

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. XXVIII.—No. 298.

FEBRUARY, 1914.

MONTHLY: ONE PENNY.

NOTES.

Force—and the Future.

Botha and Gladstone share the eternal infamy of having sacrificed what hope there was of justice, humanity, and social progress in South Africa to the fiends of finance, to the most cruel, the basest passion that blackens the heart of man—the lust of gold. Just as ten years ago these monsters cost this country twenty thousand lives and £300,000,000, to attain their end, so to-day they are costing us all that heritage of free institutions that has come down to us through the struggles of the past. The moment is fraught with the utmost peril for the whole of the forces of progress, no matter under what banner they may be ranged. We have only to note the jubilation of the dominant class in this country to understand what kind of world this is to be if their lusts and caprices are to conquer us by the use of such force as has been tried in South Africa. Their bellies are to be filled with the best, their wives are to be clothed in the richest, their children educated (?) into “classical” cads, even if phthisis is to reign supreme, even if entire races of men be swept off the face of the earth, and those who are left starve in body and mind in maintaining the parasites and providing their pleasures. With such a possibility in view, every man and woman of every class and creed should be roused to the present danger, and sinking all minor differences should join in the most determined and uncompromising protest against the scoundrels who are betraying the most elementary claims of humanity.

The World for the Wealthy.

What in reality is at the bottom of this action of the plutocrats in South Africa? Nothing less than this: the world for the exploiter. The worker may continue to exist—in slavery—if his toil is needed by his employer. If not, he can die—slowly or quickly, as he prefers. He has that freedom of choice. In other words, we are to go back to the ancient slavery of Egypt, and the rule of a Cheops is to be divided between the monster millionaires, who we see in every country plotting to drown in blood the least aspiration of the toiling millions to the smallest share in the gifts of life—to that which their labour has produced or made possible. And inversely as the pleasures increase for the rich, the pains increase for the poor. There is no mistaking the position. Since wealth begins to realize the awakened consciousness of Labour and the ideal of a Socialist society, its cry is: “This shall not be! If it means that civilisation is to be one vast battlefield, you shall not have your dream!” That is the last word of the ruling classes, and it is well it should be understood. Is the world to be for the parasitic wealth-consumer, or for the proletarian wealth-producer? That is the bed-rock question underlying it all, and that is the fight that is before us. The enemy has thrown down the gauntlet in South Africa. Their victory would mean the eternal slavery of us all; the destruction of all that is free and human and beautiful: the perpetual reign of greed, corruption, and vice.

The Labour Party Conference.

The Labour Party Conference, just concluded at Glasgow, means nothing for the cause of Labour. All the talk was more of a hindrance than a help, and for those who are watching the more significant developments of the present day only two matters have any importance: the pointed attacks on the party by Quinn (Bookbinders) and Shaw (of Oldham), and the vote, carried almost unanimously, against Syndicalism. The criticisms

are the first serious signs of the growing dissatisfaction with political action, and the remark by Shaw that “I often think when we are talking that we are the finest collection of Uriah Heeps ever seen,” must have reminded many of MacDonald’s stage-managed utterance over the sending of gunboats to Leith, when he said the workers must arm themselves with 13-in. guns against the Government. Only a political Uriah Heep could have said after that, that “Members of the Labour Party ought not to be sounding boards for discontent, but rather the allayers of discontent.” The fact is, they are neither; and their vote against Syndicalism and “irresponsible strikes” only emphasises their impotence. For this to have been carried in the face of the fact that, to take only the most recent instances, the musicians have just gained substantial increases by the use of the “lightning strike,” and at this very moment the East End hotel and restaurant employees are winning by the same means, seems to show the Labour Party as the blind *would-be* leaders of those who have had their eyes opened.

Sectarianism and Swine.

Mr. Runciman speaking at the Farmers’ Union, at Nottingham, observed that he thanked heaven “that cows and swine had no religion.” Some people might call this blasphemy, but, however that may be, it is perfectly evident that religion in human societies has been the cause of quite as much suffering and bloodshed as the lust of conquest. In other words, man’s ignorance and fear of the phenomena of storms, earthquakes, and the rest has been used by the craft of priesthoods to hold him in subjection to their dogmas. If Mr. Runciman could only give us a complete return of lives sacrificed in religious wars and persecutions, we should find that the ravages of tuberculosis and the foot-and-mouth disease was small compared to the ravages of religion amongst the ignorant masses of mankind in the past. For a thousand years from the fourth to the sixteenth century Latin Christianity held it sway in Europe. They were the “dark ages,” and the horrors then enacted were the direct outcome of religious hatreds and persecutions. And now at the beginning of the twentieth century we have not yet settled how to educate our children because of the war of sects in the schools! Hence the mental ~~starvation~~ which afflicts so many and hinders them from grasping the conception of a really free society.

The Girls of Ledbury.

We really do not know how the vote of the Labour Party against Syndicalism will affect the “unauthorised” strike of the school girls of Ledbury. It must have sadly disturbed Mr. MacDonald’s dream of “allaying discontent” by Parliamentary methods to read of these young rebels having the daring and initiative to strike in sympathy with their teachers, for that is what it amounts to. Then, again, the teachers are striking as one more proof that every mortal thing is going wrong in the vicious organisation—if it may be so called—of our present capitalist system. Every prop and pillar is either cracked or rotten, and even the children are finding it out. In the present administration of things, decency and common sense (we will not speak of such ridiculous ideals as justice and liberty) are outraged at every turn. We cannot pay decently the men who bring the coal to our door, because the capitalist stands in the way; and we cannot adequately pay to educate our children, because education is organised on a capitalist basis. The only thing we are expected to pay for without a murmur is an unlimited supply of the murderous machinery that maintains and protects all these iniquities. Well, “discontent” is rising, from the girls of Ledbury to the men in the City.

ANARCHY.—A social theory which regards the union of order with the absence of all direct government of man by man as the political ideal.—*Century Dictionary.*

The Modern State.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

IV.

TAXATION A MEANS OF ENRICHING THE RICH.

It is so nice for the rulers of the State to have at their disposal such a nice tool as Taxation! Those innocent men, the "dear citizens" of electoral periods, have been taught to see in taxation the means for accomplishing the great civilising works which make the greatness of a nation; and they accept all sorts of taxes so easily! But those who drive the "dear citizen" to the ballot-box and pull the wires behind the scenes, they know quite well what taxation means. They know it is the means, in a "well-organised" State, to make big fortunes at the expense of the small ones; to make the masses poorer, and to enrich the few; to hand over the peasant and the factory proletarian to the manufacturer first, and the financial speculator next, for further squeezing; to encourage one industry at the expense of another—and all industries at the expense of the tiller of the soil and the nation altogether. They know, only they never tell that to the people. Only fancy what an outcry would have arisen if Salisbury had come one day to the House and asked it to make a national gift of £2,000,000 to the landlords! But by the means of taxation the whole thing was managed very smoothly in 1900, and the gift was given. The landlords pocketed the millions, and the nation paid them without grumbling. And everywhere—in France, in Germany, in all "civilised" States—they manage all the time to make similar gifts to the landlords, the manufacturers, the company promoters, and the bankers—and the "dear citizen" pays, and glorifies his representatives and rulers.

It is so easy! Put only a small new tax on the peasant, on his horse, his cart, or his windows—and you have ruined ten, twenty thousand of those toilers on the land who hitherto hardly succeeded in making both ends meet. A slight increase of the taxes will send them irretrievably into the ranks of the proletarians. But that is precisely what was wanted, since they sell their small parcels of land and go to a town, where they offer their hands to a manufacturer for the mere cost of a miserable existence. Some of them may, of course, resist for some time: they may grow thin on the land; but soon comes some new increase of taxes, and they are sent to join the others.

Such a proletarianisation of the weaker ones goes on from year to year, everywhere—but who notices it, except the ruined ones? In Russia, this dream of the great landlords and the Moscow manufacturers (and the Social Democratic admirers of the great industry)—the proletarianisation of millions of peasants—has been accomplished quite smoothly within the last forty or fifty years, simply by the means of taxation. A law to that effect would have raised a hue-and-cry all over the country; but taxation has done on the sly what the legislator would never have dared to do openly.

And the economists—those who describe themselves as "scientific"—never ceased in the meantime to talk very learnedly of "the established laws of economic development," of "capitalist fatalism" and "its proceeding towards its own negation"—while a simple, honest study of taxation would have explained a good half of what they attribute to "economic laws." The fact is, that the ruining and the expropriation of the peasants, which began in this country in the seventeenth century, and which Marx described as "the primary accumulation of capital," still continues. It is accomplished every year, especially by the means of that nice little tool, Taxation.

Far from being capable of growing by itself, in virtue of "unchangeable economic laws," the force of Capital would have been terribly paralysed had it not in its service that admirable tool, the State. By means of it the capitalists have created, and continue to create every day, new monopolies (mines, railways, water supply, telephones measures against Trade Unions, the right of shooting the strikers, privileged education, and so on); and on the other hand, they have used taxation for enriching the rich and impoverishing the poor.

If Capitalism has helped to erect the Modern State, it is also—let us never forget that—THE MODERN STATE THAT CREATES AND FEEDS CAPITALISM.

* *

Adam Smith had already indicated, more than a century ago, this power of taxation; but the study of that double-edged arm of the State was not continued. The books are silent about it. So we must take our illustrations here and there from actual life.

Let us take, for instance, the taxation of the land, which is one of the most powerful arms that we have handed over to the State. The "Eighth Biennial Report of the Bureau of Labor of Illinois: Taxation, 1894," gave us some interesting data in this respect. It has shown how, even in a democratic State, millionaires' fortunes were made in Chicago, simply in consequence of the accepted mode of taxation of landed property.

The great city of the West has grown, as is known, in leaps

and bounds, reaching a population of 1,500,000 inhabitants in fifty years. And one could see there how, by taxing pretty heavily the land which had been built on, while the vacant plots were taxed very lightly, even in the busiest thoroughfares, the State created numbers of millionaires. Pieces of land which were left vacant in a great street, after having been bought formerly for £200 for a quarter of an acre, have now acquired a value of £200,000 and more.

But it is evident that if the land of the city had been municipalised from the outset, or even taxed per square foot of surface, such fortunes never would have been made. The city would have profited from the increase of its population, and might have reduced the taxes on the houses inhabited by the poorer workers; while now it is precisely these working men's tenement houses which pay the heaviest taxes—to say nothing of the abominable condition they are kept in. But what does that mean? Nothing else but that, owing to the existing taxation, it is the worker who is made to work still more, who is still more impoverished, to enrich the rich.

* *

Or, let us take another example nearer at hand, in Woolwich. Formerly it was a rabbit-warren, and its land had little value, until the State built there its great Arsenal, which employs from 10,000 to 20,000 men, and has brought about the growth of a great town.

But who has profited chiefly by that growth? Owing to taxation as it exists in this country, it was the landlord! Not the workers who built the Arsenal and for years were putting its machinery into action—but the local landlords!

One day, in June, 1899, a member of Parliament spoke about the workers at the Arsenal, demanding from the Government an increase of their wages. One of the Ministers, the economist Goschen, replied in these words:—"What for? All the increase will soon be swallowed by the landlords! During the last ten years we have augmented wages by fully 20 per cent.; but the cost of the working men's lodgings has grown at the same time 50 per cent. The increase of wages has thus gone almost entirely to the landlords." Of course, the argument of the Government was Jesuitical; but the fact was quite correct. The landlords swallowed most of the money granted by the State for improving the wages of the Arsenal workers.

More than that. In the meantime, the inhabitants of Woolwich were asked continually to pay more and more taxes for the drainage of the town, its sewer system, the paving of its streets, and so on, so that the sanitary conditions were much improved. Only, owing to the existing system of taxation, all this immense amount of money paid by the inhabitants to improve their town has gone to enrich the landlords. "The latter sell now in retail to the taxpayers the profits they have made out of the sanitary improvements, paid with the moneys of those same taxpayers," observed lately, quite rightly, the organ of the Woolwich Co-operators, *Comradeship*.

Or, speaking still of Woolwich, one day a steam ferry was set running across the Thames, in order to connect Woolwich with London. Of course, the Government, to begin with, made of the ferry a monopoly in favour of a railway company. Later on, as the company charged too much for the crossing, and the "dear citizen" grumbled, the municipality bought the ferry-right back from the company, the whole costing the town about £220,000 in eight years.

But then it appeared that a free ferry was a new handsome gift made to the landlords. The value of land in Woolwich went up by leaps. A tiny bit of land situated close by the ferry rose at once in value fully £3,000, which, of course, was a gift of the town to the owner of that piece of the land. And as the land in Woolwich will continue to rise in value (every war scare contributing to raise the value of land round the big Arsenal), we have here a new monopoly, and numbers of new capitalists added to the legions of others by the State, with the aid of the working people's money.

You see now for what the State exists, and why it is so dear to all those who are capitalists or expect to become either capitalists or members of the capitalist-making machinery.

* *

But that is not yet all. Things are still more monstrous. The Arsenal workers, overcoming many difficulties, constituted their Trade Unions, and with all sorts of struggles they succeeded in keeping their wages at a level slightly higher than what the earnings are elsewhere in similar industries. They also joined their efforts and created an important Co-operative Society, which permits them now to reduce the cost of living by about 20 or 25 per cent. But lo! thanks to our laws, they who profit most from both the Union and the Co-operative are again—the landlords! When one of them decides to sell or to lease his land, do you know how he advertises in the local papers and on special posters? He prints in big letters the following (*Comradeship* gave the exact text): "The high wages paid to the operatives in the Arsenal and the existence at Woolwich of a prosperous Co-operative Society render this property most appropriate for

building thereon workmen's dwellings." In other words, this means:—"You can pay, gentlemen builders, a high price for this land. It is most suitable for working men's houses. With the higher wages obtained by the workers, and their economies, you will be able to get higher rents." And the "gentleman builder" pays the landlord a higher price—and extorts higher rents from the worker. Don't you admire that mechanism? If not—never talk of Aesthetics!

But there is something more in store. A few enthusiasts have succeeded at last, with great pain and effort, in starting in this same Woolwich a sort of Co-operative City. A Co-operative Society was started: it bought the land, drained it, and built working men's houses. All went well, and the initiators of the scheme congratulated themselves on its success. True, the scheme was not exactly what they intended it to be at the outset: their Communist tendencies were lost amidst mercantile considerations. Still, such as it was, the scheme had succeeded, and the initiators looked forward to an enlargement of their Co-operative City. They intended to buy more land—the field that lay next to their city—and they inquired about its price. They had previously paid the landlord £500 per acre . . . but now they were asked to pay twice as much! "Why?" "But your Co-operative City," they were told, "has been such a success! No wonder the price of the land has gone up!"

Quite right! Once the State has constituted a monopoly to the advantage of Mr. So-and-So, the landlord, you must labour, and have laboured, to enrich that gentleman and to prevent the workers from having a well-being which would render them more independent in their thoughts.

"Long live, then, the State and its Monopolists!"

And you, the worker, toil, and forge, and economise, all to enrich the minions of the State—as long as you continue to expect that you can improve your conditions without daring to revolt against that Holy Trinity—Private Property, Taxation, and the State!

Keep them up—and remain their slave!

(To be continued.)

A General View of Anarchism.

By G. BARRETT.

III.

DIRECT ACTION.

To make it quite clear what is meant by the expression *Direct Action*, let us take an illustration. Not very many years ago, if there was a great national calamity, such as an outbreak of plague, the religious people used to declare that the only remedy was for us as a nation to pray that God might remove his curse. These good people were very much shocked when scientists came along and began taking merely sanitary precautions to stamp out the disease. The first was the *indirect* method: prayers were sent up to heaven so that God might send down his good influence on the plague. This was a very *indirect* route to reach a disease which was, so to speak, next door. The scientist attended to the disease itself, studied its nature, and tried to find a means of stamping it out. This was *direct* action.

To-day in very much the same way the people are divided with two methods. In their factories and homes they find themselves discontented, and some of them propose to influence the chief of society—the Parliament—so that it will exercise its power to put things right. These in their turn are shocked when advanced thinkers come along and declare that the way to get a remedy is to study the nature of the trouble and apply the cure directly to it. The former believe in the indirect or legislative method, for it is a long way from home to Westminster and back home again. The latter are the direct actionists, and they recognise that if any one is going to put the factories in order, it will be the workers who spend their lives in them, and not the politicians.

Imagine the utter absurdity of a group of politicians sitting in the House of Commons earnestly discussing the welfare of the people. While they are doing so, are there not countless bakers, builders, and tailors walking about the streets, unemployed, and cut off, by the laws which these same politicians have passed, from the means of production, machinery, and tools with which they might produce what they need. To break down the laws and allow these people to produce what is necessary for their welfare, on equal terms with the other workers, is the way to abolish poverty.

It is clear that, if we are to rid ourselves of the troubles that beset us at present, we must organise an entirely new system of wealth distribution. I do not mean by this that we must divide up, but I mean that the wealth which is produced must be stopped from flowing to the rich man who produces nothing; the stream must be diverted so that it will come to the producer.

But who is it that distributes the wealth? Is it the

politician? Certainly not; as a matter of fact, it is the transport workers. If, then, the workers who produce want an alteration in the present distribution, to whom must they apply? To their comrades, the transport workers, and not to the politicians, who have nothing to do with the matter. Similarly when better conditions are needed in the factories—larger sheds, better floors, and more efficient lighting and ventilation—who are the only people capable of doing this? It is the workers who need these reforms, and the workers who can carry them out. The task before the worker to-day is as it has been in the past: the slave class must rid itself of the dictating class—i.e., of those in authority.

Such is the simple logic of the direct actionist, and it is already clear how it necessarily leads to the Anarchist Revolution. We must, however, be careful how we follow this principle—not that we fear being taken too far, but lest it does not take us far enough. The expression has been used so much in contradiction to legislation, that any one who throws a brick through a window is generally supposed to be a direct actionist. He may be and he may not.

To be logical and true to the real meaning of the term, every act should, of course, be on the direct road towards the desired end—in our case, the Social Revolution. Sometimes it is difficult to be entirely consistent, but it is nevertheless of the utmost importance that there should be at least a minority of the workers who understand what is the direct road, so that every skirmish may be made by them a step towards the final overthrow of Capitalism.

At the risk of repeating myself, then, let me try to state the position very clearly. We have two classes—the governing, ruling, and possessing people on the one hand, and those governed and without property on the other; in a word, a master class and a slave class.

When this slave class becomes discontented and restive, it has several courses to consider before deciding which will give better conditions. It may be argued:—

(1) That since the present masters do not give enough of the good things of life, these must be turned out and a new set selected from among the slave class; or

(2) That since the slave class is composed of the producers, and the master class is, therefore, dependent on it, the former is clearly in a position to force the masters to give them more food and everything that may be desired; or

(3) That since the slave class is the producer of all that is necessary for life, there is no need to either ask or demand anything from the master class. The slave class need simply to cut off supplies to the masters and start feeding themselves.

The first of these arguments, it will be seen, is that of the politicians; and it may be dismissed without further comment, since, as will be understood after what has been already said, it obviously misses the point. It is not a question of who shall be master, but it is a matter of the essential relationship between master and slave, quite irrespective of who either of them may be.

The second argument is that of the non-Parliamentary but non-Revolutionary Trade Unionist. It is right in that it recognises where lies the true power of the workers in their fight against the capitalists, but it is wrong in that it proposes no change in the relationship between these two.

If the slave class is to be better housed, fed, and clothed from the masters' store, it means that the slaves will become more and more completely *owned* by the masters. It is not revolutionary, because it proposes to retain master and slave, and merely attempts to better the conditions of the latter.

The third argument is, of course, that of the revolutionist. It agrees with the second as to the weapon to be used, but it says that the task before the workers is to feed, house, clothe, and educate themselves, and not to spend their energies in making better masters of the capitalists.

To cut off supplies to the capitalist and to retain what is produced for the workers are the main points of the revolutionary fight. In every industrial dispute there are really two, and only two, essentials. On the one hand are the factories, warehouses, railways, mines, etc., which may be termed industrial property; on the other, the workers. To unite these two is to accomplish the revolution; for with them will be built the new society.

The capitalist and master class in general can hold their position only if they keep the workers outside the warehouses and factories, allowing them to return on condition that they pay tribute in the shape of profit and submit to the conditions dictated.

Direct action, therefore, in this strictly revolutionary sense would mean the taking possession of the means of production and the necessities of life by the workers who have produced them, and the reorganisation of industry according to the principles of freedom.

Beside this real problem, simple but great, how hollow and grotesque are the promises of the politicians. How absurd the idea of gaining liberty through the ballot-box. These hopeless

(Continued on page 15.)

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

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

Annual Subscription, post-free, 1s. 6d.; U.S.A., 40c.; France, 2fr.
Foreign Subscriptions should be sent by International Money Order.

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

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

THE MANAGER, 127 Ossulston Street, N.W.

The Editors are not necessarily in agreement with signed articles.

Notice to Subscribers.—If there is a blue mark against this notice, your subscription is due, and must be sent before next month to ensure receipt of paper.

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

Rampant Militarism.

We are assisting at a social rebarbarisation. Never were brutal force and militarism so powerful, so oppressive, and so brutalising as in our days. The cost of armaments in the past century appears childish in comparison to what Europe is spending now on armies and navies, on the maintenance of hordes of idle parasites in barracks, ministries, and palaces. Not only the military expenses of a hundred years ago, but even of the Franco-German War, appear trifling, accustomed as we are at present to the hundreds of millions the people of Europe are annually disbursing for their "defence."

All new inventions, the increased productivity of mankind, are swallowed up by militarism. The working classes of Germany, Austria, Italy, and especially Russia, are in a state of semi-starvation; and, to the dishonour of modern society, hunger riots as in medieval times have not yet become a thing of the past, but still occur in our times, especially in those countries crushed under the burden of militarism.

Not only is militarism sucking up the life-blood of the nations, but military authorities begin to impose their brutal will on the intellectual and moral life of the nations, as has been shown by the amazing events in Alsace Lorraine and the "martial law" reign of terror in South Africa.

Woe to the nation whose destiny rests in the hands of the military. At bottom, every military man has to be a brute; if he is not, he cannot be a good soldier. The German Emperor, the most perfect expression of the militarist spirit, expressed its brutal morality in his words to the raw recruits: "If I order you to shoot your father and mother, you must obey." This is, indeed, the essence of militarism, which is sweeping aside the most sacred sentiments of mankind and throwing it back to savagery.

How is it that for the last forty years militarism was allowed to develop into such a monstrous growth as that which now threatens to overwhelm civilisation?

The answer is, that during the past half-century democracy relaxed its activity and dropped its revolutionary attacks on the State and its complement, militarism; instead of an active fight against the increase of State power, the doctrine of a benevolent State has been dinned in the ears of the people, and State Socialists dangled before the eyes of the masses the mirage of the whole machinery of the State captured by Socialist votes.

Whilst this teaching was lending an additional halo to the State, the governing classes, with military and civil officialdom and crowned heads, meeting with no opposition, set to work and quietly and systematically increased their own power, imposing on the nation burdens steadily growing heavier from year to year, and of which more than half is absorbed by the Army and Navy.

With the growth of these departments not only the military caste is interested, but whole industries have sprung up whose existence depends on militarism. The captains of these industries and the heads of the Army and Navy are incessantly busy in engineering ill-feeling between nations and fabricating war scares in order to stimulate the unwilling public to new sacrifices and to greater rivalry of armaments.

Face to face with the ceaseless activity of the militarists, democracy, saturated with respect for the State, suffers in silence and submission. If protests are made, they are ineffectual platonic declarations of peace and goodwill towards other nationalities. Not only in Germany, with its three million Social Democratic votes, is no practical effort and propaganda made

against the State and militarism; but also in other countries with revolutionary traditions, as France and Italy, direct attack and resistance to militarism is cold-shouldered by Socialist politicians.

The so-called leaders of the working classes of our time will not recognise that, whilst they are expressing their feelings of goodwill and fraternity, organised power and brutal militarism are acting. No words will check the encroaching enemy; action can be stopped by action alone, by refusing to pay hard-earned money, by refusing to give children to the modern Moloch, by spoiling the engines of destruction, by refusing to transport war material and troops, and finally, in case of declaration of war, by proclaiming a general strike of all producers on both sides of the frontier.

Until this simple truth is recognised and acted upon, no lamentation, no words will stop militarism with its mad race of armaments, ruinous to the producers of every country, and threatening them with political and social enslavement.

THE LOGIC OF THE DEMOCRATIC "SOCIALIST."

The State Socialist is logical—at least, so he informs us from time to time in his platform orations and in his various writings, to save us the trouble, no doubt, of discovering so for ourselves. He is certainly too logical to convince the intelligent rebel that his logic possesses a rational character. To me, the logic of the authoritarian Socialist is self-contradictory in every connection, owing largely to his venerated and crystallised formulas, which correspond faithfully with the antiquated and obnoxious institution he so blindly worships; and for this reason fails to satisfy the demands of a rationalism evolved beyond the stage of State paternalism.

It behoves us, therefore, out of common honesty and from our desire for truth, to examine the formulated objections hurled against the Anarchist doctrines, and find out for ourselves, by an unbiased analysis, whether these objections are justified by any reason other than a blind prejudice which has been nourished by our State instructors' at school.

The general arguments of the Statist stand very much upon a par with that ancient formula of the early philosophers, that cause and effect must exist simultaneously, because without an effect there can be no cause; whereas if this formula is subjected to an examination of private judgment and common sense (not democratic logic), based upon the laws of observation, we shall find it demonstrated conclusively that every effect must follow its cause, because all is change.

I shall not waste time in returning the abuse of these democratic critics of Anarchist doctrines, but will enter into an imaginary discussion upon certain points of Anarchist teaching, which seem to have provoked an assault from our Jacobin opponents, and which assault appears to be actuated by a ferocious motive rather than an earnest desire to solve the problem of social well-being.

State Socialist. The majority decision will always follow the needs and sentiments of the majority under any system of social life. Anarchy, therefore, on this score is impossible.

Anarchist Communist. Even granting that the majority decision will always obtain in human associations, then why waste time and energy in constituting a powerful and expensive Government to impose it, when, according to your argument, majority rule will always prevail under any system of society, Anarchy included, where there would be no Government to enforce it? This, I think, shows the possibility rather than otherwise of Anarchy. But does not a minority rule to-day?

Socialist. We are altruists; we seek the well-being of the whole of society, ever striving for harmony. You Anarchists are egotists who seek your own individual well-being; under Anarchy, therefore, the strong will dominate the weak.

Anarchist. True, I am an egotist, I believe in self; my individual development is complemented, and made possible only, by my recognising an equality of all men.

Socialist. We believe society should be the first consideration, the individual secondary.

Anarchist. Society itself is only a collection of individuals. The happiness and well-being of that society represent the sum total of happiness enjoyed by every individual composing that society. The society is what the individuals are, good or bad, according as the individuals find a harmonious environment; and, after all, who can ignore the first natural instinct, self-preservation?

Socialist. All men are not of equal strength; therefore, in order to secure a free seat at the table of life for all, we must consider the weak first and ourselves last, in the spirit of self-sacrifice.

Anarchist. In order to secure this, you proclaim majority rule. Is not that the rule of the strong majority, to which the weak minority are sacrificed, and must submit?

Socialist. We proclaim freedom and equality; "government of the people, by the people, for the people," is the motto that shall always head our programme. The people are the State, and they shall rule themselves.

Anarchist. As regards the motto, stripped of all mystical meaning, it becomes synonymous with non-government society, or Anarchy. But

if the people are the State, and the State governs itself, why have a central institution to pass laws for the execution of a piece of work, instead of executing the work directly, without saying, "Let us pass a law first; then we shall be able to do the work"? I presume that when you refer to the State, you mean the majority. Who or what, then, are the minority, probably the most intellectual in the society?

Socialist. We must have laws; Nature herself forces all men, Anarchists included, to obey her laws.

Anarchist. Just so; but remember, human beings are a part of Nature, and none can live without conforming to her laws, which give us pleasure and happiness in proportion as we respect them. Man-made laws are no part of our nature; we can live without them. If Nature impresses her laws, they are sufficient; all others are unnatural and detrimental to natural beings.

Socialist. But, supposing under Anarchist Communism one commune wished to run a railway through another commune, how could you arrive at an agreement without laws?

Anarchist. Probably there will be no necessity for railways then; we know nothing of the possible development of the future society, neither do you. But tell me, if such a proposition were voted on and carried under democratic government, what would be done?

Socialist. The majority decision would be at once carried out.

Anarchist. But, supposing the minority was half minus one, two, or half-a-dozen only; what then?

Socialist. Oh, as intelligent people, we could surely come to an agreement.

Anarchist. Thus you admit the possibility and practicability of Anarchist Communism, where the same free agreement would be arrived at, with less expense and friction than under democratic rule.

Socialist. Still, you will agree that there must be a directing and regulating body to control the railways and other big enterprises?

Anarchist. Why so? Is it necessary to appoint a body of individuals to direct and control this directing body?

Socialist. No; these would be intelligent men.

Anarchist. Therefore, if the workers under Anarchy or any other social system were intelligent men and women, in the same degree these intelligent workers would require no body to direct them, but could agree to and arrange a delegation of work instead of allowing a usurpation of power. Neither State Socialism nor Anarchy will be established until the workers are ready for it; and when they are ready for a change of system, they will make it themselves, and prove capable of working it as their common sense and desire for happiness dictate.

Socialist. We proclaim equality and the abolition of exploitation.

Anarchist. You proclaim a great deal; do you forget the majority exploitation of the minority?

Socialist. I say it is inevitable.

Anarchist. Then there is no equality, neither is exploitation abolished, under democracy.

Socialist. You are too sophisticated.

Anarchist. Majority rule means government; government implies law and authority; authority demands its contrary, servility; servility excludes equality. All exploiters are governors, as all governors are exploiters. How can you sanction the existence of government when you demand the abolition of exploitation? All exploiters abolished, all governors must go; if governors remain, exploitation is not abolished. The function of an exploiter is to exploit, the function of a governor is to govern; to govern is to impose laws foreign to the well-being of "subjects," laws which are unnatural, otherwise Nature herself would provide; and, being unnatural, must be detrimental. The function is inseparably bound up with its organ; function and organ cannot live apart. If government (the organ) persists in the new society, there still would be maintained all the horrors that force us into revolt to-day. Where there is authority there will be revolt; where there is revolt against authority there is no social equality; where there is no social equality there can be no social harmony. Harmony, then, as a result of social equality is no factor of Social Democracy.

Socialist. Democracy is the only hope for the worker.

Anarchist. Anarchism is the only hope for the whole of humanity.

Socialist. Democracy is true Socialism.

Anarchist. Democracy is a contradiction in terms. The word comes from the Greek: *demos*, the people (political sense), and *kratos*, rule or government. When an individual embraces the democratic faith, he at once becomes an autocrat, vicious in proportion as he is energetic and sincere. One man is not the people, nor can one man represent the people; therefore the terms "individual" and "democrat" are inconsistent; one man cannot be a democrat. If the whole people rule the whole people, we have nothing but a confusion of Anarchy.

Socialist. Anarchy means disorder; do not Hyndman and Chesterton say so?

Anarchist. Monarchy and government mean disorder, as characterised by the chaos of present society. Etymologically, Anarchy means no government. The term is from the Greek: *an*, without or no; *archo*, government or rule. Practically, Anarchy means freedom; non-governmental society is synonymous with the free organisation which Nature forces all gregarious animals into by the instinct of self-preservation. To define Anarchy as disorder presupposes present-day society to be based upon order; therefore, as rebels, you are most absurd and irrational if you really revolt against this society, based as it must be, according to your logic, upon order. With twelve millions on the verge of starvation, and industrial disputes every week, yet you still slumber in the prejudices of your State education, tenaciously

clinging to the present "order," and furiously defend it against those who would remove it root and branch.

Socialist. Under Anarchy there will still be government, but it will be disguised under another name, such as agreement.

Anarchist. There cannot be government under Anarchy. Anarchy, meaning no government, excludes the existence of some government. But will you not have government under Social Democracy?

Socialist. There will be regulations and agreements, which you confuse with government.

Anarchist. Then you believe in a system identical with Anarchist Communism.

Socialist. Well.

Anarchist. But what will be done with the minority who refuse to accept the decision of the majority? If they are not restrained, it is absurd to assert majority rule.

Socialist. Oh, without doubt they would be placed under restraint. And under Anarchy?

Anarchist. They would be free to initiate their own method of living or to imitate the example of that group or commune which seemed best to them.

Socialist. You Anarchists advocate strikes, which are of no effect. We condemn strikes as reactionary, and would substitute Parliamentary action.

Anarchist. Decidedly so. But, then, are you not inconsistent when you collect funds to assist strikers, as by so doing you support reaction in your midst whilst you thunder against it from your platforms?

Socialist. In that respect we are actuated purely by the instinct of humanity.

Anarchist. Which proves your humanitarianism, which is strictly Anarchistic, to be more important and effective than your passion for Parliament. Our humane feelings are ever ready and sufficient, and should they be free, as we Anarchists desire and advocate, their application would extend to every action performed, and would immediately set to work to eliminate poverty and suffering while Parliaments crumble to dust and States thunder out their demands for war, placidly surveying the slaughtered, and exploiting the homes of those who gave up their best blood in its defence.

GEO. TROTMAN.

SIDELIGHTS ON SOCIAL SUBJECTS.

The Capitalist Defence Department, known as the War Office, distinguished itself in the New Year by advertising the Army. Most of the London dailies, including the so-called Labour daily, the *Citizen*, rose to the occasion and appeared in all the glory of a half or a full page advertisement. Supporting this new venture the *Standard*, January 17, in a leading article says: "Service with the colours is what the advertisers say it is: a fine opening for an active, intelligent, and well-conducted young man; and the more widely this fact is appreciated the better for the Army and the nation." Imagine, therefore, our surprise in observing in the *Standard* two days later a report that altogether removes the glamour from this "fine opening." Under the title of "Plight of the ex-soldier: Lord Dundonald's Appeal for Justice," we are told his lordship put forward "a strong plea for the better treatment of soldiers who have served their country." "Justice," he continued, "would not be done to the ex-service man until he was certain of better employment on leaving the colours."

Let us turn to the War Office advertisement. "Such, then, are some of the many advantages the Army offers to the ambitious man. Good pay, chances of promotion, long holidays, unique opportunities for games and sports, and travel to foreign parts—these are some of the benefits the Country gives a man in return for his services, while there is no career that can offer a man greater chances of distinction," and then in all probability the scrap-heap—they thoughtfully forgot to add. Very illuminating are these statements. Being of a charitable frame of mind, we would say someone has been guilty of misrepresentation. It is surely fit that a great department of State—true outcome of an age of legalised swindling and adulteration—should have adopted the methods of a sweat-shop.

The true function of the Army seems only dimly comprehended by many people. So many fail to see how blindly we follow tradition through countless ages. In that brilliant book by Charlotte Gilman, "The Man-Made World," the authoress says:—"In studying any long-established human custom it is very difficult to see it clearly and dispassionately. Our minds are heavily loaded with precedent, with race-custom, with the iron weight called authority. These heavy forces reach their most perfect expression in the absolute masculine field of warfare—the absolute authority, the brainless, voiceless obedience, the relentless penalty. Here we have male coercion at its height; law and government wholly arbitrary. The result is as might be expected, a fine machine of destruction!"—The last sentence sums up the whole function of the Army. A machine responsible for an appalling amount of human wreckage. The unit of which this machine is composed himself becoming useless in civil life. The disciplinary and other forces crippling his initiative, destroying his self-respect, making him servile, and in time producing in him a perfect machine for destruction, incapable of constructive work, and so a menace to all others. We, who

sincerely desire peace, see in the Army our greatest enemy, and know that until we have rendered it effete and powerless, our cry of "Peace, peace," will be in vain.

The struggle in South Africa provides interesting food for thought for the working-class jingoes who some fourteen years ago supported the war waged in the interests of financiers. The same jingoes are now busy denouncing with great show of horror the South African Government. Are they so ignorant of government that they think it exists to give justice to the workers—that the war in South Africa really meant freedom for its people? That unhappy country is now providing the optimistic believers in government with some terrible object-lessons, proving conclusively how class bias always expresses itself in the Government of the day. Even Percy Alden, M.P., is surprised. He says: "To declare martial law throughout the strike area, to proclaim all political meetings, including Trade Union assemblies, to arrest without a warrant Labour leaders who have any influence with their men, even though they have not incited to outrage or unlawful action, is conduct so amazing that we can only suppose the Government has made up its mind to crush Trade Unionists once and for all."

We did not expect a Government faced by determined rebels to do anything else. That martial law has been proclaimed proves that the financiers at the back of the Government have thoroughly grasped the situation. For government cannot exist without coercion, and in its defence strong measures have to be adopted. But it is time we ceased calling things by names that sound respectable and really called "law" and "government" just what they are, instruments for the defence of stolen property. Let the workers cease trusting government, recognising in it only an enemy, safeguarded by means of the Army, Navy, and police force; and then let them organise in such a way that its activities will be crippled. This can be done by refusing to serve in these forces, by withholding supplies in time of an industrial struggle, and by learning to shoot straight themselves.

A pleasant person in authority—to wit, Mr. Ingleby Oddie, the Lambeth Coroner—has been saying unpleasant things about the old-age pension evil. He is incensed with the old pensioners who continue to live in filthy surroundings on their 5s. a week rather than go into the workhouse. The *Standard* of January 17 reports him as saying: "It is a disgusting state of things and ought to be remedied. There should be inspection of old-age pensioners by local authorities, for it is terrible to find old people get in such a state of filth, and it isn't right that public money should be provided for old people to live disgusting lives."

In all humility we would like to put a question to this representative of the law. Would he, having laboured industriously producing wealth for others and living in abject poverty all his life, possess the energy or the means to live in cleanliness and comfort on 5s. a week at the age of 70? Why is it not right that money should be provided? We must remind this critic, who himself lives on public money, that, instead of grudging this small sum, he should attack the niggardly Government that compensates its veterans in such paltry fashion. The old people are right in refusing to go into the workhouse, where the last vestige of freedom is renounced. Surely it should be our first care to see that those whose lives have been spent in wealth-producing should at least be provided with that measure of comfort which neither the workhouse nor the 5s. pension will ever be able to provide.

Under the title of "Open-Air Cure for the Lean," we are informed how certain elementary school children at Dyfatty, Swansea (prophetic name, surely!), increased considerably in weight during three months of school life in the open air. We are now expecting the experimenters to recommend to the idle rich who suffer from obesity a course of treatment in confined air—the suggestion being that hard work for twelve hours a day in a cotton factory may restore a sylphlike slimness in the most obstinate case. It will be contended that the would-be clients will lack faith in the treatment; but we feel sure a revolution might help them to come to a quick decision.

M. B. HOPE.

Those of us who have craved unsuccessfully for permission to do what the Maker of us all has fitted us to do, alone understand how revolutions a regenerated. Talk about the atrocities of the Revolution! All the atrocities of the democracy heaped together ever since the world began would not equal, if we had any gauge by which to measure them, the atrocities perpetrated in a week upon the poor simply because they are poor; and the marvel rather is, not that there is every now and then a September massacre at which all the world shrieks, but that such horrors are so infrequent. Again, I say, let no man judge Communist or Anarchist till he has asked for leave to work, and a "Damn your eyes!" has rung in his ears.—*Mark Rutherford*.

I will try and give you a more concise and complete idea of the society into which I would like to be reborn. It is a society which does not know the meaning of the words rich and poor, or the rights of property, or law or legality, or nationality; a society which has no consciousness of being governed, in which equality of condition is a matter of course, and in which no man is rewarded for having served the community by having the power given him to injure it.

—*Wm. Morris*.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

France.

Twelve of the militants imprisoned six months ago, on the charge of having fomented the demonstrations against the three years' service Bill, have been liberated. These comrades all belonged to the "Sou du Soldat," an organisation connected with the Labour Confederation, with the object of keeping the young soldiers in touch with the Trade Unions. When the three years' service Bill was introduced, disorders took place among the soldiers on the point of returning home, who, by the new Act would have to serve another year. A number of soldiers were court-martialled, but the new Ministry which came into power last month amnestied ten out of the nineteen. The Government at the time of the riots was, however, convinced that the military disorders were instigated by the militant antimilitarists of the "Sou du Soldat," and clapped the most prominent twelve in prison. For six months they have been kept under preventive arrest. The Appeal Court has decided at last to liberate them till their appeal case is heard.

These men, however, are not the only political prisoners in France. There are eight more in Paris, and two at Clairvaux. And the new Ministry, in principle opposed to the three years' service, though pledged to carry it out—what is the difference to the people?—has already taken steps to prosecute the *Pioupiau de l'Yonne* for two articles against militarism. This paper of Eastern France has quite a record of such prosecutions; in one of the first it was defended by a young revolutionary Socialist lawyer—Briand—who years later, as Prime Minister, crushed the railway strike by calling out the reserves. Times change, people change, but Governments remain the same in their function of defending property and privilege, and stifling progress and the emancipation of the working classes. The popular comic song in France resignedly says: "It is surely not worth the while to try and change the Government!"

In the present period of reaction which France is traversing, the death of two men, Francis de Pressensé and in a lesser degree Piquart, is a decided loss. Colonel Piquart, by his fine attitude in the Dreyfus affair, did incomparable service in bringing out the whole dirty business of a military and clerical clique that ruled the country. As a general and as Minister of War, however, he did what all Governmentalists do: took the side of the employers in strikes, and defended their interests. Francis de Pressensé, as President of the League of the Rights of Man, deserved the whole-hearted respect and the thanks of numerous poor political refugees whom he saved from extradition to a waiting, revengeful Government. The Russian political refugees especially lose a watchful defender, though many an Italian and Spanish Anarchist or Syndicalist owes his liberty to the protest by De Pressensé to the French Government.

Portugal.

On January 14 the personnel of the railways went on strike. As the workers of the country have been in a state of unrest for a long time, the railway strike is not quite a surprise. For many months the railway servants have been kept in suspense about the old-age pension scheme claimed by them. Under the pretext that they wanted to make the conditions more favourable, the administration of the lines took back several concessions made some years ago. The number of strikers is about 7,000. They have clearly formulated their claims: old-age pensions, not at 60, as at present, but at 50 years of age, or after 30 years of service. As usual, troops were sent to the chief stations and workshops; sabotage by strikers has been reported, engines and points having been tampered with. A motor-car service for the mails and for passengers has been arranged. The revolutionary character of the movement is making the Government uneasy. Of course, the Royalists are making use of the occasion to increase their activity, which has become permanent on the Spanish frontier.

News recently received from Lisbon states that Costa's Ministry has resigned. It is to be hoped that the new Cabinet will understand that the best way to defeat the Royalists' continuous activity to re-establish the Monarchy, with its corruption and clerical domination, is to treat the working classes, who so energetically helped to establish the Republic, with humanity and justice.

Spain.

Some months ago the strikes in the copper mines of Spain came suddenly to an end by an agreement arrived at by the intermediary of Socialist politicians. The party organs of Spain's Social Democracy were naturally proud and announced the "Labour victory." After a few days, however, it appeared that the agreement was a shameful arrangement, if not a betrayal, as none of the chief claims of the strikers had been won. The conflict is far from settled, and telegrams from Madrid state that the English company of Rio Tinto has locked out twelve thousand workers and that the strike is spreading. This shows how little the men were satisfied with the agreement imposed on them a few months before.

Those of us who thought that such prison torture as the Montjuich victims revealed was a thing of the past, will be startled by an appeal sent out by a Spanish Committee for political prisoners. The document states that among the ill-famed Spanish dungeons there is one at Figueras, near the French frontier, where the prisoners are subjected to the most cruel practices. The director has had an underground cell constructed, where the unhappy men in his power are submitted to

fiendish tortures. The other prisons, if they do not possess such a special cell (called by the prisoners "Siberia"), are bad enough, as the orders of the Government are to deal severely with the prisoners, and the governors and jailers are given a free hand to show their zeal. A movement has been started to get our comrades out of the claws of their Jesuitic persecutors, foremost among whom is Barroso, the Minister of Justice (?).

A GENERAL VIEW OF ANARCHISM.

(Continued from page 11.)

government men, who talk with such sublime imbecility of feeding, housing, and clothing, only add insult to injury. The House they stand in to make their senseless speeches was built and furnished by the workers, and it is the workers who house and feed them. The doctrine of Direct Action is based on this simple truth, but it does not boast of bringing the workers easy salvation. It is, indeed, a recognition of the terrible fact that nothing can save us except our own intelligence and power. We, the workers, are the creative force, for is it not we who have produced all the food, clothing, and houses? Assuredly it is we who need them. What, then, has the politician to do with this? Nothing, absolutely nothing! What use is it to hand over to the master class all that we produce and then keep up a continuous quarrel as to how much we shall be allowed back? Instead of this we have to stop supplies, reorganise our industries, not from above but from their source below, and see that in future all that is produced goes to the producer and not to the dominant class. This is the meaning of direct action, and it is Anarchism.

But, alas! it is easier to accomplish a revolution on paper with cold logic than it is to bring it about in industrial life. We have to fight the lack of understanding on the part of the worker and the craft of the politician ever at work to increase this; and in addition we have the certainty that the class in power will attempt to resist the change, with the only argument that remains on their side—brute force. While, therefore, it is important to understand that direct action properly applied means the actual "conquest of bread," and the taking possession of the factories, we must be content probably for some little while longer to use our weapon of direct action simply according to the second of the three arguments given above—that is, to demand better conditions from the capitalist class. It is not, however, too much to hope that in the very near future the Anarchists will form a militant section of the workers, which will give to every great industrial rebellion the revolutionary character which is its true meaning. Worker as well as capitalist is beginning to recognise that a well-planned scheme for feeding the strikers is more than possible. Such a scheme would entail the capturing of the bakeries, and this is surely the first step of the revolution.

And beyond our own doubt and hesitation, what, after all, stands in our way? Let us gain inspiration from the hopeless position of our foes. How hapless they are! Is not the policeman's baton shaped by the worker, and his absurd uniform stitched by underpaid women? The soldier's rifle is certainly not made by the master class—in every particular they are hopelessly our dependents. Every instrument of oppression is supplied to them by us, and we keep them alive by feeding them day by day. Surely, then, it is apparent that this change *must* come. Those above are powerless for good or for evil; the revolution can be brought only by an upheaval from below—from the one vital section of society, the workers.

(To be continued.)

ANNUAL ANARCHIST CONFERENCE.

As was agreed last year at Liverpool, the annual Conference will be held this year at Newcastle, on Easter Sunday and Monday, April 12 and 13. A room has been secured at the B. S. P. headquarters, Leazes Park Road. All comrades who are likely to be present, should write as soon as possible to R. Cleghorn, 75, Hyde Park Street, Gateshead, stating what days they will be present, and what sleeping accommodation they will require. It is also requested that comrades send subjects for discussion, so that an agenda may be drawn up.

LIBERTY AND THE GREAT LIBERTARIANS.

An Anthology on Liberty.

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

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

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

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

BOOK NOTES.

The Revolutionary Almanac, 1914. Edited by Hippolyte Havel. 50 cents. New York: The Rabelais Press, 27-29 New Bowery.

This, if we are not mistaken, is the first Anarchist Almanac in the English language, and it is a worthy pioneer. It contains numerous revolutionary articles and poems by well-known writers, besides many cartoons and portraits. Printed on excellent paper, with a striking cover, the Almanac should have a good reception.

Syndicalism and the Co-operative Commonwealth. By Emile Pataud and Emile Pouget. Second Edition. 2s. 6d. net. Oxford: New International Publishing Company.

This book had such a good reception that a second edition was necessary, and the publishers have added more of Will Dyson's cartoons and brought the bibliography up to date.

Other Publications Received.

La Politique de l'Internationale. Par Michel Bakounine. 10c. Paris: *La Vie Ouvrière*, 96 Quai Jemmapes.

Militarism and Wages. By F. Merttens, J.P. 1d. London: "War and Peace" Publishing Co., Whitehall House, S.W.

Erinnerungen eines Proletariers aus der Revolutionären Arbeiterbewegung. Von Joseph Peukert. 3 mark. Berlin: Verlag des Sozialistischen Bundes, Wrangelstrasse 135, S.O. 33.

Das Befreiungswerk der Philosophie. Von Wladimir Solowjoff. 10pf. Same publishers as above.

Charles Kingsley and Christian Socialism. By Colwyn E. Vulliamy. 2d. London: Fabian Society, 3 Clement's Inn, W.C.

Sve ima Pripasti Svima! 5 cents. New York: Jugoslavenski Zbor Neodvisnih Socijalista, 153 W. 34th Street.

Gott und der Staat. Von Michael Bakunin. 10pf. Hamburg: *Kampf*, Sternstr. 51K.

One Union for Metal, Engineering, and Shipbuilding Workers. By W. F. Watson (A.S.E.). 1d. London: M., E., and S. Amalgamation Committee, 26 Priory Road, Acton, W.

The Township Unit: A Guide to Economic Independence. 20c. Los Angeles, Cal.: Gustavus, 572 Sierra Street.

Almanac Illustré de la Revolution pour 1914. 30c. Paris: *La Publication Sociale*, 16 Monsieur-le-Prince.

El Sindicalismo. Por Rafael Perez Taylor. Mexico City: Casa del Obrero Mundial.

Blätter aus der Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung Oesterreichs (1867-1894). Von August Kreal. 80c. Zurich: Rainer Trindler, Agnesstrasse 22.

PROPAGANDA NOTES.

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

GLASGOW.—Our Sunday evening lectures are very successful, the number of people attending steadily increasing. We are also a "fixture" at Glasgow Green on Sundays at 3 p.m. The audience here is becoming ours; quite a good many come regularly for the meetings. For the present, Dalhousie Street meetings are dropped; the Education Circle has taken their place. The Circle has drawn a number of earnest comrades together for purposes of enlightenment, and is *the thing*. Just a hint to old comrades in Glasgow: You are welcome on Wednesdays at 8 p.m. Group meetings every Tuesday at 8 p.m.

On Monday, January 25, the group had a *social* social in memory of Robbie Burns. Every one was positively beaming. Have you seen a Scotsman or Scotswoman beam? It is good! Comrade Leslie made a very felicitous and happy speech on the Scots poet. Burns's songs and recitations were given by Alex. Mackay, Bessie Mackay, Robbie Black, Duncy Cameron, "Wattie" Ponder, "Wattie's" wife, and others, to the great delight of themselves and the company (we have more singers than speakers), but the titbit was Robbie Farmer. A number of old comrades were present.

Future meetings, places, and times—

Sundays—Glasgow Green, 3 p.m.; corner of Buckingham Street, 6.30 p.m.; 74 Buchanan Street, 7.30 p.m.

Tuesdays—74 Buchanan Street, Group Meeting.

Wednesdays— " " Education Circle, 8 p.m.

Again an appeal is made on behalf of the family of Angus Mackay. A prize draw has been arranged for the fund; £2 8s. in prizes (5). Tickets, 6d. each, can be had of Geo. Traquair, 74 Buchanan Street, Glasgow, or of myself
W. PONDER.

CHOPWELL (CO. DURHAM).—Although no news has appeared in these columns of the doings of this Worker's Freedom Group, we have been far from inactive or merely passive Anarchists. On the contrary, we have been very much alive, having seen the organised constitutional Durham miners that work at Chopwell Colliery go on strike, without notice or strike allowance, against one of the largest combines in the coal trade. One of the features of the strike was the fact that the paid agents of the men took a very firm stand against the men, just as firm as their "masters." This proved how true has been our indictment of leadership, showing that the leader exists for no other purpose but to perpetuate Capitalism. It was a fitting climax to the strike that the "house-warming" or formal opening of the Communist Club, where the Worker's Freedom Group meet, should follow the end of the strike. This took place on January 24, and will stand out as the bright star on the horizon of the workers of Chopwell. After a tea-fight had taken place, the tables were cleared for an open discussion on Anarchist Communism. A good number took part, and the outcome of it augurs well for the movement in this part. Amongst those who took part in it were Comrades Davison, Tindale (Gateshead), Will Lawther, Max Melinger, and many outsiders, who supplied the opposition. Sales of

literature and FREEDOM have been fairly good, far exceeding the expectations of the most optimistic of our comrades. And to those who think that there is no hope for Anarchist Communism, we point to them the work that has been achieved in this direction. There is no mistaking the tendency of the workers to hear our gospel, read our literature, and accept the ideal and the hope that Anarchy brings into their otherwise dull, drab, and monotonous lives. It is up to those of us who believe in Anarchy to go forward with our unofficial and anti-leadership propaganda, sure and certain of the ultimate triumph of our ideal.

E.C.H.O.

INTERNATIONAL SUNDAY SCHOOL.—Our little paper, *The Modern School* is now published. The articles were written by the children. This venture ought to appeal to Anarchists who believe in self-expression, extended even to the children. The doings of the school are fully reported by the kiddies. We look forward to the time when we can afford to have future numbers printed in proper form, instead of as it now is, written on cyclostyle. Interest in the school deepens. An innovation is a sketching class conducted by our comrade Marcel. But you should buy our paper; the price ranges, says one bright lassie, from one penny to two hundred and thirty-two pennies!

Donations to *Modern School*.—L.P. £1, D.Z. 1s. 6d., N.C. 6d., G.D. 25s., M.W. 6d.
JIMMY DICK.
146 Stepney Green, E.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

(January 7—February 4.)

FREEDOM Guarantee Fund.—S. Corio 1s 6d, W. Wess 2s 6d, per H. Okeleigh 4s.
FREEDOM Subscriptions.—H.H.S. 1s 6d, T. Appel 4s, H. W. Williams 1s 6d, C. Cade 1s 6d, M. Becker 1s 6d, W. Wess 2s 6d, W. Y. Chyne 1s 6d, S. Jones 3s, A.V.S. 1s 6d, J. Hoyle 1s 6d, C. H. Grinling 1s 6d, H. Clifford 1s 6d, A.C.F. 1s 6d, R. Connel 1s 6d, E. K. Foster 1s 6d, B. Starkweather 1s 6d, E. Reed 1s 6d, J. Hose 1s 6d, W.C.C. 1s, C. Lewis 1s 6d, P. Gille 1s 6d, C. J. Saunders 1s 6d, M. Matling 1s 6d, H. B. Williams 1s 6d.

Pamphlet Printing Fund.—Essex 2s, Gateshead Group (per G. W. Tindale) 3s 6d.

Dublin Strike Fund.—A.M. 5s, F.S. 1s, Comp 1s.

BIRMINGHAM.—Group meetings (Comrades only) will be held at the Coffee House, 7 High Street, Bull Ring, on February 15 and March 1, at 6.30 p.m. Lectures at 7.30 p.m., when all will be welcomed.—C. MARTENS, 355 Lower High Street, West Bromwich.

NOTTING HILL, W.—Comrades willing to form a group in this neighbourhood are requested to communicate with S. Davis, 21, Bonchurch-road, North Kensington, W.

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

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

Modern Science and Anarchism.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

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

Back Numbers of "Freedom."

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

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

Prices include postage in the United Kingdom.

"FREEDOM" MAY BE OBTAINED of

London.—HENDERSONS, 66 Charing Cross Road, W.C. (Wholesale).
NATIONAL LABOUR PRESS, St. Bride's House, Salisbury Square, Fleet Street, E.C. (Wholesale).

W. REEVES, 83, Charing Cross Road, W.
B. RUDERMAN, 71 Hanbury Street, Spitalfields, E.
J. J. JACQUES, 191 Old Street, City Road, E.C.
QUICKFALLS, 238 York Road, and 61 High Street, Battersea, S.W.
ISENBURG, Cleveland Street, W.
A. TOLEMAN, 54 Battersea Rise, S.W.
STEVENS, 56 High Street, Islington.
GOLUB, 10 Osborne Street, Whitechapel.
SUGARMAN, 329A Mile End Road, E.
J. YATES, 114 High Road, Willesden Green, N.W.
H. ELLIOT, 329 Lillie Road, Fulham, S.W.

Liverpool.—E. G. SMITH, 126 Tunnel Road (Wholesale).
CHAS. J. GRANT AND SON, 8 and 9 Lord Street Arcade.
STANLEY'S, 30 Lime Street.

Birmingham.—NATIONAL LABOUR PRESS—100 John Bright Street.
Manchester.—H. SEGALS, 99A Great Ducie Street, Strangeways (Wholesale).
TOM SANDERS, 15 Peter Street.
HERKIN, 14A Clannon Street.
M. Robert, 86 Grosvenor Street, Corner of Brook Street.
Modern Library, 56 Oxford Street.

Coventry.—O. Lloyd, Market Stall.

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

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

NOW READY.

THE RIGHT TO IGNORE THE STATE.

By HERBERT SPENCER.

16 pages. Price One Penny.

To understand the Peasants' War in Mexico, read

LAND AND LIBERTY:

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

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

MOTHER EARTH.

Published by EMMA GOLDMAN.

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

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

PAMPHLET AND BOOK LIST.

- ANARCHIST COMMUNISM: ITS BASIS AND PRINCIPLES. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
ANARCHIST MORALITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
THE WAGE SYSTEM. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.
A TALK ABOUT ANARCHIST COMMUNISM BETWEEN TWO WORKERS. By E. MALATESTA. 1d.
THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
EXPROPRIATION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
DIRECT ACTION v. LEGISLATION. By J. BLAIR SMITH. 1d.
THE SOCIAL GENERAL STRIKE. By ARNOLD ROLLER. 1d.
THE PYRAMID OF TYRANNY. By F. DOMBLA NIEUWENHUIS. 1d.
LAW AND AUTHORITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
THE PLACE OF ANARCHISM IN SOCIALISTIC EVOLUTION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
THE COMMUNE OF PARIS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. 4d.
AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
WAR. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. By ELISEE RECLUS. 1d.
MONOPOLY; OR, HOW LABOUR IS ROBBED. WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
USEFUL WORK v. USELESS TOIL. By Wm. MORRIS. 1d.
THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONGRESS, 1907. 1d.
THE CONCENTRATION OF CAPITAL: A MARXIAN FALLACY. By W. TCHERKESOFF. 1d.
ANARCHISTS AND ESPERANTO. 1d.
KROPOTKIN: THE MAN AND HIS MESSAGE. By T. SWAN. 1d.
THE JAPANESE MARTYRS. With Portrait of Kotoku. 1d.
ANARCHY. By ANDRE GIRARD. 1d.
NON-GOVERNMENTAL SOCIETY. By EDWARD CARPENTER. 3d.
STATE SOCIALISM AND ANARCHISM. By Rev. R. TUCKER. 3d.
DUTY OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE. By H. THOREAU. 3d.
ANARCHISM AND MALTHUS. By C. L. JAMES. 2d.
THE CHICAGO MARTYRS. With Portraits. 1d.
ANTIMILITARISM FROM THE WORKERS' POINT OF VIEW. By Dora B. Montefiore. 1d.
RIGHT TO IGNORE THE STATE. By Herbert Spencer. 1d.
MEMOIRS OF A REVOLUTIONIST. By P. KROPOTKIN. (American Edition). 8s. 6d. net.
THE GREAT FRENCH REVOLUTION, 1789—1793. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 6s. net.
THE CONQUEST OF BREAD. By P. KROPOTKIN. Cloth 1s. net.
MUTUAL AID. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3s. 6d. post-free.
MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM. By PETER KROPOTKIN. A New Translation. Paper 6d., Cloth 1s. 6d.; postage 1½d. and 3d.
FIELDS, FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. New and Revised Edition. Cloth, 1s. net.
GOD AND THE STATE. By MICHAEL BAKUNIN. Cloth 1s. net, paper 6d. net, postage 1d.
ANARCHISM AND OTHER ESSAYS. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 4s. 6d. net.
PRISON MEMOIRS OF AN ANARCHIST. By A. BERKMAN. 6s. 6d. net, postage 4d.
ANARCHISM. By Dr. PAUL ELTZBACHER. 6s. 6d.; postage 4d.
NEWS FROM NOWHERE. By WILLIAM MORRIS. Paper covers, 1s.; cloth, 2s.; postage 2d.
A DREAM OF JOHN BALL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 2s., postage 3d.
FAMOUS SPEECHES OF THE EIGHT CHICAGO ANARCHISTS. 1s. 3d., postage 2d.
WHAT IS PROPERTY? By P. J. PROUDHON. 2 vols. 2s., postage 4d.
THE EGO AND HIS OWN. By MAX STIRNER. 2s. 6d. net.
ENGLAND'S IDEAL. By EDWARD CARPENTER. 2s. 6d. and 1s., post. 3d.
CIVILIZATION: ITS CAUSE AND CURE. By E. CARPENTER. Cloth 2s. 6d. net, paper 1s., postage 3d.
A VINDICATION OF NATURAL SOCIETY. By EDMUND BURKE. 1s. and 6d., postage 2d. and 1d.
WALDEN. By H. THOREAU. 1s. and 6d., postage 2d. and 1d.
THE ORIGIN AND IDEALS OF THE MODERN SCHOOL. By FRANCISCO FERRER. Cloth 9d. net, paper 6d. net, postage 2d.
FRANCISCO FERRER: His Life, Work, and Martyrdom. 1s. net.
FREE POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS. By L. SPOONER. 1s. net.
SYNDICALISM AND THE CO-OPERATIVE COMMONWEALTH. By E. PATAUD and E. POUGET. Cloth 3s. 6d. net, paper 2s. 6d. net.
LIBERTY AND THE GREAT LIBERTARIANS. Compiled by C. T. SPRADING. 6s. 6d. net, postage 4d.
THE SCIENCE OF SOCIETY. By Stephen Pearl Andrews. 5s. net.

All orders, with cash, should be sent to

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

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