ in the least from the principles of Syndicalism during Pelloutier's activity.

If we want, by all means, to connect the foundation of the Syndicalist movement in France to the name of a person, then this is undoubtedly the name of Ferdinand Pelloutier, who organised the Federation of the Labour Exchanges, and the secretary of which he became in 1895. And, historically, Revolutionary Syndicalism, as against Parliamentary Socialism, took solid root since the Congress of St. Etienne (1892), which resolved to call into existence the Federation of the Labour Exchanges, and since that of Limoges (1895). Pelloutier died March 13th, 1901. The *Almanach de la*

Revolution for 1908 asked the question, "Who used in the Labour movement the expression 'Direct Action' for the first time?" And it was found that F. Pelloutier used this term, so expressive in the tactics of Revolutionary Syndicalism, for the first time in his periodical, *Ouvrier des Deux Mondes*, for February, 1897. Later, James Guillaume, the old Internationalist, brought out two quotations from the *Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne de l'Internationale* for November, 1874, and February, 1875, which speak of "direct initiative" and of "unional action imposing 'directly' a reform upon the employers," and so on. This proves that we must trace the origin of the ideas of modern Revolutionary Unionism to the International.

The definite theoretical and practical scission between Revolutionary Syndicalism and Parliamentary Socialism materialised at the Congress of Nantes in 1894. Namely, in the same city and coincidentally with the purely Unional Congress of the Federation of Labour Exchanges, the Socialist faction led by Guesde had organised its Politico-Unional Congress. This faction turned down the General Strike resolution, whereupon the Congress of Revolutionary Syndicalists adopted it with a great majority of the votes.

As to the origin and character of the Syndicalist teachings, the misunderstandings are innumerable. Many people, including Professor Sombart, consider the above writers as the representatives of the Syndicalist movement. That this view is due to a historical and theoretical misunderstanding of the origins of the movement is evident from a statement by Sombart in which he advances the view that the origins of the Syndicalist movement are to be traced to Neo-Marxism; that the Syndicalist teachings do not represent any new theory; that they are nothing else but resurrected and therefore alone genuine Marxism. This is quite a wonderful statement, if we consider it historically, for the Syndicalist ideas have, on the whole, gained ground hitherto especially in those countries where Marxism never took root, and that just where Marxism rules in the Labour movement—namely, in the countries situated in Central and Eastern Europe, with the exception of the Free Union of German Syndicates and some Bohemian societies—there is no Syndicalist movement. The newly awakened life should then flourish just where there was no life at the beginning!

Let us go deeper. If we leave unconsidered that not insignificant contingent of Syndicalist workers which joins the Revolutionary Unions for the sole reason of the realised material benefits, and turn to those elements which call themselves consciously Revolutionary Syndicalists, to those elements, then, from whose ranks the real representatives issued forth, we will find three distinct categories among them. First, the Unionists pure and simple, who profess that Unionism is sufficient unto itself, and who gradually became Revolutionists because the development of the class struggle forced them to it in practice. Many officials of the French Unions belong to them. Second, the group of Syndicalists who left the Anarchist movement and joined the first in search of a field in which in the place of propaganda by words the propaganda of deeds could be fruitfully and directly practised. In France, Pelloutier, Pouget, Monatte, Yvetot, Delesalle, and many others belong to this group. These are the elements who contributed most in pushing the French Labour movement into the revolutionary direction, in most cases, however, without troubling themselves much with Marx and Marxism. Thirdly come those Syndicalists, like Luquet, Griffuelhes, and others, who came to Anti-Parliamentary Syndicalism from one of the many Socialist groups because they have gradually realised (and which Sombart considers the departure of the whole movement) that Socialism is about to degenerate into a flat and conventional bourgeois movement. Even among these the Neo-Marxists—if there really are any conscious Neo-Marxists among the militants—represent a very small part. The great majority comes from the ranks of the Allemanists; especially the Parisian Syndicalist movement originates largely in the Allemanistic groups, and this practically means that Marx is an unknown quantity among them, whose name they may have heard sometimes from Guesdists, which are the French "Marxian" groups. And we must consider finally that even the leaders of this latter "Marxian" faction have only a very elementary knowledge of the Marxian theories.

In the practical movement and the Syndicalist press, in the *Voix du Peuple*, *Action Syndicaliste*, and so on, the above-mentioned writers do not play any part. The Syndicalist leaflets are not written by them, but by Pouget, Yvetot, Griffuelhes, Merrheim, Delesalle, and others. Most of the writers of the *Mouvement Socialiste* came to Syndicalism in the period of Millerandism, without, however, leaving the Parliamentary Socialist movement, but forming an opposition therein against the tendencies of degeneration, especially manifest in the pre-eminently Parliamentary movement. They partly belong yet to the since unified Socialist Party. Those Revolutionary Syndicalists who are contributing to the *Mouvement Socialiste*, which is a Neo-Marxian periodical, are doing it, in my opinion, for the sole reason of deepening the opposition within the Socialist movement against opportunism, and thus strengthening their own position.

GOD AND THE STATE.

By MICHAEL BAKUNIN.

A new edition, revised from the original Manuscript.

With a new Portrait.

Paper cover, 6d. net; cloth, 1s. net. Postage 1d.

FREEDOM Office, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W.

* A French translation of it was published at Paris in 1900, and an English translation, under the above title, was published by B. R. Tucker at New York in 1907.

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 Spontaneous Strike.

The recent strike on the North-Eastern Railway came as a surprise not only to the managers and directors of the company, but quite as much so to the leaders and officials of the A.S.R.S. It was, in fact, quite an unexpected manifestation of that spontaneous action which we look for more in France, Italy, and Spain than in England. Of course, those leaders of the men who like to dally with the threat of a strike for several months, enjoying the prominence they give to themselves with all the useless parleyings with the directors, ending by compromising all the men's claims to mere shadows—these people were simply outraged at the audacity of the workers taking matters into their own hands, and displaying such astonishing solidarity over the victimisation of a mere shunter.

But let us see what was the real effect of this strike.

In the first place, the disorganisation of commerce and of social life generally which immediately set in, very soon threatened local industries with complete paralysis. It would seem from this that these overworked and poorly paid slaves of the company were really rather important links in our industrial system. One might even be led to think that we could much better dispense with a highly paid director than with a poorly paid signalman, driver, or shunter. Be this as it may, what followed was significant of much. No sooner had the strike developed into serious proportions than the managers came forward with very reasonable terms to settle the grievances of the men. Compare this result with the attitude of these same managers when dealing with the men's "leaders" three years ago. Then they would concede nothing that was of any value to the men; and when the game of "conciliation" was begun, they retaliated with their policy of victimisation. But the spontaneous strike has completely turned the tables, the masters have come to terms with the men, and we can be absolutely certain that neither Goodchild nor any other man will be again victimised for a long time to come. Not only that, but the men will to a large extent have their past grievances remedied.

The opponents of the strike will, of course, tell us that it was a mere fizzle and nothing more will be heard of it. Well, that is a sign the men have won. It is now a settled policy with the capitalist Press to report all the harrowing details of a failing strike, and to observe absolute silence when the men win. A recent instance exemplifying this can be given. On June 1 last the papers reported that serious strike riots had broken out at Bo'ness, near Glasgow, in which forty men were injured and the police overpowered. It was a strike of woodyard workers, and the fight was over the blacklegs. This direct action of the strikers soon brought the masters to their senses. "So serious was the state of affairs," said the *Daily News*, "that the men's organiser had to appeal for a truce, stating that *the employers desired a conference*" (italics ours). "Later it was stated that the Union officials had obtained a guarantee from the masters that no more imported labour would be introduced." The workers won, but not another word was reported in the Press, and so we may be sure the conference was all in favour of the men.

And so it will prove with the North-Eastern strike. It is not likely the capitalists are going to advertise the victory of the direct action of the "rank-and-file." Their policy is to concede something to the men and keep quiet. And this will be done.

The masters do not like this new spirit, the men's leaders do not like it, and the Labour M.P.'s like it least of all. It is not surprising to read that "great relief was felt by the Labour M.P.'s at the satisfactory termination of the strike." Their inability to help the workers in the Labour struggle is becoming too painfully evident to need emphasising by the direct action of the men themselves. The Eight-Hour Act, their "Conciliation" Boards—both these are not only ridiculous failures, but are even used by the masters against the men with such effect that the workers begin to realise that not one gleam of hope comes from political action.

But they also begin to learn the immense power of direct action and the spontaneous strike, and in this lies the hope of the future, so far as the Labour movement is concerned.

TO WALT WHITMAN.

O Pioneer of Liberty!

Like silver clarion's stirring call,
Thy message rings across the sea;

It sounds for those, whoe'er they be,
Whose minds or bodies ache in thrall:
O Pioneer of Liberty!

For slaves of Priestcraft's tyranny,
Whose souls the ghostly fetters gall,
Thy message rings across the sea;

It sounds for those who bow the knee
To Mammon throned in gilded hall:
O Pioneer of Liberty!

For those whom law-propped Robbery
Has rendered destitute of all,
Thy message rings across the sea.

*Through Love of Comrades brave and free,
From every slave the chains shall fall!*

O Pioneer of Liberty,
Thy message rings across the sea!

T. S.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

Germany.

Many events happening here foreshadow the coming of important political changes. The Socialist successes at the recent by-elections are significant as showing, not a growth of the Socialist ideal, but a fusion of Radical and Liberal elements with the Social Democratic Party. The reason for this can be easily seen. The liberty of the individual in Germany has been so brutally crushed by the bureaucrats and the police that the country is ripe for a popular national protest that must eventually bring about a radical change in political institutions. Free speech and free assembly will, among other things, have to be assured. All this does not indicate that the Social Democrats have been fighting the tyranny of the State. Far from it. Those who have gone into the streets and fought for and conquered the right of public meeting have done most to convince the nation that this elementary right must be assured, just as our Anarchist comrades who are constantly going to prison have done most to bring Germany within measurable distance of a free Press.

United States.

News from U.S.A. tells us that there is some revival of activity in the various advanced movements. Besides the fact that Emma Goldman has had a most successful tour (see *Mother Earth* for July), the organisation of the Industrial Workers of the World is making good progress. It has just held its fifth Convention, which was very successful. The general secretary, St. John, says:—"Throughout the whole country a spirit of discontent is at work. Economic pressure is forcing the workers to realise their helplessness, in an unorganised condition, to cope with the modern organisation of the employing class. Keeping pace with the discontent there is a growing sentiment for revolutionary economic organisation on class lines, formed so as to make possible the use of the power that is inherent in the working class. In short, the workers are beginning to turn to the Industrial Workers of the World."

KROPOTKIN'S MOST FASCINATING WORK.

MEMOIRS of a REVOLUTIONIST

2s., postage 4d.

500 pages, well bound in cloth, with Portrait.

THE MESSAGE OF ANARCHY.

The *Hibbert Journal* for July contains an article with the above title written in a very fair spirit. It is by Professor Jethro Brown, of Adelaide University, and is notable as being the first review article that has been written for many years with any serious attempt to understand and to do justice to the Anarchist philosophy. This being so, we may be permitted to make some rather long extracts for the interest they will have for such of our readers as cannot obtain the original.

At the very outset the writer shows how Anarchist ideas have been stupidly villified and purposely confused by the popular Press:—

Few of the great causes which have inspired human devotion in the past have suffered so much as Anarchy from the uncritical depreciation which confuses essentials with accidental associations. I propose to discuss several examples. Perhaps the most striking relates to the means for bringing the new social order into being. To the popular mind, the stiletto and the bomb are the very symbols of Anarchy. The means which some Anarchists employ for the purpose of achieving the end in view are mistaken for the end itself. The explanation is simple. While the annals of a certain type of crime absorb the popular interest, the abstract treatises on the nature of man and society which explain that type, and may seek incidentally to justify it, are allowed to slumber in the dust of our libraries; and Anarchy is regarded, not as a theory of social reconstruction, but as a gospel of violence and crime. So we read in our morning paper of Anarchists in India! The fact is overlooked that the native revolutionaries who employ the methods of violence merely desire to substitute one set of political institutions for another.

He thinks the Anarchists are themselves "in part" to blame for the prejudice that the use of violence has aroused against them; but we must point out that he omits to mention the fact that Governments invariably provoked these retaliations by the barbarous cruelty of the sentences they have inflicted on *innocent* propagandists of Anarchist ideas. The 11th of November, 1887, showed the blood-lust of the capitalist class, and the legal murder of Spies and his comrades is not yet forgotten.

After some remarks on law, coercion, and property, which are not very clear, owing to the confusion of the Individualist with the Communist position, the writer continues:—

I pass to the arguments by which this conception of social life is justified. It would be superfluous to warn the reader against regarding my statement of these arguments as adequate. Apart from the fact that each Anarchist has his own intellectual armoury, the exceeding difficulty of doing justice to opinions which challenge a long-established order of things will be readily admitted by any one who has made a serious effort in this direction. The conviction that political institutions are a part of the eternal order of Nature is so deeply rooted in all our ideas about social life that an adequate statement of the case for the Anarchist would imply a comprehensive treatise. I shall only attempt to give the merest outline of the subject, stating what appear to me to be the more important arguments as clearly and as forcibly as I can.

I shall begin with a subject about which most people are likely to be in agreement—the failure of human governments to secure social justice. In theory, the State exists to promote the general interest; in historical fact, governments have sought to promote, first and foremost, the interests of a governing class. Even where they have aimed at the common good, their view of the nature of that good has been determined by class institutions and prejudices. Although under modern democracies there exists a clearer appreciation of the ends which governments ought to serve, the ignorance and self-interest of rulers, the empire of traditional conceptions over the minds of the multitude, the ambitions of some and the general inertia of many, so affect the course of legislation as to suggest the disturbing question whether government is not responsible for more evil than it prevents. How many individuals are there, even in the most democratic communities, who can be trusted not to employ their political power in the interests of themselves or their class? If we are to judge an institution by its fruits, what shall be said of human government when we regard impartially its most distinctive product—our system of property? When Paley, surely one of the least revolutionary of philosophers, began his defence of that system, he wrote in a famous passage: "If you should see a flock of pigeons in a field of corn, and if (instead of each picking where and what it liked, taking just as much as it wanted, and no more) you should see ninety-nine of them gathering all they got into a heap; reserving nothing for themselves but the chaff and refuse; keeping this heap for one, and that the weakest, perhaps the worst, pigeon of the flock; sitting round, and looking on, all the winter, whilst this one was devouring, throwing about, and wasting it; and if a pigeon, more hardy or hungry than the rest, touched a grain of the hoard, all the others instantly flying upon it, and tearing it to pieces; if you should see this, you would see nothing more than what is every day practised and established among men."

Then follows a quotation from Thorold Rogers, which is

worth reproducing for its exposure of the fraud, the robbery, and the violence that has made the "classes" rich:—

"I contend," said Thorold Rogers, "that from 1563 to 1824, a conspiracy, concocted by the law, and carried out by parties interested in its success, was entered into to cheat the English workman of his wages, to tie him to the soil, to deprive him of hope, and to degrade him into irremediable poverty." "We have been able," he adds in a later chapter, "to trace the process by which the condition of English labour had been continuously deteriorated by the acts of the Government. It was first impoverished by the use of base money. Next it was robbed of its guild capital by the land thieves of Edward's Regency. It was next brought into contact with a new and more needy set of employers, the sheepmasters, who succeeded the monks. It was then with a pretence, and perhaps with the intention of kindness, subjected to the quarter sessions amendment, mercilessly used in the first half of the seventeenth century, the agricultural labourer being still further impoverished by being made the residuum of all labour. The agricultural labourer was then further mulcted by the inclosures, and the extinction of those immemorial rights of pasture and fuel which he had enjoyed so long. The poor law professed to find him work, but was so administered that the reduction of his wages to a bare subsistence became an easy process and an economical expedient."

How the Anarchist regards the debasing effect of power on the individual is here well explained:—

Two counts in the Anarchist indictment have been considered—the social injustice of which governments have been guilty, and the militancy which they seem expressly designed to foster. It would not be difficult to show that these perversions of the ends of government are peculiar to no age or people; and that the social problem as we call it to-day is no new problem, but existed in Greece and in Rome, and has existed in every developed State of which we have any knowledge. Wherever political institutions are to be found we can trace the debasing influence of power upon those who exercise it; we can see governments false to the purposes they profess to serve; we can see individuals exploiting legal institutions for selfish ends; we can see many suffering in poverty while a few revel in profligate extravagance. If we escape from the commonplace rut of taking traditional institutions for granted, if we reflect seriously upon the injustice and wrong which has everywhere accompanied political institutions like an attendant spectre, we can understand, if we do not share, that distrust of government to which the Anarchist of our day gives effective expression. Although the facts which explain that distrust are familiar to every one who has thought about the subject at all, the Anarchist may claim to be more sensible of their existence, if not more anxious to discover a means for effecting their remedy, than the respectable members of society who regard his indictment as exaggerated and his remedy as impossible.

And lastly, the true sanctity of the individual, which concerns the Anarchist before all things, is summed up in the following statement:—

To the Anarchist it seems that men in the past have been content to affirm the importance of self-government as a moral ideal while submitting, in fact, to the control of institutions which make the realisation of that ideal impossible. He shows how all existing forms of political society are based upon force, since they imply the coercion of the individual by the government. Even the most democratic State involves the coercion of the minority by the majority. "Behind the ballot there is the bullet." What is the good, he argues, of talking about self-government as an ideal while denying it as a fact? The compulsion of the individual by an external authority is unnecessary, inexpedient, and morally wrong. (1) It is unnecessary, because experience shows that men are never more ready to obey rules of conduct than when obedience depends upon their individual sense of honour and their social reputation; no debt is more scrupulously regarded than the debt of honour; even to-day men obey the rules of the State less through fear of the civic penalty than because of the fear of public censure. (2) It is inexpedient, because it violates the fundamental principle which requires that the social system should be subservient to the development of individual character. "Law," said Reclus, "instead of appealing to man's better part, appeals to his worst; it rules by fear." "As long as a man," says Godwin, "is held in the trammels of obedience, and habituated to look to some foreign guidance for the direction of his conduct, his understanding and the vigour of his mind will sleep. Do I desire to raise him to the energy of which he is capable? I must teach him to feel himself, to bow to no authority, to examine the principles he entertains, and render to his mind the reason of his conduct." (3) Finally, the compulsion of the individual by an external authority is morally wrong, because it involves an invasion of the rights of manhood; if one man has no right to tax another man without his consent, then a majority has no right to tax a minority without its consent. No man, no group of men, can impose a rule on another against that other's will. The inviolable sanctity of the individual is, in fact, the very heart and centre of Anarchist teaching. Our supreme law, says Proudhon, is justice; and "justice is respect, spontaneously felt and mutually guaranteed, for human dignity. . . . In consideration of what do I owe my neighbour this respect? It is not the gifts of nature or the advantages of fortune that make me respect him; it is not his ox, his ass, or his maid-servant, as the decalogue says; it is not even the welfare that he owes to me as I owe mine to him; it is his manhood."

Pages of Socialist History.

By W. TCHERKESOFF.

CONCENTRATION OF CAPITAL.

IV. (Continuation).

The French figures are not more favourable to the apostles of the peasants' expropriation.

In France the Great Revolution partially accomplished the economic emancipation of the French peasantry. A considerable part of the lands of churches, monasteries, and nobility fell into the hands of the peasants. Peasant proprietors are the foundation of the present wealth of France. If that country is fondly called "La Belle France," it is because it is a succession of fields, vineyards, and gardens, cultivated with real passion by their working owners.

If France during the last forty years could easily pay the five milliards of francs war indemnity to Germany, give fourteen milliards of francs in loan to Russia, and afford a yearly Budget of nearly four milliards of francs, it is the economy of the French peasants which makes these stupendous facts possible.

Surely, if a tendency to the concentration of land existed in France with its millions of landowners, we ought to find proofs of it. We give some figures from "La Statistique Agricole de France: Resultats generaux des enquetes decennales de 1862, 1882, et 1892":—

Year.	Holdings less than 1 hectare.*	1 to 5 hectare.	5 to 10 hectare.	10 to 40 hectare.
1862	—	1,815,558	—	636,309
1882	2,167,667	—	769,152	—
1892	2,235,405	1,829,259	788,299	711,118
Increase	67,738	13,701	19,147	74,809

* 1 hectare equals 2·5 acres.

Unfortunately, until now the rural statistics, especially those concerning the change of ownership of land, are generally very unsatisfactory, even in France; for that reason the figures for 1862 are not complete.

For Italy, the following figures effectually contradict the concentration of land in that country. In the "Bolletino Ufficiale del Ministero d'Agricoltura, Industria e Commercio" (Rome, August 6, 1903), we see on page 1300:—

1882 682,802 landowners.
1901 1,045,113 "

The German census for the same period, 1882-1895, has been published, and its figures are explicit concerning the increase in the number of industrial establishments, landowners, and capitalists.

1. In different branches of industry the number of establishments was:—

	1882.	1895.	Increase.
Employing from 1 to 10 workers (small workshops)	2,951,531	3,048,270	96,739
Employing 200 or more (large workshops) ...	1,897	3,301	1,422

Number of persons employed:—

	1882.	1895.	Increase.
Small workshops (1 to 10)	4,835,919	5,604,178	768,259
Large ditto (200 or more)	870,559	1,604,567	734,008

2. The same with regard to land. For Prussia the figures are:—

Year.	Land in cultivation (rented).	Land partially rented.	Land not rented.
1882	829,137	2,322,899	2,953,445
1895	912,959	2,607,210	2,951,107
Increase	83,822	284,331	Decrease 2,338

3. The number of taxpayers in Prussia has increased as follows:—

Income.	1876.	1890.	Increase.
£25 to £100	4,704,757	5,517,828	813,071
£100 to £1,000...	442,534	582,053	139,519
More than £1,000	8,833	13,583	5,550

The increase in the number of small and medium fortunes is striking. There is no possibility of concealing it.

* *

My first article against this fatalistic prejudice of concentration, then so widely spread and so generally adopted by

Socialists of all schools and of all shades of opinion, appeared in FREEDOM, August, 1894. Though at first received as a great heresy, the idea soon began to germinate among the followers of Marx, and four years later some of the best known Social Democratic writers—Bernstein in Germany and Vandervelde in Belgium—adopted my view, and declared that the law of concentration of capital did not exist.

This declaration was such a blow at the foundation of the Marxian creed, and provoked such alarm in the rank-and-file of Social Democracy, that its leaders began to put forward all sorts of theories and statistics to uphold Marx's law. But their defence exposed more clearly the weakness of their "scientific" methods and the absence of any real knowledge.

One of the most reputed among those defenders, Kautsky, seeing that the official figures of all countries irrefutably prove that the number of small and middle-class capitalists is increasing, began to explain to the workers that the comparison must be made, not between the absolute figures, but between the percentages of their increase. For instance, from the above-quoted figures we see that during the years 1882-1895 the number of small farmers in Prussia had increased by 83,000. Instead of frankly admitting this, Kautsky expresses the number in percentages, stating that 829,000 in 1882 was 15·7 per cent. of all the land then in cultivation, 912,000 in 1895 being 16·4 per cent. of all the land then in cultivation. Then he makes the subtraction of these percentages (wonderful arithmetic!) and shows that the increase of 83,000 is not 10 per cent. of 829,000, but 0·7 per cent.

Using this same trick of comparing percentages, he finds it easy to prove that the number of small workshops and of workers employed in them, as well as the number of small and middle-class fortunes, is not increasing, but "relatively" decreasing. By the same procedure he proves that the number of magnates of capital is more rapidly increasing than the number of small capitalists.

But this trick entirely alters the discussion. Let us take 100 millionaires and 2,000,000 small capitalists; let us suppose that in ten years the number of the first is doubled, that is an increase of 100 per cent.; if in the same period the increase of the small capitalists was only 10 per cent., instead of 2,000,000 their number will be 2,200,000. So that the increase of 1·0 per cent. of the millionaires gives only 100 men, but the 10 per cent. of the small capitalists means 200,000.

Does it prove the concentration of capital, the diminution of the number of small capitalists? Quite the reverse. It proves that the number of capitalists is growing, and especially the number of small capitalists, the most avaricious and the most unscrupulous and ferocious defenders of the existing social slavery.

This more than strange method of demonstration, by manipulating the percentage without mentioning the quantity from which these hundredth parts are obtained, is now greatly favoured by Social Democrats. "You see," they say to the workers, "in one case the increase is equal to 300 per cent., while in the second it is only 10 per cent. So that in the first it must be thirty times greater."

According to this, 500 per cent. increase in the population of the Republic of San Marino will be 500 times higher than 1 per cent. increase of the population of the United States of America. But what is the reality? Five hundred per cent. of San Marino's population is 47,000, while 1 per cent. of the population of the United States is 800,000. Such are the true facts.

Undoubtedly, it was a disciple of Kautsky, the statistician, who wrote: "The mortality among the cobblers in the village is fearfully high; practically it is 100 per cent." In reality, there was in the place one cobbler, and he died.

In the endeavour to save their Marxian doctrine, the Social Democratic writers have forgotten even the text of their creed. Marx's formula clearly says, "one capitalist kills many others," and "the number of magnates of capital *diminishes*"; whilst his defenders are now trying to prove the very opposite, namely, that the number of large capitalists is *increasing*, and even more rapidly increasing than the number of small capitalists.

* *

However, the greatest irony of fate is that the upholders of concentration of capital have no suspicion that their "scientific Marxian law" was not discovered by Marx, but had been already indicated in 1830-40 by French Socialists, the Saint-Simonists and Fourierists, those "Utopians" whom Marx and Engels systematically held up to ridicule. In my next chapter on "Plagiarism" I shall deal in detail with the ideas and formulas appropriated by Marx and Engels from English and French authors without mentioning their names. Here it is sufficient to say that the tendency of concentration of capital was pointed out by Dr. Constantin Pecqueur in his work presented in 1839-40 to the French Academy of Moral Science, and developed by Eugene Buret, a Fourierist, in his book, "De la Misère de la Classe Laborieuse en Angleterre et France" (1840), a work crowned by the same Academy. Buret says in his introduction, page 59:—"The accumulation of capital in the hands of a small

number of individuals, the apparition of those magnates of commerce called capitalists, does it not naturally correspond to the regular formation of those privileged families of feudal times who absorbed all profit, all independence, and all rights? The accumulation of wealth in the hands of a constantly diminishing number of persons is not the result of privilege, I know, but of fact; it is for this reason that I find it all the more threatening."

Above all, the idea was powerfully and brilliantly demonstrated in Victor Considérant's "Manifeste de la Démocratie aux 19ième Siècle." On pages 10-11 we read:—"Capital invades all, the power of the large capitals is incessantly growing; they attract and absorb, in all branches, the smaller fortunes. Society is rapidly advancing to the formation of an aristocracy as oppressive as vile, which already begins to oppress and crush us, which lies heavy on the people, and which breaks, subdues, and enslaves the middle classes themselves every day. . . . This is a social phenomenon which characterises modern civilisation. . . . It follows step by step the course of the commercial and industrial system with its invasion of machines. . . . This incessantly pumps the national wealth into the reservoirs of the new aristocracy, where it is concentrated and creates legions of famished paupers and proletarians. In Great Britain we see, in the highest degree, this phenomenon of the concentration of capital in the hands of a few aristocrats. France and Belgium, the two countries which follow Great Britain closest in this false industrial development, are also the countries where the new feudalism is spreading most rapidly."

Victor Considérant, Buret, and all Socialists of that period denounced, as a great social danger, this tendency of concentration arising from the industrial revolution provoked by the newly introduced modern machinery. They urged the democracy to act promptly against this menacing evil, and as peaceful reformers preached a social order which would guarantee to the people the possession of all the means of production, as well as the whole produce of their labour. Buret, for instance, said: "As the land is the most important factor of production, not a particle ought to be taken from those who can cultivate it" (vol. II., p. 468).

If for those peaceful French Socialists the concentration of capital was an argument for immediate social reform, so for the revolutionary Socialists of that time, as Blanqui, Desjacques, Flocon, and others, it was an incitement to call the working classes to immediate revolutionary action and social revolution.

But whilst all those French Socialists so clearly indicated and formulated concentration of capital as a great social evil, Marx and his followers by the aid of Hegelian dialectics turned it into a beneficent social law which would mechanically and peacefully liberate human society without any effort on its own side. This doctrine of Capitalism devouring itself and bringing about the reign of social justice was especially inculcated in the young generation of Germany. Under its influence, during the last fifty years every revolutionary attempt or general strike, not only in Germany, but in other countries, was decried by Social Democratic leaders as foolish and useless acts of the ignorant, hindering the natural development of their Marxian fatalistic doctrine.

W. TCHERKESOFF.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE ANNIVERSARY OF FERRER'S DEATH.

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

DEAR COMRADE,—Through the columns of FREEDOM I should like to draw attention to a coming event of great importance to the comrades of all Socialist organisations. We are nearing the first anniversary of the murder of Senor Francesco Ferrer y Guardia, by order of a Christian capitalist Government. Such an event should be commemorated in a manner suitable for such an occasion. Let not the memory of the foul murder of this brave spirit be forgotten by the members of both the bourgeois and proletarian classes. To the bourgeois we should make known the fact that the spirit of Ferrer is still alive. Let not the memory of the last scene in Ferrer's career fade in such a short space of time. The thought of this undaunted, courageous humanitarian facing the bullets of "his fellow countrymen, unwitting traitors shooting a patriot," with the cry, "Long live the Modern School!" shall not soon be forgotten. Let us organise for the purpose of commemorating this event. Let us show the capitalist class that although they have murdered Ferrer, his message still inspires the lives of hundreds and thousands of men and women of to-day, who are prepared to sacrifice everything, including their lives, for the cause that has meant the death of Ferrer and many others. Let us be avenged by working hard to bring knowledge where superstition exists, and by waging war upon the clerical murderers who have robbed us of one of the greatest spirits in the annals of the working-class movement.—Yours fraternally,

W. J. CLARKE.

To Correspondents.

A. H. HOLT.—Your article will appear next month.

W. J. ROBINS.—Thanks. Will use when opportunity occurs.

FROM A WOMAN TOILER.

(Reprinted from "Solidarity.")

FELLOW WORKER MAN TOILER,—You say you want us girls to keep out of the factory and mill so you can get more pay; then you can marry some of us and give us a decent home. Now, that is just what we are trying to escape: being obliged to marry you for a home. And aren't you a little inconsistent? You tell us to get into the Industrial Workers of the World. If we get out of the shop, the mill, and the factory, how are we to get into the I.W.W., an organisation for wage-workers only? We haven't learned of any Household Drudges' Union, not even in the I.W.W. Going from the factory back into the home means only a change in the form of servitude, a change for the worse for the woman. The best thing that ever happened to woman was when she was compelled to leave the narrow limits of the home and enter into the industrial life of the world. This is the only road to our freedom; and to be free, there is not anything to be desired more than that. It is not in the home that woman develops into a thinking and reasoning being. It is in the workshop. In the home she is more apt to become more limited in reasoning power, more bound by religious superstitions, more a slave to social conventions, more petty and gossipy and meddlesome. It is the modern woman's privilege to do her part in social production, and it is not for revolutionists to hinder her progress, but rather to aid it, for, I repeat, it is the only way to her emancipation from all bondage. So we will stay in the factory, mill, or store, and organise with you in the I.W.W. for the ownership of the industries, so we can provide ourselves with decent homes. Then if we marry you it will be because we love you so well we can't get along without you, and not to give you a chance to pay our bills, like we do now. No; tell the girls you are not going to marry them and make slaves of them; that they must work out their own salvation through the Industrial Union, just as you men are doing. Why, man, don't you know that is just why it is so hard to organise women, because they are always on the look-out for some man to take them out of the factory; and after they have landed you, do you think they are going to let you spend your time and money fighting for your freedom? No; there are too many household wants to be provided for. Teach the girls that the only moral life for woman is the self-supporting one, and true virtue lies in giving one's self for love alone, and you sweep away the fabric of lies that the bourgeois have woven about woman in order to traffic in her sex. Teach the working woman that her status as an industrial woman is not transitory, but a permanent one in which all women will be included in the coming industrial State; and when they come to understand this it will be easier to organise them into a revolutionary Union. Give them the truth and they will not be misled by the sophistries of the Craft Unionist, the Suffragette, the Socialist balloteer, who servilely subscribe to the ethics of the master class for the sake of "respectability."

We are slaves in revolt against the employing class. We will have none of their religion, their politics, their marriage system. They all work to keep the workers in subjection.

Yours for Rebellion,

WOMAN TOILER.

PROPAGANDA NOTES.

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

LIVERPOOL.

Again we are endeavouring to rally our forces to inaugurate a group to propound the idea conveyed in the General Strike. We have bobbed our heads up several times during the past few years with the object of forming something of this sort, but seemingly it has been doomed to failure. However, failure of this description only serves to spur us onward. The depletion in our ranks by deaths and removals of some of the ardent spirits has caused our struggle to be keener than before. But we are out on the warpath once more. Muston and Kavanagh have had several meetings at the Column advocating Direct Action in a telling manner. Our Brighton comrade soon catches the ear of the crowd with his interesting stories of French strikes compared to English, pointing out in a vivid manner the absolute superiority of our French comrades in dealing with crises of these kinds. It is quite apparent that our Continental comrades have fully grasped the necessity that to strike in a general manner is the means by which they attain such a large percentage of gains over their English comrades. Our French comrades show us an effective method. It now remains for France to show the world that for a complete emancipation there is one method—the General Strike.

The School reopens on August 7 at 1 Clarendon Terrace, Beaumont Street. The outing of the children takes place on Saturday, August 6. Funds are extremely low and it rests with our comrades of Liverpool whether its issue will be a success. There are nearly fifty children to cater for, and £5 is needed to cover expenses. Subscriptions received up to date (August 25):—M. K. 5s, S. H. M. 3s, J. P. 1s, J. Q. 1s, W. 2s 6d, J. E. 1s, B. B. 2s, W. B. 2s 6d, J. H. D. 5s; total £1 3s.

DICK JAMES.

International Club, Spekelland Buildings,
22 Canning Place, Liverpool.

GLASGOW.

Owing to the holidays which occur here during the month of July, no propaganda work has been done. We hope, however, to make a start again on Friday, August 5, at Avenue Road, Springburn, which site we have

chosen in preference to Cathedral Square. Meetings will be held there at 8 p.m. each Friday until further notice. We earnestly request all comrades to attend our meetings and give such assistance as lies in their power. Those who are unable to attend should communicate with us as soon as possible. Letters to be sent to J. Paton, 112 Keppochhill Road, Springburn. John McAra speaks at Glasgow Green on Sunday afternoons.

D. KENNEDY.

WALTHAMSTOW.

We have been holding good meetings at Edmonton and Tottenham, but at Edmonton we have changed our meeting place. Not being able to get a change of speakers, we thought it a good plan to try a fresh audience. So our meetings at Edmonton for a time will be held at Angel Road. Unfortunately, it was wet, but there was one redeeming feature and that was the number of comrades that turned up, quite encouraging to the opener—the Irish Rebel. At Tottenham on Sunday evenings we have had very good meetings. Comrade Kitz gave us a helping hand this month. Ponder and Baron are keeping the fight going, and we should be glad of any assistance, as it is a splendid spot to propagate Anarchism. The “only” Socialist Party has refused, by the vote of a majority, to accept Comrade Ponder’s challenge to a debate. We think the minority has had an eye-opener over this business of majority rule. Ponder and other comrades are going to Epping to hold a meeting with the Parliamentary Socialists and others, as a fight for free speech is going on. We have not restarted meetings at Hoe Street, but we hope soon to do so.

FANNER.

Notice.—An American comrade, Ben Reitman, is in London for a couple of weeks, and is open to speak for any group in or near London, weekday or Sunday. Immediate application should be made to Manager, FREEDOM Office.

WALTHAMSTOW AND EDMONTON ANARCHIST GROUP.

Meetings are held every Sunday at Angel Road, Edmonton, at 12 o’clock; and at West Green Corner, Tottenham, every Sunday evening at 7 o’clock.

GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP.

Meetings are held at Glasgow Green every Sunday afternoon, and at Avenue Road, Springburn, every Friday evening at 8 o’clock.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

(July 6—August 4.)

FREEDOM Guarantee Fund.—E. Rhodes 2s 6d, Anon £1, H. Glasse 5s 6d, R. Clarke 6d.

FREEDOM Subscriptions.—W. Hart 1s 6d, J. Kirk 2s, C. M. Stoycoff 1s 9d, W. J. N. 1s 6d, W. Birkett 9d, F. Baker 1s 6d.

WANTED.—Second-hand copy of “The Ego and Its Own,” by Max Stirner.—Offers to be sent to F. C., care of T. Keell, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W.

ANARCHISM.

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

With Six Portraits.

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

A NEW EDITION.

The Famous Speeches

OF THE

EIGHT CHICAGO ANARCHISTS.

Price 1s., Postage 2d.

“FREEDOM” OFFICE, 127 OSSULSTON STREET, N.W.

ANARCHISM AND MALTHUS.

By C. L. JAMES.

Price Twopence; by post, Twopence-Halfpenny.

The Author says: “The Malthusian Theory is the strongest possible argument for that kind of Socialism or Anarchism which proposes, through complete emancipation of women, to abolish the fundamental tyranny from whence all others spring.”

A Fine

PORTRAIT OF BAKUNIN.

Price 2d., post-free 3d.; 1s. 6d. per dozen.

NEW PROPAGANDA LEAFLET.

What is Anarchism?

6d. per 100 post free; 4s. per 1,000.

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.

The Great French Revolution, 1789—1793.

By P. A. KROPOTKIN.

610 pages 8vo, cloth, 6s. net, postage 5d.

PAMPHLET AND BOOK LIST.

- ANARCHIST COMMUNISM: ITS BASIS AND PRINCIPLES.** By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
ANARCHISM: ITS PHILOSOPHY AND IDEAL. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.
ANARCHIST MORALITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
ANARCHY. By E. MALATESTA. 1d.
THE WAGE SYSTEM. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.
A TALK ABOUT ANARCHIST COMMUNISM BETWEEN TWO WORKERS. By E. MALATESTA. 1d.
THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
EXPROPRIATION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
DIRECT ACTION v. LEGISLATION. By J. BLAIR SMITH. 1d.
THE PYRAMID OF TYRANNY. By F. DOMELA NIEUWENHUIS. 1d.
LAW AND AUTHORITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
THE SOCIAL GENERAL STRIKE. By ARNOLD ROLLER. 2d.
THE PLACE OF ANARCHISM IN SOCIALISTIC EVOLUTION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
THE COMMUNE OF PARIS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. ½d.
THE BASIS OF TRADE UNIONISM. By EMILE POUGET. 1d.
AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
WAR. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
SOCIALISM THE REMEDY. By HENRY GLASSE. 1d.
EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. By ELISEE RECLUS. 1d.
THE KING AND THE ANARCHIST. 1d.
MONOPOLY; OR, HOW LABOUR IS ROBBED. WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
USEFUL WORK VERSUS USELESS TOIL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONGRESS, 1907. 1d.
ANARCHY v. SOCIALISM. By W. C. OWEN. 2d., post-free 2½d.
WHAT I BELIEVE. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 2d., post-free 2½d.
PATRIOTISM. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 2d., post-free 2½d.
ANARCHISM AND MALTHUS. By C. L. JAMES. 2d.
THE GOD PESTILENCE. By JOHN MOST. 1½d.
SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN GERMANY. By GUSTAV LANDAUER. ½d.
ANARCHISTS AND ESPERANTO. 1d.
KROPOTKIN: THE MAN AND HIS MESSAGE. By T. SWAN. 1d.
THE TERROR IN RUSSIA. By P. KROPOTKIN. 2d., postage 1½d.

- GOD AND THE STATE.** By MICHAEL BAKUNIN. Cloth 1s. net, paper 6d. net, postage 1d.
THE GREAT FRENCH REVOLUTION, 1789—1793. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 6s. net.
ANARCHISM. By DR. PAUL ELTZBACHER. 6s. 6d.; postage 4d.
MUTUAL AID. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3s. 6d. post-free.
FIELDS, FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. Paper cover 6d, post-free 9d.; cloth 1s., post-free 1s. 3d.
MEMOIRS OF A REVOLUTIONIST. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2s.
MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1s.
NEWS FROM NOWHERE. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1s. 6d.; postage 4d.
A DREAM OF JOHN BALL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 2s., postage 3d.
WHAT IS PROPERTY? By P. J. PROUDHON. 2 vols. 2s., postage 4d.
PRISONS, POLICE AND PUNISHMENT. By E. CARPENTER. Paper 1s., cloth 2s., postage 3d.
ENGLAND'S IDEAL. By EDWARD CARPENTER. 2s. 6d. and 1s., post. 3d.
A VINDICATION OF NATURAL SOCIETY. By EDMUND BURKE. 1s. and 6d., postage 2d. and 1d.
WALDEN. By H. THOREAU. 1s. and 6d., postage 2d. and 1d.

All orders, with cash, should be sent to

Manager, “Freedom” Office, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W.

“FREEDOM” MAY BE OBTAINED OF

London.—HENDERSONS, 66 Charing Cross Road, W.C. (Wholesale).
 HENDERSONS, 26 The Pavement, Clapham Common, S.W.
 W. REEVES, 83, Charing Cross Road, W.
 O. MATHIAS, 20, Little Pulteney Street, W.
 B. RUDERMAN, 71 Hanbury Street, Spitalfields, E.
 J. J. JAKES, 191 Old Street, City Road, E.C.
 QUICKFALLS, 238 York Road, and 61 High Street, Battersea, S.W.
 E. H. JOHNSON, 23 Bride Lane, Ludgate Circus, 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.

Manchester.—J. BURGESS AND CO., 15 Peter Street.

Glasgow.—D. BAXTER, 32 Brunswick Street.
 D. G. LINDSAY, 139 West Nile Street.

Dundee.—L. MACARTNEY, 203, Overgate.

Belfast.—W. ROBINSON, 167 York Street.

Paris.—Kiosque, Boulevard Bonne Nouvelle, opposite La Menagère.
 Kiosque, Boulevard Sebastopol, corner of Rue Rambuteau.

U.S.A.—N. NOTKIN, 1332 S. 6th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
 M. MAISEL, 422 Grand Street, New York, N.Y.

New Zealand.—P. JOSEPHS, 32 Cuba Street, Wellington.

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