

Freedom

JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM

VOL. XXIII.—No. 246.

OCTOBER, 1909.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY

NOTES.

Repression.

The growing agitation against the infamies of Montjuich in the repressive measures now being taken in Barcelona reminds us once more of the terrible tribute of blood demanded by the ruling classes when a rising of the people is crushed. What could be more praiseworthy on the part of a people than to endeavour to stop such a war as that now being carried on by Spain in Morocco? Or, again, what nobler work could any one undertake than the spreading of knowledge amongst the ignorant and the poor? To resist being compelled to murder innocent peoples—that is the crime of the rebels in Montjuich. To devote oneself to the building up of the dignity and self-respect of a nation—that is the crime of Ferrer, for whose blood the clerical jackals are now screaming. The financiers and the priests, two of the blackest types that bar the progress of humanity, have their heels on the brave fighters in Barcelona. The people must be saved. Their aim was noble: their cause was great. Their enemies are beneath the contempt even of civilised Europe. Like the Black Death, they are a pest that should only be remembered as a thing of the past. Let all friends read the manifesto which is printed on another page. And let us all lose no opportunity of helping to rouse the indignation of all honest people against the orgie of blood and torture that is being called for by the Spanish reaction.

Feudalism in England.

The land question is very much to the fore just now, and some of the English people, at any rate, are beginning to understand that feudalism never has ceased to hold sway in England. But twentieth-century feudalism in England is not quite the same thing that existed in France before the Revolution. At the present moment the landowning class is a fine mixture of noble dukes, big capitalists, and American multimillionaires. In fact, the interests of land and capital have become so interwoven that in the future it will be impossible to deal drastically with one without becoming involved in an attack on the other. For instance, fifty-seven new peers were created by Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour between 1895 and 1907. Out of these, fifty-one are directors of companies; some of only three or four, some of as many as twelve. Independently, then, of their landed influence, just imagine the power wielded by these men in industrial questions affecting the workers. What childishness of the Labour Party to talk of the "Socialism" of the Budget! The day has gone by when Socialism could be approached by attacking one side of the problem. The attack must be all along the line. And when it is seen what an immense task this involves, it will be understood how needful it is to arouse the people to the widest possible conception of the necessary change, and how fatal it is to be drawn along the path of mere political compromise.

The Swedish Strike.

We wonder if the British Trade Unionist is not beginning to get heartily sick and tired of his "leaders." These gentry have only just finished airing their vanities and stupidities (not forgetting their cupidities) at Ipswich. A precious fine harvest the worker will reap from all their talk, which reminded one of nothing so much as the great original at Westminster. All the "rules," all the "procedure," all the undercurrents of petty ambitions, make a fine spectacle to gaze upon while tens of thousands of starving strikers in Sweden, who need the help of their English comrades in their terrible fight, are practically forgotten. At the eleventh hour of this bitter struggle, the Swedish leaders in a last appeal ask why have the English Unions failed to help them. It must indeed seem a mockery to them that, while failing to send them money, we have not

forgotten to send them blacklegs. The explanation, however, is not far to seek. The horny-handed Trade Unionist whose heart was devoted to his Union and the solidarity of Labour, has now become a silk-hatted politician, a respectable member of a party, with M.P. to his name. Strikes no longer interest him. All that the workers want must be had through him and his party. That is the position at the present moment. The Labour Party is dominated by politics, and the revolutionary spirit engendered by strikes is discountenanced. There is indeed the need for a revolt.

Sedition.

When the charge of "sedition" is brought against a person, we are always reminded of the saying of Napoleon's chief spy, Fouché: "Give me a line that any man has ever written, and I will bring him to the scaffold." The days of Napoleon are passed, but the days of sedition are still with us, and there are always those who are ready to take advantage of this most cowardly weapon of the law. The case of Guy Aldred comes under this general head, and otherwise has no particular significance from the Anarchist point of view. The position taken up by Aldred was a purely personal attitude as to the action of the Government against the *Indian Sociologist*. It is, however, of the first importance to remember that the Indian Nationalist movement, as is the case with all Nationalist movements, is distinctly opposed to Anarchist ideals. It may be better expressed by saying: All Anarchists are rebels, but all rebels are not Anarchists.

After this, it may be interesting to hear what the gentleman who exalts Liberalism by deporting India's best citizens *without trial* has had to say on political justice. Of course, he has said many other things equally as good—or bad—but for the moment the following will suffice: "Progress on its political side means more than anything else the substitution of Justice as a governing idea, instead of Privilege, and the best guarantee for Justice in public dealings is the participation in their own government of the people most likely to suffer from injustice" (Right Hon. John Morley, "On Compromise").

Children and the Law.

The authorities of the town of Bergen, in Norway, must be credited with making an experiment that should prove instructive and amusing in the matter of law-making. A by-law has been passed ordering that all children are to be in bed by a certain hour. A brilliant idea, indeed. But children happen to vary in age, in disposition, and in the capacity for enduring fatigue. The law does not explain how the juvenile population is to be induced to go quietly to sleep, whether it will or no; and it entirely ignores the awful consequences to the peace of the domestic circle where the howling of the rebellious spirits amongst them proved their young energies were not sufficiently exhausted. Another hour of study, amusement, or play, and the eyelids droop and sleep is irresistible. But the anxious mother must obey the law: her maternal care and discretion, her knowledge of the varying needs and capacities of her offspring, do not count beside the wisdom of the official ukase. Such is the case with all the enactments we are burdened with. Sometimes the utter absurdity of the situation opens the eyes of the people. We shall see if it will not be so in this case.

KROPOTKIN'S MOST FASCINATING WORK.

Having secured a large number of copies of

MEMOIRS of a REVOLUTIONIST

We are now offering them at the wonderfully low price of
2s., postage 4d.

500 pages, well bound in cloth, with Portrait.

Orders, with cash, to Manager, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W.

MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

[As I have now carefully revised the booklet "Modern Science and Anarchism," adding an entirely new chapter, and including an extension of the Glossary which I gave in the German edition, it has been thought better to have a new translation of the whole. This is now being done by a friend to whom I am already indebted for translations of many of my other works.—P. K.]

I.—THE ORIGIN OF ANARCHY.

Anarchy does not draw its origin from any scientific researches, or from any system of philosophy. Sociological sciences are still far from having acquired the same degree of accuracy as physics or chemistry. Even in the study of climate and weather (in Meteorology), we are not yet able to predict a month or even a week beforehand what weather we are going to have; consequently, it would be foolish to pretend that with the aid of such a young science as Sociology is, dealing moreover with infinitely more complicated things than wind and rain, we could scientifically predict events. We must not forget either that scientific men are but ordinary men, and that the majority of them belong to the leisured class, and consequently share the prejudices of this class; most of them are even in the pay of the State. It is, therefore, quite evident that Anarchy does not come from universities.

Like Socialism in general, and like all other social movements, Anarchism originated among the people, and it will preserve its vitality and creative force so long only as it remains a movement of the people.

From all times two currents of thought and action have been in conflict in the midst of human societies. On the one hand, the masses, the people, worked out, by their way of life, a number of necessary institutions in order to make social existence possible, to maintain peace, to settle quarrels, and to practise mutual aid in all circumstances that required combined effort. Tribal customs among savages, the village communities, later on industrial guilds in the cities of the Middle Ages, the first elements of international law that these cities elaborated to settle their mutual relations; these and many other institutions were developed and worked out, not by legislation, but by the creative spirit of the masses.

On the other hand, there have always flourished among men, magi, shamans,¹ wizards, rain-makers, oracles, and priests, who were the founders and the keepers of a rudimentary knowledge of Nature, and of the first elements of worship (worship of the sun, the moon, the forces of Nature, ancestor worship). Knowledge and superstition went then hand in hand—the first rudiments of science and the beginnings of all arts and crafts being thoroughly interwoven with magic, the formulæ and rites of which were carefully concealed from the uninitiated. By the side of these earliest representatives of religion and science, there were also the experts in ancient customs—those men, like the *brehons* of Ireland,² who kept in their memories the precedents of law. And there were also the chiefs of the military bands, who were supposed to possess the magic secrets of success in warfare.

These three groups of men formed among themselves secret societies for the keeping and transmission (after a long and painful initiation) of the secrets of their knowledge and crafts; and if at times they opposed each other, they generally agreed in the long run; they leagued together and upheld one another in different ways, in order to be able to command the masses, to reduce them to obedience, to govern them, and to make them work for them.

It is evident that Anarchy represents the first of these two currents, that is to say, the creative constructive force of the masses, who elaborated common-law institutions in order to defend themselves against a domineering minority. It is also by the creative and constructive force of the people, aided by the whole strength of modern science and technique, that to-day Anarchy strives to set up institutions that are indispensable to the free

¹ *Shaman* is the name given to sorcerers by the different populations of Northern Asia. They are supposed to deal with the dark forces of Nature. By their incantations and dances they are supposed to conjure illness and all sorts of misfortunes.

² *Brehons*.—Among all the free stems, Celtic, Saxon, Scandinavian, Slavonian, Finnish, and so on, which did not belong to the Roman Empire, and had no written law during the first centuries of the Christian era, the tradition of the law—that is, the decisions previously taken in different cases by the folk-motes—were kept in memory by special men who usually kept that knowledge either in their families or in special guilds. It was their duty to recite the traditional common law during the popular festivals which were kept in connection with the great folk-motes of large portions of the federated stems, and for that purpose the law was often put in the shape of verses, or *trials*, to facilitate memory. This habit is still widely in use in many parts of Western Asia. In Ireland, the keepers of the law were known as the *Brehons*, and they combined this function with sacerdotal functions. The collection of the Irish common law, compiled in the middle of the fifth century, and known as the *Senchus Mor* ("Great Antiquity"), is one of the most remarkable documents among the many similar collections of unwritten common law dating from that period. Modern historians continually represent *Brehons* and similar reciters of the law as *law-makers*; but this was not the case. The law-makers were the folk-motes—the *Brehons*, the *Knyazes* of the Slavonians, etc., being only the keepers of law in its old forms.

development of society, in opposition to those who put their hope in laws made by governing minorities.

We can therefore say that from all times there have been Anarchists and Statists.

Moreover, we always find that institutions, even the best of them, that were built up to maintain equality, peace, and mutual aid, become petrified as they grow old. They lose their original purpose, they fall under the domination of an ambitious minority, and gradually they become an obstacle to the ulterior development of society. Then individuals, more or less isolated, rebel against these institutions. But while some of these discontented, who rebel against an institution that has become irksome, strive to modify it for the common welfare, and above all to overthrow an authority, not only alien to the institution, but grown to be more powerful even than the institution itself—others endeavour to emancipate themselves from the mutual aid institutions altogether. They reject the tribal customs, the village community, the guilds, etc., only to set themselves outside and above the social institutions altogether, in order to dominate the other members of society and to enrich themselves at society's expense.

All really serious, political, religious, economic reformers have belonged to the first of the two categories; and among them there have always been individuals who, without waiting for all their fellow citizens, or even a minority of them, to be imbued with similar ideas, strove to incite more or less numerous groups against oppression, or advanced alone if they had no following. There were Revolutionists in all times known to history.

* *

However, these Revolutionists appeared under two different aspects. Some of them, while rebelling against the authority that oppressed society, in nowise tried to destroy this authority; they simply strove to secure it for themselves. Instead of a power that had grown oppressive, they sought to constitute a new power, of which they would be the holders; and they promised, often in good faith, that the new authority, handed over to them, would have the welfare of the people at heart and would be their true representative—a promise that later on was inevitably forgotten or betrayed. Thus were constituted Imperial authority in the Rome of the Caesars, ecclesiastical authority in the first centuries of our era, dictatorial power in the decaying cities of the Middle Ages, and so forth. The same line of thought brought about royal authority in Europe at the end of feudal times. Faith in an emperor "for the people," a Caesar, is not even dead in the present day.

But side by side with this authoritarian current, another current asserted itself every time the necessity was felt of revising the established institutions. From all times, from antique Greece till nowadays, there were individuals and currents of thought and action that sought, not to replace any particular authority by another, but to destroy the authority that had grafted itself on popular institutions, without creating a new one to take its place. They proclaimed the sovereignty of both the individual and the people, and they tried to free the popular institutions from authoritarian overgrowths; they worked to give back full liberty to the collective spirit of the masses, so that popular genius might freely reconstruct institutions of mutual aid and protection, in harmony with new needs and new conditions of existence. In the cities of ancient Greece, and especially in those of the Middle Ages—Florence, Pskov, etc.—we find many examples of this kind of conflict.

We may therefore say that Jacobins and Anarchists have existed at all times among reformers and Revolutionists.

* *

Formidable popular movements, stamped with the character of Anarchism, took place several times in the past. Villages and cities rose against the principle of government, against the supporters of the State, its tribunals, its laws, and they proclaimed the sovereignty of the rights of man. They denied all written law, and asserted that every man should govern himself according to his conscience. They thus tried to found a new society, based on the principles of equality, full liberty, and work. In the Christian movement in Judea, under Augustus, against the Roman law, the Roman State and the morality, or rather the immorality, of that epoch, there was unquestionably much Anarchism. Little by little this movement degenerated into a Church movement, fashioned after the Hebrew Church and Imperial Rome itself, which naturally killed all that Christianity possessed of Anarchism at its outset, gave the Christian teachings a Roman form, and soon made of it the mainstay of authority, State, slavery, and oppression. The first seeds of "Opportunism" introduced into Christianity are already strong in the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles—or, at least, in the versions of the same incorporated in the New Testament.

Likewise the Anabaptist movement of the sixteenth century, which in the main inaugurated and brought about the Reformation, also had an Anarchist basis. But, crushed by those Reformers who, under Luther's rule, leagued with princes against the rebellious peasants, the movement was suppressed by a great massacre of peasants and the poorer citizens of the towns. Then the right wing of the Reformers degenerated little by little, till it became

the compromise between its own conscience and the State which exists to-day under the name of Protestantism.

Thus, to summarise: Anarchism took its origin in the same creative, constructive activity of the masses which has worked out in times past all the social institutions of mankind—and in the revolts of both the individuals and the nations against the representatives of force, external to these social institutions, who had laid their hands upon these institutions and used them for their own advantage. Those of the rebels whose aim was to restore to the creative genius of the masses the necessary freedom for its creative activity, so that it might work out the required new institutions, were imbued with the Anarchist spirit.

In our times, Anarchy was brought forth by the same critical and revolutionary protest which gave rise to Socialism in general. However, one portion of the Socialists, after having reached the negation of Capitalism and of society based on the subjection of labour to capital, stopped in its development at this point. They did not declare themselves against what constitutes the real strength of Capitalism: the State and its principal supports—centralisation of authority, law, always made by a minority for its own profit, and a form of justice whose chief aim is to protect Authority and Capitalism. As to Anarchism, it did not stop in its criticism before these institutions. It lifted its sacrilegious arm, not only against Capitalism, but also against these pillars of Capitalism.

(To be continued.)

EVOLUTION OF ANARCHISM.

BY W. TCHERKESOFF.

II.—NEGATION OF STATE. ECONOMIC REASONS.

The fundamental difference between Anarchist Communism and other Socialistic conceptions is certainly the negation of State and authority. Concerning Capitalism and its nefarious influence on the life and prosperity of humanity, enough has been said by the various Socialist critics; but, the Anarchists excepted, very few have considered the ruinous results of the State on the life of the people.

Communism, especially the Revolutionary Communism of Babeuf and of the French revolutionists of the nineteenth century, was authoritarian; that is to say, it was to be realised by a centralised, all-powerful State. The central Government and its local authorities were to create, supervise, and regulate production and consumption, as well as national education and social life.

The idea of a reforming State, paternally organising national well-being, was a general prejudice of reformers of various social conceptions during 1840-1848.

Cabet and his school, the Fourierists with Victor Considérant as their representative, Vidal and Pequeur with their proposal of Collectivist State legislation, Louis Blanc with his system of *ateliers nationaux* (national workshops) created by the State—all these reformers were basing the realisation of social justice on the State, on its authority and finance.

These conceptions in full were adopted twenty years after by the German Socialists: Lasalle preaching the State production of Louis Blanc's system; Marx, Engels, and their followers, the Social Democrats, adopting in their "Communist Manifesto" a mixture of Considérant's "Manifesto to the Democracy" and Vidal's project of social legislation.

It is astonishing that none among those well-educated, sincere and talented authors paused to ask, "What is the State? What are its functions? Is it a productive body creating the wealth and financial power on which Louis Blanc, Lasalle, and others based their reform projects? Or is not its wealth a forced contribution from the same society, that is to say, the producers, whom those reformers intended to benefit?"

The State generally is a result of conquest and subjugation, and the modern State means an organisation based on brutal military force for the benefit of a considerable minority composed of landowners, capitalists, lawyers, and clergy, who under various forms take from the producers all the surplus value of their production.

The misery of the labouring class in town and country is the direct result of the State organisation and its functions. In order to guarantee the means of a comfortable life to the governing and unproductive class, the bureaucracy, military, and clergy, the State extorts many milliards from the producers. The white population of the civilised States of Europe, America, Australia and Africa, whether living under an Autocratic or Constitutional and Republican Government, and numbering 400,000,000, is obliged to pay yearly 43 milliard francs

(£1,740,000,000) for the needs of the State. This monstrous sum is spent almost exclusively for the satisfaction of 8 per cent. of the population. For general useful purposes, such as education, hygiene, postal service, etc., less than one-twelfth of the whole sum is expended. In some States, as Russia, for instance, even less than that small portion is devoted to public needs.

Even the most advanced democratic State cannot arrest the enforced waste of the people's production. On the contrary, State expenses are continually increasing. Since the beginning of last century the yearly budgets of England, France, Germany, Austria, Italy, and Russia together increased from £118,000,000 to £672,000,000 at the end of the century, nearly six times heavier than before. This tendency to increase the burden on the producers cannot diminish, because the needs of the State and its complicated functions are incessantly increasing.

How could the State, which, as we know, is still supplementing its yearly Budget by systematic loans, ever come to be considered a benefactor capable of reorganising production and consumption on the basis that the whole produce must belong to the producer?

Were this condition realised, and the whole produce remained in the hands of the individual producers, their associations, and the federations of the latter, this would simply mean the cutting off of the source of the material power of the State, of its economic means, its very life.

Can we imagine a Court, a Ministry, a bureaucracy without a civil list or salaries!

But, say the good people of State Socialism and Collectivism: The use and abuse by the contemporary State of the surplus of production will be stopped by a Socialist Collectivist State; it will have no King or President, no militarism. The officials of the Collectivist State will simply be engaged in calculating what quantity of commodities must be produced, how much time must be employed in their production and distribution, and how many hours each producer must give to this State production.

So speak the Collectivists. They do not stop to consider what it means to calculate the quantity of commodities to be produced and distributed for a nation: how many State officials must be employed in the bureaux of the various Ministries in order to prepare such a tremendous statistical work. If such a model democratic centralised State as France employs already over 800,000 persons in its administration, what will be the number of bureaucrats in that future Collectivist State engaged in all those useless unproductive calculations?

Contemporary bureaucracy ruins the nation; the future Collectivist bureaucracy will not only ruin but enslave the nation. We say this without exaggeration. As is known, Collectivism and State Socialism are preached by Marxian Social Democrats. They lay down that all the means of production—land, tools, buildings, etc.—will belong to the State. And a centralised calculating bureaucracy will assign to each man and woman the field, factory, and workshop where they must work for an appointed number of hours. At the same time they will have no Socialist equality of remuneration, but establish gradations, or so-called qualified wages. According to this system, a worker will never have the same opportunity as the statistical bureaucrats, who will assign to themselves and their families all they want, as their work will be remunerated by qualified wages. You, ordinary worker, will be the simple producer, calculated and thought for and put in your place by your bureaucrats!

The theorists of Collectivism in their project of the future organisation have forgotten the fundamental claim of Socialism, viz., that every able man and woman must contribute directly to the production of social wealth; that every member of human society, whilst having a right to the satisfaction of his material, intellectual and moral needs, at the same time must contribute to the realisation of those scientific, artistic or material pleasures which he enjoys in the society. Therefore in a future free Socialistic organisation there can be no place for any sort of bureaucracy.

Integral education, which Socialism has claimed from the beginning, giving to every person instruction in science, art and craft, will prepare him to accomplish manual as well as intellectual work. Being developed according to inclination, capacity and individuality, people will be able to conduct their social enterprises quite well themselves without need of a special bureaucratic body. For this reason, we Anarchists only partly changed the formula of Communists as expressed by Louis Blanc—"to each according to his needs, from each according to his capacity," and said, "To each according to his needs, from each

(Continued on page 76.)

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.

Shall Ferrer be Shot?

The world is, as yet, parcelled out into many nations ruled over by oppressive Governments. But even now a universal public conscience is coming into being, and it can be noticed that beside the Europe of the Army and the Priesthood, there already exists the Europe of Labour and Liberty; the latter is still lacking in clearness and precision; but it does exist; and in critical moments it makes its voice heard. This voice rings in all International Socialist Congresses, in all Trade Union Conferences, and the thought to which it gives utterance has made itself manifest in the last Paris "Conference of the Syndicates" (Trade Unions), where the proletariat of all countries has proclaimed in a straightforward manner that should Capitalism attempt to force people into war, the various States would have to face their own insurgent subjects.

We are even past the stage of declaration and threats. We have entered the era of actions. The glorious uprising of Catalonia marks an epoch. It has proved to the least credulous people that the world of Labour is powerful enough to check Capitalism and prevent it from silencing the outcry of the workers by the old tricks of the war mongers. Therefore the Spanish Government, which could be said to be the most cowardly and hypocritical in the world if Russia did not exist, endeavours to drown in blood all the elements of revolt still at work in the Peninsula.

At the same time it takes advantage of the present juncture to again arrest Francisco Ferrer—the victim which Europe wrested from it once—and to kill, with him, that admirable work of Educational Reform founded by him, which has spread like wildfire throughout Spain.

Ferrer is now at the Carcel Modelo (Model Prison) at Barcelona. Madame Soledad Villafranca, his devoted wife, and his brother José Ferrer, have been exiled to Alcaniz; as if the Spanish Government intended to show, with its customary impudence, that it is not prosecuting Ferrer as an insurgent (he had nothing to do with the late events), but as the founder of the "Modern Schools." Mariano, Batllori, Christoval Litran (aged 60 years), Anselmo Lorenzo (aged 70 years) with his wife and daughters, have been arrested, together with a host of teachers whose sole crime is to have aided Ferrer in his work of school regeneration. There is at Alcaniz an old fortress crammed with prisoners about to be transported nobody knows where, amongst whom are many members of the "International League for the Rational Education of Children," even girls of 14 years of age. At the same time that they are striving to suppress freedom of thought, they are doing their utmost to check the revolt, mainly by terror. A wealthy merchant, Dias, was arrested at two a.m., and imprisoned with his wife and two daughters, aged respectively nine and seven years.

At Barcelona 5,000 prisoners of both sexes, old and young, are herded together at the Montjuich fortress (of such infamous reputation), at the Atarasana barracks, and at the Carcel Modelo. There have been 1,700 arrests at Mataró, 1,000 at Manresa, 1,200 at Sabadell, 300 at Gerone, 400 at Anglés. They want to crush down all those who struggle or think, and to repeat at Barcelona the horrors of the Paris Commune. But the world has been making headway since 1871, and all the military oppressors together with the priestly serpentry will be baffled in their work of savagery. The martyrs who fall are the fruitful seed from which new heroes spring. The Barcelona insurrection is but the first lightning flash of the great thunderstorm which is brewing, and which will blast the Spanish monarchy as it wallows in the mire, foolishly believing itself all-powerful. It

will soon become but an accursed recollection. However, whilst awaiting the moment of its inevitable downfall, we must not suffer it to gratify its senile wrath with the blood of the heroes of the Catalonian insurrection, and of those whom it is ferociously persecuting, though they kept aloof from the struggle, as is the case with Ferrer. Recently the Governments of Europe remonstrated with Moulay Hafid, the Sultan of Morocco, in order to prevent him from torturing 'El Roghi and his few supporters, and the Spanish Government joined in that protest! It must be admitted that for the people who perpetrated the horrible, unprintable tortures of Montjuich (in 1896-7) to set up an example of humanity to the torturers of Fez shows an uncommon degree of audacity. In face of such impudence let the Europe of workers and thinkers signify to the Spanish monks, and their valet Alphonse XIII., their sovereign verdict. Let the conscience of the civilised world interpose between the oppressors and their victims; let that conscience make it impossible for them to perpetrate to the end the crimes for which they are preparing, and which would be a thousand times more odious than those alleged against the Sultan of Morocco.

The Madrid executioners have the cunning which belongs to degenerates; they wish to retain the public esteem whilst indulging in wholesale murder. But enlightened Europe is watching. It is her duty to rescue the guiltless and the martyrs. She can and must do it: it is to her that the Paris Committee, which has just been established for the defence of the victims of the Spanish repression, sends an urgent appeal. Let everybody send his adherence; let sub-committees be formed; let public subscriptions be made. Let an appeal be made, not only to the international proletariat, which is already on our side, but to all kind-hearted men, whatever class they may belong to, who hate cruelty and murder! Let the Press continue its agitation! Let meetings and lectures take place without a moment's delay, and in the face of the universal contempt the Spanish Government would be compelled to stop its oppression. It is not with appeals to its mercy, which the Barcelona Revolutionists are too proud to implore and which guiltless Ferrer would still less implore, that the assassins of Madrid will be disarmed. This can only be done through the universal contempt, which like a hot iron will brand their degraded faces.

For the Committee—

ALFRED NAQUET, C. A. LAISANT, CHARLES ALBERT.

The Secretary of the Committee is Charles Albert, General Secretary of the "League for the Rational Education of Children," of which Ferrer is the founder and president. The Committee numbers amongst its members:—Anatole France, Maurice Maeterlinck, Ernst Haeckel, Severine, P. Quillard, P. Fribourg, A. Cipriani, Sébastien Faure, and Guiseppe Sergi.

All correspondence must be addressed to M. Charles Albert, 15 Rue du Parc Montsouris, Paris; or to Mr. G. H. B. Ward, 390 Cricket Road, Sheffield.

(Continued from page 75.)

according to his capacity and goodwill." We are convinced that in a united and enlightened free association or commune, every member, sound of body and mind, will work not only as a duty but as a pleasure and enjoyment; that there will be no necessity for regulations or authority. Life will be regulated only by the laws of nature, science and technique, so that a rational solution of the social question may be found in free Communism—Anarchist Communism.

But such were not the conclusions of the first Anarchists, Proudhon and Bakunin. At their time, between 1840-48, Communism was preached under the form of State Communism, which subjugated the individual entirely to regulations and laws. To oppose these authoritarian teachings, Proudhon brought forward a system of voluntary mutualism, with private property of the produce by the individual. Bakunin, who spent 14 years in prison and deportation, remained his whole life faithful to this, Proudhon's, conception; and in 1867, at the Peace and Liberty Congress of Bern, he delivered his famous anti-Communist speech defending Collectivism.

Under Proudhon and Bakunin's influence, the most advanced Internationalists of the younger generation, as Varlin in France, de Paepe in Belgium, J. Guillaume and Schwitzguebel in Switzerland, Morago and Lorenzo in Spain, Cafiero and Malatesta in Italy, were all Anarchist Collectivists. Only towards 1880 in the Jurassian Federation, on the initiative of Reclus, Kropotkin and others was free Communism proclaimed as the basis of a future Anarchist society.

(To be continued.)

AN OPEN LETTER TO JAMES WILSON,

Editor of the "Industrial Worker," Spokane, Wash.

"Anarchy" is an impossibility, and while private opinion on politics or sociology is a matter of choice, the person who would use the I.W.W. as a field for the propagation of theories not laid down in the constitution of the I.W.W. must be considered a detriment and an enemy of the working class.

MY DEAR COMRADE,—I read the words above in the London *Industrialist* for August 1909. They are extracted from an editorial of the *Industrial Worker*. As they show me that there must be some kind of misunderstanding between us, I find myself compelled to offer a full explanation of my own case.

In May last, when the conclusion of my article on the Paris postal strike had been printed in the *Industrial Worker*, you wrote to me that you all had the keenest interest in the events here, and that "if you will write to me and keep us posted, it will be a favour and of the utmost possible good to the revolutionary Union." When you wrote to me these lines, you knew undoubtedly that for some years past I had contributed to *Freedom* in London and *Les Temps Nouveaux* in Paris, and that I was on friendly terms with *Mother Earth* in New York. You knew that I was an Anarchist, and that my articles on current events sent to you would always be imbued with Anarchistic thoughts and conclusions. Why, then, did you not write to me without making any restriction? How is it that high words and threats against us, not to speak of wrong comments on our theories, have been duly printed in your paper a few weeks afterwards? Is it because you have been advised that leaning towards us would prove to be a dangerous affair for you? Or is it because, having turned your thoughts upon future society, you realised that some kind of authority would, after all, be necessary to keep it safe from the "enemies of the working class," and that the ideal society would be that in which you, industrial leaders of to-day, would still remain the leaders, while the great mass of the Unionist workers would continue to be led?

Let us assure you that we Anarchists take as much interest as any one of you in the present condition of society. If you have ever read with attention our periodicals, you may have noticed that we deal with current events as thoroughly and soundly as any Unionist or Syndicalist sheet. We may claim to possess a sense of the actual life as concrete, broad, and perfect as any other writers in the Radical press. In the Meru strike here, for example, who has saved the striking workers from the clutches of the political vampires, if not our Anarchist comrade René de Marmande, who is considered an "intellectual" by some French Syndicalist leaders? Who, more recently, has denounced the real rôle and character of Samuel Gompers on his landing in France? Your fellow leaders here, the Revolutionary Syndicalists of the C.G.T., did not know a single real fact about his life; and in spite of having been duly warned in time, they received him with the most cordial greetings and helped him in the work he intended to do. What kind of people, by agitating, finally succeeded in opening their eyes, if not the Anarchists, and they alone?

In spite of the fact that in your editorial you accused us of brooding over "impossible fancies," you yourself seemed to recognise, in another issue, that the editor of *Les Temps Nouveaux* "is able to look at matters from the standpoint of the worker, and appreciates practical devotion to the cause of Industrial Unionism." Of course he is, and he does, together with many other Anarchists, so graciously labelled by you as "detriments" and "enemies of the working class" because the principles of your organisation are not followed blindly by them.

In fact, why should not we, as well you, spend a small fraction of our time in discussions (not in disputes, as you say) "about what form and structure human society will assume when the master class has been finally supplanted"? You reproach us with doing so, and in your own columns you never cease bothering your minds about that society of to-morrow. I read in the *Industrial Worker* of July 1, 1909: "The wage system will last till some other form of production is able to crowd it out and take its place." Certainly so! We Anarchists quite agree with the above. We quite agree that the child crawls till he is able to stand erect and walk. We quite agree that the chicken stays in the shell till well enough developed to break through it. We are only a little more prudent than you are. We do not affirm that the structure of the right society within the shell of the wrong one will be the Industrial Union organisation of to-day. There exists no scientific proof of this.

We suggest the formula in your Preamble should be modified to read thus: "By organising industrially, we help to educate the workers and give birth to conscious units of a new society within the shell of the old." Is it not better so? What we want the more at present is a number of conscious, clear-sighted, active, bold individuals.

We agree with you, that the I.W.W. is the bread-and-butter organisation of the working people. But, from the day when Capitalism and State tyranny will have been overthrown, from the happy day when we will have taken hold of the land and the machinery of production; from that grand day when the wage system will have been abolished once for all, the organisation of society will be indeed quite different from what it is now. The present organisation of production and consumption, which has been devised by our masters to keep their slaves in servitude, will not in the least fill the requirements of free-living and freedom-loving people. Your I.W.W. and our C.G.T. are already training some members of the future humanity. On entering these groups, they are no longer isolated. When gathered into large bodies for the actual struggle on the industrial field, they are enabled to exchange their own ideas, and by the practice of direct action they become aware of their strength and possibilities. Once begun, such interwoven relations of to-day will continue in the society of the future. They will grow and multiply in perfect accordance with the material, intellectual, and psychic requirements of the human race. But, always and everywhere, the producers will connect themselves freely, without any kind of written rule or regulation, law or statute, only because they agree to recognise such connections as advisable and helpful.

In the London *Industrialist* for July last, L. Boyne showed himself the adversary of local autonomy in production, because the failure of Trade Unionism has come from trade autonomy, "and we are not out to repeat these mistakes." We can only reply that L. Boyne makes a big mistake in comparing Anarchist Communism to Trade Unionism. Of course, we quite recognise that no locality can exist by itself, independent of other towns or cities. That is the reason why we Anarchists advocate Industrial Unionism as the best way for the present to connect the wage workers. But we do not want in the least to keep this highly centralised form of industry unaltered. Not only do we consider a new kind of trust system, with its overwhelming hierarchies and its occupations divided to the extreme, as quite unnecessary, even most mischievous to the common welfare, but above all we proclaim ourselves as quite sick of all authority, be it adorned with the Socialist, Syndicalist, or Industrialist labels. We don't want rules any longer. And we will refuse to recognise as valuable that Industrialist despotism of your dreams. In an essay on the productive groups of the future, recently published in *Les Temps Nouveaux*, Comrade Pierrot declared that the beautiful palaces schemed by Comrade Grandjouan in his Industrial Republic had seemed to him so delightful and lovely that, were they about to be built up, he would pack up his individual property and emigrate at once to other lands. He would not be the only one to do so.

We Anarchists have neither time nor energy to waste in trying once more some new specimen of State organisation. We claim to teach that the absolute freedom of the individuals will be the only way to secure their happiness. We affirm that the free agreement and free initiative of the producers is the only basis of a right and efficient commonwealth. We strongly feel that if you want to live a happy life and to have it lived by your companions, you will have to adopt our mode of life and advocate it in your turn.

You anxiously ask, "What, in the present state of men's minds, would prevent the forcible tyranny of the powerful and cunning?" It is a curious fact that you yourselves want to create a new tyranny, what Nettlau has called so rightly "a new civil militarism"; that you aspire to become the powerful in your turn. You desire "to keep free from the entanglements and vagaries of the political schemers." Then you cannot avoid accepting the aim of their most dreaded enemies. You cannot avoid showing yourselves rather Anarchistic in your thoughts and actions, whether willingly or reluctantly.

The final aim of the I.W.W. in the future society will be to disappear as an organisation and leave full room for the initiative of its free-minded members. For the present, its only ambition should be to present itself as the united forces of the conscious and freedom-loving slaves against the powerful and cunning masters of to-day. We Anarchists will do our best to prevent you from becoming a new species of rulers and monopolists, and carefully watch that you leave the door open to those who want true freedom, true harmony, true happiness for all humanity.

Fraternally yours,

ARISTIDE PRATELLE.

WHAT ANARCHISTS FIGHT FOR.

The men in authority—the judge, the magistrate, the member of Parliament, etc.—are unanimous. "The Anarchists," they say, "would dethrone the King, overthrow the power of the Houses of Lords and Commons and all their allies, corporations, mayors, councils, armies, and prisons. Thus, destroying the central Government, upon which the existence of society depends, they annihilate all forms of organisation and substitute Anarchy, which is universal murder, mutual destruction, chaos, and desolation. As a theory, it is madness; as practice, it is dynamite and death."

The Anarchist replies: "The destruction of government means the abolition of exploitation, not of society. Anarchy therefore means universal peace, mutual aid, co-operation, and prosperity. As a theory, it is sound; and as practice, it is revolution and liberty."

Here are two statements entirely contradictory to each other. Which is correct? To be honest, before condemning either side as wrong, it is necessary to understand fully how the opinions of that side were formed. It is necessary to follow along the path of thought which has been chosen, until the point is reached where it appears to turn off from the true direction. Our purpose, then, is to briefly trace the road by which we reached our opinions, so that the reader with an open mind may judge if we are right or where we are wrong.

First, we are sceptics; that is to say, we doubt those things which are generally accepted as facts, and continue to doubt them until we have collected evidence and are able to see by the light of our own reason if they be true or false.

Considering, then, from this standpoint our own circumstances, those of our friends, and the whole of society, we see that we toil long hours and have small share in the fruits of our labour. We have accomplished much in science, poetry, art, and philosophy, yet we live in fear of destitution and starvation. While possibilities grow greater, our labour grows heavier. Those who labour longest and hardest, live in the most abject poverty; while the idle wish and it is granted to them, wealth waits on them, the achievements of the human race are their property, the energy and vitality of the people are absorbed in granting their wishes.

We do not believe that this is the necessary form of society, we do not believe this is peace; for these reasons we will fight it; we are, in fact, revolutionists.

The opposite of this system of poverty and property, worker and owner, is suggested to us at once, and is summed up in the words "Liberty and Equality."

All who have claimed the word "Socialism" have appealed to the people with these words and have proclaimed the abolition of property. We Anarchists, being Socialists, are in agreement with all this; but instead of trusting the authority of the State to regulate society on these principles, we point out that authority of any kind is opposed to equality; that equality, in fact, means simply that which is left when privilege and authority have been abolished. Property, moreover, is simply a privilege enforced by the State—the privilege "to use and abuse one's own within the limits of the law." We find, further, that the State and its administrative organ, the Government, are founded upon robbery, depend upon robbery, and exist merely for purposes of robbery. Therefore do we deny that the State and the Government should organise society, whatever party of politicians may be in power. And moreover it is true that we wish to destroy the power of the King, the Lords, the Commons, corporations, in short, of all privileged men, all men in authority. We wish to destroy the State and the Government because they are opposed to our liberty. But it is not true that in doing this we annihilate society, or that we oppose organisation.

Now we come to the constructive side of our policy.

Taught by every-day experience and natural science, we believe that it is necessary to organise in order to live, and that therefore it is the struggle for existence on the part of individuals which causes them to co-operate, and the organisation so formed is society.

A free people will produce and distribute and organise all things which they believe to be necessary for the full realisation of their life, from bread-making to cricket matches, from freethought societies to churches. Individuals by free agreement will associate to form institutions; by free disagreement they will divide and form a variety of institutions, such as factories, universities, and football clubs.

These institutions will be forced to co-operate (just as the heart and lungs and brains, etc., co-operate to form our personalities), since one cannot exist without the others, and the organised whole thus formed is called society.

We now see, then, that the State and Government are not necessary for purposes of organisation. To overthrow this central power in society, and organise a free society springing from our co-operation as free individuals, is our object.

As to methods, it will be seen from the above that we do not look to Government for reform. We believe with Buckle, the historian, that "whenever politicians attempt great good they invariably inflict great harm," and that "it is absurd, it would be a mockery of sound reasoning, to ascribe to legislators any share in the progress, or to expect any benefits from future legislators, except that sort of benefit which consists in undoing the work of their predecessors. This is what the present generation claims at their hands; and it should be remembered that what one generation solicits as a boon, the next

generation demands as a right. And when the right is pertinaciously refused, one of two things has always happened: either the nation has retrograded, or else the people have risen."

We ask nothing of the legislators. We want freedom, and we shall go the straight way for it—Direct Action. Realising, to quote Buckle again, that "reforms which would have been refused to argument have been yielded from fear," we know that if there are palliatives worth having to be gained from the capitalist class, these will be conceded as our instinct of liberty develops and renders us dangerous. The influence of government will retrench only so far as we, a conscious people, demand our freedom. We therefore welcome all acts of direct rebellion against oppression, whether on the part of individuals or of industrial organisations. To no one method are we pledged, realising that there is no short cut to the establishment of liberty, that this struggle dates back to the early history of the human race; and the final triumph of the people against government can only come when we have thrown off our superstition and servility.

First, then, it is our wish to make Anarchists. We do not trust in organisations, but we will organise to develop and propagate our ideas. We do not place our faith in the General Strike, but we will use this weapon as an instrument to fight the master class. We will refuse to pay rent, we will resist the taxes, we will not sit on juries, we will adopt every method of Direct Action, until finally we make this system of force and starvation unworkable, and organise free society—Anarchy.

This article will shortly be republished as a 4-page leaflet. 4s. per 1,000 post free. Please send orders early.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

United States.

The papers bring news of quite a series of strikes, but the one which has certainly aroused the most universal interest is that which took place at the works of the Pressed Steel Car Company at McKees Rocks, near Pittsburg. The strike was accompanied with the most sanguinary encounters from its very beginning in July. The 8,000 strikers saw themselves confronted by the full force of capitalism, united with a corrupted Government: Constabulary, police, strike-breakers, attracted to their degrading work by a lavish spending of money by the employers, were used to a full extent by the capitalists. Even the American Federation of Labour turned a deaf ear to the appeal for help from the strikers, under the pretext that they were mostly poor foreigners—Poles, Hungarians and Greeks, and no members of the Federation. It is good to know that at least one American Labour organisation came to their help, the Industrial Workers of the World, who stand for Direct Action under all its forms, without making distinction of race and nationality, trying to unite the workers in America on a revolutionary basis. Thanks to this help, and the wonderful solidarity and determination of the strikers, a most striking victory has been won over the powerful Steel Car Company, and the conditions of work, which were very much like slavery, have been improved. Sunday work has been abolished except when it is absolutely necessary; better precautions will be taken against accidents, which constantly occurred; the most hated foremen have been sent away; the shops kept by the Steel Car Company, where the workers were obliged to buy, have been closed; increase in wages by about 15 per cent.; the rents of the company's lodging houses will be fixed more justly; none of the strikers will be locked out, all will be taken by the company.

Another result of the strike is that all the workers at the McKees Rocks have entered the ranks of the Industrial Workers of the World.

This strike has once again brought to the light the shameless exploitation of workers, especially if they happen to be foreign elements from the darkest corners of Europe, ignorant of Trade Unionism and political rights. The American Federation of Labour has shown now, as on so many occasions, its cowardly character as a friend of the bourgeoisie and privileged Labour, which carefully keeps its society free from the revolutionary infection of the General Strike and Direct Action.

It is not astonishing that Gompers, the President of the Federation, during a lecture given by him in Paris, called the Industrial Workers a handful of workers outside the Labour movement of America. Perhaps at the end of his journey through Europe Gompers has recognised that, at least in France, the workers follow the same methods as the Industrial Workers.

Gompers' journey in Europe was the occasion for the bourgeois press to praise this Labour leader as a model for the European workers; his mode of life, his clothes, his manners, his words and opinions all called for admiration from their side. If the workers had been quite so unanimous in their praise, perhaps it would have been better. But the workers were more concerned with the tactics of the Federation, which came in for some severe criticism. At the meeting in Berlin, where Gompers spoke about "the Labour movement on the two sides of the ocean," he was asked why the Federation had supported the American law on immigration, which subjects immigrants to such a hardship. Gompers first tried to deny the brutal treatment, but this, however, is generally known; eventually his excuse was: "We do not want the inferior elements of other nations, who come to work below our standard of wages." (This argument much reminds us of the

things we used to hear in England before the introduction of the Aliens' Bill.)

During the same meeting he was asked what his attitude was towards the bourgeois parties, as he had worked for a bourgeois candidate at the election, and why the American Unions do not vote for a Socialist candidate. On this question the lecturer refused to answer, because his audience could not judge American conditions; the American workers had been always satisfied with his explanation. One wonders why he came to lecture at all if he considered his audience incapable of understanding the subject.

Curiously enough, Gompers was warmly received by Legien, the secretary of the German General Trades Council, which makes the *Vorwärts*, the Social Democratic organ, attack the latter for his "more than strange attitude." This is another sign that the big German Trade Unions begin to snake off the Social Democratic tutelage. From the point of view of independence this is certainly good, but it is now the time and the duty of the revolutionary Unions to prevent the large Unions from falling into the hands of bourgeois politicians, as is actually the case with the Federation of Labour in America.

Sweden.

The General Strike in Sweden still continues, or rather drags on towards its end, under the title of "Great Strike," as the Trade Unions have decided to diminish the number of strikers by 100,000, and to restrict the movement to those 130,000 to 150,000 workers employed by members of the Employers' Union.

We have already given our opinion on the methods followed by the strike movement, which kills itself by the "model" order maintained. We are not the only ones who hold this opinion, as recently the Young Socialists of Sweden pronounced themselves openly on this point by urging the workers to fight more energetically. Hereby those comrades have, of course, brought down upon themselves the wrath of Social Democratic leaders of all countries, those eternal preachers of order and discipline, who are now busy in their press trying to crush those comrades by insinuating, as usual, that those "Anarchists" and "Revolutionary Syndicalists" work together with the bourgeoisie.

On September 7, the Swedish Social Democratic Deputy, Hjalmar Branting, at a big meeting convened in Berlin by the Trades Council of that city, declared that there was no occasion to speak of the failure of the general strike. "The great Swedish strike," he said, "has nothing to do either in aim or method with the general strike idea of Anarcho-Socialists and Anarchists."

If this shift pleases the Swedish comrades, so much the worse for them! But we venture to remark that, according to the words of Branting in the same speech, the strike was started "in order to guarantee one of the most important rights of the workers in a bourgeois society, the right of combination and organisation." For this reason, the Swedish comrades intended to oppose to the economic force of the Employers' Union a superior economic force, by paralysing production and distribution. So however much the words may be turned about, the Swedish strikers have applied what the Anarchists and Revolutionary Syndicalists call "direct action." They were not satisfied with the Parliamentary talking and protesting which Hjalmar Branting could have done for them; they wanted to show their own strength in real life, the only strength which counts for something. And we Revolutionary Syndicalists only reproached them for not having made their economic strength felt more by the capitalists and the Government, for not having made their movement more revolutionary and efficacious instead of remaining quiet with folded arms or going to angle in the waters of Stockholm during a general strike. That is a serious mistake in tactics which may result in the failure of the movement.—(*International Syndicalist Bulletin*.)

PROPAGANDA NOTES.

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

LIVERPOOL COMMUNIST SUNDAY SCHOOL.

The re-opening of the above school took place on September 12 at 1 Clarendon Terrace, Beaumont Street. Our first meeting was a grand success. We had over thirty children present, and the proceedings were business-like, lively and interesting. Everyone seemed pleased to get back again into school after the vacation of the past few weeks. Our old friend Mat Kavanagh, who was the lecturer for the afternoon, is a great favourite with the youngsters. To hold an audience of children, to choose the right subjects, and deal with them in simple language, is an art in itself. I believe Mat has succeeded in this, for he never fails to attract our young comrades' attention. His subject was "William Morris—His Early Days." In the short time the lecturer had at his disposal he gave ample food for the youngsters' brains to assimilate.

During the afternoon the Ferrer case was discussed. A few words by myself dealing with Spanish affairs, including Ferrer's imprisonment and the way that Governments generally deal with cases such as these, placing before the children the necessity of protesting by every means which lay in our power, and so pointing out to the Government of Spain, in particular, that there are some "people who on earth do dwell" who do not sing to gods or governments "with cheerful voice." I read a simple protest to them. Mat Kavanagh following, gave further

reasons why we particularly should protest, the Communist School being affiliated to the Ligne Internationale pour l'Education Rationnelle de l'Enfance, of which Ferrer is the founder. After Mat had spoken, two or three youngsters jumped up to support the protest. The response to the appeal was certainly enthusiastic, showing plainly that they grasped the situation of affairs in that particular country. Our protest was sent to the Spanish Embassy, London, also to the French Protest Committee. The meeting ended with the singing of "L'Internationale" by the children.

September 16th (Thursday) a protest meeting was held at Wellington Column. About 500 people were present, and the resolution was ably discussed by our Comrades Kavanagh, O'Shea and Roche. The meeting passed the resolution without a dissent, which speaks well for a clerical ridden city like ours.

The Liverpool Group of the International League have been busy with the Ferrer case. Every known paper has had leaflets sent to it. The Labour M.P.'s and the Socialist and Labour clubs have been communicated with one way or another. We must save these comrades in Spain who are being persecuted by a dirty clerical Government simply for holding opinions and giving vent to them. All comrades, if they have not yet done so, should send his or her protest to the Spanish Embassy, London, without delay. It is very probable before this appears in print Ferrer and his comrades will be dealt with. If these men are shot to muzzle their opinions in the press, on the platform, and from the teacher's desk, then it follows, as night follows day, that other comrades will give expression to their opinions in bloodier ways. We must one and all send our emphatic protest.

On September 19 Comrade Kavanagh again addressed the young comrades, his subject being "The Pelican and the Chinaman." The lecture was interesting and educative. Mat pointed out that the pelican, which has a rubber ring round its neck whilst fishing for his lazy master—the Chinaman in this case—is similar to the working man who slaves and toils for a parasite with the same ideas as the Chinaman who owned the pelican. On September 26 Comrade Tom Beavan will address the youngsters; October 3, Comrade Devos.

Comrades,—Owing to the responsibility of financial affairs falling upon one or two shoulders, we shall reluctantly have to give our school up unless the "necessary" is forthcoming. We have rent to pay, books to buy, and there is also propaganda to be done. The calls of financial aid upon our comrades are many, and to ask for further help is difficult. We have no organised group or committee to appeal to, but only a few sympathisers who have aided us. The school grows big and money is scarce. The issue remains with our comrades of Liverpool.

—Picnic Fund—Wal. J. 2s., Wm. O'H. 5s.; deficit, £1 2s.

— J. H. DEE.

LEEDS.

Comrade Kean completed his five months' tour of England and Scotland at Leeds. Eight meetings were held in the open air and one indoors. One item out of the ordinary was a two-night debate between Mr. Wishart, a well-known exponent of Secularism, and our comrade; subject, "Anarchism v. Socialism." In opening, Wishart practically admitted that he believed more in Anarchism than in Socialism, and frequently referred to politics as a dirty game. Kean said it would be well for those present to know that Wishart and himself joined issue on Secularism, and his effort would be to prove Socialism to be fixed thought, and Anarchism free thought; Socialism (political) an effort on the part of the weaklings and reactionaries to gain power, and Anarchism the open door to freedom. Wishart made a better stand than the clergyman who opposed Kean in the same town last year, and had he been affirming Anarchism instead of Socialism, he would have had a more solid basis. As it was, he was so logical that he defeated his own end, finally contending that Socialism was Individualism and not Collectivism, as represented by Kean. During the second night Wishart made much better progress. Unfortunately for him, political Socialism lays itself so much open to criticism that however well he stated the case, it melted like wax before the fire of Anarchism.

At the indoor meeting Kean spoke on Stirner's "Ego and its Own," and met with plenty of opposition from Communists and others.

He also addressed one meeting at Birmingham on "Knowledge and Belief."

With the exception of one breakdown—the last Sunday in Leeds—Kean had success all along the route, and thanks all comrades for their assistance and co-operation.

LIVERPOOL.

A conference was held in Liverpool on August 23, and was attended by comrades from Leeds, Manchester, and Liverpool; but the English comrades in the last-named city failed to put in an appearance, although a notification was sent. The chief points decided were the starting of a propaganda fund for publishing leaflets and paying the expenses of speakers, who will be exchanged from other towns. Comrades were particularly urged to push the sale of literature, as it was a good form of propaganda. It was decided to issue a leaflet for November 11 dealing with the Chicago Martyrs, and comrades who require copies should send orders and cash to E. Fox, 3 Victoria Place, Leeds.

TOOTING.

Friday, September 3, was a historical occasion in the life of the benighted neighbourhood of Tooting, when the first shot was fired for

the Social Revolution by the Tooting Libertarian Socialist Group. Comrade Barrett delivered an excellent address, which was well received, and held the audience for nearly an hour and a half, after which the Democrats put a lot of questions, most of which have been hurled at Anarchists from time immemorial. One of these so-called Revolutionary Democrats mustered sufficient courage to mount the platform in opposition and succeeded in making a tolerable mess of things, dishing up the same points as had been dealt with in questions. Comrade Barrett made a good impression on the audience, and several individuals expressed themselves in perfect agreement with the speaker. —H. J. ELLIS, Secretary, 133 Mellison Road, Tooting, S.W.

BATTERSEA FREEDOM SOCIETY.

We still continue to have good audiences here. On August 30 I addressed the meeting, and on September 13 Comrade Ponder gave a good address, rubbing it well into "the only Socialist Party." On September 20 we had a big crowd, about 600, to hear Comrade Barrett again. We had an opponent for the first time, Payne, S.D.P., who advocated the need of police under his Social Democracy, and said that brains must govern the rest of society. Barrett in replying soon pulverised him amid roars of laughter. Our comrade had quite an ovation when he left the platform, the audience asking when he was coming again. —W. UNDERWOOD.

CANNING TOWN.

Some good meetings have been held this month, and interest in Anarchism has greatly revived, thanks to the splendid addresses given by our speakers. We have had visits from Comrades Ponder, Barrett, and Pain, the audiences being much larger than usual. The State Socialists have been much upset by the exposure of the fallacy of expecting any benefit from Parliamentary action, but our speakers have been quite a match for them at question time. The crowds have been so interested that they have remained discussing the subject after the meetings have finished. Literature sales have been very good.

The Club Room at the "Rose of Denmark," Shirley Street, Canning Town, has been engaged for meetings on Sunday evenings during the winter. The first meeting will be held on November 7. —F. GOULDING.

DEPTFORD.

Things here are not so lively as they ought to be, largely owing to the absence of our comrade Sam Carter, who has gone to work in Italy for a time. However, a few of us by discussions endeavour to prove the value of Direct Action as a weapon against Capitalism, and point out that State Socialists are ever willing to jump into fat jobs at the expense of the workers. On Sunday, September 19, Comrade Pain dealt with Lord Rosebery and the absurdity of the Budget, showing that the people must have free access to the land and things thereon before they could obtain freedom. —E. GOULDING.

Notice.—Comrade Kean is leaving London on October 6 for Scotland, and is addressing meetings at various towns in England. There are some open dates *en route*, and any group or society who care for his services should write him. Subjects of lectures:—(1) Anarchism: its Philosophy and Ideal; (2) Ibsen's "Enemy of the People"; (3) Knowledge and Belief; (4) the Philosophy of Nietzsche; (5) Stirner's "Ego and its Own"; (6) The Tendency of Modern Thought. Comrade Kean also lectures on the Life and Teachings of Thoreau, Kropotkin, Proudhon, Tucker, Bakunin and Tolstoy.

All communications to FREEDOM Office.

ANARCHIST PROPAGANDA IN LONDON.

Meetings are held regularly at the following places:—

Sunday—Edmonton Green, 11 a.m.

Canning Town (corner of Beckton Road), 7 p.m.

Monday—Battersea (Prince's Head), 8 p.m.

Wednesday—Walthamstow (Hoe Street), 8.30 p.m.

Southwark (St. George's Circus), 8 p.m.

Friday—Tooting (outside Baths), 8 p.m. Edmonton Green, 8 p.m.

Sunday, October 17, at I.L.P. Rooms, 235 Uxbridge Road, Shepherd's Bush, W., 7.30 p.m., S. Carlyle Potter, "Necessity for Antimilitarism."

KROPOTKIN: THE MAN AND HIS MESSAGE.

By TOM SWAN.

A dainty and artistic little booklet, giving a short and sympathetic summary of Kropotkin's teachings.

Price 1d., post-free 1½d.

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

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.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

(September 1—October 2.)

FREEDOM Guarantee Fund.—Anon £1, R. Clarke 6d, Liverpool Conference (per E. Fox) 2s, H. Glasse 7s 6d, L. Withington 10s, Krakenhaus £1 1s, E. Rhodes 2s, H. Zisly 1s 7d.

FREEDOM Subscriptions.—D. B. 1s 6d, G. D. 1s 6d, C. M. W. 1s 6d, B. E. 3s, D. E. 1s 6d, S. H. M. 1s 6d, A. H. Holt 2s 6d, L. Withington 10s, G. E. 1s 6d, H. C. E. 1s 6d, H. Clauson 2s, S. Potter 1s 6d, R. B. 1s 6d.

FREEDOM Sales.—Burgess and Co 7s 6d, J. Drake 1s 6d, Quickfall 2s 8d, Hendersons 4s 8d, Essex 1s, T. S. 6d, T. Little 3s 9d, A. Goldberg 3s 6d, Newcastle Communist Club 9d, W. Hawkins 1s, W. Ashton 1s 6d, A. Bird 2s, F. Olson 1s 6d, C. Kean 1s 2d, I. Sugar 1s 6d, S. M. H. 1s 2d, Goodman 1s 1d, J. McAra 9s, B. Mandl 3s 9d, D. Lindsay 1s 6d, E. J. Smith 7s 6d, A. Platin 3s, B. Greenblatt 6s 9d.

Pamphlet and Book Sales.—Burgess and Co. £1 7s 3d, F. Large 3s 6d, R. Moore 1s, (Quickfall) 4s 7d, S. Sivin 9d, A. Baron 12s 3d, G. Barrett 2s 4d, A. J. 1s 2d, G. Pollard 2s 8d, T. S. 1s 6d, T. Little 8s 8d, F. H. 1s 3d, J. Dubois 6s, A. Goldberg 3s 9d, R. S. 1s, Newcastle Communist Club 5s 8d, W. Ashton 3s 6d, B. Black 2s 9d, F. Olson 5s, C. Kean 14s 3d, I. Sugar 1s 6d, A. R. 1s 3d, A. Platin 4s 8d, J. Hose 4s 4d, J. McAra 2s 6d, F. Grünblatt 1s, E. Duffy 5s 6d, D. Lindsay 2s 6d, G. Teltsch £3 1s, B. Greenblatt £2 8s 7½d, V. de Cleyre 8s 3d, B. Mandl 4s.

JUST REPRINTED.

ANARCHIST MORALITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 36 pages. 1d.

ANARCHY. By E. MALATESTA. 36 pages. 1d.

THE COMMUNE OF PARIS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

PROPAGANDA LEAFLETS.

Our Great Empire.

6d. per 100 post free; 4s. per 1,000.

PAMPHLET AND BOOK LIST.

ANARCHIST MORALITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

ANARCHY. By E. MALATESTA. 1d.

THE WAGE SYSTEM. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.

ANARCHIST COMMUNISM: ITS BASIS AND PRINCIPLES. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

A TALK ABOUT ANARCHIST COMMUNISM BETWEEN TWO WORKERS. By E. MALATESTA. 1d.

ANARCHISM: ITS PHILOSOPHY AND IDEAL. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.

THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.

EXPROPRIATION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

THE PLACE OF ANARCHISM IN SOCIALISTIC EVOLUTION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

THE COMMUNE OF PARIS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

DIRECT ACTION & LEGISLATION. By J. BLAIR SMITH. 1d.

THE PYRAMID OF TYRANNY. By F. DOMELA NIEUWENHUIS. 1d.

ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. 4d.

LAW AND AUTHORITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.

THE SOCIAL GENERAL STRIKE. By ARNOLD ROLLER. 2d.

THE BASIS OF TRADE UNIONISM. By EMILE POUGET. 1d.

WAR. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

SOCIALISM THE REMEDY. By HENRY GLASSE. 1d.

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. By ELISEE RECLUS. 1d.

THE KING AND THE ANARCHIST. 1d.

MONOPOLY; OR, HOW LABOUR IS ROBBED. WILLIAM M. RISS. 1d.

USEFUL WORK VERSUS USELESS TOIL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.

THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONGRESS, 1907. 1d.

SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN GERMANY. By GUSTAV LANDAUER. 4d.

ANARCHISTS AND ESPERANTO. 1d.

ANARCHY & SOCIALISM. By W. C. OWEN. 2d., post-free 2½d.

WHAT I BELIEVE. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 2d., post-free 2½d.

PATRIOTISM. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 2d., post-free 2½d.

THE TRAGEDY OF WOMAN'S EMANCIPATION. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 2d., post-free 2½d.

THE MASTERS OF LIFE. By MAXIM GORKY. 2d., post-free 2½d.

THE GOD PESTILENCE. By JOHN MUST. 1½d.

WAR PICTURES by EMILE HOLAREK. Coloured plates. 6d., postage 1d.

THE CONQUEST OF BREAD. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3s. 6d. post-free.

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

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

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

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

FIELDS, FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS. By PETER 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.

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

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

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

A VINDICATION OF NATURAL SOCIETY. By EDMUND BURKE.

1s. and 6d., postage 2d. and 1d.

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

and 1s., postage 3d.

LOVE'S COMING OF AGE. A Series of Papers on the Relations of the

Sexes. By EDWARD CARPENTER. 3s. 6d., postage 4d.

THE RIGHTS OF MAN. By THOMAS PAINE. 6d., postage 3d.

THE SLAVERY OF OUR TIMES. By LEO TOLSTOY. 6d.

All orders, with cash, should be sent to

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

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

KROPOTKIN'S SPEECH

(Memorial Hall, October 21st).

The execution of Ferrer has provoked in Europe and America a general feeling of indignation.

Even at St. Petersburg, under the bayonets of Nicholas II. a big indignation meeting was held at the University.

Were it not for the state of siege, scores of similar meetings would have been held all over Russia.

This striking, spontaneous outburst of anti-clerical feeling has filled with awe the ruling classes everywhere, and especially in this country. For the last few days the Conservative Press of London has ventilated its fears and it is trying to throw cold water on the movement of indignation.

The Conservative papers are afraid of that indignation movement, and they do not conceal their fears.

The *Morning Post* in its leader of October 18th, says:

"The significance of all this lies in the evidence which it supplies, that in several countries of Western Europe there is growing a class accustomed to feel itself hostile to Society and the State, ready to give vent to that hostility in words and thereby propagate it, regardless of consequences."

The *Daily Telegraph* is still more outspoken:

"There has been nothing in our time"—we read in its leader of October 21st—"more instructive of its sort than the way in which the revolutionary and ruffianly elements—it is you, friends, who are the ruffians—"have combined to exploit the Ferrer tragedy. There has been in all this a characteristic mixture of frantic excitability, histrionic calculation, and of that sheer subversive violence always ready to emerge" and so on.

"There is an evil spirit abroad"—the *Telegraph* continues—"a spirit of virulent vituperation and menacing incitement."

"The Tsar was attacked" laments the *Daily Telegraph*—"in every land, just as Italian Socialists are attacking him now, just as the "Reds" of every shade in every country are assailing King Alfonso and his Ministers. . . . Sentimental perversity can no further go, and it will destroy any society which indulges in it."

Well, friends, it is only this "sentimental perversity" which spared you the shame of seeing Nicholas II. and his hangmen parading in the streets of London.

They learn nothing, these gentlemen—always at one with reaction, with the hangmen all over the world.

We have seen it just lately. When, on the occasion of the visit of the Tsar, a handful of brave men in Parliament and in the Press protested against the admission of the hanging Tsar to these shores—what a chorus of blame came from the Conservative Press!

Let the hangman be a Sultan, or a Tsar, or a most Christian King, they are always ready to support him.

The arguments of the Conservative Press are twofold. One is, that the British Government has no right to interfere in the internal affairs of Spain.

No right—they say, except when it is to annex a Cyprus, to occupy an Egypt, or to conquer a Pretoria.

Friends! But is this the conception of the *British* nation?

No, I, an alien, loudly protest against this calumny.

I know that the rule of the Conservatives for the last twenty years has done everything to destroy the good-reputation of the *people of Britain*.

But the feeling remains, and last Sunday it has shewn what it thought of the bloodthirsty priesthood of Spain.

The British nation has over and over again interfered with the internal affairs of Belgium, Italy, Austria, France, in the Dreyfus affair, Turkey, nay Spain itself.

Not more than eight years ago, a British statesman in Trafalgar Square saw the Spanish Ambassador to ask him what truth there was in the statement of a Spaniard, released from Montjuich, who stated that he had been tortured in the Bastille of Alphonso XIII.

The Spanish Ambassador agreed first, and refused next day, to have that man examined by two English and two Spanish doctors.

—However, two English doctors examined him, and reported to a Trafalgar Square meeting the nature of the horrible wounds inflicted on that man by the Montjuich Inquisition.

The agitation in England, Germany, and France became thereupon so violent, that finally sixteen men condemned to hard labour on the strength of testimony obtained in Montjuich under torture, were released.

We greeted them here, two of them had been tortured.

The Conservative papers and Sir Edward Grey speak of no interference.

But were not the official festivities given to that perjurer Nicholas II. an interference in the internal struggle that goes on in Russia?

The result of this patting on the back of Nicholas II. you have seen to-day in the papers.

A province is torn from Finland, whose constitution and integrity Nicholas II. had sworn on his oath to maintain.

The second argument of the Conservative Press is this: "Ferrer was a bloodythirsty revolutionist and an Atheist who wanted to destroy everything in Spain."

If I had the time and the strength to tell you all that the Spanish Government have done in Barcelona for the last twelve years—Barcelona is the most intelligent centre of Spain for the development of its working class—if I could tell you all their infamies, you would rise in a fury, and say that it is a pity that the

Barcelona uprising has not already overthrown that shameless Government.

Barcelona has suffered terribly from that Government. It was there that in 1896, they tortured the Anarchists; there that for years in succession their police agents—their Azeffs—deposited bombs in the working men's quarters, killing women and children, and accusing the Anarchists of doing this. Those of you who have read the English papers at that time, know that this was proved at the trial of Rull.

And now, this Government, abhorred and despised, opened a war in Morocco for the enrichment of the capitalists, which would cost scores of millions of pounds and thousands of human lives. This was the beginning of the Barcelona insurrection.

Ferrer is accused by the Conservative Press of having taken a part in the uprising at Barcelona. But Ferrer has written that he took no part whatever in it, and we must believe him.

Well, friends, perhaps we ought to regret it. If he, and scores of men from the 'intellectuals' in Barcelona had taken part in the movement of protest against the war, there would have been perhaps less monasteries burned, but the result might have been that the Montjuich Bastille of the present clerical and military Government would have fallen, perhaps even without the loss of a hundred and thirty men and women of the people, killed by the troops of Alphonso.

Friends, don't be misled by these haters of all liberty and progress.

The truth is that the clericals had sworn Ferrer's death, and they have attained their aim with the abetting of all those who have done their best to discredit the Ferrer movement in favour of Ferrer.

The fact is, that Ferrer was the soul of a great educational movement in Spain. His tastes and education did not lead him into the active agitation, but to educational work.

After his last visit here he sent me two sets of all his publications; one for the British Museum, one for me. It is all educational work, of high value, not anti-religious, but severely scientific. Suffice it to say that Elisee Reclus—a man whose character and science Europe respects, wrote the prefaces to several of the educational books published by Ferrer.

To give you some idea of them, I take one of them. It is on the origin of Christianity. It is an analysis of the book of Malvert, *Science and Religion*, and the work of the great explorer of the history of Religions, Burnouf popularised.

The eastern 'Buddhistic' origin of Christianity, and its relation to the worship of the Sun and its son, Agni, the Fire, are told in this booklet in a quite popular language.

And this book ends—with what? With an apology of Anarchism? of Tolstoism? No! With an apology of Protestantism, which I for my account find even too enthusiastic.

“The eloquent appeals of the two new apostles, Luther and Calvin,” Ferrer wrote:

“Provoked a true explosion of conscience among the Arians. The Reform tried to reconstitute primitive christianity, freeing it from the extraneous elements which disfigured it. With Protestantism disappeared the sacerdotal hierarchy, and all fetishist worship.”

Speaking of the ethics of Protestantism, Ferrer wrote:

“It is a collection of maxims legated by the philosophers of antiquity, supported by a deep observation of man, his needs, his mission, his duties, and his social organisation, for which modern science—hampered as it is by the antagonism of interests, which presupposes the existence of privileged usurpers and of the disinherited ones, compelled to work, to exploitation, and to misery—~~was not yet able to substitute a superior ethics which would give satisfaction to both the egoistic and the altruistic feelings on the double basis of social hygiene and solidarity.~~”

A few warm words follow, to tell what Protestantism has done for the progressive evolution of mankind.

Then looking forward to centuries to come, Ferrer said:

“Protestantism also will go, like all other religions. When the great number will be better initiated to scientific knowledge, the necessity of aid from the superior powers will be less felt. The necessity of religions will disappear the day that men will be reasonable enough to regulate themselves and their conduct in a social concord.”

And he concluded the book with these words:

“This magnificent evolution of the human intelligence, full of mysticism at its beginnings, under the veil of religion, has progressed in advance of religion, and notwithstanding it. Science, tends now to acquire the supreme authority—Science and Truth, of which it is the expression and the revelation. To it will belong in the future the directing power in the world instead of divinity. Science is the benefactor of the nations and the liberator of mankind.”

These are the last words of that remarkable book, “The Origin of Christianity,” published in 1906 at Barcelona, and this is the book for the publication of which Ferrer has paid with his life under the bullets of four soldiers in the ditch of the prison of Montjuich.

Now, he is dead, but it is our duty to resume his work, to continue it, to spread it, to attack all the fetishes which keep mankind under the yoke of State, Capitalism, and Superstition.