

# Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM

VOL. XXII.—No. 229.

MAY, 1908.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

## NOTES.

### The "Promised Land" via Parliament.

If Socialism is as far off as the "Promised Land," and if it is only to be reached by means of the vote, it would seem, judging by recent elections, that the distance has been considerably lengthened by the advent of the Parliamentary Socialist. Fortunately for humanity, the future does not rest with the new-fangled politics called Social-Democratic, or the display in North-West Manchester might suggest to the workers the advantages of a cosmic suicide.

The truth is that political action by the S.D.P. is simply a form of dissipation that affords them the opportunity of an orgie of oratory, from which they awake in the morning with a bad taste in the mouth. And how could it be otherwise? They cannot preach revolution and practise politics. The English voter is not caught by such contradictory methods. If candidates of the S.D.P. wish to succeed, they must become like the wretched compromisers and political wirepullers that are developing in the I.L.P., who dare not speak of Socialism in the House nor at elections. Politics is a dirty game, and there is only one way of playing it.

### Direct Action to the Front.

Commenting on the general strike in Rome and the lock-out of masons in Paris, *Justice* says: "Our sympathies, of course, are entirely with the men, and in view of the failure of political action everywhere, we cannot wonder at the growth of a feeling in favour of more direct measures, doubtful though we may be of its wisdom until the organisation is much more complete." We have italicised the admission as to the failure of political action, not only because it is true and evident enough, but also because such a statement by the "organ of Social Democracy" compels us to ask the question why the S.D.P. should be asking its members for "pounds, shillings, and pence without delay," to waste over the Parliamentary contest in North-West Manchester. Perhaps it is one of those contradictions that can only be explained by a "scientific Socialist."

### Pillars of Society.

A host of humbugs, with Lord Rosebery at their head, have been manufacturing "evidence" against any economic change in our present capitalist system by painting in lurid colours all the imaginary crimes that Socialists would commit to establish their society. While one may laugh at or ignore these absurdities, it is at the same time instructive to observe the doings of some of the most powerful supporters of a régime that is after Lord Rosebery's own heart.

Capitalist crime, like capitalist finance, is international. We need not refer to the support given to the Russian autocracy—that is too black to be defended even by the ordinary plutocrat. But we can find a very good example of the fine flower of finance in the latest French bank scandal, wherein Rochette seems to have outclassed Whittaker Wright. By the latest accounts it would seem that official members of the French Government have nourished the growth of this upas tree. It may be incidentally observed that all these worthy people are furiously opposed to any change in the present economic system.

### More of Them.

If we turn to the Government that controls the great Teutonic race, we find the "pillars" in hardly much better odour. There we see that great centre of the solar system, the Kaiser, surrounded and supported by that bright galaxy of stars known as the "Camarilla." They are all bitter Anti-Socialists, as we know, and their counterparts flourish in all the States groaning under the system championed by Rosebery and Co.

But perhaps the most striking example of the beautiful evolution of virtue and morality in a capitalist society is given in the United States by the four millionaires now on trial for wholesale robbery and fraud, having stolen a few million acres of valuable land from the American people. When the people insist on having it back, that will be "robbery," according to Rosebery.

### Woman in Revolt.

Are the coming years to be made memorable by an active revolt of womankind against the injustices, social and economic, to which she has for so long been a patient victim? The growth of the woman's Trade Union movement, the determined and courageous action of many of the suffragettes, and, above all, the increase of strikes amongst women workers, all tend to show there is something deeper stirring in the feminine heart than a merely superficial discontent with ordinary conditions. The latest and most significant sign of a radical change in woman's attitude towards her present conditions is shown by the action of the "Cabin" waitresses. There is, in fact, a strong possibility of the strike of the "Cabin" girls becoming the starting-point of a new departure in the economic struggle, and of pointing the way to the powerful but sluggish Unions, now suffering "lock-outs" with folded hands, to be up and doing, to organise some work for themselves, rather than to stagnate at the will of their masters. "Ken's Cabin" seems to afford an excellent opportunity for that long-needed combination of Trade Union and Co-operative effort that can be trusted to form for the workers the economic basis of a new society.

### Capitalist Economy!

When Bellamy wrote his work "Equality," he proved as clearly as could possibly be needed by a sane mind that if a system had been specially organised to ensure waste—waste in every direction, material, human, moral, intellectual—nothing could have been better adapted than our present system. Of course, if people gave it a thought—which they seldom do—it would be obvious enough to them. An instance is to hand in the recent terrible railway accident at Shrewsbury, which cost the community eighteen lives, besides the many injured. The company will lose tens of thousands of pounds; and the reason for all this waste is, if one seeks for the real cause of things, to be found in the greed of the capitalist. There is nothing, perhaps, that the great monopolists have opposed more strenuously than the inauguration of an eight-hour day. Blinded by their lust for dividends, they can see no further than the increase in wages that would accrue. The increase in efficiency, and therefore of true economy, never enters their minds. Yet the Shrewsbury disaster is proof positive that the overworking of employes must end in waste both of life and wealth. There will never be real social economy till the workers organise things for themselves.

### A Loss to the Movement.

Something more than a word of sympathy is due to Benjamin Tucker in the loss by fire of all his printing plant and literary stock at a moment when years of patience had prepared all for a wide sphere of activity. In economics Tucker's path leads away from ours, and with many of his social theories we are in complete antagonism; but in the struggle for personal freedom he has achieved some splendid work, and we at least can give our hearty appreciation to one who was the first to print in English Bakunin's "God and the State" and Tchernishevsky's "What's to be Done?" Besides this he has certainly enriched the Anarchist movement by many publications devoted to the exposition of the Individualist position. We offer him our sincere sympathy in a loss that would crush one of a less indomitable spirit, and should he come to Europe, as he suggests, we shall welcome him heartily, in spite of the fact that many fights are still inevitably in store for us.

## THE FAILURE AND FARCE OF PARLIAMENT.

By GUY A. ALDRED.

Parliament and the methods of alleged progressive procedure associated therewith have been relied on by various people to secure reforms as innumerable as the abuses begotten of the capitalist system. On the one hand, Irishmen, since the days of Parnell, have relied on the Home Rule proclivities of members of the Westminster playhouse for the accomplishment of Ireland's emancipation, despite the fact that to talk of the independence of Ireland in the House of Commons would be considered treason, and that no member of the Nationalist Party has ever had the courage to so far break the terms of his induction affirmation as to speak of Ireland as anything else than an adjunct of England. By which complaint I do not wish it to be thought that I urge or favour Nationalism or any phase of reactionary revolutionary endeavour aiming merely at the establishment of a new system of exploitation, but only that the failure of the various parties sent to Westminster to achieve the object of their mission constitutes an all-sufficient condemnation of Parliamentary methods. This will be proved, so far as the Irish Party is concerned, by the narration of a few incidents sufficient to prove the existence of a compact between the canting humbugs of the Liberal Party and the alleged Nationalist members of Parliament.

First and foremost is the Irish Council Bill of 1907, which Mr. Birrell introduced on the strength of an understanding with the leader of the Nationalist Party, and the latter's further assertion in his famous Oxford speech that "the separation of Ireland from England is impossible, and if possible, undesirable." Greater proof than this of the party's loyalty to the British Constitution could not be found, unless one looked for it in the untiring efforts of Mr. J. G. Swift MacNeill, M.P. for South Donegal, to strengthen the armed forces of England, and his continual direction of his energies to the exposure of alleged abuses in the services. Then there is Mr. Samuel Young, M.P. for East Cavan, who tells his constituents that they ought to be proud of being a part of the glorious Empire on which the sun never sets; whilst T. P. O'Connor, another leader, enjoys the distinction of being a member of the National Liberal Club, to which it was sought recently to elect two further Nationalist members, Messrs. McHugh and O'Dowd. Indeed, it was only these gentlemen's fears of the effect on the North Leitrim bye-election then pending (February, 1908) which prevented their elevation to the membership of the Anti-Home-Rule Whig centre of British political Liberalism. In addition, there is the fact of John Redmond welcoming Queen Victoria on her patriotic mission to Ireland during the Boer War, and having always failed to introduce a Bill for Home Rule into the Commons owing to his fear of offending his Liberal allies, his party instead preferring to introduce and to postpone pious resolutions to suit the convenience of members of the Liberal Party. In the meantime, English Budgets, which but serve to perpetuate the robbery of Ireland, go unchallenged; and the member for North Sligo, Mr. McHugh—who was formerly the member for North Leitrim, and the helper of England against the Boer Republics, and conductor of the campaign against Parnell when he was deserted in the sight of a Puritanical Grundyism in Leitrim, and assaulter of the great leader during his illness—is welcomed as a worthy member of a great Home Rule party because of his cowardly antagonism to the Fenians.

The fact that Mr. H. M. Hyndman, the father of British Social Democracy, is willing to identify himself with the proclivities of this party and to congratulate it on its militant policy would seem to constitute an indictment of the Social Democrats and the attitude towards revolutionary activity of the Labour Party in Parliament. Abstract logic would seem to imply this, and the facts of the case fully endorse this implication. For the alleged Socialist members of Parliament no more work for the cause of Socialism than the Nationalist M.P.s above-named strive for the cause of Home Rule. Thus the humbug of the one and the hypocrisy of the other will continue so long as the fetish of Parliament can sway the minds of men, and generate wealth for political devotees of capitalistic respectability.

To come to the terms of the present indictment, let us consider the attitude adopted towards the capitalist system by members of the Labour Party in the House, and the relationship existing between these same members, the Independent Labour Party, and the Social Democratic Party outside and in the constituencies. In so doing let us not forget that the L.R.C. Constitution avows the necessity of independence of both Liberal and Labour parties, and that the S.D.P. holds to a similar thesis,

whilst declining for reasons of principle (*sic*) to affiliate nationally with the Labour Party.

In the first place, let us take the case of Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald, who previous to the General Election of 1895 was striving his hardest to get accepted as official Liberal candidate for Southampton. On the official Liberals declining to take notice of his prowess, he pushed himself forward as Independent Labour candidate for the borough, subsequently standing, at the 1900 election, as Independent Labour candidate for Leicester, where he found himself in antagonism to the Liberals and at the bottom of the poll. At a meeting held on January 5, 1906, at the Temperance Hall, Leicester, he was once more selected as Labour candidate, and appealed for Trade Union votes on the strength of the Taff Vale decision. In the course of some further remarks, he declared that it was necessary to kill Protection, and stated that the local Labour Representation Committee had empowered him to appeal to the electorate to vote for him and Broadhurst, the Liberal candidate. Councillor Hill then proposed a resolution asking every Progressive voter to use his two votes solid for Progress and the advancement of Labour by giving them respectively to Mr. Macdonald and his Liberal opponent (nominally); Alderman Wood, president of the Liberal Association, seconding in a speech in which he urged Liberals to work for "their good friend," Mr. Macdonald, as well as for Mr. Broadhurst. Throughout the contest, whilst speaking on different platforms, the two candidates coupled their names together; and after the poll was declared mutual congratulations passed between the Liberal and Labour Parties, Alderman Wood congratulating Mr. Macdonald on his victory, and Councillor Banton, of the Labour Party, averring that the electorate had given the Alderman, who was sixty-seven on the morrow of victory, a magnificent birthday present.

Thus we see, as is well said by Mr. Harry Quelch—manager of the Twentieth Century Press, Labour Party delegate, member of the executive of the new-styled Social Democratic Party, and editor of *Justice*, the organ of Social Democracy, over which the party has no control—"by a fortuitous succession of circumstances, Mr. Macdonald became secretary of the Labour Representation Committee, and, by a judicious arrangement with the Liberals, he was elected member for Leicester." Continuing, Mr. Quelch says that "he must not expect to be above criticism, or escape attacks when supporting measures for the perpetuation of child slavery"; and adds that "when he reaches his desired haven in the Liberal Party, it will be another matter." This attack on Mr. Macdonald was published in *Justice* of January 12, 1907; and Mr. Quelch has written to much the same effect since in a hack article contributed to the *Daily Express* of January 30 of this year, notwithstanding which he associates and co-operates with the subject of his attacks at various Congresses and Conferences in connection with Labour Party work, being present, as at the Hull Labour Party Conference, under the guise of a Trade Union delegate. Thus, in the same way as the parson subscribes professionally to the Thirty-Nine Articles, and insists that a belief in them is necessary to salvation, but nevertheless is willing to subscribe to the Darwinian theories for practical purposes, Mr. Harry Quelch maintains the necessity for the class war as a Social Democrat, but consents to lay aside his revolutionary shrouds in order to attend Revisionist Labour Party Conferences at which the principles of the class war are negated.

Of course, so far as his criticism of Mr. Macdonald is concerned, his contentions are valid, the latter's declarations in the House of Commons that the existing machinery for dealing with unemployment is very simple, and that the Act establishing it, for which Mr. Walter Long was responsible, was one of the most courageous pieces of statesmanship seen in our generation, being on a par with the prospect he has held out of a union between the two Labour Parties in Parliament, thus averring in practice what he has already declared in speech—the negation of any difference between the intentions of the Labour Party and those of the present Government. In addition, in company with other members of his party, as also with members of the S.D.P., he signed the memorial presented to the Chancellor of the Exchequer a few months since relating to the employment of barmaids, in which it was suggested, at the instance of the ever-slimy and bigoted Nonconformist conscience, to license barmaids on account of the demoralising character of their employment. Moreover there is the statement of the *Manchester Guardian's* London correspondent, in its issue of January 9, as to Mr. Macdonald being "certainly practical enough in Parliament," and having repeatedly sought "to do justice to the Government's good works." And as if this evidence were not sufficient, we have Mr. Macdonald's further statements that "you can find Socialists

in both the big political parties," and that "the people get Socialism from Tory as well as Liberal Ministers." Well might the *Daily News* declare that an interview with Mr. Macdonald which they published in their issue of January 8, 1908, was "an interesting evidence of the substantial identity of the immediate aims of Liberalism and Labour." No wonder it was possible for the delegates of the Labour Party to meet at Hull and to be non-Socialists, but on the day following, by virtue of having passed a meaningless resolution, to become class-conscious Socialists! In the same way, being Socialists (*sic*), the delegates of the Australian Labour Party a few months since in solemn council met, and became, by the passing of a certain resolution, non-Socialists. Shades of Marx and Morris, of Engels and Bakunin, one wonders what relation Socialism can have to the political Joseph's coat of revisionism and reform!

(To be concluded in our next issue.)

## THE PHILOSOPHY OF A SAVAGE.

The chief Commoro (the "Lion") was one of the most clever and common-sense savages that I had seen in these countries, and the tribe paid far more deference to his commands than to those of his brother, "Moy," although the latter was the superior in rank.

One day I sent for Commoro, after the usual funeral dance was completed, and, through my two young interpreters, I had a long conversation with him on the customs of his country. I wished if possible to fathom the origin of the extraordinary custom of exhuming the body after burial, as I imagined that in this act some idea might be traced to a belief in the resurrection.

Commoro was, like all his people, extremely tall. Upon entering my tent he took his seat upon the ground, the Latookas not using stools like the other White Nile tribes. I commenced the conversation by complimenting him on the perfection of his wives and daughters in the dance, and on his own agility in the performance; and inquired for whom the ceremony had been performed.

He replied that it was for a man who had been recently killed, but no one of any great importance; the same ceremony being observed for every person, without distinction.

I asked him why those slain in battle were allowed to remain unburied. He said it had always been the custom, but that he could not explain it.

"But," I replied, "why should you disturb the bones of those whom you have already buried, and expose them on the outskirts of the town?"

"It was the custom of our forefathers," he answered, "therefore we continue to observe it."

"Have you no belief in a future existence after death? Is not some idea expressed in the act of exhuming the bones after the flesh is decayed?"

Commoro (loq.)—"Existence after death! How can that be? Can a dead man get out of his grave, unless you dig him out?"

"Do you think man is like a beast, that dies and is ended?"

Commoro—"Certainly; an ox is stronger than a man; but he dies, and his bones last longer; they are bigger. A man's bones break quickly—he is weak."

"Is not a man superior in sense to an ox? Has he not a mind to direct his actions?"

Commoro—"Some men are not so clever as an ox. Men must sow corn to obtain food, but the ox and wild animals can procure it without sowing."

"Do you not know that there is a spirit within you more than flesh? Do you not dream and wander in thought to distant places in your sleep? Nevertheless, your body rests in one spot. How do you account for this?"

Commoro (laughing)—"Well; how do you account for it? It is a thing I cannot understand; it occurs to me every night."

"The mind is independent of the body;—the actual body can be fettered, but the mind is uncontrollable; the body will die and will become dust, or be eaten by vultures, but the spirit will exist forever."

Commoro—"Where will the spirit live?"

"Where does fire live? Cannot you produce a fire by rubbing two sticks together, yet you see not the fire in the wood. Has not that fire, that lies harmless and unseen in the sticks, the power to consume the whole country? Which is the stronger, the small stick that first produces the fire, or the fire itself? So is the spirit the element within the body, as the element of fire exists in the stick; the element being superior to the substance."

Commoro—"Ha! Can you explain what we frequently see

at night when lost in the wilderness? I have myself been lost, and wandering in the dark, I have seen a distant fire; upon approaching, the fire has vanished, and I have been unable to trace the cause—nor could I find the spot."

"Have you no idea of the existence of spirits superior to either man or beast? Have you no fear of evil except from bodily causes?"

Commoro—"I am afraid of elephants and other animals when in the jungle at night, but of nothing else."

"Then you believe in nothing; neither in a good nor evil spirit! And you believe that when you die it will be the end of body and spirit; that you are like other animals; and that there is no distinction between man and beast; both disappear, and end at death?"

Commoro—"Of course they do."

"Do you see no difference in good and bad actions?"

Commoro—"Yes, there are good and bad in men and beasts."

"Do you think that a good man and a bad must share the same fate, and alike die, and end?"

Commoro—"Yes; what else can they do? How can they help dying? Good and bad all die."

"Their bodies perish, but their spirits remain; the good in happiness, the bad in misery. If you have no belief in a future state, why should a man be good? Why should he not be bad, if he can prosper by wickedness?"

Commoro—"Most people are bad; if they are strong they take from the weak. The good people are all weak; they are good because they are not strong enough to be bad."

Some corn had been taken out of a sack for the horses, and a few grains lying scattered on the ground, I tried the beautiful metaphor of St. Paul as an example of a future state. Making a small hole with my finger in the ground, I placed a grain within it. "That," I said, "represents you when you die." Covering it with earth, I continued, "That grain will decay, but from it will rise the plant that will produce a reappearance of the original form."

Commoro—"Exactly so; that I understand. But the original grain does not rise again; it rots like the dead man, and is ended; the fruit produced is not the same grain that we buried, but the production of that grain. So it is with man,—I die, and decay, and am ended; but my children grow up like the fruit of the grain. Some men have no children, and some grains perish without fruit; then all are ended."

I was obliged to change the subject of conversation. In this wild naked savage there was not even a superstition upon which to found a religious feeling; there was a belief in matter, and to his understanding everything was material. It was extraordinary to find so much clearness of perception combined with such complete obtuseness to anything ideal.—*The Albert Nyanza*, by Sir Samuel W. Baker (1866).

## McARA APPEAL.

The money received has been sufficient to enable us to send Mrs. McARA £1 per week for the past month, and we hope our readers will still continue to subscribe so that we may be able to forward a small sum to our comrade, John McARA, who will be released from Belfast Prison on May 16. The following sums have been received since our last issue:—

Previously acknowledged £6 12s. 1½d., Liverpool Group (two donations) 10s., Literary Entertainment, Bath House, £1 17s., Balance from Anarchist Socialist Sunday School Party 4s. 2d., G. Metcalfe 2s., J. Hoyle 1s., Collected by C. Hutchison 5s., The Merry Pessimists, Leeds, 5s., W. Cohen 2s. 6d., J. Callaghan 1s., Total £9 19s. 9½d.

## Books Received.

*A Green Garland.* - By Victor B. Newburg. 1s. 6d. net. London: Probsthain and Co.  
*The Ethics of Corporal Punishment.* By Henry S. Salt. 1d. London: The Humanitarian Society, 53 Chancery Lane, W.C.  
*L'Empire Knouto-Germanique et la Révolution Sociale.* Par Michael Bakounine. 3 fr. 50c. Paris: P. V. Stock, 155 Rue St. Honoré.  
*Congrès Anarchiste tenu à Amsterdam, 1907.* 1 fr. 50. Paris: La Publication Sociale, 46 Rue Monsieur-le-Prince.  
*Anarchy.* By Peter Latouche. 6s. London: Everett and Co.

## Anarchist-Socialist Sunday School.

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

# 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.

## LABOUR DAY.

Considering that the majority of workers who have work will be working, and those who have not will stay at home, it would be more to the point to regard the First of May as a *day of labour* rather than Labour Day. In other words, the English worker has not by any means grasped the fact that on this one day in the year his protest should go forth to the capitalist class, and his demand for the eight-hour day should be so emphasised that the employers would understand that unless it was *given* it would be taken.

That was the idea that animated the huge gatherings which assembled in the early '90's, when May Day celebrations really had some terrors for the capitalist class. The eight-hour day seemed within reach of the workers for the simple reason that they were rapidly becoming of a mind to have it by their own action if it was longer refused. But the whole agitation was spoilt by the intrusion of the thick-skulled Labour politician, who, seeing a fine opportunity of riding into political power, suggested how beautifully the whole thing might be arranged if men were sent to the House of Commons to voice this claim and insist on the passing of an Act that would save any further trouble of agitation and demonstration. The Social Democrats, who in this matter are most to blame, turned their backs on revolutionary methods and went the whole length of the political policy, thus neutralising all the energy of an enthusiastic and popular movement. The Anarchists, who had worked hard in the face of many obstacles for the success of the revolutionary propaganda of a Labour Day demonstration, were thus isolated, and even denounced when left to the tender mercies of the police.

The heart having been taken out of the movement, the old spirit has not yet returned, and the thousands of workers who should be following the Red Flag to the Park on May Day are apathetically toiling on as before, and no doubt consoling themselves with the reflection that they voted for the "Labour Member" at the last election.

What, then, has happened to encourage the worker in all these intervening years? The sweater sweats as much as ever, the unemployed grow ever and ever more numerous, the capitalist becomes more and more covetous, times are in all ways much harder—and the worker is still waiting for the "legal" eight-hour day! For all these "mercies," fellow workers, let us be thankful to the Socialist and Labour politicians.

## LABOUR DAY DEMONSTRATION, HYDE PARK.

FRIDAY, MAY 1.

### ANARCHIST PLATFORM.

Speakers:

J. TURNER, L. WITHINGTON, GUY A. ALDRED,  
S. CARTER, TARRIDA DEL MARMOL,  
R. ROCKER and E. LEGGATT.

Commence at 3.15 p.m.

## Socialists (?) in Council.

The Easter holidays just over have afforded a fine opportunity for youthful and aspiring Labour and Socialist politicians to meet together. As the faith of the workers in politicians of the old schools is dwindling, a newer, and in some respects more dangerous, crowd of harpies is preparing to exploit their ignorance. It is no longer necessary to try and unmask the pretensions of the principal gangs of collective political coercionists that have grown up in every modern democracy. Already in every country a minority of intelligent workpeople are completely disillusioned as to the part they play in the successful exploitation of labour. Democratic Governments everywhere are the general committees of the Capitalists. After the contests of parties for power, they settle down to modify privilege in favour of the minority of powerful interests which they think gave them their position. And a growing number are beginning to grasp the fact that if Labour men or Socialists are placed in political power, it will not in any way assist their emancipation. This must be accomplished by the worker independent of political electioneering altogether.

Last month we traced the development of Socialist opinion in this country during the last twenty-five years. The steady drift backwards of those Social Democrats who practised political electioneering was clearly pointed out. Mere democratic control of monopolies, and attempted regulation of conditions of employment under capitalism, through Parliament or the municipality, has come to be looked upon, and spoken of, as Socialism. And as this largely coincided with the political and social outlook of the bulk of the men who played a leading part in the Trade Union movement, an alliance soon resulted. This enabled that sham Socialist organisation, the Independent Labour Party, to foist a number of candidates upon certain constituencies at the last election, and with Liberal votes get them returned to the House of Commons, there to be maintained largely by the money of the Trade Unionists.

This party has all the qualifications for political success. All shades and degrees of politics can be found within its ranks. Renegade revolutionists, old-time dissatisfied democrats, mere Labour electoral men on the make, and ardent young political Socialists, whose wild enthusiasm and feverish excitement is successfully exploited by the calculating and unscrupulous element. They have not taken Tory money and played their electoral game like the S. D. P., because they have found a more permanent source of securing the cash they require from the Trade Unions. They are the Socialistic section of the politically independent liberal "Labour Party."

It is quite true that the ardent and youthful section of the I. L. P. chafe at the alliance with mere Trade Union politicians: The electoral success of Victor Grayson fired their imagination. But they are quite helpless in the hands of the older and colder leaders of the party, some of whom are anxious to taste political office during their lifetime. In fact the whole creation of the present political position has had this end in view. They saw the chance of riding into position on the backs of the workers, and seized it with avidity. Once there, the Social Revolution will have been accomplished—for them—and they will kick away the ladder by which they climbed into power. Already the young and idealistic portion of the party are caught in the net. A way has been found by which Victor Grayson can join the Labour Party in the House of Commons, and others have been elected on the N. A. C. Thus they will have to shoulder the responsibility of the party as a whole, and be driven to defend what they have criticised in the past. Once again a "new" political party is coming into existence, carrying with it all the corrupting influence and practice common to those who scheme to secure power over their fellows. The ideals which brought it into being are silently squeezed out. Verbal and lip service are still paid to them when it is thought necessary to work up the enthusiasm and self-sacrifice of the rank-and-file. But the I. L. P. has already become the breeding ground, in spirit at least, for such as Messrs. Briand and Viviani in French politics, though the opportunity may not come as quickly as desired. From a really revolutionary standpoint they are the most dangerous enemies of the workers.

The recent Conference at Huddersfield has seen the parsons joining the politicians, and it is fast becoming indistinguishable from the older parties. Naturally it is growing rapidly from a numerical point of view, since it only appeals to old methods for a new party. It is successfully organising the vague discontent of the workers and the growing Socialist aspirations of the people. These forces are being led into exhausting themselves in an attempt to secure some social amelioration through middle-class

Parliamentary electioneering. The futility of such means is already apparent wherever they have been tried, and the same fate awaits the efforts in this country.

While these political confidence trick men at Huddersfield were laying their plans for future depredations, our sturdy opponents of the S. D. P. were meeting in Manchester. It is quite pathetic to read the reports. After twenty-five years of strenuous effort they *claim* to represent 12,000 members(?) My word, how the capitalists must tremble! Does this number include the Socialist Sunday Schools of the S. D. P.? At this rate they will have nearly half a million members in a thousand years from now. Perhaps, with luck, they may secure a *majority* in ten thousand years if only the population will oblige by remaining stationary, and not be in too much hurry to act on their own account.

The principal question discussed was the proposal to rejoin the Labour Party. It has dawned on some of those who desire above all else to get on the floor of the House of Commons that the S.D.P. has been completely obscured politically by the independent political action of the Trade Unions. This development is undoubtedly largely due to Social Democratic teaching. But the S.D.P. never had the acumen to manipulate the forces or the situations they created. They wished to impose their paper theories, but failed. The Fabians and I.L.P.'ers had no such scruples. They seized the opportunity to thrust their hands into the pockets of the Trade Unionists for their political purposes, and have taken good care to keep them there ever since. Even Hyndman now sees the blunder they made in withdrawing, from an electoral point of view. It was the only chance he had of getting to St. Stephen's. He did not think so before the last election, but he is now beginning to realise the electoral impotence of the S.D.P., his own pet creation. One wonders how he would act if he could go back a quarter of a century. That as a middle-class Conservative politician, converted to political Marxian Socialism, he completely miscalculated the working-class forces of this country, must be apparent to all. But now his advice to reaffiliate was rejected. H. Quelch, with irresistible logic, put the position as urged by Hyndman in the old days, and carried by four to one the isolation of the S.D.P. and all its works. It will now be able to concentrate on its trading department, and develop the very traits it despised in the early days.

For the rest, it decided to provide legal assistance "for comrades who have come in conflict with the police," so it will add a legal to the trading department.

The Conference also decided to go on with the candidature of Dan Irving for Manchester, and the electors showed their appreciation of this foolery by giving him 276 votes, thus exposing to the world the nakedness of the whole show.

Of the little gathering at Sheffield, where the Socialist Labour Party met—the logical S.D.F.'ers, completely run to earth—it is unnecessary to speak, except to welcome the glimmer of intelligence that the workers, after all, can only achieve their economic freedom by direct revolutionary economic action.

All of them echo the emptiness of political action, and emphasise how utterly impossible it is to hope for any serious improvement through electioneering. At none of these gatherings was there any discussion as to how the workers would arrange their lives under Socialism any more than how they would achieve what they were after. It was nothing but organised intrigue as to how they could scramble into political position or power under Capitalism. Not a single attempt was made to deal with the economic or social problems of the future, and evidently none imagined that the workers would ever make a serious attempt to establish Socialism.

And yet as Anarchists we must ask again, as we have often asked before, "How do they imagine Parliament or any other political agency can effect the Social Revolution, if the workers themselves have not thought out the problem?" To this the politicians have no answer. They only ask the ignorant voters to place them in power. If they do, they will only have changed their masters. We are not concerned in the slightest with such a change, and shall continue to undermine the foundations of Capitalism and Government, till the workers are able to destroy them both.

## MOTHER EARTH.

Published by EMMA GOLDMAN.

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

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

Back numbers supplied.

Specimen copy sent on receipt of 1d. stamp.

## SOCIALISM AND ITS ENEMIES.

(Concluded from No. 227.)

Weakness of defence is, if anything, worse than feebleness of attack; and, as was pointed out in a previous number (*Freedom* for March), the compromising attitude taken up by many who are, or have been, defending the Socialist position, has not only tended to give wrong impressions as to what really constitutes Socialism, but has undoubtedly confused the issue between those who uphold the capitalist system and those whose aim is to emancipate mankind from the thralldom of an exploiting class.

It is argued by some that the "palliatives" which have practically replaced Socialism in the programmes of Socialist (?) politicians pave the way most effectively to a Socialist system of society. But that depends entirely on how these measures are brought about. If, for instance, by means of a threatened general strike the employers were compelled to concede an eight-hour day, the result would be entirely for the best, as the workers would know they had gained it by their own courage and determination, and they would quickly realise that further victories were to be won along the same lines, until the last citadel of capitalism had been overthrown. It is not for a moment suggested that many of these struggles, and more particularly the final effort of complete expropriation, could be carried through without bloodshed, for the simple and obvious reason that the landlord and capitalist, with the State at their backs, will never permit a peaceful socialisation of the means of production. Every observant individual knows that the tiger with its prey is not more fierce and cruel than the threatened capitalist with his stolen wealth; and the Labour Party may vote palliatives till they are black in the face, but if they really mean to win the world for the workers, they will have to come out and fight when the "psychological moment" arrives.

It is for these reasons the Anarchists have been able to see in direct action a sure means of educating the workers in self-reliant methods as opposed to the ideas of a "paternal Government" and all the rest of the political quackery. It is the present-day preaching of the Labour Party that is making the Socialist ideal become "small by degrees and beautifully less." Twenty years ago the beautiful conception of life under Socialism was given forth in the writings of William Morris, and as the Socialist League was not organised for vote-catching or for pitchforking ambitious folk into political power, a noble and generous ideal was preached, which had a greater influence than will ever be admitted by the political bigots who oscillate "twixt Tweedledum and Tweedledee" in the corrupt atmosphere of St. Stephen's.

Coming to the question of the relation of Socialism to religion and the family, one can only regret the lack of moral courage shown in all directions by the "defenders" of the Socialist position. The reason seems to be the desire to gain prestige by the capture of certain "reverends" for the cause of Socialism. Take, for instance, the fuss over the "Rev." R. J. Campbell. More fulsome nonsense was indulged in over his "conversion" to Socialism than even over the return of the prodigal son. Yet every one knew how this man by his Jingoism supported the infamous South African War. But there are such things as Nonconformist voters, and these have to be scooped in, even at the cost of paudering to the superstition and ignorance of the little Bethels.

In dealing with this question of the Socialist spirit which, we are told, pervades the Gospels, it is necessary to say once more we have no intention of confusing the Radical reforms paraded as Socialism, for example, by that mere politician, J. R. Macdonald, with that *revolutionary* conception of economic conditions and social relationships that ensure the certainty of well-being for all workers, with true liberty and individual autonomy, without which there can be no healthy social life.

Are we to be told, then, that contentment with poverty, humbleness of spirit, non-resistance—the essence of the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount—are the things we must preach in order to build up those free and happy communities that we look for as an outcome of the Social Revolution? If such stupidities meant Socialism, then we should all regard the Local Government Board as a chapel-of-ease to heaven itself, and John Burns as Jesus Christ dealing out middle-class charity—for £5,000 a year.

But Socialism has nothing to do with all these so-called "Christian virtues," except to oppose them. For let it be remembered that all the terrible exploitation which has ever afflicted mankind has been carried out in the name of these same

"virtues." Are not all the millionaires good Christians? Has not Dr. Aked—a "Christian Socialist"—entered the service of the divine Rockefeller? Who blesses all the wars that suck the life-blood of humanity—who but the priest? Again, as Dr. Draper has so eloquently explained in his "Conflict between Religion and Science," the onward march of progress has ever been bitterly opposed by Christianity, and all efforts to free the mind from its inhuman superstitions have cost untold suffering and torture, and the lives of the best of our race.

Socialism, on the other hand, hails true humanitarian science as the great benefactor of mankind, and for this reason alone has nothing in common with Christianity; moreover, the desire that all should have the fullest possibility of self-development, of enjoying all the material advantages that science and knowledge under Socialism will place at our disposal, brings us at once in conflict with the "Christian virtues" of "contentment with our lot," "submission to our superiors," and self-immolation for the "glory of God."

It will be said, however, there are sincere Christians who wish to help Socialism with a genuine spirit of solidarity. In such a case they help as Socialists, and their religious opinions remain their own private affair. But let it be understood that Socialism does not for one moment compromise with their Christianity to gain their adherence. At the same time, it is self-evident that no true Socialist—and least of all Anarchists, who stand most firmly for freedom of thought and action—could ever dictate to any one what their solution of the "riddle of the universe" should be. Each must face the problem of existence with such knowledge as he can command, and form his conceptions accordingly. But any who should ask us all to accept their theories as true must be prepared to face the most severe and unflinching criticism. And such, indeed, should be welcomed by all sincere persons. But the Christian is the last person in the world to voluntarily adopt this attitude. He does so only when he is compelled. So once again Socialists are being advised to hold their tongues on the religious question, particularly at election times, for the sake of "Christian" votes.

This is preposterous and absurd, and it is sincerely to be hoped there is enough manhood left among the rank-and-file of all Socialist parties to speak out plainly on this subject as on all others when occasion requires. If, as we are told, there is no occasion to discuss religion in Socialist propaganda, then let the Christians keep their Christianity out of the Socialist movement. But it is precisely this that they will not do. They even affirm, with a modesty peculiar to them, that they are the better Socialists because of their religious beliefs. And they want their hymns at the meetings, with a flavour of the "new theology" permeating the general atmosphere of the gathering.

England has long been the home of religious hypocrisy, but if Socialism is to bow its head to these newcomers from the pulpit, it is evident there is another enemy to be fought besides the politician.

## LABOUR M.P. ON UNEMPLOYED TACTICS.

These Labour M.P.s are indeed a poor crowd. According to the *Clarion*, which on the unemployed window-breaking in Manchester has taken up a splendid attitude, a public meeting was recently held in Hulme Town Hall to protest against the vindictive sentences passed on the four men convicted. While not given to emotionalism, we certainly admire the outspoken and perfectly accurate sentiments expressed there by "Nunquam." He is reported to have said: "The sentences passed on the leaders of the Manchester unemployed represented the first move in an unprincipled game which was going to be forced upon them very soon. There was going to be a coalition and unity of property, and the interested classes would not stick at anything. I tell you this who know: stop them now and here; stop them by any means."

This correct description of the conspiracy of property interests seems to have disturbed the placid mind of a succeeding speaker, J. R. Clynes, M.P., J.P., successful candidate of the modest I.L.P., and organising secretary for the "revolutionary" Gas Workers and General Labourers Union. He did not altogether agree with some of the methods of the unemployed. Little good would come of marches to London or meetings in Stevenson Square. "He looked for a solution of the difficulty by the men who were in work marching intelligently to the ballot-box and recording their votes for laws which would secure that any man or woman able and willing to work should not be thrust into the outer darkness of starvation and neglect." Quite model sentiments for a J.P. and M.P. They are certainly not calculated to scare the enemy very much. These Labour M.P.s are far more conservative than many capitalists. Whatever can "Nunquam's" honest opinion be of these poor creatures. These be thy gods, oh Israel!

## What the State Gives—and Takes.

Every State is a *despotism*, be the despot one or many, or (as one is likely to imagine about a republic) if all be lords, i.e., despotise one over another. For this is the case when the law given at any time, the expressed volition of (it may be) a popular assembly, is thenceforth to be law for the individual, to which *obedience is due* from him, or toward which he has the *duty* of obedience. If one were even to conceive the case that every individual in the people had expressed the same will, and hereby a complete "collective will" had come into being, the matter would still remain the same. Would I not be bound to-day and henceforth to my will of yesterday? My will would in this case be frozen. Wretched stability! My creature—to wit, a particular expression of will—would have become my commander. But I in my will, I the creator, should be hindered in my flow and my dissolution. Because I was a fool yesterday I must remain such my life long. So in the State-life I am at best—I might just as well say, at worst—a bondman of myself. Because I was a willer yesterday, I am to-day without will: yesterday voluntary, to-day involuntary.

How change it? Only by recognising no *duty*, i.e., not *binding* myself nor letting myself be bound. If I have no duty, then I know no law either.

"But they will bind me!" My will nobody can bind, and my disinclination remains free.

"Why, everything must go topsy-turvy if every one could do what he would!" Well, who says that every one can do everything? What are you there for, pray, you who do not need to put up with everything? Defend yourself, and no one will do anything to you! He who would break your will has to do with you, and is your *enemy*. Deal with him as such. If there stand behind you for your protection some millions more, then you are an imposing power and will have an easy victory. But, even if as a power you overawe your opponent, still you are not on that account a hallowed authority to him, unless he be a simpleton. He does not owe you respect and regard, even though he will have to consider your might.

We are accustomed to classify States according to the different ways in which "the supreme might" is distributed. If an individual has it—monarchy; if all have it—democracy; etc. Supreme might then! Might against whom? Against the individual and his "self-will." The State practises "violence," the individual must not do so. The State's behaviour is violence, and it calls its violence "law"; that of the individual, "crime." Crime, then,—so the individual's violence is called; and only by crime does he overcome the State's violence when he thinks that the State is not above him, but he above the State.

Now, if I wanted to act ridiculously, I might, as a well-meaning person, admonish you not to make laws which impair my self-development, self-activity, self-creation. I do not give this advice. For, if you should follow it, you would be unwise, and I should have been cheated of my entire profit. I request nothing at all from you; for, whatever I might demand, you would still be dictatorial lawgivers, and must be so, because a raven cannot sing, nor a robber live without robbery. Rather do I ask those who would be egoists what they think the more egoistic,—to let laws be given them by you, and to respect those that are given, or to practise *refractoriness*, yes, complete disobedience. Good-hearted people think the laws ought to prescribe only what is accepted in the people's feeling as right and proper. But what concern is it of mine what is accepted in the nation and by the nation? The nation will perhaps be against the blasphemer; therefore a law against blasphemy. Am I not to blaspheme on that account? Is this law to be more than an "order" to me? I put the question.

Solely from the principle that all *right* and all *authority* belong to the *collectivity of the people* do all forms of government arise. For none of them lacks this appeal to the collectivity, and the despot, as well as the president or any aristocracy, etc., acts and commands "in the name of the State." They are in possession of the "authority of the State," and it is perfectly indifferent whether, were this possible, the people as a *collectivity* (all individuals) exercise this *State-authority*, or whether it is only the representatives of this collectivity, be there many of them as in aristocracies, or one as in monarchies. Always the collectivity is above the individual, and has a power which is called *legitimate*, i.e., which is *law*.

Over against the sacredness of the State, the individual is only a vessel of dishonour, in which "exuberance, malevolence, mania for ridicule and slander, frivolity," etc., are left as soon as he does not deem that object of veneration; the State, to be worthy of recognition. The spiritual *haughtiness* of the servants and subjects of the State has fine penalties against unspiritual "exuberance."

When the government designates as punishable all play of mind against the State, the moderate liberals come and opine that fun, satire, wit, humour, etc., must have free play anyhow, and *genius* must enjoy freedom. So not the *individual man* indeed, but still *genius*, is to be free. Here the State, or in its name the government, says with perfect right: He who is not for me is against me. Fun, wit, etc.,—in short, the turning of State affairs into a comedy,—have undermined States from of old: they are not "innocent." And, further, what boundaries are to be drawn between guilty and innocent wit, etc.? At this question the moderates fall into great perplexity, and everything reduces itself to the prayer that the State (government) would please

not be so sensitive, so ticklish; that it would not immediately scent malevolence in "harmless" things, and would in general be a little "more tolerant." Exaggerated sensitiveness is certainly a weakness, its avoidance may be a praiseworthy virtue; but in time of war one cannot be sparing, and what may be allowed under peaceable circumstances ceases to be permitted as soon as a state of siege is declared. Because the well-meaning liberals feel this plainly, they hasten to declare that, considering "the devotion of the people," there is assuredly no danger to be feared. But the government will be wiser, and not let itself be talked into believing anything of that sort. It knows too well how people stuff one with fine words, and will not let itself be satisfied with this Barmecide dish.

But they are bound to have their playground, for they are children, you know, and cannot be so staid as old folks; boys will be boys.

Only for this playground, only for a few hours of jolly running about, they bargain. They ask only that the State should not, like a splenetic papa, be too cross. It should permit some Processions of the Ass and plays of fools, as the church allowed them in the Middle Ages. But the times when it could grant this without danger are past. Children that now once come into the open, and live through an hour without the rod of discipline, are no longer willing to go into the cell. For the open is now no longer a supplement to the cell, no longer a refreshing recreation, but its opposite, an *aut-ant*. In short, the State must either no longer put up with anything, or put up with everything and perish; it must be either sensitive through and through, or, like a dead man, insensitive. Tolerance is done with. If the State but gives a finger, they take the whole hand at once. There can be no more "jesting," and all jest, such as fun, wit, humour, etc., becomes bitter earnest.

The clamour of the liberals for freedom of the press runs counter to their own principle, their proper will. They will what they *do not* will, i. e., they wish, they would like. Hence it is too that they fall away so easily when once so-called freedom of the press appears; then they would like censorship. Quite naturally. The State is sacred even to them; likewise morals, etc. They behave toward it only as ill-bred brats, as tricky children who seek to utilise the weaknesses of their parents. Papa State is to permit them to say many things that do not please him, but papa has the right, by a stern look, to blue-pencil their impertinent gabble. If they recognise in him their papa, they must in his presence put up with the censorship of speech, like every child.

—Max Stirner, "The Ego and His Own."

## JESUITICAL JINGOISM.

The following extract from Leaflet No. 8 of the "Empire Movement," as it is called, affords a good illustration of how the reactionaries are preparing the people for more war, more taxation, and more misery. Their conception of what a British citizen should be is specially exhilarating:

### British Citizens should

- 1—Love and fear God. 2—Honour the King. 3—Obey the laws.
- 4—Prepare to advance the highest interests of the Empire in peace and war. 5—Cherish patriotism. 6—Regard the rights of other nations. 7—Learn citizenship. 8—Follow duty. 9—Consider duties before rights. 10—Acquire knowledge. 11—Think broadly.
- 12—Practise discipline. 13—Subdue self. 14—Work for others. 15—Consider the poor and the suffering.

### Advice.

- 1—Send for Empire Movement Leaflets to the Secretary, 83 Lancaster Gate, London, W.
- 2—See that every British child over whom you have influence learns the "Empire Catechism," the National Anthem, the "Flag of Britain" (Leaflet No. 1), and the Empire Songs by heart, as part of the history and geography lessons.
- 3—Agitate until every school possesses a full-sized flagstaff and Union Jack, a large wall map of the Empire (Navy League or Howard Vincent maps), a portrait of the King, observes "Empire Day" annually, and until systematic instruction in good citizenship is given within its walls, and until every child is so trained, morally, mentally, and physically, as to enable him or her to give in after life the best service to the community and to the State of which he or she may be capable.
- 4—Hang up in schools, if possible framed, Lord Meath's large "Message" wall card (Leaflet 7).
- 5—See that in schools the Union Jack be ceremoniously hoisted and saluted by both boys and girls, the "Empire Catechism" recited, and the National Anthem and "Empire Songs" sung on the King's Birthday, on "Empire Day," and on such other notable dates as may be considered desirable.

What choice flowers of wisdom! What perfect advice for slaves! "Consider duties before rights." "Work for others." As if poor "British citizens" weren't doing all these things as hard as they can already, and generally following all this "advice" which leads to the workhouse.

And this abominable trash is being forced down the throats of the rising generation. A final request is "Please hang up this card." We should like to "hang up" the authors of it.

## INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

### Germany.

In most countries our comrades have hard work to keep their Anarchist papers going. In Germany these difficulties are certainly not less than elsewhere. The powerful Social Democratic Party is ever ready to denounce Anarchist propaganda, and the police are always lying in wait for an article, a sentence from which they can construe *lèse-majesté* or an offence against some other article of the law, and so search the houses of the comrades and prosecute editors and printers. Nevertheless, several Anarchist papers continue to make their regular weekly appearance. One of the oldest among these, *Der Freie Arbeiter*, founded in 1897 under the name of "Neues Leben," had No. 14 entirely confiscated quite recently owing to an article on "Expropriation." Not only in Berlin, but also in Leipzig, Cologne, etc., the police diligently searched for copies of the prohibited number; and especially for the manuscript of the article. Need it be said that the police in their zeal to find the preacher of expropriation expropriated many books, papers, documents, etc., at the houses where searches were made? But Anarchists everywhere know only too well that when bent on persecution the executors of the law are never hampered by too fine a sense of legality.

*Der Revolutionär*, the organ of the Federated German Anarchists, continues to come out regularly, and has in its five years of existence done much to keep the comrades in the various parts of the Empire in touch. It also contains illustrations from time to time. This paper, as well as *Der Freie Arbeiter*, is actively propagating the General Strike and Antimilitarism, the latter certainly badly needed in Germany. Even from the Social Democratic camp a few stragglers have begun to work in this direction, though the party has declared itself against a regular Antimilitarist propaganda, which would cost it many votes and years of prison. Another publication in the German language is *Der Wohlstand für Alle* of Vienna, which appears twice monthly with a literary supplement. Though it has only reached its eighth number, it has already earned the distinction of having had an issue confiscated by order of the Censor.

F. T.

### Italy.

On April 2 three workmen were shot dead and fifteen badly wounded by troops in the streets of Rome, and on the following morning a general strike commenced in the city by way of protest. This is a fine proof of the organisation that now exists among Italian Unions and bodies of workmen. Within a few hours the word goes forth, and the manual life of the capital ceases. Note the contrast between this forcible protest at a cruel outrage and the supine apathy that marked the murder of innocent citizens by English soldiers in the streets of Belfast not so long ago. Little or no comment or protest followed that incident either from the British public or its press, or even from the organs of the workers themselves. Such acts were "regrettable," of course—that was all. Not a stern or fiery word of denunciation from the people of Ireland or England—not an act to portend that British workers refused from thenceforth to silently permit their city streets to be turned into armed arsenals for the coercion of strikers or refractory mill hands! As soon as a soldier bars the road there is bound to be trouble, which, with all their hypocritical pretence at deploring, is just what Governments seek. The "mob" must always be terrorised nowadays, grape-shot must point the periods of Riot Acts. Why? Perhaps because it is a different "mob" to that of Roman days, which when it showed its fangs was pacified with games or burning Christians; perhaps because it begins dimly to understand, as Swinburne writes, that "when three men hold together, the kingdoms are less by three," and panic-stricken Authority stands ever in fear of that holding together of the outraged masses. Southern people, however, have learnt not to remain silent over whiffs of powder and dead men lying on the streets they maybe helped to pave. And a general strike is a fitting retort while stronger are still unavailable.

The insular Press of Great Britain, while giving a column to a sick cricketer or a dead "half-back," has little room for comment upon or insertion of foreign news other than what pertains to American divorce cases or Bourse scandals. Few outside our readers are aware of the growing consolidation of the workers in Italy and Spain or what a force lies behind their unarmed ranks. They can still be shot down, but the rich and the idle are made to remember it on the morrow. A critic objects that even if the General Strike came to be adopted by the future Trade Unionism of England, the size of London will always militate against its availability as a weapon in the capital. But where there is sympathy and concord plus organisation, all difficulties can be overcome. Needless to say, the disturbance in Rome was caused in the first place solely by the authorities. The funeral of a workman was passing through the city; the police barred the procession, and the troops "were permitted" to fire a volley. The usual tale of military ferocity and civil interference with the rights of "the common people." From later information, however, it seems that the soldiers were less brutal than the gendarmerie. These it was who fired deliberately on the flying crowd, singling out those known to them as fighters. In this way a well-known organiser of the Masons' Union, an Anarchist, Paolo Chiarella, was chased down a street by a mounted gendarme, and killed with a revolver shot.

The general strike lasted forty-eight hours, and ended with a street demonstration some 15,000 strong. Wreaths were placed on the

victims' graves, and speeches made by orators of all parties. The strike took effect not only in Rome, but also in Bergamo, Bologna and Ferrara.

### Spain.

Juan Rull, with others of his family, has been tried and condemned to death as the author of various explosions that have occurred in Barcelona within the past two years, which resulted in death and injury to many, the arrest and imprisonment of numberless Anarchist suspects, persecution of their friends by the police, and the passing of cruel and repressive measures against the workers in general. Rull and his family were arrested last June, and from the trial, which lasted many days and created great sensation as it developed, it appears that being friendly with the police and in need of money, the idea occurred to him to form a gang of police spies, and with or without the connivance of the officials, to start a series of outrages which could be credited to Anarchists, and fill his pockets with Secret Service money. The plan worked satisfactorily for many months, when it began to be noticed that the explosions grew to be coincident with refusals on the part of the authorities to comply with Rull's constant demands for money. After deceiving three Governors of Barcelona, of each of whom he was the trusted agent, public clamour forced an impartial investigation, with the result as notified. Whether the Governors were really deceived by Rull is questionable. We know that in every corner of the world the Anarchist is held up by Governments and their police as the author or instigator of every political or mysterious crime that takes place, and is now such a convenient scapegoat that they are loth to give him either quarter or justice. To such an extent are they blinded by their mania for Anarchist-hunting that they have lost all sense of proportion, the mildest and gentlest of men and women, if adjudged Anarchist, being watched and harassed more than the greatest criminals that history has known. Any spy, any journalist, who tells a lie about Anarchists is believed. It all means grist to the Government mill, as showing the "dangerous" character of the proletariat; it also means "extras" to the police pocket. So patent a fact has this become that a detective-inspector with a grain of honesty still alive in him declared at Rull's trial that the man and his gang were not the principals in these outrages, that there were "others behind of far higher position and importance, who provided them with funds and encouraged them in their dastardly campaign." Will those "others" be discovered? Never.

### Austria.

A few weeks ago Count Potocki, Governor of Galicia, was shot dead by a Ruthenian student. The act caused great sensation among the officials ruling Austrian Poland, and was, as usual, the result of deep discontent under misrule and oppression, which had so far only found vent in words until Miroslav Siczynski was driven to a so-called "political crime" as a surer means of voicing public sentiment. The act was really one of defence against national repression, Ruthenian peasants being pitilessly exploited by Polish aristocrats. He is likely to be hanged for his expression of sympathy with his oppressed countrymen, the pathetic touch being that his mother, also arrested, is trying to save her boy's life by declaring that she compelled him to do the deed. The Emperor is celebrating his jubilee (sixtieth year of reign), but is hardly one to alter a sentence of death, should such be petitioned for.

### France.

The builders' lock-out in Paris ended on April 21, after lasting two weeks, during which their men amused themselves, such as could afford it, with country jaunts, while those who could not were supplied with soup by their fellows. No disorders took place. A masons' Congress was held, at which 300,000 men were represented. They issued a statement that masons all over the country demanded a nine-hour day, and were determined to get it. The masters on their side proposed the formation of new guilds, which are to be in close touch with the masters' syndicates, and whose members and delegates are to meet on equal terms to discuss their common interests. But where and when did master and man ever yet meet on "equal terms"? The men drifted back to work by degrees, and were asked to sign a new contract stipulating for ten hours' work at the old rate of wages and a promise to join the new guild. Some signed, most did not; but in either case the result will be the same—*scabotage*—during the tenth hour as before the lock-out. The General Confederation of Labour has issued a manifesto calling on all workers to proclaim a general strike of one day on May 1 to vindicate their strength and solidarity.

### Montreal.

Comrade Bourlay sends a long account of the Socialist position in the above city, and of the growth of Anarchist ideas. Much disgust has arisen in Socialist circles by the arbitrary and reactionary conduct of one Albert St. Martin, who put the full pressure of the law in action against some poor members of a co-operative store who were a few cents in debt. He is also accused of calling for cheers for the mayor and police on May 1 last year at the very moment that the latter were shamefully maltreating the women and children massed before the doors of St. Joseph's Hall. "Let the chiefs and the monopolists in office disappear," he concludes; "they are more to be feared than the plagues of Egypt. Then, and then only, will the work of the Social Revolution advance in French Canada."

## VOICE OF LABOUR.

The "Voice of Labour" Group desire to state that, owing to insufficient support, it will not be possible to issue the paper at present.

### MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

(April 10—April 29.)

**FREEDOM Guarantee Fund**—Essex 1s., H. and B. 2s., A. G. 6d., B. G. 6d., R. O. 6d., N. £1, Rhodes 2s., H. Glasse 5s., W. Cohen 2s. 6d.  
**FREEDOM Subscriptions**—E. D. Hunt 3s., W. Ms. 1s. 6d., J. Hoyle 1s. 6d., F. Bannister 1s. 6d., J. Scarceriaux 1s. 6d., R. H. Smith 1s. 6d., G. Smith 1s. 6d., L. FitzRoy 1s. 6d.  
**Sales of FREEDOM**—Henderson 3s. 6d., Large 1s., Greenlough 1s. 1d., Goodman 1s. 10d., G. E. 6d., A. B. Howie 1s. 6d., C. Hutchison 1s., A. Goldberg 2s., A. Bird 1s. 6d., H. Glasse 2s. 6d., D. Wormald 1s. 6d., S. Vermont 2s., W. Cohen 1s. 4d., H. Rubin 2s., B. Greenblatt 6s., H. Karpin 4s. 9d.  
**Pamphlet and Book Sales**—Essex 3s. 6d., G. J. Metcalfe 1s., S. Morris 4s., Goodman 1s. 10d., W. Maddocks 6s. 4d., H. Morris 1s., A. B. Howie 3s., "Mother Earth" £1, J. Scarceriaux 1s., A. Goldberg 3s., A. Lilburn 2s. 9d., T. S. 1s. 1d., S. Vermont 2s., W. Cohen 1s. 2d., H. Rubin 6s., L. FitzRoy 9s. 6d., B. Greenblatt 9s., Greenbourn 2s. 6d.

"VOICE OF LABOUR" FUND.

Collected by Goldberg 5s. 4d., Ditto (Sheet 15) 2s. 3d.

## HENDERSONS,

66 CHARING CROSS ROAD, LONDON, W.C.,  
**For Revolutionary Literature,**  
 Socialist, Labour, Rationalist, and all Advanced  
 Thought Books and Periodicals

Publishing Office of "The Deadly Parallel," Price 1d.

### GOOD PROPAGANDA LEAFLETS.

#### Our Great Empire.

#### The Folly of Voting.

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

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

## PAMPHLET AND BOOK LIST.

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

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

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