

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. 4.—No. 45.

AUGUST, 1890.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

LEEDS AND LONDON.

THE use of the strike as an offensive and defensive weapon against Capitalism has been illustrated during the past few weeks by noteworthy revolts of workers in Leeds and London. In the former city the men have gained what they desired; in the latter they have supplied the capitalist newspapers with some sensational news by which to catch the pence of the multitude, whilst they have practically lost their cause and allowed a number of the most energetic among them to lose their employment. The reason of this difference of fortune which has befallen the gas workers of Leeds and the postmen and policemen of London is not far to seek. In the Yorkshire town the men were determined and united. Following up the tactics of the Irish peasants when evicted from the tenancy of a farm, they made it quite clear to the blacklegs that it would be a very risky thing for anyone to take their jobs away from them, and, being backed up by the public opinion of the district and by the practical help of thousands of fellow-workmen, they succeeded in convincing their employers that their claims were just, compelled them to buy off the blacklegs, with whom long-term agreements had been made, and were reinstated in triumph. In London, on the other hand, the conflict was forced on by the authorities, and the men had not made up their minds that they all ought to stick together. As regards the police, a little firm action on the part of their masters cowed them into submission, and they allowed the boldest of their number to be sacrificed. Perhaps the same thing is to some extent true about the postmen, although it would appear that the chief cause of their defeat lay in placing too much trust in their officials. A comrade who spoke to a number of North London postmen at the time of the collapse of the movement, informs us that he found them very bitter against their leaders, and declaring that if they had been efficiently led they would have scored a victory. However this may be, it should be a lesson to them not to rely upon leaders, but to act for themselves in the future. If it is necessary for them to have secretaries, treasurers, and suchlike officials, let them be kept to the clerical duties to which they are appointed, and not be looked upon as the leaders of a strike movement. For the movement to have been successful, it should have been led by men coming forward spontaneously from the ranks of the postmen themselves at the critical juncture in the various offices, and acting at once, together with their fellows, without waiting for orders from an executive, without giving time to their opponent to carry out his plans for defeating them.

It is to be noted with regard to these strikes in Leeds and London that they are all expressions of discontent on the part of employes of Government. In London it was the National Government which was affected, in Leeds the Municipality. Those who advocate the nationalising of everything—Bellamyites, State Socialists, Social Democrats—can hardly be pleased with the latest developments of these first experiments in the State Management of Industry. The workers in the Post Office, at any rate, are decidedly worse off than the greater part of those employed by private capitalists. Their hours are very long, their pay is scanty, and their liberty of association is practically nil. After this it does not make the mouth of the average working man water when he is told that all industry is to be managed by the State, and that he is to become a Government servant. Mr. Sydney Webb and other Fabians and Social Democrats have told us how very socialistic we are at present—that is to say, how very many of the workers are already employes of the Government. Perhaps these gentlemen will go on another tack after these recent strikes. Of course there are Social Democrats who honestly believe in a good time coming when the State will be master of everything and everybody, and the Government will no longer be composed of place-hunters with high salaries, but will consist of men and women whose income or whose measure of enjoyment will be no higher than that of the humblest labourer in the land. But such men do not know the history of the working-class movement in this country; they do not recognise how dangerous it is even for the best of men to pass through the slime of political trickery, and they do not see that they are advocating the maintenance of a cumbrous and costly machinery for carrying on the business of human society which cannot possibly exist when the workers are free and equal. Moreover, they are delaying the Social Revolution by preaching patience to the oppressed, and are playing into the hands of the reactionaries, who would do with their Social Democracy what Constantine did with the Christian religion—take all the virtue out of it by taking it under their protection. The craze for nationalisation may become still more pronounced than it is at present. Before the Social Revolution takes place it is possible that the railways and other indus-

trial concerns in this country—perhaps even the land—may become the property of the State, but the worker will still be exploited for the benefit of the idler. His condition will be scarcely changed—perhaps made worse. He will be as much superior to the wage-slave of to-day as the Government parcels postman is to the private carrier of Messrs. Carter Patterson, and no more. Instead of having for master a private individual making a profit of, say, £5,000 a year, he will have over him a Government official, with the title of "Director of Railways," or something of that sort, who will draw a salary of about the same amount. Evidently, fellow-workers, these strikes ought to convince you that the solution of the social problem does not consist in our all becoming servants of the State.

There is another point to be considered about these strikes, and indeed about all strikes, a point which can never be too often dwelt upon—the influence of the unemployed. But for the unemployed strikes would almost always be successful. It is the army of reserve labour which is the chief strength of the capitalist, the mainstay of his existence. And this is what the mass of the workers do not realise until they think of fighting against the exploiter. Then they see clearly enough the phantom of misery rise up by the side of their enemy and protect him against their onslaught. If the postmen and policemen, and other workers who feel that they are not treated quite justly by their exploiters, would just begin to study the meaning of that grand word, Solidarity, and seek out for themselves a solution of the unemployed problem which is always threatening those who are employed, a great stride would be made towards a better condition of society. We who are Anarchists and Communists have found this out. We realise it, and we seek to emancipate humanity in solving that problem, for we know that it is the key to the future. It is natural enough, no doubt, in the time of struggle to turn upon these unemployed men and denounce them as blacklegs, scabs, rats, etc., but what have you who dispense these epithets so freely done to help these, your brothers, in their troubles? Whilst we fully recognise that the conduct of the blackleg is cowardly and indefensible, we do not hesitate to declare that the conduct of those who do not attempt to destroy the present evil system of society is at least as bad. The starving, miserable, workless wretch who thinks only of himself and eagerly rushes forward to take the bread out of the mouth of the striking workers, has quite as much justification for reproaching the worker who disregards his wants. Fellow-workers, employed and unemployed, you who should be brothers in arms fighting against your common enemy, and who would then be irresistible, we beg of you to look outside the narrow boundary of your own requirements, give your thought and attention to the solution of this great social question which means so much to you, throw in your lot with those who are seeking for liberty, equality and fraternity, and in so doing you will do your share towards realising a condition of society for yourselves and your children such as in your times of selfishness you have never dreamed of.

ANARCHISM V. REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISM.

*Conclusion of Bruce Glasier's Letter.**

3. Regarding the election or appointment of directors or administrators in a communal society, I need say little. That such will always be necessary where society and industry exist, I believe. That it is advisable, even if it were possible, that the persons required to direct social and industrial concerns could always be appointed on the moment, I fail to see. Nor can I understand how it is possible that in every case such appointments would meet with the approval of everybody. The same reasoning that applies to laws and majorities applies to this matter also. I heartily agree with you, however, in thinking that foremen and overseers such as we have to-day will be almost, if not entirely, unnecessary. The teaching of this forms part of our Socialist propaganda.

In conclusion, let me say that, so far as the practical realisation of our ideas are concerned, I can see no real difference between Anarchist-Communists and Communists or Socialists like myself and my comrades in the Socialist League. The discussion of our differences, whenever the points are closely pursued, reveals the fact that our dispute is more about what we do not mean than what we do mean. Anarchists ring the changes by applying the terms "law" and "authority," with their full historical and class oppression significance attached to them, to the

* For the first and second parts of Comrade Glasier's objections to Anarchism and our replies see *Freedom* for June and July.

every-day reasonable regulations that Socialists believe would be required in a free communal system, and Socialists retort that Anarchists would have everybody roaming about society resolved of his own sweet will to do nothing, and in perpetual dread of being compelled to do something, while in reality the conceptions of both, when divested of ambiguous words, are substantially the same.

I need not say that, in speaking of Socialism, I do not refer to any system of what is termed "State" Socialism, whether as a temporary expedient or a final social arrangement, or that in speaking of Anarchism I do not refer to the ideas of Anarchists who are not Communists, but Individualists.—Yours fraternally,
J. BRUCE GLASIER.
250, Crown Street, Glasgow.

THE concluding portion of our comrade's letter does not call for a lengthy reply. In the last portion of his first paragraph he rather contradicts what he says in the opening sentences. For our position on the matter we refer him to the next instalment of "Society on the morrow of the Revolution." We may add that we quite see it may sometimes be necessary for an arrangement to be come to whereby an individual will do work somewhat resembling certain work done by foremen and overseers to-day. For instance, to-day it may be part of the duty of a foreman of a smithy to see about the proper supply of material. That sort of work may be done by a special individual after the Revolution, as now. But that individual will not be at all like the foreman of to-day. He will be rather a kind of clerk or storekeeper. Anarchists have never proposed to play cricket without captains, or navigate vessels without officers—that is to say, experts in the management of ships. But they do propose that such necessary leaders or experts should be deprived of the power to arbitrarily punish those who are not of their opinion, and they do not see that, in the majority of cases, there is any necessity for foremen and overseers in factories and workshops.

Certainly the differences between Socialists and Anarchists are often magnified, and especially by the unscrupulous politicians of the Social Democratic school; but our friend Glasier must be convinced by what we have already said that there are very real differences between his ideas and ours. The matter was put very neatly in the course of a discussion, the other evening, at the Berners Street Club. Mowbray, of the Socialist League, said he was a Communist first and an Anarchist afterwards, because he believed economic liberty would lead to political liberty. Pearson, of the Freedom Group, said he was an Anarchist first and a Communist afterwards, because he believed that we could not have economical liberty until we had first won political liberty. That is just it. We are Communists, as Glasier is, and, like him, we advocate Communism; but we also know that to bring about the Revolution it is necessary to strike at the root of the evil, and we say Government, in its various forms and institutions, is the cause and the support of monopoly and the present evil condition of society. Therefore we attack it first and foremost, and think it of primary importance that the worker should learn that Government must be done away with before he can have Communism—before he can be free.

Our comrade says his Socialism is not State Socialism, but we do not see how he can logically take up a position in which he is neither for the State nor against it. He also confuses the relation between Anarchism and Communism by speaking of the anarchy of Individualists as opposed to that of Communists. Anarchism itself is precisely the same thing, whether it is advocated by Individualist, Collectivist, or Communist; whether its advocates seek to obtain it by revolutionary or gradual methods. The difference between these schools of thought is not in their demand for liberty, but in their views as regards the organisation of production and the sharing of produce, and the method of obtaining the common end—Anarchism.

SOCIALISM IN SCANDINAVIA.

(From a Swedish Correspondent.)

IN an examination into the spread of Socialism in Scandinavia, Denmark must be considered first. This little, but politically active, country has special claims upon our attention, in view of the battle which is being fought with very unequal weapons between the two Socialist parties at present to be found there.

In Denmark, Socialism is as little free from schisms as in other countries. There it has reached the stage at which its speakers and writers declare for Reform or for Revolutionary Socialism. The leaders of the reform section, the now notorious "Central Committee" of the Social Democratic labour party, take their stand on the authoritarian Socialism of Marx, and prove themselves believers in despotism *à la* Marx. The revolutionary party, on the contrary, seem determined to combat authority and bureaucracy, whether in old forms or new. And the less tenable the old Socialism, with its admixture of Marxist State despotism, becomes, the greater the favour shown by the younger section to autonomy and revolution.

This conflict between the advocates of Socialist reform and the revolutionary Socialists began, there is no doubt, when *Arbejderen* ("The Worker") first appeared. That journal, which is still far too small for the work it has in hand, is the organ of the revolutionary party. *Socialdemokraten*, the organ of their opponents, had become omnipotent, and the natural consequence was that it became more than ever dominating and orthodox. But *Arbejderen* appeared on the scene, and began to indulge in criticism extremely annoying to the Central Committee; and on the approach of the Parliamentary elections the hostility was fanned into a white heat. The reformers were censured for having formed an alliance with the Liberal political groups, even for the

avowed purpose of opposing the absolute Government that at present stands at the helm of State in Denmark—a Government which distinguishes itself by its numerous and unconstitutional measures, or, in other words, by its provisional laws which trample all justice under foot, and against which the Folketing, the House of Parliament elected by the people, seems powerless. In this compromise the revolutionary party felt there was something doubtful and discreditable.

In the numerous public meetings held, principally in Copenhagen, to consider "the work of the Rigsdag last session," the views unfavourable to the Central Committee took well-defined form. At last the revolutionists could no longer work with the reform party, as the Central Committee time after time outraged freedom of thought and speech, plotted against, slandered, and in due time persecuted, "the opposition," that is, the leading men in the revolutionary camp, among whom may be specially mentioned Gerson Trier and A. Petersen. Totally forgetting the high mission of Socialism, the Central Committee employed the most jesuitical means to preserve the semblance of honourableness, which every honest Socialist regarded as lost to it for ever. Its spirit can best be judged by the following words, which one of its leaders, Hørdum, let escape him at a certain public meeting:—"In heaven's name let the revolutionists make as much opposition as they please in their own groups. They have nothing to do with our meetings, and had better take care they are not chucked out some fine day." Let this sort of thing go on, and Anarchism, in its serious sense, will soon make its appearance in the capital of Denmark.

It is quite certain that the Central Committee has suffered a severe moral defeat, and its position will by no means be retrieved by the circular which, for the purpose of explanation, it issued and circulated at home and abroad.

The seven members who were expelled from the party, and who were the mouthpieces of "the opposition," have now decided to form a new organisation—"The Revolutionary Socialist Labour Party of Denmark"—which, in unity with the Socialist party abroad, will use every means to achieve the speedy emancipation of the proletariat through independent action based on principle and class-consciousness.

This conflict, which has been not about persons, but about principles, has had the good effect of infusing new life into the torpid Socialist body, whilst it has shown clearly the weakness and despicableness of that centralised power which lies in the State idea. It has, in other words, opened a breach in Marxocracy, that is, in Marxist State despotism.

The new party will probably gain ground but slowly, because its resources are scanty as yet. Relatively the older party is widely spread, and it has at its back many influential newspapers. It owns five daily papers, in Copenhagen (issue 22,000) and Aarhus, Horsens, Randers, and Aalborg (issue in all four towns, 30,000). It also reckons on eighty purely political Social Democratic associations scattered over the country, and combined in a Social-Democratic Federation, as well as on seventy trade unions in Copenhagen and several in the provincial towns. And, lastly, in the Folketing the party has three representatives, elected by over 17,000 voters.

The strength of the new party can best be gauged, perhaps, by the fact that the resolutions proposed all over the country for the expulsion of the "opposition" were supported with 2,643 votes against 391. On this number 391 depends the future of the Revolutionary Socialist Labour Party which is now forming. And about its future I, for my part, have no misgivings.

About Anarchism people in Denmark, as well as in Norway and Sweden, have very vague ideas. The three countries, I think I may safely say, have never had the chance of grasping the true import of the theory of Anarchism. That this has been the case with Sweden I can assert with confidence. The German Marxist press and other foreign journals of the same school have great influence in the North. As far as Denmark is concerned, sympathy for Anarchism has shown itself only in individuals here and there, who have never attracted much attention. So far as I know, it has found expression only in translations of several of Kropotkin's Anarchist writings, which have been published in the *Ny Iord*, a periodical for literature, science, and art, and in the *Nylaende*, which is issued by the Women's Emancipation League of Norway.

We now come to Norway. Unfortunately I have very slender knowledge of the Socialist movement there. That Socialism has taken root in Norway, and is led by talented and well-educated people, there can be no doubt. It has an organ of its own, *Socialdemokraten*, which advocates its principles; but if Socialism does not get out of the old Social-Democratic rut, it will at the most receive a hearing only among the workers in the towns, who, in Norway above all other countries, form but a small minority of the population. Both in Norway and Sweden, the fact that the rural population forms the overwhelming majority is forgotten, or at least underrated. The centre of gravity of the State in both countries lies in the peasant class, although this is much more the case in Norway than in Sweden, where large landholders and capitalists exercise much greater influence. A Norwegian peasant Republic is the aim of that Chauvinist politician, Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson, the great Norwegian poet. In these circumstances the State Socialism of Marx can never gain much support, because the peasants are almost to a man quite averse to anything of the nature of centralisation, and would not on any account tolerate bureaucracy and authority. If, therefore, Socialism is to continue to gain ground in Norway, the chief emphasis must be laid, I think, on the uselessness of State institutions and of Governments in a free community. Present social and political institutions must be made the starting-point; economic oppression is then the natural inference, which, though in one way less striking, is apprehended more easily by the landowning peasants.

Only when the peasant or agricultural class perceives clearly the iniquities of the class state, and also becomes conscious of the importance of free associations, of free communes unendangered by *positive* checks, only then will modern Socialism be widely accepted in the country. That is just what might be expected from the national genius. Norway, unlike the great nations of civilisation, does not possess large industrial centres with their terrible poverty, or towns where all is unnatural. The population is spare, it is true; but it is equally scattered over the country, and depends for its support principally on its cattle and on the income from its forest cultivation. The Norwegians are a nation little interested in their political independence, which is built upon the possession of the land, but they and their land are one. How can State despotism take root in such a country?

(To be concluded in our next.)

INDIVIDUAL OR COMMON PROPERTY.

A DISCUSSION.

(From an Individualist Correspondent.)

I shall endeavour in this communication to make as clear as possible the Anarchist view regarding Property.

I may start by saying that an Anarchist is a consistent, an all round, Individualist, one who believes that the faith in the divine power of governments to save humanity is nothing but the crudest superstition, which our State Socialist friends ought to be ashamed to perpetuate in people's minds. The Anarchist contends that if the people cannot emancipate themselves then their case is hopeless, and further that their present misery is due to nothing else than the foolish delegation of functions to governing bodies which State Socialists would perpetuate and extend.

An Anarchist is a democratic Individualist. He agrees with the Liberty and Property Defence League so far as they show up the follies of legislation and of State meddling with this and that sphere of human activity. He agrees with Herbert Spencer in his faith in the superiority of Natural over Human Law. But he differs from the thinkers of the so-called Individualist school, inasmuch as he carries their arguments to a logical conclusion.

Whereas most Individualists, so called, are in favour of the State "stereotyping" the distribution of wealth, the methods of paying debt, and the forms of "free" contract; the Anarchist would be in favour of freedom of judgment in all these matters, and would point out that it is not only *democratic laws* that are baneful (as the Individualist is so fond of showing) but that even property laws and monetary laws and contract laws are open to exactly the same objections.

The fact is the so-called Individualist is a humbug, and when he ceases to call himself an Individualist and frankly proclaims that he wants the State to govern everybody but himself, I shall cease also to apply that epithet to him.

Anarchists are not in favour of Property at all, in so far as it means the external protection and control of a man's possessions, and hence they take up a position of complete antagonism not only to avowed State Socialists, but also to the revolutionary Socialists who are always telling us that in the Free Society of the future *they* (whoever they are) are not going to *allow* a man to possess this, that and the other. I really believe that the present system of Property is preferable to such universal meddling with one's private affairs which Socialism would involve. Let me remind such Socialists that Proudhon (whom they *occasionally* quote) applied the term *robbery* not only to private but also to common property.

But Anarchists protest against the present system of Private Property, so far as it means a legal right of robbery, as much as any Socialists do. They proclaim those economists to be liars who have the impudence to tell the people that private property means the protection of the labourer in the fruits of his labour and of his "abstinence." Any man who has spent his life anywhere but in an armchair can give the lie direct to such fools. Usury of land, usury of houses, usury of tools,—all these forms of legal robbery called "Property"—are eternally condemning the worker to a state of slavery.

But how do we propose to abolish such usury? In answer, we point to laws which Radicals, Socialists, Communists, Individualists, alike seem to agree in ignoring, and on which only a few cranks perpetually harp. We mean laws relating to money, to property, to banking, to the methods of co-operation.

Money? What is there in it? Let us leave it to learned financiers to puzzle their heads over such a question. We workmen can't be bothered with it. Ah! my friends, hug your chains, for those chains are made of gold!

Why is the labourer a slave?

Because he cannot purchase with his own labour-force.

Here is the solution of the labour-problem—the abolition of all usury when labour knows its power. No need of Acts of Parliament, no need of strikes, no need of revolutions, no need of communism, the simple establishment of Free Money which will represent labour-force and be redeemable in the products of labour—this will destroy once and for all, all power of class and of capital, for labour is the source of all wealth.

Workmen can only be free, when each can pay in the services he can render; when the bootmaker pays in boots, the baker in bread, the carpenter in wood-work, the bricklayer in houses; and it is impossible for them to be free under any other circumstances.

All government is primarily established for robbery; would you have honesty you must abolish government.

A. TARN.

NOTES.

The Tzar's Cat's-paw.

The Republican rulers of France have consummated their own disgrace by sentencing to three years' imprisonment seven young men of whom his Russian majesty was afraid. Some of these were studying chemistry and experimenting on the force of explosives, and the Tzar has his reasons for objecting to his faithful subjects becoming too learned in that line. The absurd charge of conspiracy fell through at the trial, but the popular dread of "anything that might go off" was cleverly used to make the prisoners appear dangerous. The spy who worked up the affair—the gentleman one of whose many *aliases* is Landesén—was condemned to five years by default, *i.e.*, after he had had time and means given to him to get out of the way. All of which has so gratified the Tzar that he has decorated the Russian Ambassador in Paris, and given a fine new house to the French Ambassador in St. Petersburg.

To the Soldiers.

"You are men of the people; do not fire upon your brethren. Fire upon anyone who commands you to fire upon the people." For distributing this advice amongst the soldiers of Paris, on the eve of May 1st, Comrade Merlino and four other Anarchists have been condemned to two years' imprisonment and a big fine. They are not much the worse, however, as they were all absent when sentence was pronounced, not caring to explain their conduct before a court where the president was both prosecutor and judge and the middle-class jury had condemned them beforehand. Comrades Merlino and Stoianoff sent in a declaration claiming the entire moral and legal responsibility for the "Appeal to the Soldiers," and stating that they had written and distributed it in the hope of averting the threatened massacre of the people of Paris by the troops. In both appeal and declaration our comrades plainly avow their Anarchist principles.

Resistance to Authority.

Is it not remarkable that last month's strikes have all been revolts against authority quite as much as against economic exploitation? The Guards and policemen were enraged by vexatious regulations, the post-men by the refusal of their right to combine, Allen's girls by the arbitrary dismissal of a comrade. It is a sign of the times that even soldiers, policemen, Government servants, and women will not stand unlimited bullying any longer.

"A tell-tale straw."

Last month we published an invitation to Herbert Burrows to send us a full report of his lecture on "Social Democracy, Anarchism, and Anarchists," that we might print it in *Freedom*, together with our reply to arguments which the report in *Justice* declares the Anarchists present at the lecture were "unable to answer." This invitation was written on the 14th June, and, as we informed Mr. Burrows, we went to press on the 24th. It was not until the 25th that we received a letter, in which Mr. Burrows declines to send us a report of his lecture, on the ground that it was delivered from very few notes, which he had no time to write out. He states, however, that he will shortly "publish it, with additions, as a pamphlet." Whenever it appears we shall be glad to deal with it. It is hard work to get these Social Democrats up to the scratch.

A Cry from Australia.

Comrade J. A. Andrews writes from Alexandra, Victoria, as follows:—The movement here is going on slowly at present. Many have, I regret to say, been terrified by prosecutions out of continuing active propagandist work, and many, myself included, have had to seek our bread in the country, where it is almost impossible to effect any propaganda, owing to the fact that except the moving population, who are only accessible in the large towns, the agricultural labourers are the sons of proprietors and will be proprietors and exploiters in their turn. There are only two active propagandists left in the city, which is the most important place for the work, as it contains half the population of the colony, and nearly all the salariat, excepting, as I have said, the moving population and the children of the bourgeoisie, the labourers of the country being more independent, like the industrial master workmen of Europe a few centuries ago. I can do no more than I am doing, which is to write out posters for the two Melbourne comrades to stick up; but that is very little, and I therefore ask those of the readers of *Freedom* who have friends in Australia to try and introduce the subject of Communism and Anarchy to them when they write and to send them their anarchist papers when they have done with them. If any of them know of Anarchists in Australia, and especially in Victoria, I shall be glad to be placed in communication with them, as I wish to form a group. There ought to have been many more Anarchists within my own knowledge, but many have been tainted with opportunism and gone running after single taxes and other inventions of the capitalistic devil, until they have forgotten the profession as well as the principles of Anarchy. Any communications from English or other comrades on the matter of Anarchism in Australia can be addressed to me at my permanent postal address, P. O., Richmond, Victoria, Australia, and any comrades intending to set out for Australia are especially requested to write.

ANARCHISM IN JAPAN.

We are apt to consider the Japanese as a semi-civilised race of people to whom Anarchism and Socialism are unknown, and when we proclaim ourselves as Internationalists, many of us never dream of including in the universal brotherhood those islanders of the Far East, precisely because we do not know them, and in an indistinct sort of way perhaps we fear them as a reactionary force. But progress has been making giant strides of late. The Far East is waking up. Quite recently a Mr. Kaneko was sent to Europe by the Japanese Government to get ideas as to the formation of a Parliament, and for a long time the Japs have been introducing innovation after innovation copied from Europe or America. Mr. Kaneko's sympathies are of course, as becomes an official, with the aristocracy. He is "lost in admiration of the culture and charm of the English nobility." He regards our peers as "the finest flowers of the human race," and the workers he considers "fiendish and brutal." All of which shows what a little difference there is between the aristocrats of the West and the aristocrats of the East. The *Freiheit* of New York recently gave some interesting information on the workers' movement in this far off land. Comrade Hoffmann of Osaka and Kobe is the informant. There is as yet no organisation. Only a literary movement. Books on Socialism and Anarchism written by natives are prohibited, but we are told works by foreigners are allowed and even translations of such works into the Japanese language have been made and circulated without interference. The leader of the first movement was Talui Tokitchi, who was rewarded by three years' imprisonment. His party wish neither king nor government of any sort. Kageame Hidde, a schoolmistress, one of the most active workers, in one of her speeches said, "The end to be attained must be communism, communalism, or something of that sort." An organ of the party called the *Nineteenth Century*, was started but suppressed by the authorities. It was succeeded by *Tgui*, which means *Freedom*. This paper is printed in California at San Francisco. Its first number appeared on December 13 last year. Only 500 copies of each edition of the paper are yet issued, and of these 200 are circulated in the United States and 300 in Japan. Of the *Nineteenth Century* 93 numbers appeared down to last December during a year and nine months in which it existed. The editor of *Tgui* is S. Shikitsu of 314 O'Farrell Street, San Francisco. Those who wish to help on the cause in Japan cannot do better than send any Socialist papers, pamphlets or books they have to spare, to Julius Hoffmann, No. 62 Seventh Street, New York, U.S.A., stating that they are for Japan.

A later number of the *Freiheit* gives particulars of an interview between Dr. Hoffmann and Kageame Hidde at Osaka, Japan. Kageame has very sympathetic features, she speaks well and persuasively and her general appearance conveys the idea of great nobility of character. She says that the object of her party is a society without government, and all her conversation shows that she is absolutely Anarchist. Kageame has already spent five years in prison. She desires to enter into relation with the revolutionaries of all the countries of the globe and she asks for journals and pamphlets. She will find translators amongst her friends.

THE PROPAGANDA.
REPORTS.

ST. PANCRAS COMMUNIST-ANARCHIST GROUP.—On Sunday, June 22, at 8 p.m., the group held an out-door meeting in Regent's Park, Neilson, Morton and Pearson being the speakers. There was a very attentive audience; no opposition. 2s. 10d. collected; good sale of *Freedom*.—On Wednesday evening, June 25, at 8 p.m. an outdoor meeting was held at Prince of Wales Road, Neilson and Morton being the speakers. Opposition from two teetotalers and a Radical, which was replied to by Neilson. 7½d. collected.—A good meeting was held on Sunday, June 29, at 7.30 p.m., in Regent's Park; speakers, Morton and Neilson. Collection, 4s.; three dozen *Freedom*s sold.—A large meeting was held at Prince of Wales Road on Wednesday, July 2nd, at 8.30 p.m.; speakers, Neilson, Morton, Milburn, and Pearson. Collection, 9½d.; ten *Freedom*s sold.—The group have made themselves a fine banner, inscribed "Communist-Anarchism, Freedom Group," and are now busy making a platform. They desire to acknowledge 2s., a donation to their Propaganda Fund, from R. Gunderson.—On Sunday evening, July 20, a good meeting was addressed in Regent's Park by Blackwell, Morton, and Neilson. Interesting opposition from the wife of a workman getting 24s. a week. Several other meetings have been held, but the reports have failed to reach us at the time of going to press.

EAST LONDON COMMUNIST-ANARCHIST GROUP.—In Victoria Park, at 3.30, on Sunday, June 29, a meeting was addressed by Brooks and Mrs. Lahr. Miss Lupton, a new convert to our principles, also addressed the meeting, dealing mainly with Anarchism. H. Davis reviewed the history of Governmental action in most civilised countries during periods of trade depressions, dealing with the question from the Anarchist point of view. A large number of *Anarchist Labour Leaf*s distributed, and 2s. 6½d. collected for same.—On Sunday morning, July 13th, at Hoxton Church, a very good meeting was addressed by Moore (Norwich Freedom Group) and Davis, who dealt with "Objections to Anarchism." *Labour Leaf* distributed, and 1s. 1½d. collected for same.—The same day, at Victoria Park, at 3.30, a large audience was addressed by Mrs. Lahr, H. Davis, and Burnie, the latter speaking for the first time in this park, and rendering material assistance to the doctrine of Anarchism.

A REVOLUTIONARY CONFERENCE was held under the auspices of the Socialist League on the 24th of June at the Berner Street Club, East London. C. Mowbray took the chair, and contended that all the members of the League were practically Anarchists. Tom Pearson, J. Casey, Charley Morton, and James Blackwell, members of the Freedom Group, pointed out some important differences between the Anarchists and the Leaguers. Eventually it was admitted by the whole meeting that the Anarchists were a more advanced party than the Leaguers, and a debate on principles was arranged between Pearson and Mowbray. H. Davis, of the East London Communist Group, well supported the Freedom Group Members. It was arranged that all should use their best endeavours to spread the idea of a General Strike, and a collection was taken up for the revolutionary press, 2s. 1d. coming to the share of *Freedom*.

LEICESTER.—Two members of the Freedom Group have paid visits to the Leicester Branch of the Socialist League in July. On Sunday, July 6, J. Casey lectured at Russell Square at 11 a.m. to a good audience on "Government, Palliatives, and the General Strike," and at Humberstone Gate, at 8 p.m., on "Anarchist-Communism." Owing to the coldness of the weather, the evening meeting was not as large as usual. The wind, as it swept up the wide, bleak street, was bitterly cold, which made standing in the open air the reverse of pleasant. The workers of Leicester seem to regard Anarchism with favour, for invitations to oppose the lecturer's views met with no response at either of the meetings. Municipally Leicester seems to realise Sidney Webb's idea of Socialism, notwithstanding which—but tell it not in Gath—poverty and misery, oppression and tyranny, are there, as elsewhere, not unknown. Our Leicester comrades, though nominally a branch of the Socialist League, are in reality Anarchist-Communists. They are constantly preaching Anarchism, and they have neither council, committee, rules, nor regulations. They are at any rate free from the reproach of being unable to realise that "an ideal is a reality." Indeed, so thoroughly do they realise that Anarchist-Communism is the only solution of the labour problem that they can hardly even imagine anyone wasting his energies in advocating anything else. There is, too, amongst our Leicester comrades a very instructive example of the manner in which the spirit of freedom abides in families from generation to generation. Our comrade Wardle is the son of one of the orators of the Chartist movement, and his daughter, who is not yet seventeen years of age, is rendering good service to the cause of freedom by reading papers on such subjects as "Liberty," etc., at the indoor meeting-place of the Socialist League Branch and selling literature at the open-air lectures.—On Sunday morning, July 20, at 10.30, T. Pearson spoke at Russell Square on "Communist-Anarchy." Bingham, of Sheffield (Socialist League) followed, saying that, as far as he understood Communist-Anarchy, he was an Anarchist. The speakers were received with marks of approval. In the evening, at 8, Bingham, in the course of a good lecture, said he was a Communist, and when people were economically free they would not want laws to control them. Bartlett also spoke.—On Monday, July 21st, T. Pearson opened a discussion at the hall of the Socialist League on "Anarchist-Communism v. Revolutionary Socialism." The room was full, and a long discussion followed. Opposition was offered by Radicals, Secularists, Social Democrats, and Revolutionary Socialists, who all agreed that they would punish idleness and theft by imprisonment. Comrades Gorrie and Timson spoke in support of the opener. Gorrie said he always believed we should have to let those who would not work starve, but now he believed it would be a better and nobler way to treat them as victims of a bad system, set them good examples, and rely on their social instincts and human nature. Comrade Pearson having replied, the discussion was adjourned till the Thursday evening following.—On Tuesday, July 22, at 8 p.m., T. Pearson spoke on "Anarchist-Communism" at Sandy Gate, Leicester. Chambers, Taylor, and Timson (Socialist League) also addressed the meeting.—On Thursday, July 24, T. Pearson opened the adjourned discussion on "Anarchist-Communism v. Revolutionary Socialism" at the hall of the Socialist League, Leicester. A good discussion followed. Comrade Gorrie advised the members of the branch to read the literature issued by the Freedom Group and choose which they would accept, Anarchist-Communism or State Socialism. In his opinion you cannot compromise between the two. He was glad to say he was beginning to find out what Anarchist-Communism meant, and he intended to work for it.

MANCHESTER.—An extensive Anarchist propaganda is carried on here by the branch of the Socialist League. Several new stations have been opened lately, both in Manchester and the smaller towns round about. At one of these, in the City, where we hold very large meetings on Sunday evenings, the police have tried to stop us. They arrested Comrade Barton, but contented themselves with sending him a summons; the case is now pending. We mean to fight the authorities on this ground till their attempt at muzzling Socialism fails, as it must do. Salvationists and others may speak where Socialists cause an obstruction. It is our principles which are the obstruction in the eyes of the authorities. Our chief work lies in breaking new ground and pushing the propaganda where it has been a thing unknown. This kind of work is, as may be expected, of a very up-hill nature. No new branches or groups have yet been formed, though we have many in sympathy with our teachings. Being the only body of Anarchists in Lancashire, we are held at a stiff distance by our friends the Social Democrats. They seem afraid to permit the thorough Socialism of our speakers to be heard on their platforms. They are too busy endeavouring to get their fingers in the pie of government, municipal and otherwise, to care for Revolutionary Socialism. The idea of the General Strike is now received with enthusiasm by the workers at all our meetings.

NOTICES.

St. Pancras Communist-Anarchist Group holds meetings on Wednesdays at 8.30 p.m., in Prince of Wales Road, Kentish Town, near "Mother Shipton"; on Fridays at Ossulton Street, Euston Road, at 8.30 p.m.; and on Sundays in Regent's Park, at 7.30 p.m.

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 on Sundays in Victoria Park, at 11.30 a.m.; Hyde Park, 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 of the Socialist League, H. Davis (East London Communist-Anarchist Group) will lecture on Sunday, August 10th.

"Freedom" Publication Fund.—H. G., 5s.; collected at Berners Street, 2s. 1d.

Comrade Darnaud of Foix, which is near the Pyrenees, sends us two pamphlets, "La Société Future," and "Causerie." The first very largely consists of extracts from our serial "Society on the Morrow of the Revolution," upon which it is a sort of eulogistic commentary. The second is inspired by "Fra Contadini," the popular pamphlet by our comrade Errico Malatesta. Although we cannot say that there is much originality displayed in Comrade Darnaud's little books, we have no doubt that they will do useful propagandist work in the south of France.

El Liceo Cubano, the "Cuban Lyceum," is the weekly organ of the society of the same name and is published at Tampa, Ybor City, Florida, U.S.A. Without definitely proclaiming itself Socialist and Anarchist, our contemporary is pledged to work in the interests of Liberty, Education and Country, using the latter word in its widest and worthiest sense. We wish both the society and its journal success.

Land and Labour, the monthly organ of the Land Nationalisation Society is doing useful work in exposing the results of landlordism.

La Pere Peinard, an excellent Parisian weekly Anarchist journal written in the language of the street and workshop, now appears in an enlarged form. It still has 16 pages, but these are nearly double the size of the former pages. The price is the same and a cartoon is published every week dealing with the social question.

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