

Freedom

JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM

VOL. XXV.—No. 266.

JUNE, 1911.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

NOTES.

The Rule of the Money-Bag.

Government, say the opponents of Anarchism, is necessary to keep man moral. Without government, society becomes impossible. A picture is then painted of all the wickedness of human nature let loose under Anarchism; of men flying at each other's throats; of people refusing to work, preferring to live in idleness and to use up the accumulated wealth, caring nothing for the needs of others. It would be a damning indictment of Anarchism if it were true. But it happens to be false; and not only false so far as Anarchism is concerned, but a very exact and unexaggerated picture of the present system of governmental society. Look around. See the costly idleness of the rich, whose guiltiness in disregarding the needs of others is reflected in the long list of deaths from starvation in this the wealthiest city in the world. But these are the people who govern us! See the hypocrisy of those who lyingly call Anarchism "bloodshed and disorder," and who, while preaching peace and goodwill on earth, are inventing diabolical engines for the destruction of human life which the most brutal savages would shudder at. But these are the people who govern us! Last, but not least, look at the methods these money-bags use to get themselves elected. Exeter, Nottingham, Hull. If some inhuman monster had said, "I will demoralise mankind, I will destroy its manhood with the poison of the money-bag," could he have done worse than has been done to those citizens already sufficiently degraded by a vicious system? These things have been done, and done by the people who govern us! If Anarchism preached what Capitalism practises, we should be the first to work for its utter destruction.

Poison for Profit.

We are considered enemies of society because we say that social life is based on robbery disguised as the wage-system, and on economic slavery resulting from the monopoly of the means of life by a dominating class of landlords and capitalists. While the politicians are tinkering with the evils of a society which is founded on the rotten basis of exploitation in every shape and form, the menace to health, and indeed life itself, continues to increase. Those good people who handle our food supplies all the week, with profitable results to themselves, and go regularly to church on Sunday to be reminded how blessed are the poor, are hastening our departure from this weary world by the following means (amongst others) of scientific adulteration: Butter (purchased in Sussex!) consisting chiefly of cocoanut oil; Gorgonzola cheeses coated with barium sulphate and fat to add to their weight; Dutch cheese sold as Cheshire (how *international* the capitalist can be when it profits him!); foreign birds sold as "Cheshire geese" and "Norfolk turkeys"; Norwegian herrings as "Yarmouth," and potatoes from Holland as "special Dunbars." Beverages sold as "cider" were in many cases found to be aerated sugar solutions containing no apple juice. In addition, it is just worth mentioning that worthless manures were sold at high prices as efficient—we suppose just to help the British farmer to compete with imported wheat, for instance! All these facts are taken from the report for 1910 of the inspectors of food supplies. This point is worth noting in case it might be supposed these things were the result of an Anarchist plot to destroy society. No need to be alarmed. These are only the means of enrichment of that class without whose genius for organisation of production the poor worker would not be able to live!

The Downfall of Diaz.

As we print some news from Mexico elsewhere, there is not much to say here except to point to one fact. Diaz was a despot without the shadow of a scruple of any kind, and drew round

himself all the rascality of officialdom. Stupid people call this the type of the "strong man,"—now running for his life like the meanest of mortals. Let it be remembered that he was President of a Republic, and, although hated by the majority, the vote failed to remove him. Indeed, political action never showed its absolute inefficiency more glaringly than under the Diaz régime. Now he is gone, and the worst of his gang with him. But it has required a forcible *revolution* to do it. It is to be hoped that the unspeakable slavery of the peons as well as the unbridled power of Capitalism in Mexico will end with the exit of this monster.

Sophistical "Socialism."

The Sheerness branch of the I.L.P. passed a resolution (printed in the *Labour Leader* of May 26th) emphatically protesting against the acceptance by J. R. MacDonald of an invitation to luncheon with the Kaiser, "believing that it is such tactics that undermine the confidence of the rank-and-file in the utility of the Socialist movement." Whereupon to explain the matter away, the editor indulges in the following sophistical contortion:—

"In this connection it should be stated (without prejudice) that we are given to understand that it was with the unanimous wish of the Labour Party officers that Mr. MacDonald accepted the invitation. Whilst it is undeniable that the Kaiser is the last person in the world most Socialists would dream of dining with, it is obviously undeniable also that the Labour Party differs from the I.L.P."

We hope the "rank-and-file" will duly appreciate this estimate of their honesty and intelligence. At the same time, we cannot help reminding them that they must look for nothing else. J. R. MacDonald and others will follow in the footsteps of Burns just as surely as night follows day.

A Desert for Deer.

An excellent series of articles is appearing in the *Daily News* on the conditions of things in the Scottish Highlands. It has been long known that whole tracts of splendid farming and grazing land are cleared of human population to make way for deer. But this sort of thing has been going on for years, and the people suffer, suffer, suffer, and nothing is done. The crofters have made some heroic struggles, but the British Government only sent gunboats. The Labour Party sits in the same House as some of these landowning vampires. But we should have thought the better place for the MacDonalds and the Keir Hardies was amongst their own people rousing them to a national resistance against the infamies depicted in the *Daily News*, which tells us that the flower of the Scottish peasantry is being driven from their homes to make way for "hunters cradled in Houndsditch, Nimrods of the rubber boom, marksmen from the Kaffir market, brewer, whisky distiller, and American Trust boodler."

Labour Politics in Australia.

The arrival of Mr. Fisher, the Labour Prime Minister of Australia, affords us an opportunity of gathering some ideas of his outlook on questions which are specially interesting at the present moment. For instance, he told a representative of the *Morning Post* that "the nationalisation of monopolies was not in any sense revolutionary." "It does not follow," he added, "that because an industry is a monopoly that it should be nationalised." Whatever can this man be thinking of to get himself elected as Labour Premier! Why, every workman knows that *every* monopoly is an enemy that appropriates part of his labour-force in the interest of the monopolist. We might as well have Lord Rosebery or the Earl of Wemyss for Labour Premier; they would certainly go as far as this, and the latter at any rate would have as much care for our personal liberty as Mr. Fisher. But where on earth does the interest of Labour come in? How much better off is the Australian worker for the blessing of a Labour Premier?

ROBERT OWEN AND CO-OPERATION.

A Review and a Suggestion.

To give a review of the origin of the Co-operative movement, its connection with Socialism, and to suggest a means for its further development, is the purpose of this paper. The story is taken from Holyoake's "History of Co-operation," which forms one of the most instructive books we have on the character of English Socialism and the men who endeavoured to put it into practice. Chief of these was Robert Owen, generally known as Robert Owen of New Lanark, who was born in the year 1771, so that on the appearance of Godwin's "Political Justice," which Holyoake informs us was the text-book of the working classes at that time, Owen would be 25 years of age. Few people, said Holyoake in 1875, have any idea of what the objects of the English Communists have been; and no doubt the political advocacy of the last thirty or forty years has still further obscured it, so that a reconsideration of what those objects were cannot fail to be of benefit to the student of social questions.

In Holyoake's book we have many definitions of what Co-operation really meant. After reviewing the movements and writings of earlier advocates—Sir Thomas More, 1516, Harrington, 1656, Bellers, 1696, and Godwin, 1793—he says that the first number of Mr. Owen's *Economist* appeared on Saturday, January 27, 1821, in which mention was made of the formation of a Co-operative and Economical Society, which is the earliest record he finds of a name now so familiar to the public ear.

In the autumn of 1821, the editor of the *Economist* defined the New System of Society projected by Robert Owen as Unrestrained Co-operation on the part of all the members for every purpose of social life. Clearly, says Holyoake, it meant Communism, and whoever expressed it knew very well what he meant; and during the next ten years Co-operation, then for the first time distinctively named, spread wondrously over the land. Mr. Owen and his friends had always kept before the public that a new society was intended which was to take the form of a community of interests. Many other definitions of Co-operation as implying Communism are given, but it was not until 1835 that it was described as Socialism.

Early in 1834 Mr. Owen had proposed that the friends of the human race should form an Association of all Classes and all Nations. Many notices were published that at one o'clock on May 1, 1835, a great meeting would be held in the Charlotte Street Institution. The Association was formed at this meeting, and the term "Socialism" was first introduced on the formation of the Society, the members of which came to be known as Socialists. A Congress was announced to be held fourteen days later, when Mr. Owen stated that he should retire from public life, having attained on that day the age of 65 years.

Why, then, it may be asked, has Co-operation or Socialism failed to attain the ideal its promoter had of it. First, we must understand that Co-operation as we know it to-day was only inaugurated as a means and not as an end in itself. It was commenced as a means of supplying funds for propagating the idea of Communism or the New Society.

From 1812 to 1817 Mr. Owen's opinions had been addressed to the upper classes. His great ambition had been to interest Cabinets and kings in his schemes, and he very wisely concluded that if he addressed himself exclusively to the labouring classes, the aristocracy would not identify themselves with his views. No promulgator of new ideas ever had greater success than he for many years. Consulted by the Governments of England and America, receiving princes and heirs to Empires in his counting-house, being assured by the Cabinet of his own country that they were convinced of the truth of his system, it is not surprising that he thought the world was entirely converted to his opinion. But when in 1817 he publicly declared "all the religions of the world are founded in error," he alarmed for his day and generation the bishops and clergy, who were really to a great extent in honourable sympathy with his generous views.

From being a social reformer he commenced to be a religious reformer, and, being thorough, he did by the Church as he did by the State—he proposed to reform it altogether. The consequences soon came home to him. He had friends too powerful for his life to be in danger, but those who could save his life could not save his influence. The *Times* soon wheeled into line against him, the Conservative and influential classes deserted him. Only the Duke of Kent and Lord Brougham stood by him to the end. Finding himself unable to succeed with the upper classes, Mr. Owen determined to carry his point, if he could, by committing his schemes to the hands of the people, for whom he always cared and whom alone he sought to serve.

Princes, prelates, even monarchs, had lent heeding ears to the inspired Welshman's story of what might be done for the formation of the character of mankind, if those who wielded national influences would use them to this end; but the day at length came when the most ardent paused. The world admired but did not subscribe, and it was left to chequered enthusiasts to find funds to diffuse a knowledge of the new views. It was then that some practical-minded persons advised the formation of Co-operative Stores, where money might be made without subscribing it, and proposed that shareholders should give their profits to a fund for propaganda.

Such are the origin and principles of Co-operation, as culled from Holyoake's "History."

Now comes the suggestion as to how those funds accumulated by

the Co-operative and other societies might be made a guarantee for the realisation of Robert Owen's ideas.

The funds and profits have not been used as was at first intended. Some societies still grant 2½ per cent. of their profits for educational purposes, but the manner of applying it has dwindled through science and art classes, etc., until now it mostly takes the form of children's entertainments. The propaganda of social questions is almost entirely left in the hands of the Women's Guild, an auxiliary Co-operative movement of about 500 branches and 25,000 members. As Holyoake says in his "History," where Co-operative societies now spend pounds, Robert Owen spent thousands. At one time he was spending at the rate of £15,000 per year on literature alone.

The result of this policy of thrift through the Co-operative and other societies is that the savings of the working classes now amount to £450,000,000, or about £10 per head of the population. But against these savings there is an accumulated debt of £4,000,000,000, or about £100 per head, which is made up from municipal, national, and other loans. How, then, are the people to free themselves from this vast debt and enslavement to the Government and financiers? The suggestion is that they may do so by following the methods of the bankers themselves. The bankers do not meet their liabilities with gold. They cannot do so, because for every £100 of liabilities they only hold £1 in gold with which to pay it. They create confidence in the people that they can pay, and it is for the people to imitate them by creating confidence that they also can pay.

But it is no part of this suggestion that this huge debt shall be paid, because this great amount of wealth pretended to have been lent to the people neither exists nor ever has done. It has been swelled and inflated to these huge proportions on the supposition that future labour would allow itself to be exploited to this amount. What is really required is the cost only of the maintenance of the people during the period of transition from one system of society to the other—from Capitalism to Communism. For this, one-tenth of the savings of the working classes would be sufficient. This might be effected by issuing bonds or duplicate tickets such as are used in lotteries, on the mere guarantee to pay. These guarantees could be held by the workers' organisations until sufficient funds and confidence were created to commence the revolution. Then a financial crisis might be prepared and evolved, such as was done by Francis Place when he broke up the Wellington Ministry.

After the financial collapse a general boycott and destruction of the capitalist Press might be effected, and the conditions for a general Communal Resume and reorganisation of society would be complete.

A. H. H.

ANARCHIST ACTIVITY.

It may not be amiss just now to test by as impartial an examination as possible the utility of our efforts.

First, let us see whether, being outside the pale of Parliament, we therefore doom ourselves to impotence. It cannot be shown that we do, for reforms in any way benefitting the great working class have always to be wrung from the Government of the day, and discontent with present-day conditions is what we are always endeavouring to arouse. All forms of discontent, spontaneously expressed, with the conditions of life, may be considered as revolutionary activity, the goal of which is the establishment of a life of equality. This activity is everywhere, more or less, and always to be witnessed. Such discontent, too, shows itself continually, by way of strikes, in demands for better treatment of the workers by the master class, and so benefits, of doubtful value very often, it must be confessed, are obtained by the working class as a result of dissatisfaction—the dissatisfaction that knows its origin, and not a mere quarrelling with life for no definable reason. The seething mass of discontent that has ended in a revolution in Mexico is destined at any rate to alter considerably the state of affairs in that country—there we witness a terrible revolt as a result of terrible suffering by the people. And reforms must follow, such as could not be obtained in any other way. In creating a tide of revolt, therefore, we obtain reforms that are meant to check it; so, from the mere reformer's point of view, we justify our existence.

But we desire a revolution in order to found a life of equality for man! Now it will not be denied that a revolution occurring in any country is a conceivable possibility, but many will refuse to believe that it is possible for a revolution to take place where conditions are at all supportable—let us say, where they are not as cruel and inhuman as in Mexico. Still more people will deny that it is possible permanently to establish a life of equality, even though a revolution of such violence as entirely to change the conditions of a country or a continent may occur.

Let us consider the first objection for a moment, bearing in mind what some writers assert, that a revolution is entirely the result of economic conditions. This seems hard to believe, and, if true, is something very painful to reflect upon. For unless, together with growing discontent amongst the people of a nation, there is an ardent desire for the establishment of equality amongst those who by their ability in the cause of the revolution stand out from among their fellows, it is hard to see how a new life other than a life of inequality in some fresh form is to be made possible. In asserting that economic conditions alone produce revolution, do we not attach too much importance to the effect

of such conditions upon a people? Surely at some stage in the world's career there must come a time when ardent spirits can appeal, with a prospect of success, to the people to free themselves, because freedom alone is life. I myself fail to see that a revolution in Europe will take place through actual stress of economic conditions, although dissatisfaction with such will play its part.

And now we have arrived at a convenient point wherefrom to consider the second objection, namely, that if a revolution should take place, the coming of a life of equality for man does not seem possible. For, in answering the second objection, I tried to show the necessity for a real spirit of humanity to be abroad preceding the revolution, this seeming to be the best guarantee that the revolution would not be self-defeating. But to say that such must be abroad before revolution means that men, at least a large number, must be so imbued with it that if called to positions of prominence during the time of disruption and dismay they will use their temporary personal ascendancy for the good of all, and guide the majority in a way calculated to achieve the desired result. That the result is earnestly desired by some to-day, and will be later on, cannot be doubted; the whole point for consideration is whether the forces of good will be greater than the forces of evil. The problem is a moral one, as all problems of importance are. I regard the period of transition as the most momentous, because that is the time of contending forces, and the society that succeeds any period of revolution is moulded by the individuals who have managed to gain power in it. That goodness, humanity, "sweet reasonableness" will one day triumph over their opposites must be the belief of those who hold that life is worth living and that every one is entitled to make it so.

It will, perhaps, be further objected here that this plan of reformation of the world in no wise differs from that of the earnest religious reformer, who hopes by changing men's hearts and minds to create a new life upon earth. Before showing the great difference that there is between the two, I should like to say that there is a great similarity between a revolutionist and a religious enthusiast. The similarity, of course, is not so much in what they believe, though their beliefs may in many particulars coincide, but in their manner of believing it. Both, if genuine, are types of that moral earnestness that always has been and always will be the admiration of the world. What is with the majority of people a fleeting state of rare occurrence is with them a fixed idea, part of their being. In them we witness their beliefs. The difference between them, leaving out of consideration the belief of the religious reformer that his efforts are the result of imbibing the divine spirit, is mainly in their proposals for the establishment of a new life. One considers all means on occasion legitimate and useful; the other, as, for example, the Tolstoyan, proposes the doctrine of passive resistance. One is impatient for the new life, the other to some extent patient. A revolutionist considers life sacred, but relatively sacred, and is prepared to destroy that life which is a menace to others. The other, not agreeing with this, can propose no direct remedy for the destruction of life by the tyrants of the various countries, and consistently with this advocates self-sacrifice, by which the world is intended to be saved. A revolutionist is prepared to sacrifice, but demands it of no one.

Thus it is seen that Anarchist activity accomplishes now for the people all that can be done by Socialists or others through their Parliamentary representatives; it keeps time with the progress of industrial events and impatiently awaits each new phase of a nation's life, believing that the time of revolution will come.

H. W. WILLIAMS.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

- Fabian Anarchism.* By Alexander Horr. 10 cents. San Francisco: Free-land Publishing Company, 1814 Webster Street.
- The Theory and Practice of Trade Unionism.* By J. H. Greenwood. 6d. net. London: A. C. Fifield, 13 Clifford's Inn, E.C.
- Trade Unionism and the Class War.* By Guy A. Aldred. 1d. London: 17 Richmond Gardens, Shepherd's Bush, W.
- Wat Tyler.* By Robert Southey. 3d. London: W. Stewart and Co., 19 Newcastle Street, E.C.
- The Progressive Woman: Special Japanese Number.* Photo. and Letters of Kotoku. 5 cents. Chicago: 5445 Drexel Avenue.
- L'Entente pour l'Action.* Par Jean Grave. 10c. Paris: Temps Nouveaux, 4 Rue Broca.
- Aufruf zum Sozialismus.* Ein Vortrag von Gustav Landauer. Berlin: Verlag des Sozialistischen Bundes, S.O. 33.
- Metoda Experimentală în Politică.* De P. Musoiu. 50 bani. Bucarest: Revista Idei, 35 Strada Turturelor.
- Legea și Autoritatea.* De P. Kropotkin. 50 bani. Same publishers.
- Le Industrie Nazionali.* Di P. Kropotkin. 20 cents. New York: Novatore, 500 E. 16th Street.
- Antinatalé.* Same publishers.
- Dio e Cristianesimo.* 15 soldi. Same publishers.
- El Proletariado en Marcha.* Por Anselmo Lorenzo. 15 centavos. New York: Cultura Proletaria, 314 West Street.

And why should Cæsar be a tyrant then?
Poor man! I know, he would not be a wolf,
But that he sees, the Romans are but sheep.

—Shakespeare.

COLLECTIVISM AND THE SERVILE STATE.

Some Impressions of an Interesting Debate.

There was a packed gathering in the Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, on May 5, when Hilaire Belloc and J. R. MacDonald met to discuss the very interesting point affirmed by Belloc, that "contemporary Collectivist effort is leading, not to Collectivism, but to the Servile State," without at the same time giving to the masses in any degree a more assured control over the means of production. In other words, the "Socialism" for which MacDonald is avowedly struggling looms no more distinctly on the horizon for all the sacrifices of personal liberty that are demanded of the community by those autocrats of the ballot box who propose to clothe us, feed us, and physic us on condition that we do as we are told.

No wonder the discussion of such a subject drew a large audience; and it became evident during the course of the debate that there still remains a strong feeling amongst many that there are dangers—very serious dangers—ahead, to which certain of the Labour leaders, as well as most of the Social Democrats, are either blind or refuse to open their eyes. It was a good thing, for that reason, to find an independent person with Belloc's power of criticism nailing MacDonald down to the point in dispute.

Writing as one who would wish to be fair, I must confess that MacDonald did not seem to make the best of his case. Belloc, for instance, said that nothing had been done by the political Socialists in the direction of "confiscating" the property of the wealthy classes. Now, the word "confiscating," used in this sense, is utterly wrong and out of place. MacDonald should not have allowed it to pass. If he did not care to use the word "expropriation," he might at least have insisted that to take land or any of the means of production from the monopolists and place it at the service of the whole community, can be correctly termed "Socialisation." "Confiscation" is the word accurately used not only to describe how the great landlords robbed the people of the land in the past, but also how they are still appropriating the wealth produced by the workers.

Belloc, however, was quite right in asserting that through the action of the Labour Party in Parliament the workers have gained nothing and the exploiters have lost nothing. As he truly stated, all that has happened is that the community gets more and more deeply in debt to the very class from whose financial power we are supposed to be trying to escape. All our progressive policy, all our municipal enterprise, brings grist to the mill of the landlord and the capitalist. The only people that can offer up a prayer of thanksgiving for all this is that growing class of officials who thrive at the public expense, and who will be the great pillars of that Servile State that is growing up around us.

Belloc pointed out the results that would accrue from Lloyd George's scheme: more dependence on the State, more relief for the employers, more burdens on the workers. He might have added how it was extolled by Claude Lowther, the president of the Anti-Socialist League, as "not only not Socialist, but the very antithesis of Socialism." MacDonald, however, welcomed it. Although not perfect, he said, we shall amend it in the direction we want. You never will, replied Belloc; you can do nothing in Parliament. And, as an instance, he gave in his final words an account of his own efforts to save the first victim of that atrocious instrument of torture, Gladstone's Prevention of Crimes Act. The man had stolen a mat valued at 3s. 6d. Having been in prison before, this meant that for this last offence he was to be kept in confinement for five years! Belloc stirred his audience by his indignation and horror at such torture. He told how he fought the case in the House of Commons, and how when the support of one person was needed to ensure a division on the question, not one Member—not a Labour man, not a "Socialist"—rose from his seat to support him. This unfortunate victim of a brutal spirit of revenge is suffering still. And MacDonald thinks it is right. He said so—he who as a Socialist, if such he be, knows that the ruling classes, for whose protection this poor devil who appropriated 3s. 6d. worth of property must suffer this torture, steal from the workers of this country a thousand millions annually.

And this gives one pause to note how little now is left in these political leaders of the true conception of a Socialist society. Time was when such a debate would have brought from the champion of Socialism a clear-cut demand for the Socialisation of all wealth, and an uncompromising denunciation of all the forms of robbery that are still used to keep the worker an obedient wage-slave to the exploiting masters, whom MacDonald seems so anxious shall not be alarmed or disturbed. If he had taken his stand as a revolutionary Socialist instead of as a *reforming* politician, steeped to the eyebrows in political expediency, he might have made a brave fight against Belloc's weak points. But he did not, and he undoubtedly suffered defeat on that account.

J. R. MacDonald may win a seat for himself in some future Cabinet, but he will never win for the workers of this country a single battle in their struggle for economic freedom. Belloc proved it. And we must all regret, in one sense, at least, that the victory should have fallen to one who could condone the infamous murder by priestcraft of Francisco Ferrer.

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

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.

State Insurance and the Socialist Ideal.

At last we have a politician who gives the answer of Radical statesmanship to the cry of Social Democracy and a large section of Trade Unionists for palliative legislation on behalf of the working classes. The State Insurance Bill introduced by Lloyd George may have been approved in good faith by some members of the Liberal and Radical Parties, who feel a little uneasiness of conscience at the misery they see side by side with untold wealth. Such an excuse cannot be made for those who, having studied the social question from the point of view of the worker's claim for his share of the wealth, leisure, and the many advantages that life can offer at the present day, and having proclaimed themselves Socialists, yet acclaim this measure as heralding a new era for the struggling wage-slaves of a competitive system.

Every one who is interested knows by this time what the intentions of the Bill really are. To insure against sickness and unemployment has hitherto been a thing very well organised by the Trade Unions and the Friendly Societies. Of course, a great mass of destitution, of sickness, of unemployment lies outside the ranks of these voluntary organisations. That, however, is the fault of the capitalist system, not of organised Labour. But is Lloyd George able to make the capitalist responsible for it? Not in reality, though it may appear so. The exploiting classes will really save over this business, as they have done in Germany, where, as we pointed out recently, State Insurance has been a complete failure so far as the workers are concerned. It has even proved to be against their interests, as it will prove to be here, for, if the Act succeeds, it must, as State action always does, absorb the functions of the voluntary societies with which it begins to work side by side. This will mean a blow at the Trade Unions that will either compel them to revolt or to reorganise on a new basis.

That is, if the Act "works"—a thing that does not always happen. It is not, perhaps, generally known (the Labour Party has evidently forgotten it) that in 1802 Sir Robert Peel, *after six years of Parliamentary discussion*, brought in and passed a Bill for the Preservation of the Health and Morals of Apprentices and others engaged in cotton factories, limiting the hours of work of children to *only twelve per day*. The employers soon made it a "dead letter," for there was plenty of "human raw material" outside the limits of the Act, and we are told that little children seven years old were "treated as badly as any slave on a West Indian plantation." Nearly *fifty years* passed before a *ten hours' Bill* was carried. This proves how Labour legislation benefits the worker.

Of course, the answer will be that, after all, things are very different to-day compared to those days of unbridled exploitation. In one sense, they are; in another sense, they are not. The capitalist has certainly learned a few lessons, but not from the moral teaching of the State. Quite the reverse. He has learned them from the revolts of the labouring classes, who from the beginning to the middle of the last century gave him more trouble *without the vote* than he has ever had since the extension of the franchise. That is the secret of the change that has undoubtedly taken place.

On the other hand, he has learned another lesson which is exceedingly useful to him. He has learned that the Labour man, especially if he be a "Socialist," is far less dangerous to him inside the House of Commons than outside. The fundamental principles of Socialism (a very different thing from Social

Democracy) are never breathed in that sacred edifice of lies and deceptions. Having settled that point, he finds there is still a disturbing element which is somewhat of a danger to him—that is, the active Trade Union leader who has not yet been elected. What is to be done with this man, who may give trouble at some awkward moment? Evidently nothing better can be done than to make him a Government official. And that is the great opportunity that Lloyd George's Bill affords. We are to be tabulated, examined, numbered, inspected—what for? To have justice done to us? To be assured the fruits of our labour? Not a bit of it. Rather to make the capitalist system more comfortable for the capitalist; to ease the consciences of those among the ruling classes who have still a little left. After all, the masters would be fools indeed to wish for poverty and disease, which may be dangerous to themselves. They only desire that the worker should be just poor enough, just insecure enough to accept their terms. After that, let there be peace and let the system endure!

Again it will be said, this is a mere travesty of what really happens and what will happen. Well, let us take an instance that looms large before our very eyes. The Labour Exchanges were to be a boon to the unemployed workers. All the good people who rule us told us so, and the Liberal and Radical Press sang its hymn of praise over this instance of the care the State was beginning to take of its outcast children. What has happened? *Much of the machinery of the Labour Exchanges has been turned to the advantage of the employer*, and it is quite well known in Trade Union circles that if something is not done to stop the abuses that are now flourishing *as a result of State interference*, very serious trouble will come of it.

And so it will be with State Insurance. Even if there be honest intentions behind the scheme, the fatal error remains. It is not the remedy the evil requires. We need the Socialisation of the means of production, of those broad acres that are the rightful heritage of the people, of that nineteen hundred millions of wealth their labour annually produces. Every Socialist knows this fundamental truth by heart, and those who, in the desire for their own advancement, have hailed State Insurance as a benefit for the workers, have betrayed the people whose votes have been given them in the belief that they went forth to champion the Socialist Ideal.

"Justice" and Calumny.

In *Justice*, "the organ of the Social Democracy," of May 13, there appeared another of those loathsome and slimy misrepresentations of Anarchism which some of us had been simple enough to imagine were things of the past. The more than suspicious Houndsditch affair provided the text for this base and scurrilous distortion of our principles, the pernicious intention of which was evidently deliberate and wilful.

There would have been nothing new in this stupid and puerile venom, had not the anonymous contributor passed from the usual spiteful attack upon the movement to an infamous imputation regarding our comrade Emma Goldman.

It was sandwiched in the middle of a jumble of vile insinuations about the burglary, and probably it was anticipated that no notice would be taken of it, till it should be exhumed, as an unchallenged statement, at the right moment when required.

Fortunately, it was spotted, exposed, and scotched, the editor standing convicted of having willingly given publicity to a scandalous libel upon a brave woman, without an atom of evidence to support it; and even of having tried to shield and support it by irrelevant and misleading editorial comment.

As soon as it was noticed, the following joint letter of protest was drafted and sent, and published in *Justice* (May 20):—

SIR,—In this week's *Justice* (May 13), in an article headed "Anarchist Agents," referring to our comrade Emma Goldman and her criticisms of the Milwaukee Socialists, you state:—

"It is not generally known that Emma Goldman is in the pay of the police, though the fact has leaked out recently. At one time she was employed by Mr. A. E. Olarovsky, of the Russian Secret Police in San Francisco, as an agent and a spy."

This monstrous and outrageous statement is the climax to the unscrupulous misrepresentations of Anarchists which have appeared in the Social Democratic press for years. The writer of the article gives not a tittle of evidence in proof of this infamous charge to which you give publicity.

While asking you for no apology or retraction, as we have long since grown accustomed to these calumnies—venomous as stupid—we do wish to indignantly protest against a vile and cowardly statement in reference to a brave woman who has fought during the best years of her life, and suffered imprisonment again and again, for principles.

which we and others hold dear. The remarks in the same article dealing with the English Anarchist movement are so foolish they carry their own refutation.

127 Ossulston Street, N.W.
May 13, 1911.

JOHN TURNER,
A. MARSH,
T. H. KEELL.

To this was appended the following editorial comment:—

[We naturally expected some such protest as the above. We have, however, nothing to retract. The statements were made on the most reliable authority, or they would not have been made. We do not say there are no good men and women among Anarchists; but we do say that every Anarchist who has been betrayed has been betrayed by a fellow-Anarchist, who has proved to be a police agent; that police agents have been the instigators of almost every Anarchist crime and plot, successful or unsuccessful, which has been discovered; that the principles of Anarchism lend themselves to Azeffism; and that, with few exceptions, Anarchists are either agents or dupes of the police.—Ed. "J."]

At the First of May delegate meeting, to which I was sent by my Union, I moved the following resolution:—"That this meeting expresses its opinion that the statements regarding Emma Goldman which appeared in *Justice*, without proof or evidence, are unjustifiable, and asks that the evidence be published." Though most of the delegates present were Social Democrats, to their credit this was carried. The resolution appeared in *Justice* of May 27, under this letter:—

DEAR COMRADE,—The information concerning Emma Goldman was conveyed by a definite statement to that effect made in my hearing by Mr. A. E. Olarovsky himself.—I am, fraternally,

YOUR INFORMANT.

I then wrote the following letter. At the moment I don't know, of course, whether it will be published. But I rather fancy, if it should appear, it will help to open the eyes of some of the readers of *Justice* to the infamous lengths the editor is prepared to go in his insane prejudice against Anarchist ideas:—

27 Doughty Street, W.C., May 27, 1911.

SIR,—I am more than astounded at the brief and empty note in to-day's issue of *Justice*, apparently intended to excuse the infamous and cowardly charge against Emma Goldman which appeared in your columns on May 13. So it comes to this—that "the most reliable authority" is none other than a Mr. A. E. Olarovsky, of the Russian Secret Police of San Francisco. Never before, in all my long connection with the revolutionary Socialist and Anarchist movement, have I understood that Russian secret police agents were "the most reliable authority," even amongst Social Democrats, or honest men of any opinion! It is, I feel sure, a new discovery of your own.

This vile insinuation, that our comrade was "employed as an agent and a spy," was, it is said, "conveyed" to your anonymous "informant" "by a definite statement to that effect" made in the hearing of your informer by this (unknown to me) police agent.

In spite of your extraordinary and misleading editorial note, in answer to the joint letter of protest sent, and published on May 20, the most simple must see quite clearly that so far there is not the faintest scintilla of evidence or proof given to uphold such an utterly unjustifiable statement. This abominable suggestion is reduced to the alleged hearsay of a Russian secret police agent, by an anonymous contributor! You give publicity to such an outrageous charge without apparently having even this flimsy excuse by you at the time! Was ever a more wicked imputation placed upon a less shadowy foundation, yet called by you "the most reliable authority," and made the opportunity to indulge in misleading suggestion when a protest is sent?

Do you wonder that the query arises in my mind as to when and where and under what circumstances this alleged "definite statement" was made in the hearing of this anonymous informer? It would be very interesting to get at least some slight indication of this apparently phantom incident. Is there no way of wringing from this elusive informant of yours some trifling bit of evidence which can be subjected to impartial examination? If not, what are we to understand by it? Does it mean that when any cowardly miscreant, afraid to append a name, is ready to make some monstrous and outrageous charge against an Anarchist, without the slightest shred of evidence, *Justice* will publish it, and not only shield such infamy, but by irrelevant editorial try to sustain it? Is it that any stick, however dirty, is, in your opinion, good enough to beat the poor dog of Anarchism with? I do not care to believe it of you. But so far, all must agree there has not been the faintest attempt to prove by any kind of evidence whatever this foul imputation against a woman who, whether mistaken in her views or not, has at least proved her courage and sincerity by the hard and strenuous life she has lived for an unpopular cause.

I have dealt with what you were pleased to call "the most reliable authority" for giving publicity to such an infamous libel by an anonymous "informant." I will only add that every other word written in your editorial note to the letter of protest in May 20th issue, apart from the last two lines, applies equally to revolutionary Socialists, and, I regret to say, I fear to every really revolutionary movement of whatever character. Azeff did his scoundrelly work amongst the Russian Revolutionary Socialists. I wish sincerely we had a Comrade Bourtzeff to throw a little light on your anonymous "informant."

Your utterly stupid statement in the last two lines, "that, with

few exceptions, Anarchists are either agents or dupes of the police," indicates the spitefulness of impotence, and is fathoms deep beneath contempt. It certainly lends colour to the impression that this mysterious "informant" has been successfully "pulling your leg" through your prejudices—in whose interest I can only guess. The whole thing indicates that you must be entirely out of touch with the Russian revolutionary movement of the last few years, or you would not have been led into such a stupid—I had almost said criminal—blunder. In any case, I leave the whole wretched incident to the judgment of the honest men and women among your readers, and am at least glad to have been able to nail this base coin to the counter where every one can see it.

Forgive length of epistle. I could say a lot more, but the note at the head of your correspondence column forbids.

JOHN TURNER.

What purpose, if any, the publication of this shameful suggestion against our comrade Emma Goldman was intended to serve, it is difficult to say. Whether it was done to be dug up and used against her in the United States, or whether *Justice* was used by some cunning agent in the shape of the mysterious "informant," trading upon the prejudices of the editor—whatever was the purpose, or whoever the "informant," it is equally shameful for the editor to have given publicity to such a vile imputation without the faintest trace of evidence to support it. Perhaps some of our Russian comrades who know the whole-souled devotion Emma Goldman has shown to the cause of the Russian revolutionary movement, will have something to say about it. In the meantime, we are glad to have caught and killed this ignoble lie before it got a long start.

JOHN TURNER.

HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF.

In *Justice* (May 13) we get a sample of the usual Social Democratic "injustice" towards us Anarchists. Once again Anarchists in general and Emma Goldman in particular are denounced and abused by an anonymous writer who finds hospitality in the pages of the organ of the British Social Democracy.

We understand well enough since the days of the old International that the most implacable enemies of Anarchist Communist ideals and the abolition of the State, with its social parasitism and bureaucracy, are Social Democrats of the Engels school, themselves aspirants to official posts in a future blissful Social Democratic "Volkstaat."

We are also accustomed to this habitual hatred of Anarchism which from time to time finds an outlet in some vile accusations against Anarchist comrades. History proves, however, that each time the authors or the instigators of these venomous accusations were spies or persons of such a high moral standard as the late Dr. Aveling or his friend and protector, the great Engels himself.

Without going into details, we can say that there were three periods when the Anarchists were specially attacked. The first was during the scission in the International, 1872-74; the second, at the beginning of the "eighties," when Social Democracy began to organise in France; and the third during 1895-97, around the London International Socialist Congress.

During the first period, the attacks on Anarchists were most violent in France and Italy. The protégés and friends of Engels who especially distinguished themselves in this work were Dentraygues and Van Heddeghem, who were present at the Hague Congress, 1872, as Marxian delegates, under the assumed names of Walter and Swarm, with false mandates from America given to them by Engels. These two gentlemen, who were among the majority of the Congress which expelled from the International Bakunine, James Guillaume, and the Federalist organisations of Belgium, France, Italy, Spain, and Switzerland, were afterwards sent as Marxian dictators to France, where, however, in a short time they were unmasked as spies.

During the second period, the polemics against Anarchists were especially bitter in Switzerland, where in the German, French, and Italian Social Democratic papers they were denounced and abused. Afterwards it was discovered that the principal *Anarchistenfresser* (devourer of Anarchists) was Herr Haupt, an agent of Bismarck's secret police; whilst the author of the calumnies in the Italian and French Social Democratic papers was a Signor Terzaghi, who ten years earlier had been expelled as a spy by the Italian Socialists.

The third period is probably yet fresh in the memory of many English readers. It is sufficient to remember that the moving spirit in the attacks on and hatred of Anarchists was

Dr. Aveling, of glorious memory for Social Democracy and especially for *Justice*.

The reading of the anonymous article entitled "Anarchist Agents," in *Justice* of May 13, brought the memory of those former attacks vividly back to us. An anonymous author bravely denouncing as a spy a woman far away, whose life is devoted to the revolutionary movement and Anarchism, is always a revolting sight; but this gentleman goes yet farther. "How is it that this female firebrand can carry on her propaganda of violence?" he wonders. Does he not know that in a few countries like the United States, England, and Switzerland there exists a certain amount of liberty of opinion and free speech for everybody, including Anarchists? Apparently, the writer of the article is opposed to free speech—for Anarchists; he recommends, in fact, their imprisonment and suppression. Let us encourage him by telling him that he is not the first and not the only one; the above-mentioned denouncers of Anarchists were quite of his opinion. To us the only question is, to which of the two categories does he belong? To the Avelings or to Terzaghi and Co?

A passage in the *Justice* article authoritatively states that "it is certain that where there is an Anarchist group there will be an agent-provocateur in the midst thereof." From whom has he this information? As an Anarchist-hater, surely he cannot have it from an Anarchist friend. From whom, then?

Justice of May 27 gives an answer to this question in a note signed "Your Informant," who says that in his hearing the chief of the Russian secret police in San Francisco made the statement that Emma Goldman was in his pay.

Generally, a chief of the secret police does not betray the names of his agents to an outsider; the knowledge is strictly kept among themselves. Sometimes, however, they expressly circulate a rumour with the intention of compromising an active revolutionist, knowing that there is sure to be a fool or an enemy eager to spread the calumny.

In what capacity the "Informant" obtained the information from the chief of the secret police, we leave to his conscience; but why *Justice* of London should publish a definite accusation against an honest woman in the United States is more than a puzzle for us.

And if the editor has no better proof than his "Informant's" last note, it is his duty, if he has the slightest notion of political honesty, to tender a public apology to Emma Goldman.

W. TCHERKESOFF.

REVOLUTIONARY NOTES FROM AMERICA.

I have been meaning ever since I left London to write something about the American propaganda, but various activities have prevented me from doing so. Now that I am in Los Angeles, which to my mind is the centre of the revolutionary movement of the world, I shall try to acquaint the English comrades of what is going on here. Just now the entire Labour movement of America is centred round the McNamara trial. Most of your readers are aware that some six months ago an explosion took place at the *Times* newspaper office in Los Angeles, and immediately the newspapers cried: "It is a plot on the part of the Trade Unionists and the Anarchists." A number of men, one of whom may be an Anarchist, are charged with this act. Two of the suspected men are now in jail. The entire Labour and Radical movement of America has come to the rescue of these men, and in the words of a Butte miners' Union, they have said: "We offer our comrades our moral, financial, and physical support, whether they are innocent or guilty." The Labour movement of America is aroused and solidified, because the men who are charged with complicity in this disaster, two brothers named McNamara, are well-known Trade Unionists, and if these men are railroaded to the gallows, which is not at all unlikely, it will be the greatest blow ever struck by the master class against Labour.

The Merchants and Manufacturers' Association, which has been directing the fight against Labour, has stopped at nothing in order to connect the leaders and Anarchists with the *Times* disaster. At a conservative estimate, over half a million dollars have been spent by the masters in order to break up the Unions and railroad our men to the gallows. A large amount of the money spent has gone to detectives. There are hundreds of detectives employed in this case. We have reached the stage in America when the master class will no longer trust the police department, and when they want dirty work done they will employ outside detectives.

A condition peculiar to the United States is this, that in all our Labour troubles the capitalist class hires the services of private detective agencies, completely independent of the Government, to work up the evidence upon which the trials are conducted. In the

present case, a guarantee of 50,000 dols. has been given by the above-mentioned Merchants and Manufacturers' Association to the Burns' detective agency for the conviction of the McNamara brothers. As these detectives have nothing to lose and everything to gain in work of this kind, they stop at nothing in order to gain their ends. In the present case, a McManigal, who is probably a second Orchard, is said to have been in the employ of the Burns' detective agency for the past four months.

Whatever else this affair may teach, the one great lesson is this: that violence and the destruction of property are a great educational medium. The master class paid very little attention when an occasional scab died, but now when property is being destroyed they are up in arms, and, I believe, are fighting their last great fight to keep Labour in submission. But they will fail. There is a beautiful revolutionary spirit in America. The working men are becoming conscious of their strength and of the value of direct action, sabotage, and the general strike. And this trial in Los Angeles will do a great deal of good. A very strange thing about the trial is that the newspapers are not so vituperative and bitter against labouring men as they were at the Haymarket trial and that of Moyer, Haywood, and Pettibone. Capitalists, whether they admit it or not, have a respect for the power of the working men. And in this struggle, as is the case everywhere, the most pernicious influence is being exercised by the Socialists. All the Socialist papers and leaders have rushed to the aid of these men—for political advantage only. The Socialist political organisation gives no evidence of genuine revolutionary spirit. Politics proves, as it was bound to do, an antidote for whatever revolutionary spirit the rank and file of the Socialist Party might naturally possess. But there is a part of the working class—the Industrial Workers of the World—which is giving expression to this revolutionary spirit, no longer hoping for anything good from political action. These Industrial Workers are attracting into their ranks the best of the Labour movement in America, and many of our best intellectuals. They are doing a very fine work. In Spokane, Wash., and in Fresno, California, they made a heroic struggle for free speech, and hundreds of men went to jail, some of them dying as a result. But they won their fight, and succeeded in teaching the authorities that it is not a simple thing to stop determined men when they want free speech or anything else.

Many of the members of the Industrial Workers have gone over to Mexico to help the Mexican fight for freedom, and not a few of these men gave up their lives. I hope our English comrades will understand that the revolution in Mexico is not a political affair. They are not trying to get rid of one political tyrant in order to put in a new one. The Mexican Liberal Party is composed of men who are more or less Anarchists, and they hope to establish a free society. Many of them are spreading Anarchist literature among the peons, and their slogan is—"The land for the people who till the soil." The Mexicans deserve financial and moral support, because they offer the largest possibilities for the establishment of a Communistic society.

Another significant work in America is the Modern School movement. We have in New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Salt Lake City, and elsewhere the beginnings of branches of the Modern School, carrying out the spirit and purpose which animated and inspired Ferrer. Some of the Anarchists in America are concentrating on this work, and it is not unlikely that we shall succeed in having day schools of this sort within the next few years. If ever there was a time in the history of the American movement that the words of August Spies have a significance, it is now: "Our silence will be more powerful than the voices you strangle to-day."

BEN L. REITMAN.

THE JAPANESE MARTYRS: AN APPEAL.

The legal murders recently perpetrated in Japan, and the long terms of imprisonment inflicted on many innocent people, have caused great suffering and hardship to their widows and orphans and others who were dependent on them, who have no means to battle against the unmerited misfortune that has befallen them.

We are starting a fund to help them, and we shall be glad if all comrades and sympathisers will do their best to give assistance in this exceptional case of urgent need.

All amounts will be duly acknowledged in these columns, and will be forwarded to a quarter where proper distribution is assured.

Sums already received:—A Friend 10s., Comp. 1s.

The Japanese Martyrs.

With Portrait of Kotoku.

PRICE ONE PENNY.

The Concentration of Capital.

A MARXIAN FALLACY.

By W. TCHERKESOFF.

Price One Penny, from FREEDOM PRESS.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

United States.—General Strike Threatened.

The Revolutionary Syndicalist (Industrial Unionist) organisation of the United States, the Industrial Workers of the World, have issued a manifesto appealing to the organised and unorganised workers to prepare everywhere in the States for a general strike on the day that the trial of their comrade McNamara begins at Los Angeles. The American capitalists who were defeated in their project to bring Haywood and his associates of the Western Federation of Miners to the gallows, and so deal a crushing blow to organised Labour, have now made another impudent attempt to get hold of a victim on whom they can wreak their vengeance. McNamara, a leader of the structural Iron Workers' Union, and two others are accused of having been the instigators of the so-called dynamite explosion last October at the offices of the Los Angeles Times. The three men were captured by detectives, and kept in solitary confinement in order to obtain "confessions." Their trial is to take place shortly. The I.W.W. are holding meetings everywhere in support of the project of a general strike as a protest against this conspiracy of capitalists against the freedom and the rights of the organised workers.

Gompers, Mitchell, and Morrison, the president, ex-vice-president, and secretary of the American Federation of Labour, who had been condemned to twelve, nine, and six months' imprisonment respectively, for having refused to obey an "injunction" against them in favour of the Buck Stove and Range Company, appealed to the Supreme Court against this sentence. The reader will remember that the A.F.L. had boycotted the goods of that company, whose name was put on the "black list" of the *American Federationist*. The injunction had prohibited the continuation of this publication. The Supreme Court found the judge might have imposed on the leaders a fine, but not imprisonment.

Of course, no one following the attitude of the A.F.L. would have believed that the Government would allow such respectable, peaceful, and conservative Labour leaders as Gompers and his friends to be put in jail. However, the decision of the Supreme Court shows that the agitation amongst the 1,500,000 members of the A.F.L. has had some influence. It is well known in the States that the workers are already irritated by the Los Angeles events, and a decision by the Supreme Court rendering boycotting by Trade Unions illegal might have provoked serious discontent. Nevertheless, this question does not seem solved even now, as the District Court of Columbia, by making use of one of the considerations of the decision in the Supreme Court, is instituting fresh proceedings against the above-mentioned leaders. As the boycott is a weapon of the greatest importance for the workers, the capitalists are sure to make a strong fight to render it illegal.

France.

Just like Briand last year, the Premier, Monis, prohibited the manifestations on the First of May which had been arranged by the Trade Unions and the Confederation of Labour. This shows again that Ministries may come and go, parties may follow each other in power, but the real rulers of France remain: the bureaucracy and, above all, the police. Lépine, the almighty chief of police, found it necessary to concentrate thousands of troops in Paris, as if an invasion of foreign hordes was feared. And when the day passed, and Paris still existed, the Premier went officially to Lépine to thank him and his police heroes for having preserved order. That order was disturbed at all was simply owing to the provocation caused by the presence and interference of the numerous police and soldiers. At several points fights and arrests took place; many police officers were wounded, so that the blows did not fall all on one side. The mass meeting in the Manège St. Paul was disturbed by the Municipal Guards, and thirty persons were more or less ill-treated.

The workers have decided to do their best to spoil the official holidays of the Fourteenth of July and the great racing day of the Grand Prix. If this can be done, it is certainly the best way to make the official and capitalist world understand that if they wish to have their holidays, they must allow the workers to have liberty for their demonstrations. Eye for eye and tooth for tooth may be a primitive morality, but apparently no other can be grasped by the "upper" classes in their dealings with the workers.

The French working classes are not quite so meek and credulous as their eastern neighbours. They see pretty sharply what their Socialist and Radical Government is preparing for their benefit. The Old-Age Pensions Bill, framed on the German pattern, with a compulsory contribution by the workers for 30 years, after which at the age of 65 they have the right to the magnificent sum of £12 to £18 a year, aroused great indignation and protest. But it was carried, and the preliminary measures for its enactment were taken. The Bill provided that every worker, in order to obtain the right to a pension, has to inscribe himself at the town hall of his commune or parish. This had to be done before April 30. Until now there has been only obstruction and passive resistance to the law. In some places the unwilling future pensioners went in procession to the town halls, in front of which they burned wholesale the forms of inscription which the authorities had sent them. Nearly everywhere the Trades Councils and other Labour organisations have refused their help to the authorities. In the towns where inscriptions have been received, their number is in ridiculous

proportion to those to whom the law applies. In Paris, 37,000 inscriptions were received—that is, 10 per cent. of the number expected; at Orleans, 37 out of 20,000 workers sent in their papers; at Clermont-Ferrand, 8 out of 13,000; at Thiers, 2 out of 20,000; at Limoges, 18 out of 30,000; and so on.

The French proletariat has unmistakably understood the benefits of the Act, and returns this present to the politicians with thanks. The Labour Press demands the reduction of the age limit of 65 years ("It is an old-age pension for the dead," say the French), and the abolition of the compulsory contribution by the workers. In a word, they want an Old-Age Pension Act on the English rather than on the German pattern.

PROPAGANDA NOTES.

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

LABOUR DAY IN GLASGOW.

No matter what the verdict may be as to the general effectiveness of the Labour Day demonstration in Glasgow, there can be no two opinions as to the success which attended the efforts of the Anarchists. This was in no small measure due to the ill-advised attempt on the part of the official Labour Day Committee to force the police to eject the Anarchists from the common meeting-place, Glasgow Green. The Committee, composed of delegates representing all the Labour and Socialist bodies of the city, have furnished us with a splendid example of the bureaucratic and authoritarian leanings of the Social Democrats.

The Glasgow Anarchists, desiring to express their sense of solidarity with all workers, made application to this Committee, expressing their wish to co-operate. The request was refused. The group were successful, however, in obtaining a permit from the Parks Committee of the Town Council. Without this permit no meeting could have been held. They thus obtained from the capitalist Town Council a recognition of their right of free speech, which was denied them by the supposedly revolutionary Labour Day Committee!

At the commencement of the meeting the Anarchists were peremptorily ordered to withdraw. On their refusing to do so, the police were called to the aid of the Committee, and but for the fact that they were able to satisfy the police that they held the required permit, the Anarchists would have been ejected.

The foolish tactics of the Committee proved a splendid advertisement of the Anarchist platform, the speakers secured the attention of a huge crowd, and the literature sales for the afternoon broke all records. Moreover, the reactionary attitude of the Labour Day Committee has taught a useful lesson to those of their supporters who held the opinion that a Socialist official differed from all other officials.

It is significant of much that the local Socialist paper, *Forward*, in its report of the demonstration, calls for the suppression of the independent platforms—"the rag-tag and bob-tail of the Socialist movement"—at all future Labour Day meetings. "Conflicting opinions tend to confuse the mind"—quite in the orthodox theological manner. Evidently the independents made their presence felt.

On the evening of May Day the group held a largely attended meeting in the Clarion Scouts' Rooms. Interspersed with a number of songs and recitations appropriate to the occasion, many important questions were discussed, the methods of disposing of our literature and the future propaganda arrangements coming in for a large share of attention. We were successful in getting comrades in the different districts of the city, and in some of the surrounding towns, to volunteer to act as centres for literature distribution in their respective districts.

Propaganda meetings were arranged as follows:—Kirkintilloch on the first Sunday evening of each month, commencing June 4; and at Govan Cross every Monday evening at 7.30. Other arrangements will be announced later. All comrades who are in a position to assist in any way at these meetings will be welcomed.

The group have now on sale some very effective postcard photographs of the Anarchist platform on Labour Day, the Red Flag with the word "Anarchy" in bold letters standing out particularly well. The postcards can be had on application to the Literature Secretary, Anarchist Group, care of Clarion Scouts, 7 Holland Street.

At our group meeting on the 16th it was agreed to send a letter to the editor of *Justice*, expressing our contempt for the lie about our comrade Emma Goldman which was published in the issue of May 13.

Group meetings take place every Friday at Clarion Scouts' Rooms, which are now at 7 Holland Street. J. P.

LONDON.

As the First of May fell on a Monday, the demonstration in Hyde Park was rather poorly attended by the workers, but this falling-off in their numbers was almost compensated for by the kindly forethought of Winston Churchill in sanctioning the attendance of an extra large number of policemen and detectives, who walked in the procession from the Embankment. Thousands of leaflets were distributed on the way and also in the Park, but the sale of literature was poor. The Anarchist platform drew the biggest crowd, but one or two of the speeches were not quite so educational as one might have desired. The May Day demonstration is usually attended by some of the most earnest of the workers, and the opportunity should be taken advantage of to put the Anarchist position boldly and clearly.

The open-air propaganda is now in full swing, meetings being held on Sundays in Victoria Park, Regent's Park, and Hyde Park. Fresh speakers are coming forward, and the outlook is more promising than it has been for years. Remember the Glasgow Group's motto: "Push the literature!"

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*.

LONDON PROPAGANDA.

Victoria Park, Sundays, 11.30 a.m.
Regent's Park, Sundays, 11.30 a.m.
Store Street, Tottenham Court Road, 7 p.m.
Walham Green Church, Tuesdays, 8.30 p.m.

Notice.

Newsagents have frequently refused to supply FREEDOM owing to the difficulty of obtaining the paper. We have now made arrangements with the following agents to supply FREEDOM and also our books and pamphlets at wholesale rates. Readers are requested to notify their newsagents:—

London—HENDERSONS, 66 Charing Cross Road, W.C.
E. H. JOHNSON, 23 Bride Lane, Ludgate Circus, E.C.
Liverpool—E. G. SMITH, 126 Tunnel Road.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

(April 6—May 31.)

FREEDOM Guarantee Fund.—R. Struckel 1s, H. Glasse 12s 6d, E. Rhodes 2s, Anon. £1, "Silent" 1s.
FREEDOM Subscriptions.—R. Clarke 1s 6d, F. Leoncini 1s 6d, L. Turner 4s, A. Toscolo 1s 6d, F. C. 1s 6d, B. Phelps 1s 6d, R. Stubbs 1s 6d, W. N. 2s, J. Neil 1s 6d, A. Harvey 1s 6d, W. Cieplik 1s 6d, A. W. O. 10s, S. C. Luke 2s, Theo. Appel 4s, A. Gilbert 1s 6d, J. Rooney 1s 6d, E. Lechmere 2s 6d, H. Fryer 1s 6d, P. Fijlstra 1s 6d, P. Joseph (5 subs.) 17s, P. Reclus 4s, J. Ronner 2s, Y. Hemmi 6s 2d, J. Twigg 1s 6d.
Houndsditch Leaflet Fund.—D. Fisher 1s, Plymouth Group (per J. H.) 7s, Bristol Comrades (per A. P.) 4s 6d, F. Goulding 6d, List A5, B. Goldberg 3s, No. 39, Goldstein 3s 3d, No. 30, Fritz 7s 1d, No. 4, T. Sugar 9s 5d, No. 1, Esteguy 6s, No. 29, E. Lillyan 16s 8d, No. 31, J. Wilquet 6s 5d, No. 48, Hudi 14s 8d, No. 50, Goodman 5s 6d.
Appeal for a Comrade.—Glasgow Group 7s.

PROPAGANDA LEAFLETS.

What is Anarchism?
Do Not Vote.

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

The Famous Speeches

OF THE

EIGHT CHICAGO ANARCHISTS.

Price 1s. 3d., Postage 2d.

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 AGITATOR.

A Worker's Semi-Monthly.

Advocate of the Modern School, Industrial Unionism and Individual Freedom.

Yearly, \$1; Quarterly, 25 cents. Sample free.

JAY FOX, Editor.

Home, Lake Bay, Washington, U.S.A.

"FREEDOM" MAY BE OBTAINED OF

London.—HENDERSONS, 66 Charing Cross Road, W.C. (Wholesale).
E. H. JOHNSON, 23 Bride Lane, Ludgate Circus, E.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. JAMES, 191 Old Street, City Road, E.C.
QUICKFALLS, 238 York Road, and 61 High Street, Battersea, S.W.
A. ROSE & Co., Clerkenwell Road (near Holborn Hall).
F. GOULDING, 10 Gordon Road, Manor Park, E.
ISENBURG, Cleveland Street, W.
F. BENDY, 270 York Road, Bridge End, Wandsworth, S.W.
A. TOLEMAN, 54 Battersea Rise, S.W.
Liverpool.—E. G. SMITH, 126 Tunnel Road (Wholesale).
CHAS. J. GRANT AND SON, 8 and 9 Lord Street Arcade.
STANLEY'S, 30 Lime Street.
WM. MALCOLM, 70 Penton Street, Farnsworth Street.
Leeds.—B. Goldberg, 14 Millwright Street.
Manchester.—BRADY AND Co., 15 Peter Street.
H. SEGAL, 101 Moreton Street, Strangeways.
W. WARBURTON, 1 Victoria Arch, Great Ducie Street.
Oldham.—HYDE BROTHERS, Victoria Market.
Glasgow.—D. BAXTER, 32 Brunswick Street.
D. G. LINDSAY, 139 West Nile Street.
" " 132 Gairbraird Street, Maryhill.
Bolton.—JOSEPH LEACH, 72 Bridge Street.
Bristol.—J. FLYNN, Haymarket.
Dundee.—L. MACARTNEY, 203, Overgate.
Cardiff.—M. CLARK, 26 Wood Street.
" " L. D. GILLET, Market Gallery.
Rhondda (Glam.)—F. DAVIES, 63 Miskin Road, Trealew.
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.
Canada.—S. J. ELKIN, 796 Main Street, Winnipeg.
New Zealand.—P. JOSEPHS, 52 Willis Street, Wellington.

The Great French Revolution,
1789—1793.

By P. A. KROPOTKIN.

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

FREEDOM PRESS, 127 OSSULSTON STREET, N.W.

Anarchism and Other Essays.

By EMMA GOLDMAN.

With portrait and biographical sketch of the author.

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

Pages of Socialist History.

By W. TCHERKESOFF.

Price 1s. 3d., postage 2d. extra.

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.

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 PLACE OF ANARCHISM IN SOCIALISTIC EVOLUTION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
THE COMMUNE OF PARIS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. 1d.
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.
MONOPOLY; OR, HOW LABOUR IS ROBBED. WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
USEFUL WORK VERSUS USELESS TOIL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
UNDER AN ELM TREE. By WILLIAM MORRIS. (1891. Scarce.) 2d.
THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONGRESS, 1907. 1d.
ANARCHY v. SOCIALISM. By W. C. OWEN. 2d., post-free 2½d.
THE SOCIAL GENERAL STRIKE. By ARNOLD ROLLER. 2d.
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.
SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN GERMANY. By GUSTAV LANDAUER. 1d.
ANARCHISTS AND ESPERANTO. 1d.
KROPOTKIN: THE MAN AND HIS MESSAGE. By T. SWAN. 1d.
THE TERROR IN RUSSIA. By P. KROPOTKIN. 2d., postage 1½d.
THE CONCENTRATION OF CAPITAL: A MARXIAN FALLACY. By W. TCHERKESOFF. 1d.
TRADE UNIONISM AND ANARCHISM. By JAY FOX. 2d.

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.
THE CONQUEST OF BREAD. By P. KROPOTKIN. (American edition). 5s.
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.
MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1s.
FAMOUS SPEECHES OF THE EIGHT CHICAGO ANARCHISTS. 1s 3d, postage 2d.
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.
FRANCISCO FERRER: His Life, Work, and Martyrdom. 1s. net.

All orders, with cash, should be sent to

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

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