

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. XXVII.—No. 294.

OCTOBER, 1913.

MONTHLY: ONE PENNY.

NOTES.

The Good Ship "Hare."

"In a few short weeks of industrial warfare Dublin has become a mass of misery in the midst of plenty. The barns in the country around are full to overflowing with one of the most bounteous crops that has ever fallen to the sickle, but in the City gaunt men, half clad and hungry women, and whining children, are wandering about with the look of hunted creatures in their eyes."—*Daily News*.

The above, our readers will note, is not a description from a war correspondent of the fratricidal struggle in the Balkans. Horrible as that has been, it was at least mostly a war between armed forces. It is left to the Christian and civilised capitalists to use the armed forces of "law and order" against defenceless workers. They also have the added glory of standing callously by watching the ravages of starvation amongst their slaves, what time they eat and drink their fill. With the help of Governments they can decimate a population in the name of law and order. "Starve in the midst of plenty"—that is the capitalists' war-cry. But happily the growth of the struggle has educated the workers into a feeling and sense of solidarity that is going to win them their economic liberty. The dispatch of a cargo of food opens a new chapter (may it be the last!) in the industrial war of to-day, and unites the forces of Trade Unionism and Co-operation in direct action against the exploiters. The good ship "Hare" has made a splendid page of history, and the lesson will be learned and the example imitated. It is magnificent, and it is war!

Science and Reaction.

Priestcraft and superstition had received such a shaking last year as a result of the address of Prof. Schaefer at the gathering of the British Association at Dundee, that something had to be done to produce a counterblast to the teachings of the materialists. So poor Sir Oliver Lodge is put up to make himself ridiculous with his telepathy, his "transcendence of the spiritual over the material," and "the human personality's survival of bodily death." It was a pity he could not be heckled with a few plain questions, for there is not, and could not be, one single established fact to support all this illusionism. On the contrary, the tricks of the mediums and the doings of occult circles have produced some very startling scandals, as might have been expected. If people would only think for themselves, they would soon realise that never has poor humanity been saved either from disease or disaster by the warnings of "telepathy." Never have the "occult" ignoramuses discovered one fact in Nature that has alleviated pain and suffering. They could not; it must be left to experimental science. Again, does Sir Oliver Lodge really mean to assert that human personalities survive death? That all the mentally afflicted and the hopelessly insane shall carry their terrible condition through eternity? If that is so, then all who think with him can never feel that death has been a happy release to those whose sufferings made our hearts bleed. No, the object of it all is to turn men's minds from positive science to the fantastically mystical, and give the priest a new lease of life.

The Two Camps.

Strike developments break upon us so rapidly and with such an increasing consciousness of the real economic struggle, that it is no wonder the Labour politicians feel the very ground crumbling under their feet. They are almost as much alarmed as the capitalists. And it is probably for this reason that J. R. Macdonald writes so desperately in the *Daily News* against the sympathetic strike. He calls it "poor fighting," and says it "demoralises Trade Unionism" and "weakens collective action"! As a cute man of business, Mr. Macdonald ought to realise that

all this nonsense is preached too late in the day to be of any effect. It is the hard experience of life that has taught the workers that the Labour Party has failed where direct action has succeeded. The division that has taken place as a result of this was inevitable and cannot be bridged. Nor will Macdonald restore confidence in his party by telling the world that "we are still reaping the whirlwind which Mr. Churchill called up when he poured troops all over the country during the railway strike." The reply to this is that there is such a thing as being in a false position; and just as the man who joins the police force must be prepared to bludgeon, just as the man who enlists must be prepared to shoot, so the man who believes in government must be prepared to keep "order." Such a man is J. R. Macdonald, and in Churchill's place he would have done as Churchill did. Don't protest, Mr. Macdonald. We remember Millerand and Briand in France. And ambitious men are very much alike.

Christianity and Revolution.

It is rather a coincidence that while Bernard Shaw is busy explaining to a Christian world his usual mixture of the sublime and the ridiculous manifested in his play "Androcles and the Lion," the Baptist Union's "message to the workers" is the affirmation that "the Christian man must be a revolutionist." Now, it is a well-known fact, that when an idea begins to stir the masses, the first to try to exploit it to their own advantage are the priest and the politician. That is what is being tried at the present moment, and it should be fought down. The world is getting tired of this cant about the gospel of Christ being the gospel of Socialism. The truth is, the gospel of Christ can be twisted to suit all cases; and, while some wonderful characters have been influenced and formed by the finer things preached in the Gospels—which were none the less true because they had been preached hundreds of years before by equally good men—it is just as true that the worst enemies of mankind live and die with the blessings of this very same Church. Tsars and Kaisers, as well as Presidents and Prime Ministers, wage their fiercest wars with Christian prayers on their lips, and millionaires can buy its priests to preach "blessed are the poor." It should never be forgotten that a revolutionist is—a revolutionist. But a Christian is?—well, even Bernard Shaw can't answer that question!

Parliament and Progress.

Dr. A. R. Wallace's new book, "The Revolt of Democracy," shows a keen appreciation of the direction the Labour struggle is taking—a remarkable thing in a man of his years. It is only to be expected, perhaps, that he should call upon the Government to undertake some drastic reforms, but it is here that he fails to grasp the real situation. The State, the largest employer of labour in the kingdom, is, at the same time, the greatest sweeter. He, of course, does not realise that, being the expression of a class domination, its functions are *anti-social*. It is really an obstacle in the path of progress; and the latest instance of its desire to improve (?) the status of workers—its treatment of the postal and telegraph employees—shows plainly enough what they may hope from in that quarter. The victories of the workers through direct action undermine the whole position of State Socialists. And how things happen in this direction is really remarkable. The initiative of a boy of 16 started the van boy's strike at Carter Patersons. They won an increase of wages in 48 hours. The van men follow suit, and in three more days they also win an increase of wages with shorter hours. The logical consequences of the spirit of initiative of one lad is obvious. What is the use, then, of calling for the meddling and muddling of that cumbrous old obstruction, the Parliamentary machine—even if the Cabinet contains John Burns at £5,000 a year, and the Labour Party has its Snowdens and Macdonalds ready to follow in his steps? Three cheers for the lad of 16!

THE CURSE OF COMPROMISE.

To compromise is distasteful, except to those of the most timid disposition, to those who have no vigour or thought, and who therefore act without any real power. It is the course generally adopted to avoid disaster, and is usually the very line of action which will inevitably cause it. The failure that compromise brings generally come more slowly than the troubles which beset the man who directly pursues a definite end, but it is a failure complete and far-reaching, it means utter decay and rot in all parts.

I believe the present is the very moment when we should emphasise our hatred of compromise, and when we should be expounding clearly the definite basis of our Anarchist philosophy. At first it may seem quite otherwise. The present, it may be argued, is the time when we can join hands with the advanced ranks of the Labour movement. Why offend our friends among the workers by trying to force them to accept a word against which they are prejudiced? Discretion is a valuable quality, not as the substitute for, but as the companion to, valour. Let us be practical and build up a great movement of true rebels, for such is the demand of the workers to-day.

Such an argument may contain much truth, but it seems to me that it is the other side of the question which needs to be emphasised just at present. It is doubtful if propaganda ever makes rebels. They are created by wider causes, and the great work of the propagandist is to show how the spirit of revolt, already existing, can express itself, can translate itself into action. Politicians recognise that the ideas of revolt, and even revolution, have a firm hold upon the minds of the people who suffer; and these politicians, who depend, after all, so helplessly on the people, are reduced to the miserable subterfuge of appealing to the people with the words of the rebel in order that they may get them to follow along the most reactionary paths. The innocent souls are found subscribing to conscription even while they are talking of anti-militarism and internationalism. They are cheering for Liberty, while they vote for Government control. How stealthy is the politician, and how surprisingly simple is the worker who is deceived by him!

If the Labour movement had been organised by way of an experiment to illustrate the failure of compromise, it could not have demonstrated it more fully than it has, although at the first glance quite the contrary might appear to be the case. Look, it may be said, at the old Social Democratic Federation, with its strict adherence to principle, and then lament its downfall. Look again at the Independent Labour Party, with its spirit of compromise and its conveniently elastic principles, and then mark how it has risen to comparative success.

To compromise, it may be argued from this, is the only practical method of attaining our end, the one way of avoiding death. Even further the argument may be pursued. Turn now to the Churches and ask, where are the uncompromising Christadelphians and the narrow Scotch sects who denied the pleasure of the world and lived for the love or fear of God alone? They are almost dead, and that great compromise with Mammon, the Church of England and its imitators, are highly successful. Truly the words of Saint Paul have been revised, and it appears that the wages of righteousness is death.

But all this is mere appearance, and is the result of taking a narrow view of our subject when a wide generalisation should be considered. Instead of comparing the S.D.P. with the I.L.P., or setting this creed of the religious sects against the other, we may take one sweeping look and ask, what has become of the great revolutionary spirit which the Labour movement should be expressing? In regard to the Churches we may ask, what effect has organisation based on compromise had on the religion which they were originally intended to foster?

The answers to these questions are obvious. The spirit of revolution has been as effectually excluded from the Labour movement as the spirit of religion has been slowly done to death in the Churches. Compromise may, and often does, mean success to organisations, but it invariably means death to great principles.

The truth is that it is a mistake, too often made, to confuse mere petty narrowness of action with a stern, unbending, and uncompromising attitude, just as foolish obstinacy is often mistaken for determination, and foolhardiness for bravery. It is due to this misunderstanding that the old S.D.P. was so often considered to be an uncompromising body. But, in truth, it was mere narrowness and obstinacy and a profound deafness to all new and progressive ideas that were the real peculiarities of this organisation. Like all the other authoritarian Socialist parties, its constitution was based fundamentally on a glaring compromise. We will have a new society, but the dominating forces of the present society shall bring it into being. We will have liberty, but it shall be under the control of government. Progress is our watchword, but the majority must be the rulers. We will establish social equality, but it must be from our privileged position as legislators. So one could go on endlessly with these contradictions, for every progressive principle of Socialism is negated by the reactionary policy of these hopeless politicians.

It is this attempt to compromise between opposing principles that has made the Labour movement a success merely as an organisation, and a failure as a fighting force.

"In a revolution, there is nothing so formidable as a straight line," says Victor Hugo. It is the Anarchist alone who can walk this

straight line without turning either to the right or to the left. It is the simplicity and directness of the Anarchist philosophy which gives it its strength and which must in the near future cause it to be accepted by all the active and sincere section of the Labour movement. To compromise is to lose this simplicity and render ourselves as powerless as are our much greater rivals.

The line of human progress, irregular and illdrawn, stretches from slavery towards liberty. It is the Anarchist's business to produce it up to the point where liberty is completely attained, and since a straight line is the shortest distance between two points, we find ourselves back again at Victor Hugo's words. The indefinite, chaotic, and often foolish struggle of the workers will become a movement of gigantic power when the confusion of thoughts which now govern it are replaced by the simple strength of the Anarchist philosophy. Away with capitalism, and away also with its stronghold, the State. Liberty! Tyranny is dead! for we will destroy the home of tyranny, the Government itself.

G. BARRETT.

SCIENCE AND GHOSTS.

As President of the British Association, Sir Oliver Lodge's pronouncement of his belief in "discarnate intelligence" (otherwise ghosts) has attracted much notice; but it is rather late in the day for even a man of his position to stem the tide of science. In 1895, Ludwig Buchner dealt with a similar theory put forward by one of the professors of the day; and we think his remarks worthy of republication at this moment.

The human mind, in its search for truth, must abandon empty speculation on the metaphysical or on ultimate things, and must be content to penetrate the inner causal relations of enviroing nature; by this means it will come to a knowledge of that uniformity which I have indicated as the end of all true research. Logic and science will at once convince it that whatever goes beyond the sphere of this uniformity rests on illusion or a false interpretation. The question of the source of this uniformity might be entirely neglected, even if the theory of evolution did not meanwhile afford us a sufficient explanation of it. It is enough to know that it exists, and that, where gaps are visible, these are not gaps in the framework of things, but in our knowledge. Nevertheless the opponents of a natural view of the world appeal frantically to these gaps for the purpose of saving their idea of a metaphysical intervention, or—it is the same thing—a miracle. But they are driven from one position to another, for the light of advancing science gradually penetrates the darkest corners, in which the belief in spirits, ghosts, or miracles, takes refuge—whether they be the phantoms of common spiritism or spiritualism, or those of science. For science, too, has its faith in miracles and its ghosts, which are sometimes able to delay its advance considerably, in spite of their unreality.

Such a phantom is the old belief in a *vital force*, which seems to be reappearing in a new form, though it was killed and buried long ago. "Neovitalism," or the new vital force doctrine, is the theory brought forward by Professor Rindfleisch at Lubeck. This, indeed, he could only do by an appeal to metaphysical considerations—that is to say, considerations that went far beyond the nature of things as it is known to us. The unity of force and matter, which is the foundation of philosophic monism, does not need to be gathered from the nature of each of those concepts—which Rindfleisch held to be impossible; it is simply a fact, which we must accept as such, and take into account. Professor Rindfleisch finds it inconceivable that an atom, or, which comes to the same thing, the world (since it is only a question of degree), should move itself. This is certainly inconceivable for any man who does not, with the materialist, regard movement as eternal and as an inalienable attribute of matter. The distinction which Rindfleisch draws between what he calls *living* and *dead nature* was abandoned long ago. *There is no such thing as dead nature*; the difference between organic and inorganic nature consists merely in the kind, direction, and intensity of their motion. That a bird should fly differently from a stone that has been thrown is natural enough. But the fact proves no more than the movements of protoplasm that the laws which rule in the living world are different from those of what is called dead nature. The matter which is found in both, the natural forces which operate in both, are the same; and, however intricate the characters of life may be, they are neither more nor less than movements of matter under peculiar and highly specialised conditions. What room have we here for a special vital force? The circumstance that we do not know yet, or cannot demonstrate, in what way non-vital motion passes into vital, does not in the least impair the fact that this conversion is purely natural, proceeding in a natural manner and conditioned by the general natural laws. No one who is accustomed to scientific, and not metaphysical, thinking will dispute this. Any other kind of conversion could be nothing else than a miracle, or a supernatural, metaphysical intrusion in the course of natural events. No one would think of charging Professor Rindfleisch with a belief in miracles; that would be unworthy of a physician and scientist. But he cannot be cleared of the charge of having his scientific thought over- come by a secret leaning to metaphysics. The idea which he introduces at the close of his speech, though in involved and rather obscure phraseology, is the most metaphysical of all metaphysical notions. A minister might have said from the pulpit what this scientist said, on

the basis of a text of Scripture which Rindfleisch quoted. If both are right, one fails to see why science should be cultivated for its own sake, when in the eyes of him who sees all things human science is but folly. We are in God's hand, and have only to wait patiently what he decides to do with us—that is the ultimate conclusion of the wisdom which, like that of Professor Rindfleisch, seeks to throw off the "tyranny of materialism" by rushing into the opposite extreme. Neovitalism itself can only be described as an unfortunate revival of the old vitalism, which has been long ago driven from its ancient position in science by a succession of effective criticisms. Its new supporter will have no greater success.

REVOLT OF THE ENGLISH PEASANTS IN 1381.

(Conclusion.)

However, the rebels, having gained the upper hand in London, did not hesitate to besiege the Tower, where the King and some of his ministers had taken refuge; and it was to call them off from this threatening position that the young King Richard II. agreed to meet them, and to hear their demands, in the meadows at Mile End. The demands of the rebels were bold and clear. "We will," they said to the King, "that you free us for ever, us and our lands; and that we be never named nor held for serfs." "I grant it," was the King's answer, and with that simple trust that is almost always a fatal weakness with the workers, they went quietly back to their homes. It is not to be wondered at that the honest and simple-minded peasants, unused to the guile and hypocrisy of Kings and Courts, should have been persuaded by these fair words. We must remember that the people of those days loved a King almost as much as weak-minded workers of the present love a Lord or an M.P. And Richard had as yet given them no cause for suspicion. He stood before them a mere youth of fifteen, handsome, and with an air of courage that helped to win their hearts. They could not conceive that anything of a treacherous nature might lurk beneath that fair exterior. Even historians of a later day have marvelled at the duplicity that was so strongly developed in one so young. However, in trusting the King the peasants made the one fatal mistake that cost the lives of so many brave fellows, and helped to lessen the moral effect of their attack.

As always happens in these cases, some of the rebels were more discerning; and Wat Tyler, the leader of the army that had remained encamped at Smithfield, was not so satisfied with mere promises, and to deal with him the King decided on another interview. As we know, assassination was the method here resorted to, and Tyler was stabbed in the back as he rode forward to meet the King. Again the King's innocent air, added to a courage natural or assumed, saved himself and his guard from death. For the followers of Tyler were preparing to draw on them when the King rode up to their ranks with the words, "I am your leader," and again he was trusted, as he led them away into the meadows outside the city gates.

After this came the reaction. The King, the nobles, the bishops, the lawyers, were thirsting for the blood of the rebels, and they took, as these saintly rulers of men always do, a most cowardly and brutal revenge.

The chroniclers of the times tell us that some 7,000 of the rebels were hanged or done to death. But even then their spirit was not broken, for fresh risings still continued to break out, always with the old demand that the promised liberties should be granted. At last Parliament was compelled to pass an Act of pardon to all rebels, with a few exceptions; and as the country began gradually to settle down, it became possible to estimate what would be the political and economic results of the revolt.

First of all, then, it gave the deathblow to serfdom, for after the upheaval the liberation of the serf went on with a rapidity that nothing less than a revolution could have ensured. It was the beginning of a new era for the labourer, and no one has yet been able to dispute the gains that were won by this great tide of popular revolution.

At a time like the present, when politics dominate men's minds so much more than the hardy spirit of revolt, it is as well to look back on those days and learn the lesson they so clearly teach us. For the people then, as now, there was no hope of any help from their rulers. Only five years before the outbreak, the so-called "good Parliament" was called to power. So far as I am aware, it is the only Parliament that has been given that name through all our history, and it seems to have obtained it because it was not quite so wicked or so idiotic as most of the others. At any rate, its attempts to deal with the evils that beset the nation never succeeded in bringing any relief to the labouring classes. And, as we have seen, that led to the adoption of methods which are just as necessary to-day as then. They formed their Unions, they prepared for revolt, and they formulated their demands. No palliatives for them, no miserable Acts of Parliament that take away with one hand what they give with the other, but the full measure of freedom and well-being, such as their labour might obtain for them. This they demanded, this they fought for, and this they obtained in a far greater measure than the majority of our blind leaders understand. In case, however, this may seem too optimistic a view, let me quote a few words from writers who take the legal middle-class view of things.

Trevelyan, in his book "England in the Age of Wiclif," says:—"It was better that rebellion should show its head in an age when so much was wrong than that all complaint should be stifled. Since Parliament only vented the grievances of the middle class, the labourers

needed to make themselves heard by rioting. The Government was bad, the social system was decaying, the time was out of joint. A strong expression of discontent was natural and right." And he further adds that the bases of such freedom as we have were laid and won in those days.

De Gibbins, in his "Industrial History of England," says:—"Although suppressed, the rising was practically successful, for it had shown the power of the combination of Labour in the great strife between Labour and Capital. The authorities, of course, blustered and swore they would never give in. Equally, of course, they did give in, no further attempts were made to exact labour dues or *corvées*; and within a generation or so villenage or serfage became practically extinct. After this great insurrection came what has been termed the golden age of the English labourer, and it lasted all through the fifteenth century." A hundred years of a golden age! Isn't that something worth fighting for? Isn't that something to compensate for the loss of the good men who fell in the great struggle? When will Parliamentary action bear such good fruit as that? Never!

Finally let me quote Thorold Rogers's estimate of the revolt and its effects:—"Once only," he says, "in the history of England, once, perhaps, only in the history of the world, peasants and artisans attempted to effect a revolution by force. They nearly succeeded; at least they became, for a short time, masters of the situation. That they would have held the advantages they gained at Mile End is improbable. But they caused such terror by what they actually did, that they gained all that they claimed, and that speedily. The English labourer, for a century or more, became virtually free and constantly prosperous." This is the sober estimate of a matter-of-fact economist, and it is nothing more nor less than a guarded admission that the revolt succeeded. They did not, it is true, establish the free commune, though even in those days the idea was germinating. What might have happened had Richard fallen at Smithfield it is, of course, useless to conjecture. What is of use to us is to take the facts, historically reliable, that have come down to us, and to recognise the moral of all that is written plainly enough, for all who will study, across the pages of history.

The lesson those sturdy peasants taught the ruling classes—a lesson that has been several times repeated in the course of the intervening centuries—remains unknown and unheeded by the plutocrats who rule us to-day. The slavery their heroism abolished once for all—the subjection of the serf—is no longer a necessity for the exploiters of the present time. They have fastened round the neck of the worker a chain that holds him still more inexorably in their power—the fetters of wage-slavery. But crushed, as he so often is, by his economic servitude, he yet enjoys some advantages which the rebels of the past have won for him. As a matter of fact, we are not always mindful enough of what we owe to the rebels of the past. Often enough when disappointments follow the efforts we make to awaken the people to a sense of their wrongs, we experience that feeling of helplessness and even despair that sometimes makes us hesitate in our work. But at such times should we not ask ourselves what the world would have been like to-day if all those martyrs to freedom and progress had held back because they would never see the day of victory? The truth is, the victory is in the work we accomplish, no matter who gathers the fruit.

The spirit that animated the peasants of 1381 needs to be with us again to-day. For once more a decaying society makes life well-nigh intolerable. Once more the burdens are becoming heavier than men can bear. Again, we see the unbridled rapacity of the exploiter, the unspeakable brutality of Governments, the sickening insolence and contempt of the ruling classes for the workers whose lives are given for their profit. The great lesson of revolt is needed once more. Little they care for our elections, for our municipal councils, for our Labour Members who talk and talk and bow the knee to all the forms and ceremonies of an outworn institution. What they dread is that we may learn to act for ourselves, that we may awaken to the power of the general strike, and to all the manifold advantages of direct action. In this lies our strength and their danger; and if the workers of to-day could learn and understand the lesson of the Peasants' Revolt, and could bring to bear the courage and endurance of those worthy forefathers, the days of capitalism would be numbered, and another golden age—the age of the free commune—would be dawning for the oppressed of all nations.

THE SINGLE TAX.

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

DEAR COMRADE,—I cannot see how the Single Tax theory can take the great mass of the people back to the land. In the primitive communities, every member of a clan had a right to live out of the land. At the beginning of last century the workers in all trades, skilled and unskilled, used to take their turn in the garden, which helped to feed their families; but now about 75 per cent. of our people are massed in towns. I think in the same way as the famous John Bellers, who wanted to start co-operative societies on the land, each society to consist of 300 members, to be entirely self-supporting, and to produce its own food, clothing, and shelter.—Yours fraternally,
Manchester.

W. MUTTER.

[Our comrade, however, does not give us any idea as to how his societies will get possession of the land.—ED. FREEDOM.]

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., 40c.; France, 2fr.
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 to ensure receipt of paper.

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

What is Political Action?

The struggle between Capital and Labour has become more and more acute during the last three years in England, France, and the United States. Partial strikes, strikes in a whole industry, and even general strikes have continually been taking place in those countries, and often were accompanied by sanguinary conflicts with armed police and troops, as in the West Virginian mine strike, that of Lawrence, the Liverpool dock strike, and at present in Dublin. It is evident that the working classes of our generation are determined, as in the "thirties" and "sixties" of last century, to force the capitalist and governing classes to make concessions of an economic and social nature. By strikes and a widespread popular agitation, the Trade Unionists and Socialists of 1832-45 obtained the Reform Act, a ten-hour day, and the regulation of children's and women's work. Again, in the "sixties," by strikes, demonstrations, and attacks on property, the working classes imposed on the governing and the capitalist classes their demand for electoral reform and legalisation of Trade Unions. The whole history of Europe teaches us that it was only by popular agitation and active struggle, by direct revolutionary activity, that the political franchise and economic concessions were obtained.

No Parliament in any country by its own initiative, without popular pressure and agitation from outside, inaugurated reforms. That is why all sincere reformers in political as well as in economic life were rebels, revolutionists. But for the last forty years Social Democrats in Germany and their followers in other countries, contrary to these lessons of history, began to preach that the only way to political and social emancipation was legal Parliamentarism; that the working class must send their representatives to the existing capitalist Parliament to obtain economic and social reforms. These Parliamentary tactics were called "political action," and the most ridiculous part of this terminology is that the tame process of election and sitting in Parliament is called *revolutionary* political action! At the same time, the activity of the French Syndicalists, with their propaganda and demonstrations against capitalism, militarism, and State oppression is called by Parliamentarians "non-political action," because it does not act through Parliament.

Again, with Anarchists. When we attack the State and preach its destruction, the Parliamentarians call this non-political activity, as if the State is not a political organisation. When our comrades Bresci, Angiolillo, and others were avenging the people shot in the streets of Milan and the tortured victims of Montjuich, was not theirs heroic revolutionary political action?

The absurdity of the Social Democrats in affirming that they only are employing political activity was especially demonstrated during the anti-war campaign of last winter. When the Social Democrats and Parliamentarians held an anti-war meeting in Zurich and issued an anti-war manifesto resembling that of the peace societies, they pompously called that political action. The French Syndicalists and Anarchists holding anti-war meetings all over the country, and even organising a 24-hour general strike of 400,000 workers to protest against militarism and the war—this was non-political action, according to the Social Democrats' standard!

In this way it would appear as if all great revolutionary fighters were non-political! Mazzini and his heroic friends, never having been in Parliament, in spite of their life-long

struggle for the liberties of their country, were not political! So Blanqui and Garibaldi, John Brown and his sons, would be non-political.

The absurdity and immorality of the definition that political action means Parliamentary legalism is evident. Every individual or collective act directed against the State or against capitalism is political, because the State in its modern role is the mailed fist in the service of capitalism against the workers. It would be a great moral and social calamity if the workers should listen to the voice of those leaders who would persuade them to cease their daily struggle in all its various forms, and confide their emancipation to Parliamentary representatives who are submitting to the existing order of exploitation and State oppression.

When a most "Liberal" Government, on the friendliest of terms with "Labour" in Parliament, is sending armed police, troops and gunboats to shoot down strikers, when exploiters are combining and raising a fund of £50,000,000 in order to crush even the elementary right of organisation among their wage-slaves, it is surely not only futile but criminal to urge the workers to put their faith in legal tactics and Parliamentary representation.

Whilst the exploiters do not have the slightest hesitation in acting in the most brutal way, whether legal or non-legal, are the workers to do nothing but, through their Parliamentary representatives, implore the masters to respect the right of combination and to strike, won in hard struggle by their forefathers?

No, because it would be too degrading, too cowardly. We hope the workers will realise that the time has come to brush aside the web of Parliamentary futilities and impotence, to take their own affairs into their own hands, and to use the only weapon feared by their enemies—revolutionary direct action—in order not only to preserve already conquered rights, but to clear the way towards the great aim: abolition of wage-slavery and State oppression.

THE INTERNATIONAL SYNDICALIST CONGRESS.

About forty delegates arrived in London for this Congress, which was held in the Holborn Hall, Gray's Inn Road, from September 27 to October 2. The delegates came from Germany, Holland, France, Belgium, Spain, Italy, Argentine, Brazil, Cuba, Norway, and Sweden, besides the English members of the Congress. Interesting reports were read, dealing with the Syndicalist movement in the different countries. A declaration of principle was worked out by an international Commission of the Congress, and unanimously accepted. It runs as follows:—

"That this Congress, recognising that the working class of every country suffers from capitalist slavery and State oppression, declares for the class struggle and international solidarity, and for the organisation of the workers into autonomous industrial Unions on a basis of free association.

"Strives for the immediate uplifting of the material and intellectual interests of the working class, and for the overthrow of the capitalist system and the State.

"Declares that the class struggle is a necessary result of private property in the means of production and distribution, and therefore declares for the socialisation of such property by constructing and developing our Trade Unions in such a way as to fit them for the administration of these means in the interest of the entire community.

"Recognises that, internationally, Trade Unions will only succeed when they cease to be divided by political and religious differences; declares that their fight is an economic fight, meaning thereby that they do not intend to reach their aim by trusting their cause to governing bodies or their members, but by using direct action, by the workers themselves relying on the strength of their economic organisations.

"And in consequence of these recognitions and declarations, the Congress appeals to the workers in all countries to organise in autonomous industrial Unions, and to unite themselves on the basis of international solidarity, in order finally to obtain their emancipation from capitalism and the State."

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*.

The Trades Union Congress.

It is a matter for regret that one is compelled to speak in a subdued tone when referring to the recent Trade Union Congress. In itself, the spectacle of 550 delegates, representing 2,250,000 organised workers, meeting for the purpose of conferring in the common interests of their class, is an inspiring one. The possibilities are enormous in number and scope. Yet while year after year the same imposing display of the numerical strength of organised Labour is made, the earnest spirits in the cause turn from it with disappointment, and wonder whether it is worth the time and cost.

Such a Congress as that which assembled at Manchester on September 1 should be capable of sounding an inspiring note which would reanimate the whole of the forces of Labour in their struggle against capitalistic greed and tyranny. The task before it is a gigantic one, if understood aright. The Congress possesses all the necessary machinery for exact and full inquiry into the social and economic conditions in which the toiling masses exist. It has under its control a magnificent organisation which is in a position to attend to the pressing needs of workers of every kind by direct and immediate action. Its strength increases annually; every period of social discontent and every Labour revolt adds to it. Oppressed workers throughout the country look for aid; but, to speak frankly, this great organisation, which might stretch out a giant's arm on their behalf, as a rule seems content with emitting a few mouse-squeaks at the capitalist beast of prey.

Really, organised Labour, both officials and members, is not conscious of the power of its own movement. For a long period Trade Unionists have been looking so much to an alien institution for redress of the major portion of their grievances. Quite consistently, not being contented with the futile results of many years' "lobbying," they have become ambitious of entering the House of Humbug as its recognised members, and regard the Congress as a means of giving them a help in that direction. As if the work and sacrifice so unselfishly expended in the Labour movement were given for such purposes!

Probably one of the chief reasons for the non-progressive character of the proceedings is the fact that the official element is predominant. The title should be the "Trade Union Officials' Congress." And when we remember that many of them are putting up a stubborn fight against progress within their own societies, and then meet each other in force on an occasion which they regard in a fraternal light more than in any other, different conduct cannot reasonably be expected of them. The change in the method of appointing the president of the Congress illustrates these facts very well. While the local Trades Council had the selection in their hands, it was always possible that a man of forward tendencies might occupy the chair and give the Congress a moral and intellectual lead. But now any such hope must be abandoned, because the Parliamentary (ominous word!) Committee appoints the president.

Thus, Mr. W. J. Davis's address as president this year was typical of minds still lagging behind the times—minds held in bondage by the ideas current in the "seventies" and "eighties" of last century. The address would make one weep if it were taken seriously. His audience must have been destitute of a sense of humour if they refrained from ironic smiles. The conclusion of his address is a good sample, and needs no comment:—

"To forecast the future or to suggest programmes is somewhat like building castles in the air, but most assuredly vested interests must be prepared to surrender to the people who so largely contribute to the nation's prosperity that which is overdue. In the interests of commerce this will be demanded. To co-ordinate the rights and responsibilities of property may shock the holders of capital, but, if I mistake not the indication of the times, the time is fast approaching when those who can best afford it will not be permitted to escape by contributing less than their proportion to the national burdens, but will have to meet taxation commensurate with their accidental or fortunate financial holdings."—(*Manchester Guardian*.)

"The best thing of the week," as the sporting papers say, was without question the expression of feeling of the delegates upon the Dublin atrocities. To the horror of the "higher grade" officials, the proceedings were interrupted in order to attend to that question. It is pleasant to record complete unanimity by the Congress, and its immediate and direct action in this matter shows that the Congress would become an institution of some real importance if it proceeded more often upon those lines. Action was also taken in reference to the wanton police brutality to the clayworkers on strike in Cornwall, though the standing orders did not permit similar prominence being given to it.

But so far, so good. Everything, it is said, must have a beginning; and may be, though the first step is made as a consequence of unexpected circumstances, the road onward, so obvious and yet so easily missed, will yet be taken.

At last, too, the claims of the workers on the land were recognised, though meagrely. How easily might a tithe of the money and effort uselessly expended upon political action have most profitably been devoted to the work of organisation of farm workers, thus completing the great circle of organised Labour unity.

It would be a waste of time to follow in detail the proceedings of the Congress. The "hardy annuals," of course, appeared upon the scene, and made one feel how necessary a completely new start really is. The ghost of the legal eight-hour day was raised on the second day, and the result of the ballot in the Unions (only 33,082 voting for it) showed what a shadowy creature it has become. On its grave should be inscribed: "Killed by political action."

The farce of sending deputations to Ministers of State upon Labour questions was admitted by Mr. Walkden, who testified that he had been on deputations for one or two years, and found that practically no results accrued from them. His Union, strange to say, wants more.

Mr. Dubery, of the Fawcett Association, was compelled to acknowledge that nationalisation "will not bring the millenium," but could be accompanied, as in the case of the Post Office, by "examples of speeding up, low wages, and conditions that would compare for badness with any capitalistic concern in the country." His remedy was "democratic control" and more political action! The Congress then decided, *nem. con.*, in favour of nationalisation of railways.

On the third day, the "Osborne judgment" was discussed. The political actionists do not appear to be conscious of their ignominious position upon this question. After all these years of power expressed through the ballot-box, and by success at the polls and in Parliament, and with a party sympathetic to them in office, they have been treated as of less consequence than a single Chamber of Commerce, and their members denied the right to expend their own money even in accordance with the avowed objects of their societies! That is a typical effect of political action. Will Thorne, M.P., challenged "the Syndicalist crowd" to discuss the question. Well, they were discussing that question and others in a more fruitful sphere than the Congress, as that gentleman may, to his sorrow, learn before long. While we resent the insolent interference of the Legislature and the imbeciles on the judicial benches with the rights of Trade Unions, we hope that their action will assist the tendency of the workers to help themselves. The greater that tendency, the sooner will the Osborne judgment be reversed. No pains will be spared to persuade the workers to return to the political fold, as witness the alarm of the politicians not many months since when Syndicalism first affrighted them.

Before concluding, we may turn with some satisfaction to the reception given to the French and German delegates, and to the resolution against militarism. We applaud both, for international Labour has the power to prevent the ghastly wars which Governments indulge in chiefly for the benefit of financial ghouls and other parasites.

Taken as a whole, the Congress reflects to some extent the opinions and feelings of the organised workers; but there is a great lack of reality about the proceedings. It does not express the general passionate feeling of discontent with capitalist society which, happily, is so prevalent amongst the working class. It does not represent the intensity of the demand for the "mending or ending" of the present economic conditions. When it does, it will concern itself more seriously with fundamental principles. It will convert the ideas of radical change into practical projects and methods, and it will be compelled to strike at the very basis of the wage system. The perfecting of the strike weapon, the boycott, mutual aid between the Unions, the provisioning of the workers in their struggles with their economic and political enemies, new and improved methods of fighting—all will receive necessary consideration. Then may arise the supreme question of the control of land and industry, and the distribution of wealth by the workers. The expropriation of the capitalist class must follow.

These are ideas which will not appeal to those persons generally responsible for the policy of the Trade Union Congress, but they are important and urgent in the minds of the most earnest amongst the hosts of Labour. Let the workers remember the important fact that progress, even in the Labour movement, must come from their own ranks, and cannot descend like manna from above. Freedom cannot be given, it must be taken.

SIDELIGHTS ON SOCIAL SUBJECTS.

The Trade Union Congress, appropriately enough termed the "Parliament of Labour," has met, gone through the usual formalities, and passed beyond our ken for another year. It would be well, therefore, to briefly review the Trade Union position by the light of this Congress. The membership represented was over 2,250,000, the increase during the past twelve months being 200,000. This is significant when we realise the number of Trade Unionists in 1868 was 118,367. The question, however, naturally arising from a study of these figures is: Have the Trade Union gains been commensurate with this increase? Before dealing with this wonderful numerical growth it would be well to note one or two incidents of the Congress which are worthy of criticism, notably the deputation sent to the seat of the Labour war at Dublin. In this connection the speech made by James Sexton, J.P., is interesting. "Sexton, speaking very low and in a guarded manner, called upon the Irish Parliamentary Party to take action. He did not applaud violence; as a 'holder of His Majesty's Commission of the Peace,' he had no personal love for some of those involved." Therein lies the whole point. The most effectual extinguisher of any militant Labour movement is always some leader bribed by an office conferred upon him or given over to the fetish of Parliamentary action, for, being of the same class as the rebels, he makes the most efficient "Guardian of the Peace."

How much longer will the workers tolerate their "leaders"? Progress will never be made by a tame official-ridden body such as the Trade Union Congress now is, with its respect for laws made against its own class, and its foolish endeavour to model itself on the lines of Parliament with its Parliamentary Committee corresponding to the British Cabinet. How far will the workers ever get until they realise that law-making is the capitalists' method of hindering their growth. To defy their laws will ever remain an impossibility so long as officials and leaders dominate the movement and strangle initiative in the rank and file.

One pathetic statement was made by an American delegate to the Congress. C. L. Baine declared the American Federation of Labour stood for law and order. With such brilliant satellites, no wonder this famous Federation is wise in its generation. It now remains for our American comrades to teach their leaders that they exist to break down class law, not to obey it. But, alas! on the day when such an awakening comes the hour of the C. L. Baine type of delegate will be over, and meanwhile their baneful influence keeps back the hands of the clock.

Those of us who have studied the Labour movement during the past few years contend that the growing consciousness in the mass of workers is very near the revolutionary bursting point, and sooner or later the leaders and officials, with their antiquated political methods, doctrinaire gospel, and bankruptcy of ideas, will have to go. For the great realisation of economic power among the rank and file must prove creative, and construction will be in proportion as each one is fired with an ideal worthy of expression. It is everywhere becoming apparent that the Trade Unionist of yesterday, content with a mere bargaining for improved conditions, has to-day been transformed into the revolutionary, actuated with the ideal of freedom, seeing the necessity for the absolute abolition of wagedom. He has become conscious of his invincible power as a worker. This is expressed in the rebellion against industrial agreements drawn up by officials, which plays so large a part in the frequent industrial upheavals. Everywhere are signs of the breaking away from the fatalistic belief in Parliament, which has for so long been a pathetic feature of the Labour struggles.

There is hope for Britain in as far as "general initiative and creative self-action" is undertaken by her wage-slaves. The spirit of rebellion will in time break down the traditions at present surrounding halo-like the heads of the leaders. Then Labour J.P.s and Labour M.P.s will cease to be political "pied pipers," and, despoiled of their bourgeois tinsel, will appear only average persons. As the mass itself becomes educated, it will see through the political chicanery of the enemy, and realise that it must think and act for itself without having its hands tied by officials.

That history has a habit of repeating itself is shown in the first act of the Trade Union Congress deputation to Dublin. The members, like good law-abiding citizens, we are told, went straight to interview Lord Aberdeen on their arrival in that city. Since then the capitalist papers have been saying complimentary things about the spirit of compromise displayed by them. The sequel might prove interesting, but organised Labour has lost too much by official interference in the past to quietly submit to it much longer.

Here is the parallel, and although the persons concerned are on the other side of the Atlantic, the moral is obvious. During the fight between the West Virginia miners and the mine owners, an investigation committee of the American Socialist Party visited the scene of action. Their first act was to visit Governor Hatfield, the tool of the mine owners; and this is what the *International Socialist Review* for July says:—

"This conference (with the Governor) took place before Debs had investigated among the strikers, and resulted in Debs's endorsement of

the Governor. . . . It was Hatfield who issued the famous ultimatum commanding the strikers to get back to work within thirty-six hours or be deported from the State. It was the United Mine Workers' officials who went in the strike zone (accompanied by soldiers) to tell the strikers their financial support would be withdrawn, thus forcing the miners to return to the mines. . . . It is the rank and file of the U.M.W. who have found it necessary to fight and expose the Governor as well as their own officers. If the United Mine Workers could rid themselves of their compromising officials and rule their own organisation, the splendid men in the rank and file would make it a real fighting industrial Union that nothing could check."

This might be a chapter from British modern industrial history—so clearly do we see the canker always following the appropriation of power by officials. Militant Trade Unionism in no uncertain way must soon make this betrayal an impossibility.

The epidemic of strikes which is so palpably agitating Stock Exchange circles just now is a grave symptom of a disorder which will not be easy to "treat," despite the remedy proposed by Mr. Asquith. We learn from the daily press that in reply to a question from Mr. Cooper, the Conservative Member for Walsall, asking him whether he knew how discontented the wage earning classes are and whether it was the settled policy of the Government "to postpone intervention until a struggle had broken out," Mr. Asquith said the matter never ceased to engage the attention of the Government, and so we have the announcement that a Royal Commission is to consider "Industrial Unrest." But "Dr" Asquith with his political quack remedies is beginning to be found out, and on the day when the awakening becomes universal the long-deceived "patients" will exact a heavy reckoning for the fraud. The Black Country, Leith, Dublin, and Cornwall are still in our memory, and it is just possible it will take rather a larger dose of quackery than usual to heal the afflicted this time.

Under the title "Equal Suffrage in the U.S.A.," a passage recently appeared in the press to the effect that: "This year Illinois, by a constitutional amendment, granted almost full suffrage to 1,600,000 women in that important State, making the tenth Suffrage State in the Union. The effect of the operation of equal Suffrage in ten States can be readily guessed. It gives them a tremendous advantage over States where only the men can vote. The Presidential vote has been increased by three or four millions, which practically means that the Suffrage States can swing the next Presidential election. This fact has naturally excited large interest in the rest of the Republic, the advantage being easily apparent."

We are bound to remark that the advantage to the capitalist certainly is apparent. The information is interesting in view of the revelations concerning the work of the National Association of Manufacturers recently made by Mulhall and appearing in the August *International Socialist Review* under the title "The Invisible Government." The extracts speak for themselves:—

"The actual government of this country was not the President, Congress, and the Courts, not any body or power created or recognised by the Constitution, but always a combination of important business interests. These interests were in fact the real, if invisible, government. They issued their orders, and the puppets that filled the ostensible places of power, obeyed. We have said that these interests never failed to get what they wanted; that their hands were discernible in every piece of important legislation; that they selected the Cabinets and made or unmade laws as they pleased; that in this country the people really had little to say about their affairs. . . . A great power like the National Association of Manufacturers, with unlimited money and a vast army of unscrupulous agents, can wield an almost irresistible political dominion. As shown so repeatedly in the confessions of Mulhall, it can go into the district of a Member that is not obedient to its order and beat him for renomination or at the polls. You can carry practically any election if you have money enough. . . . It can and does control the press, and every day poisons the minds of thousands of workers that never suspect the nature of the stuff they are imbibing."

All this only serves to emphasise the great service Illinois is rendering humanity by its adoption of equal suffrage!

Little by little the prestige formerly enjoyed by the Social Democratic leaders is falling away, and we see unmasked the great men and women the movement has made. In August Bebel's last letter, an absolute sacrifice of principle to expediency is shown. We are told, "He held his tongue in order not to embarrass the German Emperor in his attempt to enlarge and strengthen the German Army." Bebel says: "My discretion as a Member of the Reichstag did not permit of my doing it. . . . The German Emperor has seen during the Balkan War that our army has completely gone to the dogs." Surely a reactionary policy to adopt. A revolutionary's course should be quite clear, for, unless the work of all Socialists is to embarrass their respective Governments, they had much better seek salvation by more metaphysical means than that indicated by the way of the Social Revolution. But incidents such as these vindicate the position adopted by Anarchists, who, seeing the pitfalls lining the way of political action, avoid them by strenuously opposing all such methods.

M. B. HOPE.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

Spain.

The workers of Spain have had the satisfaction of seeing their militant comrades, who were imprisoned since the beginning of August, liberated by the Government. When in July the textile workers of Barcelona formulated their claims for higher wages and less hours, the owners refused to consider them. The workers of the same trade in the whole district enthusiastically made common cause with their Barcelona fellow workers, and on July 30th the general strike was declared. Over 100,000 persons took part in this demonstration of solidarity. When the employers still did not show any willingness to cede, the delegates of the Provincial Federation held a meeting to decide whether a general strike in all trades should be called. The authorities, alarmed by the firm attitude of the workers, came down on this meeting of the Federation and arrested twenty-three of the best known Anarchists and Syndicalists of Barcelona. Since that night these men have remained in prison. But if the authorities thought they could crush the movement, they had miscalculated. In the end the workers' demands for higher pay and less hours were granted. The Federation started an energetic protest campaign, appealing to revolutionary fellow workers of all countries; and now the Government has been obliged to bow before necessity and liberate the prisoners.

This decision to give in to the popular demands of Catalonia, which is the storm centre of the whole country, has been much hastened by the continuous disastrous news from the field of war in Morocco. Though censorship and a lying capitalist press are trying to keep the truth from the people, the evil tidings of defeat, suffering, and mortality is filtering through to the anxious parents at home. The corruption and disorder of the Government; the wasting of the millions on this "little" war in Morocco, a pendant to the costly brigandage in Tripoli by Italy; the economic crisis; labour unrest in Catalonia; threats of strikes by the miners in Asturia and Huelva—all have helped to create a state of fermentation and violent discontent that at any moment may break out and sweep away the Government and Alfonso, the murderer of Ferrer, to their well-deserved fate.

South Africa.

Now the outburst in the Rand Mines has been temporarily stifled by the usual method of Governments and capitalists—viz., the appointment of a Commission and inquiries, interviews of an unlimited number and length, wearing out the interests of the public and the hopes of the strikers, who, had in the meantime gone back to slavery—the Randlords, who had been lying low when the bullets flew, now again feel their courage revive. One of them, Sir Lionel Phillips (the Liberal Government is responsible for his title), has had the impudence to complain publicly that the white miners are lazy, the proof of which is that Sir Lionel had seen miners in the consumptive sanatorium who might have done some small jobs and didn't, out of pure laziness. That titled cad, after living in luxury on the proceeds of the miner's labour, cannot even allow his workman to die in peace, but must still insult him. If the miners could get this coward down in the mine and force him to share their hell for a few months, one's sense of justice would feel relieved.

Among the blessings of civilisation introduced by the white man's government is the rule that coloured women in the Orange Free State when they go about must have a passport on them. This degrading measure has at last so revolted the native women of Bloemfontein that they decided to take a leaf out of the white man's book: they applied passive resistance, and refused to provide themselves with passes. This courageous action has ended in 34 coloured women being sent to jail in Bloemfontein. The public meeting at which the women of Bloemfontein decided to destroy their passes, caused great enthusiasm everywhere. We hope these daring pioneers will find support and followers.

Switzerland.

We all know that the General Strike, with its Anarchist origin, is in reality an abomination in the eyes of Social Democrats, though they have been obliged even in the German Congresses to admit its usefulness for "political" purposes. The Trade Unions of German Switzerland have demonstrated in their recent Congress how orthodox are their views regarding this heresy. The secretary of the Executive had proposed a resolution against the general strike; this was accepted by the Executive, but had to be ratified by the Congress held last week at Zurich. Thirty-three delegates were against any resolution binding their Unions to an attitude in future circumstances. Nevertheless forty-four delegates adopted the anti-general strike resolution—"That the Congress condemns every general strike for purely labour demands. It can only support a general strike for political motives, when some Governmental measures are threatening the vital interests of the working classes. But the Congress is of opinion that a general strike for the upholding of Constitutional rights will not be necessary in Switzerland."

So the German-Swiss workers are ordered to abstain from the general strike for the amelioration of their economic conditions; but the politicians, recognising the value of this powerful weapon, wish to limit its use to their own purposes and aims. The Congress of Swiss Trade Unions may accept scores of such ridiculous resolutions, but

they will share the same fate as the German Social Democratic leader Auer's words: "General Strike is general nonsense"; they will be remembered only with shame when the bitter experience of the daily struggle of the workers has convinced them that they, the workers themselves, must fight their own economic battle, and that the general strike is an invaluable asset in that fight.

Portugal.

The persecution of Syndicalists and Anarchists still continues, propagandists being arrested wholesale, and all advanced papers suppressed. Afonso Costa, the present dictator, leaves no stone unturned to break up the Syndicates. One of the strongest opponents of the Government's policy has been Machado Santos, the commanding officer of the Republican forces when the Republic was established. But even his paper, *O Intransigente*, has been seized so often that it has suspended publication, and Santos himself threatened with imprisonment. Advocates of political revolutions will find little encouragement in Portugal just now.

FERRER AND THE USE OF FORCE.

Anarchists and Revolutionists are much indebted to Mr. Joseph McCabe for his splendid work on behalf of Francisco Ferrer, and to find fault with him may seem ungrateful; but in his Introduction to Ferrer's "Origin and Ideals of the Modern School" * he makes a statement which calls for comment, if Ferrer's ideas are to be properly understood. Mr. McCabe says:—"He [Ferrer] was also an Anarchist, in the sense of Tolstoi; he believed that liberty was essential to the development of man, and central government an evil. But, as rigorously as Tolstoi, he relied on persuasion and abhorred violence." Mr. McCabe means, of course, that Ferrer was of the opinion that the government of man by man and the consequent exploitation of the workers could be abolished without the use of physical force—by education and persuasion. But his writings are a flat contradiction of this view. While Ferrer, like other Anarchists, believed that force without education was useless, he also knew that education without force would be of no avail. The rulers and exploiters of the world will never give up their privileges until they are compelled to do so, however beneficial it might be for the world in general. This is a fact that must be recognised by the workers, and that it was recognised by Ferrer is shown by the following extracts from "La Huelga General" (The General Strike), a series of articles written by him in 1902-3, and subsequently published in pamphlet form. The quotations are taken from translations by "S. C." in the *Anarchist*, 1912:—

"What have the workers gained by the vote? Had the Parliamentary Socialists given to the propaganda, and to the organisation of the working classes, the time they have wasted in political warfare, it is many long years since that we would have battered down capitalistic society. The Anarchists have the duty to make this truth known to those who still believe in the power of the vote and of the Parliaments. The full emancipation of the workers cannot come from the State no more than from the Church, but from a general strike that will crush these two institutions and destroy them. Will there be bloodshed? Yes, much. Yes, although we do not desire it.....It is certain that a day will come when the workers and the poor, sufficiently organised and awake, will give orders to quit to the capitalists. Then there will happen a phenomenon greater than any yet mentioned in history. The owners of the world's riches and their supporters—instead of them reasonably entering into agreement and intelligently co-operating in the change of a system of robbery into one of fraternity and solidarity—will oppose resistance: inevitably that day will come the tragedy. Useless wails! Late and hopeless curses! Serene, strong, unfaltering, Revolution will follow her triumphant route without stooping to sorrow over the dead in her way; the mind fixed on the new era of peace and justice, that through the last baptism of blood will come existence for the first time, setting up the society in which life really will be worth living."

Here he does not advocate force as a policy, but as a disagreeable necessity. Again, he says:—

"We must not ask for charity: we must not beg help from anybody: we must not elect commissions for pleasant journeys, nor even make pacific demonstrations. If we are not strong enough to take what really belongs to us, we must go on propagating our ideas of freedom amongst our fellow workers, until the day arrives when we can take it—by our own sole efforts—from our masters of to-day."

These extracts are sufficient to show that Ferrer did not believe that the oppressors of mankind would peacefully agree to the transformation of society. His zeal for education, however, proved that he realised the necessity for an enlightened people if the revolution was to have permanent results.

However, in translating "The Origin and Ideals of the Modern School," Mr. McCabe has made it possible for English readers to learn from Ferrer himself the real facts concerning the School, which was the cause of his tragic end. The book can be obtained from FREEDOM Office.

* * * Owing to pressure on our space, several interesting articles, including Book Notes, are crowded out.

* The Origin and Ideals of the Modern School. By Francisco Ferrer. Translated by Joseph McCabe. Cloth, 9d. net; paper, 6d. net. London: Watts and Co.

PROPAGANDA NOTES.

EAST LONDON GROUP.—For the past eight months a thoroughly vigorous open-air propaganda has been carried on in Hackney. Five meetings a week have been held throughout the summer, and the consequence is that we have now a large and sympathetic following, and the comrades themselves are nearly thirty in number. Now we think the time has arrived when definite measures are necessary to confirm sympathisers in their sympathy and make converts of them. To this end a meeting was held, and the following things were agreed upon:—That membership cards be issued for the purpose of providing some bond between the comrades, and that the subscriptions to be entered in same shall be voluntary; that the secretary, who was appointed at this meeting, should arrange for a systematic change of speakers; and that a library be formed. Further, that it is absolutely necessary that we have a club-room, which shall be a centre for our activities and a place to which newcomers in the movement can be invited. The strength of the movement and the public support justify us, we think, in saying that such a place can be maintained by us. The discussion then turned on ways and means for raising money to initiate the scheme outlined. It was decided that collections be taken at public meetings, that sympathisers be written to, and that we appeal through FREEDOM for funds, to be sent to the address below. We are having weekly group meetings at this address until our funds are large enough to take other premises.

C. PALMER, Secretary.

5 Belmont Mansions, Goldsmith Row, Hackney, E.

FERRER SUNDAY SCHOOL.—It must not be forgotten that the anniversary of the brutal legal murder of Ferrer by the Spanish Government takes place on the 13th inst. We propose having an open school on the 12th inst., when the tragic incidents of Ferrer's trial and execution will be explained to the young folk.

On the 30th of last month the School concert took place. The children acquitted themselves remarkably well in their singing, reciting, and dancing. During the month we have had the pleasure of Bessie Ward talking to the young folk about "The Story of the Ogre." Now the winter session is upon us, we are hoping for some pleasant and profitable Sunday afternoon discussions. Thanks are due to Comrade Lahr and other comrades for their gifts of books. These are much appreciated by the youngsters.

146 Stepney Green, E.

JIMMY DICK.

LIVERPOOL (Communist Club, 20 Islington).—Comrades should rally round now the winter session begins. Lectures and reading class; French class will also be started, providing a sufficient number of students join.

ANARCHIST EDUCATION LEAGUE.

A Social and Dance has been arranged to take place at the Central Labour College, 13 Penywern Road, S.W. (close to Earl's Court Station), on Saturday, October 11, at 7 p.m. Tickets, single 9d., double 1s. 3d.—to be obtained from FREEDOM Office. All comrades and sympathisers are urged to support the London Groups in their efforts to ensure a successful evening.

Subscription in Aid of a Comrade.

List No. 1 (J. Walsh) 3s. 6d., No. 2 (B. Platten) 10s. 6d., No. 3 (Fritz) 3s., No. 4 (L. Kavanagh) 13s. 6d., No. 8 (Willesden Comrades) 5s., No. 9 (F. Large) 3s. 6d., No. 10 (J. Dick) £3, No. 11 (T. Keell) 7s., No. 11A (Corso) 4s. 6d., No. 12 (A. Sugar) 13s. 6d., No. 15 (M. Rocker) 17s.; total, £7 1s. This amount has been handed to the comrade.

M. KAVANAGH, Hon. Treasurer.

Dublin Strikers' Fund.

We have received the following sums on behalf of the Dublin strikers and their families, and will be pleased to receive and forward any further sums sent to us:—Essex 2s. 6d., Comp. 1s.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

(August 29—October 1.)

FREEDOM Guarantee Fund.—S. Corio 1s 6d, H. Glasse 5s, K. Walter £1.

FREEDOM Subscriptions.—A. Roberts 1s 6d, T. Marmol 1s 6d, A. Pratelle 1s 6d, G. Teltsch 2s, K.K.S. (Canton) 1s 6d, S. G. Scoffham 1s 6d, C. Hoggett 1s 6d.

Pamphlet Printing Fund.—Gateshead Group (per G. W. Tindale) 8s 6d, G. Teltsch 2s 2d, C. Hoggett 1s, Essex 1s.

EAST LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP.

Sunday Mornings—Victoria Park, 11.30; Ridley Road, Dalston, 12.
Wednesdays—Outside Hackney Town Hall, Reading Lane, 8 p.m.

West London Socialist League (Direct Action).

Walham Green Church, North End Road, Fulham, every Tuesday evening at 8.15; and 2nd and 4th Fridays in the month, same time and place.

The Grove, Hammersmith, every Sunday evening at 8.15.

Birmingham.—Comrades are requested to note that a Stall for the sale of Anarchist literature is open in Smithfield Market every Saturday evening.

WE WANT TO PURCHASE

"In Russian and French Prisons," by P. Kropotkin.—State price and condition to Manager, Freedom Press, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W.

PAMPHLET AND BOOK LIST.

ANARCHIST COMMUNISM: ITS BASIS AND PRINCIPLES. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

ANARCHIST MORALITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 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 SOCIAL GENERAL STRIKE. By ARNOLD ROLLER. 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.

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

WAR. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. By ELISEE RECLUS. 1d.

MONOPOLY; OR, HOW LABOUR IS ROBBED. WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.

USEFUL WORK v. USELESS TOIL. By WM. MORRIS. 1d.

THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONGRESS, 1907. 1d.

THE CONCENTRATION OF CAPITAL: A MARXIAN FALLACY. By

W. TCHERKESOFF. 1d.

ANARCHISTS AND ESPERANTO. 1d.

KROPOTKIN: THE MAN AND HIS MESSAGE. By T. SWAN. 1d.

THE JAPANESE MARTYRS. With Portrait of Kotoku. 1d.

ANARCHY. By ANDRE GIRARD. 1d.

NON-GOVERNMENTAL SOCIETY. By EDWARD CARPENTER. 3d.

STATE SOCIALISM AND ANARCHISM. By Ben. R. Tucker. 3d.

TRADE UNIONISM AND ANARCHISM. By JAY FOX. 2d.

THE CHICAGO MARTYRS. With Portraits. 1d.

MEMOIRS OF A REVOLUTIONIST. By P. KROPOTKIN. (American Edition). 8s. 6d. post-free.

THE GREAT FRENCH REVOLUTION, 1789—1793. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 6s. net.

THE CONQUEST OF BREAD. By P. KROPOTKIN. Cloth 1s. net.

MUTUAL AID. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3s. 6d. post-free.

MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM. By PETER KROPOTKIN. A

New Translation. Paper 6d., Cloth 1s. 6d.; postage 1½d. and 3d.

FIELDS, FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS. By PETER KROPOTKIN.

New and Revised Edition. Cloth, 1s. net.

GOD AND THE STATE. By MICHAEL BAKUNIN. Cloth 1s. net, paper 6d. net, postage 1d.

ANARCHISM AND OTHER ESSAYS. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 4s. 6d. net.

PRISON MEMOIRS OF AN ANARCHIST. By A. BERKMAN. 6s. 6d. net, postage 4d.

ANARCHISM. By Dr. PAUL ELTZBACHER. 6s. 6d.; postage 4d.

NEWS FROM NOWHERE. By WILLIAM MORRIS. Paper covers, 1s.; cloth, 2s.; postage 2d.

A DREAM OF JOHN BALL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 2s., postage 3d.

FAMOUS SPEECHES OF THE EIGHT CHICAGO ANARCHISTS. 1s. 3d., postage 2d.

WHAT IS PROPERTY? By P. J. PROUDHON. 2 vols. 2s., postage 4d.

THE EGO AND HIS OWN. By MAX STIRNER. 2s. 6d. net.

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.

THE ORIGIN AND IDEALS OF THE MODERN SCHOOL. By

FRANCISCO FERRER. Cloth 9d. net, paper 6d. net, postage 2d.

FRANCISCO FERRER: His Life, Work, and Martyrdom. 1s. net.

FREE POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS. By L. SPOONER. 1s. net.

SYNDICALISM AND THE CO-OPERATIVE COMMONWEALTH.

By E. PATAUD and E. POUGET. Cloth 3s. 6d. net, paper 2s. 6d. net.

LIBERTY AND THE GREAT LIBERTARIANS. Compiled by C. T. SPRADING. 6s. 6d. net, postage 4d.

All orders, with cash, should be sent to

FREEDOM PRESS, 127 OSSULSTON STREET, LONDON, N.W.

"FREEDOM" MAY BE OBTAINED OF

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

NATIONAL LABOUR PRESS, St. Bride's House, Salisbury Square, Fleet Street, E.C. (Wholesale).

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.

ISENBURG, Cleveland Street, W.

F. BENDY, 270 York Road, Bridge End, Wandsworth, S.W.

A. TOLEMAN, 54 Battersea Rise, S.W.

STEVENS, 56 High Street, Islington.

GOLUB, 10 Osborne Street, Whitechapel.

SUGARMAN, 329A Mile End Road, E.

J. YATES, 114 High Road, Willesden Green, N.W.

H. ELLIOT, 329 Lillie Road, Fulham, 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.

Birmingham.—NATIONAL LABOUR PRESS—100 John Bright Street.

Manchester.—H. SEGALS, 99A Great Ducie Street, Strangeways (Wholesale).]

TOM SANDERS, 15 Peter Street.

HEWKIN, 14A Clannon Street.

72 Brook Street, Corner of Grosvenor Street.

Yeovil.—W. R. FOWLER, 5 Sherborne Road.

Dublin.—J. C. KEARNEY, 59 Upper Stephen Street.

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