

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM

VOL. XXII.—No. 230.

JUNE, 1908.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

NOTES.

Mrs. Partington Again.

The gentleman who as First Commissioner of Works exercises some control over public meetings in Hyde Park must be of a capricious temperament judging by his action on May Day last. After having officially given permission to the Anarchists to have a van in the Park, this "permission" was withdrawn at the last moment, viz., by the first post on May 1. "First she would and then she wouldn't" occurs to one's mind as the likely explanation of this perversity; but no doubt the real one is a sudden remembrance that Anarchists would speak from the van and the official mind said to itself, "This shall not be." And lo! it was not.

As our readers will see in another column, large and sympathetic meetings of protest were held in the Park; so that what Mr. "Lulu" Harcourt of "liberal" mind succeeded in doing was to deprive the Anarchists of their van as a punishment for being Anarchists. Later the information was given that all this was done "in the exercise of the authority vested in him," and that "he is not disposed to give any reasons for his action."

Liberalism and Liberty.

Amongst the many new political developments that are now taking place nothing is clearer than the fact that many of the "rising young men" in the Liberal Party are quite out of touch with Liberalism of the old school, and are, moreover, ignorant of the historical significance of the party to which they belong. For all that, they do not advance towards Radicalism; they are turning towards Imperialism, for this way lies the field for their ambitions. In reality, they are playing at being Napoleons, these would-be "men of destiny." They will do some mischief, doubtless; but they are too effeminate: destiny will crush them.

That Liberalism has stood for something definite and intelligible in the development of the English nation is matter of history, although these presumptuous young politicians with their "University educations" are ignorant of what it was. Let them learn if they can. For the moment it will suffice to quote the words of one who understood what Liberalism really meant, and whose works have helped progress far more than these neophytes will ever impede it. The following words of Thorold Rogers are particularly applicable at the present moment:—

"It is only when a Government which has been brought into power by liberal opinion plays false with its principles, or declines to develop its policy, or makes ignoble alliances, or affronts the convictions of those who have made it what it is, that the progress of liberal opinion is arrested, and its vigour is paralysed."

Labour and the Lock-Out.

The "trouble," as it is called, between the shipbuilding firms and their employees seems to be ending in disaster for the men. For it is a disaster that the masters should have the power to inflict a reduction on those they have been robbing all their lives. But there is a great deal to be said about this struggle which has not been said by those who either play the official game or choose to condemn the men.

It is obvious that the tactics of the leaders have been woefully wrong. Consciously or unconsciously, they play into the hands of the masters. To allow the capitalist to choose the fighting ground and the hour of the fight is to court defeat. Add to this all the weeks of uncertainty that dishearten the men while the leaders and mischievous politicians are negotiating with the employers, and it is clear as daylight that the men's chance has gone and the Unions are mere shuttlecocks in the masters' little game. The deplorable stupidity of the leaders and the lack of "fight" in the men will always leave the employer master of the situation.

Going Astray.

How is it that powerful Unions like those of the engineers and the shipyard hands should go down like ninepins before the tactics of the masters? Here is a question that every worker in England should be asking himself, since his well-being depends far more on his intelligent understanding of it than on all the voting he may do till Doomsday. The answer is not far to seek. The Trade Unions have been going astray ever since they attached more importance to politics than to the economic struggle. All this nonsense about arbitration, boards of conciliation, and the rest is the jugglery that deceives the worker and delights the officials and the exploiting classes.

Wanted, Initiative.

At the same time, political action is utterly destroying every particle of initiative amongst the workers.—The consideration of one fact alone will make this clear. Every one knows why the men have accepted the masters' terms. It is because they cannot live without bread, and their cupboards were getting empty. But suppose instead of simply folding their hands these men had used their funds and their labour force in producing food for themselves. Would the masters so easily have brought them to their knees? And besides the material advantage, there is the vast moral gain to be considered. For the men would have twice the spirit in them if they had something to do, and something, above all, that meant hope. "A sheer impracticable dream," we shall be told. But the "Ken's Kabin" girls did not find it so hard to make a beginning in this direction; and if the men who can build ironclads and the giant liners of the Atlantic cannot co-operate to supply their own bread, well, let them begin to learn without delay.

The Art and Craft of Government.

When folks say we could not get on without government, we wonder if they really understand what the functions of government consist of. They repeat all that has been pumped into them from childhood upwards as to the necessity of law, with judges, soldiers, police, etc., to protect life and property, to administer justice, and so on. But unfortunately they do not reason over things to discover if they are actually consistent with all they are told. If they did, they would find that government is at the bottom of nearly all the mischief that is going on in the world; for after all it only means that a few cunning, ambitious, and unscrupulous men are lording it over the rest of mankind. As an instance, take what the *Daily News* says is being done by government in India:—

Meanwhile the development of terrorism in Bengal has made the work of Indian reform no easier, while it has rendered it immensely more urgent. It is easy to guess at some of its causes. Great hopes were aroused by the appointment of Mr. Morley. The Indian leaders remembered the veneration with which as students they read his essays on the history of democratic ideas. His decision not to modify the partition of Bengal, followed as it was by several arbitrary acts of repression, gave a severe shock to their hopes. We in this country heard the central facts about these deportations and prosecutions. But behind these public acts there has been an immense development of obscure police persecution. The Indian police on Lord Curzon's own admission is not above the suspicion of corruption. Where one leader was deported, a score were terrorised and blackmailed by spies and informers. The Post Office habitually opens letters, even when they are addressed to leaders of indisputable loyalty. These persecutions have been quite indiscriminate, and even Lajpat Rai, who was deported without trial, turned out at the Congress to be one of the Moderate leaders. The flogging of youths in Calcutta for political offences has produced the result which we might expect. A lad of fifteen who has endured this humiliation is only too likely to devote the rest of his life to vengeance, and meanwhile he has brothers and older comrades who share his anger. It is significant that the only bomb outrage which is quite certainly genuine was directed against the magistrate who ordered these floggings. When we add to these recent causes of unrest the permanent provocations to bitterness—the difficulty of obtaining equal justice between Europeans and natives, the brutality of tone which Anglo-Indian society affects towards "natives," the almost total want of kindly and human relations between the bureaucracy and the subject races, and the sense of impotence which paralyses men capable of great work for their country—we cannot be surprised at the swift growth of a violent nationalist opposition, ready to adopt all the weapons which the "intellectuals" of Russia employ against Czarism.

Let Governmentalists take this to heart.

ANARCHISTS AND THE INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE, ESPERANTO.

BY EM. CHAPELIER AND GASSY MARIN.

Report presented to the International Anarchist Congress at Amsterdam, August, 1907.

In our opinion, Anarchists have manifold reasons for subscribing to the idea of an international language, that is to say, of a language that would put the nations into direct communication with each other. Unfortunately, time does not allow of our making here a thorough study of all these reasons, and we shall confine ourselves to indicating the two chief.

The first reason is purely sociological. Let us suppose that the children of all the nations, or even of those which are in the forefront of civilisation, were to enter into possession of such a language; that they were able to understand one another, to exchange without any intermediary their ideas, their sentiments, their aspirations. Would not a vast, an immense step have been taken towards the demolition of the fictitious frontiers which separate them?

Unfortunately we have not yet arrived at that point, and in our opinion it is of the greatest importance that all who have in their hearts the love of humanity should consecrate a part of their fighting power to spread around them the knowledge of this new revolutionary weapon. For let us not forget, if man can traverse in a few moments the highest mountains of Europe or of America; if he can cross the most tempestuous seas more rapidly than the giants of the ocean world; if, thanks to electricity, he can cause his thought to make thrice the tour of the earth in less than a second; if, in a word, all the means of rapid communication which we actually possess have reduced material distances to fantastic proportions, the most terrible intellectual and moral distances always exist. This regrettable fact has several causes, among which we must note the multiplicity and difficulty of all the living languages. In a few hours we are transported from Brussels to Berlin, but the difference of language makes it impossible for us to fraternise with our Berlin brethren. "Learn German," says some one. But of what use would German be any more than French in England, Spain, Italy, or China? And if we suppose—absurd idea—that each person knows at least a dozen languages, would not our planet still remain a Tower of Babel?

We therefore conclude that it is necessary to adopt a common auxiliary language in order to hasten the *rapprochement* which, little by little, by natural means, is surely being brought about between all human beings.

The second reason which demands from us Anarchists the adoption, and therefore the study, of such a language, is rather a question of tactics, a means of fighting. The difficulty of carrying on a discussion in an assembly such as this constitutes an unanswerable argument on our side. How much precious time is lost in translating the speeches, how many arguments are fatally injured, and how many ideas lose their point in passing from one language to another! How many comrades who would have become friends, are obliged to separate without having been able to speak to each other! On the other hand, how much time would be saved, how many *ententes* (understandings) easy to realise, what exactness there would be in the ideas that we exchange, if we could all express ourselves in a common tongue!

To follow another line of thought, what facilities there would be for our militant comrades in their work of educating the people! To-day the greater part of our comrades of the people know what is going on beyond the frontier only from the information, for the most part false, supplied by the daily Press, which, as everybody knows, is in the pay of capitalists, bureaucrats, and "those who have arrived" of all sorts.

The use of an international language would enable the militant spirits among us to furnish each other with information in special reviews on all branches of revolutionary activity carried on in all parts of the world.

Then what loneliness, misery, sorrow, and despair would be spared to deserters, to military defaulters, to persecuted propagandists, to all the victims of reactionary fury, if in any country in which they took refuge they could, thanks to a common language, find themselves in a new family, among comrades in the struggle.

The ideas we have just expressed are not new. This propaganda has already been carried on for several years by a few enthusiasts who have known how to brave the ridicule which attaches to all new ideas, all new ways, even in the world of Anarchism! To-day their efforts are rewarded, for in spite of

all obstacles, material and moral, they have succeeded in founding and making live an excellent monthly review, which has correspondents and readers in all parts of the civilised world. We refer to the *Internacia Socia Revuo*,* so well edited by revolutionary Esperantists.

We hope that this brief statement of the question will suffice to convince all reasonable minds.

Now let us examine the subject from another point of view.

When one has assented to the idea of a common auxiliary language, one may still be puzzled by the multitude of solutions proposed. Since the fifteenth century, to go no further back, there have been about 180 projects, more or less different, for such a language, and even to-day there are several before the "Delegation" for the choice of an International Language."

For us Anarchists, who take knowledge and reason as our only guides, whatever the decision of that assembly, it can only have a very limited value. Truth prevails; it is not dictated to.

For this reason we believe that we ought to call attention to the different principles which underlie the different systems actually brought forward.

We can recognise among the partisans of an international language the same conditions of mind as in the social and political struggle.

(1) At the extreme right are the Chauvinist Conservatives, who in their ignorance believe themselves to be the centre of the universe. Idolaters of what they call their "Fatherland," they will not recognise for others, practically at least, the right of existence. Their country is the most beautiful and the most important in the world; it alone has a past, it alone a future. Their language is the richest, the most flexible, the most musical, the most logical, the easiest, the most widely spread; and according to the corner of the earth where they were born, they wish to impose on all nations the French, the English, the German, or other tongue. But if the inveterate Nationalist wishes to impose his language on all nations, it is not only for the honour of the national rag which Gustave Hervé has thrown on the rubbish-heap; it is also because that would favour his senseless dreams of universal domination, and perhaps also because revolutionaries could never use it as a weapon; because, in fact, no matter which of the above-named tongues is chosen, it presents such difficulties that the study of it is quite impossible for the greater part of the proletariat. For example, the rules which govern the change of the adjective into a substantive, of the verb into a substantive, of the adjective into a verb, etc., are so complex and would render the grammars so voluminous, difficult, and expensive, that it has been preferred to suppress them at the risk of encumbering the dictionaries with some thousands of supplementary words to be learnt by heart. But the mind has been so deformed by a long, wearisome, and false education that a man ends by taking the idiocies of his language for the riches of its grammar; and as he is wanting in the critical faculty, he persuades himself of the wealth of his vocabulary.

Lastly, from the point of view which preoccupies us, another grave fault inherent in the living languages is that they clash fatally with all Chauvinisms except their own national one, and on this account it would be much more difficult to agree on the choice of a living language than of one that is artificial and neutral.

(2) Further to the left we meet with the Liberals, who represent the so-styled "enlightened" middle classes. Their mind is obscured, we may even say deformed, by classical studies. They are those who, whenever an invention or discovery is made, hasten, not to examine the use to which it can be put in the future, but to seek its origin in the intricacies of Greek and Latin authors.

Moreover, the idea of an international language only makes them think of the language of Julius Caesar, an illustrious bandit who one day had the folly to believe himself to be the Emperor of the Universe. And as they are "men of progress" (just as was Clemenceau), they wish to resuscitate the Latin, just as the Theosophists wish to revive the dreams of Buddha. We believe that the same future lies before both.

In spite of the suppression of a considerable number of grammatical rules, which of itself renders the neo-Latin much easier than living languages, we are forced to say that from its origin it falls under the same criticism: there is a glut of words to be learned by heart, a want of flexibility in the expression of shades of meaning and the formation of derivatives. And on the other hand, if it does not owe support to patriotic prejudice, it owes it to racial prejudice, and therefore it offends against the Chauvinism of the Slavs, Germans, etc.

(To be continued next month.)

THE FAILURE AND FARCE OF PARLIAMENT.

BY GUY A. ALDRED.

(Concluded from No. 229.)

Turning from the case of Mr. Macdonald, we find that at Halifax Mr. James Parker obtained a Labour victory by making a compact with the Liberals, and advising his supporters to give one vote to Mr. Whitley, the Liberal candidate; whilst the Labour Representation Committee opposed the introduction of a Socialist candidate (Bramley) in East Manchester on the ground that this would injure the prospects of Messrs. J. R. Clynes and G. D. Kelley, the respective successful candidates of the Labour Party in North-East and South-West Manchester, owing to an arrangement with the Liberal Party that Labour candidates should not be opposed in these two divisions if the other Manchester and Salford divisions were not contested by the Labour Party. As a further result of this compact, the prospective nominee of the I.L.P. for West Salford withdrew some time before the General Election.

Of the Labour Members for the two Manchester constituencies thus referred to, Mr. G. D. Kelley has explained at Hulme that he did not wish to see the Government wrecked by the introduction of an unacceptable Licensing Bill, and also that he was not a Socialist. In addition to this, he had his expenses paid to Switzerland and back by those friends of Labour, the National Service League, in conjunction with Mr. J. T. Macpherson, the Labour Member for Preston, and Mr. J. A. Seddon, Labour Member for Newton. Mr. J. R. Clynes, M.P., speaking also at Hulme, said Socialism was a long way off, and they had to work for immediate reforms, whilst he had previously expressed himself as being in agreement with a practical working policy with the Liberal Party.

Messrs. D. Shackleton, Labour M.P. for Clitheroe, and A. H. Gill, M.P. for Bolton, and President of the Trade Union Congress for 1907, are both opposed to the securing of better conditions for the "sweated children" and "half-timers" in the textile industries, since, as they explained at the Belfast Conference of the Labour Party, if it were insisted that they should initiate or support legislation to this effect, they would lose their seats, and the societies they represented would withdraw from the Labour Party, which would involve withdrawal of their payment of £900 a year to the Labour Party funds. In addition, the former states that the Labour Party has had experience of two Governments, as a result of which he feels it incumbent on him to state that the atmosphere of the House of Commons has changed, the Labour Party finding itself to-day, with very rare exceptions, supporting measures brought in by the Government which are in the right direction.

Mr. Arthur Henderson, M.P. for the Barnard Castle division of Durham—whose transition from Liberalism to Labourism resembles strangely the metamorphosis of Mr. J. R. Macdonald, with whose name he couples his own, together with those of Messrs. Shackleton and Gill, as signatories to the barmaid memorial to which reference has already been made—has so far been loyal to the conditions of the Labour Party constitution as to become a committee-man of the Nonconformist Party in the Commons, in addition to writing articles on the Labour movement for a Liberal news agency, and rejoicing in the declaration that the Labour Party contained more religiously inclined persons and took the pulpit oftener on Sunday than any other section of politicians. And he has further declared that, in spite of the House of Lords, there remains to the credit of the present Liberal Government an output of legislation benefiting the condition of the millions they represent greater than ever had been accomplished by any Session of Parliament.

Then there is Mr. Philip Snowden, M.P., who believes in Christian Socialism, and dreads lest the introduction of Tariff Reform should ruin Liverpool. In more than one local paper he has assured Liberals of his sympathy with Mr. John Burns's difficulties, and mildly protested against the latter's offensive attitude in the Commons towards the Labour Party. Mr. Pete Curran, Jarrow's Socialist Member, has earnestly entreated all parties in the House, including the Government, to prevent the possibility of revolution in this country. Nor can we ignore the fact that from Mr. Macpherson to Mr. Seddon, including, of course, the inevitable Will Crooks, the Labour Party congratulates itself on its exceptional proportion of P.S.A. workers and teetotal advocates, as also on its belief that "Christ died to adjust social inequalities," and thus implied the duty of his disciples to subscribe to the Labour Party's constitution. Again we have "the notorious fact that almost every member of the Labour Party belongs either to the Established Church or to one of the

great bodies of Nonconformity." If this be overlooked, we do not forget the case of Mr. Jas. Holmes, the Labour candidate for West Hull, who endeavoured to drop his Socialism during the election, despite the fact that that "uncompromising and revolutionary body," the S.D.P., vied with the I.L.P. in his support. And again Mr. Hill, the Socialist candidate for Kirkdale, appealed to Nonconformity for support and reliance on the assurance to the electorate of Mr. Stephen Walsh, Labour M.P. for Ince, Fancs., that the Labour Party "would not confiscate the land or rob the landlords, but they would soon be in a position to say to the privileged classes, 'So far and no farther!'" If these facts be relegated to the vortex of oblivion, as they assuredly deserve to be, one cannot overlook the testimony of the late Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, M.P., in a speech at Liverpool on September 24, 1907, in which he stated that "as to the Labour Party, they had every reason to be proud of those who had been sent to Parliament. They had done their work loyally and fairly, and he did not regard the Labour Members as by any means the most dangerous section in the House of Commons." Add to this the sympathy which Liberal organs like the *London Daily Chronicle*, the *Daily News*, and the *Manchester Guardian* never tire of evincing towards the Labour Party; and Mr. Winston Churchill's description of the Trade Union movement underlying this party's activity as the great social bulwark; plus the statement of the S.D.P. executive, in an appeal for money, that, in defining its policy on social and economic questions, the Labour Party is forced to proceed on Socialist lines; and Mr. Will Thorne's description, at the Labour Party's Conference on unemployment, of the party's Unemployed Bill, with its penal clause and his personal backing; as only playing with the question,—add these things together, and also Mr. Thorne's evasion alike of the rules of the S.D.P. and the Labour Party, and the desire of the I.L.P. not to "unduly tax the capitalist system," to quote Mr. H. Russell Smart, of that party, and a fair index is obtained to the "revolutionary aspirations" of the political Socialist and Labour Parties.

For the rest, Mr. Victor Grayson, M.P., of Colne Valley and Belfast broken bottle fame, since the S.D.P. has praised him for his revolutionary activities, has denounced "the esoteric philosophic ramblings of Belfort Bax and the exotics of Karl Marx," and declared that not revolution but a fairer Labour representation was wanted. And Mr. Herbert Burrows is prospective Parliamentary S.D.P. candidate for Haggerston should the Liberal party abstain from putting a candidate in the field; whilst J. F. Green, after having been adopted by the local branches as Parliamentary candidate for Rossendale, was withdrawn by the S.D.P. executive, as "they do not think it wise to put up a candidate against Mr. 'Lulu' Harcourt, as he is about the only member of the present Liberal Government who has added prestige to his name." Without consulting the party, who had sanctioned his adoption at their annual conference, the executive caused him to become prospective candidate for South Bristol. All of which, together with the party's wavering at the polls from time to time, is suggestive of political corruption and bribery, in its turn conclusive evidence of the rottenness of political Socialism and Parliamentary Labourism. From which the reader who thinks may well conclude that as Parliamentary progress reflects economic power, there is no hope for the workers so long as they place their trust in politicians, whose place in the Pantheon of history is by the side of priests and princes and other parasites of like social growth.

THE HYPOCRISY OF POLITICS.

"There is no doubt that politics is the science of hypocrisy," says the *Star*. "The politician lives in a hot bath of humbug. He seldom dares to face reality. . . . If all the politicians in London were to begin to say what they think, what a shock we should receive." What a dreadful explosion of Anarchist truth from a paper that has done as much as the vilest of the Yellow Press to malign Anarchism. And the funniest thing of all is that the *Star* has been advising its readers for the last twenty years to elect a certain set of these hypocrites and humbugs—these noodles who cannot "face reality"—these cowards who never say what they think—and have them make the laws for the comparatively honest population they have the impertinence to attempt to govern. Judging by the *Star*, it would almost seem that people who would send these "hypocrites" and "humbugs" to the rightabout had some sense and reason on their side. Is the *Star* prepared to give that amount of credit to the Anarchists? Or because we speak the truth are we to be regarded as outlaws of a society founded on the morals of the politicians? If so, will the *Star* join us?

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

Monthly, One Penny; post free, 1½d.; U.S.A., 3 Cents; France, 15 Centimes.

Annual Subscription, post free, 1s. 6d.; U.S.A., 36 Cents; France, 1fr. 80c.
Foreign subscriptions should be sent by International Money Order.

Wholesale price, 1s. 6d. per quire of 26 post-free in the United Kingdom.

All communications, exchanges, &c., to be addressed to:

THE MANAGER, 127 Ossulston Street, N.W.

The Editors are not necessarily in agreement with signed articles.

Notice to Subscribers.—If there is a blue mark against this notice your subscription is due, and must be sent before next month if you wish to go on receiving the paper.

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

Keep Off the Grass!

The First of May demonstration in Hyde Park has afforded the opportunity of once more showing that the only folk feared by the authorities are the Anarchists. Evidently the recent revival and continued growth of the movement has scared them. We certainly feel flattered by their intended insults. The only politics they are afraid of are those which refuse to play the game of the privileged classes. Social Democrats, and political Socialists of all kinds, have become quite respectable. They conform strictly to the politics of the established State. There can only be one outcome from such compliance: utter impotence to accomplish the change we desire. Seeing this quite clearly, it is not surprising that the "powers that be" try to hinder our propaganda. But their very efforts in this direction only help it on.

While public meetings are allowed to be held in certain parts of Hyde Park, before a van or vehicle of any kind, intended to be used as a platform, can be taken across the grass a permit has to be obtained from the Commissioner of Works. As usual, those of us connected with *Freedom* and the *Voice of Labour* applied for the permit, and it was forwarded at Comrade Keell's request. Our comrades of the Yiddish-Speaking Anarchist Federation also applied a few days before May 1. In previous years we have applied in the name of the *Voice of Labour* or *Freedom* Group. Last year we had a special *Voice of Labour* platform. And our East End comrades have applied in the name of the "Workers' Friend" Club and been allowed a platform. This year the applications were made by Comrade Keell in the name of the English Anarchists, and by the East End comrades in the name of the Yiddish Speaking Anarchist Federation. It must have been our Jewish comrades the authorities were afraid of, for a permit was sent to Comrade Keell in reply to his application, which was sent in early, as already mentioned. On the morning of the 1st of May a letter was received cancelling the permit, which was said to have been granted in error, and our Jewish comrades by the same post received a refusal to their application for a permit.

Needless to say, there is no appeal against this arbitrary refusal. But it was soon arranged that a protest meeting be held at the Marble Arch after the demonstration, and so call public attention to it. Comrade Turner, speaking for his Union at one of the official platforms, also called attention to the refusal, the feeling of the audience being altogether against such denial of fair play to all on such an occasion. The protest meeting was a most enthusiastic one, a resolution in favour of free speech being carried unanimously.

Comrade Keell made enquiries as to the reason for the refusal of the permits, but the officials would give none. Like the man with the loaded gun, they give no reasons. It is just possible that some Social Democrats belonging to the First of May Committee hinted to the police authorities that we were not wanted in the Park, not being affiliated to the committee. We remember their attitude in 1903 and 1904. But if they thought to extinguish us they made a big mistake. The protest meeting after the demonstration, together with the one held in the Park on May 24, have called attention to our ideas and movement ten times more than had we been allowed the permits on May 1. It was amusing to see the number of plain clothes police (political section) that were at the meeting on Sunday, May 24. One might have thought they feared a revolutionary outbreak. But no damage was done, the general feeling expressed by the speakers being that we ought to be thankful to Mr. "Lulu" Harcourt for making such a fool of himself and helping our

propaganda so splendidly. Mr. Harcourt is the gentleman who, as Comrade Aldred mentions in another column, the executive of the S.D.P. declined to oppose at a by-election on the ground that he was about "the only member of the present Liberal Government who has added prestige to his name." Evidently he thought that one good turn deserves another. It is a significant fact that although Mr. Harry Quelch, the editor of *Justice*, was chairman at the platform where Comrade Turner spoke, and heard him read the letters refusing the permits, no reference to the affair appeared in that paper.

To sum it all up, the authorities got scared and so refused an official permit to take a van over the grass to act as a platform. Result: Unofficial meeting several times as large as what would otherwise have been held. In addition, another enormous crowd at the protest meeting on May 24. A large number of sympathisers, and a general feeling that Anarchists have been unfairly treated. All this is to the good. We thank the Commissioner of Works for his stupidity. We bow to his folly. And the Anarchist propaganda will grow all the more actively here in London as a result of the feeling raised. We shall push home our principles and point the moral of the situation.

RELEASE OF COMRADE MCARA.

We all join in a hearty welcome to our comrade on his restoration to such liberty as the capitalist system permits. He is in excellent health, and each Sunday since his release has addressed most enthusiastic meetings at the Custom House Steps, Belfast, under the supervision of a small army of detectives and police eager to find an excuse for stopping him. He still keeps up his reputation as the best literature seller in the Kingdom, in three weeks having sold 150 *FREEDOMS* and about £2 worth of books and pamphlets. The name of John McAra will always be associated with the beginning of the Anarchist movement in Ireland. Our comrade has sent us the following account of his experiences, which we are sure will be read with great interest:—

DEAR COMRADE,—I will try to give you an account of what happened on February 17. The day previous (Sunday) I opened the meeting at 2.30, and was taken to the police station at 5 o'clock, charged with indecency. I was prepared for that charge the next morning. When my case came up, a sergeant of the Royal Irish Constabulary stepped into the witness-box and swore by the Almighty God that he would do his utmost to convict the Anarchist. Said he: "I was on duty, your worship, at the Custom House yesterday, and the prisoner was addressing a large gathering. After commenting on the King of Portugal's death, he declared that he was ready to kill the King of England if necessary." I asked him if he remembered me saying that the King of Portugal brought the disaster upon his own head by abrogating what the people considered their rights. He admitted that. Then I said: "Do you also remember me showing that the kings who interfered least with the people were in a way safe?" and I instanced the King of England. He owned that I did say that. "Then," I replied, "that makes your evidence inconsistent." He said it did not. "Well," said I, "I think it does." The magistrate reminded me that I was not there to think, and added: "I think the evidence is consistent." Then the witness continued: "Your worship, I was told that if I didn't take him away the crowd would throw him in the tide." He took me, according to this, to save me from the fury of the crowd. "Now," said I, "this crowd that you say wanted to drown me bought 11s. 7d. worth of penny papers and pamphlets, and on two previous Sundays they assisted me with collections to lift me out of monetary difficulties caused by eight mouths out of work."

The magistrate paid no attention to these replies of mine, but instead he turned round to the witness and said: "Didn't he say something about morality?" "He did, your worship." "I suppose it was too bad to be repeated in court?" "It was, your worship." Then the policeman left the box and went into the well of the court and whispered to the gentleman who conducted the case for the prosecution. With that the said gentleman gets on his heels and holds up Kropotkin's pamphlet, "Anarchism: its Philosophy and Ideal." Now, he was appealing to the bigotry of those around, for, as you know, the word "Anarchism" is in large letters. I challenged them on it, and told the court that Kropotkin's pamphlets giving a definition of Anarchism appeared in a high-class English magazine, the *Nineteenth Century*. That squashed him, but his worship took no notice. The truth is, his mind was made up before he entered the court. He wanted to know if I was going to call evidence in my defence. I told him that the police made sure I should have no witnesses, for when they took me into the office several men desired to speak for me, and wanted to put their names down; but the police would not allow them to enter, and I was compelled to pass the night in the cell. They would not take bail. None of all this was noticed by his worship. Then I got what the victims call my "dolltip."

I used to be amused reading the speeches of Irishmen denouncing the magistracy and R.I.C. I used to imagine they were liberal with the brush. The Scotch police are as great liars as the R.I.C., but they

are held in check by the magistrates. A policeman's word in Scotland has to be well corroborated, and there are magistrates that the police are afraid of. Not so here. One R.I.C. is enough; there is no doubt put on his word. Instead of that, the magistrate assists him by calling to his mind what he has forgotten, as he did in my case with the morality question. Now, I think I have a right to an opinion about the Irish Peelers and magistrates, and here it is. If my experience of them is a fair sample, then the Twelve Disciples and the tribes of Israel, and all the other tribes of land, sea, and air could not furnish anything to equal in treachery the magistracy and constabulary of Ireland.

Now my liberty depends wholly on the good nature or interest of the R.I.C. Any Sunday, if they want to, they can rob me of it. All that's required is to take me to the lock-up and charge me with anything they have a mind for, then give what evidence they think will suit the charge. Whenever a policeman opens his mouth in the witness-box, the magistrate opens his on the bench and swallows everything.

Yours fraternally,

JOHN McARA.

Belfast, May 23.

THE REFORMED SCHOOL.

(Letter from P. Kropotkin to F. Ferrer, founder of the new review, *L'Ecole Rénovée*.)

DEAR COMRADE AND FRIEND,

I am very glad to note that you are about to issue *L'Ecole Rénovée* (the Reformed School), regretting but one thing: that I am unable to give it all the assistance I would.

Everything has to be begun over again in the schools of the present day. Above all, education in the true sense of the word: that is to say, the formation of the moral being, the active individual, full of initiative, enterprise, courage, freed from that timidity of thought which is the distinctive feature of the educated man of your period—and at the same time sociable, communistic by instinct, equal with and capable of feeling his equality with every man throughout the universe; starting emancipated from the religious, narrowly individualistic, authoritarian, etc., principles which the school inculcates.

As regards all this, the work of the most perfect school will almost certainly be always paralysed so long as the family and society operate in opposite directions. But the school must react against these two factors, and can do so through the personal influence of those who teach and the manner in which they teach.

To ensure this, we must evidently, step by step, create a new exposition of all the sciences: concrete, in place of the present metaphysical expositions; social—"associated," if I may employ the term—in place of individualistic; and "popular" expositions, from the point of view of the people, instead of that of the leisured classes, which at present dominates all science, and especially our books of instruction.

For history, social economy evidently, no one doubts it. But the same holds good for every science: biology, the physiology of living creatures in general, psychology, and even for the exposition of physics and mathematics. Take, for example, astronomy. What a difference when it was taught from the geocentric point of view to what it became when conceived and taught from the heliocentric standpoint, or to what it will be when taught from the point of view of the infinitely small, travelling through space and producing through incessant collision, celestial harmonies. Or, take mathematics when taught as simple logical deductions of signs which have lost their original meaning, and, remaining signs only, are treated as entities, to when they will be taught as simplified expressions of facts which are life infinite and infinitely varied even in Nature. I shall never forget the way in which our great mathematician, Tchebycheff, taught us the integral calculus in the St. Petersburg University. When he would say, writing the given signs of his integrals:—"If, gentlemen, within certain limits, we take the total of all the infinitesimal variations that can occur in the three dimensions of such a physical body, under the influence of such forces. . . ."—when he spoke thus his integrals became the *living emblems of living things in Nature*; whereas with other professors these identical signs were but dead matter, metaphysics without any real meaning.

Now the teaching of all the sciences, from the most abstract to those of sociology, the economic, and the physiological psychology of the individual and the crowds, requires reconstruction in order to reach the level of the science of the day. Science has progressed immensely during the past half-century; but the teaching of science has not followed a similar development. It must be brought up to date. First, in order that instruction, as already mentioned, should no longer be an

obstacle in the development of the individual; and next, because the cycle of instruction now necessary has become so much enlarged that the effort of all must be to elaborate methods which will combine an economy of energy and time whereby to reach the desired end. Formerly it was he who was destined for the career of priest, scholar, or administrator, who studied. He thought little of devoting ten or fifteen years to study. To-day the whole world wishes to study, to know; and the producer of wealth, the worker, is the first to demand it for himself.

There should not be a single human being to whom knowledge—not superficial semi-knowledge, but true knowledge—should be refused on account of time.

To-day, thanks to the extraordinary progress of the nineteenth century, we can produce everything that is necessary to assure wellbeing to all. And we can at the same time give to all the joy of true knowledge. But in order to do it we must reform the methods of instruction.

In our present schools, formed to make an aristocracy of knowledge, and up to now directed by this aristocracy under the supervision of priests, the waste of time is colossal, absurd. In English secondary schools two years of the time reserved for the instruction of mathematics are given up to exercises on the transformation of yards, perches, poles, miles, bushels, and other English measures! Everywhere history in schools is time absolutely wasted on the memorising of names, of laws incomprehensible to children, wars, admitted falsehoods, etc. And in each branch the waste of time reaches outrageous proportions.

Well, it is easy to foresee that we shall be compelled to adopt *integral instruction*—i.e., teaching which, by the practice of the hand on wood, stone, metal, will speak to the brain and help to develop it. We shall arrive at teaching every one the *basis of every trade as well as of every machine*, by labouring (according to certain already elaborated systems) at the work-bench, with the vice, in shaping raw material, in oneself making the fundamental parts of everything, as well of simple machines as of apparatus for the transmission of power, to which all machines are reduced.

We must come to the *merging* of manual with mental labour, as preached by Fourier and the International, and which is already to be found in a few schools, notably in the United States; and we shall then see the immense economy of time that will be realised by the young brain developed at once by the work of hand and mind. Then, as soon as the matter is seriously studied we shall find means to economise time in every branch of teaching. The field for cultivation as regards instruction is so immense, so vast, that the union of every spirit freed from the mists of the past and turned towards the future is necessary; all will find therein an immense work to accomplish.

My best wishes for the success of *L'Ecole Rénovée*.

With fraternal greetings,

P. KROPOTKIN.

The Movement in Manchester.

Manchester Progressive Group invited me to start their open-air propaganda on May 17. It was arranged that we should hold our morning meeting in Peter Square, but the police would not permit us, so we adjourned to Stevenson Square, and although the meeting was not large, yet there was a good deal of literature sold and a collection made. We returned at 3 p.m., when we found an audience already awaiting us, which so heartened our comrade J. Coates that he at once occupied the chair and opened the meeting by briefly outlining existing social conditions, concluding by explaining the root meaning of Anarchy and what its adoption would mean to the workers. Our comrade is indeed an acquisition. A healthy discussion followed, but, remarkable to relate, both the I.L.P. and S.D.P. comrades who kept the discussion going did so more in the spirit of kindly inquiry after truth. This is far from having always been the case, but my hope is that it may continue. All our FREEDOMS were sold and a good collection made. The comrades were so well satisfied with the success of their initial venture that they invited me again for the 24th, when two very good meetings resulted in good collections and our stock of literature being cleared out. Comrade M. Kavanagh spoke on the 31st, and I follow again on June 7.

All comrades to whom I sent tickets for the *Voice of Labour* are requested to send all money in hand to me at 10 Bamber Street, Liverpool.

A. DESPRES.

MOTHER EARTH.

Published by EMMA GOLDMAN.

Offices: 210 East 13th Street, New York City, U.S.A.

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

Back numbers supplied.

Specimen copy sent on receipt of 1d. stamp.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE ENEMIES OF SOCIALISM.

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

DEAR COMRADE,—

I was interested but somewhat disappointed in your article on "The Enemies of Socialism," especially the concluding portion dealing with Christianity. I am myself a preacher of the Christianity of Christ as I understand it (not, of course, the Jingo and sentimental stuff of so many professing Christians), and fail to see how Jesus can possibly be regarded as having been opposed to the best interests of the workers. Your article states that contentment with poverty, humbleness of spirit and non-resistance are the essence of the Sermon on the Mount, and decries them as useless for building up free and happy communities. What then? Are we to suppose that their opposites will secure this end? Will greed for wealth, conceit and contempt for the "lower" classes, and a spirit of revenge and hatred (the antitheses to the Christian virtues), build up our Anarchist Communism? Let us not make the mistake of reading twentieth-century meanings into the words of the Reformer of nineteen centuries ago. Jesus said, "Blessed are ye poor"; but the poor of His time were not the drudges of our factory system, but the healthy tillers of the soil in the agricultural districts of Galilee who were blessed, *i.e.*, happy, because they had not enriched themselves at the expense of others, and to whom belonged the "kingdom of God," or, in other words, who were ruled by "goodness" instead of the lust for gain. Jesus also said that the hungry were happy; but why? Because they could look forward to a time when "they should be filled," surely a very real source of happiness to a hungry man. And surely it stands to reason that if all had been filled with the spirit of Jesus, who went about doing good, healing the sick and rebuking the selfish and hypocritical, pronouncing woe on the rich, satiated, flippant time-servers of his day, and mixing on terms of brotherly intimacy with those whom the "orthodox" and "respectable" chose to consider the outcasts of society,—surely, then, there would be no need of the Revolution, since Anarchist Communism would have become an established fact without.

It is also significant that the first followers of Jesus, not only during His lifetime, but also after His death, "had all things in common, neither was there any among them that lacked"; and they refused to have anything to do with the State either as lawyers or soldiers. Only when the State "took over" the Christian organisation did it become the corrupt tool it has been ever since.

"As ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise"; this is the saying of Jesus which must be used as the touchstone to try both His other teachings and His professed followers, and it is only by acting on this principle that happiness can come or the progress of the world be secured.

Jesus says, "Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you," etc. How does this square with expropriation? it may be asked. On the same principle as before. Because to expropriate the rich and turn them into workers is to do them good, and to promote their ultimate welfare and happiness. I say this, not as one who does not know, but as a member of a group of men and women who have voluntarily turned their backs on the middle class in which they were brought up, and who deliberately choose a life of labour and poverty in preference to one of comparative ease and luxury. We Cotswold Anarchists claim no merit for this action on our part; on the contrary, it is because we find in it our happiness; that we desire this state of life for our brothers of the middle class who have drugged themselves into a sleep of self-seeking and exploitation, and who must be awakened from their doze and brought back to reality as quickly as possible; this is the kindest thing we can do for them.

Read the Gospels without prejudice, and many dogmas will disappear from popular theology; and the Christian God will be found to be, not three individuals sitting up in the sky, but a universal principle of love, wisdom, and energy which alone can bring enduring happiness to mankind.

That Jesus had not much respect for kings is evident, for He called Herod a fox, faced Pilate with counter-questions, and warned His followers to avoid all positions of authority, saying, "You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and they that exercise authority over them are called benefactors; but it shall not be so with you."

Personally, I have no doubt that on the social side of His work Anarchist Communist is the best title by which Jesus can be described.

Yours fraternally,

Cricketty Mill, Bisley, Stroud.

ARTHUR RYLAND.

THE FAILURE AND FARCE OF PARLIAMENT.

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

DEAR COMRADE,—

In his article in FREEDOM for May, Comrade Aldred said: "On the one hand, Irishmen, since the days of Parnell, have relied on the Home Rule proclivities of members of the Westminster playhouse for the accomplishment of Ireland's emancipation, despite the fact that to talk of the independence of Ireland in the House of Commons would be considered treason, and that no member of the Nationalist Party has ever had the courage to so far break the terms of his induction

affirmation as to speak of Ireland as anything else than an adjunct of England." Now, Comrade Aldred evidently has not studied the Irish Parliamentary history since Parnell's time, for as a matter of fact the Irishmen have repeatedly stated both inside and outside the House that Ireland would not be contented until she had gained her absolute freedom from England; and both Liberals and Tories whilst in office and in Opposition have repeatedly taunted the Irish Party with it, and have accused them of treason.

Aldred goes on to say that he does not wish it to be thought that he is in favour of Nationalism, but simply desires to show that the failure of the various parties sent to Westminster to achieve the object of their mission constitutes condemnation of Parliamentary methods. This, he says, will be proved, so far as the Irish Party is concerned, by the narration of a few incidents sufficient to prove the existence of a compact between the Liberals and the Nationalists. My friend Aldred seems to be completely at sea over the Irish question. He must remember that the Irish Party have usually held the balance of power in their hands until recent years, and have quite consistently had compacts with both parties. They have never made any secret of it. What is more, they have told the Government that they would not allow them to proceed with the other business of the House until Ireland's just demands were considered, and they have been repeatedly thrown out of the House for obstruction.

First and foremost, says Aldred, is the Irish Council Bill which Mr. Birrell introduced on the strength of an understanding with the leader of the Irish Party, and the latter's further assertion, in his famous Oxford speech, that separation is impossible; and if possible, undesirable. In the first place, Mr. Birrell knew that Mr. Gladstone appealed to the country on his Home Rule Bill, and was defeated; consequently Mr. Birrell's Government did not see their way clear to chance their arm on the same policy, but let the Irish Party have the Council Bill as a small instalment, promising other instalments (one way of hoodwinking the Britisher) until the full measure of Home Rule was granted. Now, I should say that that was very good business considering that the Irish Party had lost the balance of power. As to separation being "impossible," that is ancient history. I could have told the Irish leader that thirty years ago. "Undesirable." Quite so! Since Lord Salisbury told us that there was no chance for small nations to depend upon themselves, we have, I think, found it so in South Africa and elsewhere.

Then, says Guy, there is Mr. S. Young, M.P., who tells his constituents that they ought to be proud of being a part of the glorious Empire on which the sun never sets. Well, I can quite understand that. You see, in Ireland, when they want to hold a demonstration they placard the town with the particulars. When the authorities think fit, they prohibit the same by proclamation; and knowing that the Irish don't give a damn for their proclamations and will hold their demonstration, the authorities hold hundreds of armed troops and constabulary in readiness under cover (if possible), and wait for the demonstrators. The usual procedure is for the police to draw their batons and charge. If the heads of the demonstrators are too hard to break, they advance the troops with fixed bayonets and ball cartridge, just to penetrate their bodies. But in England, don't you see, things are managed very differently. If the Government know that you are a bloody revolutionary body, they will grant you permits to hold demonstrations; but should the authorities refuse to grant you the permit, they don't bring out their armed forces as they do in Ireland. So long as you compromise and don't take your platform with you, you can hold your demonstration. So that as the British Government have told the "ould country" that they wish to treat her as a sister, Mr. Young is only trying to permeate the Irish with the love that England has for her. Does she not supply the Irish Guards with shamrock on St. Patrick's Day, for instance? She did not do that thirty years ago. Oh no! She used to give Irish soldiers imprisonment for refusing to take it out of their caps. Things have altered, don't you know?

Aldred quotes the names of several Irish M.P.s who have joined the National Liberal Club. But, my dear comrade, why shouldn't they? I will ask you: Is it any more unreasonable for these Irish M.P.s to join the N.L.C. than it is for Anarchist Communists to join and speak from the platforms of the I.L.P., S.D.P., and pure and simple Trade Unions. For the life of me, I don't think so. The Anarchist Communists want to permeate the other organisations with Anarchist ideas; the Irish M.P.s want to permeate the N.L.C. with Home Rule.

Aldred also speaks of John Redmond welcoming Queen Victoria to Ireland. He again forgets that Ireland wants a Republic (or did), and Republics do welcome monarchs; they are in duty bound to do so. No doubt John Redmond was looking forward to the time when an English monarch would return the compliment to him as the President of the Irish Republic. There is another gentleman, says Aldred; one Mr. McHugh, who, amongst other crimes which he committed, showed a cowardly antagonism to the Fenians. Aldred speaks as if the Irish Parliamentary Party were favourable to the Fenians, or that the majority of the Irish race were so. Such was not the case, any more than the people of other countries are favourable to the Anarchists. The Fenian Brotherhood was a Republican body whose aim was to free Ireland from the British yoke. They were not Anarchists, nor even pure and simple Social Democrats. I question very much whether the Irish proletariat would have improved their position much if they had had an Irish Republic. The Irish people have not yet learned

that capitalism and government alike are their enemies. The Irish people believe in domination and being dominated. Their only objection is that they want it "home-made," not foreign.

Guy also says: "In the meantime, English Budgets, which but serve to perpetuate the robbery of Ireland, go unchallenged." That is not true. Again and again have the Irish Party fought against the Budgets, and have accused the Governments of their bare-faced robbery of Ireland. But my friend Alfred must remember that there is a limit to human endurance. If my friend Guy comes knocking at my (?) door for the next quarter of a century, demanding the money that I owe him, he will get tired of his fruitless demands. Let my friend Guy examine the economic conditions of Ireland, and let him also examine the Parliamentary tactics of the Irish Party since 1874, and I think he will admit that the Irish Party have played their part second to none on the face of the earth. My comrade knows that I am just as bitterly opposed to Parliamentarism as he is, but he has commenced his attack in the wrong sphere of operations altogether. He knows as well as I do that the people get just as much "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity" as they deserve; they also get the misrepresentatives which they deserve. If my friend wants to enlighten the Irish race, let him set to work and point out to them the absolute fallacy of their trust in the political machine. By doing so he will save them from being exploited by politicians. I, like my friend Guy, am out for the absolute destruction of capitalism and government, not for any palliatives, not even the eight-hour day.

Fraternally yours,
THE IRISH REBEL.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

France.

A few weeks since, two men were arrested with ten dynamite cartridges in their possession, and every paper according to custom bristled forthwith with Anarchist plots. The simple facts were that a comrade named Roux, while on his way by appointment to meet two others, Kühn and Roussel, at a wayside station, where they were expecting by the Brussels train a parcel of *Terre et Liberté*, was accosted by some unknown police agent and politely requested to hand over a small parcel to his friends. As it was being presented to these the police appeared and arrested all three for carrying explosives. The police plot, however, has only partially succeeded, for if Roux has been condemned to a year's imprisonment, Roussel to two weeks' for carrying explosives, while Kühn remains unconvicted, the police have been unable to prove to the satisfaction of the judge that any Anarchist "plot" was in existence. *Mem.*: In future, French as well as other comrades might do worse than examine parcels placed in their charge by amiable strangers. The "wicked Anarchist" is singularly guileless at times.

The trial has just concluded of a young bourgeois for the deliberate murder of a worker. A few months since the latter was dismissed by the foreman of a foundry; unable to find employment, he returned to the factory and upbraided the man who had ruined him, the quarrel as was to be expected ending in blows. Passing by at the moment this scion of the bourgeoisie fell upon the worker, pinned him down, and taking a revolver from his pocket, shot his victim deliberately through the head. Needless to say, judge and jury have acquitted him. The dead man was only a worker. Long live the bourgeoisie!

Italy.

Under the growing summer sun the agricultural districts in many of the provinces are fermenting with strikes. As a consequence of last year's general strike in May, a contract had been concluded between the landed proprietors and their labourers fixing an eight-hour day. A wealthy family in Parma broke this clause in regard to certain labourers; and the result was a general lock-out in that province alone of 30,000 field workers, who were soon joined by the stablemen. What this means with the hay harvest at hand can be imagined. The struggle has now lasted a month. As yet the Government has not interfered beyond sending sufficient troops into the province to protect the few blacklegs and such gentlemen farmers as have not been above baring their arms to field labour. So far the peasants hold their own in spite of their masters' efforts to recruit labour from the towns and elsewhere, to expel every Unionist from his home, and to insist on fierce punishment for militant acts. The strikers have sworn to eat grass sooner than yield. Help comes from many parts. The General Confederation of Labour, though its desire to arbitrate has been scouted, is pushing an appeal for funds; the Communist soup kitchen is kept busy; the strikers' children are boarded by comrades in neighbouring towns. At present the strike is extending into Sicily, but as yet without disorders. When it began there were sharp encounters between strikers and the armed volunteer guards, but now the strike runs on calmly, though the slightest incident may provoke little less than civil war, owing to its being in some aspects as much a class struggle as a peasants' strike. The demands of the rebels are modest, but the landowners begin to feel that the real object is the ousting of landlordism and the handing over of the land to those who till it. Of town workers there have been four massacres within 40 days. It is enough for a city striker to throw a stone at a trooper to be answered by a bullet, and this has meant death in four cities.

The *Libertario* has appealed to the French on the subject of the

Czar's proposed visit to France. In Italy there are threats to proclaim a General Strike if the blood-stained autocrat dares to cross their frontier; why should not France do likewise?

Belgium.

The Labour Federation of Liège has lately published an appeal for the formation of a Trade Union Confederation similar to that of France. Under the influence of their political leaders, the workers of Belgium have dropped the active direction of their own affairs, and under the banner of universal suffrage have become supine and apathetic to all else. The appeal states that an economic crisis is at hand. Just as an article in the April issue of *FREEDOM* pointed out, a slump in the coal market—Belgium's chief product—is about to occur, and over-production threatens to cause slackness in mining and every industry dependent on it; once again it is the workers who will suffer, not the fat bourgeoisie. It is necessary, therefore, that Labour should organise by profession and subsequently federate, leaving politics to politicians.

Unhappily, the Belgian workers have never been of a strictly revolutionary turn, if in old time they were quick to assert their rights and privileges. Their neighbours, the Dutch, fought to the death for religious and political liberty; but the Belgians, for centuries under the thumb of a reactionary Church and priesthood, seem to have lost every noble ideal, or else such are dormant only. To sum up the matter in the words of a contemporary:—"The situation here is frankly bad. Politicians have accomplished their task and killed every germ of revolt in the working class. . . . The Trade Unions alone continue their uninterrupted but purely professional propaganda. The Anarchist movement is quiescent. . . . Still, interest in it revives, and there is a growing undercurrent of sympathy for it among certain sections of the workers. Unfortunately, organisation is lacking." Without this it is impossible for scattered groups to do the work they might. When will Anarchists the world over comprehend that even in their body union means strength?

Meanwhile Belgium's Socialist deputy and leader, Vandervelde, has struck a new and astonishing note in Paris. According to *L'Action Syndicale*, at a lecture on the General Strike given before the School of Higher Social Studies, he emphatically acclaimed it as becoming more and more the modern form of the street movement of the proletariat. With Pouget and others, he considers the weapon as yet to be first the work of a minority, next that it is anti-Parliamentary in character, and thirdly he includes, as the outcome of direct action, the strike, boycotting, and sabotage, not to mention antimilitarism. Recognising two forms of general strike, the political and the economic, he finally decided that each country should choose that best for itself; but that were his choice to lie between the two, he would give the preference to the proletarian Syndical movement. Whether this is a sincere opinion remains to be proved.

New Zealand.

A comrade writes:—"You are aware that a Conciliation Board and Arbitration Court exist here to settle disputes between master and man. Seven miners were recently dismissed from a mine on the West Coast, at a little place called Blackhall, for no reason. All the miners left work in sympathy with their comrades. Government officials hastened down to arrange a settlement, but met with a surprise. The miners refused to have anything to do with them, and told them they would settle the matter themselves. Resolutions were passed all over the country sympathising with the Blackhall strikers, and offering financial and moral support. The whole Press was at once in arms against them and tried to mislead the public; but the miners sent two of their best men through the country explaining their position, and wherever they went their reception was sympathetic. They determined to make a stand for their demands, which meant reinstating the dismissed men, better ventilation, half an hour mealtime (instead of a quarter, as at present), and a few other minor demands. After a fortnight the Employers' Association forced the Government to take action against the men, who were fined—each being liable to a £10 fine. They all refused to pay, preferring prison to the decision of the Arbitration Court. Anarchism progresses here too."

In consequence of this attempt to "kick against the pricks," the Premier, it appears, demands a new law to deal with refractory workers of this sort. As the *Anarchist International Bulletin* aptly remarks:—"Naturally it is by new laws and amendments that the Parliamentary mill carries on its work. But the strangling of strikes seems difficult to accomplish even in New Zealand!"

Canada.

The reduction of wages by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company resulted last month in a conflict between strikers and special constables in Ontario. The police fired their revolvers, wounding many. This has much embittered the struggle. "Indian Anarchists" being the bugbear of the moment, of course a nest of them has been discovered in Vancouver by the correspondent of a London daily. He has "positive information" that they are subscribing money for seditious purposes, and have started a school for teaching what they call English and he calls revolutionary ideas and the manufacture of a world plot. If hell, as the wit said, is paved with good intentions, the carpet that covers it must surely be woven of journalists' lies.

A comrade at Montreal sends cuttings respecting Socialist demonstrations in that city, which seem to be easily suppressed by the

combined influence of the police and the French Canadian Socialist "leader" St. Martin. The 1st of May demonstration, organised for the Champ-de-Mars, was quickly dissolved by the two, the confiscation of the red banner being also peacefully accomplished. Just as the people were assembling the Socialist "leader" appeared on the scene, after a visit to police headquarters, and delivered the following speech: "Conformably to instructions from the authorities, the Chief of Police forbids any procession or meeting, and I have promised to ensure this. The chief has to do his duty and we have nothing to complain of if he does it energetically. However, I invite you all to the Labour Hall for next Sunday, where we shall hold a meeting of protest." Here, as bidden by a police officer, M. St. Martin ceased to speak; he was not to make comments. The revolutionary germ is certainly missing in this "leader," for if report be true, the order for the dispersion of the demonstration was arbitrary in the extreme. Three weeks earlier he had obtained a permit both for a parade and mass meeting. It was only at the last moment he learnt through the press the permit was to be cancelled on the police plea of possible disturbance. He then called at headquarters and asked to be arrested so that there might be a test case. But the police officials smiled at him. No doubt they knew their man. Peace at any price may be skilful policy, but it is seldom dignified and never inspiring.

McARA APPEAL.

With our comrade's release, this fund is now practically closed. Mrs. McAra and John both wish to thank all comrades for coming to the rescue so opportunely, thereby helping the victim of police persecution to bear his imprisonment philosophically. The item "Solicitor's fee £1" was incurred in the desire to procure bail in London, the solicitor being asked to make inquiries as to the possibility of such being acceptable in Belfast; but letters began to come in from him so quickly, without any definite result, that he was asked to stop inquiries and send in his account. The £1 does not represent the full cost of the inquiries, the balance having been met by one or two comrades. Subscriptions are invited towards the deficit of 4s. 6d., any surplus received to go to Mrs. McAra.

Receipts.		BALANCE SHEET.		Expenditure.			
£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.		
Previously acknowledged...	9	19	9½	Mrs. McAra...	9	10	0
Liverpool Group (7th and 8th donations) ...	6	6	J. McAra ...	5	0	0	
S. C. Potter ...	6	6	Solicitor's Fee ...	1	0	0	
B. Harvey ...	6	6	Postage and postal orders...	4	6	4	
Essex ...	9	9	Total	£10	19	6½	
G. J. Metcalfe ...	2	0					
A. Ryland ...	1	0	Deficit ...	4s.	6d.		
Merry Pessimists, Leeds ...	1	6					
Anon ...	2	6					
Total	£10	15	0½				

Anarchist-Socialist Sunday School.

The East London Anarchist-Socialist Sunday School meets at 3.30 every Sunday at the Workers' Friend Club and Institute, 163 Jubilee Street, Mile End. Children in the district invited. An Esperanto class for adults and children is specially conducted by Comrade Dusa.

Group Notice.

The Newcastle-on-Tyne International Anarchist Communist Group hold their meetings and lectures every Wednesday at 8 p.m. in 51 Douglas Terrace.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

(April 30—June 3.)

FREEDOM Guarantee Fund—W. Wess 2s. 6d., Rhodes 2s., H. Glasse 5s., B. G. 6d., R. O. 6d., R. Clarke 6d., L. FitzRoy 5s., W. Cohen 2s. 6d., K. W. 10s., J. Baker 1s.

FREEDOM Subscriptions—S. C. Potter 1s. 6d., G. J. Metcalfe 1s. 6d., Z. O. Bower 1s. 6d., W. Maddocks 9d., J. Lewis 2s., H. O. Allison 2s., R. Stubbs 1s. 6d., W. A. Pope 1s., C. M. Stoycoff 2s. 6d.

Sales of FREEDOM—Hyde Park 2s., C. Lipshitz 2s., Henderson 2s. 4d., Greenbourn 1s. 2d., R. Gundersen 4s., S. Vermont 5s. 6d., G. Glass 1s., Essex 3s., A. Goldberg 2s., A. Bird 1s. 6d., J. McAra 9s., D. Wormald 1s. 6d., B. Greenblatt 3s., P. Josephs 1s., H. Karpin 6s., A. B. Howie 3s.

Pamphlet and Book Sales—C. Lipshitz 1s. 6d., C. Roth 2s., B. Harvey 2s. 9d., B. Tchaykovsky 2s. 6d., T. S. 2s., J. Webb 1s., W. Harris 13s., Dubois 6s., H. Glasse 5s., J. Scarceriaux 8s., R. Gundersen 4s., J. Selkirk 1s. 7d., S. Vermont 5s. 2d., R. Harvey 1s., A. Ryland 1s. 2d., A. Goldberg 5s. 6d., C. Stoycoff 1s. 6d., J. Baker 3s. 6d., J. McAra 1s. 5s. 8d., B. Greenblatt 7s., A. Despres 1s. 6d., P. Josephs 1s. 10s., L. FitzRoy 1s., R. Clarke 1s. 6d., H. Karpin 2s., B. Chatard 1s. 2d.

"VOICE OF LABOUR" FUND.
M. Brodman 2s.

GOOD PROPAGANDA LEAFLETS.

Our Great Empire.

The Folly of Voting.

9d. per 100 post free; 5s. per 1,000.

FREEDOM Office, 127, Ossulston Street, Euston Road, -N.W.

On Whit Sunday, June 7, at 3 p.m.,

THE MARKET PLACE, NORWICH.

JOHN TURNER.

"The Tendencies of Trade Unionism."

HENDERSONS,

66 CHARING CROSS ROAD, LONDON, W.C.

For Revolutionary Literature,

Socialist, Labour, Rationalist, and all Advanced Thought Books and Periodicals.

PAMPHLET AND BOOK LIST.

- ANARCHISM: ITS PHILOSOPHY AND IDEAL. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1s.
THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
WAR. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
LAW AND AUTHORITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
ORGANISED VENGEANCE—CALLED "JUSTICE." By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
RESPONSIBILITY AND SOLIDARITY IN THE LABOR STRUGGLE. 1d.
SOCIALISM THE REMEDY. By HENRY GLASSE. 1d.
SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN GERMANY. By GUSTAV LANDAUER. 1d.
EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. By E. RECLUS. 1d.
THE KING AND THE ANARCHIST. 2d.
MONOPOLY; OR, HOW LABOUR IS ROBBED. WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
USEFUL WORK VERSUS USELESS TOIL. BY WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONGRESS, 1907. 1d.
THE SOCIAL GENERAL STRIKE BY ARNOLD ROLLER. 2d.
THE TRAGEDY OF WOMAN'S EMANCIPATION. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 3l. post-free.
THE CRIMINAL ANARCHY LAW. By T. SCHROEDER. 3l. post-free.
THE MASTERS OF LIFE. By MAXIM GORKY. 3d. post-free.
MATING OR MARRYING—WHICH? By VAN ORNUM. 3d.
ORIGIN OF ANARCHISM. By C. L. JAMES. 2d.
THE BASIS OF TRADE-UNIONISM. By EMILE POUGET. 1d.
PAGES OF SOCIALIST HISTORY. By W. TCHERKESOV. 1s., post. 3d.
MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1s.
THE CONQUEST OF BREAD. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 10s. 6d.
CONQUER DU PAIN. By P. KROPOTKIN. (In French.) 3s. 6d. post-free.
MEMOIRS OF A REVOLUTIONIST. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3s. 6d. post-free.
MUTUAL AID: A FACTOR OF EVOLUTION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3s. 6d. post-free.
FIELDS, FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS. By P. KROPOTKIN. Paper cover 6d., post-free 9d.; cloth 1s., post-free 1s. 3d.
WHAT IS PROPERTY? By P. J. PROUDHON. 2 vols. 2s., postage 4d.
NEWS FROM NOWHERE. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1s. 6d.; postage 4d.
A DREAM OF JOHN BALL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 2s., 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 FRENCH REVOLUTION. By C. L. JAMES. 2s. 6d. post-free.
ENGLAND'S IDEAL. By EDWARD CARPENTER. 2s. 6d. and 1s., post. 3d.
CIVILISATION: ITS CAUSE AND CURE. By EDWARD CARPENTER. 2s. 6d. and 1s., postage 3d.
LOVE'S COMING OF AGE. A Series of Papers on the Relations of the Sexes. By EDWARD CARPENTER. 3s. 6d., postage 4d.
PRISONS, POLICE AND PUNISHMENT. By E. CARPENTER. Paper 1s., cloth 2s., postage 3d.
THE RIGHTS OF MAN. By THOMAS PAINE. 6d., postage 3d.
MAN versus THE STATE. By HERBERT SPENCER. 1s., postage 3d.
MARRIAGE AND RACE-DEATH. By M. I. SWIFT. 2s. 6d. post-free.

All orders, with cash, should be sent to
Manager, "Freedom" Office, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W.

"FREEDOM" MAY BE OBTAINED of

- London**—HENDERSON, 66 Charing Cross Road, W.C. (Wholesale).
London and Suburban Publishing Co., Bride Lane, Fleet Street.
A. RICHIE, Pemberton Row, Fleet Street, E.C.
W. REEVES, 83, Charing Cross Road, W.
O. MATHEAS, 20, Little Pulteney Street, W.
B. RUDERMAN, 71, Hanbury Street, Spitalfields, E. (also Pamphlets).
J. J. JAKUES, 191, Old Street, City Road, E.C.
- Liverpool**—E. G. SMITH, 126, Tunnel Road.
- Leeds**—A. Goldberg, 14 Millwright Street.
- Leicester**—A. GORRIE, 2, Brazil Street.
- Manchester**—S. WERMONT, 1 Barland Street, Ramsgate Street.
- Newcastle-on-Tyne**—R. STUART, 51 Douglas Terrace.
R. GOLDBERG, 114 Blenheim Street.
- Glasgow**—Reformer's Bookstall, 126 Bothwell Street.
D. BAXTER, 32 Brunswick Street.
- Dundee**—L. MACARTNEY, 181, Overgate.
- U.S.A.**—N. NOTKIN, 1332 S. 6th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
M. MAISEL, 422 Grand Street, New York, N.Y.
- New Zealand**—P. JOSEPHS, 64 Taranaki Street, Wellington.

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