

Freedom

JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

Vol. XXIV.—No. 25

^{April}
MARCH, 1910.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY

NOTES.

Conferences and Common Sense.

The advantage of such conferences as have recently been held by the I.L.P. and the S.D.P. is that they afford an opportunity for outsiders to judge not only how much common sense may exist in such gatherings, but also what stupidities can be uttered by leading wiseacres, and what ridiculous attitudes can be taken up by political *poseurs* who are anxious to make a name. For instance, here is H. M. Hyndman, after twenty-five years of fruitless "Revolutionary Social Democracy," repeating the sterile formula of attaining their ends—whatever that may mean—"by peaceable means if possible, forcible if necessary." If ever the possessing classes cared a brass farthing about this sort of talk, that time is passed, for they certainly do not now. Again, as if to confirm the truth of what we have always said, Hyndman declared "it was essential to point out that from the very beginning the S.D.P. had advocated all the stepping-stones to collective and social organisation which were now being adopted by Radical Opportunists" (*Daily News*, March 26th). Need he and his friends be so dreadfully offended when we say that is precisely the party to which they belong—the Radical Opportunists? Continuing, he said, the General Election showed clearly that under the existing electoral system *no* independent candidate had a really fair chance against the two great political parties. In that case is it honest to tell the working men they can, *if they will vote*, have scores of representatives returned as things are, and so drag them to the polls under false pretences?

Lépine Asking for More.

M. Lépine, the Paris Prefect of Police, is a wily customer. He knows how to play on the nerves of the Parisian bourgeois. In giving evidence before the Paris Municipal Council as to the security of the French capital, he did not forget to make the most of his chance. He spoke almost despairingly, poor man, of the fruitless efforts of the police to cope with the undesirables and the "Apaches." "We live in an age of humanitarianism," he said, and he complains that the magistrates will not convict the hooligans that are brought before them. Of course, there are Apaches and undesirables in Paris as in all great cities, but as the *Temps Nouveaux* has pointed out, M. Lépine has an eye to business, and finds this persistent exaggeration of the insecurity of Paris brings grist to his mill. He quite forgot to remind the Municipal Council that during the inundations, when the *people* took matters into their own hands, the Apaches and undesirables were on their best behaviour, and *dared* not commit outrages that are common enough when things are left to the police. The brutality and blind stupidity of police methods and "legal" punishments only aggravates the evil, and costs the public a pretty penny, whereas the direct action of the people's vigilance, *even under existing conditions*, does wonders. This is a bad omen for M. Lépine, and so we find him asking for more police. He evidently knows the Paris bourgeois, for we are told that "M. Lépine's remarks created so profound an impression upon his hearers that a resolution was passed authorising the enrolment of 160 more police this year; and an additional 500 spread over a period of five years." And so the game goes on.

An Awakening.

At the present moment, while so many cross-currents are bewildering the workers, it is a hopeful sign to see that the miners, North and South, are in revolt against the disgusting conduct of the "leaders." All the capitalist tricks of conciliation and arbitration have clearly shown how futile it is to trust to "leaders" where questions in dispute should be settled *decisively* by the common sense and determination of the workers themselves. Of course, this leads immediately to direct action, but that is precisely what is needed to end all the miserable procrastination and delay, dragging on for months, which breaks the

hearts of the men long before the real struggle begins. It will be remembered how 10,000 Durham miners rose in anger against the action of their "representative" in settling, against their wish, some disputed points regarding the eight-hour day. Such a demonstration of their will would have been enough to have imposed their demands on the masters in a few days without the help—or hindrance—of the "leaders." Now we find the miners of South Wales ready to throw over the officials who, for reasons of their own self-interest, are ready to betray the interests of the miners to the capitalist wolves. We hope that both these manifestations mean an awakening of the men to a perception of the folly of submitting to all this official trickery, and a desire to employ the more effective methods of the General Strike.

The Fraud of Co-partnership.

The failure of the Furness scheme of co-partnership is another sign that the skilled workers are, at any rate, beginning to see in which direction their real interests lie. This latest capitalist dodge, which unfortunately succeeded with the gasworkers, has been tried and found wanting by the engineers of the North-East Coast. They may have been lacking in foresight in joining in the scheme in the first place, but their speedy determination to have done with it is nevertheless encouraging. Of course, it will be argued that they are acting merely as Trade Unionists, absorbed by their own selfish interests. But it must not be forgotten that the Trade Unionists form the vanguard of Labour, both in the resistance to capitalist encroachments and in the struggle to wrest concessions from the exploiters. What would be the conditions of labour at the present day had it not been for the efforts made by organised Labour? It is absurd to harp on the mistakes that have been made. The capitalist spreads his net with consummate cunning, and often holds the "leaders" in the palm of his hand. But if the rank and file are intelligent enough to profit by experience, that is something to be glad of, and holds out promise for the future. The failure of these attempts to lure the worker off the lines of his real interests will help greatly to keep the true issues clear.

The Absurdity of Majority Rule.

The counting of votes in Finsbury at the County Council election, and the complete turn of the scale by one vote, gives us a fine example of the beautiful working of majority rule. Anarchists are regarded as impracticable—or worse—because they regret this stultifying and ridiculous method of conducting our social and economic life; but we ask could anything approach nearer to sheer imbecility than the position created by this one vote in Finsbury? In reality, all executive and administrative powers rest in that vote. And you cannot fix the responsibility, because you cannot individualise a vote. It may have been given by a genius or a fool; but that matters nothing, for in the ballot box one carries as much weight as the other. If men were not so cowardly, they would despise this absurdity. At any rate, it is a point for sensible people to ponder over.

Losing our Life Blood.

Mrs. Bradlaugh Bonner does well to call attention (*Morning Leader*, April 5th) to the evil of emigration. We lose annually thousands of the best of our population, who go thousands of miles to be brutally exploited, or to pave with their bones the highways for future landlords and capitalists. And our chief cause of this is the monopoly of the soil of England by that gang of land thieves we call the House of Lords. We take a great deal of trouble to keep out so-called undesirables, but we do nothing to keep in their native land those most needed to ensure a healthy population.

SPECIAL NOTICE.

The May number of FREEDOM will be published on Friday, April 30.

MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

VI.

HERBERT SPENCER'S SYNTHETIC PHILOSOPHY.

When the study of Anthropology—i.e., the study of the physiological evolution of man and the growth of his institutions and religious beliefs—began to be carried on with the methods that are applied in all other natural sciences, it became possible at last to delineate in its essential outlines the history of mankind, and to do away with metaphysics which had obstructed till then the study of history, just as Biblical tradition had obstructed the progress of geology.

One might have thought, therefore, that when Herbert Spencer undertook in his turn the construction of a synthetic philosophy in the second half of the nineteenth century, he would have done so without falling into the errors that had characterised the "Positive Politics" of Auguste Comte. And yet, even though Spencer's "Synthetic Philosophy" is a great step in advance (it does not lead to a religion or to a new form of worship), yet in its sociological part it contains fallacies quite as misleading as those that were embodied in Comte's Positive philosophy.

The fact is, that when Spencer came to the psychology of societies (after having admirably examined the substance of our knowledge in physical sciences, biology, and psychology), he did not remain faithful to his rigorous scientific method, and did not dare to face the consequences to which such a method would have brought him. Thus, to take one single example, Spencer fully recognised that land should never be private property; because the owner of the soil, profiting by his right to raise the land-rent, may hinder his fellow men from obtaining from the soil all they could get out of it by means of intensive culture; or, he may keep the land uncultivated, waiting till its value be raised by the work of other people around him. Spencer readily recognised that such a system is noxious to society and full of dangers. But while recognising this as regards land, he did not venture to use the same arguments as regards other accumulated riches, such as mines or docks, not to mention workshops and factories. In natural sciences he did not hesitate to come to opinions absolutely contrary to those that had been maintained for centuries by religion. But here he had not the courage to accept the logical conclusions of his own reasonings.

Or else, to take another striking example, he loudly raised his voice against State interference with the life of society; he even gave to one of his works a title representing in itself a whole revolutionary programme: "The Man *versus* the State." But little by little, under cover of safeguarding the *protective* functions of the State, he entirely reconstructed the State as it exists to-day, with but few very timid restrictive limitations.

These contradictions and many others besides could easily be explained by the fact that Spencer planned the sociological part of his philosophy under the influence of the English Radical movement, long before he had written that part which dealt with natural sciences. In fact, he published his "Social Statics" in 1851; that is to say, when the anthropological study of human institutions was still in its infancy. But, be it as it may, the result was that, like Comte, Spencer did not undertake the study of human institutions as a naturalist, for their own sake, without preconceived ideas borrowed from other domains, outside science.

Moreover, as soon as he reached the philosophy of societies—that is, Sociology—Spencer began to adopt a new method, and a very treacherous one: the method of resemblances, or analogies, which he evidently did not resort to in his study of the facts of physical nature. The consequence was that this method allowed him to justify a mass of preconceived ideas; and the result of all these concessions is, that up till now we have not got a synthetic philosophy that has been built up on the same foundation for both natural and sociological sciences.

It must also be said that for the comprehension of the primitive institutions of the savages—which represent a substantial portion of all Sociology—Spencer was the least suited man. In this respect he even exaggerated a failing that is frequent with Englishmen: a want of understanding for the morals and customs of other nations.—"We English are Roman law people, while the Irish are Common law people; that is why we do not understand one another," I was told once by an English friend, a very intelligent and well-informed man.—The misunderstanding is still greater when an Englishman has to deal with those who are described as "inferior races." The same is true of Spencer. He was quite incapable of understanding the savage's respect for his tribe and tribe-rule; or the hero of an Icelandic saga, who considers "blood-revenge" as a holy duty; or

the inner life of a mediæval city, which, though it was full of strife within, was nevertheless, and precisely for that reason, a life of wonderful progress. The conceptions of Right and Law which prevailed at those stages of civilisation were entirely strange to Spencer: he saw nought but savagery, barbarism and cruelty in that life.

Besides—and this is perhaps even more important—Spencer, like Huxley and so many others, had completely misunderstood the real meaning of the "struggle for existence." He represented it to himself, not only as a struggle between different species of animals (wolves preying upon hares, many kinds of birds living on insects, and so forth), but also as an acute struggle *within each species*, among all the individuals of the species. In reality, however, such a struggle does not exist—certainly not to the extent imagined by Spencer—even among animals, and still less so among the most primitive savages. But once it was admitted by the philosopher, all his sociological conceptions suffered from that false supposition.

How far Darwin himself was responsible for this erroneous conception of the struggle for existence, we need not discuss here. But it is certain that when he published his "Descent of Man," twelve years after the "Origin of Species," he already took a far broader and a more metaphorical conception of the struggle for existence than that of a hard struggle between all the individuals *within each species*, which he had taken in his first great work in order to prove the importance of natural selection for the origin of new species. In his second great work, "The Descent of Man," he wrote, on the contrary, that those species which contain the greatest number of mutually sympathetic individuals have the greatest chance of surviving and of leaving a numerous progeny, and thus he entirely upset his first conception of the struggle for life. And nevertheless, Spencer maintained it in full.

The chapters which Darwin devoted to the subject of development of human ethics out of the sociable habits of the animal ancestors of man, might have been the starting-point for the elaboration of a conception, exceedingly rich in consequences, on the nature and evolution of human societies (Goethe had already divined it); but these chapters of Darwin passed unnoticed. It was only in 1879, in a lecture given by the zoologist Kessler, that we find a clear conception of the relations existing in Nature between the struggle for existence and mutual aid. "For the *progressive* evolution of a species," the Russian professor said, giving a few examples, "the law of *mutual aid* has far more importance than the law of mutual struggle."

A year later, Lanessan delivered at Paris a lecture, "The Struggle for Existence and Association for Struggle"; and soon after that Büchner published his work, "Love," in which he showed the importance of *sympathy* among animals as a step towards developing the first conceptions of morality; but he gave to filial love and compassion too prominent a position, and thereby uselessly limited his field of research.

It was easy for me to give (in "Mutual Aid: a Factor of Evolution") further proof of Kessler's remarkable idea, and to extend it to man. I had only to base my conclusions as regards mutual aid among animals on the accurate observations of Nature by the best field zoologists, and my views on the history of human institutions on the mass of modern historical research. Among animals, mutual aid is, in fact, not only the most efficacious weapon in the struggle for existence against the hostile forces of Nature and against other inimical species, but *it is also the principal instrument of progressive evolution*. Even to the otherwise weakest animals it guarantees longevity (and consequently accumulation of experience), security for breeding their offspring, and intellectual progress. This is why those animal species which most practise mutual aid not only better survive in the struggle for life than those which lead an isolated life, but they also occupy a higher position in their own respective classes (of Insects, Birds, or Mammals) by the superiority of their physical structure and their intelligence.

This fundamental fact of Nature was not noticed by Spencer until 1890. He accepted, on the contrary, an acute struggle for life within each species as an established fact, which needed no proof—as an axiom. A struggle to the death "with beak and claw" for each bit of food: "Nature stained with the gladiator's blood," such as Tennyson represented it, was his conception of animal life. It was only after 1890 that he began to understand, up to a certain point, the importance of mutual aid, or rather the sentiment of mutual sympathy in the animal world, and began to collect facts and make observations in this direction. But even then, primitive man always remained for him the ferocious beast of his own imagination, which exists only on the condition of seizing the last bit of food from the mouth of its neighbours.

It is evident that once he had adopted a premise as fallacious as this, Spencer could not construct his synthetic philosophy without falling into a series of errors.

(To be continued.)

Pages of Socialist History.

By W. TCHERKESOFF.

CONCENTRATION OF CAPITAL.

(Continuation.)

The formula "one capitalist kills many others," in order to increase his capital, presupposes that there exists only a fixed, invariable amount of capital for the distribution of which the capitalists are fighting among themselves. In reality, we see that the amount of capital produced by the people's work is yearly increasing, and during the last forty years has increased very quickly.

The national wealth of this country has increased since the beginning of last century as follows:—

ESTIMATED IN MILLIONS OF POUNDS STERLING.

	1812	1840	1860	1888
Houses	255	280	350	414
Railways	—	21	348	865
Shipping	15	23	44	134
Merchandise ...	50	70	190	344
Furniture	130	370	580	1,212
	450	764	1,162	2,969

During the last sixteen years this total increased by nearly a milliard, and rose from £2,969,000,000 in 1888 to £3,790,000,000 in 1904.

These figures very clearly indicate the true source whence great fortunes spring. Chiozza Money in his book, "Riches and Poverty," estimates the total national wealth of the United Kingdom at £11,413,000,000, possessed by 1,250,000 rich families and 3,750,000 middle-class families, out of 43,000,000 inhabitants of the United Kingdom.

A similar increase of wealth and yearly incomes is observed in all European States. The growth of wealth in the so-called new countries, such as the United States, Australia, Canada, etc., is astonishing. In France, according to the tables of Fournier de Flux and Yves Guyot, this increase of wealth is:—

ESTIMATED IN MILLIONS OF POUNDS STERLING.

	1826	1840	1873	1888
Houses	510	720	1,158	1,704
Railways	—	10	270	532
Shipping	7	7	12	15
Merchandise ...	19	23	120	155
Furniture	255	360	675	852

How quick and continuous this increase of wealth has been from 1840 in England may be seen from the figures given in the "Fifty-first Report of the Commissioners of His Majesty's Inland Revenue, 1908." The yearly national income subject to income tax in this country is calculated at £870,000,000. Deducting all abatements and exemptions, the yearly net income subject to taxation is £720,000,000, or nearly equal to the whole national wealth of 1840.

GROSS AMOUNT OF DUTIES COLLECTED BY THE INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

1848 ...	£32,811,000	1895 ...	£68,674,000
1865 ...	40,806,000	1903 ...	94,361,000
1885 ...	54,735,000	1905 ...	96,098,000
1890 ...	58,779,000	1908 ...	99,105,000

We have purposely omitted the figures for 1853-55 and 1900-03, as these were war periods, when the income tax is always above the normal.

We see from these figures that the Inland Revenue at the present day is three times that of 1848. According to the formula "one capitalist kills many others," the present enormous sum of £99,000,000 of taxes must be paid by a smaller number of capitalists than in 1848. Let us see whether the statistics prove that the number of capitalists has diminished. First let us find the average amount of property left at death since 1845-50, when Marx's law was formulated:—

In 1841-50 average amount at death	£99
" 1861-70	" 160
" 1871-80	" 210
" 1881-85	" 235
" 1904	" 418

Thus we see that since Marx formulated his law the average amount has multiplied four times.

When we turn to the average yearly number of estates left

at death, again we find the figures show an enormous increase:—

	1840.	1877.	1908.
Estates of £100 to £5,000...	17,936	36,138	46,232
„ over £5,000 ...	1,989	4,478	21,301

From 1876, the increase of probate, legacy and succession duties, and of income tax, was as follows:—

Years.	Probate, etc.	Income Tax.
1876-77	£5,860,781	£5,280,000
1880-81	6,657,393	10,650,000
1884-85	7,720,195	12,000,000
1888-89	6,557,886	12,700,000
1890-91	7,413,290	13,250,000
1892-93	9,637,872	13,925,000
1900-01	—	18,828,000
1905-06	—	30,966,000
1907-08	14,400,000	32,000,000

It must not be forgotten that estates under £100 escape the Probate Court. As wealth increases, there is nothing strange in the fact that the revenue of the State increases also. But what changes may be observed in the numbers of those upon whom the duties and taxes are levied? Who are the spoilt children of our modern society? It seems the middle classes as a whole.

In 1840 only 5.4 per cent. of the taxpayers paid £20 and more annually as income tax. In 1880 the proportion had risen to 14.5 per cent. Since 1850 the increase in the number of taxpayers earning more than £200 per annum was:—

Year.	Total Number Assessed.	Per 10,000 of Population.
1850	65,389	23
1860	85,530	30
1870	130,375	42
1880	210,430	63
1886	250,000	70
1908	441,363	100

We see that in 56 years the number of taxpayers with a yearly income over £200 has multiplied 6 times, and relatively to the growth of population, 4.5 times.

All the preceding figures show the enormous growth of the wealth of the middle classes. But to return to our subject, let us see if this increase has been to the profit of the great capitalists by the ruin of the small. To avoid any pretext for objections, I will confine myself exclusively to the results of commerce and banking as summed up by Schedule D of the income tax. Let us compare the figures from 1815 till the present day, so that the influence of the so-called law may be able to show itself:—

NUMBER OF PERSONS, FIRMS AND COMPANIES ASSESSED FOR INCOME TAX (SCHEDULE D) FROM 1815 TO 1907.

Income.	Number of Assessments.				
£	1815	1868.	1889.	1900.	1906-7.
150-200	10,250	76,888	162,714	119,280	308,918
200-300	10,518	57,651	106,761	111,826	112,115
300-400	5,902	24,854	45,133	74,357	45,045
400-500	2,905	12,420	18,462	57,297	24,616
Total of small incomes ...	29,575	171,813	333,070	362,760	490,694
500-1,000	5,665	22,704	29,841	31,789	38,318
1,000-5,000	3,514	14,305	17,104	25,340	29,821
Middle-class incomes ...	9,179	37,009	46,945	67,129	68,139
Over 5,000	814	2,152	2,907	7,914	9,259
Total ...	39,568*	226,672	382,922	437,803	568,092

* In 1815 there were 120,635 assessments from £50 to £150, but even these will only bring the number for that year up to 160,203.

These figures show that the 39,568 persons with an income of over £150 in 1815 had increased to 568,092 in 1907; or, put in another way, at the present day the number of persons paying income tax is 14.3 times that of 1815, whilst the population has only doubled. The increase in the number of small capitalists is 16.8 times, whilst the increase in the number of the very rich is only 11.03 times that of 1815.

(To be continued.)

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.

THE ENGLISH ELECTIONS.

(From the *Temps Nouveau* of February 19.)

If more confirmation were needed to prove that Parliaments exist, not to reform abuses, not to abolish existing monopolies, but to prevent democratic reforms, to maintain and consolidate the monopolies, the recent English elections give us the demonstration.

It is a long time since England has had an electoral struggle so hotly contested as this one has been. In many constituencies four-fifths of the electors went to the poll. Not for many a year has so much passion been shown in an election.

And what has such a heated contest been about? Little enough, after all! But little as it was, the monopolists of all sorts have felt the Budget to be a menace, and that was enough for all who live by exploitation to unite to check those disturbers of their feast, Lloyd George and Asquith.

It has happened exactly as it happened in 1886, when Gladstone, carried into power by the Radical vote, wished also to slightly curtail the big monopolies.

For twenty years after his fall, from 1886 to 1905, with a short interruption in 1892-94, England was governed by the Conservatives. Undoubtedly, the difference between the Conservatives and the Liberals or Radicals is meagre. In the event of a conflict with the working men, each of them would show the same ferocity against them. And yet the difference is important, since the Conservatives represent a strong Government, while the Liberals represent a weak one; and a strong Government always means the obstruction of all progress.

The difference is vital, above all in England, where the Conservatives, with their land monopoly, represent a feudalism of the past, to which have been added all the great monopolies of the brewing, mining, and shipping interests, as well as all the great robber companies both in England and the Colonies.

The English Revolution of 1648 did not touch the property of the great feudal landlords. Feudalism continues to exist in England side by side with bourgeois capitalism, and it becomes more and more menacing in proportion as the immense industrial and commercial development of England brings in formidable incomes to the landed proprietors, to the extent of making them millionaires and multi-millionaires. And these extremely rich landowners, supported by all other monopolists, possess, besides their wealth, an immense political power in the House of Lords. They can oppose their veto to any measure passed by the Commons if it should in any way menace their wealth or power.

What makes the situation still worse is, that besides the hereditary peers—great landowners for the most part—the House of Lords contains also a large number of peers created by Royalty: financial speculators like Rothschild, Colonial adventurers like Milner, big manufacturers and railway magnates, and above all, the brewer lords, with whom are associated the whole band of rich publicans and wine merchants, all ready to fight to the last in support of all the great industrial and financial monopolies.

All these people, one can guess, are with the Conservatives; and one can see the influence the Conservatives possess when they are in power and are aided by all the interests of landlordism and the exploiting classes. It is the survival of the *ancien régime*, supported by the gang of bourgeois profitmongers and the powers of the modern centralised State.

We know that it is often maintained in England that the Conservatives represent the landed interest, while the Liberals

are the representatives of industrial capitalism. This might have been true (if it ever was) fifty years ago, but it is true no more, since all sorts of capitalism have grown up, and immense fortunes have been accumulated quite independent of industry. It is now known that the incomes of this country derived from monopolies—banks, railways, navigation, water, and so on—secured in England, in the Colonies, and all the world over, are far greater than the incomes derived from industry. And besides, particularly since the formation of the Unionist Party, an immense majority of the industrial lords have joined the Conservatives in their hatred and contempt for every democratic and Socialist movement. The Conservatives are the nucleus round which all the enemies of popular progress unite.

During the twenty years of Conservative rule we have seen the cessation of all that rich intellectual movement, and the emasculation of all that democratic spirit which animated England in the years 1860-85. The progress of the great Socialist movement which began to flourish in the years 1880-86 was also checked with the coming into power of the Conservatives. In the destruction of these two popular forces we have a fact of the first importance.

It was, above all things, to crush the rising spirit of the new-born Socialism that the middle class, in 1886, threw themselves into the arms of the Conservatives. From this it would have seemed that the Socialists ought necessarily to have used all their forces to prevent the return of the Conservatives to power. . . . But they have done precisely the reverse.

It would take too long to explain here the reason for such reactionary tactics of the English Parliamentary Socialists; but the fact remains that already in the elections of 1885 and 1892, but more particularly in 1895, they did all in their power to prevent the return of the Liberals: In their meetings and in their press they attacked only the Liberals, and during the elections they prevented their return by putting up Socialist candidates who had not the least chance of success, but who took votes from the Liberal candidates.

* * *

The triumph of the Conservatives was completed in this way. And then, in all the great questions which interested the country there came a general reaction. Instead of discussing the great problems which the Socialist revival had brought to the front, the British worker was compelled to fight for retaining his most elementary liberties: the right of combination and the right of striking, non-sectarian education, freedom from conscription, cheap food free from import duties, and so on.

In the years 1884-86, workmen were discussing in their meetings the expropriation of the docks and the railways, in order to transfer them to working men's associations. They spoke of dwelling houses becoming the property of municipalities, which would rent them at cost price. "Municipal Socialism" was discussed, and Municipal Communism was in the air. The nationalisation or the communalisation of the land was a favourite topic, and the eight-hour day gradually began to be introduced in the workshops of the State and certain municipalities. The idea of a general strike was whispered in the factories. . . .

Now we had to forget all that. Different matters were introduced.

No sooner had Salisbury got into office than, by the stupid arrogance of his diplomatic notes, he brought England within an inch of war with the United States over the Venezuelan affair. Then a war with Russia was within measurable distance. And finally, that absurd turncoat, Chamberlain—Republican in 1876, coquetting with Socialism in 1886, and Conservative in 1892—was teaching "good manners" to France, and nearly provoked war in consequence of the Fashoda incident.

And then came the Boer War, the ignominious failure of the would-be Unionist statesman, the defeats inflicted on the British Empire by a handful of peasants, and thereupon, as a result of these defeats, the hysterical revival of militarism and national self-conceit.

A little later, war with Russia was on the point of breaking out over the Dogger Bank incident, when Germany mobilised her fleet to prevent it; and since that time Europe has had the menace of an Anglo-German war suspended over its head.

It is easy to understand that under such conditions the further development of advanced ideas was completely stopped. Socialism was shelved and packed away, and the middle classes, always very clever, took full advantage of the respite for accumulating immense fortunes in the meantime, and for dividing the working classes and trying to demoralise them.

The Conservatives lost no time in pursuing their policy against the workers. They attacked positions that had been

considered as most firmly established, and instead of going forward, the workers found themselves compelled to defend rights that hitherto had been regarded as most sacred.

The decision of the judges in the Taff Vale case left the workers henceforth responsible for the losses of the masters caused by striking without due notice. The Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants had to pay £35,000 to the masters for a single strike.

Then the new law on education was introduced. The Conservatives abolished the School Boards, elected by popular suffrage (women included), for the organisation of primary instruction; and gave new powers to the Church of England, which is the church of the rich. All continuation instruction, introduced by the School boards, was abolished. "Who is to do the menial work if our servants learn the piano and want time for reading?" was the chorus of all those parrots reciting their lessons—the dames of the Primrose League, the powerful organisation of Conservative women for gaining votes, by fair means or foul, for the Conservative Party, and the boycotting of those who remained independent.

And the same thing happened in all directions.

* * *

It needed the defeats of the Boer War, and the fall of Consols from 105 to 79, to arouse popular resentment against the Conservatives. At the elections of 1906 the Liberals obtained an unexpected majority. They held 373 seats against 168 held by Conservatives (Tories and Unionists), and there were besides 46 Labour representatives, practically with the Liberals, and 83 Irish Nationalists. The Conservatives, it is true, made little effort to maintain their position. They preferred that their war debts should be left as a burden to the Liberals.

Lloyd George, the Radical, and John Burns, the ex-Socialist, were taken into the new Liberal Ministry. It must not be imagined, however, that this Ministry started out to make Radical reforms. Far from that. It introduced old-age pensions—a small thing in itself, but containing some promise for the future. A promise was also given to deal seriously with the unemployment question and to inaugurate Labour Bureaus, which will pave the way for Labour officialism. They promised also to revise the Education Act and the law regarding strikes, and an Act was passed making the land more accessible to cultivators in Scotland. They thus began to nibble at the land question—a question which Socialists of the German Social Democratic school had taken care not to touch.

These reforms, however, required money, and money was not to be had, especially as the middle classes would have at any price a strong Army and an immensely increased Navy.

Then Lloyd George had the quite natural idea of taxing the immense incomes of the rich. It is known what fabulous incomes the landlords receive from their lands, more especially in the neighbourhood of the great cities; and the worker understands already that it is himself and not the proprietor who gives this great value to the land. Also, it is beginning to be known what huge sums this nation of moneylenders, which the English are becoming, takes in interest every year for the moneys lent to various foreign States, to cities, railways, canals, navigation, banks, and industries abroad.

The great bulk of this colossal revenue escapes all taxation. And it was but a small part of this revenue that Lloyd George proposed to tax in his Budget. But his greatest crime was, that in reply to the landowners, who said they were totally ruined by democratic legislation, he proposed to make a national inquiry into all land values and to tax them in proportion to the valuation. Not in proportion to what these lands bring in now as private parks or being rented as game preserves, but in proportion to what they would be worth if they were used for agricultural purposes. What sacrilege!

We know the result: the refusal of the Lords to sanction the Budget—contrary to Constitutional usage, which gives the Commons absolute power in finance matters—and then the new elections.

* * *

These elections were followed everywhere with the greatest interest—with anxiety by the international clique of monopolists. Nearly all advanced people have had some illusions about their possible results.

Now we have the result, and it is such as we might all have foreseen. *The English middle classes have taken fright at innovations that threatened their pockets, and have gone over to the Conservatives.* The same thing happened to Lloyd George as happened once to Gladstone, who also had a conflict with the Lords over a programme of reforms more or less advanced, and who as a result lost the confidence of the English bourgeoisie.

"We have drawn the teeth and clipped the claws of the Socialist tiger," exclaims with jubilation that Conservative journal, the *Spectator*.

The Liberals in reality have lost more than 120 seats. Together with the Labour Party, they will probably have a majority of about 40 votes over the Conservatives. They will have with them about 85 Nationalists ready to vote against the Lords. But they will probably make the stipulation of Home Rule for Ireland, and this is what the middle class of England are opposing by all means.

The elections thus mean the end of the Liberal Ministry and the victory of the Conservative elements. The Liberals may remain in power, but they will be unable to accomplish anything.

The Budget will probably be accepted by the Lords; but this is the end of all promised reforms. It is the maintenance of the *status quo* and a speedy return of a Conservative Government—a return into the quagmire in which England has been paddling from 1885 till 1905.

And the working men? we shall be asked. Since they have joined as a party in Parliamentary politics, they are helpless. Of their 78 candidates, some 30 have been piteously beaten, and the others have entered Parliament only with the support of the Liberals. But this fact would require some explanation, which must be left for another occasion.

For the moment, we have received a great object-lesson. *Parliaments exist for preventing serious reforms, not for aiding them.* If the working men want to have reforms—even the most moderate ones—they must impose them. They must threaten Parliaments, not enter them cap in hand.

P. KROPOTKIN.

FERRER AND HIS WORK.

"Now that Ferrer is dead, it is our duty to resume his work, to continue it, to spread it, to attack all fetishes which keep mankind under the yoke of State, capitalism, and superstition."—KROPOTKIN.

Let it be understood that I do not wish to develop hero-worship, nor do I wish to minimise the superhuman efforts of our comrades to resume with greater vigour their attacks upon capitalism, and superstition. Speech after speech, pamphlets and articles have been given to the populace, eulogising the great work of Ferrer, and invariably culminating in an appeal to carry forward with more incisiveness the propaganda for which he was murdered.

But what are we, as Anarchists, doing to spread our ideas amongst the young people of tender years? I contend that this was Ferrer's principal work—a work that was the most inimical to those "fetishes" which prop up this moribund society of ours.

The Church and Government of Spain fully realised that dangerous results would follow if the child's mind was freed from the shackles of the superstitions which they relentlessly implanted in it. They, at all events, are aware of the fact that childhood is the most receptive period in our mental evolution, and they act accordingly. It is a thousand pities that we do not pay more attention to this vital work of our late comrade.

The murder of Ferrer has called forth forebodings of bloody deeds to avenge a trick which is of paramount importance to "good government." The murder must be avenged, but in a form that will undermine all the foundations that exploitation and slavery are built upon, *i.e.*, by freeing the child's mind of the prejudices that are daily inculcated by the State and Church.

Study the psychology of an average audience. The hypnotic influence the State and Church have wielded stupefies them. Their faces betray intellects that have been shaped and moulded with prejudices that have been carried from childhood. Once they had plastic minds, but they hardly begin to assert themselves when into their mouths is put the dummy teat of superstition. The child is at once handicapped; but often, as age creeps on, the mind struggles against these fearful odds, and yet dreads to strike them down. At this stage the child naturally launches out on the troubled sea of thought, but is quickly snuffed by those men who are presumably endowed with an especial mentality, whose only object in life is to dictate and to render submissive all healthy minds which crave for liberty.

To reach manhood, a child passes through a stage of life where the proverbial "wild oats" are sown. That youth must have its way is obvious. There is something lacking mentally

or physically with the youth whose energies are not riotous enough to render those "ultra-respectable" people indignant. Upheavals in society are inevitable, and I presume one of the planks of our propaganda is to spread our ideas and prepare for the aftermath.

The same argument is applicable to the life of man. As the form of a future society depends largely upon the ideas prevalent before the revolution, so also is it in the case of man who passes through the stage of rebellious youth. Witness the students of Russia; ever and anon they will "kick over the traces." They are steadily denying the existing laws, and nothing but success can follow their persistent methods. Witness also the students of India. Although I hold no brief for national movements of this description, yet it serves as a forcible argument in favour of Anarchists paying more attention to this phase of the movement. The youth of India is restless. Peace will not be purchased at the price of serfdom. The fire of liberty has undoubtedly been fanned in their infancy, and the holocaust is manifested in the flush of youth. The authorities thought that they could afford to smile upon the growing discontent of the students, but as soon as they realised the force of their propaganda they quickly muzzled the press and the speeches of the youthful rebels. Shepherds don't muzzle sheep.

The International League of Modern Schools, founded by Ferrer in 1908 in Paris, was intended to strike an effective blow at statecraft and priestcraft through the mind of the child. Ferrer was short-lived before his idea could be developed, but that should not deter this work. We are apt to depend too much on one man in our propaganda. This should not be the case. There is no need to wait for committees, conferences and the like. Committees and conferences are often abominations. If you believe the work to be good and effective, then set about it. The mind of a child is more susceptible to change than the mind of a man, too often steeped in patriotism and religion. Gather a few lads and lasses together, and tell them, at least, that there are some people in the world who say that government and gods are false and treacherous. Do it now.

DICK JAMES.

THE CASE FOR NON-RESISTANCE.

(Conclusion.)

To begin with, it is not to be imagined that non-resistance is the sole solution to the problems of the present day. It is but a link in the chain, and, like all others, depends on the slow development of the public conscience towards a higher order of morality. When we reflect on the Mosaic law of eye for eye and tooth for tooth, we notice that the predominant idea is that of justice, and that the finite creature is considered fit to judge or condemn. In the New Testament we have a totally different idea advanced. Instead of straining to get equal with our neighbour for wrongdoing, for bearing and self-sacrifice are taught. Evil is not to be resisted with evil; as Paul says, "Overcome evil with good." Instead of keeping up blow for blow, which is the game nations are playing at the present day, we are told to suffer rather than to hit back. Underneath it all there is a drawing on the higher faculties in the human, that if we love even our enemies we will thereby cause them to see more clearly their errors.

Along, too, with the shifting of the centre of authority from without to within came the true method of reforming society. "Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also." Here we have the keynote to all true reform—"Get right within first." Man-made authority is indeed one of the greatest evils that we are suffering from at the present day. For instance, in dealing with the question of war, which is resistance *par excellence*, it is usually claimed that it is one's duty to defend their country at all costs; but if to defend one's country is to act contrary to the divine authority within, then one is not justified in taking part in war. The error lies in not recognising that the duty of the individual to his own conscience is always before that to the State. In answer to this it may be said that we must not forget to look at results; that for a nation to practise disarmament would lead to its invasion by another nation and end in its own ruin. This hypothesis, like many more, is ever likely to remain a hypothesis. Granted a nation did invade another practising non-resistance, it would not care about even harming peaceful people; there is no military glory in killing the defenceless.

It is not to be supposed that the practice of non-resistance would be carried on without harm or suffering, for it seems an inevitable rule with all new movements that some one must suffer while the change is taking place. Besides, non-resistance being an ideal, it requires that determination of character which is prepared for suffering, and even welcomes it so long as it hastens the reaching of that goal which it is desirable humanity should attain. When we reflect, too, on the past history of the world, we know that the principle of resistance has also been accompanied with suffering. War alone has been responsible for an incalculable amount of suffering. Think of the millions that have

been slain on this altar to satisfy violence. Truly, non-resistance would have a big handicap to make up before it could even be judged by its victims.

But the crux of the whole matter soon reveals itself when we come to deal with the question of Governments, for many are quite willing to admit the error of war, but to ask for the abolition of Governments seems, to say the least of it, ridiculous. It would soon result, they say, in widespread panic and disorder, the robber and murderer would reign supreme. One would indeed imagine, from hearing those who argue thus, that no single transaction could take place in society at the present day without a few heads being chopped off. It is amusing besides to hear of the awful state of affairs that is detailed were people to begin to live in a sane manner. The error is caused by ignoring the historic fact that changes in the constitution of society do not happen in a cataclysmic manner, but by an exceedingly slow process, a gradual leavening of the whole mass. When we consider also what a radical change is involved in the acceptance of non-resistance, let us be careful and not forecast all kinds of hypothetical absurdities.

In reviewing those movements that are trying to better the present social conditions, it is noticeable that they practically all agree in their methods. They think that by entering Governments they will manage, by means of majorities, to create a better social state. The Socialist Party, for instance, who are trying to effect a more radical reform than perhaps any other, do not as a body object to man-made compulsory laws. Certainly, the ideal of land nationalisation is good; but if it is to be established by compulsory law, which would mean greater compulsion to maintain, then it will only be another wolf in the sheep's skin. This is where the principle upon which war rests agrees with that upon which Governments rest: they are both based upon resisting evil with evil. If men, and even now women, instead of striving to create merely a new system of violence, would devote their energy to the bettering of their own lives, before long we would see the dawn of a new era in civilisation. It is folly to complain of murderers roaming at large under non-resistance, when we know that Governments exist by murder and are always increasing their preparations for murder. Why, think of the grotesqueness of it all! Thousands of men depending for a livelihood on making machines to murder men! As to robbery under non-resistance, let us reflect first on how much of it exists under resistance. To be brief, our whole land system is little else than a gigantic robbery. It is here, too, the Socialists err, for if private property is wrong, so also is public property; it is all stealing, whether it be property owned by the individual, municipality, or State.

How inconsistent it is for workmen to co-operate in Trade Unions, etc., to try to overthrow the capitalists, and at the same time take part in Governments by means, say, of the Territorials, whose object it is to defend that which they are trying to pull down. This is the error which Tolstoy has so clearly pointed out in his book called "The Slavery of Our Times." How barbarous, too, our criminal laws, which place a reproach on him who steals the coat, but none on him who steals the labour that made it. They are nothing else but carefully devised mechanisms to give ease and luxury to a privileged few. Who in the name of crime is able to throw the first stone? If it is wrong for the Anarchist to use lyddite, it is also wrong for a nation to use lyddite. If it is wrong for individuals to settle their disputes by fighting, so also is it wrong for nations to do so. When we consider besides the many temptations there are for the criminal to commit crime, the force of heredity and environment, how unjust our criminal system becomes. The sense of pity is conspicuously absent from the statute-book. How many of us have done our duty in helping to lift the fallen that we can afford to act as judges and juries?

The question still remains to be discussed in how far the use of restraint is permissible under non-resistance, for it is not improbable that for a long time under non-resistance many incidents would arise which would necessitate the use of a wise restraint. Tolstoy's entire condemnation of physical force between human beings has led him to overstate the case for non-resistance. For example, were some unruly fellow to attempt to block the traffic by placing himself in the midst of any of our public streets, there would be no violation of the principle of non-resistance in removing him physically, as long as we do not willingly injure him in doing so. To be plain, I see nothing contrary to non-resistance in having an equivalent to our present police if thought desirable, for it is folly to conclude that the policeman, like, say, the executioner, is only an instrument for violence.

In conclusion, let us note that the chief difference between resistance and non-resistance is that of motive. Resistance says, "Avenge your enemies"; non-resistance says, "Love your enemies." Some may plead, however, that it is love that animates one in defending their rights. Truly, it may be; but it is only self-love without love for others. What perhaps will prove the greatest obstacle to many in their acceptance of the teaching of non-resistance is the fact that it is first and foremost an individual question. It is here that it differs especially from most reform movements. Looking at the great amount of preaching that goes on at the present day, one would think that evil would soon be banished from the face of the globe. But it is all mere talk; they all wish to reform every one but themselves, and thus it is only reasonable to conclude that non-resistance will not be a fashionable reform at first. Let us, then, always be fair, and while admitting our own gross inconsistency, which we are all more or less tainted with, show that we are trying to be faithful to our cause; always willing to

recognise the truth even though it should involve self-admission of wrong-doing. Again, do not let us hasten to draw a cord round non-resistance and establish a sect, for the truth is not the sole right of any sect. Besides, the ideal of non-resistance is contained more or less in the teaching of all the great minds since the world began, from the gentle Buddha to the prophetic Tolstoy. Nor is it confined to great minds nor to the lesser, for it is to be found even in the lower animals, as witness the dog who will lick the hand of his cruel master. The same spirit which caused the loving Jesus to utter these memorable words, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do."

DUGALD SEMPLE.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

Brazil.

As you hardly ever include Brazil in your "International Notes," I have resolved to send you, from time to time, some information on the Anarchist movement and other actualities out here.

We have in all the following Anarchist journals:—*La Battaglia*, a weekly paper, written in Italian and published in Sao Paulo. This journal has a very large circulation throughout the interior of the State of Sao Paulo, where the Italian colony is exceedingly strong. *A Terra Livre*, a fortnightly journal, written in Portuguese, also published in Sao Paulo. This paper was suspended for some time, but has fortunately reappeared, being published regularly every first and fifteenth days of the month. *A Luta*, a journal which appears every fortnight in Porto Alegre (Rio Grande do Sul), written in Portuguese. Apart from these periodicals there exists, in Sao Paulo, an Anticlerical and Rationalist weekly named *A Lanterna*.

There are propaganda nucleuses in several States of Brazil, namely, Paraná, Rio Grande do Sul, Minas, Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo, where, apart from the many groups spread throughout the interior of the State, there are in the capital the following:—Grupo Aurora and Grupo Libertas, who work together, publishing propaganda pamphlets and selling them at very low prices. They have already issued the following leaflets:—"A Mulher e o Militarismo" (The Woman and Militarism), by Domela Nieuwenhuis; and "O Programa Socialista Anarquista" (The Socialist Anarchist Programme), by E. Malatesta. Grupo Pensamento e Acao, who undertake the organisation of benefits and subscriptions for propaganda purposes; Circulo de Estudos Sociais, who openly propagate Anarchist ideas.

In Sao Paulo an association has been organised called Associação pro Escola Moderna (Modern-School Association) to found a Modern School there, following the principles of Francisco Ferrer. For that purpose Oreste Ristori, editor of *La Battaglia*, is now making a lecturing tour, with limelight views, in the interior of the State of Sao Paulo. The idea of the foundation of a Modern School has been received with great enthusiasm by the Freethinkers of Sao Paulo. We have just founded in Rio de Janeiro an association whose object is to gather money to help the opening of the Sao Paulo Modern School. As soon as it is built and the books published, we shall open one here.

From the foregoing you will see that the most active movement is being carried out in Sao Paulo.

With fraternal greetings,

MYER FELDMAN.

America.

Solidarity brings the gladdening news that the prolonged fight for the right of free speech on the streets of Spokane, Washington, has ended in practically a complete victory for the Industrial Workers of the World.

The I.W.W. put forward the following demands: 1. The promise that landlords would not be intimidated into refusing the use of halls to the I.W.W. as has been done during the past few months, and that the I.W.W. hall meetings be absolutely free from police interference, provided of course that the meetings are held according to the usual rules. 2. Freedom of the press, and the right to sell the *Industrial Worker* on the street as other newspapers are. 3. The release of I.W.W. prisoners in the city and county prisons. 4. The use of the street for public speaking.

These were the rights for which our comrades had been fighting for many months. It is evident that these demands are the very basis of freedom, and it was high time that a stand was made by the workers against the encroachment of the Government on the elementary rights of citizenship.

The first two points were ceded at once. For the fourth, the Mayor and municipal delegates promised that free speech would soon be allowed in Spokane; meanwhile the regular religious organisations must also await the time till the streets are open to all, and no favour will be shown to them. On the third point, the prisoners in the city gaol (15) were liberated at once, and those in the county gaols are to be released successively. In return, the Mayor asked the organiser of the I.W.W. to put himself at the disposal of the Spokane courts, though bail will be allowed till his case will be dismissed formally.

As is seen, the workers had nearly a full victory. But the significance of their fight for free speech lies not so much in the result as in the unprecedented fact that the civic authorities have been obliged to treat with the delegates of the I.W.W., as the representatives of one independent power with those of another.

And yet this new power, this Industrial Democracy, had not used any of its formidable weapons, as a general strike, armed resistance, etc.,

but had simply resolved to ignore the police laws. They were arrested and sent to gaol in numbers, but the quiet determination of the workers, though voteless and without political influence as really all of them were—the surprising solidarity of these fighters for freedom soon brought the authorities to a state when they were willing to submit the whole question to a committee of representatives from both sides.

The I.W.W. has already shown several times its real character, and again it has reason to be proud of the fight and of its results. It is to be hoped that the increasing brutality of the police will be checked also in other places where the old American liberties have become more tradition than reality.

After Syndicalist and Anarchist publications in the Chinese and Japanese languages, we now learn that in the Dutch East Indies the railwaymen are publishing a paper in the Malay language to defend their Syndical rights. But with the usual vindictiveness, the Government has promptly dismissed the president of the Railway Employees Union, as the paper was not edited in a spirit pleasing to the authorities.

Spain.

Jouhaux, the secretary of the General Confederation of Labour in France, had been sent as a representative of the Confederation to a meeting which was to be held in Barcelona. But under the pretext that the Spanish Constitution prohibits foreigners occupying themselves with the internal affairs of the country, the authorisation for the meeting was refused by the Governor of Barcelona.

As, however, entrance into Spanish territory had not been denied to the secretary of the Confederation, he could make the acquaintance of the militant spirits of Barcelona, and in the *Voir du Peuple* he says: "The impression made on me by this interview was excellent. However weak in numbers the working class organisation in Catalonia is at present, it is nevertheless a great acting and combative force. Contrary to what often is the case in our Syndicalist circles, the Catalonians are animated by a spirit open to all noble and generous ideas. The Syndicalists in Barcelona are men of initiative and courage, whom no enterprise, however daring, can frighten. The atmosphere in the Syndicalist meetings is fraternal and sympathetic. In my opinion in this lies the strength of a movement."

Jouhaux nevertheless recognises the weak side of the Spanish movement. "The weakness of the Catalonian movement lies in its lack of organisation. But," he adds, "considering the high sentiments of this exceptionally studious people, we may rest assured that they will draw the conclusions from the recent events in Barcelona. Most of the militant persons have already done so, and though just come out from a period of ferocious oppression, full of enthusiasm, they have set to work at the reorganisation of their Unions. Soon they will have a powerful and mighty organisation. Animated by a strong fighting spirit which is their characteristic, working for a high ideal, the future will be theirs."

Switzerland.

A great reaction on the part of the Government, as well as a state of depression in the working-class movement, are for the moment very evident in the French-speaking part of Switzerland. Here, as elsewhere, politics are the means used to break up the workers' Unions. The National Trade Federation, which follows the orders of the Social Democrat Labour men of German-speaking Switzerland (Gewerkschaftsbund), has passed the word to the local sections to leave the Trade Unions of French-speaking Switzerland (Bourses du Travail), because these have a Revolutionary Syndicalist and Federalist tendency. So in Lausanne the metal workers left the Union; the printers are going to do the same under the pretext that the Union is too actively engaged in antimilitarist propaganda, though its only activity consisted in sending a delegate to the Antimilitarist Congress of Bieme. In Geneva, the metal workers and tailors have left; in Neuchatel, the same is expected; in Fribourg, the Centralists forced the whole Trade Union to leave the National Trades Federation, all under the pretext that the Syndicalists are revolutionary. Side by side with this work of disorganisation, the politicians are doing their best to get the workers into politics. In Montreux, the German-Swiss element, which form the greater part of the Centralists, want to put participation in elections in the programme of activity of the Trade Union; the same is being tried in Neuchatel.

Simultaneously with the sowing of discord by the Social Democrats of the Gewerkschaftsbund, the Government are also active. In Vevey, meetings of the Trade Unions, where only administrative questions are discussed, are stopped in nine cases out of ten, for as soon as the authorities hear of a convocation, they send the police to the owners of halls, warning them with menace not to let them to the Syndicalists, who are forced to meet as conspirators in small groups. Absolutely all militant workers have been dismissed by their employers and obliged to leave the town. Foreign workers are not permitted to assist at public meetings, except as listeners, under pain of being sent out of the town. This régime is increasing daily in severity.

In Montreux, the season tax (kurtax) is collected from the workers at the employer's house before the wages are paid to the men; when the workers protested, they were sent away; others have appealed to the court—no answer! The police pretend to have the right to assist at meetings of the Syndicalists when these by chance have found a hall.

A mad reaction has set in, and it is difficult to say how to stop it.

The authorities are acting evidently under the pressure of the hotel keepers, who, in the interest of the development of their business, are afraid that the slightest indication of economic and social discontent in Switzerland may hurt the sensitiveness of the foreign travellers.

The *Voix du Peuple* of Lausanne, in spite of difficult times, is in a good condition, and in its enlarged size is now the most important paper of the working class and Socialist press of French Switzerland.

PROPAGANDA NOTES.

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

LIVERPOOL INTERNATIONAL MODERN SCHOOL.

Our numbers still keep a good average, and all is well. Mat Kavanagh continues his lectures on Evolution to the boys. They quickly cross-examine him when the opportunity occurs for questions. Needless to say, these youthful minds can put posers that cause Mat to rummage his brain-box for suitable answers. The girls are unfortunate in not getting a suitable teacher. This is a pity. Methinks we want a capable woman. Is there a woman in Liverpool who subscribes generally to the views of FREEDOM, who would care to take charge of a group of girls for one hour each Sunday at 1 Clarendon Terrace, Beaumont Street?

We have made a start with an adult class. Mat Roche sets the class in motion. They have taken "The Conquest of Bread" as their text-book. We hope Roche succeeds in his enterprise. We endeavoured to rent an extra room from the I.L.P., but failed. Why? I don't know.

Subscriptions are coming in very slowly. Mark you, comrades of Liverpool, the list:—Jack 5d, B. 4d, A. S. 4d (Feb. 25—to March 25).

At the International Club, 22 Canning Place, the Spanish Group have discussions every Saturday night from 8.30 to 10.30. Spanish students are invited to attend these lectures. We had some splendid gatherings of students on March 12 and 19. Our Spanish comrade Bartet on both occasions gave splendid addresses, attacking Governments and priestcraft with all the energy that is typical of our Continental comrades. There is a mixed set of opinions in the room, as far apart as the poles, and naturally the discussions that followed were lively. We hope great things from our Spanish group, and the comrades are taking full advantage of it. For further information, apply to

DICK JAMES.

International Club, 22 Canning Place, Liverpool.

WALTHAMSTOW.

Unfortunately, we could not carry out our plan of holding indoor meetings during the winter months. We were not able to get speakers for Wednesday evenings, and could not secure a room for Sundays, when we could have had speakers. Comrade Barrett has gone North, so we shall not have his help in the propaganda this summer. And we want speakers, for, in my opinion, the time is opportune; that is to say, since the General Election the workers are more ready to discuss the efficacy of the Parliamentary machine than has been the case for years. When weather permitted, Comrade Ponder has held meetings at Edmonton Green, with the help of Comrade Baron. A report should have been sent of the debate that was held at Edmonton Green on two Sunday mornings, February 6 and 13, between Ponder and C. R. Smart, S.D.P. The subject was "Free Organisation or Majority Rule." Comrade Pontler certainly had a good grip of his subject. C. R. Smart, when he got up to reply, congratulated him on the way he had dealt with the subject. Smart was an excellent exponent for the S.D.P. on majority rule (now made null and void by Hyndman, the autocrat, at their Congress, Canning Town). We have started to hold meetings on Sunday evenings at the Green, Tottenham, Seven Sisters corner. Good attendance and plenty of questions and discussion. We also hold meetings at Hoe Street Station on Wednesdays at 8.30 p.m. Speakers wanted.

W. FANNER.

KENNINGTON.

Comrade Parker often has a social gathering of friends and relations at his house. At a recent one, after some music and singing, our comrade Underwood gave a short address on "Natural Laws versus Man-Made Laws." Questions and discussion followed, most of those present agreeing that man-made laws were bad, but not quite seeing how we could carry on production without compulsion. The discussion was very interesting. Let us hope we shall soon have a good working Anarchist Communist group here. Comrades who could follow the example of our friend Parker would greatly help the movement in this quarter.

F. LEE.

GLASGOW.

Comrades who are willing to help in outdoor propaganda in this district are requested to write to G. Barrett, care of D. Baxter, 32 Brunswick Street, Glasgow.

NORWICH LABOUR CHURCH.

APRIL 24, Afternoon and Evening.

JOHN TURNER.

FRANK KITZ FUND.

We regret to hear that, owing to the boycott of the employers, our old comrade Frank Kitz has no work and is greatly in need of help. We shall be very glad to receive and forward to him any sums sent us.—Anon. 5s, Comp. 6d.

To Correspondents.

BRISTOL SOCIALIST.—Too late for this issue. It is usual for correspondents to send name and address.

The fine poem "War and Music" in last month's issue was by Richard Le Gallienne, whose name was omitted by an oversight.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

(March 10—April 7.)

FREEDOM Guarantee Fund.—H. Glasse 10s 6d, L. FitzRoy 3s 6d, E. Rhodes 2s. FREEDOM Subscriptions.—H. Compton 10s, C. Saunders 1s 6d, H. F. Miller 1s 6d, B. Rose 1s 6d, H. Fryer 1s 6d, W. Jago 1s 6d.

WORKERS' FRIEND CLUB, 163 JUBILEE ST., MILE END, E.

A Socialist Reunion and Dance

Will take place at the above

On Sunday Evening, April 17,

For the Benefit of our old comrade FRANK KITZ.

Vocal and Instrumental Music.

J. Morrison Davidson will take the Chair, and John Turner will speak during the evening.

Commence at 8 o'clock. All comrades invited.

PAMPHLET AND BOOK LIST.

ANARCHIST COMMUNISM: ITS BASIS AND PRINCIPLES. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
 ANARCHISM: ITS PHILOSOPHY AND IDEAL. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.
 ANARCHIST MORALITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
 ANARCHY. By E. MALATESTA. 1d.
 THE WAGE SYSTEM. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.
 A TALK ABOUT ANARCHIST COMMUNISM BETWEEN TWO WORKERS. By E. MALATESTA. 1d.
 THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
 EXPROPRIATION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
 DIRECT ACTION v. LEGISLATION. By J. BLAIR SMITH. 1d.
 THE PYRAMID OF TYRANNY. By F. DOMELA NIEUWENHUIS. 1d.
 LAW AND AUTHORITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
 THE SOCIAL GENERAL STRIKE. By ARNOLD ROLLER. 2d.
 THE PLACE OF ANARCHISM IN SOCIALISTIC EVOLUTION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
 THE COMMUNE OF PARIS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
 ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. 1d.
 THE BASIS OF TRADE UNIONISM. By EMILE POUGET. 1d.
 AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
 WAR. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
 SOCIALISM THE REMEDY. By HENRY GLASSE. 1d.
 EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. By ELISEE RECLUS. 1d.
 THE KING AND THE ANARCHIST. 1d.
 MONOPOLY; OR, HOW LABOUR IS ROBBED. WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
 USEFUL WORK VERSUS USELESS TOIL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
 THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONGRESS, 1907. 1d.
 ANARCHY v. SOCIALISM. By W. C. OWEN. 2d., post-free 2½d.
 WHAT I BELIEVE. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 2d., post-free 2½d.
 PATRIOTISM. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 2d., post-free 2½d.
 THE TRAGEDY OF WOMAN'S EMANCIPATION. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 2d., post-free 2½d.
 THE MASTERS OF LIFE. By MAXIM GORKY. 2d., post-free 2½d.
 THE GOD PESTILENCE. By JOHN MOST. 1½d.
 SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN GERMANY. By GUSTAV LANDAUER. 1d.
 ANARCHISTS AND ESPERANTO. 1d.
 KROPOTKIN: THE MAN AND HIS MESSAGE. By T. SWAN. 1d.
 THE TERROR IN RUSSIA. By P. KROPOTKIN. 2d., postage 1½d.

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

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

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

FIELDS, FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. Paper cover 6d, post-free 9d.; cloth 1s., post-free 1s. 3d.

MEMOIRS OF A REVOLUTIONIST. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2s.

MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1s.

NEWS FROM NOWHERE. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1s. 6d.; postage 4d.

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

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

PRISONS, POLICE AND PUNISHMENT. By E. CARPENTER. Paper 1s., cloth 2s., postage 3d.

ENGLAND'S IDEAL. By EDWARD CARPENTER. 2s. 6d. and 1s., post. 3d.

A VINDICATION OF NATURAL SOCIETY. By EDMUND BURKE. 1s. and 6d., postage 2d. and 1d.

WALDEN. By H. THOREAU. 1s. and 6d., postage 2d. and 1d.

All orders, with cash, should be sent to

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

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