Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM

VOL. 4.—No. 44. JULY, 1890. MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

ANARCHISM V. REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISM.

*Continuation of Bruce Glasier's Letter.**

2 REGARDING the distinction between voluntary acquiescence in the will of the majority for the sake of the common weal, and agreeing to submit to a law made by the majority in the interest of the common weal I do not think the distinction is of any practical moment. People only voluntarily acquiesce in the doing of things distasteful to them because they are compelled to; because, in fact, resistance would entail more evil than submission. It is the same principle (though often misapplied) that actuates us to-day in submitting to law, as in voluntarily submitting to the general opinion of our friends or comrades. The law may be indeed bad, but so may the judgment of our friends; and we only rebel or resist if we think that is the wiser course under the circumstances.

Under a Socialist system, as I conceive it, neither majorities nor minorities will seek to impose their will arbitrarily upon others; that I am sure of, and Anarchists, if they believe their ideas can be realised, must be certain of that also. But Anarchists must admit that conflict of judgment will frequently arise the more frequently in proportion as individual habits of thought and action are encouraged. In such cases it is inevitable that one side of opinions must willingly or unwillingly submit to others, else serious wrong may result to one or both sides, or conflict involving disastrous results. Take a case: Suppose a ship is wrecking on the coast, and a lifeboat has to be put out. At the outset the men dispute as to the safest place to launch the boat. One set desire one place, and another set desire another place. Both sets firmly believe that, if their place is not chosen, not only will they be unable to save the people on the ship, but their own lives will be unnecessarily forfeited; yet if they do not agree on one or other of the places, the boat cannot go out. Now, unless there is a captain whose word is law, one set must agree to submit to the will of the others. To say such submission would be *voluntary* submission in the interests of the common weal, in distinction to compulsory submission, is simply to play with terms. No more *compulsory* submission than is implied in that *voluntary* submission would ever be exacted by a majority or a law under Socialism. And if, in such a case under a system of Anarchism, one side or the other did not submit, their Anarchism would grievously fail to meet the every-day contingencies of life.

You will probably say that there is a difference between one side being ruled by the other, as in the above instance, and a minority submitting to a *law*, even when intended for the general well-being. You may say that in the former case the free judgment of all is always in the first instance exercised, and that the continual exercise of free judgment in this way is of the highest importance, even although one set of judgments must eventually give way. That I admit; and I am sure that under a Socialist system no laws or regulations would ever be imposed that would exclude or tend to discourage free judgment.

The difference at most between a law under a Socialist System and what I have supposed would occur in the above case where there was no law, would be this: that the law might operate in cases where the minority could not every hour of the day dispute with the majority as to the wisdom or justice of the thing to be done. But while they could not dispute a law at the moment, surely it will be assumed that ample opportunity for disputing it would be afforded immediately afterwards, so that the voice of the minority might influence the majority. In cases where regulations might be beyond the immediate influence of an individual *e.g.*, in the case, say, of inter-communal or national regulations the individual, if he thought himself seriously aggrieved, might rebel, as men frequently do to-day; but, unlike to-day, the rebel would not, I am sure, be imprisoned or executed, but his rebellion, unless he was esteemed an incorrigibly indolent or knavish fellow, would be reckoned a sufficient reason to cause a revision, or perhaps abolition, of the regulation complained of. And so long as human nature is not perfect, so long as men are possessed of different and varying dispositions, and have not a perfect knowledge of each other's wishes or capacities, I do not see that a much closer approximation to absolute freedom than this implies is possible. Of course, if it is found that men will not only not shirk any social duty, but will, without imposed regulations, always be at their posts when necessary, then Socialists will not think of making any regulations. And if it is found that, without laws dealing with murder and other grave social offences, these offences can be prevented or dealt with without involving injustice either to society or the criminal, then laws also will be found unnecessary, and no laws will be enacted. Whether this will be possible or not is meanwhile a matter of speculation, not of principle. Socialists are no more anxious for laws and restrictions than Anarchists. All they say is that they do not see how society could be well maintained without laws and regulations of some kind. No body of Socialists that I know of contemplate manufacturing an enormous network of laws over the land. Many Socialists believe that, when capitalism is destroyed, it will be necessary for a time to maintain the revolution by strong, and maybe severe, regulations. But that really means that they, like the Anarchists, will require to protect themselves from their enemies. When Socialism is *actually* accomplished, the laws will certainly be few and only such as the people generally believe to be necessary in the interests of the common weal.

If the people have not the liberty to make general regulations or laws for general purposes, then I think their state of freedom will be really a state of slavery. There is, however, no identity between such rules or regulations, freely made and cheerfully obeyed, and the oppressive laws of a dominant class such as existing and historical law; and to apply the same condemnation to the one as to the other appears to me most unreasonable. People do not, even to-day, in their clubs or societies make rules or laws to oppress themselves; and when it occurs that some rule or law is found to be injurious or oppressive, it is generally disregarded, becomes inoperative, and is formally repealed. It is surely taking a very sardonic view of the human nature that will exist under Socialism to assume that when private property, class interest, and all that at present tends to make men overbearing and distrustful towards each other are swept away, that people will foolishly yoke themselves and their neighbours in useless or irksome restraints and regulations. For my part, I have no fear of law becoming oppressive when the motive to oppress no longer exists; and I fail to understand how an Anarchist, above all persons, can have such a fear.

(*To be concluded next month.*)

The second part of our comrade's letter it will be seen is a defence of Law—or rather an apology for it. By Law we mean regulations for the conduct of Society made by majorities and enforced by certain definite punishments decreed by majorities. It matters not whether the majority is a majority of a House of Commons, of a National Assembly, of a municipality or of a nation, nor whether the punishment is a fine, imprisonment, or the taking of life. It matters not whether the end is for the good of the many or the few. In principle law is a regulation or rule of conduct backed up by force, and in the necessity for such law our comrade believes.

Now we Anarchists do not deny the necessity of certain regulations. But we believe that those regulations should be made by the people concerned and should not be enforced by arbitrary punishment. For instance, every one knows the rule of the road that persons driving in the public streets are to keep on the left side. That is a rule which only concerns those who use the roads and should certainly be fixed by them alone. The infringement of such a necessary rule carries its own penalty with it and does not call for any additional punishment at the hands of the law-makers. If a man deliberately goes on the wrong side of the road he runs as much risk as anyone else from collisions and it is hardly credible that anyone in their senses would do such a foolish thing. It must be evident that nothing is gained by passing an Act of Parliament to make this regulation law, and attaching penalties to its infringement. Again, with regard to the running of trains and tramcars there must of course be regular times for the men to be at their post, but we Anarchists who look forward to the time when the workers will themselves own the railways and tram-cars think that they can best arrange those matters themselves. It will be their special business to run trains and tramcars at convenient hours for the public, and seeing that even under the present disorderly system when public convenience is a secondary matter, shareholder's profits being of the first importance the workers do their duty with punctuality and care, we cannot for one moment believe that everything would go wrong if they were free citizens. Even now there is no law to compel punctuality. Of course unpunctual men are not allowed to remain at the work, but under either State Socialism or Anarchy it would be just the same. Men unfitted for certain classes of work would be compelled by circumstances to take up a calling for which they were fitted.

An important difference between law and regulations come to by voluntary agreement by those concerned is that these voluntary regula

* For the first part of Comrade Glasier's objections to Anarchism and our reply see *Freedom* for June.

tions when observed serve the purpose for which they are designed; directly they are found unnecessary they cease to exist without having to go through any formal process of repeal. Acts of Parliament, on the other hand, are almost always a dismal failure as far as the workers are concerned. Our Socialistic legislation—consisting of one or two Factory Acts which if carried into effect would be excellent in their results—is practically useless. In order to be effective these Acts have to be enforced by the action of the workers, and where that is lacking, as in certain sweated industries in the East end of London, the Factory Acts are useless. As Lewis Lyons, an admitted authority on sweating amongst tailors, has told us, there are very many ways of dodging the inspectors, who are mighty few in number. And what a task to get an evil Act of Parliament repealed! what agitations have to be got up, what sufferings endured! In the same way if it is desired to get a useful measure passed into law the work appears endless, the opposition tremendous; and at any rate it is quite certain however useful the suggested measure might be supposed to be the effort expended upon it is quite out of proportion to the result; the same effort expended in another direction would do ten times the good.

Our comrade does not think the distinction between voluntary acquiescence in the will of the majority and submitting to a law is of any practical moment. We would remind him that the distinction between the two consists in the force behind the latter. In the former case you fall in with the wishes of the majority because the matter is perhaps of no great moment and you are ready to sink your difference of opinion. In the latter you give way because if you do not there is a fine or imprisonment to put up with. If that is not of practical moment what is? Why should resistance entail more evil than submission? Why should not a man be free to act according to the dictates of his own will. It is easy for an aristocrat to answer by saying that some men are inferior to others, but what can a Revolutionary Socialist say who believes that all men should be equal. What becomes of equality if freedom is lacking?

Glasier speaks of what is not to be under a Socialist system. We take this to mean that he would not consider that system of society a Socialist one in which such arrangements would exist. Very good, but to get to this desired state of society as quickly as we can, we must get our ideas and principles quite clear. Socialism will never be "actually accomplished" until the mass of the people know what they want and set about getting it for themselves. Socialism will be worked out by the people and will be the result of the teaching of the reformers and revolutionists of to-day. But if we do not combat the stupid trust of so many of the people in laws and law makers, if we lead them to believe that such things are possible under the ideal state of society to which we are directing them, we are in reality delaying the establishment of true Socialism, and maintaining the evil system which exists to-day. Comrade Glasier says that when Socialism is accomplished "the laws will certainly be few." We Anarchists say that Socialism will never be accomplished so long as there are any laws at all. He appears to think that Socialism can be established by force and that afterwards laws will be abolished as they may be found unnecessary. We know that it is only by abolishing these laws first of all that Socialism can be realised. Certainly we Anarchists "have no fear of the law becoming oppressive when the motive to oppress no longer exists," but we know very well that while law exists the motive to oppress will exist.

We must not forget to refer to the shipwreck story. Here is a case in which there are two sets of men both of which firmly believe that if the life-boat is not launched in the place they have chosen, their lives will be sacrificed and they will be unable to save those on board the ship. How shall we solve the difficulty. Glasier says, Give way to the captain. Yes, that is what the men would do, but why? Not so much because of his authority as because of his superior knowledge. In a free condition of society a captain would not be a bully, as is so frequently the case to-day, but a man selected from among his fellows on account of his superior knowledge to do certain necessary work in the management of the ship. They would not obey the officer, but they would follow the advice of the expert. If at such a critical juncture as our comrade speaks of the men had no faith in the captain's ability, they would certainly not risk their lives to obey him even under the present system of society.

NOTES.

Justice under a Republic.

Not content with playing into the hands of its ally, the Russian Tzar, the French Republic is trying, under the rose, to make things pleasant with the rulers of Italy, by doing a little dirty work for them. Not only has it expelled Comrade Molinari but, as we go to press, we hear that it is secretly preparing to *hand over* Comrade Galleani, who is wanted by the Italian Government for a *purely political* misdemeanour. He has already been imprisoned in Paris at the instigation of the Italian police, on the pretence that he was concerned in a dynamite "plot" which the aforesaid Italian police got up at Spezia, but as no case was made out against him, the French Government proposed merely to expel him. Now we hear that instead of conducting him to the Swiss frontier, they are quietly sending him to Italy!

Comrade Merlino's trial for inciting the French soldiers not to fire on the people on May 1, will take place early in July. Meanwhile he is at liberty, after over a month's cellular confinement.

A Pecksniffian Confabulation.

The Tzar's Government has been entertaining the Prisons' Conference; in the Empire of the Night they are so deeply interested in the scientific treatment of our erring brother, the criminal! We hear that there was much talk of model prisons and little or nothing said of the pestilential dens all over Russia where thousands of prisoners are huddled together, with scarcely room to breathe or stir; much talk of extradition treaties and none about the manner in which the Tzar treats his political opponents when he gets them into his clutches; great laudation of John Howard and other foreign reformers and no allusion to the numberless men and women who have attempted reforms in Russia and got Siberia or Schusselberg for their pains. "'I weep for you,' the Walrus said, I deeply sympathise'"—— Well, we have all read "Through the Looking Glass," and know the nature of the Walrus's sympathy for the oysters.

A Valuable Find.

Amongst the finds of the French police in their searches at the lodgings of our Russian comrades in Paris was one of a somewhat humorous character. It appears that according to the Buddist religion, a drop of holy water from the sacred Ganges placed upon the lips of the dying is supposed to be very efficacious in securing the admission of the dying person to heaven, or something of that sort. In the Siberian province of Trans Baikal there are a good many Buddists, and some years ago their supply of holy water ran out. Unfortunately for them the Ganges is a long way off beyond almost impassable mountains. However, the Grand Llama came across a Russian exile who was leaving for Europe and asked him to get a supply. This he promised to do, and after much difficulty a bottle of this mystic fluid arrived in England from India, properly blessed by the Indian priests and hermetically sealed so as not to be defiled by the unbelievers. When it reached here the comrade to whom we are indebted for this information tried to get the Russian authorities here to supply the necessary papers to get it passed through to Siberia. But of course the Czar's agent saw treason and dynamite everywhere and refused in the most decided manner to lend his aid in the matter. Then our comrade went through to Paris, safely passing the agents of Douane and Octroi, although we understand the barbarians smiled loudly at being told the contents of the bottle. At Paris it was handed over to a Russian comrade who thought he could get a Buddist friend to have it passed on to Siberia all right. Alas, fortune refused to smile any longer upon the Buddists of Trans Baikal. The police came down and captured all sorts of things including quinine, glycerine, antepyrin and last but not least the holy bottle. "Nitro-Glycerine, of course," said the intelligent chief of French bobbies, and away the bottle was carried, with the greatest care lest it should explode on the way. At last the seal was broken, the sacrilegious hands of the *chef de laboratoire* poured out some of the sacred fluid and analysed it. It was water which was evidently not fresh.

Shameful News from Chicago.

Broderick, an engineer who was imprisoned for attempting to form a plot to blow up the railway from Chicago to Burlington, has been pardoned. He was in prison with our comrades Neebe and Fielden and gives the saddest account of their lives. They are treated abominably. "If a prisoner shows firmness and courage," says Broderick, "he is sure to suffer for it. I saw much in that prison, but nothing to equal the case of the two Anarchists. Fielden, who is an Englishman, is immovable and meets his fate with unflinching fortitude. This is enough to draw upon him the hate of the jailers and make them punish him on the slightest pretext. I have seen him chained for long hours against a wall, whilst the warders struck and insulted him. And with Neebe it is no better. They are not looked upon as the same as the other prisoners and they are hated for their superiority." (*Révolte*, June 14, 1890.)

Fielden was sentenced for life, Neebe for fifteen years. How long are the workers of the world going to submit without a protest to this shameful treatment of men who are suffering for the cause of labour, for the cause of human freedom?

An Anglo-Russian Newspaper.

The "Friends of Russian Freedom" are issuing a monthly journal called "Free Russia." * Its objects is to make known the truth about the doings of the Russian Government, and the efforts of the revolutionary and liberal parties to free their country. Our hearty good wishes to the paper and to the cause it supports.

"Free Russia" is printed at the New-Fellowship Press, an association of workers who, while belonging to the Compositors' Union, and conforming to its trade regulations, live communistically amongst themselves. This commune was founded by the late William Frey, and his widow still belongs to it. Their style of printing shows that communism is certainly compatible with first-class work.

Socialists of the Workshop and the Arm Chair.

Our comrades at the East End celebrated the opening of their new club room, at 40 Berner Street, Commercial Road, E., by giving a grand entertainment on Sunday, June 8th, to which the Freedom Group were kindly invited. William Morris took the chair, and after tea speeches were made in various languages by the most prominent workers in the social cause who were present. Kropotkine, Stepniak, and Tchaikovsky spoke in Russian, Kropotkine having to repeat his speech in English for the benefit of the home socialists. Morris and Turner spoke for the English workers, Feigenbaum and Gilles for the

* Reeves. Price One Penny.

Germans; Yanovsky, Kahan, and others held forth in Yiddish. Then followed a concert, in which the most striking feature was some Russian folk-songs, sung by all the Russians present. The affair concluded with a ball. We can only hope that the new room will be the scene of many pleasant reunions in the future, and the nucleus of much good propaganda.

On the following Monday evening, June 9th, our friends the Fabians also gave a party in the Banquetting Hall, St James' Restaurant, to which one or two Anarchists were admitted. It was beautifully respectable. Most of the men wore white ties, and many of the women had long trains. The entertainment consisted of drawing-room songs, recitations, and polite conversation. One almost expected it to wind up with "God Save the Queen;" but no, Miss Morris played the "Marseillaise," and the company hurriedly dispersed. We may confidently announce that the Fabian blow will not be struck this year.

SOCIETY ON THE MORROW OF THE REVOLUTION.

Translated from the French of JEHAN LE VAGRE.

VI.—THE EDUCATIONAL PERIOD (*Continued*).

In all probability, when the commodities are taken possession of, all those which are not required for immediate use will be gathered together in warehouses, something like bazaars, and a special class of workers will be established to look after the goods and prevent them from spoiling. These bazaars, which will be available to supply the wants of all, being in communication with each other, will know exactly what varieties of commodities are in demand and will exchange what they have as may be necessary. The producers when coming to give in their products, by the mere fact of this understanding amongst the warehouses, and without any administrative pressure whatsoever, will be able to ascertain the necessities of consumption, the under-production of this article, the over-production of that, and instead of our seeing as to-day, associations of speculators springing up spontaneously to exploit an invention, a mine, or a discovery, we shall then see producing groups arise spontaneously to produce the articles required for consumption.

Since nothing will be compulsory every effort will tend towards progress, every individual will do only what he thinks best, and as the individual well-being will result from the collective well-being, there will be no reason for individuals to go against the general interest. Besides we know that bad will exists only where there is authority; for it is in our natures to dislike being commanded. In fact, if those of our comrades who still believe that some sort of authority will be necessary to keep matters right in the future society, were to think the matter out fully, they would see that although they desire an authority it is with the reservation that they may be free to dismiss it whenever it might seek to compel them to do something they had an objection to doing. If these comrades would only reflect a little more they would see that an authority under these conditions would have no reason for its existence; they would need it then only for those or rather against those who are not of their opinion. But what a peculiar idea of liberty is this! It is true that certain Collectivists have pretended that the more man developes the more he becomes the slave of society and by means of science they seek to prove that the autonomy of the individual is an impossibility. This is an error which we shall refute later on; we will therefore not deal with it at greater length here. To those who tell us that there must be rules and regulations that we cannot make everybody contented (which would be true if we tried to make everybody see and think alike), that in a word the majority ought to make the law, we have only one thing to say: What is the criterion which will enable us to recognise when the majority is in the right and when in the wrong? Where does the power of the majority commence and where does it end?

If the majority is right we have only to bow very humbly before the exploiting classes, since the majority is of their opinion and we are only in a minority. In reply to that it may be said: Yes, but in an improved society where the worker will have the whole produce of his work, where he will have all sorts of liberty a society where education will be free to all, etc., etc., it will be quite easy for the workers to freely choose their representatives and to be guided by the best ideas. But if we look at humanity from the commencement of history we see that every time an idea has gained a majority and thus conquered its place in society, it has had behind it a still greater truth which was pushing it on, and when this idea had come into power it became old and oppressive in its turn, until through the evolution of ideas a new revolution took place which destroyed it in its turn and took its place. Well, we Anarchists think that it is necessary to break this vicious circle. The earth is big enough to nourish us all and to allow us plenty of room for evolution. There is room for all in the sunlight without our seeking to cut one another's throats. If we wish that evolution may take place peaceably in the direction of progress we shall have to break down that which hinders its forward march, without paying any regard to what is called the majority. Every truth is proclaimed by a minority when it first appears.

The objection has been raised that in leaving individuals free to organise themselves as they please, we shall see taking place between groups the competition which to-day takes place between individuals. This is a mistake, for in the society we look forward to money will be abolished, consequently there will be no more exchange of products but exchange of services. Moreover, in order that a revolution such as we desire may be effected we must admit that a certain evolution of ideas will take place in the minds of the masses, or at least of a strong minority. But if the workers are intelligent enough to destroy the exploitation of the present system it may be granted that they will not do so to re-establish it in their midst, especially when the satisfaction of their wants will be assured.

As may be seen the Revolution itself will supply to a very considerable extent the educational period desired by certain belated Socialists. The comrades who talk to us in this way may do so in good faith, but for our part we see no reason in these objections. We have an idea which we believe to be good and we seek to make it known round about us and to make it comprehensible to those whom we seek to carry with us to the Revolution. Perhaps when the Revolution takes place our ideas will not be sufficiently advanced to rally around us the masses who take part in the struggle, but at least by our propaganda we shall have endeavoured to spread them and if on the morrow of the Revolution we are compelled to submit to a transitional period, it will be bad enough to have to submit to it without having made ourselves its advocates. Besides which, that sort of fervour and exaltation which lays hold of individuals in revolutionary times is not sufficiently taken into account. At such moments ideas germinate and develope rapidly. Men are urged forward to a certain abnegation of themselves. This has never been missing in the revolutions of the past, but on the other hand it has been the chiefs of the movement whom we have seen stifle large and generous ideas.

FROM BEYOND THE SEA.

NORWAY.

Arne Dybest of Trondjhem writes:—Since my last communication to *Freedom*, the movement in Norway has taken a new and fertile direction. Since April our paper *Fedraheimen* has printed several pamphlets, and in this way we have succeeded in getting an Anarchist-Communist library containing eight books. The first one issued was 'Ein Anarkist um Anarkie,' by Elysée Reclus. The next was 'Olav Husmann og Per Snikkar'; No. 3 is 'Kann politiken hjelpe uss?' ('Can the politicians help us?') by R. Steinsvik, the editor of *Fedraheimen*. It is one of the best things in our literature; he shows us in a striking manner the uselessness of reforms, laws and representative government. No. 4 is 'Til de Unge' ('An Appeal to the Young,') by Prince Kropotkine, translated by myself. We have also 'Law and Authority,' by Kropotkine; and 'Society on the Morrow of the Revolution.' The two last pamphlets are 'Til Kvinna' ('To the Woman') and 'Treng ni vere matlaus?' ('Can we do without eating?') by Kropotkine, translated from *La Revolte*. With this *Fedraheimen* will cease to appear for three months. In autumn it will be published from Kristiania, the capital of Norway. In the summer months the editors, R. Steinsvik and Tvar Mortenson, intend to make an agitation journey over the whole country, doing propaganda for Anarchism and selling pamphlets. Since the new year I have written several articles for capitalist papers about Anarchism and Anarchists and have also published a biography of Kropotkine in the only Norwegian Review *Samtiden* (the contemporary review). We are now in communication with the Scandinavian Anarchists in London and they have already done much to support the propaganda in Norway. We hope that comrades all over the world who are better pecuniarily situated than we are will remember us. Our ideas are spreading from country to country. Soon they will be understood over all the world. We are waiting for the great revolution. May it soon come.

THE FRANCO-RUSSIAN ALLIANCE.

Our readers are well aware, from the reports of the daily papers, that the French Republic has been playing into the hands of the despot of Russia, and arresting, on pretence of a dynamite conspiracy, any Russian students in Paris who were indicated from the Embassy as "suspicious," *i.e.*, Socialistic or revolutionary; and of course every Russian student worth his salt is the foe of the Tzar. Athelin, the official entrusted with the investigation, failed to find any sort of evidence of a conspiracy amongst the letters and papers seized, and has informed the prisoners so, but we have not heard that they have been discharged. Demski and Mendelsohn are said to be released provisionally. There is no doubt that no conspiracy whatever existed; the whole affair has been got up by the Russian Government as a sort of excuse for its conduct to political prisoners, and it has made the French Republic its catspaw; just as it did when Kropotkine was sent to Clairvaux at the instigation of the Russian ambassador, and when Goldenburg was very nearly handed over to the Tzar's blood hounds. Rulers, whether they are called autocrats or the servants of the people, have a sneaking sympathy all the world over and play into each other's hands.

A comrade, who has just returned from Paris, tells us that the lodgings of the Russian exiles and students there have been surrounded with swarms of spies, French and Russian. You might almost imagine yourself in Petersburg, they were so plentiful, and, as in Petersburg, the doorporters were in League with the informers. The French police and officials are working hand in glove with the Russian Embassy, and even when Russian spies break French laws by disguising themselves as Frenchmen or personating some one else there is no redress to be obtained from French justice. "The spy came direct from the Russian Embassy and any remonstrance from us would endanger the Franco-Russian alliance," was the answer received by one who complained! If the French Government be induced to expel the Russian students, the Tzar will have had his revenge, for their career as students will be ruined. If the Republic can be cajoled into handing over the letters seized in

their lodgings, their families and friends at home will thereby be handed over to the tender mercies of the tyrant; and no vengeance is too mean or too cruel for the Emperor of all the Russias to take against those who dare to desire the freedom of their native land.

We are glad to note that Clemenceau and a few French Liberals have protested against the dastardly time-serving policy of their Government.

"SOCIAL DEMOCRACY, ANARCHISM AND THE ANARCHISTS."

With reference to the "timely" lecture on the above subject, delivered by Herbert Burrows on Saturday evening, June 7th, of which a garbled report was published in *Justice*, we publish the following correspondence.

To Herbert Burrows.

June 14, 1890.

DEAR COMRADE, In the report in this week's *Justice* of a lecture delivered by you upon "Social Democracy, Anarchism and the Anarchists," it is stated that the Anarchists present were wholly unable to meet your arguments. I am requested by the Freedom group to tell you that we shall be happy to publish in *Freedom* for August as full a summary of your lecture as you may care to send us and that we will there deal with your arguments point by point. We propose to print this letter and your answer to it in our July issue. Awaiting an early reply, I remain

Yours fraternally,

C. M. WILSON,
(On behalf of the Freedom Group).

[Up to the date of going to press (June 24) we have received no reply from Mr. Burrows.]

To the Editor of Justice.

June 14, 1890.

SIR,—In your report in this week's *Justice*, of Herbert Burrows' lecture, "Social Democracy, Anarchism and the Anarchists," delivered at the Central Hall of the S.D.F. on June 7th, you state that the Anarchists present were "wholly unable to meet his arguments." I am requested by the Freedom Group to inform you that we have invited Herbert Burrows to publish as full a summary of his lecture as he thinks fit in *Freedom* for August, where we will reply to his arguments point by point. We shall be obliged if you will kindly insert this letter in *Justice*. It will be published in *Freedom* for July together with our letter to Herbert Burrows and his reply.

Yours faithfully,

C. M. WILSON,
(On behalf of the Freedom Group).

[The Editor of *Justice* has not thought fit to insert our letter, but has alluded to it as a "Tell Tale Straw" in a paragraph where he has ingeniously contrived to squeeze two glaring inaccuracies into five lines: he alludes to the above letter, together with the offer to print a summary of Burrows' lecture and to reply to it in *Freedom*, as coming from Mrs. Wilson personally, omitting all mention of the Freedom Group, and he represents the offer and promise aforesaid as referring to the *July* number of *Freedom*.

We have received a letter from Comrade Underwood of the S. D. F., challenging us to a debate on Communist-Anarchism. If he or any other Social Democrat will state his objections to Communist-Anarchism in *Freedom* we will gladly answer him to the best of our ability.

PROPAGANDIST LITERATURE.

A recent addition to our exchanges is *Fedraheimen*, the Norwegian Anarchist weekly, which is about the same size as *Freedom*, from which it frequently translates. Our Norwegian comrades send us in pamphlet form "Ein Anarkist un Anarkie," which is a translation of the well-known *Contemporary Review* article of Elisée Reclus, "An Anarchist on Anarchy." "Olav Husmann og Per Snikker," which we have also received is our old friend "Fra Contadini," or to give it the French title, "Entre Paysans," in its Norwegian dress. We do not doubt but that it will be as popular in Norway as it has been in Italy, France and Spain.

A Dutch translation of our pamphlet on "The Wage System," has reached us from the Hague.

Our article on "The Situation in Germany," appeared in a French dress in *La Révolte* of the 29th April.

We have received from Barcelona the first part of a report of the "Certamen Socialista," held in the Palace of Fine Arts at Barcelona, on the 11th November last year. This report is to be published in parts at 5d. each, is well printed, and will form when complete and bound a valuable addition to an Anarchist's stock of books. The part before us consists of 64 pages and is mainly devoted to a report of the proceedings, a list of the subjects for which prizes were offered, together with the groups taking part. The publication of the essays is, however, commenced in this number with the first instalment of an exceptionally well-written composition called into existence by the group "Avant" of Barcelona, who offered as a prize a magnificently framed group of the Chicago Martyrs. The subject is "Anarchism, the origin, progress, evolution, definition and present and future importance of this social principle," and the authors are Richard Mella of Seville and Sergio de Cosmo of Molfetta, Apulia, Italy.

Comrade Octave Berger of Brussels, is now publishing a useful monthly review of Anarchist Sociology in the French language, called *La Question Sociale*. The current issue contains a leading article on "Les Anarchistes Individualistes," an instalment of Malato's "Philosophie de l'Anarchie," which is appearing as a serial and other interesting articles.

The *Anarchist Labour Leaf* for June is now ready and can be supplied at 7s. per 1000 post free. Apply to H. Mackenzie, 12 Basing Place, Kingsland Road, London, N.E.

THE PROPAGANDA.

REPORTS.

FREEDOM DISCUSSION MEETINGS.—Gleicheit Club, 117 Old Street.—The third of this series was opened May 22nd by Comrade Walter Neilson, who took for his text "The Dangers and Fallacies of Democracy." His speech was severely criticised by the Social Democrats present. The fourth discussion was opened, May 29th, by Comrade T. Pearson, on "Organisation, Free and Unfree;" but the Social Democrats failed to keep to the point in the discussion, and wandered off into a debate on the Eight Hours Bill, payment of members, and the maintenance of children. C. Morton, of the S. D. F., in speaking, said that he feared more dangers to liberty were contained in Democracy than he had at first supposed. The opener replied in his usual brilliant manner. Comrade Kropotkine, who was announced to open the fifth and last discussion of the series on the 5th June, could not attend owing to illness. It was found impossible to replace him by an adequate lecturer, so that at the last moment N. Dryhurst volunteered to read a paper by C. M. Wilson on "Anarchy and Socialism." The paper was well received by the Anarchists present, as being an able sketch of the two creeds; but the Social Democrats refused to debate it, alleging that they had not been able to hear the reader's voice at their end of the room. As there seemed at first no prospect of a discussion, it was proposed that Comrade Neilson should read it again, which he did, standing upon a chair directly in front of the Democrats who had not been able to hear. A lively debate then took place, the ball being thrown by Comrade Cores, who read from *Justice* a portion of an attack upon Anarchists by Hyndman, and also charged the Democrats with being the hangers-on of a political party. This the Democrats indignantly repudiated, admitting that they did not see in the ballot box any solution of social problems. Casey, Harrigan, White, Wess, and Yanovsky took part in the discussion, which was kept up to a very late hour. A collection of 5s was made. In next month's issue an announcement will be made of the entire collections and surplus after paying expenses.

ST. PANCRAS GROUP.—The first open-air meeting, in Prince of Wales Road (close to the "Shipton"), was held on Wednesday evening, 18th June, at 8 o'clock. The speakers were T. Pearson, W. Neilson, and C. Morton. There were about 200 people present. The speaking was continued for two hours, and the audience, which was very attentive, appeared much interested. Friendly and intelligent opposition was offered by a teetotaller, to whom Neilson replied. Collection, 8½d.; *Freedom* sold.

EAST LONDON COMMUNIST-ANARCHIST GROUP.—This energetic group, the formation of which is principally due to the steady work of agitation carried on in Victoria Park and district by H. Davis for many months past, is now making an extensive propaganda of our principles in the eastern district, in conjunction with the East London Branch of the Socialist League. On June 1st. H. Davis went to Streatham where he spoke in the morning on Anarchism and in the afternoon on Carnegie's Gospel of Wealth. On June 5th, Davis spoke at Hoxton Church, criticising from an Anarchist point of view Earl Wemyss' speech in the House of Lords on Socialism. On June 7th at Union Street, Commercial Road, H. Davis and George Cores delivered Anarchist addresses. An open-air meeting was held on Sunday, June 15th, at 11.30, outside Hoxton Church (bottom of New North Road). Speakers, H. Davis and T. Pearson. Fair audience, who were attentive, but offered no opposition. On Sunday June 15, at 11.30, Davis and Pearson spoke at Hoxton Church from the Anarchist point of view. At Victoria Park, in the afternoon, Davis criticised the report of the Sweating Commission. The second number of the *Anarchist Labour Leaf* has been widely distributed in the East End.

KNIGHTS OF LIBERTY GROUP.—On May 30th and June 7th very successful and crowded meetings were held at Cooper's Hall, Commercial Road, E.

ANARCHIST LEAGUE (Individualist).—On Sunday, June 1, H. Green lectured at the Manhood Suffrage League, Berwick Street, on "Anarchism *versus* Social Democracy." We hope our comrade succeeded in convincing the members how useless manhood suffrage is likely to be to the workers. Members of the League have also held open-air meetings on Sundays in Hyde and Regents Parks and discussions in the hall of the Autonomie Club.

NORWICH FREEDOM GROUP.—On the 1st of June two very successful meetings were held. A. D. Moore and George Poynts spoke at Crostwick, a village about five miles from the town, to an attentive audience of sturdy agricultural labourers who strongly expressed their approval and purchased several copies of *Freedom*. At Horstead, in the afternoon, our two comrades, reinforced by comrades Houghton, Morley and Darley, held an animated meeting which included an interesting discussion on Anarchist principles.

DUNDEE.—At the Labour Institute, 72 Overgate, Comrade Cameron opened on Sunday June 1, an adjourned debate on the question of "Working Men Representatives for Town Council," in the course of which he explained the Anarchist position and read some extracts from Kropotkine's pamphlet on "The Place of Anarchism in the Socialist Evolution." On the following Monday Ben Tillett addressed a mass meeting of labour representatives under the auspices of the local branch of the Dockers' Union. In the course of his speech he said: "Some people said appeal to Parliament. Well I have had quite enough of Parliament. I believe it is the most unwieldy and stupid piece of machinery we are cursed with. The junior member for Dundee said to me on Friday night that Parliament was something like five locomotives at one end of a train and six at the other, and they snuffed and snorted but prevented each other from moving." We hope Mr. Tillett, as a prominent leader of the "New Trades Unionism," will stick to his words and not go back on them if he should see a chance to get into Parliament himself.

ABERDEEN.—On May 18, Comrade Gerrie delivered a lecture on Communist-Anarchism. Report not yet to hand.

NOTICES.

Freedom Discussion Meetings have been postponed until the autumn that comrades may devote all their energy to open-air propaganda during the summer. Due notice of their resumption will be given in *Freedom*.

St. Pancras Communist-Anarchist Group holds meetings on Wednesdays at 8 p.m., in Prince of Wales Road, near "Mother Shipton," and on Sundays at 11.30 a.m. in Regent's Park.

East London Communist-Anarchist Group will hold open-air meetings on Sundays at 11.30, a.m. outside Hoxton Church (bottom of New North Road) and at 3.30 p.m. in Victoria Park. Comrades are earnestly invited to roll up and support.

Anarchist League (Individualist) will hold open-air meetings in Hyde Park on Sundays at 4.30 p.m., and discussions in the Hall of the Autonomie Club, 6 Windmill Street, Tottenham Court Road, at 8.30 p.m.

Leicester. Under the auspices of the Leicester Branch S. L., Tom Pearson will lecture on Communist-Anarchism on Sunday July 6, at Russell Square, at 11 a.m., and Humberstone Gate at 8 p.m.

"Freedom" Publication Fund.—H. G., 10s.; A. M., 2s.

Printed and published for the proprietors by C. M. Wilson, at the Labour Press Limited (Co-operative Society), 57 Chancery Lane, London, W.C.