

Freedom

JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM

VOL. XXIV.—No. 250.

FEBRUARY, 1910.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY

NOTES.

A Lesson from Australia.

Now that the election fever is over, and those who have worked for the Labour Party can begin to estimate what return is likely to come to the workers for all their efforts, it is an opportune moment to call attention to what is happening in Australia. In our International Notes we quote from the Melbourne *Socialist*, which is not opposed to political action, and from this can be seen once more the suicidal result of Labour's effort to win emancipation through Parliamentary methods. The betrayal by the Labour Party in Australia of the miners' strike is only what can happen wherever Labour sends its "representatives" to mingle with capitalist corruption; to learn the tricks of political deception, and to have their antisocial ambitions inflamed. Here in England we have seen how easily Labour can lose ground politically, and how much personality counts for in an election. But if capitalism is too strong for it outside Parliament, it is a thousand times more so in the shadow of its own stronghold. So, quite apart from the fact that a Labour Government would prove as great an obstacle to liberty and progress as any other, we see that the workers will gain no more, if as much, from such a Government than they would from a Democratic Radical combination. Even to influence this they must agitate outside.

The Genius of Paris.

What city in the modern world has endured the vicissitudes that have befallen Paris? Revolts, revolutions, sieges—she survives them all, and one might say that this divine city rises above them all, glorified by the ordeals. The "ordeal by water" which she is now passing through adds one more laurel to her crown. The city of the Commune knows how to organise for such a catastrophe; her splendid solidarity conquers everything. She gives the world her greatest arguments for all that is noble and ideal. Let us turn our backs for a moment on the shameful orgies of a Parliamentary election, and see what the great city has done in her dire calamity. First, let us quote the capitalist press. The *Daily News* states that with this suffering and destitution "no acts of robbery or violence of any kind are reported." And this has been the result of the vigilance of the people themselves, of the warning sent forth, not by M. Lépine, but, in the choice phrase of the *Daily News*, through "the warnings sent forth by the orderly mob." We have the same statement with regard to "cornering." The people themselves have checked it, because they would have lynched the authors of it. "Inhumanity, sin against citizenship, contempt for the 'rights of man'—these are the sins that can arouse your Parisians to deeds of vengeance." Just one point more. It is the capitalist, the proprietor, who rails against Communism; but when Nature by her catastrophes teaches us how "equal" we are in our distress, then humanity turns to Communism. And so it is now in Paris, where want and suffering are relieved without question or distinction. Now that profit-making is for the moment a secondary matter, the spirit of mutual aid is abroad, and voluntary organisation is greater than the State.

Criminality and Environment.

Anarchism has many enemies, but none perhaps more obstinate, more difficult to overcome than prejudice. So hopelessly stupid are some of the "arguments" used against us that it has been said that under Anarchism, without government and law, we should most of us become more or less criminal. We have answered that society makes its own criminals; that once you change your social conditions to what are just and reasonable, the "criminal" soon learns to become a good citizen without your police and your hangmen. For answer, prejudice has only laughed and gone on its way. An interesting volume

has just been written by Miss Marion Phillips, which is the history of a convict colony in New South Wales from 1810 to 1821 ("A Colonial Autocracy," P. S. King and Sons, 10s. 6d.). Now what are the conclusions she arrives at? Simply these, that from a colony of "criminals" of every description, male and female, has sprung a generation of men and women which shows no taint of its parentage so far as crime is concerned. And this has happened simply as the outcome of evolution in a healthy environment; no special efforts at "reformation" had been made. Well, after all, the Anarchists are very unpractical—for those who do not wish to see any change. But somehow experience seems to bear out their views—that mankind develops best without the fetters with which prejudice ever hampers it.

"Law" and "Experience."

In reference to a remark made in the leading article in last month's FREEDOM, "A Bristol Socialist" asks: "Why do you differentiate between 'law' and 'experience'?" A brief answer would be, *because* of our experience. But it will be better to reason it out a little. We will take a law as enacted by "representative government," since we assume "A Bristol Socialist" favours majority rule. In such a case an Act becomes law by virtue of the number of votes cast in its favour. But the fact that a minority, however small, has voted in an opposite direction proves that even among our law-makers experience has brought them to form different conclusions. Our opponents say the majority is right, because we *must* decide by numbers—which history proves to be an utterly false assumption. We assert that directly a law is passed it becomes an injustice, because it cannot adjust itself to the varied experience of everyday life. Perhaps the following will suffice to prove this. From 1868 to 1901 a hundred and twenty-two Acts of Parliament were passed ostensibly for the protection of the working classes. A great number of these are "Amendment Acts" to those that had been passed and *found wanting*. What does this prove? *That the law was in conflict with experience.* And on every hand the cry is still for "amendment" of the laws we already have. The fact is, all this stupid, unworkable machinery is mostly a godsend to the lawyers and nobody else. This is one among many of the instances where law is at variance with experience.

Profit and the Humanities.

Miss Kenealy's recent action against the *Daily Mail* threw a very amusing sidelight on the tricks of the individual known as Lord Northcliffe. This money-bag had the happy inspiration of giving a column of space in his paper to what he called "The Humanities," the remainder of the journal being devoted presumably to all that is inhuman, such as war-mongering and the like. So we have arrived at this stage of journalistic morality, that an editor can say to himself: "I must pay so-and-so to write up the 'humanities'; there's money in it." So he goes down to his office and switches on "humanities," like he would the electric light. And one can imagine him phoning for more "humanities" copy, and adding that he has room for so many inches. Only a system that is rotten at the core could tolerate such a Press as is rampant in England to-day. By the way, we noticed that Miss Kenealy called this Northcliffe the "Napoleon of Carmelite Street." Was this because Napoleon had been branded by Emerson as a "boundless liar"?

Seizure of "Mother Earth."

In a letter from New York dated January 26, our comrade H. Havel writes:—

"We have just found out that the January issue of *Mother Earth* has been held up in the New York Post Office on complaint of the Federal authorities. So far we have been unable to ascertain the reason for this outrage. The matter is at present in Inspector Comstock's hands."

MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM.

BY PETER KROPOTKIN.

V.

THE AWAKENING IN THE YEARS 1856—1862.

Auguste Comte had failed in his study of human institutions, and above all in his study of the origin of morality. But we must not forget that he wrote his "Positive Philosophy" and "Positive Politics" long before the years 1856-1862, which, as was already remarked, suddenly broadened the horizon of science and rapidly raised the level of the general conceptions of educated men.

The series of epoch-making, fundamental works which appeared in the course of those five or six years, dealing in quite a new way with all the principal branches of knowledge, accomplished so complete a revolution in all our ways of looking at Nature, at life in general, and at the life of human societies, that no similar revolution has ever taken place in the whole history of science in the last twenty centuries.

What the Encyclopaedists had dimly perceived or only foreboded, what a few only of the greatest minds of the first part of the nineteenth century had succeeded in disentangling with so much difficulty, became all of a sudden a matter of general knowledge—a certitude, rich in results. And this new knowledge was won, by the application of the inductive scientific method, with such a fullness and in so comprehensive a form that henceforth every other method of research appeared incomplete, false, and purposeless.

Let us ponder for a moment over these results, the better to be able to appreciate the next attempt at a synthetic philosophy which was made by Herbert Spencer.

In the course of those six years, Grove, Clausius, Helmholtz, Joule, and a whole phalanx of physicists and astronomers—including Kirchhoff, who, by his wonderful discovery of the spectral analysis, enabled us to find out the chemical composition of the stars—broke the spell that forbade till then to men of science the domain of wide generalisations. And in a few years they proved to evidence the *unity of the whole inorganic world*, including the most distant stars—that is, the most distant suns surrounded by their planets.

Henceforth it became impossible to speak any longer of those mysterious "fluids"—caloric, electric, magnetic—to which physicists had previously resorted for explaining the different physical forces. Now, it was proved to evidence that all the physical phenomena, including light, heat, electricity, and magnetism, are the results of those same mechanical vibrations of the molecules which produce the waves of the sea and the vibrations of a bell or a tuning-fork.

At the same time we learned the means of *measuring* these invisible vibratory movements of the molecules—to weigh, so to say, their energy—just as we measure the energy of movement of a stone that falls from a certain height, or of a railway train in motion.

It was demonstrated, moreover, always during those memorable years, that the celestial bodies furthest removed from us—even the myriads of suns which we see in the Milky Way—are composed of those same simple bodies, or elements, of which all other bodies on the Earth are composed, and that absolutely the same vibrations of molecules are going on there, with the same physical and chemical results, as on our planet. The movements themselves of the massive celestial bodies which travel through space according to the laws of universal gravitation, are in all probability but the resultant of all these vibrations that are transmitted in all directions for billions and trillions of miles, through the interstellar space of the Universe.

These same caloric and electric vibrations suffice to explain all chemical phenomena. Chemistry is but another chapter of molecular mechanics. And even plant and animal life in its countless manifestations is but an exchange of molecules (or rather atoms in the molecules) in that vast series of unstable, easily decomposed chemical bodies of which the living tissues of all animated beings are built up. Life is but a series of chemical decompositions and recompositions in very complex molecules: a series of fermentations due to chemical, inorganic ferments.

Moreover, during those same years it was discovered (to be proved more fully later on, in 1890-1900) that the life-processes in the living cells of the nervous system also consist of chemical permutations in the molecules of the cells, and that the transmission from one nerve-cell to another of molecular vibrations and of chemical permutations gives us a mechanical explanation of the nervous life in animals and of the transmission of irritations in plants.

The result of all these researches is immense. Owing to them, we can now, without leaving the domain of purely physiological facts, understand how images and impressions are produced in our brain, and engraved on it; how they act upon one another, and how they give rise to conceptions and ideas.

We can also understand the so-called "association of ideas"—that is, how new impressions revive the old ones.

An insight is thus gained into the very mechanism of thought.

We are certainly very far yet from knowing all that is to be known in this direction. Science only just now frees itself from the metaphysics which strangled it, and only scouts the borderland of this great domain. But a beginning has been made. A solid foundation has already been laid for further research. The ancient division into two separate domains, which the German philosopher Kant endeavoured to establish—the domain of phenomena which we examine "in time and space" (the domain of physics), and the other, which we are able to examine only "in time" (the mental phenomena)—this division has now to disappear. And to the question that was put one day by the materialist Russian physiologist, Professor Syetchenoff: "To which department does psychology belong, and who has to study it?" the answer has already been given: "It belongs to physiology, and it is the physiologist who has to study it, by the physiological method." In fact, the recent researches of physiologists have already thrown infinitely more light on the mechanism of thought, on the origin of impressions, on their fixation in the memory and their transmission, than all the subtle discussions with which metaphysicians have entertained us for centuries.

Metaphysics is thus beaten now, in the stronghold itself which formerly belonged to it without contest. The domain of psychology, in which it formerly considered itself invincible, has also been invaded by natural sciences and by materialist philosophy, which has caused our knowledge in this branch to increase with a rapidity entirely unknown in former times.

However, among the works that appeared during these five or six years, there was none which exercised so deep an influence as the "Origin of Species," by Charles Darwin.

Already Buffon in the eighteenth century, and Lamarck in the very first years of the nineteenth, had ventured to maintain that the different species of plants and animals peopling the Earth do not represent immutable forms. They are variable, and vary continually under the influence of their surroundings. The family likeness which we recognise in different species belonging to a particular group is a proof, they said, that these species descended from a common ancestor. Thus, the different kinds of buttercup which we find in our prairies and in our marshes must be the descendants of one and the same ancestral kind—descendants that have grown dissimilar in consequence of a series of changes and adaptations they have been subjected to in the varied circumstances of their existence. Likewise, the present species of wolf, dog, jackal, fox, did not formerly exist; but in their stead there was once a species of animals which in the course of ages gave birth to several branches representing now the wolves, the dogs, the jackals, and the foxes.

But in the eighteenth century it was dangerous to profess such "heresies." For far less than that the Church had already threatened to prosecute Buffon, and he had been compelled to recant his statements about the geological evolution of the Earth. The Church at that time was still very powerful, and the naturalist who dared to uphold heresies offensive to her was threatened with prison, torture, or the madhouse. That is why the "heretics" spoke with so much prudence all through the first half of the nineteenth century. But now, in the second half of the century, after the revolutions of 1848, Darwin and Wallace could bravely affirm the same heretic teaching, and Darwin had also the courage to add that man, too, was the product of a slow physiological evolution; that he drew his origin from a species of animals like the present monkeys; that the "immortal mind" and the "moral sense" of man had developed in the same way as the intelligence and the social instincts of a chimpanzee or an ant.

We know what thunderbolts were hurled by the Elders of the Churches at Darwin, and especially at his courageous, learned and intelligent apostle, Huxley, who made most of those Darwinian conclusions which chiefly alarmed the priests of all religions.

The struggle was hot, but the Darwinians emerged victorious, and since then a new science—biology, the science of life in all its manifestations—has grown up under our very eyes. The origin of all species by descent is now an established fact. Some of the clergy themselves accept it, and try to reconcile Evolution with Revelation.

Darwin's work gave at the same time a new key and a new method of investigation for the better understanding of many other phenomena. It applies to the life of physical matter, the life of organisms, and the life and evolution of societies. The idea of a continuous development—of a progressive Evolution and a gradual adaptation of beings and societies to new conditions, in proportion as these conditions become modified—this idea found a far wider field to work in than that of merely explaining the origin of new species. When it was applied to the study of Nature in general, as well as to the study of man and his social institutions, it opened up quite new horizons and made it possible to explain some of the most difficult problems in the

domain of all branches of knowledge. Taking this principle, so rich in consequences, as a basis, it was possible to reconstruct, not only the history of organisms, but also the history of human institutions.

Biology, in the hands of Herbert Spencer, showed us how all the species of plants and animals inhabiting our globe were able to develop, starting from a few very simple organisms that existed on the earth at the beginning; and Haeckel was able to draw a sketch of a likely genealogical tree of the different classes of animals, man included. This was already a great result; but it also became possible to lay a solid scientific foundation to the history of human customs, beliefs, and institutions—a knowledge the want of which was so much felt by the philosophers of the eighteenth century and Auguste Comte. Now, the history of human societies, institutions and religions can be written from the point of view of adaptive Evolution, without having recourse to the metaphysical formulas of Hegel, and without resorting to "innate ideas," to revelation from above, or to Kant's "substances." We can reconstrue it without appealing to those formulas which were death to the spirit of research, and behind which the same ignorance was always hidden—the same old superstition, the same blind faith.

Aided by the works of naturalists on the one hand, and, on the other, by the works of Henry Maine and his followers, who applied the same inductive method to the study of primitive institutions and to the law codes that originated from them, it was possible during the last thirty years to put the history of human institutions on as firm a basis as the history of the development of any species of plants or animals.

Of course, it would be very unjust to forget the work that was already accomplished as early as the "thirties" of the nineteenth century by the school of Augustin Thierry in France, and that of Maurer and the "Germanists" in Germany, of which Kostomarov, Byelayeff and so many others were the followers in Russia. The method of evolution had certainly been applied since the Encyclopaedists to the study of customs and institutions, as well as languages. But to obtain correct and really scientific results became possible only since men of science learned to treat the facts of history in the same way as naturalists examine the gradual development of the organs of a plant or that of a new species.

In their own day, the metaphysical formulas no doubt had helped the thinkers to make some approximate generalisations. They helped especially to rouse numbed minds, and they stimulated thought by their sometimes poetical indications of the unity of Nature and its never-ceasing life. At a time when reaction was supreme, as it was in the first decades of the nineteenth century, when the inductive generalisations of the Encyclopaedists and their English and Scotch predecessors were nearly forgotten, and when it would have needed moral courage to speak of the unity of physical and "spiritual" nature in the face of triumphant mysticism—in those dark days the poetical conceptions of some French thinkers and the nebulous metaphysics of the Germans upheld at least the taste for generalisations.

But the generalisations of that time, being established either by the dialectic method or by means of a half-conscious induction, were on account of that despairingly vague. The first—the dialectic ones—were mostly based on naïve assertions, similar to those made by Greeks in ancient days, when they affirmed that planets *must* travel through space along circles, because the circle is the most perfect curve. If the naïve character of such assertions and the total absence of proofs did not strike everyone, it was only because it was concealed by the vagueness of the arguments and nebulous reasonings, as well as by an obscure and grotesquely heavy style. As to the second, *i.e.*, those generalisations which had at their origin a semi-conscious induction, they were always built upon a series of extremely limited observations—like the hasty generalisations of Weissmann, built upon a very narrow basis of facts, which have caused some stir of late among our biologist contemporaries. The value of the hypothetical generalisations based upon such half-conscious induction was easily exaggerated, and they were represented as indisputable laws, while they were mere guesses, mere suppositions, or embryos of generalisations which needed to be subjected to the most elementary test by facts.

And finally, all these loose generalisations were expressed in a way so abstract and cloudy—as, for instance, the famous "thesis, antithesis, and synthesis" of Hegel—that they left the fullest liberty to draw from them the most arbitrary practical conclusions. In fact, one could deduce from them (this was really done) the revolutionary spirit of Bakunin and the Dresden Revolution, the revolutionary Jacobinism of Marx, and the "Recognition of what exists," which led so many "right-wing" Hegelians to make "Peace with reality"—that is to say, to indulge in the glorification of autocracy. I hardly need mention here the economic errors into which the Marxists have lately fallen, owing to their predilection for the dialectic method and economic metaphysics, as against the study of the actual facts of economic life.

(To be continued.)

FOR THE YOUNG FOLK.

We have made a start—that is good! And letters have come of encouragement and good wishes—that is good also! But these letters have come only from the "grown-ups"; not a solitary one from my young comrades—that is bad! Is it because the elder ones have not told you of the letter, or is the idea of no use? Don't be afraid to speak out. Space in FREEDOM is scarce; there is no room for idle talk. FREEDOM has seen no reason to open up a column for young folk. Their sole object has been to deal with workers, and not the workers-to-be. Probably this is the reason you have not received a copy. It cannot be that you are not wise enough to understand. The letters I have seen from young folk to various papers compare favourably to the article they are inserted in. In fact, in many cases the article is babyish to the various letters.

It makes me wax sarcastic when I hear such stuff as a certain individual (who happened, I am sorry to say, to be an Anarchist) said to me: "Where's the use of talking to children? They are a nuisance, and it is a waste of time!" I hope this is not the case with all my elder comrades. If the spirit of Freedom is to grow, we must not ignore the little ones.

My young friends must not be disheartened by these silly statements of "grown-ups" (in age only). Remember, whiskers and wisdom *don't* always go together. You will write to me and tell me your ideas, the thoughts that pass through your minds on things of social life. Then I shall know how to deal with the column I have captured for the young folk. You will probably wonder why some people live in mansions and others in hovels. You will wonder why this little girl and that little boy have no boots or shoes, and sometimes nothing to eat. Why some people have the power of making people happy or miserable at pleasure. These questions will surely rise in your mind if you keep your eyes wide open and observe all that goes on in your own sphere.

Some people will say to you, if you ask questions: "Child, you must not be so inquisitive; it is very wrong!" Ah! my young friends, that is the seat of the trouble. "Grown-ups" have been so schooled in that command that they have allowed other people who are in power—prince, priest, and politician—to do the thinking for them, hence the wretched state of the worker. Mark you, comrades, that trinity I have just named does not like young folk to be inquisitive. They will impress that particular "virtue" upon your elders, that they in their turn may impress you in a like manner.

Yes, that is the seat of the trouble. Did you ever go to a Church Sunday School? Did you hear how the teacher answers those questions which are so simple and yet so difficult for them to evade? Imagine a pupil asking this: "If God loves us all and tells us to love our enemies, why does he send some of us to hell?" Nine times out of ten the teacher will caution the pupil where inquisitive people go to. Then if the boy or girl is not subdued, they will probably ask: "Will God be vexed with me for being inquisitive? If so, why did he make me inquisitive?"

As soon as you start to be inquisitive, this trinity—prince, priest, and politician—will do their utmost to stop your mouth, for the simple reason that they will lose your pennies that help to fatten them. Let us, for one moment, see what this Church has done to those who have been inquisitive and spoken freely to their comrades. There was Hypatia, a girl teacher, who lived in Alexandria in the year 415. This poor girl was dragged through the streets of the town and cruelly murdered by Christians in a church dedicated to Christ. Her "crime" was being inquisitive about things of life and telling people what she thought. We have also a man like Giordano Bruno, an Italian, who was a bold and fearless thinker, one who also was inquisitive, and as a result was hounded down and compelled to pass seven long years in prison, and afterwards burnt at the stake opposite the Vatican in Rome. Now there is a monument in his honour at the place where he was executed.

Then we have one who has just been murdered by the Spanish Government—Francisco Ferrer. This man's sole object was to satisfy those inquisitive minds of the young folk of Spain. That "Great Lying Church," as Carlyle named it, soon stopped his mouth with a bullet. That "Great Lying Church" will quake if you but just let your voices be heard. I could fill pages of instances where brutal methods have been adopted to stay that inquisitive mind which every child more or less possesses.

Now, comrades, what are you going to do? If you think me wrong in any statement I have made, or idea I have expressed, tell me of it. Letters will always be welcomed by your comrade,

DICK JAMES.

15 Boswell Street, Liverpool.

The Great French Revolution, 1789—1793.

By P. A. KROPOTKIN.

610 pages 8vo, cloth, 6s. net, postage 5d.

"FREEDOM" OFFICE, 127 OSSULSTON STREET, LONDON, N.W.

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

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

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

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

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

THE MANAGER, 127 Ossulston Street, N.W.

The Editors are not necessarily in agreement with signed articles.

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

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

The Cost of a General Election.

It is said that the known cost of the present election is something like £2,000,000. What has been spent in barefaced bribery and corruption must be left to the imagination. Besides this, we have to reckon an infinitely greater cost in the moral degradation of a people by the lies, the trickery, the hypocrisy and humbug of the whole nauseating business of vote-catching. Then again there is the immense waste of a quantity of misdirected energy, which if intelligently applied in the direct aim of conquering some social, political, or even economic liberties for the people, might have won something worth striving for.

Instead of this, we have the spectacle of a Labour Party that was to be the hope of the workers losing a fifth of their strength in their first encounter with the middle classes. For that is one of the features of the struggle. The middle classes are aroused, and have thrown in their lot with the landed aristocracy, not only to check the onward march of democracy, but to win back such "reforms"—trifling as they may be—as have been already gained.

As we have pointed out all along, the Labour Party has chosen the wrong ground on which to decide the battle that has to be fought. It may do very well for the leaders, who have a keen eye for official appointments, to play the political game as other parties play it; but for the workers battling with a cruel and heartless wage system it spells nothing less than disaster.

So while the Labour Party tends more and more to merge itself into a party of democratic Radicalism, we see all hopes of Socialism as a Parliamentary power absolutely destroyed. What in this case do the "revolutionary" Socialists—if any still exist—intend to do? If Parliament is closed to them, do they imagine there is no other work to do? Apathy and indifference would be the worst of crimes in such circumstances, especially when it is clear that the work which will really help the future remains entirely distinct from and outside of Parliament.

Let us inquire for a moment what really faces us all, Anarchists and Socialists alike, as the most serious problem of the immediate future. Evidently reaction is fighting desperately for the upper hand. While it can control votes—and it can do this, as we plainly see, in spite of all the Corrupt Practices Acts—it will work its will against the people. Do we all realise what this means? For one thing, a fierce and uncompromising attack on the organised Labour of this country. They have already given us a foretaste of this. For another thing, we should soon be plunged in a European conflagration of which war between England and Germany would only form one chapter in the volume of crime. It is true no one can say what might happen as a consequence of all this. But if we wish to avoid it, what is to be done? Leave it to the Labour Party in the House?

It were better to use our common sense while there is time. We will look for a moment at France. There an antimilitarist propaganda, coupled with *Direct Action*, has had some effect—enough at any rate to cause alarm in governmental circles. It is clear that if anything could stay the hand of the Jingoists, it would be the fear of the General Strike and the antimilitarist spirit. And if these forces were only as well developed in Germany and England as in France, we might have some hope of checkmating the Imperialists, who are at this moment a European danger.

English Trade Unionism may have cast its votes for the Labour candidates, but they will not win what Labour needs. In fact, if the Unions were rid of their politicians and their

misleaders, they would be the better able to free themselves from that confused action which leads them to vote a "representative" into Parliament the while they are organising a strike against the masters to resist an encroachment or to win a concession! The task of educating the workers in the advantages as well as the need for Direct Action will never be done by those who are absorbed in the Parliamentary struggle. It should be done, and could be done, by those who strive for true Socialism, as well as by those who share the Anarchist ideal. And it is such work that will sweep away not only the Lords and their veto, but also the capitalist and his exploitation, the financier and his wars. With such work we are brought nearer to the revolution; without it we have nothing to face but reaction.

EVOLUTION OF ANARCHISM.

BY W. TCHERKESOFF.

V.—TACTICS.

The two elements of our social conception—viz., Communism as the economic foundation, and the abolition of the State as the political basis—impose upon us Anarchists a two-sided struggle: on the one side, the economic fight against capitalism and exploitation; and on the other, the struggle against the State and political oppression.

Both forms of struggle were not discovered by Anarchists. Since the Plebeians marched out of Rome to force concessions from the Patricians till the strikes of the English workers especially practised during the first half of the nineteenth century, it has been known what a powerful weapon a strike, and especially a general strike, may be. In recent years, the triumphant general strike of 1905 in Russia, which wrung a Constitution from an obstinate despot, again confirmed this conviction.

Though not originated by Anarchists, in the people's mind the idea of the General Strike is associated with Anarchism and considered a specially Anarchist weapon, as during the last forty years, under the influence of German Social Democratic Parliamentarianism, the leaders of the working-class movement, guided by what interests it is difficult to say, were opposed to the idea of a general strike, and it became the task of Anarchists to propagate amongst the workers this effective method of fighting.

The same may be said of the struggle against the State. Every party and individual at every period in history has made use of arms, conspiracy and rebellion. Abundant proof may be found, from the time of Brutus's dagger to Orsini's bomb, Mazzini's conspiracies and Garibaldi's uprising. And yet nowadays Anarchists alone are credited with the use of bombs and armed violence.

Again, this may be explained by the fact that during the last twenty years nearly all revolutionary acts in France, Italy and Spain were accomplished by Anarchists.

Nevertheless, by a strange misunderstanding, our opponents as well as many comrades emphatically declare that Anarchists are a party of non-political action. This error arose from the fact that for forty years, especially under the teaching of Social Democracy, the conception of political action was narrowed down to Parliamentary action, as if Mazzini, John Brown, or Garibaldi, who never sat in Parliament, were not among the great champions of political liberty.

Our negation of Parliamentary tactics appears to many incomprehensible. But it must not be forgotten that our principles and our conceptions of a future society logically lead us to this abstention. A Parliament is a political institution which legalises the State extortion of money from the producers in order to uphold militarism, class organisation, and the existing political and social iniquities. Never has a Parliament of its own initiative abolished any social injustice, but only under pressure of popular agitation.

Many sincere and honest people believe that when one day the representatives of the working class shall have a majority in Parliament, they can dictate a great social expropriation, thus peacefully bringing about the solution of the social problem. To believe in a peaceful social expropriation by an Act of Parliament was easy for those people who were convinced that under the imaginary law of concentration of capital the number of capitalists was progressively diminishing, and by the time that the people would have a majority in Parliament the number of possessors would be very few, who could be easily forced to submit to a Parliamentary decision. But we know at present that the number of possessors, instead of diminishing,

has tripled during the last generation; and instead of becoming submissive, they are uniting in trusts and corporations, and are defying Parliament and people.

After all, it is only the people themselves, by revolutionary direct action that can compel the capitalists to restore to the producers that which is their own. For that reason, we Anarchists do not intend to waste energy in futile Parliamentary agitation, which happens, after all, only once in four or five years. We prefer to propagate by word and deed the idea of a constant, daily struggle by direct action in the economic, and by rebellion and uprising in the political struggle.

* * * * *

Such are, in brief, the ideals, principles, and tactics of contemporary Anarchist Communism. If we compare them with the conception of the first Anarchist thinkers, such as Godwin and Josiah Warren, we clearly observe that they, like many Continental thinkers, specially occupied themselves with the rights and liberty of the individual and of the minority. They fully recognised the uselessness of a Government interfering in the life and decision of the individual or of the community, and first showed the futility of any Government, which at that time, even in Constitutional countries, often acted arbitrarily and despotically.

But those first Anarchists rather neglected the economic side of the social question in defending the rights of the individual, whose full freedom they could not conceive without private property.

Even Proudhon, who lived a generation later, and who expressed his Anarchism in the following words: "To dissolve, to merge the political or governmental system into the economic system by reducing, simplifying, decentralising, and suppressing one after another the parts of that huge machine called Government or State"—even he advocated the individual ownership of the produce of labour.

This fear of Communism, especially in Proudhon's case, must be explained by the authoritarian form in which it was preached at that time, as we mentioned before.

Besides, none of those precursors of Anarchism, not even Proudhon, was revolutionary. Revolutionists in the first half of the nineteenth century were Republicans and Nationalists who were fighting for the liberation of their oppressed nation, and authoritarian Communists such as Blanqui and his friends. But among the Socialist workers many were revolutionary at that time. One of these, Dejacques, who fought on the June barricades of 1848, formulated his Anarchist ideas in his paper, *Libertaire*, saying: "Authority and property are the evils! Genius of Anarchy, spirit of future ages, deliver us from those evils!"

Those revolutionary Communist workers were severely persecuted, many perishing on the barricades or in deportation and exile. During the whole of the following generation Socialist literature was systematically destroyed by the authorities, especially in France, Italy, and Germany. But in the "sixties" of last century Socialist ideas of all shades, including Anarchism, revived; and again the question of Communism was brought forward and discussed by the workers of the International.

After the defeat of the Commune of Paris in 1871, revolutionary Socialism in Europe was represented only by Anarchist Communists. Only they continued the fight, by word and deed, against authority and oppression; and we can say that practically the strength of State and Capitalism was concentrated against them.

But amidst this persecution the Anarchist Communist ideas spread and developed, and the young generation of Anarchists, starting the propaganda of antipatriotism and antimilitarism, and revolutionary direct action in the economic struggle, succeeded in awakening, especially in France, Italy, and Spain, that revolutionary spirit which alone can lead to a Social Revolution and to the realisation of equality and justice which has always been the dream of suffering humanity.

W. TCHERKESOFF.

[These articles will shortly be republished as a pamphlet.]

GOD AND THE STATE.

By MICHAEL BAKUNIN.

A new edition, revised from the original Manuscript.

With a new Portrait.

Paper cover, 6d. net; cloth, 1s. net. Postage 1d.

FREEDOM Office, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

Australia.

Anarchist propaganda is making solid progress in Melbourne. We commemorated the anniversary of the Chicago Anarchist Martyrs on November 11 in the Trades Hall. Several years ago, being a member of the Council, I succeeded in obtaining the use of the hall and we commemorated the execution of our martyred comrades, and the Press denounced the Trades Hall Council as Anarchists. This was more than the Labour politicians could swallow, consequently I was summoned before the Council, who were afraid their prospects of obtaining a Parliamentary job would be jeopardised, so after a lively debate, in which the politicians emphasised the fact that they strongly upheld law and government, and wished to preserve the honour and respectability of the Council, it was resolved that I be expelled.

This year we applied for a room in the Trades Hall, obtained one, and held our meeting in the same Hall from which I was expelled six years ago. The place was crowded. Tom Mann, Harry Holland, our lady comrade, Mrs. Barbes, and myself spoke.

We have also had a protest meeting about Ferrer's execution, on the Yarra Bank. There were several thousand people present, and much indignation was shown. Ferrer was in Australia some years ago and was spoken highly of even by the capitalist press.

You are aware of the great coal miners' strike at Newcastle, New South Wales. As usual, the Labour politicians have destroyed what was likely to develop into a general strike. There is a bitter struggle going on between the Direct Actionists and the political Labour Party. The political tricksters, at present led by a schemer named Hughes, are masters, and have accomplished nothing after trying for over a month to get a conference. Hughes advised the wharf labourers to handle and unload the coal from the ships, but the coal lumpers refused. If the waterside workers would only join the miners, a general strike would be inevitable, which would expose the uselessness of the Labour politicians. So the Labour Party are assisting the Government to maintain what they call order, in the interest of the whole community, or, rather, their own interest—they don't want the workers to see through their capers. Hughes and Holman, another Labour leader, have denounced Peter Bowling, the miners' president, as an agitator and law-breaker. The outcome is that Bowling, Burns, and Brennan have been arrested on charges of conspiracy. This would not have happened only for the cowardly attack of the Labour politicians, of which a majority are on the Strike conference. The strike must end either in a miserable compromise or worse, a wretched defeat, owing to being betrayed. But there is satisfaction in the fact that a long step has been made in the direction of the General Strike, coupled with distrust in Parliamentary action, and this promises well for Anarchy.

J. W. FLEMING.

WHAT COMPULSORY ARBITRATION MEANS.

Our readers will have seen the ferocious sentences pronounced on the Australian strike leaders; that on Bowling to twelve months' imprisonment is scarcely credible. The following quotation from the Melbourne *Socialist* will show that the matter is not to be let drop:—

"Once again the Unionists of Australia are getting a taste of what the infamous Industrial Disputes Act really means, and of what was secreted in that measure supported by their own Labour Party. Entrenched behind the Act, the Wade Government (the creature of the Vend) at last shows its hand, and almost concurrently with the opening of the Union co-operative mines sets in operation the provisions of compulsory arbitration. Five strike leaders have been arrested! The question of supreme importance is—how shall the arrests be taken, by turning the other cheek, or with an eye for an eye? In war, to knuckle under is to be conquered—to reward blow with blow is to bid for success. But, departing from this analogy, there is nothing surer than that resistance to oppression is oppression's death. Tyranny triumphs only with weaklings. . . . If allowed to pass unresisted, these arrests will be followed up with mock trials and brutal jailings—witness all Australia's strike history—therefore, prompt and determined protest should be made, and the machinery of the Industrial Disputes Act completely wrecked so that imprisonment under it will be impracticable. This protest can effectively be made by the General Strike! The true plan of retaliation at the present moment is the General Strike! To sit idly by, or even to rest content with denouncing the partisanship of Wade, is to condone the ignominy and iniquity of the arrests. Action is imperative. Action! Action! Action!"

Russia.

The State Budget is everywhere a heavy burden on the people, but nowhere is it so crushing as in Russia, where 2,400,000,000 roubles (£240,000,000) is spent annually by the Government, and yet every year there is a deficit of 17 to 20 million pounds which have to be covered by internal or mostly foreign loans. This enormous sum of £240,000,000 has to be extorted directly or indirectly from the people. Every article of consumption is taxed, and life in the small provincial Russian towns has become as expensive as in the most fashionable centres of Europe. This means that for a hundred million of the rural population starvation or the dread of starvation is their continual fate. How the State's resources are wasted may be guessed from the fact that the Government is contemplating the appointment of special inspectors (Revisors), as a recent inspection of the War Commissariat,

of the administration of Central Asia, and of the Railway Department has disclosed gigantic frauds and embezzlements. These were carried out not only by petty officials, but by high functionaries with the title of General and Councillor of the Empire, and it has been decided to hand over forty-five of these from various parts of the Empire to the judicial tribunals.

To give an idea of the extent of the embezzlement, we quote the figures of the deficit of the Russian railways:—

1900	36,000,000 roubles.
1902	403,000,000
1905	895,000,000 "
1907	1,330,000,000 "

Our Social Democratic friends, who are so persistently preaching that all must belong to and be managed by the State, should note that nearly all the railways are a State monopoly.

The above-mentioned enormous sums of money are squandered by a despotic Government in a country where the economic condition of the workers is worse than in any country in Europe. Recent inquiries made by independent persons and societies have disclosed a terrible state of affairs. In St. Petersburg, in 1908, 70 per cent. of the workers had no separate lodgings; they could only afford to hire a bed or a corner of a room, where they live sometimes with wife and children. Their living and sleeping accommodation is no better than that provided for the homeless in the night-shelters of London, except that in London such a condition is the exception, whereas in the Russian capital 70 per cent. of the workers live in such misery.

In the prosperous province of Saratoff, in a few trades only the workers' wages are from £26 to £30 yearly; in some they are as low as £7. In the highly industrial central province, Vladimir, the inquiry by the Zemstvo showed that only 5 per cent. of the workers earn more than 50s. monthly; more than half of the population earn only 15s. a month, and many even less than that. It is stated by the Moscow inquiry that in the industrial centres of Russia the condition and wages of the working classes generally had grown worse by about 25 per cent.

America.

The relations between the Steel Trust and the American Federation of Labour have been strained lately, and since the Federation's Congress in Toronto it has been organising the resistance against the Steel Trust and collecting funds for the conflict. On the other hand, the Trust has profited by the reformist and even conservative tendencies which the Union of the steel workers has fostered amongst its members for the last few years. The absence of revolutionary spirit in the ranks of the Unionists has made it easy for the millionaire employers to lead them on the road of corporative selfishness which the Unionists themselves had initiated. Years ago the steel kings began to interest their workers in their business. As a Christmas-box, the Trust distributed this time no less than 2,000,000 dollars amongst its workers, and advised them to buy with the money 25,000 preferential shares, which they offered at a figure a little lower than the market price. It is estimated that the steel workers and other employees of the Trust possess now in all 15,000 ordinary shares and 193,500 preferential shares, representing a value of over 17,000,000 dollars.

If a conflict should break out between the Steel Trust and the American Federation of Labour, those workers of the Trust will be obliged to choose between their employers, in whose benefit they are so deeply interested, and their own Union.

Norway.

A project of law against strikes and lock-outs has been brought before Parliament. It proposes to create four Conciliation Bureaus, each consisting of three members. Neither strikes nor lock-outs will be tolerated unless the dispute has been previously before the Conciliation Bureau of the region. The Arbitration Court, which has to come into action when the Conciliation Bureau has failed, will be fixed at Christiania, and will also consist of three members: one appointed by the Government, and one each by the employers and workers.

On these points the Commission which has elaborated the project is unanimous, as well as on the demand that arbitration should be compulsory in disputes concerning wages. On matters of a more general interest, the Commission is divided in opinion.

Another country where the workers' right to strike will be limited! New Zealand and Australia, as we have shown above, give the best illustrations of the blessings of such laws for the workers.

Italy.

At Spezia, the local committee for the victims of Spanish reaction held a great meeting to demand a revision of Ferrer's trial. M. Luigi Campolunghe said it would be a great crime if the Jesuits were allowed to burn Ferrer's books and use the rest of his property to build more churches and convents. A strong resolution was passed and sent to the Spanish Minister of Foreign Affairs at Madrid.

Our Italian comrades are carrying on a strong propaganda against clericalism, and a new pamphlet by Pasquale, "Down with the Vatican!" has just appeared.

MURDER!

In a world-wide scientific society containing four thousand members, and having branches and correspondents in every civilised country and every large city of the universe, in a society whose general secretary has written so many pages of the most radical character, only fifteen persons have had the elementary courage to raise their voices and protest against one of the most horrid and repelling crimes yet committed in our civilisation of the twentieth century. It is a curious fact, indeed, and quite typical of the true character of these large gatherings of scientists of all shades, that such a degenerate as the King of Spain, such an idiot, such a wicked creature, such a backward mind so remote from our own conceptions of life and the universe, should have been duly admitted and tolerated so long amongst a society of learned people, and his presence considered as a high honour by its leading members. It is a curious phenomenon, really, that for ten years such a broad-minded scientist as Mr. Flammarion seems to be has repeatedly loudly praised the "virtues," the "merits," and the "intelligence" of "that mediæval piece of furniture without value."

In the beginning of last October, when our claim for "the exclusion of such a Fellow to be pronounced in the shortest possible time" was about to be discussed during the course of the monthly sittings of the French Astronomical Society, its president answered that the Council of the Society considered that our claim "was urged by purely political considerations, and that the regulations of the Astronomical Society forbid all deliberations of that kind." Yet, in our first letter to the president, published in the French Radical press a few days after the murder of Ferrer, we had duly specified that our demand was only a matter of "moral cleanliness." It was a shame, indeed, to keep such a Fellow beside us. The murderer of Professor Ferrer, we wrote, had deliberately put himself outside of humanity.

Having understood that the Council had taken no heed of our claim, the vice-president of the French Astronomical Society, Mr. Laisant, a most prominent and valuable scientist, and above all a sincere and straightforward citizen and a man of courage, gave us the signal to withdraw on the spot. Then there was no other attitude to be taken in presence of the general indifference and cowardice of these people. In the course of November we all sent individual letters of resignation to the president. We stated that we did not agree with the Council regarding the true character of our claim: "We believe that a murderer remains always a murderer, even if carrying a crown upon his head." We added that our withdrawal was the only way to solve the problem, "because nobody can compel us to have our names kept side by side with the name of a criminal whose foul deed fills our consciences with horror." In our own letters, Comrades Jean Grave, Couture, and myself also asked for the exclusion of Porfirio Diaz, the Mexican Nero, as cruel and bloody as the Spanish Nero.

This is only a short synopsis of the conflict, which shows plainly that a society of so-called enlightened people, a society which loudly boasts of having "benefactors of science" among its members, has in reality gathered up and sheltered a lot of backward and retrogressive elements in its bosom. At present, it is easy to understand these noble words of Comrade Simone Bodeoc in a letter to the secretary of the exclusion committee: "If there exists in this world of ours too large a quantity of wild creatures, there are above all people far worse than the wild beasts, there are the meek and timid, who have nothing to lose, who are afraid of their own shadow, and are willing to keep bandits among them." It has been demonstrated too many times that learned people are not necessarily generous, disinterested, deserving people.

Notwithstanding, our conflict seems to be only beginning. The first act of the play has just been performed, and the most interesting part of it will only come to-morrow. Indeed, the fifteen revolted are far from believing themselves vanquished. Not only in France, but all over the planet, they expect generous help from all people of spirit, they hope for a fraternal outbreak of solidarity from their comrades and brothers. Of course, their claim has been unsuccessful, their voice has been silenced, and they seem to have sustained a great loss through the fact that they are now deprived of some exquisite satisfactions and rejoicings. But now they have another reason to rejoice and be satisfied, for they are free to cry loudly "Murder!" in the ears of those who wish to be deaf and dumb. Above all, they are free to place the matter before the international judgment of all free-minded citizens. Out of that worn-out society which is

The receipt of a free copy of this paper is an invitation to subscribe. 1s. 6d. per annum.

proud to possess a ferocious murderer among its honorary members, we are now quite free to raise our voices and address our message to the world. If we can live and breathe no longer in that old Temple of Science, whose steps are stained with the blood of a martyr, we are sure to have the fraternal support of all our freedom-loving brothers when we begin to build up a new international edifice of knowledge.

ARISTIDE PRATELLE.

CORRESPONDENCE.

ANOTHER POINT OF VIEW.

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

DEAR COMRADE,—

The article in your last issue, "A General Survey," besides stating many things that we all need to be reminded of, raises some points that must certainly be discussed from another side, if the "Survey" is to include all facts in due proportion.

"N." admits that events have happened in Spain, in Turkey, in Persia "of a magnitude that has not happened in years in the quiet past," and immediately after this he speaks of the terrible reaction that in Spain, and in Russia more particularly, continues to inflict atrocious cruelties on the people. We all know these things too well, and we all feel that if the great masses of people amongst powerful nations had made their voices heard, in Russia, at any rate, things would not have been so bad. The people are not alert enough; if they were, the capitalist system would have been swept to the winds long ere this. They trust too much in "leaders," and the leaders betray them. Also, it must be confessed, the majority lack the energy and moral courage to think and to act independently.

But all this is so well understood by Anarchists—Anarchist Communists, I mean—that the whole of their conceptions of a revolutionised society and the means to attain it are based upon the historical fact that all progress is *initiated* by minorities. Therefore to that extent the Anarchist who spreads his ideas lives his life. This is the only "oasis" he can hope for in present society: this or the life of a recluse.

So many of "N.'s" statements seem to me to be contradictory, that I will try to put some, as fairly as I can, side by side, admitting at the same time that in this method there is always some risk of unfair quotation. As one instance, take the following: "To-day to 'Socialists' everything is permitted to acquire personal well-being and power; they bid everywhere for a share in the spoils of the people, and they are let alone; no one thinks of blaming them, most people seem ready to imitate them." Against this I put what "N." "proposes" or "believes" himself: "I believe in Socialism for Socialists, as I believe in Anarchism for Anarchists, and in all other systems or standpoints for other people, *just such as their natural disposition prompts them to adopt.*" I have italicised the last sentence, which seems strange after complaining that "to 'Socialists' everything is permitted." Why, then, attack anybody or any system? "Whatever is right," as Pope has told us. This contradiction, as it seems to me, arises from confusing the issue at the very outset. "N." understands quite as well as any of us that Anarchist Communism proposes two fundamental things: first, that the individual shall be free; secondly, to ensure that his freedom shall be secure, the establishment of conditions of *social equality*—not "uniformity"—which logically lead to Communism. "N." I think, is quite wrong in confusing the idea of uniformity with the desire of securing for all mankind life-conditions that assure freedom and well-being. It is as if one should cavil at the "uniformity" of us all being free and having bread to eat. In my view, freedom comes after we have reached these conditions and not before—not even for the individual in his "oasis." Besides, the "differentiation" which I as well as "N." regard as one of the greatest needs of a healthy social life, only begins to develop in a real sense after a social revolution has made Anarchist Communism possible. It is not a question of bringing "the last stragglers" up to our own "level," whatever that may be. It is a question first of all of human solidarity, of insisting that all have an equal opportunity for *individual development*. That is quite a different thing from the uniformity of an authoritarian system of society which we oppose with all our strength. So what can we do but work for Anarchist Communism and take our full share in the economic struggle?—Fraternally yours,

ANARCHIST COMMUNIST.

ANARCHISM AND THE SITUATION.—A COMMUNAL RESUME.

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

DEAR COMRADE,—

It was stated in FREEDOM sometime ago that no body of comrades had hitherto openly faced the problem of the organisation of the Social Revolution. I have tried individually, as no doubt have many other comrades, to solve these difficulties; and now that they seem to have somewhat cleared away, I try to put the position before you as it appears to me, in the hope that if there are difficulties which I have not been able to perceive, they may be openly discussed.

I have used the word "Resumé" as a substitute for the word

"Revolution," as more indicative of the method to be pursued; and I have used the word "Communal," as indicating the character of our aims. My idea is that there must be a retaking, or, as our Esperanto friends might say, a *Resumo*, of the prime necessities of life—fire, food, clothing, and shelter. And one thing that is quite clear to my mind in this matter is that anything of the nature of a General Strike cannot attain to what we desire. A strike is a relinquishing, and our great need is not to relinquish anything which is essential to the well-being of the community from a Communist standpoint.

It has been demonstrated that one of the greatest errors in the course of history has been the relinquishing of the control of military power by the people, and allowing it to be controlled by an external authority. It is necessary to resume control of it. This, it seems to me, can be done most effectively by a Communist Resumé, by making the necessities of life free and plentiful for all, people and military alike, in order to break down the authority under which the military are controlled. My proposal is that it should be done by a vast credit system. The people have an abundance of credit. They have numerous and immense organisations in a condition for affiliating with each other, which would enable them to carry out successfully this idea. I don't think there is any need to go into figures or attempt to make precise statements. We know that the people are organised into thousands of associations of various kinds and purposes, and that they possess a vast amount of both private and socialised wealth on which credit could be obtained to successfully carry through the Social Revolution without the loss of either wealth or life. We know we have one great organisation, born of the people after years of struggle and suffering, which now numbers millions of members and is quite capable of undertaking the immense task of regulating the supply of the needs of society. But it must be done by the people themselves. It is quite clear that all State, judicial, provincial, and municipal authority must be thoroughly cast aside, so that the people may be free to associate and arrange the supply of their own requirements. Many difficulties have presented themselves to me in considering this matter, and perhaps will suggest many in the minds of others; if so, I hope we shall have the benefit of considering them, so that we may get a little nearer to the thought that leads to action.—Yours fraternally,

A. H. HOIT.

Mr. H. W. Nevinson on Rebellion.

On Sunday, January 30, at South Place Institute, a lecture on "Rebellion," given by Mr. H. W. Nevinson, had special interest for London Anarchists. The lecturer made a strong point of the fact that all through history rebels had always been more cruelly tortured and executed than ordinary criminals. And yet, although the governing powers had behaved in this way, the people had always loved rebels and had made heroes of them after their death. He discussed at some length the point as to whether future democratic States would concede the right of rebellion to their citizens. He thought not, and considered they would be right in refusing it.

It was rather disappointing to find Mr. Nevinson falling back on the hackneyed assertion that although Anarchism would solve the question, we should need to have a population of angels before it could be established. The answer: it is *because* men—and women!—are not angels that they cannot be trusted to govern us, has been so often given that he can hardly be ignorant of it.

The lecture was both interesting and instructive, but the subject was too big to be treated in an hour's discourse, so that the point that needed development—namely, that rebellion and authority, the two forces that have been fighting it out all through history, and have yet to meet for the final struggle on the economic field—could hardly be touched upon. A course of lectures on that subject, treated from a libertarian standpoint, would be of the greatest value at the present moment.

What is the Aim of Anarchism?

To combine complete development of Individuality with the highest development of Voluntary Association, and, in seeking to achieve this laudable end, it closely follows old Dame Nature's methods, and is, therefore, nothing if not *Scientific*. Indeed, the Anarchist Conception of Society is anything but new. Analysed, it simply signifies Association minus Coercion. Its germs can readily be traced in the history of the Clan, the Village Community, the Mediaeval Guilds, and most notably in the grand Federation of Urban Communes known as the Hanseatic League, instituted by Hamburg and Lübeck in 1241. The State uniformly exerted itself to suppress or extirpate whatever was good in these, and unfortunately the baleful Conquistador traditions of Imperial Rome, in spite of the counterbalancing teaching of the Christ, has everywhere prevailed in Camp and Court of Law. Yet men lived in Societies thousands of years before the first States were constituted, and, on the whole, to much better purpose. Nor is the conflict over—Appearances notwithstanding, the Commune grows and Empire dwindles apace.—MORRISON DAVIDSON, *Reynolds's*, January 30.

PROPAGANDA NOTES.

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

LIVERPOOL INTERNATIONAL MODERN SCHOOL.

As I mentioned in a previous issue, we decided to form into classes. On January 3 Mat Kavanagh addressed the children on "War." Each of them had been presented with copies of Holarek's "War Pictures," so Mat took the opportunity of explaining them. This proved interesting and instructive to all. On this particular Sunday I visited a Socialist Sunday School—Rock Ferry—where classes were in operation. The idea seemed good and workable. The teachers were better able to instruct them in various subjects according to age. It was agreed that the plan might be adopted at our school, so we straightway did it, and, as far as we can see, it gives more satisfaction. The difficulty is to get teachers. Our classes are too big, and we want more teachers. Are there any volunteers? Those who do take the responsibility will find it instructive and interesting. Since we have started this method the school has been attended exceedingly well, and it makes it very difficult for such a small staff as three! However, let us hope that before long we shall capture a comrade or two that will help us out of our difficulty.

This month (January) we took advantage of FREEDOM's offer on the front page and distributed a hundred copies amongst the N.S.S. on January 16.

There is a desire to have an adult class connected with the school, but I am afraid our elder comrades are too apathetic. The class could be formed for propaganda purposes, lectures or discussions. The opportunity is there; what are you going to do? Oh! that comrade who is a great Damper! His one business is to damp down every enthusiasm and every hope. He would damp down the sun in the heavens if he could. Save us from the great Damper!

We shall be glad to see comrades at the I.L.P. Rooms, 1 Clarendon Terrace, Beaumont Street, on Sundays, 3 p.m.

Donations (Dec. 25 to Jan. 25) 3s 10d, Wm. O'H. 2s, B. Black 1s.
DICK JAMES.

GLASGOW.

On Sunday, January 9, John Turner addressed a crowded meeting in the Metropole Theatre on the "Aims of Anarchism." He created a good impression, and fairly silenced the politicians, who were present in force. The applause which greeted his advocacy of Direct Action was hearty, and the audience keenly appreciated his scathing indictment of Parliamentary action. Altogether it was a most successful piece of propaganda, and the "Clash on Scouts" are to be congratulated on their courage in allowing a subject hated so much by their clique to be on their syllabus.
J. S. MASON.

LEEDS.

The propaganda in Leeds is not dead yet. Meetings are held every Sunday evening at 7.30, at the concert room of the "Pointers Inn," North Street. Good discussions take place, but we are short of speakers, therefore I would ask every comrade in and around Leeds who is able to speak to come to the meetings and give us a helping hand, as the work is very necessary.
D. M. F.

LEICESTER.

C. H. Kean's Monday evening lectures at the Secular Hall during the past month have aroused great interest, the lecturer's unorthodox views shaking the faith of his audiences in some of their most cherished convictions—economic, religious, and political. A few years ago Leicester was a regular centre for Anarchist propaganda, but the Parliamentary will-o'-the-wisp has drawn many away. It is to be hoped that Kean's lectures will revive the old spirit. The election fever has slightly affected the attendance, but now that the excitement has subsided good audiences may be looked for. The lectures will be continued every Monday during February and March.

EDMONTON.

In spite of the changeable weather, Comrade W. Ponder has been holding meetings at Edmonton Green on Sunday mornings. His attacks on Parliamentary action have stirred up the local S.D.P., and a debate on "Free Organisation or Majority Rule" has been arranged between our comrade and C. R. Smart, S.D.P., to take place at Edmonton Green on two Sunday meetings, February 6 and 13, commencing at 11.30 each day.

CANNING TOWN.

We sincerely regret the loss of two of our Canning Town comrades, who have recently died. Thomas Little and Walter Knight were both active in the propaganda, and will be greatly missed by their fellow workers. We sympathise with the members of both families in their loss.

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.

(January 7—February 8.)

FREEDOM Guarantee Fund.—E. Rhodes 2s, T. S. 2s, Anon. £2 10s, H. Glasse 5s.
FREEDOM Subscriptions.—T. Humphreys 1s 6d, A. K. B. 1s 6d, A. Finch 1s 6d, F. H. 1s, D. Semple 1s 6d, D. 1s 6d, F. W. L. 2s 6d, J. W. Fleming 5s, F. C. 1s 6d, Dr. T. M. 4s.

SECULAR HALL, HUMBERSTONE GATE, LEICESTER.

C. H. Kean

Lectures every Monday night, at 8 p.m., during February and March.

February 14—Kropotkin's "Mutual Aid."

" 21—Ibsen's "Enemy of the People."

" 28—The Plays of Bernard Shaw.

Admission free.

Discussion invited.

KROPOTKIN'S MOST FASCINATING WORK.

MEMOIRS of a REVOLUTIONIST

2s., postage 4d.

500 pages, well bound in cloth, with Portrait.

THE MARTYRDOM OF FRANCISCO FERRER.

Price One Penny. At FREEDOM Office.

"New Age" Photos, 1s., postage 2d.

Post Cards, 1d. each, 1½d. post free.

PROPAGANDA LEAFLETS.

Our Great Empire.

What Anarchists Fight For.

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

PAMPHLET AND BOOK LIST.

- ANARCHIST COMMUNISM: ITS BASIS AND PRINCIPLES. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
ANARCHISM: ITS PHILOSOPHY AND IDEAL. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.
ANARCHIST MORALITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
ANARCHY. By E. MALATESTA. 1d.
THE WAGE SYSTEM. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.
A TALK ABOUT ANARCHIST COMMUNISM BETWEEN TWO WORKERS. By E. MALATESTA. 1d.
THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
EXPROPRIATION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
DIRECT ACTION v. LEGISLATION. By J. BLAIR SMITH. 1d.
THE PYRAMID OF TYRANNY. By F. DOMELA NIEUWENHUIS. 1d.
LAW AND AUTHORITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
THE SOCIAL GENERAL STRIKE. By ARNOLD ROLLER. 2d.
THE PLACE OF ANARCHISM IN SOCIALISTIC EVOLUTION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
THE COMMUNE OF PARIS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. ½d.
THE BASIS OF TRADE UNIONISM. By EMILE POUGET. 1d.
AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
WAR. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
SOCIALISM THE REMEDY. By HENRY GLASSE. 1d.
EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. By ELISEE RECLUS. 1d.
THE KING AND THE ANARCHIST. 1d.
MONOPOLY; OR, HOW LABOUR IS ROBBED. WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
USEFUL WORK VERSUS USELESS TOIL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONGRESS, 1907. 1d.
ANARCHY v. SOCIALISM. By W. C. OWEN. 2d., post-free 2½d.
WHAT I BELIEVE. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 2d., post-free 2½d.
PATRIOTISM. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 2d., post-free 2½d.
THE TRAGEDY OF WOMAN'S EMANCIPATION. By EMM GOLDMAN. 2d., post-free 2½d.
THE MASTERS OF LIFE. By MAXIM GORKY. 2d., post-free 2½d.
THE GOD PESTILENCE. By JOHN MOST. 1½d.
SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN GERMANY. By GUSTAV LANDAUER. ½d.
ANARCHISTS AND ESPERANTO. 1d.
KROPOTKIN: THE MAN AND HIS MESSAGE. By T. SWAN. 1d.
THE TERROR IN RUSSIA. By P. KROPOTKIN. 2d., postage 1½d.
GOD AND THE STATE. By MICHAEL BAKUNIN. Cloth 1s. net, paper 6d. net, postage 1d.
THE CONQUEST OF BREAD. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3s. 6d. post-free.
ANARCHISM. By Dr. PAUL ELTZBACHER. 6s. 6d.; postage 4d.
MUTUAL AID. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3s. 6d. post-free.
FIELDS, FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. Paper cover 6d. post-free 9d.; cloth 1s., post-free 1s. 3d.
MEMOIRS OF A REVOLUTIONIST. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2s.
MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1s.
NEWS FROM NOWHERE. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1s. 6d.; postage 4d.
A DREAM OF JOHN BALL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 2s., postage 3d.
WHAT IS PROPERTY? By P. J. PROUDHON. 2 vols. 2s., postage 4d.
PRISONS, POLICE AND PUNISHMENT. By E. CARPENTER. Paper 1s., cloth 2s., postage 3d.
ENGLAND'S IDEAL. By EDWARD CARPENTER. 2s. 6d. and 1s., post. 3d.
A VINDICATION OF NATURAL SOCIETY. By EDMUND BURKE. 1s. and 6d., postage 2d. and 1d.
WALDEN. By H. THOREAU. 1s. and 6d., postage 2d. and 1d.

All orders, with cash, should be sent to

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

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