

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. 5.—No. 54.

MAY, 1891.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

THE FIRST OF MAY.

FIVE years ago a goodly number of the workers of America were looking forward to the first of May. That day had been generally fixed upon as the date on which a general strike for the establishment of the Eight Hour Day was to be inaugurated. The capitalists and the government were terrified, and were ready to use any means to put off the victory of the workers. Chicago was the centre of the movement, and when the strike took place the capitalists were not slow to avail themselves of an opportunity, probably one of their own making, to imprison the leaders of the movement and inaugurate a reign of terror which in the then unprepared state of the people was sufficient to check the movement. For the time it was crushed and a few months later our brave comrades were murdered. But what was then essentially a national movement has now become an international movement. No doubt the speeches and writings of our martyrs, which have been translated and circulated among the European workmen, have done much towards this. No doubt the idea of a general strike, which appears to have emanated from Belgium and has in some way bound itself up with this May movement, has also contributed towards the popularisation of the idea. Doubtless the resolution of the Congress of Paris of 1889 is also a factor in the matter. But whatever the cause or causes the fact is before us that the May Day movement, crushed in America, in 1886 is to-day an international movement threatening the very existence of capitalism.

The program and policy of the workers in regard to this May movement is vague and undefined. For some it means merely a demonstration in favour of a legal eight hour day. For others it means the inauguration of strikes to establish an eight hour day. For others again it is merely a labour holiday wrenched from the capitalists. On the other hand for the capitalists it is a menace. The governments scent revolution in the air and they are making their preparations. In Italy demonstrations are to be forbidden: in Spain the army and navy are to be kept ready for action. The workers have no general program, no fixed policy. The only general idea is that they want to improve their lot and the first of May seems to them an opportunity which will enable them to take some steps towards effecting this improvement. Here in England the mass of the workers will doubtless content themselves with demonstrations in favour of an eight hour day, because here the mass of the workers do not comprehend that a man has a right to his freedom and to the product of his labour. They will be very well content with a very small amelioration of their condition. With them it is the day of small things and the government, fully understanding the position, has graciously come forward of its own accord and given them a Labour Commission consisting of Mr. George Livesey, of gas strike fame, and other capitalists, to whom have been added one or two trade unionists of the old and new schools so as to give the thing a little colour. The commission will take probably eighteen months to enquire whether the lot of the workers is capable of improvement and if it can be done without interfering with the interests of the capitalists. They will then issue a bulky volume of questions and answers and disband themselves. In the meantime a general election will no doubt have taken place and some other dodge have been devised by the party in power. Our only wonder is that Tom Mann can consent to sit in the company of such a lot as Lord Salisbury has scraped together. Burns may consider himself lucky to have escaped the "honour."

On the European continent things are not likely to run so smoothly. There will be big demonstrations, there will be strikes and there may be riots. There the people are in a frame of mind somewhat similar to that of the people of France in 1789. They suffer, they are uneasy and they are seeking the remedy. They have no generally settled idea as to what is to be done, but they are ready to do something, maybe to pull down a bastille, maybe to dethrone a king. At present many of them are willing to cry Hurrah for Carnot, or William, or Umberto, as the case may be. But to-morrow Carnot may be glad to run away by the back door as Thiers did twenty years ago, William may have to fly as his grandfather, the "cartridge prince," did in '48, and Umberto may be staying down at Windsor or some other of the numerous royal palaces of which England is the happy possessor. One never knows what may happen. We do not however anticipate this just yet. We expect the net result of the first of May movement to the workers will be a few successful strikes, probably the passing of some labour legislation in Spain, the granting of the suffrage in Belgium, and the spread

of the idea, probably the widening of the aims of many thousands of workers.

As for us conscious revolutionary Anarchists, the movement, coming as it does from the midst of the workers, endeared to us by the blood of some of our best and bravest at Chicago, must have a peculiar interest. But for that reason we have to be all the more careful we do not permit ourselves to be led away by the movement into the paths of reaction, following in the footsteps of the Social Democrats. We must not let the movement use us, we must use the movement. For us it can be nothing more than an opportunity. We have no desire to create another workers' annual holiday. On the contrary we wish to do away with the system of holidays and working days altogether and make men free and equal so that they may take their holidays when they will, just as the exploiting classes do to-day. The first of May will lose all its significance and degenerate into a sort of universal Bank Holiday if it is to be established as a regular thing. It is only valuable to the workers now because it is a revolutionary menace against the capitalists. When the capitalists no longer make elaborate preparations to put down insurrections on the first of May, it will no longer be worth the while of the workers to celebrate the day. Therefore whatever view State Socialists may take, we think that Anarchists should only regard it as an incident, an opportunity for action, such action to be according to the temperament of the locality or country. Here in London every cool-headed English Anarchist must admit that the first of May this year can only be an opportunity for propaganda. We can hold meetings and show the workers the inefficacy of the eight hours' day as a means for the improvement of their condition generally, and we can sell our papers and pamphlets, distribute leaflets, etc. But in other countries the opportunity may arise for revolutionary action and if it does so arise we may be quite sure that our comrades will not be wanting.

THE STRIKE MOVEMENT.

Strikes and rumours of strikes continue to be recorded every day in the capitalist press. The breath of revolt is penetrating everywhere. Here in England we have had the strike at Manningham Mills, Bradford, which, however, is not so remarkable in itself as for the events which resulted from the attempt to suppress the right of public meeting in connection with this strike. Comrade Cores of Sheffield and other Anarchist Communists have taken an active part in endeavouring to preserve the right of public meeting, and as a result there have been conflicts with the powers that be in the persons of their myrmidons, the people being armed with brickbats and similar rude weapons. The superiority of Anarchist tactics was shown by the way in which the authorities and the newspaper reporters were surprised by a meeting being held after a certain Socialist county councillor had consented to be a test case as to the right of speaking, so as to act over again the rather stale farce of public rights in the police court, the policy which resulted in the loss of Trafalgar Square. It was understood that the people would be quite quiet until the following Sunday, when a mass meeting was to be called. Strange to say, however, this nicely arranged little plan did not act, as some workers of initiative, not feeling themselves bound by this agreement to which they were no party, held a meeting the same evening. So long as there are recognised "leaders" with whom the authorities can treat the game is in the hands of the men of law and order, but when there are no longer recognised leaders and the people are ready to act by themselves when they please, without caring one jot what a leader may undertake, it looks very much as though the people were beginning to be too much for the authorities. Another bit of initiative was displayed by an active worker in pulling down a hoarding behind which was a plentiful supply of brickbats and other useful defensive material.

Then there are the strikes of the soldiers against drill, &c., which are noteworthy signs of the times. There has been a good deal of barrack propaganda done in England during the last few years, and it is well-known in Socialist circles that many unemployed Socialists have joined the army, who it is pretty certain have not been idle during their stay. Of course all our comrades know of the energetic work done by the revolutionary Social-Democrat, George Bateman, by means of his pamphlet and in other ways, but a good deal of other quiet propaganda has been done, and it is said that an enquiry is to be instituted by the military authorities with a view to discover the Socialist emissaries in the British army.

In America a strike of serious import has taken place in the Pennsylvania coke region. In fact Pentecost, in the "Twentieth Century", speaks of one of the encounters which took place between the strikers and the authorities as a "battle" which is "forerunner of the revolution that is now in process of development." We have no trustworthy details as to why the men have struck, but what little news has reached us shows that the situation is very grave, that a number of men have been killed and a good many wounded. A few days ago the strikers, who appear to have been living in houses belonging to the company which employs them, were evicted, and further contests took place, during which the women took a very active part in defending their homes and a girl was shot. The capitalist papers say that a Mr. Jones addressed a large meeting of the strikers in which he declared that the American flag was the flag under which John Brown and our Chicago comrades were hanged and the fellow-strikers of the men he was addressing murdered; he therefore preferred the red flag. The revolutionary possibilities of that particular district are very great, and we shall expect to hear of further developments. Some few of our readers may remember the events of 1877 and what is called the great American Railroad Strike, when Pittsburgh and the surrounding district, including several of the States, was practically in the hands of the strikers, who however, instead of making a social revolution, as they might have done, had they been Socialists, were beguiled by their "leaders" into the paths of arbitration, legislation, &c., so that the whole result of what was really a victory for the workers was lost. This particular great strike is as important in its way as any of the events of the past quarter of a century, and we regret that no cheap and reliable account of it is published in England. Perhaps at some later date we may make an attempt to fill up the gap ourselves by publishing in *Freedom* one or two articles descriptive of the principal events. Amongst the strikes now taking place in America, we note that there are 20,000 stonemasons, carpenters and other workers engaged in the building trade out on strike at Pittsburgh. In New York 700 stonemasons are out, and several other trades are preparing to strike. At Detroit the tramway men are out, and 3,000 stove moulders have joined the strikers and helped to tear up the metals on three different lines so as to prevent cars running. Thousands of other workers of different trades are also out, and it is rumoured that all workers in the city will come out unless the demands of the tramway men are speedily granted. It is said that the American capitalists are getting desperate and are persecuting and prosecuting the workers all over the country. A few weeks ago the secretary of a brewers' union in San Francisco was shot by a policeman, whilst engaged in sticking up a boycott placard, and the policeman has been honourably acquitted. The *Bakers' Journal* says "the acts of violence now crowding upon one another seem to be the results of secret and concerted action on the part of the employers."

A good idea of the way in which a certain section of the American capitalists represented by the Jay Goulds, the Vanderbilts, &c., plunder the people and get possession of the great industries, railroads, telegraph lines, &c., may be gathered from Bronson Howard's play, "The Henrietta," now being acted at the Avenue Theatre here in London. We strongly advise all Anarchists and Socialists to have a shilling's worth one evening. It is one of the most revolutionary plays ever acted on the stage, and is quite a show up for the gamblers of the stock exchange. After seeing such a play one feels that the power of kings is comparatively small to that of a great American capitalist, or for that matter a capitalist of any country. "Then there is the legislature," says one of his clerks to the millionaire operator when he is carrying out a big "operation." "Oh, buy that too," says he carelessly. How much longer, we wonder, are American working men going to stand this sham republicanism? Who can say? These strikes, however, show that things are moving on more rapidly than ever towards the great social liquidation.

MUTUAL AID AMONGST SAVAGES.

In the *Nineteenth Century* for April, Comrade Kropotkin continues his series of articles upon "Mutual Aid." * Having clearly shown by argument and examples that the principle of mutual assistance in the struggle for existence prevails to a very large extent amongst the lower animals, and has been a main factor in their evolution, Kropotkin now goes on to point out its existence in the lower stages of human development. "We saw how few are the animal species which live an isolated life, and how numberless are those which live in societies, either for mutual defence, or for hunting and storing up food, or for rearing their offspring, or simply for enjoying life in common. We also saw that, though a great deal of warfare goes on between different classes of animals, or different species, or even different tribes of the same species, peace and mutual support are the rule within the tribe, or the species; and that those species which best know how to combine, and to avoid competition, have the best chances of survival and of a further progressive development."

"It is evident that it would be quite contrary to all that we know of nature if men were an exception to so general a rule; if a creature so defenceless as man was at his beginnings should have found his protection and his way to progress, not in mutual support, like other animals, but in a reckless competition for personal advantages, with no regard to the interests of the species." But there have always been

writers who, knowing nothing of human history, but their own limited and perhaps unfortunate personal experiences and the descriptions of wars and oppressions in historical annals, rushed to the conclusion that "mankind is nothing but a loose aggregation of beings, always ready to fight with each other, and only prevented from so doing by the intervention of some authority." This was the position taken up by Hobbes, a philosopher who wrote whilst Charles I. was fighting with the Parliament and who in those days of violent partizanship was an ardent partizan of the divine right of kings. Nothing in those days was known of comparative anthropology, of the traces of the dawn of human life upon the earth, and very little indeed of the habits of then existing uncivilised men, and thus the widest scope was left for fanciful theorising. It is strange, however, that even now-a-days the Hobbesian philosophy can find admirers. "We have had of late quite a school of writers, who, taking possession of Darwin's terminology rather than his leading ideas, made of it an argument in favour of Hobbes' views upon primitive man and even succeeded in giving them a scientific appearance. Mr. Huxley, as is known, took the lead of that school, and in a recent paper he represented primitive men as a sort of tigers or lions, deprived of all ethical conceptions, fighting out the struggle for existence to its bitter end, and living a life of 'continual free fights'; to quote his own words—'beyond the limited and temporary relations of the family, the Hobbesian war of each against all was the normal state of existence.'"

"It has been remarked more than once that the chief error of Hobbes and of the eighteenth century philosophers was to imagine that mankind began its life in the shape of small straggling families, something like the limited and temporary families of the bigger carnivora, while in reality it is now positively known that such was *not* the case." "A most careful investigation into the social institutions of the lowest races has been carried on during the last thirty years, and it has revealed amongst the present institutions of primitive folk some traces of still older institutions which have long disappeared, but nevertheless left unmistakable traces of their previous existence. A whole science devoted to the embryology of human institutions has thus developed, in the hands of Lubbock, Edwin Tylor, Morgan, MacLennan, Bachofen, Maine, Post, Kovalevsky, and many others. And that science has established beyond any doubt that . . . far from being a primitive form of organisation, the family is a very late product of human evolution. As far as we can go in the palæo-ethnology (most ancient race peculiarities) of mankind, we find men living in societies, in tribes similar to those of the highest mammals; and an extremely slow and long evolution was required to bring these societies to the clan organisation, which, in its turn, had to undergo another also long evolution before the first germs of family, polygamous or monogamous, could appear. Societies, bands, or tribes—not families—were thus the primitive form of organisation of mankind and its earliest ancestors. . . . The first human societies simply were a further development of those societies which constitute the very essence of life of the higher animals."

Turning to the positive evidence of this, we see that the traces left by the human beings who lived in Europe such countless ages ago that the whole climate was entirely different, and like that of the arctic regions to-day, and the very shape of the solid ground vastly changed from the country we see now, the traces of even these ancient human creatures show that men were then living in societies. Before Europeans knew the use of metals, when their dwellings were caves or overhanging rocks, when they hunted elephants and rhinoceroses, and many huge animals now extinct upon earth, they were living in societies. Their cave dwellings are found hollowed out in colonies close together; their domestic implements and hunting weapons of stone are found together in quantities, with the bones of extinct animals; the remains of their wooden lake dwellings, built on piles in lakes, and marshes that once were lakes, are in villages. "And whole workshops of flint implements, testifying of the numbers of workers who used to come together, have been discovered." Indeed, it is very rare to come upon isolated traces of this ancient human existence.

Turning from the buried traces of the past to the present life of savages, whose actual existence is not very far removed from that of our savage fore-runners, we see the most primitive left are now arrived at the clan organisation. "With most of them the family, in the sense we attribute to it, is hardly found in its germs. But they are by no means loose aggregations of men and women, coming together in a disorderly manner in conformity with momentary caprices." All have apparently passed through the "communal marriage" stage where all the women in the tribe were the mates of all the men, into the stage where relationship on the mother's side began to be recognised, and mating between maternal relatives of various degrees was considered immoral. The next step was that mating within the clan was disliked. It still remained "communal," but the new mate was taken from another clan. Individualist marriage (and thus the germs of the separate family) seems to have begun with the individual appropriation of a captive taken in war.

"Now, if we take into consideration that this complicated organisation" (of the exogamous clan in which the germ of the family is developing) "developed amongst men who stood at the lowest known degree of development, and that it maintained itself in societies knowing no kind of authority—besides the authority of public opinion, we at once see how deeply inrooted social instincts must have been in human nature even at its lowest stages. . . . The fact becomes still more striking

* For the two previous articles see the *Nineteenth Century* for September and November 1890; resumé in *Freedom* for November and December last.

* *Nineteenth Century*, February 1888, p. 165.

if we consider the immense antiquities of the clan organisation." It has been traced by means of history, prehistoric monuments and folklore, in the development of the early Hebrews, Greeks, Romans, Germans, Celts, Slavonians. "Unbridled individualism is a modern growth, but it is not characteristic of primitive mankind."

The remainder of Kropotkin's article is devoted to a series of instances of social feeling and mutual aid as existing amongst the most degraded savages, selected from the multitudinous examples that may be found in the most reliable descriptions of travellers and explorers.

But, he concludes, the family and private property, the growth of the warrior class and of a class possessed of the knowledge which is power, disturbs tribal unity, and the traditions of early social life remain with the mass of toilers. "It is one of the most interesting of studies to follow that life of the masses; to study the means by which they maintained their own social organisation, which was based upon their own conceptions of equity, mutual aid, and mutual support—of common law, in a word, even when they were submitted to the most ferocious theocracy or autocracy in the state. That life we hope to analyse in a subsequent article."

A T A L K

ABOUT

ANARCHIST COMMUNISM

BETWEEN TWO WORKERS.

BY ENRICO MALATESTA.

(Continued from previous number.)

William. But if, as you yourself say, intellectual work is a great pleasure and gives those who do it an advantage over others who are ignorant, surely every one would want to study; I should as much as any body. And then who is to do the manual work?

Jack. Every one; because whilst studying literature and science they should also do physical work; every one should work with both head and hands. These two sorts of work, so far from interfering with one another, are supplementary; for a healthy man needs to exercise all his organs, his brains as well as his muscles. He whose intelligence is developed and who is accustomed to think does best at manual work, and he who is sound and healthy, as people are who exercise their limbs under healthy conditions, has his mind in a more wide-awake and penetrating state. Besides, as both kinds of work are necessary and as one is pleasanter than the other and has enabled man to attain to the dignity of self-consciousness, it is not just that a part of mankind should be condemned to the stupefying effects of exclusively manual toil, that the privilege of science, which means power, may be left to a few. Therefore, I say again, every body should work at once physically and intellectually.

William. I can understand that; but there is manual work which is hard and manual work which is easy, some is ugly, some is beautiful. Now who would be a miner, for instance, or a scavenger?

Jack. My dear William, if you only knew what inventions and researches are being made every day, you would see that even now, if the organisation of work did not depend upon people who are not working themselves and consequently don't trouble about the comfort of the workers, all manual labour could be carried on under conditions which would prevent it from being repulsive, unhealthy and toilsome. Therefore there is no reason why any work should not be done by workers who have chosen it voluntarily. And if this would be possible to-day, just fancy what might happen when, everybody having to work, the studies and efforts of all would be directed towards making work less burdensome and more pleasant. And if after all there were still some crafts harder than others, it could be arranged to make up for these inequalities by some special advantages. Besides, when men are working in common, for the common benefit, we see arising amongst them that same spirit of brotherliness and compliance which belongs to family life in its best aspect; so that each, far from seeking only to save himself trouble, tries rather to take the heaviest work for his own share.

William. Right enough, if all this happens; but suppose it doesn't?

Jack. Well, if in spite of all this, there still remains some needful work which no one will do by choice, then we shall every one of us have to take a hand at it, each doing a little, working at it, for example, one day a month, one week a year, or something like that. But set your mind at rest. If a thing is needful for every one, means will certainly be found to do it.

William. Do you know, you are beginning to talk me over! Yet there's one thing I can't rightly see my way to. It's a big job that taking away property from the gentry. I don't know, but— isn't there anything else you could do?

Jack. How would you manage? Whilst it remains in the hands of the rich they will be cocks o' the walk and will follow up their own interests without troubling about ours, as they have done since the beginning of time. But why don't you want to take away property from the gentry? Perhaps you fancy that it would be unfair, and a wrong thing to do?

William. No, no; after what you have told me it seems to me that it would be very right, as in tearing it away from them, we are snatching from them also our own bodies on which they are feeding. And besides we are not taking their fortune for ourselves, but to put it in common to do good to every one, aren't we?

Jack. Most assuredly. And if you look close at the matter, you will see that the gentry themselves will also be the gainers. They will have to give up ordering others about, putting on airs and graces, and idling; they will have to set to work, but when work is done with the help of machinery and every possible consideration for the comfort of the workers, it will become nothing but a useful, pleasant exercise. Do not the gentry now-a-days go hunting? Do they not ride on horseback, practise gymnastics and take exercise in other ways which prove that muscular exertion is a necessity and a pleasure to healthy, well-fed men? For them then it is merely a question of putting into production the physical energy they now put forth purely as an amusement. And then how much advantage they will reap from the general well-being! Look, for example, at what we see before our eyes. A few gentlefolks are wealthy and can play the lord in their own houses, but for them as for us the streets are hideous and filthy, and the bad air which rises from our hovels and slums makes them ill as well as us; with their private fortunes they can't improve the whole country, a thing which could be done easily if every one set about it. Our poverty is a continual blight upon their lives, acting upon them indirectly in a million ways, without counting their dread of a violent revolution. You see then that we shall be only doing good to the gentlefolk by taking their wealth. Though they certainly don't understand this, and never will, because they like to give orders and they fancy that the poor are fashioned of a different clay from themselves. But what matter? If they will not come to terms with us, so much the worse for them, we shall know how to force them to do so.

William. That is all fair enough; but can't things be done bit by bit, by mutual agreement? Property might be left to those who possess it, but on condition that they would increase wages, and treat us like human beings. Then, gradually, we might lay by something, and we too might buy a bit of land, and, at last, when we were all property owners, we would put everything in common, as you say. There was a chap I heard proposing something of the sort.

Jack. Now look here! There is only one way of coming to friendly terms, and that is for the property owners voluntarily to renounce their property. But you know, as well as I do, that it is no good thinking of that. Whilst private property exists, that is whilst the land, instead of belonging to every one, belongs to Peter or Paul, there will always be poverty and things will go from bad to worse. Under private property each is trying all the time to bring grist to his own mill. The property owners not only try to give the workers as little as they can, but they are always fighting amongst themselves. Generally speaking each tries to sell his produce for as much as he can, and each buyer, on his side, tries to pay as little as possible. And then what happens? The land owners, manufacturers, and large merchants, who can manufacture and sell wholesale, provide themselves with machinery, take advantage of all favourable states of the market, wait until the right moment to sell or even sell at a loss for a time, end by ruining the small proprietors and dealers, who sink into poverty and are obliged, they and their children, to go and work for a daily wage. Thus (it is a thing we see every day) men who work on their own account alone or with a few journeymen, are driven, after a bitter struggle, to shut up shop, and go to seek work in big factories, small land-owners who cannot get enough capital for their farming and cannot even pay their tithes and taxes have to sell their fields and houses to the large proprietors, and so on. If a kind-hearted employer really wished to better the condition of his work-people, he could only put himself in a position to be ruined by competition.

On the other hand, the workers are goaded by hunger into competing with one another; and as there are more hands to be had than are needed for the work to be done, they are continually snatching the bread out of each other's mouths. Not that there is not plenty of work that needs doing, but that at any particular time there is only a certain amount which it pays the employer to have done. Thanks to this situation, progress itself becomes a misfortune. A machine is invented: immediately a number of men are thrown out of work; they can earn nothing, therefore cannot consume as before, and thus indirectly effect the bread winning of other workers. In America wide tracts of land are brought under cultivation and much corn produced: the land-owners, of course without enquiring if everybody in the United States has plenty to eat, ship their grain over here that they may get more for it. Here the price of corn is lower, but the poor do not reap the advantage, for the European land-owners, not able to compete with this cheapness, let the soil go out of cultivation, except some of the most productive portions, and thus a number of agricultural labourers lose their employment. When a man has not even a penny in his pocket cheap bread is no good to him.

William. Ah; now I understand! I've heard say that they would not let the corn come from abroad, and I thought it a rascally thing to try to keep food out of the country; I believed the gentlefolks and the farmers between them wanted to starve the people. But now I see they had their reasons.

Jack. No, no; if the corn did not come it would be very bad from another point of view. Then the landlords and farmers, having no competition to fear from outside, would sell at any price they chose and —

William. Then what is to be done?

Jack. Done? I told you before; everything must be put in common. And then the more produce there is the better it will be.

(To be continued.)

FREEDOM.

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

MONTHLY, 1d., POST FREE 1½d.

Annual Subscription, post free to all countries, 1s. 6d. Foreign subscriptions should be sent by International Money Order.

Wholesale Price, 1s. 4d. per quire of 27, carriage free.

Back Numbers.—Volume I., October 1886 to September 1887 (No. 2 sold out) price 2s. Volume II., October 1887 to September 1888 (Nos. 16, 17, 18, 19, sold out) price 2s. Volume III., October 1888 to December 1889, price 1s. 6d. Volume IV., January to December 1890, price 1s. Carriage: single volumes, 2d., four volumes, 4½d., throughout the United Kingdom.

Address "FREEDOM," New Fellowship Press, 26 Newington Green Road, London, N.

Freedom Pamphlets.—No. I., "The Wage System," by Peter Kropotkin, 1d., post free, 1½d. No. II., "The Commune of Paris," by Peter Kropotkin, 1d., post free, 1½d. Per quire of 25, 1s. 4d.

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

Donations.—C. B., 6d.; Autonomie Club, 4s. (towards expenses of South Place Meeting); W. B., 1s. (for Manifesto).

NOTES.

A DISGRACEFUL BRIBE.

The Tories have always carried off the palm in posing as friends of the people and keeping their authority by airily handing an ornamental concession to a nation beginning to cry for justice. But they have surpassed themselves in cynical audacity in their "free" education bid to the electors. "Leave us our system of tyranny and greedy oppression in Ireland and we will give you this pretty thing"; so say Balfour and Co., through their spokesman Goschen, who a little while ago was publicly proclaiming his belief in the injustice of "free" education. But, as Bismarck said, "free" education is about as safe a thing as you can give the working classes—after the chance of keeping them in ignorance is hopelessly gone and circumstances oblige you to give them something.

BALTIMORE WAKES UP.

This city, which might have been called "a city of the dead," for all the interest its Catholic population has hitherto taken in the world's affairs, has awakened to the knowledge of an active and powerful propaganda of Anarchist and Socialist ideas in its very midst. One of the most active of the revolutionary workers, Michael Cohn, was arrested on February 5th for "uttering language at a meeting at Canmaker's Hall, on the night of February 1, 1891, designed to cause a breach of the peace." Cohn spent a night in a loathsome cell, and was brought up and examined before the magistrate, who liberated him on a thousand dollars security to appear later before a criminal jury. Meanwhile, he is carrying on his work with increased courage and determination, and the local newspapers are devoting whole columns to "Anarchism and Anarchists" in general, and to Michael Cohn in particular.

CRIMINAL ANTHROPOLOGY RUN MAD.

The Italian Professor Lombroso has rendered great service to humanity by his researches into the symptoms and physical malformations of criminals. He is one of the most active and influential of the school of scientists who recognise crime as disease, and demand, in the name of common sense, that it shall be treated on the same rationally scientific basis as fever or lunacy. But, like every other medical specialist who for years directs his mind to one particular sort of ailment, and so becomes inclined to see signs of that special malady in every sick person, the criminal anthropologist is liable to see everybody with whose conduct he does not sympathise in the light of a criminal. Some of the later portions of Lombroso's great book, "The Criminal Man," which has been coming out in parts for years, can only be described as comic. He is now publishing the section on Political Criminals, and allowing his political prejudices sadly to interfere with the calm judgments of the unbiassed investigator. The Chicago *Monist* for April gives some translations from the chapter on Anarchists which are delightfully funny.

THE ANARCHIST EAR.

For information concerning the Chicago Anarchists and their doings Lombroso has applied to Schaack, the police historian of evil repute. Possibly his information concerning the Italian and French Anarchists was drawn from similar sources. However, as far as his scientific reputation is concerned, that would have mattered less if he had taken some pains in the arranging of the material he collected. As it is, on reading his "Physiognomy of the Anarchist," one meets with unenumerable inconsistencies and unproved statements. The first paragraph states that true revolutionists (i.e., successful ones) are almost always geniuses or saints, and then gives physiognomical characteristics which are to be seen in the countenances of some most orthodox and law-abiding citizens—high foreheads, bushy beards, and large soft eyes. On the next page he takes the Anarchist peculiarities, which in his view are the peculiarities not of "true revolutionists," but of enemies of society. The criminal type of face, he tells us, is in the ratio of 12 per cent. among the photographs of Communards, and 34 per cent. among 100 Turin

Anarchists arrested in the rebellion of 1st May last, as compared with 43 per cent. among ordinary criminals of the prison at Turin. He found 40 per cent. of the criminal type among photographs of the Chicago Anarchists, seventeen out of forty-three having disagreeable peculiarities of the face. The others we are left to suppose had no malformations, and, in fact, Parsons and Neebe are admitted to have had a noble and truly genial physiognomy. But there is one peculiarity which Lombroso states was common to all the Chicago martyrs—their ears were without lobes. This might have been a useful hint in helping us to find comrades, or to know a suitable auditor, when on propaganda work intent; but unluckily Lombroso adds that lobeless ears are very frequent in normal men as well. By normal, of course, he means sleek and greasy citizens.

MORAL INSENSIBILITY OF THE ANARCHIST.

Along with degenerate peculiarities of physique the Anarchist, according to Lombroso, is still further accursed with mental taints, characteristics "common to criminals and to the insane and possessing these traits by heredity." Thus, he says, Parsons had a very religious Methodist mother and his father took an interest in the Temperance League! Spies was born in a German chateau celebrated for feudal robbers! This reminds one of the old query, Is a man a horse because he happened to be born in a stable. These samples of the law of heredity as quoted by Professor Lombroso, are quite on a par with the proof he puts forward of Lingg's and Parsons' moral insensibility. Lingg showed it, he says, by preferring to put an end to his own life, rather than to await the torture and shame of the hangman's cord; Parsons by his advising Anarchists to "Strangle the spies and throw them out of the window"! If our comrades had gone to their shameful death with indifference or consoled amicably with spies, they might have been accused of moral insensibility. But the real point at issue between the Anarchists and M. Lombroso lies as deep as the question, In what does moral conduct in present social conditions consist? To us the criminality seems to lie with men who can calmly and indifferently accept the existing state of things as inevitable, with the men who are not rebels.

ANARCHISM AMONGST THE FRENCH PEASANTS.

The Anarchist idea continues to gain adherents among the peasants. Quite a series of meetings have been held recently in the district around Rochambeau, near Orleans. A good speaker has been spending three weeks with the comrades there, and has enabled them to hold meetings at Vendôme, Montoire, Villiers, Lunoy Thore, and Mazanzé, besides which a number of conversational meetings have been held for the elucidation of knotty points. These people, who mostly own the land they cultivate, readily agree with Anarchism, whereas they would be the bitterest enemies of any form of collectivism or nationalisation. Although "proprietors" themselves, they are amongst the most oppressed of humanity, for all the burdens of the present society fall as heavily upon them as upon the town workers, and the cultivation of their little plot of land is of the most burdensome description, as they are extremely short of capital and are mostly heavily mortgaged—the slaves of usurers instead of landlords. Our comrades are habituating the little "proprietors" to the idea of association, and Communism is teaching them that there is no necessity for them to have masters in order to combine, and that it is the Government which oppresses them to-day, with its heavy taxes and the submission it enforces to the cruel legal rights of the usurers. The result of this work in the Rochambeau district has been the formation of an energetic group calling themselves the "Rebel Peasants."

A FRENCH ANARCHIST DEMONSTRATION.

At La Ricamarie a demonstration was organised recently in commemoration of Comrade Gerbier. It was a great success. About three hundred miners marched to the cemetery between a double row of policemen. They had been forbidden by the Mayor to carry any flags, but just after the start some red and black flags were produced and headed the procession. On our dead comrade's tomb some fine speeches were made by several comrades. They spoke of the misery of the life of Gerbier, of his aspirations towards freedom, and of the exploitation of which he had been the victim. Afterwards there was a distribution of papers and pamphlets, and the people returned to the town singing revolutionary songs. This was followed by a meeting, at which the propaganda of Anarchist ideas in the district was discussed.

SPANISH PROPAGANDIST LITERATURE.

We have just received from Spain the concluding parts of the "Segunda Certamen Socialista" which contains the essays which were awarded prizes in the Literary Anarchist Competition initiated by the group "Eleventh of November" at Barcelona, in 1889, in honour of our murdered and imprisoned Chicago comrades. This is really a fine work and deals with Anarchy from all points of view. It also gives a full account of the Haymarket meeting and the ensuing events, together with a brief biography and the defence of each of our eight comrades and a phototypic reproduction of the large picture recently given to its readers by *El Productor* containing our comrades' portraits. The seven parts can now be had nicely bound together for five pesetas and postage, say 5s. post free from the office of *El Productor*, San Olegario, 2, 1º, Barcelona. We have also received several new pamphlets "Como nos Diezmen" (How they decimate us) is a little book of 95 pages by Vicente Marsh, which we hope to review at greater length later on. "El Crimen de Chicago" is the translation of an address delivered some time ago by Hugh O. Pentecost of New York. "En Tiempo de Ellec-

ciones," and "La Política Parlamentaria en el Movimiento Socialista" are Spanish translations of Italian pamphlets already noticed in these columns. Both are from the pen of our comrade Malatesta. An English translation of the latter is being prepared and we think will do good service. It will be called "Parliamentary Politics and the Socialist Movement."

COMMUNISM AND ANARCHY.

A REPLY TO H. DAVIS.

DEAR COMRADE DAVIS,

You have raised the three questions of competition, property owning and Communism.

As to competition. You do not mean emulation by it? (by emulation I understand, what may be called benevolent, harmless competition which brings no detrimental loss to the loser; playing children, members of a family striving each for the common good, etc.) You say yourself, there must be "something to compete for," and wish "an equal opportunity to each to obtain possession of any object to satisfy needs." You mean serious, real competition.

I maintain that "equal opportunity" never exists, as people are of different strength, ability, etc. If all conditions were really equal, nobody would ever win; thus by "equal opportunity" you can only mean certain conditions to which all who compete submit, some to their advantage, some to their loss. To call this submission "voluntary" or "free" does not mean very much; "voluntary" submission to the stronger means coercion, nevertheless, is a gilded pill, a farce and nothing better. In competition those win who are stronger from the beginning, or who let themselves be forced by the greed of winning to work harder than the others. Again, are these slaves of greed free? Winning in a competition and robbing or monopolising something is almost identical; force and coercion are at the bottom of all competition.

You do not examine the consequences of competition and seem satisfied by the assumption that the absence of law and authority, privilege and monopoly, will provide for all. How long will these good things be absent? Exactly as long as they are not wanted. Wanted, not by the exploited, of course, but by the exploiters, and they will soon want them, for they will have been carefully brought to life again by the working of competition.

Those who win in competition can use the advantage won to win other advantages in what you, yourself, will call unfair competition; where is the "equal opportunity" left? Still more, they can henceforward enforce their conditions of work, price, etc. upon others, thus coercing them like monopolists of to-day.

You may say, The others are free to compete with them. Yes, but only free to undersell them;—that means, being already weaker than those who have won in the competition, they are forced to work still harder than those who are possessed of greater strength, ability, etc. This I no more call freedom than I call freedom, "free opportunity," the opportunity a worker of to-day has to become a capitalist, or that of the small shopkeeper to compete with the large city merchant. It is freedom to starve; the distinction is only one of degree.

You maintain that competition and monopoly "can be separated." I do not see how. Either you hinder a successful competitor to become a monopolist by so-called "free" competition, that is, in my opinion, by coercing others to work under his or under still harder conditions,—and this you can only do by forcibly depriving him of his "property"—where is his "equal opportunity" left? or these others submit "voluntarily," and the successful man is allowed to grow up into a monopolist. Still you might rely, in your opinion, on the absence of law and authority. If the successful competitor is protected in no way, he has no guarantees of reaping the fruits of his policy of working for his own good (which must be done at the cost of other peoples' benefit)! will he have to face the jealous people, his enemies, all around, at his own risk and peril? You will say, yes. But is he free in that case? Must he not expect lynching? And, if many people are in this position, face to face with their fellows whom they have exploited, cheated and starved—to which evils competition and the right of property must lead very soon—will they not have recourse to laws and police to protect them and their property? Of course they will. Where there is property, won at the cost of others, it needs protection, and people care more for their property than for their freedom; the more so because what amount of freedom or license they may want, their property buys them. Do we see the leisured classes of to-day craving for freedom? Freedom of exploitation is all they care for, and so will the new monopolists too.

I shall discuss your third point (Communism) before your second (property owning).

Compulsory Communism is a term which may be used now like the expression compulsory abolition of slavery might have been used by abolitionists a hundred years ago; to-day nobody thinks of the compulsion with regard to slavery, its abolition has become a matter of course. The air we breathe is compulsory common property. A path leading over some grounds which were railed in yesterday, but opened to-day, becomes instantly a natural, self-evident part of our needs, and we think with disdain or wonder of the absurd state of yesterday, and can hardly imagine how we stood the nuisance so long. The same will, in my opinion, be the case with the extension of Communism over all phases and domains of life. Once the people know of it, they will claim food, clothing, and shelter, in the same way in which they claim to-day the right to use the streets, to breathe the air, etc. On this fact, our con-

viction of the necessity of the immediate introduction of Communism after the revolution, the expropriation, and our rejection of an intermediate state of collectivism (to each the full result of his work) are based. If, in the future state of society, a man did not understand this Communism of all the means of living, the people would think the same of him as of a man who would build to-day a wall up to the skies to shut in the air on his estate, or the like.

The stress laid—in face of this immense extension of Communism—on "property owning" might remind one a little of the ordinary objection we hear so often raised; "but if somebody wants to take your coat from you, what will you do in that case under Communism?" The reply is, no sensible person understands, by Communism, the rambling about of robbers and fools. Taking an example from present society, countless as the horrors and absurdities of modern family life are, still there are here and there families in which, with regard to the ordinary means of life, Communism practically exists; do we see in these families, where all work for each other, etc., if one member possesses a favourite thing, that the other members try by all means to snatch it from him, spoil it, etc.? Of course not, or there must be a fool or an idiot among them. (I refer for discussion of the right of use to the second article on "Freedom and Property," March, 1891).

"Property owning" will be possible and, indeed, a matter of course, within the limits of Communism. We cannot know beforehand, nor dictate, speculate about, etc., to how many things Communism will extend. This will depend on the progress of time, on the locality, the physical conditions of the country, the inclinations and wants of the people of the particular parts, etc. We may expect that the differences between different nations, localities, etc., will disappear by-and-by, but it is nobody's business to make rules for that. We hope that Communism will extend far enough (and continually spread more) not to leave to the commodities not put in common sufficient economic power to become the instruments of monopoly. For we are convinced that monopoly may step in through the slightest loophole left. For instance, in this district it may not be worth while to produce such and such an article for which there is no sufficient demand; then those who care for it will have to get it by their own exertion and by combination with others; in other parts that article will be produced by all and be easily accessible to all; but all these are details on which no serious issue can depend. The moment the people at large prefer "property owning" to Communism, they will have to put up with the consequences—monopoly, law, and reaction. If isolated individualist anarchists or groups of such persons wish to live in their own way, of course nobody will object, except in case they monopolise things which are for common use.

In short, in the future society we shall have Communism of all commodities, which, if individually produced, would become monopolies, besides property owning in all things which satisfy individual wants without being required in sufficient quantity, equal quality, etc., as to make their common production and consumption worth while. Thus the development of Individualism will not be crushed out by Communism, as our opponents say; only individuals will have no longer an opportunity to become monopolists.

Thus far my remarks. You will find that the point to which I chiefly object is the first one raised by you. The belief that the momentary absence of law and authority can make a good thing out of a bad thing, a good thing out of competition instead of the bad result—monopoly, I consider is the cardinal point where your mistake, in my opinion, begins. Monopoly, an inevitable result of competition, is by itself economic superiority of individuals, hence force, coercive power, authority, etc., at the disposal of individuals; it is the source and not the consequence of law. Before there can be a law, there must be something to protect, and that is monopoly in its countless forms and variations.

I know the way in which the individualist anarchists of "Liberty" defend their position, which is almost identical, yet, I should say, more consequent in the wrong direction, than yours. Let us hope that your arguments in defence of this point will carry more weight with them than theirs have done up till now as far as I am concerned.

Yours fraternally,

March 29, 1891.

N.

VALUE IN USE AND VALUE IN EXCHANGE.

THE science of political economy* may be divided into three branches, treating of *Consumption*, *Production*, and *Value* (comprising exchange and distribution). With which of these three branches ought our inquiry into the relations between value in use and value in exchange to begin? One will answer that we ought first of all to learn something about Production. He evidently thinks that Production is the first condition for the existence of any political economy at all. Others will say that we ought to begin with Exchange, and emphatically declare it is Exchange which makes the distinction between our subject, the science of National Economy and that science of Private Economy which we do not intend here to consider. A peasant family produces bread; this bread is every day distributed to the various members of the family, according to certain rules. In a community, too, bread is produced

* Here we mean to consider only the economic conditions which now exist, not those which ought to exist. The scientific treatment of the latter may be described as the art of political economy.

and is daily distributed to the bread-consuming members; but this distribution is always connected with a process of Exchange. The member of the community who does not himself produce bread gives something in exchange—money or work—to get a share in the distribution of bread. Thus we see that in the peasant family the bread has *only* value in use or utility, but that in the community it evidently has, besides its value in use, value in exchange. It is this fact which has led many well-known economists to the conclusion that the subject of exchange is the first to be investigated of the three above-named branches of our science. Many later economists, however, maintain that this is quite wrong, and that we must begin with a theory of Consumption, if we do not want to base our theories of exchange-value, capital, rent, wages, and so on, upon unproved assertions and metaphysical speculations. To be able to defend this assertion, the modern economist must be able not only to prove that his own theory of exchange value is founded on a theory of Consumption, but also that all theories of exchange value devoid of such a foundation are false.

The so-called classical school of political economy, to which belong Adam Smith, Ricardo, and also, as far as his value theory is concerned, Karl Marx, maintain that the value in exchange of a commodity is a function of either its cost of production or that quantity of labour which is necessary for the production of that commodity (Marx). The new economic school, one of the earliest promoters of which was Mr. Stanley Jevons, shows that this notion is entirely false; that value in exchange is a function of quite different economic factors, and that we are utterly unable to comprehend the nature of value in exchange until we have to some extent investigated the nature of value in use, which last investigation it was the fatal mistake of the older economists, and especially Karl Marx, to have practically ignored.

Now an investigation of value in use or utility means an investigation of consumption.

It is a fact that man, to be able to live, must consume. He must have food, wear clothes, burn wood or coal, use houses to protect himself against the weather, etc. His needs are of various kinds. So, the need for starchy food (*e.g.*, potatoes), is different from the need for albuminous food (*e.g.*, meat). Both these needs are something different from the need of using shoes, hats, and clothes, which again differs from the need of burning a lamp during the winter evenings. With the growth of civilisation needs grow in number—apparently indefinitely. When lower wants are satisfied, higher ones are developed, and so on without any limit. But even if we imagine that in the course of evolution the sum of possible different wants is an infinite quantity, it is quite certain that every special want is a finite quantity; it can be satisfied with a finite quantity of the required article. Nobody can live without food or drink, but no one can consume a cartload a day even if it consisted of the most choice dishes and wines. Nobody can, in our climate, be without clothes, but no one can wear out a shipload of clothes, even if he is the greatest masher. Nobody can enjoy five five-act dramas on the same day. Thus it becomes evident that every special kind of want *can* be satisfied by a certain amount of the wanted thing.

(To be continued.)

NOTES FROM SCOTLAND.

The Scottish Railway Strike, the impression of which has already almost passed away, has not as yet brought any redress to railway workers, except in the case of the Glasgow and South Western Company, where considerable concessions have been made in the reduction of working hours. The new regulations issued by the North British Company rather aggravate than diminish the grievances of the men. However the final results of the joint conferences of directors and delegates have yet to be made known.

Quite a large number of the strikers have not yet been re-engaged—and probably the majority of those re-engaged have not been reinstated in the former positions.

One thing which the strike has accomplished for good or evil, is, that from henceforth the railway companies will have no peace from parliamentary interference. The "freedom of contract" which capitalists so much extol will be more and more limited by special enactments as the sessions go by.

Another thing is, that the men have been wakened up to an interest in the labour and social problem. It is quite certain that as a result of the strike agitation hundreds of quiet, stolid, and loyal men, have become chronically discontented, and imbued with more or less definite Socialist convictions.

The report of the jurors of the Glasgow East End Industrial Exhibition draws attention to a melancholy evidence of the lack of imagination and initiative amongst even the more skilful and industrious of our artisans. It seems that the great mass of the exhibits sent in by workmen were merely toyish models of engines, ships, machinery and the like, almost entirely lacking any impress of invention and devoid of utility. We need hardly wonder, however, that only servile art should

come from slaves; it is natural that men who toil contentedly for masters all day long, should devote their leisure to celebrating the triumphs of their servitude.

The labour candidates (of advanced opinions) at the recent School Board elections, have so far as I have observed, been defeated all round. As an indication of the opinions of the workers, this result is of little moment, as the School Board is not generally regarded as a suitable or important arena for fighting the battle of the toilers. It is suggestive of the whole tendency of electioneering that although many of the candidates were Socialists, none of them saw fit to stand as Socialist candidates; although Carson and Brodie, who sought admission into the Glasgow Board, did not seek to disguise their Socialist convictions.

The most interesting event since the Railway Strike has been the attempt of a number of Lewis cottars to squat upon land presently let by Lady Mathieson for sheep-farming and game purposes. The cottars allege that the land was grabbed from their fathers, and that they cannot exist without the use of it.

Several parties of cottars, carrying with them spades, seed, and provisions, boldly went forth and took possession of portions of land, which they immediately began to till and sow. The portions fixed upon were many miles away, in rather inaccessible parts, and the poor fellows soon found, I guess, that land restoration without the restoration of capital and means of exchange would be no great boon. Any way, when the representatives of landlords' law'n order came to serve them with summonses for criminal trespass, the daring pioneers of land restitution were discovered in a desperate plight, for want of food and covering from the cold.

The men were all brought before the Sheriff, and, of course, found guilty. Some of them, on promising not to repeat the offence, were liberated; the others, who refused to give any such promise, were sentenced to a fortnight's imprisonment.

If the workers in the factories of our large towns understood their rights, and were as courageous in asserting them as many of these poor Lewis cottars, the social revolution would not be very far off. Good speed to them!

No attempt, as far as I am aware, will be made by Trades Unionists in Scotland to demonstrate on the 1st of May, or even on Saturday, the 2nd, or Sunday, the 3rd. Several of the Socialist bodies mean, however, to hold special labour demonstrations on the Sunday. Scottish artisans are very slow in adopting new ideas; but I venture to prophesy that ere many years go by they will turn out on May Day as enthusiastically as their Continental brethren.

J. BRUCE GLASIER.

SOCIETY ON THE MORROW OF THE REVOLUTION.

Translated from the French of JEHAN LE VAGRE.

XIII.—THE STRUGGLE AGAINST NATURE.

As we have seen in the preceding chapter, without having to look for other arguments in support of the right of revolt, which we loudly proclaim, we have only to take for ourselves those with which the middle-class has supplied us, and with the middle-class theories we can undermine the bases of the social order which they seek to consolidate. But we have wider aims. Instead of looking at human society as a vast battle-field, where the victory belongs to those who have the largest appetites, we think that all men's efforts ought to be united and directed only against Nature, which presents to man sufficient mysteries, sufficient difficulties, to supply him with the elements of a long and bitter struggle, for which all his strength will not be too much.

What force is lost, how many lives sacrificed, either in the hard struggle for life or in stupid wars! What intelligences are wasted which in other conditions might be turned to the profit and enjoyment of humanity! If all the men who are brutalised and enervated by the life of the camps and barracks were employed in sanitary work or other useful employment, such as the construction of canals, the tunnelling of mountains, etc., etc., can we not see what an immense advantage humanity would derive? Besides which, these men would be doing their share of the common work instead of living as parasites on humanity.

If all the energy which is expended in producing the implements of warfare and destruction was devoted to the manufacture of machinery and tools necessary to production, how the hours of work that every one has to give to society would be reduced. If all the efforts of the inventors who are intent upon the discovery of cuirasses and sheet armour for ships, which their heavy armour only makes slow, and which to-morrow the invention of a new gun or a new system of torpedoes will render

THE HERALD OF ANARCHY.

A MONTHLY EXPONENT OF CONSISTENT INDIVIDUALISM.

Shows how Rent and Interest can be abolished by free competition, and defends the right of the labourer to the fruit of his own toil.

Published at the New Fellowship Press, 26 Newington Green Road, N.

DER ANARCHIST: A FORTNIGHTLY JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM. Post free to Great Britain for One shilling per quarter. Address: C. Timmermann, P.O. Box, 758, St. Louis, Missouri, U.S.A.

† The mathematicians call a measurable quantity a function of another measurable quantity, if any alteration whatsoever in the magnitude of the first causes or determines a corresponding alteration in the magnitude of the second. Thus, the price I pay for a piece of silk of given quality is a function of its length, as every alteration in the length of the piece of silk bought causes a corresponding alteration in the amount of money I must pay for it.

useless, were directed towards the making of new machines to lessen the necessary amount of work or to triumph over nature, what ideas might not be realised which to-day appear to us only as a dream.

In the society we desire, all this progress, all these discoveries, would be to the advantage of the producers, seeing that in this society there would only be workers, whilst nowadays, when a discovery of this kind is made, it only increases their burdens and misery, taking their place in the workshop, throwing them without resources upon the street, whilst the masters increase their capital by the advantages over hand labour which they are able to secure.

Then what is the good of continuing to contest the supremacy of nation over nation and race over race? Is not the earth big enough to nourish everybody? Certain of the middle-class deny it.

In order to justify this scarcity of food which they say exists, our short sighted economists have established (in their books)—we do not know on what grounds—some calculations which they say show that articles of consumption increase in an arithmetical ratio of 2, 4, 6, 8, etc., whilst the population increases in the geometrical ratio of 2, 4, 8, 16, etc.; so that if things were allowed to continue in this way food would, after a while, be completely wanting, and men would be forced to return to the state of cannibalism in which they formerly lived. Happily, they say, the social organisation intervenes with all its accompaniment of frauds, wars and diseases occasioned by continual work and insufficient nourishment, decimating them and preventing them from eating each other by making them perish of misery and hunger.

Now nothing can be more false than this calculation, for, apart from all the uncultivated land that may be rendered productive, it has been demonstrated that the present system of cultivation on comparatively small patches of land prevents us from applying to the soil all that which it would be possible to do by farming on a large scale, with steam power machinery and chemical manure.* We may instance America in regard to this, with its immense plains, the soil of which, turned over with steam ploughs, even though cultivated without any science, gives so much better results than the English or French farms, and with so much less work that it is no longer possible for us to compete with them. We may also instance the innumerable flocks of South America, which are only killed for their skins, the meat being thrown away, not for want of markets, but because the low price caused by importation would be prejudicial to the interests of certain individuals who here at home raise cattle for the purpose of selling the flesh to us as dear as possible.†

The study of natural history shows us that the prolific power of animals is in an inverse ratio to their degree of development, that is to say, the lower the species are in the social scale the more they multiply, in order to make up for the losses occasioned in the war made upon them by the superior species; so that man who has succeeded in subduing and domesticating most of the species useful to him for food, is always assured of being able to supply his needs by organising reproduction according to his wants for consumption.

As we have seen, nothing is easier than to refute the theories of the middle-class economists by their own arguments. Thus, when they tell us that "a society of equals cannot exist because certain cerebral inequalities exist; that, the intelligent man being naturally superior to the unintelligent, he certainly cannot be the equal of the brute; that the people of superior intelligence must be able to find a greater amount of enjoyment since by their works they give more to society," we can boldly reply that this again is a mistake, for from a purely philosophical point of view it is not humanity, which is indebted to the intelligent man, but the intelligent man who is indebted to humanity, by the mere fact that he has monopolised a greater amount of brain matter, and that if he has been able to develop his brain he has only done so by drawing upon the stock of knowledge and discoveries which has resulted from the work of past generations. Consequently the more society has enabled him to develop himself, the more he is indebted to it. But we only say this by the way, for, looking at the thing from the point of view of plain fact, we see that man finds his recompense in his intelligence itself and the enjoyment given him by the work which it causes him to undertake. In fact, the more intelligent he is the more easy he finds it to satisfy his wants; for in consequence of his intelligence he has created intellectual wants imperceptible to those who are termed unintelligent, and which consequently will not be disputed with him.

Then, again, by what right does a man, because he is more intelligent than another man, dictate laws to him? In spite of his intelligence, the so-called superior man has all the defects, or at least a part of the defects, inherent to human nature. There are no perfect beings, and one who will reason in a superior manner in the most abstract sciences will often cut a very small figure in the most ordinary affairs of life. Educated men themselves, even, do not deny it.

"So, in the case of certain men of learning, intellectual development has completely extinguished the life of the affections. For them there is no longer either friend, family, country, humanity, moral dignity, or sentiment of justice. Indifferent to everything which passes outside the intellectual realm in which they combat and enjoy, the greatest social iniquities do not trouble their quietude. What does tyranny matter to them, so long as it respects the phials and retorts of their laboratory? So we see them pampered and caressed by the shrewdest

despots. They are beings of luxury, whose existence and presence honor the master, serve as a passport for his bad actions, and are besides not able to trouble him in the least." (Letourneau, "Physiologie des Passions," page 108.)

Moreover, we cannot make people happy in spite of themselves. Every one has his own ideas of the happiness he requires; every one looks at it from his own point of view, according to his temperament, according to the degree of development which he has reached. Consequently there is no single rule for the happiness of individuals, and we can only let everyone arrange it in his own way. Let us destroy all the institutions which are able to serve the ambition of individuals, let us see that the happiness of each results from the general well-being, and then individuals, no longer pressing upon one another—since no one will press upon them, and anyone whom others may wish to oppress will always be in a position to send about their business those who strive to press upon him—then everyone will seek to accommodate himself in the best way, in accordance with his tendencies, by associating himself with those who sympathise with him or who look at things from the same point of view; and as all these individuals will be held together by no laws, as they will be there only by their own will, because they will themselves have chosen the circle in which they move, and will be free to leave it when it no longer responds to their ideas, an understanding between them will be easy.

Far from desiring to return to a state of nature, as we have been accused of doing, we fully understand that only a state of association will permit of our utilising all the inventions and discoveries put at man's disposal by science, and which ought to enable him to obtain the greatest sum of enjoyment for the least expenditure of strength; only if science demonstrates that, it also shows us that there can be no lasting association except between elements possessing the same affinities, the same character, or like properties.

Thus, far from looking at society as a vast battle-field, where the victory belongs to those who have the largest appetites, and in which so many intelligences are lost, because the social organisation has not allowed them to develop, we think that men ought to stop these murderous and stupid wars which they make under the hollow pretences of patriotism, etc., and in which they waste so much ill-directed force, and that they ought rather to unite their efforts to make war—yes, but war against nature, in order to draw from it all the enjoyment possible.

We do not know that we can do better than conclude by quoting from a writer who could not possibly be suspected of revolutionary ideas, although it is true that we do not accept the sentimentalism which guides him:—

"To-day the strongest, the richest, the most elevated in social position, and the most learned, exercise an empire almost absolute over the weak, the ignorant, the lower orders, and it seems to them quite natural to put the strength of those others to their own individual profit. Society as a whole must necessarily suffer from such a state of things. It ought to understand that it is much better for all individuals to unite their efforts, assist each other with the same end in view—that is to say, to shake off the oppression of natural forces, instead of wasting their energy in struggling with each other, in mutually exploiting one another. Rivalry, so useful in itself, should continue to exist, but the ancient rude form of war and extermination in the struggle for life should be cast aside, and competition should take the nobler and really human form of emulation having for its end the general interest. In other words, instead of the struggle to live, the struggle for life in general, general harmony; instead of universal hate, universal love! In proportion as man progresses in this direction, he moves further away from his animal past, from his subordination to natural forces and their inexorable laws, and approaches the ideal development of humanity. In this direction also man will find again that paradise which, according to the legend, has been lost to us through sin; with this difference, however, that the future paradise is not imaginary, but real, that it is to be found not at the beginning, but at the end of human evolution, that it is not the gift of a God, but the result of work, the gain of man and of humanity." (Buchner, "Man according to Science.")

A MANIFESTO To the Workers of Germany,

By a German Anarchist Group.

This Manifesto issued by one of the Anarchist Groups in Germany is a powerful appeal to the workers to join the Anarchists in the fight against capital, and to save the labour movement from the moral ruin of Social Democracy. We translate the concluding portion.

And now, know why we are Anarchists. We are Anarchists, because we recognise that men will ever fall into the old error, so long as the workers do not organise themselves on the basis of free agreement. You must accustom yourselves to guide your own destinies, and not to put your whole faith in party leaders, for these, of necessity and often involuntarily, develop into authorities, rulers, and in the end, oppressors. Workers! If the new society does not rest on the independence of the individual, and if the individual allows himself to be led, driven, and finally governed, you cannot say you have achieved economic freedom; and your Socialism is so far a chimera. If you wish complete, unlimited freedom, you are Socialists and we are with you. But lay your destinies again in the hands of a clique and you are no longer free men, for you prove thereby that you

* Or by applying the "intensive" gardening system, under which, by individual science and skill, small patches of carefully pulverised and artificially made soil, either in the open or under glass, can be made to yield crops which seem incredible to persons accustomed to the slovenly cultivation general to-day.—Ed.

† See "Les Produits de la Terre," "Les Produits de la Industrie," and "Richesse et Misère," published by *La Révolte*, Paris.

cannot yet freely unite with friends because you require leaders and rulers. But then you have no right to call yourselves Socialists, for logical Socialism is Anarchism, or more correctly, Anarchist Communism, that is, a social system based on morality, justice, freedom, and equality—a society which rests on the highest morality of the individual and recognises neither law nor judge, neither Parliament nor State, a society of groups or communes freely constituted, with their interests regulated according to circumstances, time, and necessity, in Assemblies or in Congresses, whose resolutions, however, are not binding. In a word, we desire a *Society* resting on the free initiative of the individual; and the social democratic jobbers desire a society resting on authority delegated to your representatives. We say, "Down with authority." You strive to strengthen it. We say, "Discipline is at the root of all the evils suffered by the people." You say, "Discipline is the primary condition of social prosperity." You wish to call yourselves free, and you follow authority blindly. You speak of freedom of action and you follow with military precision the directions given you. You speak of freedom of thought, and repudiate any of your people who advance a step beyond you. So long as you do not break with authority, discipline, and the election swindle, so long as you pick up the stupidities of that hoary form of society called by the name of State, and introduce them into your modern "ideals," into your "Socialism," so long is a radical improvement of your condition not even to be thought of. Learn to free yourselves *individually* of your faults and all tutelage, and you will no longer require controllers of your destinies, who only betray you. Down with authority! Is it manly to higgie with a society which has its roots in robbery, murder, misery, lying, exploitation, and hypocrisy, which daily regales you with the crumbs from its table, which is always prating of the sacredness of property and yet steals your real and natural property, namely, your labour-power, every hour of the day? Is it manly, we say to treat with such a society? If the privileged classes will not give up one iota of their dishonestly acquired property, if they will only yield to force, why do you not prepare yourselves, that is, organise yourselves until you are strong enough to crush the enemy? While you are fighting as revolutionary Socialists, do you think your enemy will not give you the crumbs; will he not be forced to give even more and more? What are your speakers in the Reichstag after? What did Liebknecht use to say? "Our speeches cannot exercise a direct influence on legislation. We cannot convert the Reichstag by them, nor spread any truths among the masses, which we could not disseminate much better by other means. What 'practical' effect then have speeches in the Reichstag? None. And to speak to no purpose is a pleasure to fools only. Not a single advantage! And now on the other hand the disadvantages: principle sacrificed, earnest political warfare degraded to a parliamentary sham fight, the people led into the delusion that the mission of Bismarck's Reichstag is to solve the social problem. And shall we on 'practical grounds' take part in this parliamentary business? Only treason and shortsightedness can demand it of us. . . . Fidelity to principle is the best policy." Workers, how does that please you? What does this same Liebknecht, who said that, do in the Reichstag to-day? We are well aware that the Revolution must, when ripe, break out among the people by the force of circumstances. We therefore do not wish to make the Revolution, but to bring it to ripeness. By a revolution you shorten the death struggle of the *bourgeoisie*, by reforms you prolong it and at the same time prolong your misery. There is no alternative but Revolution. Workers! Brothers! Is it such a great piece of good fortune to stupidly drag out a wretched life of slavery? Is it not much braver, more human, more honourable to live fighting, and if it must be to die fighting? Workers, we appeal to you to cry with us: Down with exploitation! Down with the reform swindle! Down with the *bourgeoisie*, and their tools! that is, your false friends, your leaders! Your Social-Democratic state was always an absurdity to our minds, and now since the Halle Congress you have yourselves unmasked this sham revolutionary Socialism. "The chief aim of the Revolution is the destruction of all authority; it is—after the transformation of society—the substitution of social economy for politics, of industrial organisation for Governmental organisation, it is Anarchy," says C. de Paepe. Your State is like a steam engine that lacks steam, that is, the living force which we call complete freedom, equality, and justice. Do you wish to fight us, destroy us with the old weapons of the law, the police, and the military? In that case you are no Socialists, you are tyrants, and your society is like that of to-day, as one egg is like another.

But you will perhaps wish us to express our ideas more exactly. Although we swear by no programme, as we are of opinion that society like the individual is in the process of an unbroken development which nothing can stop. Yet we wish to make you acquainted with our ideas regarding organisation in a free society, and these are very simple.

First, let us transport ourselves into the Revolution itself. The first thing will be to provide the most necessary requirements of life, and to this end all wealth must be expropriated, that is, the warehouses of the capitalists will be opened and placed at the free disposal of the people, similarly with the instruments of labour and work-shops, for free use, for further production. In this wise the governing classes will be deprived of every opportunity of utilising, as hitherto, the necessitous position of the people for the counter-revolution. As we must strive to hinder the resuscitation of any government or authority, we cannot permit any committee to be formed for the purpose of overseeing production or of distributing the articles of consumption as they think proper. The workers in their respective trades will do this themselves as they think best, and they will place their produce at the free disposal of the Com-

mune or of other groups, that is, at the disposal of society. As with other branches of industry, so will it be with agriculture. The agricultural labourers will seize the soil, and hand over the products to society, in so far as they themselves do not require them, and in return they will be provided with all the other necessities of life. Only in this way can the principle be practised: "From each according to his capacity and inclination, and to each according to his needs," and perfect equality and justice guaranteed to all. Education will, of course, be free, and will be placed on a scientific basis. All affairs will be settled by free and public discussion.

These are, in a few words, our ideas. And now, workers, decide whether you wish to be in the future underlings or free men. You can only become the latter by making the means of existence free.

From *Die Autonomie*.

THE PROPAGANDA.

REPORTS.

St. Pancras Communist-Anarchist Group.—April 26th, Comrade H. Davis lectured on "Trades-Unionism," at the North Western Coffee Tavern, 249, Great College Street, N.W.

PROVINCES—

Newcastle-on-Tyne.—Sunday, April 12, De Mattos lectured at the Lecture Hall, Nelson Street, on the "Legal Eight Hours' Bill." At the end of the lecture opposition was offered by Comrade Pearson. DeMattos never attempted to answer the arguments brought forward but told the audience Anarchism simply meant that every man shall have liberty to do as he likes with his neighbour, which meant that society should be organised on the principle that might is right.

In the evening DeMattos again lectured, taking for his subject—"What Socialism Is," claiming that Socialism means "State interference, nationalisation of land, capital and all means of production and transit, universal suffrage, and one man one vote," and the "protection of the weak from the strong by the Government." DeMattos ended by saying "that what the ruling classes fear most is Education, the workers themselves must study these economic and political problems—this can be done by attending lectures, discussions, and reading Socialistic literature." How much the Tyneside Fabians believed this was shown by the fact that the chairman (a Fabian) only allowed five minutes for discussion, and the other Fabians present tried to stop the sale of *Freedom* and *Commonweal* in the Hall.

Pearson protested against the distorted definition of Anarchism, and pointed out that some of the best thinkers in the Socialist party were Anarchists. He then went on to show that the lecturer had mixed Socialism with Democracy. Socialism does not necessarily imply State slavery or government in any form. The lecturer was trying to mix the fresh life of Socialism with the dying order of politics, but as Shakespeare says, "Crabbed age and youth cannot live together," and the dying and corrupt order of politics cannot march side by side with the fresh life of Socialism, it can only be a drag to true progress. It is absurd to argue that every man will have a voice in the making of the law. Majority rule means that if you are in the majority you have an infinitesimal voice in sending men to make the law for you; if you are in the minority you have no voice at all. He then pointed out that Democrat not Anarchist proposed to organise society on the principle of might is right. The principle of Anarchist-Communism means economic and political liberty, the principle of Democracy is that the majority (the strongest) have a right to invade the liberty of the minority (the weak).

Comrades Wood and Thompson, Social Democrats, then protested against the compensation arguments, and said that the Socialism of De Mattos was Radicalism under another name.

De Mattos again never attempted to answer any of the arguments brought forward, but simply stated that he was sorry that he had misrepresented Anarchism. He did not deny that Anarchism was the ultimate goal of society. He then stated that in his opinion we must always have a government of some sort.

Great Yarmouth.—Our comrades in Yarmouth have moved to new premises. Their address is now Carmagnole House, 40 Howard Street. A large shop belongs to the Club, one half of which is devoted to the sale of revolutionary literature, the other being used by a comrade for his trade of boot-making. Several new comrades have joined and everything is in train for a vigorous propaganda during the summer months. Comrade Cropley, who has been out of work for a few weeks, has employed his leisure in distributing back numbers of *Freedom* and *Commonweal* and other literature, in several of the neighbouring villages. On Good Friday Comrades Hindes, Bourne and Brightwell went to Bolton Fair and stirred up the pleasure-seekers there. April 3rd Comrade Headley discussed the Result of Christianity with a local gospel grinder. The meeting lasted an hour and was dispersed by the police. April 12th, there was a large attendance in the new club room to hear Comrade Hindes read "Why I am a Socialist," which evoked an interesting discussion. April 12th, Headley opened a discussion there on "Radicalism and Socialism"; there was a good attendance and lively debate. The Comrades are going to issue a leaflet protesting against the Baker's Ring.

Anarchist League (Individualist).—April 19th, Albert Tarn lectured before the N. W. London branch of the National Secular Society on "Anarchism, Its Aims and Methods."

Comrades and friends are earnestly requested to send in reports regularly. The importance of this column should not be undervalued.

NOTICES.

St. Pancras Communist Anarchist Group.—Meetings for discussion will be held every Sunday at 8 p.m. at the North Western Coffee Tavern, 249 Great College Street, N.W. All are invited. Admission free.

East London Communist Anarchist Groups.—Discussion meetings every Tuesday evening at 8.30, in the hall of the I. W. M. Club, 40 Berner Street, Commercial Road, E. As further numbers of the *Anarchist Labour Leaf* cannot be printed, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, the only copies extant, have been put in pamphlet form and can be had from H. Davis, 97, Boston Street, Hackney Road, N.E., at the rate of 8d. per quire of 24, or single copies, one halfpenny each, by post, 1d.

Great Yarmouth.—May 3rd, open-air meetings commence.

Dublin Socialist Union.—87 Marlboro' Street, Thursday May 7th, at 8 p.m. R. H. Fitzpatrick, "How to realise Socialism." All friends invited.