

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. XXVII.—No. 295.

NOVEMBER, 1913.

MONTHLY: ONE PENNY.

NOTES.

Mr. Hyndman's Mistake.

We must say we feel sincerely sorry to find Mr. Hyndman so conspicuously failing to understand the new trend of things. The solidarity of Labour, the keynote of all present Labour struggles, has come to be what it is to-day by virtue of the strike and the economic struggle. In the *Daily Herald* (October 20) Mr. Hyndman says: "So far.....strikes have had no guiding idea whatever." We should say most emphatically they have a far clearer and saner "idea" to guide them than has ever emanated from any member of the Parliamentary Labour Party, with its political fooling all these years. But there is another answer. The Syndicalists are trying to educate the workers into the very clear and definite aim of organising and controlling their labour so as to produce for the whole community instead of for their master. Does this meet with any greater approval from the Social Democrats? On the contrary, they are even more bitter and antagonistic to Syndicalism than to Anarchism; possibly because it spreads so much more rapidly. But Mr. Hyndman also fails to grasp the moral results of strikes—even strikes that fail. He shows this in his attitude toward the Dublin strike. "But for the handsome support of the British Trade Unions, the wage-slaves of Dublin would have been starved into submission some time ago," he tells us. Quite so; that's just the point. *The Unions are helping the economic struggle*, and no action in Parliament could do as much. Not only that, but the spirit of solidarity engendered has broken the spell of the priest and the politician in Ireland, and, in spite of the squabble over the children, their ultimate fall will be traced to this phenomenal strike.

Other Issues.

In connection with the Dublin strike it is interesting to quote what the special correspondent of the *Daily News* wrote on October 15:—

"While the peers and politicians of Ulster were making sounds said to resemble Irish civil war, the revolution actually began in Dublin, where the vast majority are Home Rulers. The Irish revolution happens to have preceded the Irish Parliament. 'Two months ago,' said an influential Dublin man to me to-day, 'I could place politically every man of my acquaintance. To-day it is impossible to label anyone here unless he tells you what his new sympathy is. Irish politics are in the melting-pot. Even our Nationalist Members are looking on as puzzled as us all. We have been gazing at Westminster so long that we have failed to see what is happening in our midst. One might say that the birth-throes of a new Ireland have begun a little prematurely, and most of us are free to admit that the only man who goes confidently to the control of the job is Jim Larkin.'"

We imagine this gentleman to be less enthusiastic about strikes than even Mr. Hyndman. But at any rate he has his eyes open and can see things.

Nationalisation v. Free Organisation.

Now that Nationalisation of Railways is in the air, it is the moment for all really desirous of an intelligent solution of the railway problem to ask why the lines could not be managed—and infinitely better managed—by the men themselves than by the State. Let us consider for a moment the real causes of the recent accidents. Taking the Aisgill disaster first, we all know that had the request of the driver of the first train for an additional engine been granted the accident would not have happened. The driver knew by experience the requirements for

his heavy train, and should have had that extra help. Everyone, of course, knows that Caudle was *doing two men's work*, and so missed his signals. He was found guilty to save Sir Guy Granet and his fellow criminals. Now turn to the accidents at Liverpool and at Waterloo Junction. In both cases the men were doing *two men's work*, and in both cases the danger of this had been communicated to the managers. In both cases it was ignored. But the men knew by their *practical everyday experience* what was needed, and would have supplied it had they been free to do so. Finally, we may recall why guard Richardson was dismissed—because he actually refused to take the risk involved in obeying the orders of managerial mismanagement. He was a good friend to the public, and therefore an enemy of the directors! All this shows how much better the men know the requirements in railway organisation than the masters who exploit them. If the public wants to save its skin, and have decent travelling, let the men run the railways. Otherwise we shall have that abominable system of "regimentation" of the workers which we see on Continental State railways.

The Evolution of Home Rule.

Sir Edward Grey's suggestion of "Home Rule within Home Rule" is a remarkable development, politically speaking, of the principle of autonomy. Carson, Smith and Co. have by their "rebellion" brought things to a point that may teach a much-needed lesson to centralised Governments, and teach it in a way not much to their own taste when the tables are turned. If it were not for the blind fools who echo nothing but the parrot cry, "Govern, rule, force," autonomy would be in the way of solving the tens of thousands of difficulties with their trouble and strife—and cost—that beset us on all hands to-day. The little flutter among the indignant inhabitants of Seven Kings illustrates on a minute scale what we mean. Here the Borough Council, for some unaccountable reason (perhaps jobbery), had proposed allotting so many acres of land, to be divided between the making of a public park and a cemetery adjoining! The outburst of indignation was so great that the Local Government Board had to withdraw its permission from the scheme. The next trouble was the threat to build a "dust destructor" in the midst of the people's dwellings, polluting the air with its fumes. The people of Seven Kings have answered this proposed outrage by threatening to resist by force all attempts to build the thing, to refuse to pay rates, and to elect a committee to fight the Borough Council. An autonomous commune would certainly save us all this friction and waste, by first knowing what it wanted, then doing it for itself.

The Power of the Priest.

The outrage perpetrated by the priests in Dublin—who were dumb dogs enough while the poor workers endured the horrors of their awful lives without protest—reminds us that the devilish spirit of bigotry and Jesuitical fanaticism is far from dead. There is an echo of it here, too, in the prosecutions being instituted against Dr. Nikola at Wolverhampton for blasphemy. These scandals arise on certain occasions and in certain places, and this indicates that some person or persons are behind the law, pulling the strings when their religious spleen finds an opportunity. All of which goes to prove that a new crusade against priestcraft is badly needed. We have just heard Bernard Shaw eulogising the character of Bradlaugh. But something more serious than this is wanted. We want men with the physical and moral courage of Bradlaugh as well as his fighting spirit. Is there one growing up amongst us?

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

The Modern State.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

I.

THE ESSENTIAL PRINCIPLE OF MODERN SOCIETY.

In order to understand thoroughly the direction that is now taken by the development of society, and to see what has hitherto been acquired by progressive evolution, and what we may expect to conquer in the future, we must consider carefully, first of all, what are the distinctive features of modern society and the modern State.

It need hardly be said that society, such as it is now, is *not* the logical development of some unique fundamental principle applied to the infinite variety of the needs of human life. Like every other living organism, society represents, on the contrary, an extremely complex result of thousands of struggles and thousands of compromises, of survivals of the past and of longings towards a better future.

The theocratic spirit of a remote antiquity, slavery, imperialism, serfdom, the mediaeval commune, the old superstitions, and the modern spirit—all these are more or less represented, with all possible gradations, in the societies of the present time. Shadows of a remote past, and rough sketches of the future; habits and customs as antiquated as the Stone Age, and aspirations towards a future which is hardly perceptible on the horizon—all these are found in our present human agglomerations, struggling one against the other in every individual, every layer of society, and every generation.

However, if we consider the great struggles, the great popular revolutions which took place in Europe and America since the twelfth century, we see one principle distinctly arising out of all these struggles. All the uprisings of the last eight centuries were aiming at the abolition of what had survived of ancient slavery in its mitigated form—Serfdom.

All these struggles had the purpose of freeing either the rural populations or the inhabitants of the towns and cities, or both at the same time, from the *obligatory labour* that was imposed upon them by law, to the advantage of some masters. To recognise the right of every man to dispose at his own will of his own personal powers, the right to do the work he himself chooses to do, and so long as he likes to do it, without any one having the legal right to *compel* him to do that work—in other words, the liberation of the *personality* of the peasant and the artisan—this was the object of all those popular revolts. The uprisings of the communes in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries; the peasant upheavals in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in Bohemia, Germany, and the Netherlands; the revolutions of 1381 and 1648 in England; and, finally, the Great Revolution of 1789-93 in France—all had that purpose.

* *

It is true that the aim of these upheavals was only partially attained. In proportion as the individual freed himself and gained *personal* liberty, new economic conditions were imposed upon him, so as to paralyse his liberty, forge new chains, and bring him back under the old yoke by the menace of starvation. A striking example of that was given quite recently, when the Russian serfs, liberated in 1861, were compelled to pay for their liberation by a redemption of the land that they had cultivated for centuries past—which meant poverty and misery and the reimposition of a new economic serfdom. And what was done in Russia was done, in one way or another, everywhere in Western Europe during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Physical compulsion disappeared, but new forms of constraint were established. Personal serfdom was abolished in the laws of the country, but it reappeared in a new form—the economic one.

And yet, with all that—theoretically, *in Law*—this is proclaimed as the fundamental principle of our modern society. In theory, the freedom of labour is proclaimed as every one's fundamental right. By law, work is no longer *obligatory* for any one. A caste of slaves, bound to work for their masters, does not exist; and, at least in Europe, there exists no longer a class of men, bound to give to their masters three days of work every week, in return for the use of a small piece of land to which the serf formerly remained attached all his life. Every one—at least, in law—is considered free to work where he likes, and so much as he likes.

* *

And yet we know—and the Socialists of all shades of opinion are never weary of demonstrating it every day—how illusory, how unreal is this supposed freedom. Millions and millions of men, women, and children are forced every day, under the menace of starvation, to give their labour to a master, accepting the conditions he imposes upon them. And we know, and we try to make it well understood by the masses, that under the name of land-rent, house-rent, interest, profit, and so on, that are paid to the capital-owner, the industrial working man and the agricultural labourer continue to give, to several masters instead

of to one, as much as the three days they formerly used to pay to the landlord, in order to cultivate a plot of land, or merely to live under a roof.

We know, moreover, that if some day an economist would make real "political economy," and calculate all that several masters—the employer, the house-owner, the landlord, the countless intermediaries, the capital-owners, and the State—levy directly or indirectly upon the wages of the working man, one would be amazed to learn how little of it remains for paying all other workers whose produce is consumed by every working man. The working man hardly realises how small is the part which goes to pay the agricultural labourer who has grown the wheat he consumes, the mason who built the house he dwells in, those who made the clothing he wears, the furniture he has in his rooms, and so on. One would be amazed to find how little goes to all those workers who produce the things consumed by other working men, in comparison to that immense portion which goes to the feudal barons of our own time.

* *

However, this robbing of the worker is not accomplished by one master imposed on every worker by the law. There exists for that purpose a special mechanism, extremely complicated—impersonal and irresponsible. Nowadays the worker gives, just as in olden times, a considerable portion of his life to work for the privileged ones; but he does it no more under the whip of a master. The compulsion is no more a bodily constraint, as it was under serfdom. He will be thrown out into the street, and be forced to dwell in a slum; he will be so reduced as never to have sufficient to satisfy his hunger, and he will see his children perishing from want of food and healthy surroundings; he will have to beg in his old days, or go to a workhouse. But he will not be put on a bench in a police-station and flogged for a badly sown coat or a badly harrowed field, as was done in our childhood days in Eastern Europe, and was formerly done all over Europe.

Under the present system—which is often more ferocious and pitiless than the old one—man has nevertheless a feeling of personal liberty. We know that for the proletarian such a feeling is almost an illusion; and yet we must recognise that all modern progress and all hopes for the future are based on this feeling of freedom, whatever its limitations may be.

The most miserable man, in the darkest moments of his dejection, will not exchange his stone bed under the arch of a bridge for the secure daily food of a slave, with the slave's chain in addition. More than that. This feeling, this principle of personal liberty, is so dear to modern man that continually we see whole populations of working men starving for months in succession, and marching against the bayonets of their rulers, only to maintain some conquered rights.

The most obstinate strikes and the most bitter popular revolts result nowadays more often from questions of rights than from questions of wages.

* *

The right to work at what a man chooses to work at, and so long as he chooses, thus remains the *principle* of modern society. Consequently, the chief accusation we level at society is, that this freedom, so dear to man, is continually rendered a fiction, by the worker being placed under the necessity of *selling* his labour-force to a capitalist—the modern State being the chief weapon for maintaining the working men under this necessity, by means of the monopolies and privileges it continually creates in favour of one class of citizens, to the detriment of the others.

It begins, indeed, to be generally understood that the fundamental principle, upon which all are agreed, is continually evaded by means of a widely-developed system of monopolies. He who owns nothing becomes once more the serf of those who possess, because he is bound to accept the conditions of the owners of the land, the factory, the dwelling-houses, the trade, and so on; he is thus compelled to pay to the rich—to all the rich—an immense tribute, as a consequence of the established monopolies. These monopolies become hateful to the people, not only on account of the lazy life they guarantee to the rich, but chiefly on account of the rights they give to the monopolists over the working class.

Consequently, the great fault we find with modern society is, that after having proclaimed the principle of liberty of work, it has created such conditions of property-ownership that *they do not permit the worker to be the master of his work*. They wipe out this principle, and place the worker in such a condition that he *must* work to enrich his masters, and to perpetuate, as it were, his own inferiority. He is forced to forge his own chains.

Well, then, if it is true that the principle of liberty of work is really dear to modern man, if he repudiates servile work and cherishes personal freedom, then the course to be followed by a revolutionist is quite evident.

He will repudiate all forms of a veiled serfdom. He will work to put an end to a state of things in which freedom has come to be an empty word. He will try to find out what it is that prevents the worker from being the master of his own brain and hands; and he will aim at the abolition—by force if

necessary—of the obstacles opposed to that freedom, always taking care that he does not introduce new obstacles which, perhaps, might give a temporary increase of well-being to a section of the working class, but would limit their liberty at the same time.

Let us, then, analyse the obstacles which reduce the working man's liberty and tend to enslave him, in opposition to a principle generally recognised.

(To be continued.)

A General View of Anarchism.

By G. BARRETT.

INTRODUCTION.

An Anarchist is a man who does not believe that government is a good thing for the people. He is, in fact, a man who believes in and strives for liberty. Liberty is to him not a superstition, or a god of which to make images, but a practical theory or plan of action. The first step necessary in establishing liberty will be, clearly, the abolition of government. This may at the first glance seem wildly impossible; but if we think for a moment, we shall see a new side of the question.

In the first place, is there not something quite wrong and mixed up in your ideas, for I assume you are not an Anarchist? You believe in *government* as a necessary part of our social life, and yet you will not like to say that you deny and reject *liberty*. This is so with almost all people who are not Anarchists—they spend one half of their intellect apologising for their belief in government, and the other half in excusing themselves for their love of liberty. They are in just the same position in regard to their political beliefs as the Christians are in regard to their religious ideal. The Christians build churches to the glory of Christ and worship him; should any man speak against him, they are horrified; but when it comes to practical life, they do not in the least apply their religion. "Take no thought for to-morrow" they translate "Keep a good balance at the bank." "Thou shalt not kill" becomes "£60,000,000 annually for the Army and Navy." "Judge not" and "Swear not" is written in the book by which they swear in the courts of judgment. "Call no man your master, for ye are all brothers," is interpreted to mean that the soldiers must protect their masters by shooting their brothers during a strike.

So one could go on till it is proved that every point taught by Christ has been rejected by those who worship him.

Exactly the same thing has happened in regard to Liberty. As a people, we worship it. Our boast is that "where the Union Jack floats there is liberty." We erect statues to it, our poets sing its praise, our politicians stir our manly blood with rhetoric in praise of it, so that we march with proud step to the polling booth; but when it comes to practical life, none of these in the least applies his ideal. "We must have a Government, we must have some one in control," they say; and behind these words are hidden the policeman's bludgeon, the wretched prison system, and the Army ready to shoot down those rebels who dare to attempt to overthrow the politician's ideal of society. Liberty is a fine thing to make speeches about, and to which to erect statues; but for practical politics they demand government.

We begin to see now where the Anarchist comes in. He *really* believes in Liberty, and, as I have said before, he sees that this means the abolition of government.

Those who believe in government, then, are a trifle muddled in their philosophy; but the reader may yet be of the opinion that it would be entirely impossible to overthrow it. The fact is, anything else is impossible.

Does not all history show us a conflict between the dominant or governing class and the people to whom it tries to dictate the conditions of life? Does it not also show that the march of progress is away from government towards liberty?

But what more damning proof of the impossibility of government can we wish for than the age in which we live? It almost seems that the *impossible* becomes but a small field to be achieved, for day by day we extend the boundary of the possible. Our greatest thoughts have been translated into action, our imagination has materialised. The inventive genius of man brings into reality a world of marvels more beautiful and full of wonder than the most imaginative fairy tale of our childhood. We fly above the clouds or traverse the ocean bed; we may circle the earth with amazing rapidity; more and ever more easily Nature gives up her wealth to us, and the full richness of life is laid bare. Such are the individual and social achievements of man.

In the midst and at the head of the social structure, which comes into existence because our activities are carried on by groups and not by single individuals, is an association of men calling themselves the Government. These men are for the most

part cultured, and have enjoyed the greatest advantages of education that the system is able to offer them.

What is the result, the gain to humanity, of this wonderfully regulated society which has been built solely to make life richer? Millions are on the verge of starvation, hundreds of thousands are spending their lives in producing instruments for the destruction of human life, and millions again are wasting their existence in a dull tragedy of monotony. In every great industrial centre where wealth is most plentifully produced, there is poverty and want. In the rich town where no production is carried on, there is plenty and enjoyment. He who labours hard or produces wealth is in poverty, he who lives in idleness is rich. When the warehouses are full, there is want and hunger. Those without food are forbidden to produce because the demand is *already* supplied.

In all this, what part does the Government play? It controls and regulates—as if, forsooth, invention and production were not in themselves orderly processes. It protects the property necessary for all this production, but, with tragic imbecility, it protects it for the non-producer *against* the producer. It protects the wealth created; but it does not preserve it for those who need it, but for those who are already wealthy—and thus arises the *problem* of poverty.

What can the politicians say to these appalling facts? From Socialists to Conservatives, they can only raise the pitifully weak appeal: Put us in power and we will do better.

Thus, to detect the Government helping to upset the social equilibrium may not be *proof* that it is necessarily and innately an unsocial factor in our civilisation, but it should at least shake our faith and throw it open to criticism—a criticism not aimed at the particular party in power, but directed to the institution itself.

Custom, in truth, has a marvellous power to paralyse our mind; but if we rid our thoughts of the folly of believing that what is right, and if we imagine the free society that *might* be, it surely becomes difficult to conceive the audacity of the man who could seriously prefer the Government system. Is it not sufficiently convincing simply to remember that the Government is represented by a gang of men armed with bludgeons, who hang about our streets and country roads by night as well as by day.

It must at least appear possible that this attempt to keep the dispossessed from the food of the country and the means of production may be a relic of the darkest ages in history.

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE SINGLE TAX.

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

DEAR COMRADE,—Your correspondent, W. Mutter, should know that "the people" are now on the land, and as certainly serfs as they were when agriculture and its allied industries were the only ones in this country. The Single Tax is designed to give the people the land on which they live and by which they live, and it will do it (1) by destroying the selling price of land, and (2) by making workers independent of capitalists—that is, masters of their own capital, which now they create.

Mr. Mutter is evidently labouring under the very common delusion prevalent in these days of grandmotherly legislation, that the workers can be helped by some authority, whether that authority be a Government or, as he suggests, a co-operative society. They cannot be helped. They are indeed the only source of help, and it is by reason of that help which they render being exploited by officials and monopolists that they are rendered so helplessly servile. Mr. Mutter will find by a careful study of "Progress and Poverty" (Henry George's famous book) that the primary method of exploitation is land monopoly, and that when that method is destroyed all other chains which bind the workers will be broken by themselves easily enough.—Yours fraternally,
St. Anne's-on-the-Sea. JOHN BAGOT.

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

DEAR COMRADE,—You have pointed out that I did not give any idea of how to get possession of the land. Could not the Wholesale Society plant a farm in each county, and carry out the famous John Bellers's ideas on co-operative societies on the land? It is not for the working class to worry about the middle-class shopkeepers and their Single Tax. They should be members of the co-operative societies, and have a voice in the business. A few useful hints on the subject can be found by reading "Cottage Economy," by William Cobbett, and also "The Conquest of Bread," by Kropotkin, who tells us that, "whether we like it or not, this is what the people mean by a revolution. As soon as they have made a clean sweep of the Government, they will seek first of all to ensure to themselves decent dwellings and sufficient food and clothes."—Yours fraternally,
Manchester. W. MUTTER.

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

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

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

Annual Subscription, post-free, 1s. 6d.; U.S.A., 40c.; France, 12fr.
Foreign Subscriptions should be sent by International Money Order.

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

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

THE MANAGER, 127 Ossulston Street, N.W.

The Editors are not necessarily in agreement with signed articles.

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

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

Hyndman on Political Action.

Syndicalism, with its rebellious spirit of direct action, is rapidly gaining ground in this country. Three years ago nobody except us Anarchists spoke on the subject; two years ago the first Syndicalists raised their voices, and to-day everybody is busy discussing the subject.

This rapid spread of Syndicalist ideas and tactics of direct action is a great event, and every friend of social justice and the social emancipation of the workers must rejoice, as Syndicalism means the abolition, by the people's own initiative and direct action, of capitalism with its wage-slavery and State oppression. Yes, every friend of social emancipation, every Socialist, especially every revolutionary Socialist, it seems, must be pleased. But it is especially from would-be *revolutionary* Socialists that Syndicalism and its fighting spirit meets with its bitterest attacks. Among those "revolutionary" criticisms, the most serious and evidently sincere were delivered by H. M. Hyndman in three articles in the *Daily Herald*. In his opinion, Syndicalism is not a revolutionary movement, because the Syndicalists are against "political action," and do not arm themselves, nor drill for a fight, as in Ulster. With regard to the economic struggle by strikes, or even by general strikes, Hyndman finds that they are only weakening and discouraging the workers. He says:—

"I have never advised a strike myself at any time..... because it is not my business to do so. [Quite right; nobody but the workers can decide a strike.]..... Because if one-quarter of the cost of strikes to the strikers were devoted to political action on definite class lines, or to the organisation of an armed force under their own control.....enormously greater success would be achieved."—(*Daily Herald*, October 20.)

Perfectly true; armed productive classes would accomplish much more efficacious action than a peaceful partial strike. But with the same reason we may say that an armed uprising could lead to much greater results than peaceful Parliamentary voting once every four or five years. Hyndman finds the German Social Democrats the "best educated and most thoroughly trained people in Europe," and says their "political action on definite class lines"—otherwise, peaceful Parliamentary voting—must be imitated by the workers and Socialists in all countries; and at the same time he condemns Syndicalists for not using arms! We, the revolutionary Anarchists, always were convinced that only by armed masses could the struggle between Capital and Labour be fought out. But Social Democrats always were denouncing us as heretics for this opinion.

If somebody proposed that "revolutionary" Social Democracy should arm and train the members of the party, the answer would be "Agent provocateur!" or "Dangerous lunatic!" No other epithets would be applied to him by the orthodox Kautsky, or by the revisionist Bernstein. We remember quite well with what opprobrium the leaders and the press of the party loaded our Italian comrades for a revolutionary *armed* attempt in Benevento. Nevertheless, this powerful Parliamentary party is looked upon by Hyndman as the model revolutionary one.

We may ask: What revolutionary act was accomplished by Social Democracy during the last forty years? None. Why do they call themselves revolutionary? Because they are in opposition, and are often imprisoned for newspaper articles? Well, opposition does not yet mean revolution, and condemnation for an article is known as "*délit de presse*." Real revolutionists were always called noble and heroic people; the fighters and conspirators who were risking and sacrificing their lives for

liberty, like the brothers Bandiera, or the heroic young Republicans at Sapri with Pisacane.

Political action always meant action, not mere innocent Parliamentary voting. That is why during the forty years of existence of Social Democracy, in spite of their pompous and sonorous phraseology, they never obtained a single concession from their oppressors. In a period of forty years, or even less, the true revolutionists and people of political action liberated Holland from Spanish oppression, created the independent and federated United States; liberated and united Italy; gained autonomy in Hungary; and even in Russia they humiliated an all-powerful despot, and forced him to grant a Constitution—a very poor one, it is true. But in Germany, with the model, the numerous, and the revolutionary Social Democracy—what do we find? "Everybody knows," says Hyndman, "that its political forms, particularly those of Prussia, the predominant partner in Germany, are quite antiquated." So that model political action with voting by ballot is good for preserving "antiquated forms." And working humanity must imitate Social Democratic tactics? No, thanks; better not.

As in the true revolutionary political action the people were constantly engaged in conspiring and in the armed struggle, so in the daily industrial struggle Syndicalism, with its *direct action*, brought an incessant economic fight by strikes, partial or general, sympathetic or otherwise. Hyndman disapproves of these strikes, as being mostly unsuccessful and very costly, requiring much self-sacrifice. But what sacrifice may be greater than to ask the people to arm themselves for a revolutionary fight, which also may not be crowned with immediate success? Nevertheless, Hyndman himself—and quite rightly—advises the people to arm themselves, to be ready for any emergency. Can he guarantee a success at once? Certainly not. But even an unsuccessful heroic act encourages the disinherited and oppressed; while the Social Democratic anti-strike and legal—always legal—electioneering creates only political and social quietism.

It is better to inspire and encourage the sufferers "to fight than to keep them quiet. That is why revolutionary Syndicalism—this true people's form of Socialism—is so rapidly spreading. It inspires, it encourages the toilers, and one day will bring them the victory.

The Strike Weapon and its Critics.

The tendency of the working class to adopt the methods of direct action in place of Parliamentary futilities is becoming more and more alarming to the capitalist class. The sympathetic strike is particularly distasteful to them, because it is the practical application of the principle of solidarity of Labour, and may easily become the precursor of the international general strike against the present system of society. It is becoming increasingly difficult in these days to isolate groups or sections of workers, and to crush them in their weakness. The social rebels in the ranks of the workers carry the cry for help to their comrades all over the land, and, as in the case of the locked-out working people of Dublin, the field of sympathetic action threatens to become a wide one. To Anarchists these signs are most hopeful and arouse joyful feelings. It shows that there is every probability that by such means the power of the monopolists and exploiters of labour may be broken.

Naturally, the capitalist class is annoyed by such manifestations. Their loyal servants, the politicians of every school, are ready to stem the tide of social rebellion—if they can. They are all full of sympathy with the working class, but they cry aloud in speech and print against the only useful means the workers have at hand to check the rapacity and tyranny of the employing class. They distort the facts by lists of enormous sums they assert have been lost in wages, and they ascribe the suffering of the people—normal as well as abnormal, by implication—to their strike policy. Now, as a matter of fact, it is doubtful if a single penny in wages is really lost by the working class as a whole through striking. Certainly the coal miners of this country lost nothing in that way. Nor the railway men. That there was a temporary loss is true, but that has been more than recovered in both those cases since their struggles occurred. That the Union men among the London dockers have been shamefully treated by their employers since the failure of their last strike, and their wives and children slowly tortured by the employers at the docks, is quite true. But that was because of the restrictions imposed upon the strike, particularly in its "sympathetic" phase, by so-called "leaders," ecclesiastics, and other enemies of direct

action by the workers. The suffering of the workers and their children during a strike is due in the first place to their impoverishment precedent to its occurrence. Secondly, the reliance of the workers upon "good (?) government" and law-making has very largely accounted for their own disunity, and consequent unpreparedness for a dispute, whether long or short. Lastly, real organised action by the working class could easily place their fellows beyond extreme want in any local or sectional struggle, as has been proved in some measure by what is happening at Dublin.

The bog of Parliamentary action has for two or three generations swallowed up a vast quantity of thought and action which, if applied to these problems, would have solved them, at least in their more acute forms. As regards health, it is true that starvation is destructive, but a thorough conception of direct action *in all its forms* provides simple and easily applied remedies for that. The workers know how to do it, if their middle-class critics do not. So far as many factory industries and positively unhealthy occupations are concerned, a strike often affords an opportunity of cleansing the workers' bodies of the poisons and impurities which have entered them during their period of unhealthy drudgery. At least, the blessings of "phossy-jaw" and similar advantages of "regular employment" cannot be ascribed to strikes. As a worker, the present writer has often wondered how it is that these critics who condemn the strike policy so heartily on account of the misery and loss, as well as utter defeat, they allege it involves, can find it in their hearts to invoke its aid to back up demands for political reforms. They forget then that the general strike "will be quenched in blood," etc. They cannot assert that they intend to wait till they have a Parliamentary majority and an armed force, because it is not long since—in Belgium, for instance—that one section did use it in other circumstances.

We often hear Social Democrats declaring that they do not advocate strikes, but support them when they take place. That does seem a bit illogical; and we may fairly ask them how they can excuse themselves for assisting the workers in these actions of self-injury or self-destruction. Of course, they are really adapting the facts to their political theories, for large numbers of Social Democrats who are workmen know by experience that strikes are a necessity in the economic struggle. Having to choose between a theory and necessity is a bit of a farce. There is no choice in the matter; and if the Social Democrats were to realise that their position is intellectually dishonest, as it is, there would be an end of Social Democracy.

The truth is, as every Socialist knows, that profits and all other forms of so-called "surplus value" are obtained by the exploitation of labour. The economic antagonism between the workers and their employers produced by this system results in constant friction between them. This antagonism and friction is not a matter of Parliamentary debate, heated or philosophic, but a perpetual daily conflict, open or concealed, in every branch of industry throughout the civilised world. The workers are obliged to resist, and sometimes are also ambitious of obtaining a few of the good things of life.

"But they are seeking merely to ameliorate their conditions, and not to end them by the complete overthrow of capitalism"! Don't be hasty, Mr. Politician; you who would wait a lifetime for an amendment of the laws governing the registration of Parliamentary electors, and other political husks! If you will cease from bulldozing the workers with political mesmerism, we will get on much faster to the Free Commonwealth.

Every kind of Parliamentary action has been tried already, from Toryism to orthodox Social Democracy; and all have equally failed to aid the workers in their economic struggle. But always has the union of the workers themselves and their joint action been of advantage. Even when beaten for the time being, it but exhibits to them the weak places in their organisation or action, and leads them on to another fight sooner or later. And, if successful, a great impetus is given to the Labour revolt in general. Always it shows them their real enemy. It proves their common interest, and the necessity of more and more solidarity. Every time the Social Revolutionist is afforded an opportunity of pointing the moral—viz., abolish capitalism. Thus, strikes are educational.

By the way, one would like to protest against the recognition of the so-called "leader." People are constantly complaining of errors or treachery on the part of well-known "leaders" connected with the Labour movement. As a matter of fact, there is no such post created by any Trade Union rule in England. A Trade Union elects and pays officials, whose duties are defined in the rules of the society. But they are all subject to the members—even the most autocratic of them. The "leader,"

with his stupid or dependent followers, is a Parliamentary figure. They rely upon him for direction and tactics. The term is out of place in the Labour movement. No man could or should accept the responsibility of such a position, even were it created. The "labour boss" is an unpleasant creature wherever he exists, whoever he is. And the more sincere and honest he is, the more he must regret the sad plight of the helpless creatures who are without understanding and resolution of their own.

We will have no more masters. The coming world-fight is a fight for liberty. The seed sown in many years' endeavour is bearing fruit. Nowhere are the signs of a good harvest more encouraging than in the organisations of Labour. Every encouragement should be given to the proposal that the miners, the railway men, and the dockers should unite in a great general strike for their common cause. The working class now recognises the necessity of such union and effort.

Anarchist Communists advocate the strike, the general strike most of all, and point out to the workers the only final remedy for the starvation and suffering which is their portion at present—i.e., the free common possession of the earth for all, and the use of all wealth by those who labour to produce it, and make civilised society possible. We are only at the beginning of the great battle for justice to-day, but the working class is surely, though slowly, awakening to the fact that it may, without any intermediaries, and without any machinery but its own, dictate the terms of emancipation.

G.

MEXICO'S BATTLE-CRY: "LAND AND LIBERTY."

At the present moment interest in world-politics has shifted from the Balkans to Mexico, where the two great groups of financiers—Rothschilds and the Standard Oil Company—are face to face, prepared to plunge the nations into war in defence of their interests. President Wilson is loth to intervene, knowing the task would be a gigantic one; but the Trusts are tired of the present situation, and their greed for dividends is likely to force the President's hand, unless Huerta can subdue the rebels, which is very unlikely, as the latest news shows that they are gaining ground.

At this interesting moment the Mexican Liberal Party have issued a pamphlet* which will give the reader a better idea of what the rebels are fighting for than all the columns of newspaper articles which have recently appeared. Here we see that the one object for which they strive is the recovery of the land stolen from them under the Diaz regime.

Madero, who unseated Diaz, gained his position by definite promises to restore the land to the peons; but his failure to do so was his undoing, and the rebels attacked him as fiercely as they had previously attacked Diaz. Huerta now finds himself in the same position, and although he is throwing the national lands open to the people, his concession has come too late. The natives know now that the State is the enemy, and nothing will satisfy them but the free cultivation of the soil by which they and their ancestors have lived for centuries.

This pamphlet consists of a series of articles reprinted from *Regeneracion*, the organ of the Mexican Liberal Party. The writers are Ricardo Flores Magon (now imprisoned on McNeil Island by the American authorities), A. de P. Araujo, and Wm. C. Owen, the editor of the English section of the paper, whose articles week by week have been an inspiration to all revolutionists. Throughout this pamphlet runs detestation of the State and Authority, as being the great obstacles to freedom, and a determination to get back their stolen land by the only means the rulers recognise—force of arms. The reader will find nothing here about voting, or small holdings, or land nationalisation, or Single Tax. Magon goes straight to the point when he says:—

"What you need is to secure the well-being of your families—their daily bread—and this no Government can give you. You yourselves must conquer these good things, and you must do it by taking immediate possession of the land, which is the original source of all wealth. Understand this well; no Government will be able to give you that, for the law defends the 'right' of those who are withholding wealth. You yourselves must take it, despite the law, despite the Government, despite the pretended right of property. You yourselves must take it in the name of natural justice; in the name of the right of every human being to life and the development of his physical and intellectual powers."

Animated by ideals like these, the victory of the rebels is but a question of time. We would that the workers of this country had such ideals.

With a view to spreading the facts of the Mexican situation as widely as possible, we have written for a supply of this pamphlet, and copies will be on sale at 4d. each, postage extra.

* *Land and Liberty: Mexico's Battle for Economic Freedom and its Relation to Labor's World-wide Struggle.* 10c. Los Angeles, Cal.: Mexican Liberal Party, P.O. Box 1236.

SIDELIGHTS ON SOCIAL SUBJECTS.

It seems inevitable that the industrial war now being waged in Dublin should let loose all the forces of reaction. We are not, therefore, surprised to learn that the priests of that city are opposed to the scheme whereby the starving kiddies of strikers are to be fed and housed by sympathetic friends of freedom in Britain. Intimidation has been followed by direct action on the part of the priests and their trusty henchmen, the police. The children were prevented from travelling with their benefactors to England, and two of the organisers of the scheme arrested. We welcome this open declaration of war on the part of the religious fraternity. It is not long ago that the *Daily Herald* published a list of some of the shareholders in the Dublin Tramways Company. It was then found that reverend gentlemen of the Roman Catholic Church in Dublin were among the shareholders—small wonder that these militant tactics should be adopted. The Church has been surprised into showing its hand more plainly than is customary, and is thus, by openly allying itself with "Murphyism," again demonstrating the fact that religion has ever been willing to support oppression and exploitation by its appeals to the superstitions of the ignorant and uneducated.

The situation, however, is hopeful. All that has ever been asked by rebels is that there should be a fair and straight fight, and the present war in Dublin, by showing us what solidarity can achieve, is marking the beginning of a new era. For even were "Larkinism" apparently beaten by the forces of reaction, the moral will remain, the seed sown will germinate, and the day be materially hastened when all Ireland will be free from the curse of exploitation.

The capitalist papers have published diplomatic articles upon the situation. In face of Sir George Askwith's findings, it has been impolitic to throw the blame entirely upon Larkin and other rebels. A few passages culled from the *Westminster Gazette* of October 8 are of some interest:—

"They [the employers] point out to us, what is admitted by responsible Trade Unionists in England, that no industry could be conducted on the principles of Larkinism, that the position is intolerable, if the 'tainted goods' theory is to be admitted and the sympathetic strike permitted at any moment and on any pretext in trades where the workers have no quarrels with their own employers. It is all quite true, and it is all enforced in the report of Sir George Askwith's Commission. When the settlement comes it will have to bar the sympathetic strike, and, if nothing else were at issue, we do not think that this alone would prevent a settlement. . . . Whatever the employers do, the Transport Union will continue to exist in Dublin, but the weight of opinion, and especially of the best Trade Union opinion, can be brought to bear on it to abandon the sympathetic strike, if the masters will abandon an attitude which is a challenge to all Trade Unionists."

The "responsible Trade Unionists in England" are presumably of the Philip Snowden and Ramsay MacDonald type, whose articles in the capitalist press should give Trade Unionists furiously to think. The outstanding fact is, of course, that the sympathetic strike means the introduction of science into industrial warfare; and its danger to capitalism is therefore well recognised by the enemy. We like the term "best Trade Union opinion," and must thank the above-mentioned Labour leaders for so opportunely hastening to assure the employers of their disapproval of these tactics. Meanwhile we are heartened by the statement in the *Westminster Gazette* that "strikes and lock-outs, the origin of which it soon becomes impossible to trace, spread on the same principle through all the trades, and men and women who till then had been thought the most patient and least capable of organised joint action suddenly develop and begin to act upon the extremest doctrines of the advanced school of Labour." Direct action scientifically applied will thus prove the salvation of the workers, despite the treachery of officials and the jeremiads of Labour M.P.s.

We congratulate the *Suffragette* on the publicity it has given to the subject of venereal disease, although we disagree with the statement that votes for women will effect a remedy. Our Suffragette sisters should know that a political revolution alone would prove powerless to check the evil they attack so vigorously. Prostitution is responsible for the spread of venereal disease, and prostitution in turn has its origin in the economic enslavement of women. It therefore follows that an economic revolution, and not one of a purely political character, will be necessary to destroy the canker. It is useless to argue that the vote will prove an important factor in effecting this destruction, for the cause is economic, not political. The root cause will only be destroyed when private property is abolished, for prostitution is always found side by side with monogamy. In Engels's "Origin of the Family," he shows how monogamy appears as "the first form of the family, not founded on natural, but on economic conditions—viz., the victory of private property over primitive and natural Collectivism."

Only when an industrial revolution shall have destroyed all forms of exploitation will the economic emancipation of women be possible. Then, and then only, will prostitution cease to exist and venereal disease die out. We hope that continued publicity will be given to the facts relating to the human and social organisms, for knowledge will prove the most powerful weapon with which to break down the old traditional barriers to progress.

The European financiers are likely to reap a rich harvest from the Balkan War, for we learn that not only the States which have directly suffered from warfare, but those countries which, owing to hostilities, were forced to take costly precautions, are about to apply to France for a loan, the sums required running into over £100,000,000. Now, we suppose, these backward Balkan States are to be treated to all the joys of industrial development, and the worker pay the usual price in order to repay the cosmopolitan vultures. When each war brings the same aftermath, it does seem of some importance that the causes underlying the outbreak of hostilities should be rightly understood by those called upon to pay with their lives and labour. The women of all countries must realise they have a historic mission to fulfil, and refuse to provide food for the Juggernaut car of capitalism; or, bearing children, train them to combat that type of patriotism which calls on the disinherited worker to defend a country for the benefit of financiers.

The members of the Women's Co-operative Guild seem possessed of that clarity of vision which we commend to the notice of Labour statesmen and others. They have recently issued a circular strongly opposing compulsory attendance at evening schools. They give as a reason that it makes an excessive demand on the energies of growing boys and girls. The women realise that our present educational system is entirely in the interests of the employing class. We cannot refrain from comparing their attitude towards education with that of some Trade Union leaders, who have consistently supported the retention of the half-timer in the mill and factory, in opposition to those who saw in this same half-timer the greatest enemy of the adult worker. We heartily wish the working women Co-operators good luck in their campaign.

When a capitalist paper describes a Labour dispute settlement as "satisfactory," we are not left in ignorance as to the side which has scored the victory. This announcement was made concerning the recent sympathetic railway strike in Liverpool, Peacemaker J. T. Williams being the hero of the hour. It is now a well-known fact that the workers in this and other towns concerned were deliberately hoodwinked and coerced by their officials. That these gentry are increasingly useful to employers appears to be borne out by the following paragraph in the same paper (the *Liverpool Echo*):—

"The meeting of the president and secretary of the National Union of Railwaymen with the general managers of several of the companies is considered a very notable event by those who watch Labour troubles, for it is held to constitute 'recognition.' . . . In 1911 the strike was ended by two of the managers consenting, at the urgent request of the Government, to meet the representatives of the men."

The reason for this tardy recognition is not far to seek. When officials are found to be such useful sheepdogs, surely it would be a suicidal policy to deny recognition to any Union. The whole history of Trade Unionism teems with examples of this character. The rebels in any movement are its brain and muscle, fettered by compromise between the Union officials and the employers.

M. B. HOPE.

South African Labour Movement.

Our comrade H. Glasse, of Port Elizabeth, sends the following notes:—"The movement in Johannesburg is following the evolution I expected; the more revolutionary party, formerly represented by the Johannesburg *Voice of Labour*, which was edited by A. Crawford, who has recently gone to gaol for sedition, and aided by Mrs. Mary Fitzgerald, proprietress of the Modern Press—this party has now formally declared for Syndicalism in contradistinction to the Parliamentary party led by Cresswell and Andrews, both able men, but, like the rest of their kind, setting more value upon forms and methods of organisation than upon the end to be obtained. A prominent official in our local Labour branch actually told me a short time ago that it was not advisable to tell people too much about the goal of Socialism, but rather to get people on the road thereto. I replied that I considered that our policy was to preach and teach the fundamental principles of Socialism, and that when people were sufficiently accustomed to our ideas, and had become convinced of their justice and of the necessity of carrying them into practice, they would then of a certainty find the road for themselves. But this, of course, is not a method that commends itself to candidates for Parliamentary and other honours."

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

- Anti-militarism from the Workers' Point of View.* By Dora B. Montefiore. London: Workers' Antimilitarist Committee, 9 Mauette Street, W.C.
- Woman: From Judaism to Islam.* By Kwaja Kamal-ud-din. London: J. S. Phillips, 99 Shoe Lane, E.C.
- A Handbook on the Conduct of Public and other Meetings.* By Walter W. Mattingly. 6d. net. London: Grant Richards.
- Cuestiones de Enseñanza.* Por Ricardo Mella. 25c. Madrid: Accion Libertaria, Florida, 14, bajo.
- Young Delinquents: A Study of Reformatory and Industrial Schools.* By Mary G. Barnett. 3s. 6d. net. London: Methuen and Co.
- Dogs Discarded.* By Guy A. Aldred. 1d. London: Bukunin Press, 17 Richmond Gardens, Shepherd's Bush, W.
- The Small Family System: Is it Injurious or Immoral?* By C. V. Drysdale, D.Sc. (Lond.) 1s. net. London: A. C. Fifield.

BOOK NOTES.

The Science of Society. By Stephen Pearl Andrews. 5s. net. London: C. W. Daniel.

This book may be correctly called an Anarchist classic, and, although out of print for many years past, is, in its new edition, both as to workmanship and contents, an attractive addition to the bookshelves of any who appreciate exact thinking. The author, Stephen Pearl Andrews, was the accredited apostle of Josiah Warren, of Cincinnati, U.S.A., one of the first to proclaim, even prior to Proudhon, that the necessary prerequisite to harmony in society is the recognition of the principle of individuality, and the sovereignty of the individual over all laws and institutions whatsoever, which is, of course, the principle of Anarchism itself. Etymologically, Warren and Andrews were not Anarchists, since they maintain that in the system of the sovereignty of the individual is to be found the "true constitution of government," but, after all, this is merely a verbal distinction, as may be seen by a consideration of the author's argument. Most of those who have any experience of the movement of Anarchism can doubtless call to mind cases of persons who are Anarchists especially etymologically, but philosophically only faintly so; therefore, it is a pleasant surprise to find an author who is especially philosophically Anarchistic if not exactly etymologically so.

The book is divided into two parts, the first of which discusses the subject of individuality, and traces the historical progress of that principle through its developments in the movements of Protestantism, Democracy, and Socialism, showing that the underlying character of each of these movements has been "the assertion of the supremacy of the individual—a dogma essentially contumacious, revolutionary, and antagonistic to the basic principles of all the older institutions of society, which make the individual subordinate and subject to the Church, the State, and to society respectively."

The second part deals with the author's interpretation of the views of Warren upon economics; discussing such subjects as "Cost, the only Equitable Limit of Price," "The Adaptation of Supply to Demand," and an equitable currency, or circulating medium, which is neither subject to the fluctuations of our existing monopolistic specie basis, nor characterised by the eternal exactions of usury.

Altogether it may be said that the book is calculated to be effective in the good task of making Anarchists out of those who may not so readily be appealed to by the sensational methods more generally in use.

W. J. R.

WORKERS' FREEDOM GROUPS IN SOUTH WALES.

On Thursday, October 16, the Ammanford Group of Anarchist Communists opened their new building and club, which will be known as "The Communist Club." It is a beautiful building, both inside and outside. Tea, coffee, and dainty refreshments were plentifully supplied to a large gathering of rebels from the surrounding villages, and the lady friends joined in making both the refreshment and musical parts of the entertainment a great success. In the evening, songs, recitations, and addresses were thoroughly enjoyed by about 120 people. A discussion, took place, and was both educative and interesting. Comrade George Davison, who has liberally co-operated with the comrades at Ammanford, made some pointed and telling remarks as to the need for militancy and anti-officialism in the organisation and programme of the Workers' Freedom Groups and the Communist Club. The discussion was animated, and many questions were put and replied to by the various speakers. The general distrust of "leadership" now met with amongst the workers was specially commented on.

The workers are beginning to realise that any movement or action which has as its object the trusting to intermediaries and representatives, and the application of palliatives, falls short of being a "workers' movement." Right throughout the industrial centres of Great Britain, and particularly amongst the miners, this spirit of revolt and dissatisfaction with "leadership" in all its forms is rampant. Leadership always curtails the liberty and freedom of the many (the productive class), and brings high salaries and other privileges to the few (leaders). It creates a class whose interests can only be gained at the expense of those who are led. This fact is clearly seen in the industrial strikes which have taken place in the last few years. This spirit of revolt may perhaps be helped by organisation. The constitution and programme of the Workers' Freedom Groups have been shaped upon the model of future society at which they aim, namely, Anarchist Communism. Rooms are provided and set apart for library, study circles, and discussion circles. No chairman, secretary, treasurer, nor any other official can play any part in such an organisation, and it is the intention to extend these groups, either as Anarchist, Anarchist Communist, or Workers' Freedom Groups, and each individual to be allowed to express himself or herself to the fullest. We hope to see, in the near future, similar institutions in some of the other mining villages around Ammanford, as well as in other parts of the country, which will link up and co-operate with the Anarchist groups already existing.

Most of those present felt very stimulated by the fact that Ammanford had found at last a centre where a rebel could breathe, think, and act without fear of being turned out by landlordism and other "isms." Jack Griffiths and D. R. Owen also took part in the discussion, as well as many other comrades, and the general impression was that a very interesting evening had been spent.

The comrades are starting classes, study circles, and discussions at the club, which will continue throughout the winter; and they invite all who are interested in Anarchist principles to co-operate with them. They will also welcome any comrade who happens to be in the district who will turn in and spend an evening with them. The flag must be kept flying. Freedom and Liberty will be our war-cry, and the Communist Club will be the means of extending far and wide the spirit of revolt against officialism, leadership, and all their obnoxious consequences. We hail the day with glee. J. G.

PROPAGANDA NOTES.

GLASGOW.—Since our comrade Barrett left Glasgow, propagandist activities had somewhat diminished; but now we have comrade W. Ponder with us, things have livened up greatly. We are now continuing our group meetings at 74 Buchanan Street, and they are being very well attended. Outdoor meetings will be held every Sunday afternoon on the Jail Square at three o'clock. We are also holding meetings at Dalhousie Street on Fridays, and indoor discussions on Wednesdays. Up till now comrade Ponder has had to tackle the Dalhousie Street meetings himself. Of course, there is not much need to mention our ubiquitous comrade Black, who attends all meetings with the literature. On Sunday afternoons Ponder has had the assistance of comrade A. Mackay, senr., and Max Seltzer. There have been good crowds at all the meetings, and at the last two Jail Square meetings we collected 6s. 3d. and 8s. 7d. for the Dublin Strike Fund. The first of a series of indoor Sunday evening lectures took place at Buchanan Street on October 19, when Ponder gave a very interesting lecture on "The Materialistic Conception of History." There was not a vacant seat, and the discussion which followed augurs well for the success of this series during the winter. Comrade John Nicholson will speak on October 26.

Lively discussions have taken place in Glasgow of late regarding the position of Anarchists and Trade Unionism, and as a consequence a debate took place on Tuesday evening, October 22, in the Union Halls, West Nile Street, between W. Ponder and G. A. Aldred, the subject being "Should Anarchists Support Trade Unionism?" the former taking the affirmative, the latter the negative. The debate proved very interesting, and was thoroughly enjoyed by the large audience present. Ponder, in opening, contended that it was possible to work in the Unions, so as to bring about the thorough organisation of the workers. He showed that Trade Unions were the result of a conflict of economic interests, and that they largely determined the standard of living of the workers; that the formation of new Unions antagonistic to existing ones would create a division in the ranks of the workers. Aldred, in reply, said that Trade Unionism was reactionary, and that it tended to palliate the present system; and further, he stated that we were compromising with the capitalist by accepting better conditions, and that he desired the workers to abolish the wage system, not reform it. Ponder then asserted that to develop solidarity and strength among the workers it was necessary to struggle with capitalists for better conditions, for the purpose of developing unity of action and defending present conditions from aggression. He also stated that ideas were changing among Trade Unionists, and direct action was becoming their watchword. Aldred, in reply, said that if Trade Unions took militant action, they ceased to be Trade Unions. In some instances, he said, workers organised in Trade Unions blacklegged upon one another, and Trade Unionism made blacklegging essential by organising them in crafts. When question time arrived, Aldred was bombarded with questions from Trade Unionists, which, I think, indicates the feeling of the meeting.

The sale of FREEDOM has been increased this month by five quires, which speaks well for Ponder's first three weeks in Glasgow. We hope to still further increase our order for November, and also hope to see the "Voice of Labour Bulletin" issued, as we think it will stimulate propaganda.

A. MACKAY, Junr.

Huddersfield.—One or two comrades have been active throughout the summer. From the beginning of March to the middle of October, meetings have been held on the Market Cross every Sunday evening, with one exception. We do not claim to have made a lot of converts, but it is plain to observe that a different attitude is taken towards Anarchist views by a large number of people than that which prevailed two years ago, when we first broke the ice. We have made Anarchism talked about, and we are satisfied that when social affairs are being discussed by a group of individuals in public, it is seldom some one does not chip in with an idea derived from the Anarchist philosophy. Which is all to the good. Indeed, we could produce testimonials from the most respectable quarters. We have done well in the sale of books, and moderately in pamphlets and FREEDOM. About four dozen "Conquest of Bread" that we sold have often been the subject of appreciative remarks by the purchasers. On Sunday, October 12, a parson of the Congregational faith took up the gauntlet, and a dense crowd listened to a keen debate, with evident approval of the Anarchist version. The week before that we had a wordy encounter with G. F. Jones, whom the B.S.P. billed as "the King of Socialist Orators." And thus do we habitually break the monotony of workaday life. G. H. G.

Cowdenbeath.—We held our first Francisco Ferrer commemoration on Saturday, October 11. All the comrades did not turn up, owing to the short notice. Nevertheless, we had an interesting meeting, which has left us with good prospects for the cause in future. We have had discussions on many subjects. We held a Chicago Martyrs' commemoration on Sunday, November 9, in Parker's Hall, North Road, Cowdenbeath, at 2 o'clock. Comrades Armstrong and Sodorom will speak on the judicial murder of our Chicago comrades. All friends and sympathisers are cordially invited. L. STORIONE.

Liverpool Communist Club.—We had a great time here on Sunday, October 12, when we held a reunion to mark the opening of a new session of the Sunday School and also to commemorate the brutal murder of our comrade and friend Francisco Ferrer. About sixty people assembled, nearly half of them being youngsters of the school; and in the limited space afforded by our little room you can imagine how busy a scene it was. It was a treat to feel the atmosphere of comradeship and mutual aid which pervaded the place. The grown-ups found plenty of work to do in serving the kiddies with tea. When all had had their fill, we had a short speech by our comrade Matt Roche on the Modern School. His criticisms of priest- and politician-ridden systems of society, and particularly their effect upon the minds of the children, were greatly appreciated. We had plenty of music furnished by comrades. The evening closed with a distribution of fruit to the kiddies, and the comrades were all delighted to have realised for a little while their ideal—happiness.

The following Sunday evening we started the first of a series of discussions round the subject of Trade Unionism, at which we hope to bring along a lot of the rebellious spirits amongst railway men, dockers, etc., and everything points towards an interesting winter propaganda.

The School is in urgent need of a piano. We are at present seeking ways and means of acquiring one, and will welcome assistance from comrades interested in the School work. We wish our meetings to be as bright as possible. By so doing we can make the children happy, and help them to take their part in the fight for freedom. H. SMITH.

FERRER SUNDAY SCHOOL (East London).—On October 12 the youngsters commemorated Ferrer's glorious death. Tarrida del Marmol gave them a short address on the incidents that occurred prior to Ferrer's returning to Spain on the eve of his arrest. The sad leave-taking of Ferrer and his friends was vividly described by our comrade. He followed with a review of Spanish prison life from his own experience, and also stated the principles to which Ferrer adhered.

Letters of greeting were read from Mat Roche, of the Liverpool Ferrer School, and also from comrade Portet, of the Modern School, Barcelona. The latter stated that "Ferrer's conception of the Modern School was to try to form free and happy men; therefore, it was against religion, Governments, and capitalism, as they are the principal causes of the present misery, oppression, and suffering of the human race." We were also pleased to hear that on the anniversary day a first-class Modern Day School had been started in Milan, Italy. Soon we shall have them in all countries, and hope their existence will prove that Ferrer had not lived in vain. Jack Tanner referred to his tramp abroad, and told the kiddies about that wonderful little country, Andorra, which lies between France and Spain. The youngsters were highly interested in this country, where it approaches the Communist conception.

On October 17 our comrade Griff Maddocks, a South Wales miner, spoke on the cause and cure of explosions in collieries, and showed that most of them are preventable; but profits stand in the way. To hear a miner speaking of the dangers of his occupation greatly interested the children.

We intend having a concert about Christmastime, and the dancing lads and lassies are preparing themselves. We need finance to get things shipshape. Donations can be sent to
JIMMY DICK.
146 Stepney Green, E.

HACKNEY.—Progress is rather slow in regard to the proposed establishment of group premises. In spite of the appeal in *FREEDOM*, the only donation received is from A. J. R. (Upton Park), 5s. However, we are determined to carry the scheme through, even if we have to do it entirely on our own contributions. In spite of bad weather, we are still running our five open-air meetings per week, and we always get a large and attentive audience. For the benefit of those comrades who would like to attend some of our meetings, I append a list:—

Sunday morning, 12 o'clock, Victoria Park (Bandstand).
Sunday evening, 8 o'clock, King Edward Road, Mare Street, Hackney.
Monday evening, 8.30, Queen's Road, Dalston.
Wednesday evening, 8.30, Reading Lane, Mare Street, Hackney.
Friday evening, 8.30, Morning Lane, Mare Street, Hackney.
A group meeting is held every Thursday, at 8 o'clock, at address as under. All comrades are welcome.
C. PALMER.
5 Belmont Mansions, Goldsmith Row.

NORTH LONDON.—Although it is a long time since we gave a report of our group's open-air propaganda, we have not relaxed our efforts in spreading our principles. Thanks are due to our comrades Kavanagh, Ponder, and James, and also to the latest addition to our ranks, the two Kings, for their support at our meetings. We are now beginning to see the result, as we have retaken a part of Barnsbury Hall, where we intend to hold our group meetings for the purpose of discussing with more studious effort the ways and means of hastening on the Revolution. Open-air meetings:—
Sunday, 3.30, Finsbury Park. Monday, 8, Barnsbury Hall, group meeting.
Thursday, 8 p.m., Garnault Place. J. WALSH.

EAST LONDON.—A highly successful meeting was held at the corner of Philpot Street, Commercial Road, on Saturday, October 18. The speakers were our comrades J. T. Bilmen, who opened the meeting, M. Shugar, and another Yiddish speaker. Comrade Shugar dealt principally with the ritual murder case in Russia, in which Mendel Beilis is accused of murdering a boy to obtain his blood for Jewish religious rites. The audience listened for hours, the speaker being applauded for the manner in which he exposed the criminality of the Russian Government.
J. T. B.

Dublin Strikers' Fund.

We have received the following sums on behalf of the Dublin strikers and their families, and will be pleased to receive and forward any further sums sent to us:—Already acknowledged, 3s. 6d., List No. 1, £1 5s.; List No. 2, 14s., Mac 2s., A. M. 5s., F. S. 1s. Per L. Storione—D. Callaghan 1s., J. Callaghan 1s., W. Walker 1s., H. Paterson 6d., W. Blair 1s., A. Davison 1s., A Sympathiser 6d.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

(October 2—October 30.)

FREEDOM Guarantee Fund.—S. Corio 1s 6d, N. £1, G. D. £5, W. Ms. 1s; R. Avis 5s, H. Glasse 5s.
FREEDOM Subscriptions.—J. Gambera 1s 8d, H. Block (4 subs.) 6s, "Brihwiba" 1s 6d, C. Cescinsky 3s, E. Griffiths 1s 6d, H. Y. R. 1s 6d, E. P. T. 1s 6d, F. Cobb 2s, W. Ms. 1s 6d, W. Fanner 1s 6d, R. Avis 2s, A. Perkins 1s 6d.
Pamphlet Printing Fund.—Essex 1s 6d, R. Avis 3s, Gateshead Group (per G. W. Tindale) 5s 6d.
For a Comrade.—O. K. (Manchester) 2s 6d.

GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP.

A Chicago Martyrs Commemoration Meeting will be held at Union Halls, West Nile Street, Glasgow, on Sunday, November 9, 7 p.m. Speakers—W. Ponder, J. McAra, A. Mackay, and others.

COWDENBEATH (FIFE) GROUP.

A Chicago Martyrs Commemoration Meeting will be held on Sunday, November 9, at Parker's Hall, North Road. Commence at 2 o'clock. Comrades and sympathisers heartily invited.

BIRMINGHAM.—Group meetings will be held at the Coffee House, 7 Bull Ring, on November 9 and 23, at 6 p.m. Comrades only. Lectures will be given at 7 p.m. All are welcome.—C. MARTENS, 355 Lower High Street, West Bromwich.

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

WE WANT TO PURCHASE

"In Russian and French Prisons," by P. Kropotkin.—State price and condition to Manager, Freedom Press, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W.

PAMPHLET AND BOOK LIST.

ANARCHIST COMMUNISM: ITS BASIS AND PRINCIPLES. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
ANARCHIST MORALITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
THE WAGE SYSTEM. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.
A TALK ABOUT ANARCHIST COMMUNISM BETWEEN TWO WORKERS. By E. MALATESTA. 1d.
THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
EXPROPRIATION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
DIRECT ACTION v. LEGISLATION. By J. BLAIR SMITH. 1d.
THE SOCIAL GENERAL STRIKE. By ARNOLD ROLLER. 1d.
THE PYRAMID OF TYRANNY. By F. DOMELA NIEUWENHUIS. 1d.
LAW AND AUTHORITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
THE PLACE OF ANARCHISM IN SOCIALISTIC EVOLUTION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
THE COMMUNE OF PARIS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. 1d.
AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
WAR. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. By ELISEE RECLUS. 1d.
MONOPOLY; OR, HOW LABOUR IS ROBBED. WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
USEFUL WORK v. USELESS TOIL. By Wm. MORRIS. 1d.
THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONGRESS, 1907. 1d.
THE CONCENTRATION OF CAPITAL: A MARXIAN FALLACY. By W. TCHERKESOFF. 1d.
ANARCHISTS AND ESPERANTO. 1d.
KROPOTKIN: THE MAN AND HIS MESSAGE. By T. SWAN. 1d.
THE JAPANESE MARTYRS. With Portrait of Kotoku. 1d.
ANARCHY. By ANDRE GIRARD. 1d.
NON-GOVERNMENTAL SOCIETY. By EDWARD CARPENTER. 3d.
STATE SOCIALISM AND ANARCHISM. By Ben. R. TUCKER. 3d.
TRADE UNIONISM AND ANARCHISM. By JAY FOX. 2d.
THE CHICAGO MARTYRS. With Portraits. 1d.

MEMOIRS OF A REVOLUTIONIST. By P. KROPOTKIN. (American Edition). 8s. 6d. post-free.
THE GREAT FRENCH REVOLUTION, 1789—1793. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 6s. net.
THE CONQUEST OF BREAD. By P. KROPOTKIN. Cloth 1s. net.
MUTUAL AID. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3s. 6d. post-free.
MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM. By PETER KROPOTKIN. A New Translation. Paper 6d., Cloth 1s. 6d.; postage 1½d. and 3d.
FIELDS, FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. New and Revised Edition. Cloth, 1s. net.
GOD AND THE STATE. By MICHAEL BAKUNIN. Cloth 1s. net, paper 6d. net, postage 1d.
ANARCHISM AND OTHER ESSAYS. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 4s. 6d. net.
PRISON MEMOIRS OF AN ANARCHIST. By A. BERKMAN. 6s. 6d. net, postage 4d.
ANARCHISM. By Dr. PAUL ELTZBACHER. 6s. 6d.; postage 4d.
NEWS FROM NOWHERE. By WILLIAM MORRIS. Paper cover, 1s., cloth, 2s.; postage 2d.
A DREAM OF JOHN BALL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 2s., postage 3d.
FAMOUS SPEECHES OF THE EIGHT CHICAGO ANARCHISTS. 1s 3d, postage 2d.
WHAT IS PROPERTY? By P. J. PROUDHON. 2 vols. 2s., postage 4d.
THE EGO AND HIS OWN. By MAX STIRNER. 2s. 6d. net.
ENGLAND'S IDEAL. By EDWARD CARPENTER. 2s. 6d. and 1s., post. 3d.
A VINDICATION OF NATURAL SOCIETY. By EDMUND BURKE. 1s. and 6d., postage 2d. and 1d.
WALDEN. By H. THOREAU. 1s. and 6d., postage 2d. and 1d.
THE ORIGIN AND IDEALS OF THE MODERN SCHOOL. By FRANCISCO FERRER. Cloth 9d. net, paper 6d. net, postage 2d.
FRANCISCO FERRER: His Life, Work, and Martyrdom. 1s. net.
FREE POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS. By L. SPOONER. 1s. net.
SYNDICALISM AND THE CO-OPERATIVE COMMONWEALTH. By E. PATAUD and E. POUGET. Cloth 3s. 6d. net, paper 2s. 6d. net.
LIBERTY AND THE GREAT LIBERTARIANS. Compiled by C. T. SPRADING. 6s. 6d. net, postage 4d.
THE SCIENCE OF SOCIETY. By Stephen Pearl Andrews. 5s. net.

All orders, with cash, should be sent to
FREEDOM PRESS, 127 OSSULSTON STREET, LONDON, N.W.

"FREEDOM" MAY BE OBTAINED OF

London.—HENDERSONS, 66 Charing Cross Road, W.C. (Wholesale).
NATIONAL LABOUR PRESS, St. Bride's House, Salisbury Square, Fleet Street, E.C. (Wholesale).
W. REEVES, 83, Charing Cross Road, W.
O. MATHIAS, 20, Little Pulteney Street, W.
B. RUDERMAN, 71 Hanbury Street, Spitalfields, E.
J. J. JACQUES, 191 Old Street, City Road, E.C.
QUICKFALLS, 238 York Road, and 61 High Street, Battersea, S.W.
ISENBURG, Cleveland Street, W.
A. TOLEMAN, 54 Battersea Rise, S.W.
STEVENS, 56 High Street, Islington.
GOLUB, 10 Osborne Street, Whitechapel.
SUGARMAN, 329A Mile End Road, E.
J. YATES, 114 High Road, Will'sden Green, N.W.
H. ELLIOT, 329 Lillie Road, Fulham, S.W.
Liverpool.—E. G. SMITH, 126 Tunnel Road (Wholesale).
CHAS. J. GRANT AND SON, 8 and 9 Lord Street Arcade.
STANLEY'S, 30 Lime Street.
Birmingham.—NATIONAL LABOUR PRESS—100 John Bright Street.
Manchester.—H. SEGALS, 99A Great Ducie Street, Strangeways (Wholesale).
TOM SANDERS, 15 Peter Street.
HEWKIN, 14A Clannon Street.
72 Brook Street, Corner of Grosvenor Street.
Yeovil.—W. R. Fowler, 5 Sherborne Road.
Dublin.—J. C. Kearney, 59 Upper Stephen Street.

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