

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. XXVII.—No. 296.

DECEMBER, 1913.

MONTHLY: ONE PENNY.

NOTES.

Signs and Portents.

If the ruling classes ever really thought that soldiers, police, and spies could check the onward march of mankind towards a new ideal of social organisation, they must have lately had a rude awakening. It is a plain fact, of course, that it is no more possible to stop evolution in the social sphere than in any other; and when men and women see what is happening to-day, and realise by their own bitter experience the inhuman injustice of the system that surrounds them, they question the "rights" of capital and of private property in controlling the means of life, which condemns them to misery and premature death. The untold misery of the Dublin slums had sooner or later to find a voice. Murphyism could not endure for ever, and the parasites are confronted with a revolt which it pleases them to call "Larkinism." It is a great deal more than that. It is one phase of a world-wide movement that is only in its initial stage: the determination of the exploited masses everywhere to so reorganise their life-conditions that, if not the whole, then at least a far larger share of the wealth they produce shall be used by them to lift them out of misery. They see that productive powers can give it, and they mean to have it. It is not the social revolution—yet. But it is a very important step in that direction. Intelligent people will not wonder at all this. They will wonder that it has taken the workers so long to find it all out.

"Justice" on Trial.

It is not only the rights of property that are now seriously called in question by a whole population. Law and "Justice" are equally up for trial at the bar of public opinion. What legality and police methods can do against innocent people was exemplified in its blackest form at the Beilliss trial. Such horrors in the twentieth century prove how long overdue is a great and effective popular protest against the *legal injustice* which obtains in courts of law. The imprisonment of Larkin, and Birrell's apology for this brutal form of revenge of the master class (for that was at the bottom of it), was an instance of the miserable hypocritical shifts an educated man can be driven to to bolster up the infamies of the "law and order" which his official position compels him to maintain. The imprisonment and release of Larkin showed the cruelty and cowardice of the law. The treatment of the students who tried to spoil the Albert Hall meeting, but who, after being a bit "spoilt" themselves, had to be content with spoiling a little private property, and their dismissal by the magistrate without punishment, was an instance of "class justice." And finally, the law is again on trial over the question of forcible feeding. The protest meeting at the Queen's Hall, with bishops and clergy galore denouncing prison methods, will not, with the general public, add to respect for and confidence in the official treatment of the victims behind those stone walls.

Voluntary Organisation.

From Vienna comes a most interesting account of the wonderful work achieved by voluntary organisation. The report of the "Weiner Freiwilligen Rettungsgesellschaft" (Voluntary Ambulance Society), quoted by the *Daily News* (December 2), states that "during 1912 alone there were 35,920 cases in which the society rendered assistance—that is, about 100 times within each twenty-four hours." Formerly this ambulance and first-aid work was managed—or rather *mis-*managed—by municipal functionaries and the police. It was all so slow, so inadequate—tied up with red-tape, we may be sure! Now, with its splendid *free* organisation, the voluntary society, "with its large staff of doctors and well-trained attendants, gives the quickest possible medical assistance" in *all* cases of

accident, and even takes people fallen suddenly ill from their dwellings to the hospitals. Rich and poor alike regard it as one of the most useful institutions in Vienna, and, in proof of this, contributions from its supporters, as well as some legacies, have provided a reserve fund of £132,000, toward which the State, finding its chief work, the organisation for human slaughter, so expensive, can only contribute £1,500! In our opinion, it is time that all those opposed to State organisation and control should do their utmost to give publicity to the many unnoted instances of successful work on the lines indicated above. The danger of the State grows apace, and there are even signs that some middle class people are beginning to distrust it.

The White Man's Rule.

South Africa and the Indian complication are affording us a nice example of the white man's obsession as to his god-given right to rule the coloured races—the "god-given right" in this case meaning the right to rob. For we may be very sure that the white man is not risking his precious skin for the love of his coloured brother. No, he wants that brother's land, and that brother's labour. The first he gets by his quick-firing guns; the latter by a hypocritical form of slavery. But there is an extraordinary contrast in the situations as established between India and South Africa. In the latter country the Indian has "intruded," and is suffering for it by forced labour and payment of taxes. In India the white man is the "intruder," and imposes his taxes on the whole country to a pretty tune. In a word, in the white man's dealings with the coloured races it is always a case of "heads I win, tails you lose." But even the white man begins to see that at last he must be careful. Lord Crewe's answer to the Indian deputation makes this clear. Well, it is time! The horrors of capitalist exploitation on the Amazon are only different in degree, not in kind, to the brutalities inflicted and the shocking death-rate still obtaining in the mines and compounds of South Africa.

A Babel of Tongues.

It is simply impossible to note all the discussion, the denunciation, the defiance, the dread, that present-day unrest has stirred up from the depth of capitalist class-rule. It is all to the good; and some voices are raised even against the evils of the very system they defend. Listen to some of them. Earl Grey and Lord Courtney favour proportional representation. Why? Because "it secured that no thought was suppressed, and no voice was silenced." Excellent! Just what we Anarchists desire, but which we know cannot be had by political reform. They need liberty and equality to ensure them. These cannot be had under the present system. So exit proportional representation as a panacea. Then comes Chiozza Money. He finds that the growth of "class" incomes during the last eight years has greatly accentuated poverty. He proposes steps to be taken—by means of taxation, presumably—to bring about "a more equitable distribution of income." But wage-slavery is the consequence of capitalist robbery; or, let us say, capitalist robbery implies wage-slavery. From this vicious system spring poverty, slums, prostitution, disease, and degradation of the toiling masses. Cannot he see that an economic revolution alone can cure these evils? The truth is, events are moving faster than the reformers and their belated programmes. Look at the sudden and unexpected blows to militarism in France and Germany simultaneously. Who can tell what new developments may take the wind out of the "reformer's" sails when the new year begins? How much better to be honest and sincere, and go the root of the evils that have to be fought.

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 Modern State.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

II. SERFS OF THE STATE.

"Nobody can be compelled by the law to work for somebody else." Such is, we said in our previous issue, the fundamental principle of modern society—a right conquered by a series of revolutions. And those of us who have seen serfdom at work in the first half of the nineteenth century, in Russia, or those who have seen its vestiges in this country up to 1848, will fully appreciate the value of this conquest. Those who saw how children were taken by force from their parents if the latter had entered a workhouse, transported to the cotton factories of Lancashire, and there compelled to work fourteen hours a day in abominable conditions for a miserable pay—those of us who have seen that, and realised the stamp that such conditions impressed upon society as a whole, will understand the importance of the change accomplished by the definite abolition of legal servitude.

But if the *legal* obligation for men to work for other men does not exist any more, the State has retained to itself the right of imposing obligatory work on its subjects. More than that, in proportion as the relations of master and serf disappeared from society, the State increased its own powers of imposing forced labour upon the citizens. And it has succeeded so well, that the powers of the Modern State over its subjects would have inspired with envy the lawyers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, when they worked to constitute it.

Nowadays, for instance, the State imposes upon every one an obligatory primary education. An excellent thing, in principle, so long as one sees in it only the *right* of every child to go to school, even if its parents were opposed to it, or sent it instead to a factory, or to an ignorant "sister" in a convent.

But, in reality—what has become nowadays of the instruction given in primary schools? It is a tissue of false doctrines that are taught, to persuade the children of the rights of the State over its subjects; to establish the holy rights of the rich ones to exploit the poor and thus to grow rich upon their poverty; to teach children that revenge, when it is exercised by society, becomes Supreme Justice, and that military conquerors were the true benefactors of society. Worse than that! State instruction—a worthy heir of the instruction given by the Jesuits—is a perfected means of killing in the child all spirit of independence and to teach it servility in thought and action.

When the child will have grown, the State will impose upon it compulsory military service—as well as, if need be, various sorts of obligatory work for the State and the Commune. Besides, by means of rates and taxes, the State will compel every one to accomplish during his life an immense quantity of work for the State, as well as for the favourites of the State—only doing it in such a way that the innocent citizen should believe that it is he himself who imposes it, and who disposes, through his representatives, of the masses of money which run into the coffers of the State.

A new principle has thus been introduced in modern society. Personal servitude exists no more. The State has no slaves. A king can no longer order that twenty or thirty thousand of his subjects should build his fortresses, or lay out parks and gardens for his favourites. The palaces and the parks of the kings are no longer built and laid out by "statute labour." It is by means of taxes, under the pretext of "productive works which will serve to protect the liberty of the citizens and increase their wealth," that the State obtains the same services from its subjects.

* *

We are the first to greet the abolition of the principle of serfdom, and to indicate the importance of that abolition for the general advancement of the ideas of freedom and progress. To be brought bodily to Versailles or Westminster, in order to build there palaces for a king's favourites, was certainly harder than to pay, as we do now, so much in taxes—*i.e.*, so many days of labour. We feel our indebtedness to the men of 1648, 1793, and 1848 for having freed Europe from "statute labour."

But the fact remains. In proportion as the abolition of personal servitude disappeared in Europe in the course of the nineteenth century, the servile obligations towards the State grew. From year to year the number and variety, as well as the quantity, of "duties"—really work exacted by the State from the citizen—were increasing.

By the end of the nineteenth century we even see the State openly proclaiming its right to statute labour. It imposes upon the railway workers (it was done quite recently in Italy) compulsory work in case of a strike—that is, true statute labour in favour of the railway companies. From the railway to the coal mine, and from the coal mine to the factory, is but a short step. And once the pretext of *public safety*, or even only of *public utility*, will have been recognised as an excuse for forced labour, there will be no more limits to the powers of the State.

If miners and railway men have not yet been treated as guilty of high treason each time they went on strike (in Russia it has already been done, in 1906, while a new law treats as felony all strikes in "establishments of public utility"), it was only because the need of it has not yet been felt. Our rulers still prefer to take advantage of the menacing attitude of a few men to shoot down the crowds of strikers and to send their leaders to hard labour.

Up till now they have found enough "voluntary servility" amongst the workers not to feel the need of proclaiming compulsory servitude. But the moment the need of it or the fear of such a need will be felt, it will be done. And if we do not take our precautions, we shall see the day when discontented strikers will be executed or transported to some pestiferous colony, simply for having failed to accomplish the "public service" imposed upon them by the rich exploiters.

* *

Let us make no mistake on this account. Two great currents of thought and action have characterised the nineteenth century. One of them was a systematic fight against all survivals of serfdom. And the result of it was that in the laws of Europe personal servitude has at last disappeared, even in Russia (in 1861) and in the Balkan States (after the war of 1878).

More than that; in every nation man has worked to conquer personal freedom. He has freed himself to a great extent from superstitious respect for nobility, royalty, and the upper classes; and by a thousand small acts of revolt, accomplished in every corner of Europe, he has established—by using it—his right of being treated as a free man.

At the same time, all the intellectual movements of the nineteenth century—its poetry, its romance, its drama, when they were something more than a mere amusement for the leisured class; its history and philosophy, even its music—have borne in their highest productions the same character of a struggle for freeing the individual, the woman, the child, from the habits and manners of thought that had been established by centuries of slavery and serfdom.

But, by the side of this liberating movement, another movement, which also had its origin in the Great French Revolution, was going on at the same time. And its purpose was, *to develop the omnipotence of the State* in the name of that vague and treacherous conception which has opened the door to all ambitions—the *conception of public welfare organised, not by the nation itself in each town and village, but by its chosen so-called representatives.*

* *

Born in the times when the Church had undertaken to govern men in order to bring them to salvation, inherited by us from the Roman Empire and the Roman Law, this idea of an omnipotent and all-organising State has silently made its advance during the second half of the nineteenth century.

Take, for instance, compulsory military service, as it is practised now, and compare it with what it was several centuries ago; and you will be terrified with the growth of that idea of servitude towards the State.

Never did the mediaeval serf allow himself to be deprived of his human rights to such a degree as he is deprived now, with the present spirit of voluntary servitude. At the age of twenty—that is, at the age when the young man needs most his liberty—he lets himself be imprisoned for three years in barracks, where he ruins his intellectual and moral health—what for? To learn the military trade, which the Boers have learned so well while they cultivated their fields and rode across their wide plains on horseback.

He not only risks his life, but he goes further in his voluntary servitude than the serf of old. He permits it to control his love, he abandons the woman he loves and accept celibacy; he lets himself be commanded by men whose military knowledge and capacities he has no means of controlling. Worse than that! He supports without revolting the horrors of a punishment battalion in Africa—in the terrible Biribi.*

When in the Middle Ages did men styling themselves free ever accept such conditions? When did peasants or artisans ever abandon their right to make their own secret leagues to oppose the leagues of the lords, and to fight them arms in hand? Was there in mediaeval times an epoch so dark that the citizens of the free communes should have disowned their right to throw their judges in the river, if they disapproved of their justice? And when did it happen, even during the darkest periods of antiquity, that the State had the means of perverting all instruction, from the primary school to the Academy, by its system of education? Machiavelli was dreaming of that, but his dream was realised only in the nineteenth century!

We have thus had during the last hundred and twenty years a great *progressive* movement, which worked during the first half of last century for the complete liberation of the individual and of human thought; and we have had a great *regressive* movement which overcame the former in the second half of the century, and

* See the book of Lucien Descaves on these places of horror.

which works to re-establish the servitude of old, *but in favour of the State*—and to increase it, by rendering it voluntary.

And yet what we have mentioned refers only to the *direct* servitude. As to all sorts of *indirect servitude*, established by means of taxation and different capitalist monopolies, they grow every day. They become so powerful and so menacing, that it is high time to study them very seriously. This we shall do in our next essay.

(To be continued.)

A General View of Anarchism.

By G. BARRETT.

I.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT.

It is quite true that we Anarchists are extremists; we want to bring about a complete and far-reaching change in the order of things, and we believe that this change can only be accomplished by rudely disturbing, upsetting, and overthrowing the institutions which belong to to-day, and establishing in their place those of a free society. We believe, in fact, in a revolution, not merely political or constitutional, but a social revolution—a complete change in our relationships one to another.

Thus, for example, in the future society there will be no rich keeping the poor in poverty, since the authority and law by which the one forces the other to give up the wealth it produces will be swept away.

"The result will be chaos," says he who refuses to think; whereas if he would but open his eyes and look round, instead of bending over his employer's desk or bench all the days of his only life, he would see that to-day we were in such a chaos that it would seem the Devil himself had been tempted out of hell to come and live in a climate more congenial to him.

But we will try to get at the whole thing from the simplest point. Let us first of all consider the Labour movement, and try to understand what all the noise and confusion and strife between Labour and Capital is about. Roughly stated, this is what is going on in every great industrial centre. The majority of people spend day after day in huge factories, producing wealth. These factories are not their own, but belong—the law says—to a party of men called shareholders or capitalists. Most of these buildings have high walls round them, so that the workers may not come in and go out when they like, but rather when the owners like. The point about which there has been so much trouble is this. When the workers have produced wealth in these factories for a week, they are given a set of round tokens, called "money," which they can exchange for wealth, food, clothing, etc. The trouble is, however, that they are never given enough money to buy back the wealth they have produced; it is enough only to buy part of it. The remainder is kept by the capitalists and called profit. Profit, therefore, is that part of the wealth produced by the workers for which they are not paid.

In recent years there has been no end of a row kicked up about this. Some of the workers call it robbery. "We have produced all the wealth," they cry, "and from each one of us you have stolen part of what he produced, so that you comparatively few capitalists are immensely rich, enjoying what we have created; while millions of us are struggling with poverty, and all our lives are wasted."

At this the middle classes and all respectable members of society look most mighty superior and pained. They start professorships of political economy to teach the workers how they have been misled by extremists, Socialists, and Anarchists. "You forget," they explain, "that although you supplied the labour in our factories, we supplied the capital. How could you have produced without using *our* machines, in *our* buildings? You must be moderate."

"But," exclaim the workers—or those of them who think—"did not our labour produce these machines, and the machines, again, which made these, right back to the first machine ever produced? All of it was made by us, and you, as owners, did absolutely nothing. Even your useless money, with which you juggle us out of our own, we have dug out of the earth and moulded into shape for you. To all the wealth of the world we the workers lay claim, for we have created it."

In answer to this, the capitalist does two things. He approaches the workers with a show of friendship. He says: "Shall we share profits?" (knowing that so long as he controls the scheme he can get the same, or even more, for himself.) "Above all things, let us be more moderate. You will only win by moderation. Let us try to establish Conciliation Boards to make Capital and Labour more friendly. Let us remember we are all brothers, and most of all, let us avoid bloodshed—and, we may add," say the capitalists, "that we have decided to give £400 yearly to any of you who will sit in our Parliament."

The other side of their programme is to strengthen the police

force throughout the country, and train soldiers to go on strike duty.

That is the position to-day. The wealth which the capitalist has obtained by paying the worker for only a portion of what he produces, is held by brute force—the policeman's bludgeon and the soldier's rifle—while, according to our last Prime Minister, 13,000,000 live on the verge of starvation; and thousands of unemployed are entirely cut off from the means of production while they starve.

This state of affairs is called *peace* by the respectable members of society, politicians, churchgoers, and business men; while any attempt to break it down and recapture the wealth that is needed for the people is considered a breach of the peace, and the rebels are shot down by the soldiers or bludgeoned by the police.

Now let us see where the Socialist and the Anarchist come in.

The modern Parliamentary Socialist understands this matter; he sees that what is wrong is this power of the capitalist to dictate the conditions upon which he will allow the workers to work, and he logically argues from this that the capitalist class must be abolished. As to how this will be done, there seems some doubt. However, when it has been accomplished, the State, which until now has favoured the capitalists, will take over the industries, and everything will be controlled by the politicians. It is, of course, hoped by the Socialists that when this universal nationalisation takes place their own party will be in power; and of course they promise, as all other politicians have promised, that they will act in the interest of the people. Several different electoral systems have been suggested to take the place of the present limited suffrage, most Socialists wishing that every adult should have a vote, and many thinking that the constituencies should be divided according to industries rather than merely geographically as at present.

With this system of State or Government control we Anarchists entirely disagree.

The capitalist is wrong because he *is* a capitalist, and has the power to dictate the conditions of life. If he was one of ourselves or our own brother, it would make no difference; his power as a capitalist must be put an end to. So far we agree, you will see, with the ordinary Parliamentary Socialist; but now we come to consider the men in authority, the Government, and we apply to it the same reasoning, and come to the conclusion that, just as the capitalist is wrong because he *is* a capitalist, so the Government is wrong because it *is* a Government. If members of our class, or even our brothers, composed it, still it would make no difference; its power to dictate the conditions of life, which would be complete in a Socialist State, would give it all the evils of Capitalism. The institution of Capitalism is wrong, and the institution of Government, which is a part of the capitalist system, must also be abolished, to give place to the free organisations of the future society.

But, it may be asked why we come so easily to the conclusion that the Government must be abolished; and this question is, of course, equivalent to asking why we are Anarchists, and must be answered in the next chapter.

(To be continued.)

SERVIA AFTER THE WAR.

A letter in *Wohlstand fur Alle*, written by a Servian comrade, draws a terrible picture of the condition of the people after the war. "Everybody trembles at the approach of the winter and its inevitable suffering. Over 60,000 men were killed in the war; complaints are heard everywhere, added to the lamentations of tens of thousands of maimed. Industry is at a standstill, and the cost of living is incredibly high." We cannot help asking: If this is the condition of the "conquerors," what must be the misery of the conquered? The latter's silent suffering has aroused only here and there a little sympathy; they are heathen—a fact which seems sufficient to dry up the springs of kindness in the Western Christian public.

The letter continues by speaking of the revolting rôle played by many Servian Social Democrats; several of the leaders even enrolled among the Komitadji, the irregular bands which committed unspeakable crimes on the defenceless Mussulman population. Now that misery is everywhere in Servia, the Social Democrats thunder against the war, which they justified before as "scientific." Some of our comrades have united their efforts for Anarchist propaganda, and during the present discontent they hope to find the people more disposed to see and understand the causes of their suffering.

Modern Science and Anarchism.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

112 pages; Paper Covers, 6d. net; also in Art Cambric, 1s. 6d. net. Postage, paper 1½d., cloth 3d.

"As a survey of modern science in relation to society.....this book would be hard to beat.....The glossary of about 16 crowded pages is alone worth the price of the volume."—*Maoriland Worker*.

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.

An Appeal to Socialists.

Do you consider yourself an out-and-out Socialist—a revolutionist? Are you a little tired of the struggle to get to Parliament and the endless tricks of the politicians? Do you believe in *direct action* by the workers themselves?

There are many who can say "Yes" to each of these questions, and to them I address myself.

You will agree at once, I think, if you take a general view of the Labour movement, that at present it is in a very chaotic state. Divided as it is into many parties, it is not only difficult to say what is the general policy of the whole, but it is also almost impossible to find out what each separate party is after. The reason for this confusion—perhaps more apparent than real—is that we are passing through a period of very rapid progress. The workers' organisations, moulded on a more or less conservative basis, remain almost unchanged. Their leaders, their general basis and official programmes are unaltered—as such things are wont to be—in spite of the fact that the ordinary members have become inspired by the revolutionary spirit which recently has been so apparent. It is these facts that make the confusion.

The Trade Unions are, officially, talking about Parliamentary representation of Labour, conciliation boards, and other devices for ensuring the smooth running of the exploitation of the workers; but the workers who form these Unions are day by day discussing the revolutionary tactics of direct action. In just the same way the official B.S.P. and the "organ of the Social Democracy" are preaching the narrow centralisation and Parliamentary tactics so popular among Socialists a few years back; but the rank-and-file—or, rather, what were formerly the rank-and-file—are now beginning to think for themselves, and are discussing Syndicalism and the direct war on Capitalism. The leaders and official element of the I.L.P. are trying to persuade the workers that discipline should be their chief virtue, and that solidarity, as shown by the sympathetic strike, is fatal to their interest; but among themselves the members of this organisation know that Capitalism cannot be defeated without such tactics.

The result of all this is that we find parties with definite programmes and principles fighting along lines quite contrary to their constitution, and constantly we see strikes in defiance of leaders, while always and everywhere we find leaders following and the men leading. The general appearance of all this is chaotic; but, carefully examined, as we have shown, it is really easily explained. It is simply imperfect progress. The husks of the old organisations remain, and inside them the new spirit of revolt has germinated.

Now that we understand so much, we can see the importance of inquiring much further. What is the true meaning of this new rebel movement, and where will it finally lead us? What part should each of us play in it—should we assist it in wrecking the old, or resist it?

The first and most obvious point is that the new movement comes from below. The strikes of the boilermakers, the seamen, the railway men, etc., which really were the first indications of the present revolt, all showed the same characteristic; and later still, many of the strikes were in actual defiance of the leaders.

We find, then, this tendency clearly worked out to its logical conclusion. First, the workers relied on their masters to use their influence in their favour. Then this plan is given up in disgust, and a party of their own is formed, so that some of themselves may sit in high places and legislate in the interests of those below. Then, again, this idea is abandoned, and the workers turn to their own organisations and rely on Trade Union action to effect reforms. But even here

the process is carried still further. The Trade Union leader is looked upon with suspicion and mistrust, and at last the worker is forced to recognise himself. It is he himself in comradeship with his brothers who must accomplish the revolution; no longer must he rely upon leaders or politicians above him.

The first meaning of the new rebel movement is, then, not merely that direct action is the revolutionary weapon, but, further, that this direct action must be organised from below, not from above. Discipline is superseded by Liberty in the new order of things.

Surely nothing could be more striking than this! The wonderful and really most beautiful thing is that from the struggle for existence itself, the grim necessity and want of the oppressed, the hard experience of life, is actually born the philosophy of Liberty. This is the meaning of the new movement.

What part ought we to take in it, then, as workers and advanced Socialists? There is a most important work yet to be done. The swing of the pendulum is an oft-repeated analogy, and though, of course, it cannot be applied too closely, yet roughly it must be admitted to hold good. The turbulent era of progress is followed by the peaceful period of reaction, until progress again asserts itself, and so on. The majority supports now this side and now that, until it turns again to this; but through all the seesaw and change there is a minority of each side which holds its ground and is not washed over by the flood of circumstance and oratory. This small minority is firm because those who compose it see more than the mere outside appearance of what is going on. They understand the philosophy and principle behind it.

It is essential, then, that every real Socialist should understand the meaning behind this new phase of the Labour movement. It is not enough merely to rejoice in and encourage the new development, for unless it is understood and explained in the light of the philosophy which belongs to it, reaction will overtake it. There is but one way in which it can be explained, for the philosophy and practice of liberty are summed up in the word "Anarchism." It is the Anarchist, and he only, who has consistently taught that the revolution must come from below. And it is the workers now who by their semi-conscious action confirm it.

It is essential that at least a minority should become conscious Anarchists and ensure that the present revolt is carried to its logical conclusion—the expropriation of the capitalist and the establishment of the free commonwealth, or, in other words, Anarchist Communism. We therefore appeal to all Socialists who really are concerned for the liberty of man, as well as for his material welfare, to consider the meaning of the new spirit that now so strongly animates the workers, and to decide whether it is not for them to join in the work which at the present moment needs all the energy such a minority can give.

G. BARRETT.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

France.

When the patriotic wind was blowing over France, the objections of opponents to the outcry for more soldiers and more arms were brushed aside by the patriots. The three years' service was voted by Parliament, and now the bill is presented to the nation. But the rich are quite indignant at the idea that they should pay an income-tax, and it is clear that in any case it is necessary that a new State loan of about £40,000,000 should be added to the already heavy burden of the National Debt of France.

Another curious outcome of the three years' service is that the mine-owners, complaining that its consequence is a scarcity of men, managed to get a Bill passed in Parliament allowing miners to work overtime during 150 days a year, instead of the eight-hour day and nine hours for 30 days a year. A perfect storm of indignation broke out among the miners of the Pas-de-Calais pits, who were heartily supported by the miners of other districts of France. The cessation of work was general. The two existing big mining Unions, the old Union of the Pas-de-Calais, entirely under the domination of the Socialist Deputy Basly, and the new Federation du Sous Sol (Miners), affiliated to the Confederation of Labour, forgot their old standing feuds, and seemed ready to make peace face to face with the common enemy—the employer. Knowing that it is only in the Pas-de-Calais mines that overtime is a burning question, as in the other mines there is hardly ever any need for it, the leaders of the new Federation of Miners tried to interest their own members by giving a more general character to the strike movement. Three claims were put forward: the eight-hour day pure and simple, a minimum wage, and an old-age pension of two francs a day for miners of 50 years of age with 25 years' service. This was not at all to the liking of the politician Basly, who saw his influence with his own Northern Union replaced by a united miners' action under the guidance of the Confederation of Labour. He at once reduced the strike to a movement against overtime. Then he conferred with the mine-owners, and triumphantly announced to his Union that they could return to work, as the employers had promised not to work overtime

till the Senate had given its definite vote on the Bill! The strike was broken, though nothing definite was obtained. The men of the new Federation were furious, and indignation and cries of "betrayal" were general, even among his own followers. For the moment the politician has triumphed, but it is a victory which may cost him dear. If the Senate thinks that it can risk adopting the Bill, Basly's Union will be the first to suffer. In any case, their "leader" has shown that in order to preserve his political influence he is ready to sacrifice the cause of Labour, and to destroy the much-needed unity among the workers.

Reaction and militarism are always going hand in hand, and are followed by their inevitable shadow—Clericalism. Since the three years' Bill was adopted in the teeth of popular opposition, the Government of President Poincaré has been waging war on the militants of the libertarian groups and their press. The *Reveil Anarchiste*, *Germinal*, and *L'Anarchie* have been prosecuted, and their editors and collaborators sentenced to various terms. Eighteen members of the Confederation are being prosecuted for antimilitarist work through the "Sou du Soldat," whose crime consists in keeping the young recruits in touch with their Unions. But not only our comrades are harassed; reaction stalks everywhere. In the Army the more Republican officers are replaced by reliable Royalist and Clerical adherents; militant liberal teachers are found fault with on every occasion; and the Clericals and their friends have even started a campaign in the Paris press and municipality to readmit nuns as nurses to the hospital. Everywhere the conquered ground is slowly being re-invaded by the priests; and the Government in its reactionary, militarist activity is seconding the endeavours of the Church to regain its position. The situation is neatly expressed by a cartoon of one of our contemporaries: a good bourgeois has hung up Poincaré's picture beside that of the Pope; complacently contemplating his work, he says to his wife: "It looks well there, doesn't it?"

Norway.

For those that follow the events of the industrial war, it is not a new thing to see Social Democrats ready to violate all principles of solidarity and class consciousness when it comes to breaking a strike which has not their official sanction. The long building trade strike in Amsterdam last year, and the dockyard strike in Stettin, Bremen, Hamburg, and Kiel, are some of the most important recent examples of the attitude of Social Democratic leaders towards the workers who have dared to take their fate in their own hands. These rebels are refused support from the funds they have contributed to; and if this indirect means of helping the employers is not sufficient to bring the strikers to submission, Social Democratic leaders do not shrink from supplying blacklegs to the masters. Norway has had an example of these disciplinarian tactics. At Odda 600 workers had spontaneously gone on strike without asking permission at headquarters. The Norwegian Social Democratic politicians who dominate the Unions were very indignant at such temerity, and the party organ not only published an article against the strike, but actually inserted an advertisement asking for men to replace the strikers!

The paternal desire to protect the capitalists from strikes, the only thing which disturbs their peace, is animating the Government, which last year laid a Bill for compulsory arbitration before the Storting. As this Bill was not much liked either by employers or men, Parliament appointed a committee of three representatives of the employers, three of the workers, and a president nominated by the Government, to elaborate a new Bill. This has been done, and the following are the chief points: (1) All conflicts about interpretation of tariffs and contracts must be put before an arbitration bureau on which masters and men are represented. (2) One or two arbitrators will be appointed. The arbitrator must be told of any case where men and masters cannot agree; if he thinks that a strike or lockout will be dangerous to "society," he can prohibit it for a fortnight; but it may be declared after that period if peace has not been established. Up till this point the committee agreed. But the employers proposed a fine of 25,000 kronen for the party which disobeys this law. The workers do not want this punitive article. Parliament will probably adopt the whole proposal, including fines, as otherwise the arbitration would hardly be compulsory.

This is another lesson to the organised workers not to collaborate with their masters in forging laws which in the long run can only tend to hamper their liberty of action. The revolutionary elements in the Norwegian Labour movement have already begun a campaign against this project; they are opposed to any intervention by the State in conflicts between employers and workers.

The revolutionary Unionists, numbering about 5,000, have their propaganda groups working inside the Unions, and at Christmas they intend to hold a conference at Trondhjem to deal, among other questions, with this compulsory arbitration.

Belgium.

In Belgium, as in all other European countries, the Labour movement has suffered already too much from the political parties, all trying to become its master. Some of the Unions are led by the Social Democrats, others are under clerical domination. That the introduction of politics in economic organisations tends to weaken them is clear to many workers and unprejudiced people. An effort to create a movement free from politics and religion has been recently made, and promises success. On October 19, under the auspices of the Trades Council of Liège, a congress was held, about 30 organisations being represented. These organisations are independent Trade Unions, and they succeeded in laying the foundation of a new "Confederation

Syndicale Belge," which will work for the economic emancipation of the working classes, a task which it will accomplish free from political and religious tutelage. The new Confederation will hold another Congress at Christmas. Its monthly organ, *L'Action Ouvrière*, published at Liège, is a bright little paper, animated by the right spirit when it prints as its motto, "The workshop will abolish the Government," the words of Proudhon, who knew that the State is superfluous when production is controlled by the producers.

Cuba.

Even the official "Republican" press of Cuba strongly protests against the murderous attack by the police against the sympathisers with Evaristo Vazquez, who has now been tried and sentenced for life in connection with the death of two sugar plantation owners, who (as reported some months ago in *FREEDOM*) threatened to shoot Vazquez because the latter asked for wages much overdue. The police fired a hundred shots into a crowd demonstrating in favour of Vazquez, and, besides wounding a large number, killed three or four. Evaristo Vazquez has appealed, and there is to be another trial.

In Havana the very active Social Study Group has determined to get the funds to establish a large Casa del Pueblo ("Maison du Peuple" as they are called in Belgium and France) as headquarters for the Trade Unions, and at the same time a place to welcome comrades who arrive as emigrants, as well as to form a centre for a rational school and playground for children. The group will be very grateful for any contributions sent to the Centro de Estudios Sociales, Salvador 125½, (Cerro) Havana, Cuba.

SIDELIGHTS ON SOCIAL SUBJECTS.

Mr. John Burns can be most illuminating at times. The *Standard* tells us that, speaking at Melton Mowbray on November 15th, he suggested that "if Ireland secured Home Rule, it was possible that time, patience, toleration, and wisdom would secure the rest. As the Home Rule Bill gave adequate and indulgent protection to the minority, it settled, he trusted, for all time what Ireland needed, what she must get, and what she deserved. Without it he saw a long vista of discord, faction, social and political unrest for Ireland and the Empire. There was scope, as there was hope, for an amicable settlement."

We like the phrase, "adequate and indulgent protection," and Mr. Burns's prophetic air of finality is delightful. It is good to know that Ireland's future is safe in his paternal hands, although for ourselves we had once cherished a feeling that Ireland alone should control her own destiny, which would, in our opinion, involve change just whenever expansion in ideas made such change necessary. We confess to no optimism as to any amicable settlement so long as the means of production lie in the hands of an exploiting class. Other words of wisdom follow. "Alluding to the land proposals, Mr. Burns said that unless this country took into consideration pretty soon the solution of our economical, industrial, and social questions, they were going to drift into a disagreeable temper and a nasty mood. Revolutions were only reforms delayed too long, and conceived too late."

Meanwhile Larkin is here to tell this modern Rip Van Winkle that we have already drifted—that the nasty mood has descended upon the owning class, and that a revolution is a thing inevitable, the distant rumblings of which we already hear.

That we are persons not possessed by vivid imaginations is proved by the following cryptic sentences:—

"Fifty-two cases of lead-poisoning and nine of anthrax were reported to the Home Office under the Factories and Workshops Act during October. Two cases were fatal under each head."

"Seven hundred and six workpeople, exclusive of seamen, were killed in the course of their employment during October, an increase of 422 on the same period of 1912. This increase is accounted for by the Senghenydd Colliery disaster. One hundred and nine seamen were killed in the month."

Otherwise how could we tolerate an insane system which makes this tragic death-roll possible? Had we eyes to read the significance of these figures, such a record would long ago have become ancient history. Blame must attach itself to the workers for tolerating the evils of capitalism. How big a toll in human lives is Labour prepared to pay for the privilege of existence on this planet? To us there seems but one answer. Inspired by hope in an industrial revolution, we must go forward dauntless, united, and untiring, until a sepulchre is raised about a system which has demanded such useless sacrifice of human lives.

The Labour leaders have been busy of late explaining the hidden beauties of political action. In a long resolution issued to a recent conference they tell us that "the rights of trade combination were first won by political action, and recent experiences have shown that unless that action is continued, the destruction of these rights will follow." We have not space in which fully to analyse the sentence, but in view of this declaration it is somewhat disconcerting to read in the next clause: "The vigorous entrance of the Unions into politics in 1906 regained for them the right to strike without their funds becoming attackable, as they had been under judge-made law." In our humble

opinion, it does seem somewhat futile to indulge in political action at all if the net result of all law is only a judge-made interpretation. Knowing full well that man-made law only became necessary after private property appeared, how is it possible for a judge to escape giving any verdict not influenced by respect for property? We seem also to have heard of a certain "Osborne Judgment," which certainly was given some years after the Labour Party's first appearance in Parliament.

The third clause is inspiring. "During the late unrest it was proved by the action of the Government that in future no great industrial dispute can be conducted without the interference of Parliament." We certainly agree that Parliament has repeatedly interfered in industrial disputes—during the Labour Party's existence—but solely and always to throw the balance of its power on the side of the oppressing class. The last clause is also heartening. "It is essential to the interests of the industrial classes that Labour representation should be continued and increased, as it is only by legislation that poverty and all its evils can be abolished, and the permanent welfare of the nation achieved."

We suggest that a few industrial history lessons might very usefully be taken by the officials of the Labour Party. It would certainly interest us to know how this optimism is justified. Where, and at what period of the world's history, has poverty been abolished by legislation? It does occur to us that the function of legislation has ever been to preserve and protect private property, and that poverty has always existed side by side with private property.

The Labour Party has been singularly unfortunate in seeking to assign reasons for its belief. Faith alone would have been a more sufficient conquer. Surely our friends are obsessed with an excessive desire for moderation and respectability. One final word, therefore, in passing. Not by law making, but by law breaking, will the workers achieve their emancipation from poverty.

M. B. HOPE.

THE ILLUSION OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE.

"Two men I honour and no third. First the toilworn Craftsman that with earthmade Implement laboriously conquers the Earth and makes her Man's. Venerable to me is the hard hand, crooked, coarse; wherein notwithstanding lies a cunning virtue, indefeasibly royal, as of the sceptre of this Planet. Hardly-entreated Brother! For us was the back so bent, for us were thy straight limbs and fingers so deformed; thou wert our conscript on whom the lot fell, and fighting our battles wert so marred. Yet toil on, toil on: *thou* art in thy duty, be out of it who may; thou toiled for the altogether indispensable, for daily bread.

"A second man I honour and still more highly: Him who is seen toiling for the spiritually indispensable; not daily bread but the bread of life. Is not he too in his duty; endeavouring towards inward harmony; revealing this by act or by word, through all his outward endeavours, be they high or low? Highest of all when his outward and his inward endeavour are one; when we can name him Artist, not earthly Craftsman only, but inspired Thinker, who with heaven-made Implement conquers Heaven for us! If the poor and humble toil that we have food, must not the high and glorious toil for him in return that he have Light, have Guidance, Freedom, Immortality?

"These two in all their degrees I honour; all else is chaff and dust which let the wind blow whither it listeth."—*Sartor Resartus*.

I wonder how many young inquiring souls this passage in Carlyle's writings has sent on a vain search in books and speeches, in sermons and orations, to find Guidance, Freedom, and Immortality.

Carlyle was here trying the impossible; he was trying to justify the division of mankind into workers and thinkers—hand-workers and head-workers; to reconcile that with the idea of justice and truth. But it cannot be done. It is only one of the phases of the division of mankind into rulers and ruled, clergy and laity, slaveholders and slaves, masters and servants. It is a venerable deceit, and Carlyle was caught by it.

Let us look for a moment at Carlyle's dictum, and we will see the vagueness and ambiguity of it. He pities the hand-worker for having to do the brain-worker's share of the manual labour as well as his own. He calls him a conscript. He is predestined by Providence or some force beyond human control to be a hand-worker! Some one has remarked sarcastically that the privileged classes will preach to the poor, teach them, sympathise with them, pity them, do, in fact, anything for them excepting the one thing that would relieve them—namely, get off their backs. Was it not the simplest, plainest duty of Carlyle to say to the worker whom he pitied: "I will do my own share of the necessary work, and relieve you of it"? Did the most profound, forcible, and original thinker of the last century not see that it was precisely because the poor worker was doing work for him which he ought to do for himself, that he was in the state of ignorance and poverty which he deplored?

But Carlyle would have us to believe that while he was being supplied with the materially indispensable by the worker, he was giving something in exchange as valuable and as indispensable. Let us see what this spiritually indispensable is. It is to be found in books, lectures, speeches, orations. Are these indispensable to the worker?

I trow not; their output might be stopped to-morrow, and so far as the worker is concerned they would not be missed. On the other hand, if the hand-worker struck work for a month, many would starve; and if he continued on strike long enough, all of us would die off like flies at the first winter frost. The hand-worker's produce is indispensable; that of the head-worker is not—nay, it is too often, as I shall show, worse than useless.

Book-learning and culture were at one time confined to the ruling classes, and rulers were jealous of the workers acquiring it. Rulers kept the workers in ignorance as long as they could, and when they could no longer keep them in absolute ignorance, they gave them poisoned knowledge, false religion, false history, false science. The clergy kept the Bible under lock and key as long as they were able; when that could not be done longer, they cunningly, by their "higher criticism," explained away all the Bible teaching which might be dangerous to rulers.

Simple people think that books are written to enlighten the mind and elucidate the truth. They are easily deceived. Ninety per cent. of the books in existence were written merely for money or to bolster up the position of the privileged classes. The so-called standard works are all bricks in the edifice of our wonderful civilisation, which provides for the workers poverty, and for the idlers riches!

Most books, as I have stated, are written for money. The monied classes will not buy anything that tells against themselves or criticises their class; therefore, the great majority of books uphold the rich and privileged classes.

Books, sermons, orations, lectures are for the most part handmaids of the Government deceit, and are meant to justify iniquity and mislead the ignorant. The ruling classes recommend education—that is, the acquisition of certain kinds of knowledge by reading, by hearing lectures and speeches; and capitalists and masters endow reading-rooms and public libraries, not for the purpose of enlightening the ignorant, but to mislead them. The workman who spends his leisure time in reading the standard works on science, religion, history, political and social economy, and the like, will be quite a safe man to govern and enslave. He will be studying these to the end of his life, and be neither wiser nor better than he was at the beginning. There is no surer way of stultifying a man's mind than by setting him to study those questions in the works of their accredited teachers.

The inventions which have been of universal benefit to mankind have not been the work of the learned and cultured. The men who cultivated wheat and other edible grains from wild grasses, who domesticated the cow, horse, and sheep, who invented the distaff and the loom, who first smelted iron and made bricks, were not cultured and learned. To come down to modern times, I do not suppose that the men who applied steam to machinery, who built iron ships, who made the railways, and planned the bridges which carry them, were men of learning and culture. What the learned and cultured have done is to help the ambitious, the cunning, the idle to enslave the simple and industrious.

The workers should cease to have faith in books and teachers. They know the evils and injustices of their position without the help of books, and books will not tell them how to escape from those evils and injustices. Their instincts, common-sense, experience, observation, and reason should be their guides.

Wherever we find great learning and culture, we find great ignorance and superstition. China for thousands of years has contained the most learned and cultured men on the earth; the bulk of the Chinese people are steeped in ignorance and superstition. It is the same in our own country—the greatest learning and culture balanced by the grossest stupidity and ignorance. The one is the cause of the other. For the worker, education (as presently understood), culture, and learning are a fraud, delusion, and snare.

AMOR VINCIT.

IN LIGHTER VEIN.

"THE ICONOCLAST."

If you have been a reader of FREEDOM for as long a period as I have, you will not need telling what an Iconoclast is; for the pages of this journal—as is fitting and proper in a respectable revolutionary organ—are confined to sober academic discussion. In such discussion the dictionary is very frequently used; not passing swiftly from the hand of one disputant to the venerable head of another, you understand, but merely—that is to say, in a word, the Standard Dictionary is in constant use by the staff, and is a well-thumbed and bulky affair.

All this is, perhaps, mere platitude to some; but it is for the sake of those others to whom it is otherwise that I have put it down here in print, and it is to these others that I wish to introduce the Iconoclast.

He was straw-haired and red-cheeked, yet of no rustic origin, for he had been born and bred in the unwholesome city, and was more familiar with narrow streets, area railings, and rickety stairs than he was with barns, haylofts, and such empty vanities.

This afternoon he was standing on a floor of very dirty planks of unspeakable plainness, grease-soddened and slippery. On the four sides were whitewashed walls, broken here and there by an occasional doorway, or window. From small nails let in between the cracks where the bricks joined (and you could plainly see through their disguise of lime-water) were appended notices and printed regulations. The whole was, indeed, except for a few articles of furniture, which I will presently

describe, as bare as a prison chamber. It had as dismal and soul-deadening a look.

In various suitable positions, but without an eye for artistic effect, there were interspersed about the room several stacks of paper, three or four machines, a table with a ferruginous supercrustation (called, by superstitious custom, a "stone"), two ordinary tables, some dozen or so upright cases of racks, a score of iron frames of varying sizes, and precisely fifteen people of the male sex. These latter were adorned in ordinary habiliments of the present day—minus coat and hat. They had the sleeves of their respective shirts rolled up, and wore aprons of diverging degrees of cleanliness.

In this printing workshop the air was heavy and dull, due to a paucity of ventilators. It appeared to have affected some of the workmen, for not a few of them were grouped in attitudes of listless ease. The absence of the overseer accounted for the fact that they were talking.

At this precise moment the Iconoclast was speaking. In plain, simple, straightforward phrases, he was telling them the blasphemous truth that they were indeed wage-slaves. He had not told them this before—he had merely hinted it in an occasional conversation—for he had been there barely a matter of three weeks. But he had begun lately to use his heavy artillery. Some of them shook their heads. Others were affrighted. The rest held their breath in dubious awe.

"Yes," he was saying, "I do not deny that there are social reforms that may help the worker in this or that. They give him better food, perhaps; better security, maybe; but none the less he remains a slave. The State is merely becoming a National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Workers. What you want is—"

"Not so much gas," interjected the wit of the room; whereat the rest indulged in a gurgling of mirth.

The Iconoclast was about to press his point home, when a door opened at the far end of the room. Instantly the listless figures became imbued with a nervous energy. Type clicked into the sticks, racks were pulled out and pushed back again, galleys made unnecessary journeys; in fact, all of them tumbled over each other in their eagerness to exhibit an outer seeming of industry.

The overseer closed the door, passed down the room, and saw—nothing. Then he retired to his desk at the farther corner.

At the opposite end, in another corner, furthest from the overseer's desk, the Iconoclast stood before a demy cylinder—a species of printing machine—to which he had discreetly retired at the opening of the door. Above the throbbing of the pulleys, and the pulsating of the belts, an electric motor sent out a continual whirr as it imparted automatic energy to the machine, now on a run of five thousand at one thousand odd copies per hour.

Immediately in front of the Iconoclast was a board that sloped gently towards a cylindrical drum placed horizontally to its lower edge. Revolving seventeen times to the minute, the cylinder took in a blank sheet at each revolution, and returned it printed. A mechanical arrangement carried the printed sheets to another board on the main part of the machine. Nothing, therefore, was necessary for him to do except to lay the blank sheets in position, attend to the distribution of the ink at odd periods, resume putting the sheets through, and—dream.

His hands placing the sheets exactly "at register" with a monotonous expertness born of long experience, his mind would be absent in the future or in the past. Dreams of the yet-to-be, dreams of the might-have-been, thronged before him. Now he would fancy himself in the remote confines of Siberia, where, in bleak wildernesses, in prisons, mines and fortresses, unspeakable atrocities would be borne by men of noble soul for the sake of a cause they knew must surely triumph in the end; anon his imagination would take him to some ideal Utopia—the thing of which we all dream—where the slave ceases, and the master of slaves ceases.

Click, throb, rattle—the monotone of toil went on.

Presently the overseer rose and strolled to the cylinder, in his usual quiet way. He lifted a printed sheet from the receiving board and scanned it.

Then he gave vent to an excessive noise.

Across the sheet he held in his hand was a big black smudge where some foreign matter had got into the type and blurred it beyond all legibility. On each side of the two hundred sheets on the board was a similar smudge.

His face became incarnadine. The expression that leapt to his lips ended in an unintelligible splutter. He glared at the printed sheet with a rugose expression, and then with the blackest of looks approached the Iconoclast.

And the Iconoclast, oblivious of all this, still dreamt, and his thoughts were far away.

L. AUGUSTINE MOTLER.

LIBERTY AND THE GREAT LIBERTARIANS.

An Anthology on Liberty.

Edited and Compiled, with Preface, Introduction, and Index, by
CHARLES T. SPRADING.

Presenting quickly and succinctly the best utterances of the greatest thinkers on every phase of human freedom. Many valuable quotations from suppressed, ignored, and hitherto inaccessible sources.

Price 6s. 6d. net, postage 4d.

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

BOOK NOTES.

A HISTORY OF SOCIALISM.

A History of Socialism. By Thomas Kirkup. Fifth edition, revised and largely rewritten by Edward R. Pease. xi., 490 pp. 5s. net. London: A. and C. Black.

Kirkup's old book (1892, 301 pp.; fourth edition, 1909, 436 pp.), lacking all preciseness and swarming with errors, shows the author constantly wavering between a vague sympathy for Socialism as leading towards social reform which he desires, and a repudiation of almost all that Socialists have claimed or are fighting for, as being too revolutionary and interfering with that infinite slowness and peacefulness of progress which he is so fond of. The only good, therefore, which his book could do, besides transmitting some information in the form of quotations, was that it impressed the reader with the fact that there are many currents of Socialist thought, none of which may claim to be definite and to predominate; that exclusiveness is but narrow and odious, and that the free co-operation of all Socialists on broad, unsectarian lines will alone be sufficiently powerful to make anything approaching Socialism ever a reality on a large scale. The revision and rewriting of the book by one so intimately connected with a sectarian organisation, the Fabian Society, as Mr. Pease is, has, in my opinion, inevitably deprived the book of this only merit, and made it a very incongruous production indeed. Mr. Pease left the historical part dealing with early Socialism and the International "virtually unaltered" (p. vi.), which is very unfair towards the older Socialists, who are very much better known now than in the time of Kirkup, who was often content to use secondhand and rather antiquated sources. One looks in vain for any mention of the names even of Godwin and William Thompson.

Mr. Pease's main work consists in making Socialism culminate in Fabianism and the Labour Party, and he grows pathetic, lyrical almost, when he reaches that heaven on earth, Australia and New Zealand, "the most perfect democracies on earth," where "State organisation of industry and State care for labour" and "the political organisation of Labour" have so wonderfully developed. He omits to inform the reader how Labour feels "leg-ironed" in these countries and has to begin the old fight over again against chains imposed even by some of her own class. This pitiful downfall of Parliamentary Socialism, which Anarchists recognise, should also be visible to the casual reader, and in this way Mr. Pease's work may do some good.

It is rather amusing to read his account of the early Fabians, the "Government clerks at Whitehall," who understood so well that "the country is not so much governed by the votes of the electors, as by the ideas put into the heads of official persons, whether Parliamentary chiefs or permanent civil servants" (p. 379)—hence the policy of permeation; and the reader who will conclude from Mr. Pease's book that Socialism—at least, as understood by early Socialists and revolutionists—will be either realised or advanced by trickery of this description, may really be given up as hopeless.

As an intelligent account of how recent Social Democratic and Labour politics have inevitably gone from bad to worse, Mr. Pease's new historical chapters are, of course, welcome; and so is his description of Syndicalism, which he treats with relative fairness when speaking of France (he curiously ignores its importance in Spain, p. 294); but when speaking of England, he descends to ordinary polemics out of place in a book which has some pretence of a more lasting character.

It must have been an ordeal to Mr. Pease to deal with Anarchism. Kirkup had written (I quote from pp. 249-50 of the third edition):—

"It is an ideal, also, which we must cherish for society and for the human race. And not in vain; for there is an ever-widening circle of human action, in which good and reasonable men do the right without pressure or stimulus from without, either from law or government. We are therefore to regard a well-ordered, intelligent, and ethical freedom as the goal of the social development of the human race. . . . They [evil institutions and reactionary Governments] have outlived their time. We are certainly right to get rid of them, as of other evil habits and conditions of the past; but it is best done wisely and reasonably. And it cannot be done in any wise or effectual manner except through wide organic change in the human beings concerned."

In Pease we read:—

"The social ideal of Anarchism is the ideal of every thinker. . . . Towards this ideal state we are moving. But the way is through the extension of law, and not its immediate abolition," etc. (pp. 278-9).

"In countries where the government is more or less popular, and especially where the people recognise that it is but themselves organised for special purposes, Anarchism has never taken root," etc. (p. 276).

Here and everywhere Pease is necessarily a victim of his belief in popular democratic institutions, at which, however, as he knows, the youngest Fabian Government clerk snaps his fingers. He shuts his eyes to the fact that democratic institutions inevitably become as corrupt and oppressive, the object of hatred and disgust to the people, as despotic institutions, because all political institutions lead to domination and exploitation by ruling cliques, by whatever names they may go. If this is clearly seen by Anarchists, it is also dimly felt by Syndicalists and by other currents of thought which lead away from

the miserable, ugly game of politics, to which Fabians and Labour politicians would degrade Socialism. Of all this, of the part of Socialism in intellectual life, in morals and art, the book before us tells us very little.

FREEDOM, in particular, is indebted to Mr. Pease for the information (p. 478) that it ceased publication in 1908, whilst he generously antedates its origin by one year (1885 instead of 1886). May his other information prove to be more reliable!

N.

PROPAGANDA NOTES.

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

ABERTILLERY.—Comrades of this district will appreciate the difficulty encountered in getting a place to meet in, and they will know of my efforts to bring local rebels together; and I ask all who realise the necessity for some live work in this district to communicate with me with a view to making our existence as Anarchists a live force and by the time the fine weather comes agreeing on some effective method of distributing our literature over a wide area. We must exercise our energies if we want a weekly paper. Now then, you local rebels, don't let one man do all the work; assert yourselves as Anarchists. Let us create a demand for Anarchist literature. Those willing to help should send me their name and address.

C. J. SMITH.

5 Gwastod Terrace, Cwmtillery, Mon.

MANCHESTER.—The true gospel of Anarchism is not dead yet in Manchester in spite of there being no group here. I am sorry to say that the comrades, with a few exceptions, belong to the No Hope Brigade. All propaganda in the way of selling FREEDOM, pamphlets, and books, is left to me; even at the Larkin meeting no one gave a helping hand. During past eighteen months £4 worth of books and pamphlets have been sold, and 500 leaflets given away. Much more might be done if two or three willing comrades would only come forward. I will be pleased to help any speaker who comes to Manchester.

O. K.

FERRER SUNDAY SCHOOL (East London).—Things are livening up amongst our kiddies. In response to the appeal for the Dublin kiddies, they collected 46s. The children, being anxious to "do summat," have been learning the art of selling literature, with no small success. Thanks are due to comrades for their generous help in keeping our school together, and also to the guarantors who have made themselves responsible for the rent of the premises. The children have recognised their responsibility, for by their prowess at the "light fantastic" they have gathered 16s. 5d. Do not forget our place and time of meeting—146 Stepney Green; Sundays, 3.30; Thursdays, 7. Donations: Our Dancers 16s. 5d., L. P. 10s., Mon Ami 4s.

JIMMY DICK.

BIRMINGHAM.—A Workers' Freedom Group has been formed here in the last few months, and comrades are very active. Open-air meetings have been held on Sundays in the Bull Ring. Good audiences and lively discussions have been the rule. The sale of literature has been very good. We intend to hold group meetings and lectures every fortnight. For place and time, see FREEDOM each month. On November 9 our first lecture was given by R. Pool, on the Chicago Martyrs. On November 23 G. Sidaway lectured on "Jesus and the New Testament." The audiences were not very large, because of short notice; but we hope to be more successful in future.

C. MARTENS.

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:—Already acknowledged, £2 16s. 6d. Essex 1s. 6d., South London Joiners' Shop 3s. 6d., Mac 2s., Comp. 1s., G. Lewis 6d., A. M. 5s., F. S. 1s.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

(October 31—December 4.)

FREEDOM Guarantee Fund.—S. Corio 1s 6d, H. Marques 2s, H. Glasse 5s.
FREEDOM Subscriptions.—W. M. S. 2s, F. Baker 1s 6d, E. Lewys 1s 6d, J. Osis 1s 6d, F. Miller 1s 6d, G. D. L. 1s 6d, B. Ward 1s 6d, L. Robertson 1s 6d, M. v. d. W. 1s 6d, M. Smith 2s, "Paul" 1s 6d, W. Mutter 1s 6d, J. Livshis 1s 6d, B. B. Susanka 1s 6d, L. G. W. 1s 6d.
Pamphlet Printing Fund.—W. G. Orr 2s, Gateshead Group (per G. W. Tindale) 4s 6d, Birmingham Group—G. Martens 2s 6d, R. V. Harvey 2s 6d, E. Keating 6d, H. Fine 1s.

BIRMINGHAM.—Group meetings (Comrades only) will be held at the Coffee House, 7 High Street, Bull Ring, on December 7 and 21 and January 4, at 6 p.m. Lectures will be given at 7 p.m., when all will be welcomed.—C. MARTENS, 355 Lower High Street, West Bromwich.

West London Anarchist Communist Group.—The Grove, Hammersmith, Sundays, 8 p.m.; and Walham Green Church, Tuesdays, 8 p.m.

FULHAM INDIVIDUALIST GROUP.—Open-air meetings are held on Saturdays, 8 p.m., at Walham Grove, Walham Green; and on Sundays, 11 a.m., at the Grove, Hammersmith. Visitors are invited to Group meetings on Wednesdays, 8 p.m., over Lockhart's Coffee Rooms, Walham Green.

Back Numbers of "Freedom."

We can supply a few complete sets of FREEDOM from 1906 to 1912, all in good condition for binding. Prices:—

1911 and 1912 ... 1s. 6d. per year; two years for 2s. 6d.
 1906 to 1910 ... 2s. " five years for 8s. 6d.

Prices include postage in the United Kingdom.

NOW READY.

THE RIGHT TO IGNORE THE STATE.

By HERBERT SPENCER.

16 pages. Price One Penny.

To understand the Peasants' War in Mexico, read

LAND AND LIBERTY:

Mexico's Battle for Economic Freedom and its Relation to Labor's World-Wide Struggle.

64 pages. Price Fourpence. Postage 1d. extra.

MOTHER EARTH.

Published by EMMA GOLDMAN.

Offices: 74 West 119th Street, New York City, U.S.A.

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

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.

ANARCHISM AND MALTHUS. By C. L. JAMES. 2d.

THE CHICAGO MARTYRS. With Portraits. 1d.

ANTIMILITARISM FROM THE WORKERS' POINT OF VIEW. By Dora B. Montefiore. 1d.

RIGHT TO IGNORE THE STATE. By Herbert Spencer. 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 1d. 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.

CIVILIZATION: ITS CAUSE AND CURE. By E. CARPENTER. Cloth 2s. 6d. net, paper 1s., postage 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.

THE SCIENCE OF SOCIETY. By Stephen Pearl Andrews. 5s. net.

All orders, with cash, should be sent to
 FREEDOM PRESS, 127 OSSULSTON STREET, LONDON, N.W.

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