

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. XXVIII.—No. 303.

JULY, 1914.

MONTHLY: ONE PENNY.

NOTES.

Cause and Effect.

The assassination of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand and the Duchess of Hohenberg is a consequence, if we are to believe the *Star*, of his "unbounded ambition"—an ambition which was the cause of the Balkan troubles. Whether this be so or not, one thing is perfectly certain, that tyranny is always open to the attack of the tyrannicide; and ambition has cost many a ruler his life, both since and before the days of Cæsar. It seems almost incredible that any man of sense in this twentieth century can deem it possible to "annex" nations, and dragoon whole populations under the brute rule of militarism, without arousing the hatred of some fiery spirits who will strike back at all costs. As Prinzip and Cabrinovitch were Nationalists, we may take it that "patriotism" inspired the deed, and we must leave it to the jingoes of all nations, with their cry of "My country, right or wrong," to decide how much responsibility they feel in the matter. We only know that the *Daily News* and the *Chronicle*, after vainly trying to connect the affair with the Anarchists by stating that the bomb was obtained from an Anarchist group, have lowered their voices on discovering that the said bomb "was made in the Servian arsenal at Kragujevatz." The Liberal press must be quietly shocked to find that Cabrinovitch used a State-manufactured bomb, and that it was thrown by a Nationalist. One other point is worth noting. The *Daily Mail*, by some extraordinary accident, printed the truth from the very first by announcing that the assassination had nothing to do with the Anarchists.

Guild Socialism and the State.

In the *Daily Herald* of June 30, G. H. D. Cole and W. Mellor discuss the question of Guild Socialism in its relation to the State. "You can change the State by ending the wage system," they tell us. But it seems to us they are confusing the real point at issue. In the first place, we shall never abolish the wage system till the workers have socialised all the means of production. The Guild Socialists' idea of remuneration, as far as we understand it, is an attempt to compromise between the two systems of wagedom and Communism, just as by accepting its charter from the State it attempts to compromise between State Socialism and freely organised co-operation. The writers admit that complete Communism would avoid any possible abuses of a Trade Union monopoly. But apparently they do not see that if the workers gained effective control of all food supplies, they would have to begin with Communism, and not risk the delay and injustice that would follow on any attempt to apportion "according to merit." And after all, the Guild Socialists would be foolish to imagine that Capitalism will stand quietly by while its hold on property and control of the State were being insidiously loosened. And, moreover, do they really think the State, as long as it has any power at all, will consent to the abandonment of its official control and direction of industry, and allow its great patrons and chief supporters—the capitalists—to become the bottom dogs? Not likely! It would be a happy thing if we could glide with comparative peace and goodwill from Capitalism into a better system than the present one. But the State will spoil that dream.

Fads and Fancies.

If Rome in its decline developed the portents that foretold its fall, the present mania of modern cranks in all phases of social life ought to betoken the speedy dissolution of this corrupt system. The impostors who are reaping a rich harvest from the growing crowd of foolish faddists are besieging London from all quarters. The French Institute in London has been listening to Dr. Lipinska, a lady from Poland, who has discovered that sleep is a necessary thing for the health, and is much better without

the nightmare, if you can get it. She wasn't telling this to the weary workers, but to a select audience of the well-to-do. No doubt over-eating with nothing to do may bring bad dreams. But what we want is a prescription for sleep for those unfortunates who, working in bad conditions for long hours, retire at night to a stuffy bedroom, with a railway running almost on top, and stables under the arches. There are thousands of such sufferers in the East End and elsewhere whose daily life is a nightmare, but she gives no prescription for them. We get instead the faddists' silly talk about "telepathic communication" during sleep. Must we wait for the revolution to make a clean sweep of these mystic, artistic, spiritualistic, egotistic cranks on the make?

Citizens' Solidarity.

One of the most extraordinary features of the rapid evolution of things now going on is that in which we are shown, even by capitalists themselves, how social life might be organised if there was a clear field to work in. Such an example has been given in the reconstruction of the city of Dayton, which a year ago was almost destroyed by devastating floods. In a few brief months the city has been restored, with many additional advantages. It is still a capitalist city, of course, and it must not be supposed we are speaking of it as a free Commune. But as an instance showing what can be done when men unite to achieve something really constructive, it is most interesting. Mr. Patterson, who has been interviewed, told how a Bureau of Municipal Research was formed, how a survey of the city was made, and how when the first committee was started it had at hand a mass of information necessary and valuable, just as Kropotkin has suggested would be needed to reorganise housing and food distribution after a revolution. Of course, in Dayton it was all carried out on "business principles," but not by State departments; and it is very evident that great enthusiasm and zeal for an ideal object was animating the public spirit behind it all; for we are told that "Socialists, Republicans, Democrats, and all other political sections unite in one body for the purpose of discussing the city problems." Take away your State, give us enthusiasm and an ideal, and a free field of action, and humanity will conquer all difficulties that a revolution may bring with it.

Doctoring the Docker.

The futile attempts to deal with the evils arising from unemployment—a necessary condition of the present system—and to make our capitalist society look decent and respectable, are enough to exhaust the patience of Job—and disgust him into the bargain. Down in Dockland, life is terrible indeed: so uncertain is employment, such risks when working, so heart-breaking to unload the rich cargoes which one will never take home to enjoy with wife and little ones! Then along comes Lloyd George to try and cheer things up with his Insurance Act. But conditions of employment—or rather unemployment—make things worse than before, and insurance is a curse rather than a blessing. To relieve things, new regulations are introduced. Now the *Daily News* tells us the scenes at the Docks are "a disgrace to a civilised community," and it calls for measures to stop the "out-o'-works" from rushing in crowds to get just half a day's work. "If we are to drain the morass, we must first cut off the flow thither," is the elegant and humane dictum of this Christian daily. We congratulate it on its "flow" of brotherly love. The one thing needful in its eyes is to white-wash "the system" and make it look civilised, never mind who suffers. The "submerged tenth" have no organisation, no voice; and can be driven from pillar to post without fear of losing votes. To suggest that these hungry crowds would fare better if the whole flock of vultures who profit by their misery would only get off their backs, would sound too much like practising the precepts of Christianity to suit the pious readers of the *Daily News*.

THE STATE AND GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRACY.

By MICHAEL BAKUNIN.

(From "Letters to a Frenchman, on the Present Crisis," written at Locarno, September 3-9, 1870.)

Whosoever mentions the State, implies force, oppression, exploitation, injustice—all these brought together as a system are the main condition of present-day society. The State has never had, and never can have, a morality. Its only morality and justice is its own interest, its existence, and its omnipotence at any price; and before its interests, all interests of Humanity must stand in the background. The State is the negation of Humanity. It is this in two ways: the opposite of human freedom and human justice (internally), as well as the forcible disruption of the common solidarity of mankind (externally). The Universal State, repeatedly attempted, has always proved an impossibility, so that, as long as the State exists, States will exist; and since every State regards itself as absolute, and proclaims the adoration of its power as the highest law, to which all other laws must be subordinated, it therefore follows that as long as States exist wars cannot cease. Every State must conquer, or be conquered. Every State must build its power on the weakness, or, if it can do it without danger to itself, on the destruction, of other States.

To strive for international justice, liberty, and perpetual peace, and at the same time to uphold the State, is contradictory and naive. It is impossible to alter the nature of the State, because it is just this nature that constitutes the State; and States cannot change their nature without ceasing to exist. It thus follows that there cannot be a good, just, virtuous State. All States are bad in that sense, that they, by their nature, by their principle, by their very foundation and the highest ideal of their existence, are the opponents of human liberty, morality, and justice. And in this regard there is, one may say what one likes, no great difference between the barbaric Russian Empire and the civilised States of Europe. Wherein lies the only difference? Russian Tsardom does openly what the others do under the mask of hypocrisy. Tsardom, with its undisguised political method, and its contempt for humanity, is the only goal to which all statesmen of Europe secretly but envyingly aspire. All States of Europe do the same as Russia, as far as public opinion, and especially as far as the reawakened but very powerful solidarity of the proletariat, allow them—a public opinion and solidarity which contain in themselves the germs of the destruction of States. There is no "good" State, with the possible exception of those that are powerless. And even they are quite criminal enough in their dreams.

He who wants freedom, justice, and peace, he who wants the entire (economic and political) liberation of the masses, must strive for the destruction of the States, and the establishment of a universal federation of free groups for Production.

As long as the German workers strive for the establishment of a national State—however popular and free they may imagine this State (and there is a far step from imagination to realisation, especially when there is the fraternisation of two diametrically opposed principles, the State and the liberty of the people, involved)—so long will they sacrifice the liberty of the people to the might of the State, Socialism to politics, international justice and fraternity to patriotism. It is clear that their own economic liberation will remain a beautiful dream, looming in the distant future.

It is impossible to reach two opposite poles simultaneously. Socialism, the Social Revolution, presupposes the abolition of the State; it is therefore clear that he who is in favour of the State must give up Socialism, and sacrifice the economic liberation of the workers to the political power of some privileged party.

The German Social Democratic Party is forced to sacrifice the economic liberation of the proletariat, and consequently also their political liberation—or, better expressed, their liberation from politics—to the self-seeking and triumph of the bourgeois Democracy. This follows unquestionably from Articles 2 and 3 of their programme.* The first three paragraphs of Article 2 are quite in accord with the Socialist principles of the International, whose programme they copy nearly literally. But the fourth paragraph of the same article, which declares that political liberty is the forerunner of economic liberty, entirely destroys the practical value of the recognition of our principles. It can mean nothing else than this:—

"Proletarians, you are slaves, the victims of private property and capitalism. You want to liberate yourselves from this yoke. This is good, and your demands are quite just. But in order to realise them, you must help us to accomplish the political revolution. Afterwards we will help you to accomplish the Social Revolution. Let us, therefore, through the might of your arms establish the Democratic State, and

* As an explanation for students of the history of the development of the German Social Democracy, as well as for all seekers after truth, the following notes will be interesting: Bakunin's polemics are directed partly against the programme which was adopted, under the influence of Bebel, Liebknecht, etc., at the fifth Congress of the German Labour Unions (Arbeitervereinstag) at Nuremberg, 1868, and partly against the so-called Eisenach programme of August 7, 1869. The before-mentioned third article runs literally: "Political liberty is the indispensable preliminary condition to the economical liberation of the labouring classes. The social question is, therefore, inseparable from the political question; its solution is conditioned by it, and is only possible in the Democratic State." As many assertions as there are in this third Article, as many untruths does it contain. This article is the third in the Nuremberg programme; in the Eisenach programme it is the fourth.

then—and then we will create a commonweal for you, similar to the one the Swiss workers enjoy."

In order to convince oneself that this preposterous delusion expresses entirely the spirit and tendency of the German Social Democratic Party—i.e., their programme, not the natural aspirations of the German workers, of whom the party consists—one need only study the third article of this programme, wherein all the initial demands, which shall be brought about by the peaceful and legal agitation of the party, are elaborated. All these demands, with the exception of the tenth, which had not even been proposed by the authors of the programme, but had been added later—during the discussion, by a member of the Eisenach Congress—all these demands are of an entirely political character. All those points which are recommended as the main object of the immediate practical activity of the party consist of nothing else but the well-known programme of bourgeois Democracy: universal suffrage, with direct legislation by the people, abolition of all political privilege; a citizen army; separation of Church and State, and school and State; free and compulsory education; liberty of the Press, assembly, and combination; conversion of all indirect taxation into a direct, progressive, and universal income-tax.

These are the true objects, the real goal of the party! An exclusively political reform of the State, the institutions and laws of the State. Am I not, therefore, entitled to assert that this programme is in reality a purely political and bourgeois affair, which looks upon Socialism only as a dream for a far distant future? Have I not likewise a right to assert that if one would judge the Social Democratic Party of the German proletariat by their programme—of which I will beware, because I know that the real aspirations of the German working class go infinitely further than this programme—then one would have a right to believe that the creation of this party had no other purpose than the exploitation of the mass of the proletariat as blind and sacrificed tools towards the realisation of the political plans of the German bourgeois Democracy.

ANARCHISTS IN CHINA.

[Translation from the *Voice of the People*, a weekly paper printed in Chinese and Esperanto, and published at Shanghai.]

Our readers may be assured that the Chinese Republic exists only in name. Really, it is as monarchical as the Chinese dynasty, possibly more so. The cruelty practised by the Chinese dynasty, which was opposed by the revolutionists, was the same as in Russia. Now Yuan-Shi-Kai's Government practises the same despotism; for while the Chinese dynasty was in power, Socialists or Anarchists did not exist. It was only after the foundation of the Chinese Republic that Socialists and Anarchists came into evidence. Some months after Yuan-Shi-Kai became seated on the Presidential chair, he ordered the breaking-up of the Anarchist Socialistic Party. Conquering the Nationalists, he ordered the breaking-up of the "Socialist Party" (non-Anarchist).

Soon after the murder of Sen-yek-lon (partisan in Peking), the Socialist (Anarchist) named Fen-Fen was murdered in Tung Chow. At that time the *Voice of the People* appeared for the second time, and was forbidden by Lung-Sai-Kwang. The last-named ordered the breaking-up of our group, and directed the police to persecute our comrades. Happily, we obtained information from the police beforehand and avoided persecution. After we moved to the Portuguese colony of Macao, we continued our publication. Meanwhile, the infamous administration of China asked the ruler of Macao (the diplomatic minister of the Portuguese Embassy) to forbid our journal and break-up our branch. As a matter of fact, Portugal is a Monarchical Republic, whose administration in Macao is cruelty itself; therefore it willingly suppressed our gazette to oblige the Chinese Government.

But that is not all. Yuan-Shi-Kai, receiving a telegram from Li-Yuan-Hun (vice-president), gave orders to all provinces to persecute our comrades severely and to search everything sent out by us. That unworthy conduct we did not worry about; but one can understand that the Chinese Government intends to oppose Anarchism to the utmost. The Anarchist growth is now entirely cut off by the great robbers. From now, what is our duty? Our movement against the Government is, of course, disliked by that body; but that cannot weaken us. From now we must consider each Governmental cruelty as material for our propaganda. The more cruel the Government is, the more culpable will the Government show itself, and the people will the sooner awaken.

Comrades! Let us decide to destroy all violence. Forward! Be not afraid! Tire not! We are certain to gain a definite victory. Further, we hope that our comrades in other lands will get to know of the birth of the Oriental Anarchistic movement, and about the difficulties of our situation. May they do their best to help our labours, so that the universal revolution may come about sooner.

[We learn, with regret, that the editor of the *Voice of the People* has been assassinated, probably by an agent of the Chinese Government. We hope to publish one or two more translations from his paper.—ED. FREEDOM.]

** Owing to pressure of other work, our comrade Kropotkin has been unable to continue his articles on "The Modern State"; but he hopes to do so in our next issue.

BOOK NOTES.

THE SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MODERN DRAMA.

The Social Significance of the Modern Drama. By Emma Goldman. \$1.00 net. Boston, Mass.: Richard G. Badger.

Emma Goldman has made the modern drama a special feature of her propaganda work in the United States, emphasising the revolutionary tendency of many of the best known playwrights. In this book she reviews in turn the Scandinavian, German, French, English, Irish, and Russian drama; and with a great number of well-selected extracts explains to the reader the message of the modern dramatists. Many people who imagine themselves well acquainted with the great writers will be rather surprised on reading some of the extracts from their plays quoted in this volume. It is unnecessary to name all the writers dealt with by the author, but her chapters on Ibsen, Hauptmann, Brieux, Shaw, and Galsworthy are especially well done. Of Ibsen, she says:—

"Uncompromising demolisher of all false idols and dynamiter of all social shams and hypocrisy, Ibsen consistently strove to uproot every stone of our social structure. Above all did he thunder his fiery indictment against the four cardinal sins of modern society: the Lie inherent in our social arrangements; Sacrifice and Duty, the twin curses that fetter the spirit of man; the narrow-mindedness and pettiness of Provincialism, that stifles all growth; and the Lack of Joy and Purpose in Work which turns life into a vale of misery and tears."

The author, in contrasting Shaw's plays with Shaw's politics, quotes the following from "Major Barbara." The cannon manufacturer Undershaft says:—

"Let six hundred and seventy fools loose in the street; and three policemen can scatter them. But huddle them together in a certain house in Westminster; and let them go through certain ceremonies and call themselves certain names until at last they get the courage to kill; and your six hundred and seventy fools become a government. Your pious mob fills up ballot papers and imagines it is governing its masters; but the ballot paper that really governs is the paper that has a bullet wrapped up in it. . . . Vote! Bah! When you vote you only change the names of the cabinet. When you shoot, you pull down governments, inaugurate new epochs, abolish old orders and set up new. Is that historically true, Mr. Learned Man, or is it not?"

"Cusins. It is historically true. I loathe having to admit it. I repudiate your sentiments. I abhor your nature. I defy you in every possible way. Still, it is true. But it ought not to be true."

"Undershaft. Ought, ought, ought, ought, ought! Are you going to spend your life saying ought, like the rest of our moralists? Turn your oughts into shells, man. Come and make explosives with me. The history of the world is the history of those who had the courage to embrace this truth."

Of this, the author says:—

"'Major Barbara' is one of the most revolutionary plays. In any other but dramatic form the sentiments uttered therein would have condemned the author to long imprisonment for inciting to sedition and violence. Shaw the Fabian would be the first to repudiate such utterances as rank Anarchy, 'impractical, brain cracked and criminal.' But Shaw the dramatist is closer to life—closer to reality, closer to the historic truth that the people wrest only as much liberty as they have the intelligence to want and the courage to take."

Emma Goldman has often been taken to task by comrades for devoting so much of her propaganda to dramatic criticism, but in answer to this she truly says: "Any mode of creative work, which with true perception portrays social wrongs earnestly and boldly, may be a greater menace to our social fabric and a more powerful inspiration than the wildest harangue of the soapbox orator." And this book is proof of her statement.

The volume is well printed and bound, with a portrait of the author as a frontispiece, and it should have a good sale.

Publications Received.

Selected Works of Voltairine de Cleyre. Edited by Alexander Berkman. 1 dol. New York: Mother Earth Publishing Association. — We are pleased to see this splendid selection in print; it is a worthy memorial of our comrade's work. We hope to review it next month.

The Mexican Revolution, 1906—1914: Its Progress, Causes, Purpose, and Probable Results. By Teodoro M. Gaitan. Vancouver, B.C.: Mexican Workers' Association, 516 Main Street.

The Economic Foundations of the Women's Movement. By M. A. 2d. London: The Fabian Society, Clement's Inn, W.C.

La Sciopero Generale. By Francisco Ferrer. 10c. Geneva: Edizione del Risveglio, Rue des Savoises, 6.

Los Crimenes de Dios. By Sebastian Faure. Traducción de J. Prat. 15c. Barcelona: Salud y Fuerza, Provenza, 177.

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

THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONGRESS.

Devonshire Hall, Devonshire Road, Hackney, N.E.

August 29—September 5.

The Congress promises to be a great success. The list of countries that have expressed a wish to send delegates to London is sufficient guarantee that the international character of the gathering is thoroughly assured. The following are the countries that have so far decided to take part in the London Congress (we take these data from the second number of the *Bulletin*, just published):—England, Scotland, Wales, France, Germany, Holland, Austria, Bohemia, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Russia, Switzerland, United States of America, Mexico, Argentine, and most of the other South American republics.

As to the organisations taking part, we have the following list—For Great Britain: "Freedom" and "Voice of Labour" groups; the Anarchist Education League; the Yiddish Anarchist Federation; the French and German groups; the groups from Glasgow, Newcastle, Bristol, Liverpool, Cwmtilery, Ammanford. It is hoped that all Anarchist groups besides those enumerated above will also send delegates. For France, we have the Anarchist Communist Federation, which is preparing a list of its groups that will be sending delegates; those of Montreuil, Bezons, and Avignon have already signified their intention of being represented. For Bohemia, Russia, and Germany, their respective Federations are sending delegates. Most of the other countries are still having regional and national congresses for the purpose of selecting their delegates.

As to the agenda, it is already taking shape. The following papers are already assured:—"The Labour Movement," P. Kropotkin; "The Modern State as the Greatest Exploiter of the Productive Forces of a Nation," W. Tcherkessoff; "Revolutionary Tactics and Nomenclature," W. Tcherkessoff; "Economic Activities of Revolutionary Direct Action by Anarchism," R. Grossman; "Necessity of an International Correspondence Bureau," Dutch delegation; "Organisation in France," Schneider (Bezons); Antimilitarism, F. Domela Nieuwenhuis; "International Language," Dutch delegation.

In an introductory article with reference to the agenda, the Organising Committee appeals to the Congress not to waste its energies on too many subsidiary points, but to attempt to thrash out at least the three most important items, viz.: Organisation, Syndicalism, and Antimilitarism. It points out, *inter alia*, that the first of these—organisation—is at present the most burning question among Anarchists in all countries, and that therefore it should be the duty of the Congress to lay great stress on that question, and to endeavour to find a common ground for common action. With reference to this point, it is also mentioned that it would be well if, when giving the reports on the movement in different countries, the comrades would refer to the position of the question of organisation in their own midst: it would greatly assist the Congress in its judgment on the possibilities of an *entente* amongst the Anarchists all the world over.

The *Bulletin* contains also, besides an article on the latest developments of the Labour struggle in Italy, reports from Argentine, Spain, Portugal, etc., on the progress made in connection with these countries' representations in London, as well as an appeal by the Mexican comrades to deal seriously with the great struggle for freedom taking place in their country.

The languages of the Congress will be French, English, and German, and any speech in one of these will be translated into the other two.

Among the side attractions of the Congress, we have a public meeting at the Devonshire Hall, Hackney, on Saturday night, August 29, and a reception of the delegates, arranged by the Anarchist Education League; the latter will probably take the form of an outing to Epping Forest on Sunday, August 30. One or two more public meetings will be arranged during the Congress week, and will be announced later.

Last, but not least, there is the question of cost. An International Congress is no small matter, and, in the stereotyped phrase, contributions, whether large or small—preferably the former—will be gratefully acknowledged by the treasurer, F. W. Dunn, 127 Ossulston Street, N.W.

The *Bulletin* will be sent post free to all who ask for it, by the secretary, A. Schapiro, 163 Jubilee Street, London, E.

"THE MODERN SCHOOL."

We have just received No. 3 of this little magazine published by the children of the International Modern School, at 146 Stepney Green, E. The children write most of the articles, and express themselves in their own way on matters which interest them. The present number contains, amongst other things, an article entitled "What is Anarchy?" by Willie (aged 11), two letters from children in Canada, and "Bits by the Bairns" (illustrated), by Henry (aged 7). The whole production is a labour of love, and we hope our readers will help to support the magazine by buying it. Price one penny—or as much more as you please.

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.

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.

Votes and Violence.

The present condition of the struggle that is being carried on by the W.S.P.U., with its militancy of the last few weeks, has brought forth some criticism of the women's movement which in so far as it tends to identify them with Anarchists, or denounces them as using "Anarchist methods"—as the cant of Capitalism loves to express it—is equally unfair to them and to ourselves. In this connection, it is regrettable to find H. M. Hyndman in the same boat as the stupid and prejudiced coroner who conducted the investigation into the death of the unfortunate Laura Grey.

Is it possible to clear away some of the ignorance and confusion that flourish like choking weeds round many of the most important questions that are agitating the public mind to-day? It is worth the attempt, so let us try.

In the first place, it would be well if the attitude of Anarchists towards the Votes for Women movement could be clearly stated. This is not difficult. For we affirm, as everyone must who reasons honestly, that if men have the right to vote, so equally have the women. This cannot in justice ever be denied, and those who believe in the virtue of the vote, and yet withhold it from women, *because* they are women, have to share in the responsibility for all that is happening around us in this (as we regard it) mistaken struggle. That this effort for political enfranchisement, which is costing so much to many sincere and courageous women, is a fatal digression from the true path towards woman's complete freedom, we hope to be able to prove.

A glance at the events of the nineteenth century would teach the women that what has been gained for the masses, whether in the direction of liberty or of economic betterment, has been won by agitation, strikes, and popular demonstrations, sometimes peaceful, sometimes threatening. The Reform Bills of 1832 and 1867, though fiercely demanded by the workers and their middle-class leaders, have done little else but solidify middle-class rule and the expansion of capitalist exploitation at home and abroad. So that to-day, while women are pursuing this will-o'-the-wisp of the vote, the men, after decades of disappointment, have rediscovered in Direct Action and the General Strike a means to the conquest of economic emancipation.

What an immense gain for the mass of unorganised and exploited women if all the misdirected energy of the militant and non-militant organisations was devoted to the economic struggle! To strike is at least to act; to vote is not even necessarily to think. A vote is a quantitative expression, and implies nothing of the qualitative. It is no exaggeration to say that laws might be passed just as effectively by *weighing* the votes, so that what was "right" or "wrong" would be decided by the tipping of the balance. The blind rule of numbers, the power of the compact majority, is all that voting manifests. The vote of the fool cancels that of the wise man, and we suffer the tyranny of mediocrity. Hence it is that all progress comes from the initiative of outside minorities, and what thoughtless people regard as "Parliamentary action" is but the legal stamp "granting" popular demands.

All this is plain, simple historical truth hidden from the people by the heaped-up rubbish of political, religious, and social fictions; and the Anarchists, who are constantly attacking these prejudices, are denounced by those even who are opposed to the present system. Amongst these we find H. M. Hyndman, who in his article, "The Suffragettes of Anarchy" (*Justice*, June 11) denounces the militant methods as "Anarchist outrages." For this leader of Social Democracy every *unorganised* outbreak of

violence is Anarchist, whilst "organised force is one of the indispensable steps towards the realisation of our programme." But Hyndman knows, just as well as the authorities that militant methods are very skilfully and carefully "organised." In fact, their "organisation" ought to win his admiration.

But, like the foolish coroner in the case of the poor unhappy Laura Grey—who, as all the world could plainly see, was an unfortunate victim to bourgeois morality—he cannot resist the temptation to vilify the Anarchists, for no other reason apparently than that they attack the *foundations* of the present system rather than the superstructure. It is, of course, the basest hypocrisy to pretend that violence in any form is Anarchism, simply because we preach the overthrow of the State with the end of the capitalist system. Hyndman knows, if the coroner does not, that every kind of violence has been used by all political and religious factions throughout the world, to attain ends which have generally been base and seldom good. The Suffragette outrages he would identify with Anarchism are really used to attain that which Anarchists combat and which he favours. It would be with far better reason that we should accuse his policy of electoral methods as being responsible for these outbreaks than that he should accuse us.

But what would it all avail? We are entering on a period of great change, and we would be the last to wish to see anything beautiful destroyed. Yet we may remind our friend Hyndman that just as in the suppression of the Commune, so at the present day, it is the guns of our enemy the capitalist that he should fear most, not only in the destruction of the beautiful, but also of human life itself. And if one has cause for anxiety and regret as to these sacrifices, he can be sure—and we all foresee it only too clearly—that it is in the disastrous struggles as to *who shall rule* that the most terrible tributes will be demanded by rivalry and ambition. All who favour government will use the utmost violence to establish their power; and Social Democrats are all for government. It is only those who believe in real freedom, real equality, that earnestly strive for peace. And foremost amongst these are the Anarchists.

THE GENERAL STRIKE AND THE INSURRECTION IN ITALY.

The events which have taken place recently in Italy are of the greatest importance, not so much in themselves, but as an indication of the disposition of the Italian people and of what we can anticipate in the near future.

The immediate cause of the outbreak was a massacre of unarmed demonstrators by the gendarmes of the town of Ancona.

For over a year the revolutionary and Labour organisations of all political shades had been carrying on an agitation in favour of several victims of military despotism and for the abolition of *disciplinary battalions*, to which are sent all young soldiers known to hold anti-monarchial and anti-bourgeois opinions. The treatment is barbarous, and the unhappy young men are submitted to all kinds of moral and physical tortures.

As the meetings and demonstrations were held all over Italy, but on different dates, they seemed to make but little impression on the Government; and the Trades Council of Ancona proposed, therefore, to organise manifestations in the whole country on the same day, that day to be the date of the official celebration of the establishment of Italian unity and the Monarchy. As on these occasions great military reviews are always held, the comrades thought that the Government would be obliged to postpone the review in order to hold the troops ready to preserve "order," and the attention of the whole public would be drawn to the object of the demonstration.

The idea put forward by the Ancona comrades was everywhere received with enthusiasm by all the opposition parties. The Minister ordered the police to prevent any public demonstrations. Of course, that did not deter us. In fact, we had counted on the police prohibition to give more publicity to the demonstration and to instigate the masses to resistance.

To stop the people who were leaving a meeting-hall from going to the central square to demonstrate, the gendarmes fired on the unarmed crowd, killing three workers, and wounding twenty more. After this massacre, the gendarmes, frightened, rushed to the barracks for shelter, and the people were left masters of the town. Without anybody even mentioning the word, a general strike was soon complete, and the workers collected at the Trades Council to hold a meeting.

The Government tried to prevent the events of Ancona from

being telegraphed to other parts of the country; but nevertheless by-and-by the news became known, and strikes broke out in all the towns of Italy. The two Federal Labour organisations of Italy, the General Confederation of Labour, which is reformist, and the Labour Union, with revolutionary tendencies, proclaimed a general strike, and the same was done by the Railwaymen's Union.

These strikes and demonstrations in several towns provoked new conflicts with the police, and new massacres. At once, without any common understanding, one place ignorant of what the other was doing, as communications were broken off, the movement assumed everywhere an insurrectional character, and in many places the Republic, which meant for the people the autonomous Commune, was proclaimed.

All was going splendidly; the movement was developing, and the railway strike, spreading on all lines, paralysed the Government; the workers were beginning to take measures of practical Communism in view of reorganising social life on a new basis; when suddenly the Confederation of Labour, by an act which has been qualified as treachery, ordered the strike off, thereby throwing the workers into confusion and discouraging them.

The Government was not slow to profit by this condition, and began to restore "order."

If it had not been for the betrayal of the Confederation, though we could not yet have made the revolution for lack of necessary preparation and understanding, the movement would certainly have assumed larger proportions and a much greater importance.

In every way these events have proved that the mass of the people hate the present order; that the workers are disposed to make use of all opportunities to overthrow the Government; and that when the fight is directed against the common enemy—that is to say, the Government and the bourgeoisie—all are brothers, though the names of Socialist, Anarchist, Syndicalist, or Republican may seem to divide them.

Now it is up to revolutionaries to profit by these good dispositions.

E. MALATESTA.

WHERE MEXICO STANDS TO-DAY,

The Mexican Revolution, fought out beyond the Rio Grande, is begetting a profound revolution in our own attitude toward the social question. The wide-spread opposition to war with Mexico must surely have been an eye-opener to our Hearsts and Otises, and should be most gratifying. It should lay the foundations in this country of a persistent and effective anti-military movement. The almost universal ridicule heaped on the Mediators shows a healthy conviction that the disinherited are not to be freed by gentlemen in laced uniforms but by their own brains and strong right arms. That conviction is spreading and ultimately will have a deep effect on the revolutionary movement both here and abroad. It will give an impetus to what is called Direct Action, and will show that nineteen-twentieths of what our present Labour movement labels as such is not worthy of the name, since it does not aim, even in the remotest degree, at the abolition of human slavery.

Expanding international capitalism, which seeks to bring Mexico under the yoke of wage slavery—as it has brought India, Africa, and the greater part of the world—has received its first decided check, at the hands of a nation which knows what capitalism is, loathes it, and is fully determined to have none of it. From the plutocratic dream of owning down to the Panama Canal, and thereby establishing United States suzerainty from the Canadian border to Cape Horn—as voiced by Taft, Roosevelt, and other Presidents—there has been a rude awakening.

A nation of fifteen millions, most of whom, four years ago, could hardly recognise a rifle when they saw it, has become armed and highly skilled in those guerrilla tactics which are the most advanced and efficacious style of modern warfare. Moreover, the peons have armed themselves chiefly at the expense of their own governments, which they have been engaged in attacking and overthrowing. In no other country have the disinherited, as yet, had the sense and courage to perform this necessary feat.

It will be no longer possible to impose in Mexico that hideous slavery with which the Congo, Peru, and other localities too numerous to mention, have shocked mankind. There the natives have remained unarmed and, therefore, have stood helpless before their white exploiters. In Mexico the situation has been reversed, and it is well for the peon. This also is a lesson that will sink gradually into the consciousness of the international

proletariat. One ounce of this experience is worth a ton of peace orations.

Prolonged warfare between contending factions has not only given the Mexican peon opportunity to arm himself, but also has forced the contenders to court his support with economic promises of the most substantial kind. The more desperate the needs of the contending factions, the more substantial will be the emancipation promised, and the more determined that his leaders shall not cheat him will the peon grow. Our own United States history is one continuous record of politicians' promises broken with absolute impunity, and of a supposedly intelligent nation humbugged by fakes. Consider, for example, the career of William Jennings Bryan, who deluded half the United States into the ridiculous conception that Free Silver would rescue it from poverty. Do you suppose that we would entrust the economic future of the peon to Bryan's theorisings?

Meanwhile, and in conclusion, the Mexican situation is, by all odds, the most universally discussed topic of the day, and justly so. As said before, it is the first serious check Capitalism has received at the hands of Labour. It marks, therefore, the opening of a new era, and as such is one of the world's great historical events.—WM. C. OWEN, in *Regeneracion*.

THE PRETENCE OF PARLIAMENT.

The Anarchist in the past alone of all men sane on the question of the futility of Parliament, can boast that proud position no longer. Lloyd George, when criticising his Tory opponents, said they had "rummaged in the dustbins of ancient precedent" to prevent his Budget being accepted in its entirety. We like the term immensely when applied to the sacred archives of Parliament, more particularly as it comes from one of our "governors," who, while epitomising the Government in his person, yet affects to despise the laws that have in the past moulded society. Of course, the inference is quite obvious: Lloyd George would be a law unto himself and do everything for the common people's good if it were not for the wicked Tories and those most importunate Radical millionaires of the Holt persuasion, who, troublesome to him as a guilty conscience, are ever at hand to keep in check his well-known passion for the poor and the oppressed. So yet a little while we fear must elapse before our ranks are strengthened by the addition of Comrade George. A law unto himself he may endeavour to be, but so long as there are patriotic Tories who for the good of society and Empire are willing to continue "rummaging in the dustbins" of Parliamentary enactments, we are likely to see Lloyd George remain a model of governmental decorum.

But one is forced to wonder what the man in the street will think of the truthfulness of his very apt description of our Statute Book. May it not lead to the desire to get rid of the "dustbins" altogether? Then, perhaps, our outspoken friend may regret his very illuminating reference to what has been in the past the bed-rock of capitalist society.

Should, however, fresh evidence of the antiquated character of Parliament be required, one has only to study the daily press of June 25, where it is recorded that on two recent occasions much time had been wasted by a Standing Committee of the House owing to the failure of members to turn up. It was there stated that on one day that week a Cabinet Minister was seen scouring the lobbies to get a quorum for a Government Bill. But is this not an everyday occurrence? Our representatives, we are well aware, consent to receive £400 yearly in return for the light and lustre they lend to our venerable House; and it is surely not in the realms of justice to expect punctuality, interest, or even attendance at the committees which are supposed to control our destinies. We will, however, give them the credit of having once possessed the noblest intentions, the highest motives. Mayhap, even their patience has been worn out by the whole farce of Parliamentary procedure, and time has rendered them impervious to the high sense of duty which, who knows, may have led them to seek the lustre of M.P. and the £400. Let us bear kindly with them and at worst attribute their laxity to an atrophy consequent upon a too ready acceptance of the Traditions of the House. They know, perhaps, in their hearts that so long as a mere handful of capitalists really govern us, any effort at pretence of usefulness is futile. Only we should esteem them as men if they possessed but the courage to unmask the monster that masquerades under the name of Government.

M. B. HOPE.

THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONGRESS.—The Yiddish Anarchist Federation invite comrades and friends to a Tea Party and Social on Saturday, July 4, at the Crown Hall, 40 Redmans Road, Mile End, E. A discussion on "The Importance of the International Congress" will be raised during the evening. Tea, 7—8.30 p.m. Tickets, Ninepence.

THE MODERN SUNDAY SCHOOL.—A Soiree and Ball in aid of the School will take place on Saturday evening, July 11, at the Devonshire Hall, Devonshire Road, Mare Street, Hackney, N.E. Commence at 8 p.m. Ball till 3 a.m. Tickets, One Shilling.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

United States.

After seven years of legal fight, going from one court to another, spending thousands of dollars, the American Federation of Labour has been taught the very simple truth that Justice is as much a handmaiden of Capital as the Church. In July, 1908, an "injunction" prohibited the A.F.L. from putting the Buck's Stone and Range Company on the black list of factories to be boycotted. As the company was then fighting its workers, this "injunction" was disobeyed; and the three chief officials of the Federation—Gompers, Morrison, and Mitchell—were sentenced to twelve, eight, and six months' imprisonment respectively. Since then the case has been going from court to court till at last the Supreme Court, which evidently did not like to put in prison the leaders of such conservative Unions as are affiliated with the A.F.L., decided that the acts of Gompers, Mitchell, and Morrison did come under the Act, but that the time of prosecution had lapsed. So now all is as it was in the beginning, and any court can prosecute a Trade Union for disregarding some fantastic "injunction," this American legal dodge of the fundamental law.

Mexico.

The economic character of the revolution in Mexico has been always insisted on by all who were in close touch with the conditions there. In spite of the political turn the movement has taken in the fight against Huerta, in the North of Mexico, where Zapata is powerful, the economic character has been preserved. This has been confirmed from an unsuspected quarter. The correspondent of the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, the leading German newspaper, states that the Zapatists have all the time 10,000 men under arms. He describes them as "barbarians." Of course. But let us remark two special features of the campaign of those barbarians.

"The Zapatists," he says, "demand the repartition of the land, and where they occupy the country they put this in practice. They burn the archives and try to destroy all signs of the old order; they give the land to the people, and do everything to affirm the new society of which they dream, where none of the old proprietors shall exist. . . . The programme of the rebels of the North is full of Socialist phrases, half understood; and at Torreon, at Monterey, and in the State of Sinaloa the rebels have simply confiscated the private property of rich people, and work the mines, breweries, factories, etc., for their own instituted government."

Barbarians! When will the "civilised" workers follow this example?

France.

Whilst the politicians were running about like disturbed ants, trying to form a Socialist-Radical Ministry capable of "loyally" carrying out the three years' service Act and at the same time abolishing it according to their own promises, the postmen of Paris took a short cut to get the much-needed improvements in their condition. Their Union had been received by the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs on various occasions, and had received promises, promises. The Chamber of Deputies had voted a project which authorised a first credit of 58,000 francs to supply the Paris postmen with the demanded extra payment for house-rent, boots, drugs, etc. But the Senate, that bulwark of the respectable bourgeoisie and Capitalism, refused to pass the Bill, as it eventually would mean expenses up to 1,000,000 francs; and, as everybody knows, Upper Houses are always very careful of the finances of the country when it is a case of increasing wages, but forget all precepts of economy when millions and millions have to find their way into the pockets of armaments and warship contractors.

The postmen seeing that nothing could be expected any more in an "orderly and constitutional" way, on June 23 began in the Central Post Office of Paris the *grève perlée* or "obstruction"; in the afternoon, the service was at a standstill, and 2,500 postmen barricaded themselves in the building. At 11 o'clock the Minister himself arrived and tried, first by threats, then by vague promises, to get the men to work. But next morning the postmen set seriously to work—to defend their fortress by putting chairs, tables, etc., against the doors. They knew from the bitter experience of the strike in 1900 that if the soldiers once got inside, the work would be done by them. So they preferred to make themselves prisoners rather than let the enemy take the fort. Their wives had in the meantime brought provisions: loaves and sausages were tied to strings let down by the strikers, and the police were outwitted by the women or dared not interfere.

In the afternoon, the Minister, having received numerous complaints of losses by business houses, saw a delegation of postmen and formally pledged the Government to support the claims of the men when the second reading of the Bill is taken by the Senate. So the strike was called off, and, after this short but impressive lesson, it looks as if the men's needs will receive attention.

A general strike, if unexpectedly sprung upon the masters, has more effect than a prolonged struggle with all legal formalities of notice, etc., which enable the employers to take measures in time.

A PRIMER OF ANARCHISM.

IV.—LAW AND CRIME.

As a rule, when the voice of those who want to put an end to the State is heard, there are loud cries of wrath. For the State has no lack of friends. From what it steals by means of the tax, it bribes a large mob of men in ways that are not clear to those who pay the tax. Those whom it thus bribes form a class which lives a rich and full life at the sole cost of those who toil. This class of folk, then, to whom the State is a good thing, will be well to the front when we say: "Down with the State!" and their cry will be: "Hang him! Shoot him! To death with all who would throw down the State!" For they think that he who says, "Down with the State!" says down with them, for by the State they live a rich life at the cost of the fools who pay the tax; but they say: "He who says 'Down with the State!' says, 'Up with Crime!' for the State lives to keep down crime, and if the State goes down, crime goes up." Is that so? Let us see!

What is crime? A crime, in the sense of the State, is an act which is done in spite of some law laid down by the State which says that such act shall not be done, such as, in some States, to buy or sell a glass of beer. Now, it is a fact that in some States to buy or sell a glass of beer is said to be a crime. Put such a thought to a man of the world and he will laugh at you for a fool. Yet such is the case. In spite of all the pomp of wigs, gowns, big books, quill pens, and all the rest of the fool's play, Law is no more than a code of rules laid down by those who have the force of arms at their back for those who have not such a force. Law feigns to act by weights and scales. Its true force is the judge, the jail, and the rope; the man in blue with his club, and the man in red with his gun, stand all the time at the beck and call of those who "lay down the law." That is all there is to the thought of Law and Crime as far as the State goes.

But is that all there is to the thought of crime from all points of view? I should say not. Men at large have had a thought of crime more clear and true than that of the State, for such a thought has grown up at all times in each place where men live in a mass. And that thought has been this: A crime is an act of force which is done with a will to hurt or harm. It is the will to hurt or harm in the act which makes it a crime. Is this not clear? Can it not be seen that where men live in a mass they must live at peace, or the mass will tend to break up; and if the mass life is a good life, it is plain that acts which tend to break it up will not be to the good of those who see in the mass life a life that suits them? Now peace will not reign on earth as long as one man or a set of men can say to the rest, "Thou shalt!" for where there is a man who says, "Thou shalt!" there is a man who will say, "I will not!" A life of peace for men who would live in a mass means a life of give and take, in fair shares. If we want such a life, we must see to it that all our acts have at their base this thought of give and take, in fair shares. Those who will not act in a line with this thought are foes to all who would live the mass life of peace.

Now, just as the State calls a crime an act which tends to break up the State, in so far as by such act the will of the State is set at naught, so a mass of men who wish to live at peace will call a crime an act which tends to break up their mass life, in so far as by such act the thought of give and take is set at naught, by which their life of peace is kept up. By this it may be seen that, from the point of view of those who wish to live a life of peace, the State, in its base, is a crime. For the first act of the State is a theft—the tax! Those who stand up for the right of the State claim that it rules by the will of all. This "will of all," in fact, is found to be, through the vote, the will of the great mass which rules the small mass. Now, they who stand by the State say that if we throw down the State, might will be right, and the weak will go to the wall. But what takes place through the vote? Why the strong mass rule the weak mass, and the weak mass—go to the wall! Then they who stand up for the State say, "Well, that is as it is, as it has been, and as it will be all through time. It is the fate of the weak to go to the wall! Is it right that the weak should rule? Why should the weak rule, and not the strong?" Thus they are bound to give up their case that the State rules by the will of all.

It comes to this, then, that where we have a State there is a life, not of peace, but of war. The State hides this fact by a trick of words. An act of force by the State on the mass it calls Law. An act of force by the mass, or some of the mass, it calls Crime.

Now, we who wish to throw down the State, and to live a life of peace, must not be held back by mere words. From the point of view of the State, all acts that tend to throw down the State are crimes. But, from our point of view, the State is first, last, and all the time one great crime. So that, with us who wish to live a life of peace, and to be free from those thefts of the wealth of our work by which, through all time, the State gets its strength, the State code of law and the State thought of crime no more hold us in awe. We see that the State has just that force which we, with our lack of sense, give it; and we see that the State turns and rends us for our pains. Our task, then, is not to take back that force which we give to the State, but to get rid of it, so that we may live a free life, the base of which is to be a pact with man to man to form a free mass for all those ends which need joint work, and to leave each one free to live the rest of his life in his own way.

WILLIAM J. ROBINS.

CORRESPONDENCE.

ANARCHISM: INDIVIDUALIST OR COMMUNIST?

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

Dear Comrade—The controversy now going on over the two social concepts, Individualism and Communism, would be of great utility to the movement if it were successful in irrefutably establishing a difference or an absence of difference between the two. Anarchist integration is, I think, a very desirable thing, and this will only be brought about by the separation of the unlike and the bringing together of the like. We take care to let this process operate in our relations with Socialists, Labourists, and the divers politicians, realising it is impossible to integrate with these several unlikes. But we suspend the action of segregation from operating amongst these several unlikes—Individualists, Communists; Trade Unionists, anti-Trade Unionists; Direct Actionists, Passive Resisters—merely because they all endeavour to pass current as a “like” by the simple process of stamping their various different wares with the same mark, *i.e.*, Anarchy.

Of course, there are many who are of the opinion that the difference between the two social concepts under discussion is largely a matter of unfinished thinking, and really exists only in the imagination; but the more general view is that there is a real difference, carrying with it an unavoidable antagonism. It is from this understanding that controversy is possible; and convinced of the material difference, I intrude upon the discussion with the suggestion that two things of such an unlike character cannot be brought under or comprehended by the term “Anarchy,” a term which *does not* admit of a double interpretation.

If a certain social concept *is* Anarchy, then all other social concepts different from this certain one cannot be Anarchy. That is a simple truism. It would be well if it were always kept in mind that Anarchy is an *effect* and not a cause. Anarchy will not cause Individualism, nor will it cause Communism. It will not do these things simply because an abstraction cannot be an operating factor. The operating factor in determining freedom will be something concrete and practical. It will be the method upon which the individuals composing society will decide to carry on economic and social intercourse. (It is, of course, true that there are several antecedent causes of the economic mode, but they are severally too remote to deal with, and do not affect this discussion.) Should the economic method decided upon be Communism, what would be the unavoidable political effect? Would it be Anarchy? If the decision favoured Individualism, would that result in Anarchy? The correct answers to these questions would go far in finally separating the unlike and bringing together the like, thus effecting Anarchist integration. Also, if they would bring a welcome end to the confused thought and inactivity resulting from the thoughtless endeavour to reconcile the two, many in the movement will look hopefully once more for the birth of a virile and active organisation with a tangible, unambiguous object in life.

I have never heard of or read a concise definition of Individualism. It is seemingly too vast a concept to be held within the limits of an ordinary definition, for in self-explanation it has encroached upon the space room of several volumes without once boiling itself down to a statement of its first principles, *always substituting in lieu thereof a definition of Anarchy*. It is, in discussion, best to tie ourselves down to something definite, and so limit as much as possible ambiguity as to what is attacked or upheld. To do this, I will submit the following, with the reminder to the reader that it is what the definition embraces that is being attacked.

Individualism: basis (economic), free access to everything; (political) free individual. Structure: individual control of economic activity; or, not Communistic. Communism is exactly the same in basis, but differs radically in structure, which is, communal control of economic activity.

Individualism, in embracing, as it must, the definition (a favourable one) put forward, is, to me, unthinkable. It admits only of verbal construction, and cannot be transformed into reality. Assuming the (questionable) possibility of a primitive individual existence to be outside contemplation by the modern man, and confining ourselves to the fact that men require association and the comforts which it brings, it will be seen that Communism, being the factor in the continuity of life, is unavoidable once all adverse economic restrictions are consciously abolished. For all who desire to approximate to a provisioned condition of comfort and well-being must of necessity—it being beyond individual effort—come together for its realisation. Whether the individuals thus of necessity uniting for a common purpose associate as “Individualists,” or under any other label, the fact remains that in this coming together they would immediately and inevitably establish Communism—that is, if the principles of liberty were in action.

It may be rightly observed by the man who is content to wallow in abstraction, that a condition of freedom implies that an individual is free to do just as he likes. He may, for instance, wish *not* to associate, to avoid Communistic endeavour, and to declare himself independent of communal effort for the several commodities necessary to his existence. And, given freedom, who can say him nay? This is quite correct; he cannot be forced by man *not* to do these things. The man thus *acting* is the only true Individualist; all others not acting in a like manner are Communists. But do these several wishes involve reality? I think not. The man may *declare* his independence, but actually that is as far as he may go. He is “forced” into communal dependence for bread in much the same manner as he is “forced” to depend upon his digestive apparatus to render the bread fit for assimilation. Through the operation of several factors—some only remotely, and some not, controllable—man is *not* free to act just as he may wish, and foremost amongst the determining factors is *individual* limitation. Nature and the ages have endowed man with a physical and mental equipment that effectually puts an end to aspirations that rely solely upon individual activity for their realisation. Another prominent factor is what is sometimes called “economic determinism.” The only *method* of production we know of is social production: this determines that all who eat and live are dependent upon social activity. Until we find a method of production other than social, all must remain dependent and “controlled,” irrespective of wish. Numerous other factors operate against the real declaration of independence, including the demand and satisfaction of the various desires the aggregate of which is *life*. So then actually when exploitation is a thing of the past, the individual who attempts to transform a declaration of independence into reality would simply hurry along his demise through unfitness. *He*, of course, would be at liberty to do this; but *Anarchists* are chiefly concerned with a life-theory, and not one conducive to extinction.

But we have the actual Individualist as distinguished from the imaginary one just contemplated, who, in the attempt to establish his “not necessarily Communistic” doctrines, has introduced “theories” and suggestions which are shown upon examination to be diametrically opposed to the basic principle of Anarchy—no government. For instance, his banking systems (why banking systems in a condition of economic equality, would be hard to explain) presuppose a number of privileged persons philanthropically concerning themselves with the wants of the unprivileged. Whence came the privileged persons and the unprivileged? Do not these classes form the pillars of the structure of inequality, therefore government? Then we are told about “free competition,” which asks for an open market for all commodities, including labour, prison room, and policemen. You can even buy judges and jurors at the “best article for the lowest price.” The first necessary condition about this arrangement (excluding for the nonce all the perfectly admissible observations on the nonsense of the introduction of policemen, judges, and prisons in a free society) is that there are people ready to sell and others able to buy. When came the wealth of the buying persons? How the absence of wealth in the bought persons? If Labour is still obliged to sell its power, and police and prison still flourish, then freedom is *non est*. For it is an incontrovertible fact that labour as a commodity, policemen, etc., are the logical and inevitable results of Capitalism. Government is inseparable from economic inequality, and the Individualists sneakily recognise this. They see that in order to perpetuate their hold on property, a “protective agency” is required. But while they deny the right of a national Government to supply this “protection,” they subscribe to the idea of private Government. All this involves the question: from whom are they to be protected? Which shows just how much “free access” there is here.

The ideas of the Individualists are, in short, merely a Utopian rehash of the modern political and economic subservience of the many to the few, and would have a fitting meaningless name if termed “Free Capitalism.” Therefore, the man who sincerely strives for economic and political equality—*i.e.*, Anarchism—must necessarily antagonise Individualism, which produces not Anarchy, but Government.

Everything, let me repeat, is produced socially. Unless one is in the position to demand the result of communal labour without taking part in communal labour, one is “forced” to be a Communist. It is as reasonable to cry out against being “forced” to be a Communist as it would be to cry out against being “forced” to stand on the earth when you would wish to jump into the moon. Communism, meaning free access to everything, destroys Government, both in the abstract and the concrete. The *idea* of Government is foreign to the man with *free* access to all things, and actual Government exists only where there is economic inequality. Communism, therefore, is the only mode of human aggregation that can bring about Anarchy. Anarchy, therefore, is inseparable from Communism.—Fraternally yours,

JOHN NICHOLSON.

RENT CANNOT BE ABOLISHED.

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

Dear Comrade—Mr. Wm. J. Robins, in his article on “Work and Wealth,” allows his animus of Single Taxers to warp his judgment. After clearly showing that all wealth is the result of labour applied to land, and that the “lords of the land” rob us of at least three-fourths of our wages, he says that if we tax these lords they will sell their land and buy shares! Shares in what? Who will buy their land if it is taxed to the full extent of its value? Also, what earthly good would it do the landlord—providing he was able—to put up the rent of his taxed land if all the rent is appropriated by the community?

If Mr. Robins looks squarely at this matter—in the light of his own teaching—he will recommend the people to *pay no taxes*. If a man pays no rent, then he becomes a landowner. If he pays no taxes, then the community will collect the rent—a community-earned product, now appropriated by private individuals—and so discharge community expenses.

It is ridiculous of Mr. Robins to say that we must abolish rent. He might as well say we must abolish men and women, for where there are men and women there always will be rent (land value). As long as we dwell in communities there must be public charges, and rent is the only just method of defraying the charges.

To appropriate rent by taxation will be to destroy the selling price of land—a very different thing to rent. When we have done that—and not before—there will be no landlords, any more than there are now landlords or waterlords.

As a true Anarchist, who seeks to arrive by what I conceive to be the only way—the abrogation of the buying and selling of natural opportunities for the satisfaction of human desires—the attitude of certain Anarchists to the Single Tax is a puzzle to me. I can only suppose that they have not yet mastered Henry George’s great classic, “Progress and Poverty.”

St. Annes-on-the-Sea.

Yours fraternally,

JOHN BAGOT.

NEW PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO MAX STIRNER.

Of late years, mainly by fortunate discoveries made by Dr. Gustav Mayer, quite a number of unknown and anonymously published writings by the author of “The Ego and His Own”—a pamphlet, articles and correspondence (1842 to 1848)—have come to light and been reprinted (in part) in scattered German reviews. These contributions will be included in John Henry Mackay’s second edition of Max Stirner’s “Kleinere Schriften” (Minor Writings), of which Mackay is preparing a preliminary edition for subscribers only (100 copies, at £1 each).

Mackay is also rewriting his “Life” of Max Stirner, embodying the numerous new materials, as well as a facsimile of the only manuscript which has ever been found of Max Stirner. Of this only a private edition will be issued (325 copies, at £1 each).

Subscribers should write to the author, who is his own publisher in this case—Mr. J. H. Mackay, Berliner Strasse 166, Charlottenburg bei Berlin, Germany.

LITTLE LIBERTARIANS.

The *Daily News* of May 21 gives an account of an experiment which, if its deep significance was understood and acted upon by the wiseacres who are so busy trying to "reform" the world by coercion, would bring about a revolution in the education of the young. And such a revolution would cost a great deal more than one-and-fourpence to insure the present rotten capitalist system that kills children as indiscriminately as grown-ups, against the grand advantages that liberty offers humanity from birth to death.

Tempting as the subject is to write upon, we will say no more for the present, but give as fully as possible the description from the *Daily News*, as nothing could be more eloquent than this simple narration of an actually accomplished fact.

It seems, then, that the "Mitre," an old disused "pub," was noted by Dr. Harry Roberts, of Stepney, as affording accommodation for the carrying out of a plan which he propounded to Mrs. Waldorf Astor. This was simply the idea of a club for infants; and now let us learn, mark, and inwardly digest the moral of the following description:—

Miss Brahms takes charge of about twenty babies, who are brought to the club by their seniors when on the way to school. Their elders call for them when on the way home. But the joke is—most parents won't believe this—that the lady in charge does as little as possible for the youngsters except to see they do things for themselves.

"Well, it was a bit disastrous at the start," admitted Miss Brahms, casually.

"It was," said Dr. Roberts, grimly; "but you see," added the doctor, "all the kiddies were alike to begin with. It was hard to tell one from the other at the start. But in a few weeks each has developed a distinct character, and they all maintain, on their own account, a very good order, with complete liberty of individual action. Watch them get their own dinner ready!"

At a signal on the piano, the nippers idled off—or ran; they suited themselves—to the scullery, and presently appeared carrying tablecloths, stacks of plates and basins, and in a very matter-of-fact and creditable way got their little tables in order.

It just happened. Some did more than others because they liked doing it—notably George, a fair young Saxon, who ought to make a fine boatswain some day; and Kimi (as near as the visitor could make the name), who is a very fascinating little Japanese flirt, aged six.

George got on a stool, and, aided by a shrewd little Jew (about four years of age), portioned out fish and potatoes with awful impartiality. Both were terribly fair in their judgment of what was right. Two or three others made the distribution.

"There were some smashes at first," said Miss Brahms, reminiscently. "But they don't want much attention at all now. They have acquired the handkerchief habit, and are even ostentatious about it."

"Only one of the crowd now licks his plate, but I rather fancy he has got the action somehow mixed up virtuously with our advice about cleanliness, so I have to be careful how I interfere."

After dinner the nippers washed themselves carefully, indicating the fact in a perfectly friendly way if a club member was using the wrong tooth brush, and then each hauled out a mattress, and took a well-earned nap.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

(June 5—July 2.)

FREEDOM Guarantee Fund.—W. G. Orr 5s, S. Corio 1s 6d, H. Glasse 7s 6d.

FREEDOM Subscriptions.—J. Dick 1s 6d, Paul 1s 6d, K. Wei 1s 6d, R. C. Poulter 1s 4d, J. Weinberger 1s 8d, J. Boltuck 1s 6d, C. A. Ohn 1s 6d, J. Meyers 1s 6d.

TWO NEW BOOKS FROM U.S.A.

The Social Significance of the Modern Drama.

By EMMA GOLDMAN.

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

Selected Works of Voltairine de Cleyre.

Edited by ALEXANDER BERKMAN.

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

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.

B. RUDERMAN, 71 Hanbury Street, Spitalfields, E.

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

QUICKFALLS, 238 York Road, and 61 High Street, Battersea, S.W.

ISENBURG, Cleveland Street, W.

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

J. WINTERS, 196 Church Road, Willesden, N.W.

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.

M. ROBERT, 86 Grosvenor Street, Corner of Brook Street.

Modern Library, 56 Oxford Street.

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*.

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 1913 ... 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.

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.

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. ½d.

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.

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

ANARCHY. By ANDRE GIRARD. ½d.

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

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

DUTY OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE. By H. Thoreau. 3d.

ANARCHISM AND MALTHEUS. 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.

LAND AND LIBERTY: MEXICO'S BATTLE FOR ECONOMIC FREEDOM.

4d.; postage, 1d.

FOR LIBERTY: An Anthology of Revolt. Cloth 7d., paper 3d.

WOMAN'S FREEDOM. By Lily Gair Wilkinson. 1d.

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

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

FIELDS, FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. New and Revised Edition. Cloth, 1s. 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.

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.