

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. 5.—No. 56.

JULY, 1891.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY

THE THIN END OF THE WEDGE.

Now that the severities of the winter are past and Londoners are enjoying a little fine summer weather, Hyde Park has become a rallying ground of demonstrations almost every Sunday. Men and women who have received the gospel of discontent are by no means so rare now as they were a few years ago. Their appetites are still small. They are grateful for a very trifling alleviation of their terrible life of slavery. Still we anarchists and revolutionaries have reason to be pretty well satisfied when we consider how downtrodden the workers have been and are, how the hope has been crushed out of them by the skilful manipulation of brute force on the part of the exploiters, and how ignorant the workers have been of the true causes of their misery. The thin end of the wedge has penetrated, or to use another metaphor, the valley of dry bones (apparently a good deal more lifeless than Ezekiel's) has begun to stir. Even the women—laundresses and servant girls and others—are beginning to make a move. Less hours and more pay is the universal cry and the poor capitalist in his greedy desire to wring out every day the last grain of energy in his slaves is beginning to fear for his future. For those who to-day cry for less hours and more pay are on the broad path which leadeth to destruction—of the capitalists and landlords. The little streamlet is likely to become a torrent before very long. Small victories will lead to greater. Defeats will lead to more energetic measures being taken.

The strike of the busmen is one of the most noteworthy events of the past month. Busmen like dockers have generally been thought incapable of making a move in their own defence and yet here they have come out one fine morning and left London busless. The traditional old lady who waits outside the Mansion House about six months before she can get across to the Bank has been able to walk across quite leisurely. Cheapside has been almost like a promenade and thousands of Londoners have developed the very healthy habit of walking "to business," and, better than all, the rising public opinion in favor of the new world which is about to be born has supported the men in their claim for leisure. Within a few days the exploiters climbed down and the men gained their twelve hours day. It does not seem much of a concession. Some of us wonder how any man can ever consent to work sixteen and eighteen hours a day as a regular thing, but still there are such mortals and to them it is a distinct gain. It is a sign of the general progress of the socialist idea that these, the oppressed amongst the oppressed, should make even such a small move in the right direction. It will turn their thoughts in a revolutionary direction, and, who knows, some of the most active spirits in the coming Social Revolution may come from the ranks of the busmen.

It is rumoured that the bus companies are thinking of playing the men false. We can hardly think they will be so foolish. In the first place they must know that they will have all the enlightened public opinion against them, and in the next place, they will play into the hands of us Anarchists excellently. Nothing can advance the revolutionary education of the busmen better than to be dismissed for trying to improve their position to such a trifling extent. If the bus companies should be so stupid and so vindictive as to seek revenge upon the men, it will recoil upon their own heads. The men will perceive better than we could ever tell them how rotten the present state of society is, how it is built up on brute force and the power of a few, and how absolutely essential it is to the happiness of the workers that it should be destroyed root and branch, so as to make way for a new society in which all men will be equal and free, in which the power of life and death, the control of the means of living will no longer be vested in the hands of a committee of gentlemen whose sole work is to see that they extract plenty of work from others.

We hope the busmen will not be too grateful to their "leaders." Possibly some of these leaders have the interests of the men at heart in some degree, but very certainly they have most of them their own interests very much at heart and the men could have got on just as well without them. When a number of men make up their minds to do a thing there is not the slightest necessity for them to appoint somebody else to tell them how and when to do it. Certainly they will do it very much better if they do not have recourse to the help of these intermediaries. They are not so likely to be sold or to compromise when they are not helped by these gentry. We know very little of Lawyer Sutherst, and we know nothing good of lawyers generally, but we know at any rate that the notoriety he will obtain through the bus

strike may be very serviceable to him, should he, which is perhaps not unlikely, attempt to become a member of that charming club at Westminster. We also note that the orders given out by him are worthy of a dictator, and lead one to suppose that he would make an excellent member of the Social Democratic party. We do not deny that such men do useful service in stirring up the feeble hearted amongst the workers, but we shall pay dearly for their services if we make them rulers over us, such as a good many of them appear to be trying to become.

But encouraging as these signs of progress are, showing as they do that the workers are beginning to move, are beginning to feel the necessity to be free, let us never forget that the net result of all this marching and countermarching, striking and demonstrating, is very trifling indeed compared with the great problem itself which the workers of the present generation have to solve. A few busmen may have their hours reduced, a few shop assistants may get a half-holiday once a week (except before bank holidays!) but the great problem of the unemployed is untouched. The great mass of workers in misery remain as they are. According to Mr. Charles Booth's book on "Labor and Life of the People," over thirty per cent. of the London people are in poverty, by which he means that the head of the family gets 21s. a week or under. Nearly a million (938,293) persons are living in London amongst whom the heads of families, say one in four or five, get from eighteen to twenty-one shillings a week, and about 360,000 more are worse off than that. When we remember that the poorest families are generally the most numerous, it will be seen that our estimate of four or five in a family is very moderate, and when we think what sort of living can be got for four or five persons on 18s. a week, say 4s. a head, we must admit that Mr. Booth's estimate of comfort is not too high. It must be remembered too, that the workers do not touch the worst robbers in their strikes and demonstrations. The capitalist's wail that if he grants a certain advance he will make no profit at all seems very plausible, and indeed the direct employer of labor is not our worst enemy although he is bad enough. The indirect robber who lives without any work at all, the speculator and money-market manipulator, who has the small capitalist under his thumb and who really acts upon us by lessening the value of money itself or in other words by increasing prices, or by causing fluctuations in credit, is by far the more dangerous, and he can never be really interfered with except by the complete overthrow of the present system of society. It is for us then to show the workers the futility of half measures, to point out to them the real causes and the real effects which build up and maintain the present social system. Then when their education has got so far, a very slight push will cause to crumble to the ground the rotting system of exploitation and villany under which we live.

DOMESTIC SLAVERY.

In a state of Society in which work will be looked on as a means of satisfying the needs of all, not merely as a method whereby certain are to be enriched; in a state of Society in which each person, be he poet or astronomer, Darwin or Irving, will be expected to do his share of manual labour; in such a society workshops, factories and mines will assuredly be turned into healthy, well-ventilated, pleasant laboratories. Disgusting, unhealthy work will disappear, as unhealthy scientific laboratories and gloomy hospitals are disappearing to-day. But a Society regenerated by the Revolution will do more than this. Such a Society will put an end to domestic slavery; the last and most tenacious form of servitude, perhaps because it is the most ancient. But Society will not set about this in the way some Socialists have imagined.

Millions of human beings have a dislike to the idea of a phalanstery. The least sociable man feels a need to meet his fellows when he and they have some common work to do. The more the worker feels himself part of a great whole, the more attractive the work. But when folks have done working, they specially desire the company of those with whom they find themselves most in sympathy. They seek the society of those with whom they are most intimate. But the phalanstery only supplies this need by artificial groups. And this is why the phalanstery, which after all is nothing but a big hotel, may please some, or rather all at one period of their lives, but for the greater number will be less pleasing than the family circle (the family of the future be it understood). The greater number prefer a separate flat, and the Saxon races go so far as to prefer a four or eight-roomed cottage, where a family, or group of

friends, can live by themselves. The phalanstery may have its uses, but it would become hateful if it were the general rule. However it was organised, it would always be a convent or a barrack. Solitude alternating with hours spent in society is the law of human nature. And this is why the impossibility of being alone is one of the greatest tortures of prison life; just as solitary confinement becomes a torture when it is not relieved by hours spent in social intercourse.

As for the economic considerations put forward by some authoritarian Socialists in favour of the phalanstery, such petty economies are those of the huckster. The far-sighted, and only reasonable economy is that which makes life pleasant to every one; for the man who is content with his life produces far more than he who is continually cursing all that surrounds him.

There are other Socialists who will none of the phalanstery; but who, when they are asked how domestic work is to be organised, answer: Each will do his own for himself. "My wife gets through the house work well enough, middle-class women will do the same," answers the workman. And if a middle-class man is talking Socialism, he turns to his wife smiling complacently, and says: "You will manage easily without a servant in a Socialist society, won't you, my dear? You will do like the wife of our brave comrade John, the carpenter you know? To which the wife replies with a sour smile, "Oh yes, my dear," saying to herself that happily it is not soon likely to occur.

Servant or wife, it is still upon the woman that the man counts to rid him of the burden of household work. But the woman also demands, at last, her part in the emancipation of humanity. She no longer wishes to remain the family beast of burden. It is quite enough that she must give so many years of her life to bringing up her nurslings and to children in general. She does not wish to remain the household cook, laundress and housemaid. As American women take the lead in the movement of emancipation, there is a general complaint all over North America. Madam prefers art or politics, literature or the gaming table to domestic work, and the workman's wife does not care for it either. As for servants they are not to be got. Very few women and girls care to accept the slavery of cap and apron.

And life itself is bringing with it an unexpectedly simple solution. Machinery is undertaking two thirds of domestic drudgery.

You black your own boots and you know what dull work it is. To rub a shoe over twenty or thirty times with a brush, can anything be more tiresome? It needs that a tenth of the population of England (nearly three millions) be reduced to the necessity of selling themselves into domestic slavery in return for food and shelter, often none of the best; it needs that woman consider herself a slave, before such an operation can be performed morning after morning by countless arms. Yet hairdressers have already brushing machines for brushing sleek heads and waving curls; would it not be very simple to apply the same principle to the other extremity—the shoe? And this is what has been done. Boot blacking machines are daily becoming more common in the big European and American hotels. They are coming into use outside the hotels. At the great English public schools, where each house-master has from ten to two hundred boys in his house, it has been found more convenient to have one establishment, where all the thousands of shoes are brushed every morning by machinery, than to keep extra servants in each house for this stupid work. So the boots are fetched every evening and brought back, blacked and polished, every morning.

Washing up! What housekeeper is there who does not find it tiresome? Tedious and dirty at the same time! And it is work that is still generally done by hand, simply because domestic slave labour goes for nothing. But as American women are beginning to rebel against it, it has become needful to find some other solution. The solution has been found, and it again is very simple. In America there are already a certain number of towns in which hot water is laid on in the houses, like cold water in ours. Under these conditions the plate-washing problem became very simple, and a woman, Mrs. Cochran, has solved it. Her machine washes twenty dozen plates and dishes, wipes and dries them in less than three minutes. A factory in Illinois has been started to make these machines. Thus small households could send their plates and dishes to a washing-up establishment as they could send their shoes to the Blackery. But is it not still more likely that shoe blacking and washing up will be done in the same establishment?

Knife cleaning, which galls the skin and strains the hand; washing and wringing clothes, these are tasks which may be performed by human muscles as long as woman is the slave of Humanity; but they are already on the road to disappearance. They are better done by machinery; and machinery is making its way into the household, at the same time that it is becoming possible to lay on motive power, which can set the machines in motion without the expenditure of the slightest muscular effort. None of these machines are costly, and if they are still very dear, it is because they are not generally used, and more especially, because we pay tribute on all we buy to the gentry of the money market, who manipulate everything on 'Change: soil, raw material, manufactures, sales, taxes, and what not, and who, all of them, are eager to drive in their carriage and pair, and live on the fat of the land.

But it is not the ideal of the future to have a shoe-blackening machine, a washing-up machine, a washing and mangling machine, etc., etc., in every household. The household must come out of its present isolation, must associate with other households to do in common what is today done separately. The future is with the common furnace, which

sends its heat into every room of a whole town-ward, and renders fires needless—such as already exists in some American towns. A great central heater sends hot water into each house and each room. The water circulates in pipes, and to regulate the temperature of your room you have only to turn a tap. If you care to have besides the flame of a fire in such and such a room, you have only to turn the tap of the gas laid on for heating from a central reservoir. Thus all the business of stove cleaning and making up fires (and women know how long it takes!) disappears.

The candle, the oil lamp, and even the gas jet, are superannuated. There are whole cities where it is enough to press a button and the electric light flashes forth. It is so in some of the new flats in London. In fine,—to provide one's self with the luxury of an electric lamp is merely a question of economy—and knowledge.

In America they are forming societies to put an end to almost the whole of domestic work. They are thinking of starting household work establishments for each block of houses. A cart is to call for your baskets of boots to black, crockery to clean, clothes to wash and things to mend (when the latter is worth while), and the next morning it will bring back your crockery, your shoes, and the rest, nice and clean. The same establishment will send you also, if you like, your hot coffee and your boiled eggs in the morning, and your dinner ready cooked at dinner-time.

Between twelve and two o'clock, there are at least twenty million English people eating every day roast beef, or roast mutton, or boiled pork, potatoes, and whatever other vegetable is seasonable. And at the lowest estimate there are four million fires, burning two or three hours each, to cook this meat and these vegetables; and four million women spending their time over a *menu* which, after all, rings the changes on not more than ten sorts of food. "Fifty fires," wrote an American woman the other day, "where one would be enough!" Eat at your own table with your children if you like, but why, I pray you, should these fifty women lose their mornings in preparing this simple meal? Why fifty fires, when two persons and one fire would be enough to cook all these pieces of meat and all these vegetables? Choose your own pieces of beef or mutton if you are particular. Season your vegetables if your delicate palate demands some special sauce. But why all this waste?

Why? Because women's labour counts for nothing. Because in every family there is at least one slave—the mother—and often three or four servants besides, who are supposed to devote their lives to domestic drudgery. Because even those who dream of the enfranchisement of the human race exclude women from their dreams of liberty, and think it almost unworthy of their lofty masculine dignity to think of those household matters, which they have shunted upon the shoulders of the woman, the drudge of Humanity.

To emancipate the woman is not merely to throw open to her the doors of the University, is not to admit her to the Bar or to Parliament. The woman thus emancipated only flings household drudgery upon another woman. To emancipate the woman is to free her from the degrading toil of kitchen and washhouse; to organise the up-bringing of children in such a way as to free the mother and give her leisure.

That will be done, for already it is beginning. But let us recognise that a Revolution intoxicated with the most beautiful words about Freedom, Equality, and Solidarity, whilst it maintains the slavery of the hearth, will not be a Revolution. It will yet remain for the half of Humanity still in domestic slavery, to revolt against the other half.

(From the French of P. Kropotkin.)

A PLAIN WORD.

The State is the executive of the wealthy, *i.e.*, plundering classes, imposing their will upon the ignorant by confronting them with the "Majesty of the Law," a phantom which owes its influence entirely to the stupidity of the slaves who respect it; and coercing those who are less servilely disposed with the aid of its armed mercenaries, the soldiery and police.

Yet just at the time when this truth begins to make its way more rapidly among the people, the Social Democrats persist in inviting us to accept *their* State in place of that which at present oppresses us. Thank you, we would rather not. When we have induced a sufficient number of persons to join us in throwing off the present yoke, we shall not feel disposed to submit ourselves to a new one, even though it should be of different material and another make.

"But," say the Social Democrats, "the State we wish to establish will be one representing the public will, surely you will not refuse adhesion to that!" To this we reply that we have no faith whatever in what is commonly called "the popular will."

A majority supports the existing social order, some through perversity, more from stupidity, and most from apathy; and we see no reason for believing that a majority would not accept the rule of new imposters and new usurpers in the future, unless an enlightened minority were free to set constantly before the world the example of free life in free society claimed by Anarchist Communism. This freedom, it is evident, no State could tolerate, for in so doing it would repudiate its own authority, and authority is the life of the State.

Therefore, down with Authority! Away with the State!

HENRY GLASSE.

A TALK ABOUT ANARCHIST COMMUNISM BETWEEN TWO WORKERS.

BY ENRICO MALATESTA.

(Continued from previous number.)

Jack. And why must we be ordered? Why can't we manage our affairs ourselves? He who rules always seeks his own advantage, and, either ignorantly or wilfully, betrays the people. Power makes even the best of men giddy with pride. Besides, and this is the principal reason for not wishing to have any chief, men must cease to be led like a flock. They must grow accustomed to think, and learn to recognise their dignity and strength. If the people are to be educated, and accustomed to freedom and the management of their own affairs, they must be left to act for themselves and feel themselves responsible for their own conduct. They may often make mistakes and do wrong, but they will see the consequences for themselves, and understand that they have done amiss and must go on another tack. Another thing. The harm the people may do left to themselves will never be one millionth part of that which is done by the best of governments. If a child is to learn to walk, he must be let walk by himself, and not be afraid of the falls he may have.

William. Yes, but before a child can be set down to walk, he must have some strength in his legs; if he has none, he must stay in his mother's arms.

Jack. That's true. But governments are not in the least like mothers. It is not they who improve and build up a nation. As a matter of fact, social progress is almost always made in opposition to the government or in spite of it. The most government does is to put what the masses have begun to need and desire into the form of law, and this it spoils with its spirit of domination and monopoly. The people are in different stages of advancement; but in no matter what state of civilisation, or even of barbarism, a people may be, they could manage their affairs better without the government which has sprung up amongst them. As far as I can see, you fancy that the government is composed of the most intelligent and capable men. Nothing of the sort. Generally speaking governments are directly, or by delegation, composed of those who have the most money. And besides, the exercise of power spoils the finest spirits. Put those who have hitherto been the best of men into the government and see what happens. They no longer understand the needs of the people, they are obliged to busy themselves with the interests created by politics, they are corrupted by the absence of the emulation and criticism of their social equals, and they are diverted from the sphere of action in which they were really competent, to make laws about things they have not even heard of before. Finally, they end by believing themselves a superior order of beings, and form a caste which takes no heed of the people except to check and baffle them. Better, far better, for us to manage our own affairs, by putting ourselves in agreement with the workers of other trades and other parts of the country; and not only with those of England and Europe, but of the whole world,—for all men are brethren and have an interest in aiding one another. Don't you think so?

William. Yes, you are right. But what about the wicked? What is to be done with thieves and robbers?

Jack. To begin with, when there is no more poverty and ignorance we shan't be troubled with many of that sort. But even supposing there were some left, is that a reason to have a government and police? Can't we ourselves bring them to reason? Not by ill-treating them, as both innocent and guilty are ill-used to-day, but by putting them in conditions where they can't do any harm, and doing everything in our power to set them on the right road again.

William. So when we have Socialism, everybody will be happy and contented, and there will be no more wretchedness, hatred, jealousy, prostitution, war, or injustice?

Jack. I can't tell how far human felicity may go, but I'm sure things will be very much better than now. You see, men will go on trying to better things, and all the progress made then will benefit every one, not only a few.

William. But when is all this going to happen? I'm an old fellow, and now that I know that the world isn't always going on as it does at present, I shouldn't like to die without having seen one day of justice.

Jack. When will it happen? I don't know. It depends upon us. The more we do to open folk's eyes, the sooner the change will come about. However, there is one thing to be said. A good advance has already been made. A few years ago there were very few who preached Socialism, and they were treated as fools, madmen, or incendiaries. To-day the idea is understood by many. Then the poor suffered in silence, or revolted when maddened by hunger, without knowing the causes or the remedies of their wrongs, and were massacred, or made to massacre one another. To-day all over the world they come to a common understanding, agitate and revolt with the idea of liberating themselves from their employers and from government. They do not count on anything but their own powers, having at last begun to understand that all the parties, into which their employers are divided, are equally their enemies. Let us, then, be active

in spreading our ideas now, when the moment is favorable. Let all of us who understand the question unite more closely. Let us fan the fire which smoulders among the masses. Let us profit by all discontent, every agitation, every revolt. Let us strike while the iron is hot, without fear or hesitation. Then it will soon be all up with the middle-class, and the reign of well-being will begin.

William. Good! But we must take care to count the cost. To take the property of the employers is easily said, but there are the police, the soldiers. Now that I come to think of it, I'm afraid hand-cuffs, swords and guns are made more to defend the middle-class than anything else.

Jack. That's as plain as a pike-staff. But if the middle-class government use arms against us and try to keep us in slavery with their powder and melinite, we must teach them that we too can play at such a game as that with the appliances of modern scientific warfare. The poor are the immense majority, and if they begin to understand, and taste the advantages of socialism, there is no power on earth which can force them to remain as they are. Consider, the poor are those who work and make everything. If only one large section of them were to stop working, there would be such a todo, such a panic, that the revolution would quickly prove to be the only possible way out. Consider, too, that soldiers, for the most part, are themselves poor men, driven by hunger to sell themselves to hunt and butcher their own brothers. As soon as they have seen and understood the facts, they will sympathise, at first secretly and then openly, with the people. You may be sure the revolution will not be half so difficult as it appears at first. The essential thing is to keep the idea that the revolution is necessary constantly to the fore; to be always prepared for it. If we do this, there's no doubt that somehow or another the chance to act will crop up.

William. So you say, and I believe you are right. But there are those who say that the revolution would do no good, and that things will slowly ripen of themselves. What do you say to that?

Jack. You must know that since Socialism has become a serious matter, and the middle-class have begun to be really afraid of it, they have been trying in every possible way to turn aside the tempest and deceive the people. All sorts, even emperors, are beginning to say they are socialists, and I leave you to guess what such "socialism" is worth. Even amongst our own comrades, there have been traitors tempted by attention from the gentlefolks, and the advantages they might gain, to desert the revolutionary cause and set themselves to preach legal means and alliance with political parties, which they say are all more or less 'socialistic'. "We are all socialists now!" as Harcourt said in the House of Commons. Such men treat revolutionists as fools and worse. Some of them profess still to wish for a revolution, but, meantime, they wish a great deal more to be M. P.'s. When any one tells you that the revolution is not necessary and begins talking about nominating M. P.'s, and County Councillors, or making common cause with any middle-class party, if he is one of your mates, try to show him that he is wrong, but if he is a middle-class man, or seems as if he would like to be one, send him about his business. Amongst those mistaken Socialists there are some who in all good faith wish to do good, and believe they are doing it; but if some one, sincerely believing he is doing you good, thrashes you till you're half dead, you will think first of all how to get the stick out of his hands. The most his good intentions will do will be to stop you, when you have got the stick, from breaking his head with it.

William. Right you are! But now there's something else I want to ask you. When you say SOCIALISTS, what do you mean exactly? I often hear tell of Socialists, and Communists, and Collectivists, and Anarchists, and I know no more than Adam what all those words mean.

Jack. Ah, I'm glad you've got on that. There's nothing like clearing up the meaning of words. Well now, Socialists are folks who believe that poverty is the first cause of all social ills, and that as long as poverty is not destroyed, neither ignorance, nor slavery, nor political inequality, nor prostitution, nor any of the evils which keep the people in such a horrible condition, can be rooted out; to say nothing of the frightful suffering which arises from actual want. Socialists believe that poverty results from the fact that the soil and all raw materials, machinery and all instruments of labour, belong to a few individuals, who thus are able to dispose of the lives of all the working class, and find themselves involved in perpetual struggle and competition, not only with the proletariat (those who have nothing), but also amongst themselves, for the possession of property. The Socialists believe that by abolishing private property, i.e., the cause, they will at the same time abolish poverty, the effect. This property can and ought to be abolished; for the organisation and distribution of wealth ought to be regulated by the real interests of men, without regard for the so-called "acquired rights," which the middle-class claim for themselves, because their ancestors were stronger, more lucky, or more knavish than other men. So you see the name SOCIALIST betokens all those who wish that social wealth should be at the service of all men, and that there should no longer be property-owners and proletarians, rich and poor, employers and employed.

(To be continued.)

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.

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.—H. G., 10s.

NOTES.

WHERE ARE THE REVOLUTIONARY SOCIAL DEMOCRATS?

We wonder if our Social Democratic friends here in England have read the speech of their comrade Vollmar, Social Democratic deputy in the German Reichstag, in which he expresses his devotion to the Fatherland, his sincere patriotism and readiness to fight against the French in defence of the empire, and his abandonment and the abandonment of his party, of all means other than those which are strictly constitutional in the realisation of the Social Democratic aims. Now that the Anti-Socialist Law is non-existent he does not see the necessity for a Revolution. And yet in this happy country, where everything is to go on so smoothly under the reign of the Emperor and his friends Liebknecht, Bebel, Vollmar, & Co., we hear of people getting fifteen years imprisonment for having Social Democratic pamphlets in their lodgings, and five years for writing the Social Democratic programme upon the wall. If the pamphlets and programme had been Anarchistic we suppose the luckless individuals would not have got off with their heads. Really the Emperor William should devise a special medal, or a particular sign of honour, for his trusty Social Democratic deputies. They are doing their work of gulling the people well. We should very much like to know if there are any Revolutionary Social Democrats left anywhere in this wide world. We are very strongly under the impression that the English Social Democrats are now very much of the same colour as Herr Vollmar, and have given up all ideas of revolution. At least we know that the German Social Democrats are a fraud, and that the Anarchist cause in Germany will gain by his plain speaking. Will not the English Social Democrats make it equally clear for the workers that they are merely a party of constitutionalists, who have for ever abandoned the policy which inaugurated the Trafalgar Square campaign?

PEACE OR WAR?

The strike and lockout amongst the London carpenters and joiners continues, and the men are showing a sense of solidarity and a courageous persistence which promise well for their success. They struck, union non-union men together, on May the first, for tenpence an hour and an eight hour day, and the employers replied by a lock-out. They were going, as was openly stated at the meeting of the masters' association, to starve their rebellious wage-slaves into submission. Just as an army of foreign invaders might set about starving a besieged city! Some gentle-hearted folks reproach us Anarchists for "fomenting ill-feeling" between employers and employed, who might live in peace and good-will together. What can our optimistic friends make of such a fact as this? When a set of human beings can deliberately plan to starve thousands of their fellows, men, women, and little children, until in their despair they must submit to sell themselves for a half-penny less an hour, and an hour longer a day, is it not idle sentimentality to talk as if there were peace between starvers and starved? There can never be peace between one set of men who have command of workshops and the material to work upon and another set of men who have nothing but a few tools and their working power, whilst the first claim the lion's share of all the second make. The relation between them can be only the relation of enemies, who temporarily conclude an armistice, watching one another all the time with jealous suspicion, and each trying to get the advantage.

THE PROGRESS OF THE STRUGGLE.

It looks as if the would-be starvers were not going to have it all their own way in this case. The carpenters and joiners have strong unions, and the amalgamated societies have arranged to allow the non-unionist strikers 10s. a week, besides paying £1 weekly to each of their own members. It is bitterly hard work keeping a family on ten shillings a week, but these brave fellows have got along somehow for two months and show no signs of giving in. Pickets have been posted so effectually that no blacklegs have got into the workshops, only on building jobs a few have crept in, these being impossible to watch in the same way. But altogether some firms show signs of having had enough of it, having pressing orders on hand. A few gave in before the lock-out and are now

working on the men's terms, and many more would give in now, if it were not for the tyranny of the Masters' Association. One firm did try to start the other day, but was immediately pulled over the coals by the exploiters' union and threatened with a heavy fine. But this cannot go on for ever, and the workers have a fair chance of winning this skirmish. May victory put heart into them for the great battle that is coming.

THE PLEASURES OF PICKETTING.

One day when a picket was on duty, the foreman of his shop came close up to him and spoke to him so impudently that the picket answered roughly and pushed him off. Apparently this was not quite unexpected by the foreman, for in a trice a policeman had whisked round the corner and taken the picket into custody. He was hailed before the magistrates and got six months, or £10 fine, for "assault and battery."

THE GENDARME OF EUROPE.

The "free" democracy of Switzerland has become of late years little better than an international police agency, at the service of surrounding tyrannies. Since it expelled Kropotkin at the bidding of Russia in 1881, it has become more and more of a mere cat's paw. Now no political exile is safer there than in the "free" republic of France, which, by the way, has not Switzerland's plea of weakness to excuse its subservience. During the last month, Lugano, in Italian Switzerland, has been disgraced by the arrest of Malatesta, the able and devoted comrade, so well known to readers of FREEDOM as the author of the "Talk about Anarchist Communism." Malatesta has committed no offence against Swiss law; but he is "wanted" by the Italian police to work out a term of penal servitude for having belonged years ago to an association of Anarchist workmen, and no doubt also because, in spite of being a refugee he still contrives to take a very energetic part in the Italian movement.

A WORD ABOUT BUSINESS.

The "Talk about Anarchist Communism" will be finished next month and we propose to publish it as a pamphlet. It will be a PENNY pamphlet, though double the size penny pamphlets usually are, and we appeal to all comrades to aid in the special effort we are making to spread this most useful piece of propagandist literature. Nothing can be better for sale at open air meetings. Even the most commercially minded enquirers will be tempted by such a big pennyworth, whilst the poorest will be able to afford it; and there is no clearer and simpler explanation of revolutionary Anarchist Socialism. Lately it has been translated into yet another European language, Roumanian. In September we propose to begin a translation of another pamphlet by Malatesta, which enters thoroughly into the leading principles of Anarchism with great force and clearness.

A LOSS.

A comrade writes to us from Great Yarmouth: "Kindly announce the death of Comrade

ELIJAH WATERS,

murdered by the present system at the age of 33 years and 4 months. He was poisoned by the filthy work he had to do for the Corporation on the Fish Wharf urinals. He leaves a wife, six children, and an aged mother, who were dependent on his labour for their lives and home. He is better known to the readers of FREEDOM by the name of Barnes, which he assumed to avoid the boycott of the local capitalists. He was treasurer to our Socialist Society for nearly two years, and connected with the movement here from its infancy. By his death we lose a hard worker for the cause, who never missed an opportunity of making propaganda, whenever he saw two or three persons gathered together. His mother, wife, and children lose the best of sons and husbands and the kindest of fathers, besides their only bread winner. He died an Anarchist and Atheist."

FRENCH JUSTICE.

OUR esteemed Comrade J. Grave, editor of "La Révolte," has been condemned to six months' imprisonment and £4 fine, for having "directly provoked the military to forsake their duty and the obedience they owe to their chiefs." This awful crime he committed by printing in "La Révolte" an article on the Fourmies massacre wherein occur the following passages:

"The most unworthy and revolting thing of all is not the massacre, but its cause: it is that in our days men are still to be found ninny enough to let a rifle be put into their hands they don't know why, and cowardly enough to use it according to the pleasure and caprice of the gold-laced, pampered sots who command them. If they would only think a little, they would see directly that this made the massacre inevitable, and that it is only the prelude to greater massacres. As long as men are fools enough to approve of the military system, or dastards enough to submit to it, where is the use of being indignant about a thing one has accepted and of which one is oneself directly or indirectly the author? It is illogical....

"A deserter! What then? Ah! that is just the point to be considered. What do they wish us to understand by this word? Do they think we shall draw back from the action and reject the epithet? No, we accept both act and word. We shall be proud of the first as a merit,

FREIHEIT: INTERNATIONAL ORGAN OF THE GERMAN SPEAKING ANARCHISTS, edited by JOHN MOST. Subscription, 2s. per quarter; under cover, 4s. Address: John Müller, Box 3135, New York.

we shall bear the second as a title. Merely to be a deserter is a glory. To desert! What is it but an act of courage and energy of which those cowards are incapable, who at the command of a tipsy officer consented to fire upon women and children! A deserter!* What is he but a man who refuses the slavery of discipline, who breaks away from the filthy corruption of barracks and shuns murder. Only deserters have logically a right to be indignant and protest against the butchery, the rest can but say, I have sinned. Can it be that people have not yet realised that if every man were a deserter from military service the massacre of Fourmies and the many which have preceded it, to say nothing of those to follow, would be impossible?"

Even according to French law this is merely an "apology for disobedience," not a "provocation," and as such not an indictable offence under the present press law. But Comrade Grave sternly refused to allow a lawyer to defend him,—every accused person is allowed a counsel for his defence in France—and he himself is no orator and certainly no lawyer. He contented himself with remarking, "I recognise no man's right to judge me, nor to hinder me from saying what I think . . . , but do what you like and a fig for it all!" The jury found him guilty without extenuating circumstances.

To those acquainted with Comrade Grave the incident is highly characteristic. He is a silent, serious middle-aged man, without wife or children, who for many years has lived wholly for the Anarchist cause; true as steel, absolutely trusted by the few closely acquainted with him, following always the line of conduct he believes the best, without turning to the right nor to the left for the praise or blame of any man; for years he has been the back bone of "La Révolte"; one of those tireless workers for the enfranchisement of humanity, little known or appreciated by the crowd, but who are the very personification of the steady, persistent, energy which never knows when it is beaten, and is one of the main factors in securing the advance of every great onward movement.

Another French Anarchist paper, "La Lutte," has also got into trouble for advising the conscripts to refuse "obedience"; but its editor, Tournadre, has been acquitted and the writer of the article, Vivier, did not remain in court to hear his sentence of three months' imprisonment.

HOW "RISINGS" ARE PROMOTED AND SUPPRESSED BY THE ITALIAN GOVERNMENT.

COMRADES,

In reply to your request, although rather late in the day, I will give you the best account I can of what I saw, and heard, and partly experienced myself with Socialist friends in Italy, shortly before and on the 1st of May.

About the middle of April, I had the great pleasure of making acquaintance with a few very active Socialists in Rome. At that time it was already known that the government would permit a laborers' demonstration on 1st May. But as a precautionary measure the police authorities were then diligently occupied in clearing the city of all the UNEMPLOYED they could find, sending them off to country parts. Also the few friends I met with were carefully shadowed, or at least their houses were, so much so that they would ask me not to come to them, as I might immediately have been honoured, as a "suspect," with the same kind attention on the part of the authorities. As to themselves, the faithful comrades, they were fully prepared in their houses for police inspection, and were more and more astonished as the 1st of May drew near, that, according to the usual custom, they were not arrested, by way of precaution. The farewell greeting at this time ended with, we shall meet at such and such a time, "if we are not locked up."

On the 30th of April I was kindly invited to a private meeting of representative members of all the different republican, as well as socialist, groups or societies in Rome, who were unitedly taking part in the preparations for the demonstration. The manifesto, drawn up strictly within the limits imposed by the government, was read and discussed. It strongly emphasized two points, namely, that the meeting was to be of a PEACEFUL character, and that it was held with FULL PERMISSION of the authorities. I was informed that all parties, from mere Radicals to Anarchists, for the first time in Rome, on this occasion had agreed to unite, the latter party being convinced that it would be useless to attempt anything more than the spreading of their propaganda, under the local conditions of the moment. This in itself was a strong guarantee that no "rising" was intended on the part of the PROMOTERS of the demonstration. Furthermore, when the 1st of May arrived, I myself had personal testimony that the Socialists were not expecting any disturbance—for I was kindly invited to spend the evening after the meeting with some, and was to have met Cipriani and others whom I had not yet been able to see.

On arriving with two friends at the Piazza S. Croce, where the meeting took place, we found a large crowd of people assembled, about as many, I should imagine, as would surround two popular platforms at a Hyde Park demonstration, but this crowd was surrounded by cavalry and foot soldiers on every side, besides a goodly number of armed police. We had to pass close between the divisions to get in at all.

The day was glorious, and the large assembly of men, women, and children were good humoured and gentle as on a Carnival holiday. But the speeches were listened to with intense interest, and the favourite

* Our readers must bear in mind that military service is COMPULSORY in France.

speakers, particularly Cipriani, met with warm applause. There was just one difference between the character of this meeting and such a one as would be held in Hyde Park, and that was the evident timidity of the poor people, surrounded as they were with an army of soldiery. From time to time the least little excitement in any part of this immense crowd was sufficient to make many begin to take to their heels. However, one or two such little commotions had been appeased and all went well, until, all at once, a man who had made his way uninvited on the platform, calling himself an Anarchist, but refusing at the moment to give his name, quickly seized the opportunity as one speaker had finished to harangue the people in a most violent manner, and ending a few sentences with "there are plenty of us here; let us make for them," sprang down among the crowd as though to lead them against the forces. Immediately Cipriani pressed forward to quieten and reassure the people, but, alas! too late, for the authorities, military and civil, were on the move. ONE blast (not THREE, as the regulations for signal order) was given, and the cavalry galloped down through and after the terrified, flying multitude; while the police made for the platform, arresting whom they could lay their hands on. Cipriani, among others, was thrown down and slightly wounded. Altogether 110 were taken prisoners. In their zeal the police almost arrested a deputy of the Italian parliament, however, finding out their mistake—they only wanted Anarchists and real Socialists—they let him go.

When my friends and I turned to escape the cavalry rushing down upon us, we thought to get away by a bye-street close at hand, but there to our amazement cavalry and foot-soldiers barricaded the way, the foremost horsemen with revolver extended in our faces ready to fire. The screams of the women, and the cries of the men on their behalf, seemed to hold them in check for a few moments. My friends and I were rescued from the danger in a small, half underground, cellar, from which, however, through chinks in the shutters, we could see what went on in the streets. Before we were there, I had already seen two poor fellows who had been shot rushing madly about, screaming that they had done "nothing—nothing," and crying for protection and assistance. From our retreat we still heard the screaming of the people, the chasing and occasional shots of the soldiery, and some time later the throwing of stones by the exasperated populace. Almost two hours we had to wait in our retreat, and then to get a safe pass from the military on guard was not such a very easy matter. With great reluctance did they let my friend off, who had been driven to save his wife and myself from the danger, no doubt my presence (being so evidently a foreigner and also a woman) helped to persuade the imperious officer in charge to let us go, and to give the order down the line, of the road that we might go.

Such from beginning to end was the story of the "rising" in Rome, except the significant fact, that the man who provoked the commotion had called on Cipriani a day or two previously, professing to be an Anarchist, having come on foot from Paris to Rome. Cipriani, however, distrusted him, believing him to be simply a spy—and had even warned some of his Roman comrades to be on their guard concerning him.

The police still continued to arrest Socialists to the number of four hundred in that one city.

Yours sincerely,

A. H.

SOCIETY ON THE MORROW OF THE REVOLUTION.

Translated from the French of JEHAN LE VAGRE.

CHAPTER XV.—AUTONOMY ACCORDING TO SCIENCE.

Whatever anyone may have said, science itself comes to the support of the Anarchist theories and demonstrates that everything in nature moves according to the law of affinities and consequently is self-governing. Nature is a vast crucible in which the various bodies are transformed as they acquire new properties, but it is all done without any preconceived will and, as we have said, by the law of affinities.

It is certain that in nature, in the mineral, vegetable and animal kingdoms, everything is linked together. It is true that the movements and the developments of some are regulated by the movements and the developments of others, that consequently the individual depends on the society in which he moves and develops, but, as far as the middle-class and the authoritarians of all kinds are concerned, this society is resumed and condensed in a certain organisation that represents it under the form of constituted power, and it is this which we reject. It is not the individual, as we have just seen, who ought to give way before the caprices of society, for this latter is only the result of individual agreement.

It is also true that science demonstrates to us that everything in nature is ruled by those immutable laws which are called natural laws, laws which cause all the molecules having the same affinities to seek out one another and to unite themselves so as to form, according to the manner in which they are juxtaposed, according to the surroundings in which their association is made, maybe a mineral or perhaps some sort of organism. But who has made these laws? For the priest it is a supernatural being to whom he has given the name of God. For the learned man, if he has succeeded in getting rid of all the superstitions by which he has been surrounded in infancy and during his education, these laws are the result of the properties themselves which are possessed by the different materials of which the universe is composed and they are contained in these very properties.

But law here does not imply a means of ruling different parts of a whole. It is simply used to explain that if these phenomena are produced in a certain particular manner it is so because by very force of the qualities of the bodies it could not be otherwise. Social laws in our opinion can have no other meaning than natural laws; they can only explain the relations between individuals. But then there is no necessity for an oppressive authority to put them into execution, seeing that they are only the authentication of an already accomplished fact. It is therefore only necessary to make the surroundings such as will permit these laws to apply themselves by the very fact of the free evolution of individuals.

In chemistry, for example, when it is desired to associate two bodies is it the will of the operator that acts and causes the two bodies to be associated? No, he has had to study beforehand the properties of these bodies in such a way that he has ascertained that in employing such quantities in such conditions such a result will be obtained. It is imperative that every time the operation should be carried on under the same conditions.

If, on the contrary, the operator wished to employ other substances, gifted with different properties, these substances would destroy each other. It will always be just the same in human societies so long as it is attempted to organize them arbitrarily, without taking into account the temperament, the ideas, and the affinities of individuals.

The chemist then has to limit himself to preparing the conditions under which certain combinations which he desires to produce will work, and it ought to be the same in sociology. Anarchist and revolutionists have a similar part to play. Their work is to prepare the conditions under which individuals will be able to freely develop themselves.

When the molecules, the cells composing the universe, have been able to freely associate themselves with each other, when nothing has hindered them in the evolution which ought to result in the formation of an organism of some kind, then their association, their amalgamation, takes place, and the result is a complete, perfectly-constituted being. On the other hand, when this association has not been able to take place freely, when the evolution has been hindered, when the autonomy of the different molecules has been violated, the result has been what is called a monster.

And it is precisely because we Anarchists wish to see a healthy and perfectly constituted society that we demand that the autonomy of the individuals, these molecules of society, should be respected. It is precisely because we wish that all who have the same affinities should be able to associate themselves freely together in accordance with the tendencies of each that we rebel against all authority which seeks to reduce every individual to the same pattern, even though this authority should call itself "scientific."

Moreover, we have already said and we repeat it, there is no brain vast enough to be able to include all human knowledge. However much we may profess to esteem learned men, we are compelled to recognise that, as far as most of them are concerned, they are indifferent to the greatest social inequalities. It is only necessary to follow the arguments of many amongst them to see that when they have given themselves up to such and such a study, to such and such a branch of human knowledge, they make it a hobby which they are continually riding; they make it the motive of everything, and consider the other sciences only as accessories, if not useless at any rate of very little importance. No, no, science is a good thing but only when it keeps its place, which is to verify the phenomena which occur, to study their effects, to trace their causes, but let everyone be free to assimilate the discoveries according to his aptitudes and his degree of development.

Besides, is it not presumptuous to wish to regulate everything "scientifically," seeing that so many points of interrogation rise before the true man of science who is eager to know? And then is it not precisely because so many attempts have been made to regulate this association of interests causing individuals to act, that this formless monster has been called into being which we term the "society" of to-day?

It has even been asserted that the more man is developed, the more science widens her domain, the more man will lose his freedom, for the employment of machinery and the motive powers put at his service by science compel him to associate, and thus take away his freedom of action by subordinating his will to that of his fellow workers. It is declared that if we seek for a society wherein the complete harmony of the individual exists, we shall have to go back to primitive man, or else to go amongst the lowest of the existing races; so that it would be safe to conclude that the ideal society of these eager authoritarians (who after all desire authority only in order to impose their own ideas upon those who think differently to them) would be a society in which the individual would no longer be free to take a walk without first of all asking permission.

We believe, on the contrary, that the more science is developed the more she will enlarge the freedom of the individual, and that if at the present time each scientific discovery brings the workers more into the power of the capitalist, it is simply because the existing institutions turn all the common efforts to the profit of the few; but that in a society based on justice and equality these discoveries would continually add to the autonomy of the individual. One must indeed be blinded by the authoritarian mania to dare to pretend that we have either to go back to primitive man or to seek the existing inferior races, in order to find freedom. Was man free at a time when he was naked and defenceless, had only a rudimentary intelligence and was subject to all the risks of life, forced to struggle against nature, which he had not yet learned to understand, compelled to fight for his food against ferocious beasts whose strength was greater than his own? What amount of freedom could man have possessed then, compelled as he was every moment to engage

in a rough struggle for existence? And the man of the so-called inferior races still existing, who represents fairly well to our fancy the idea of that struggle, shows us well enough that there is very little freedom there where man is compelled to keep constantly on the alert the little faculty he possesses in order to satisfy his material wants.

We recognise certainly that the discovery of steam has destroyed the boundaries, which formerly separated communities and peoples, to put in their place universal solidarity, and that is so evident to us that we do not think the social revolution is possible unless it be international. But because the workers have to associate their efforts so as to overcome the obstacles which nature has raised against them, does it follow that their autonomy should be lessened in any sense of subordination whatsoever? We do not think so. On the contrary, we think that steam having put communities and peoples in constant communication, any authority for the purpose of establishing this communication and imposing its will so as to socialise the efforts of individuals and groups becomes all the more injurious.

If in the early days of humanity the federation of isolated groups and the socialisation of efforts has been made by means of an outside authority, to-day this expression of solidarity takes place spontaneously, without making any attempt to interfere with the autonomy of the groups, and it is precisely due to steam and to the progress of mechanical arts that this condition of constant and mutual interdependence has been established between those who formerly learned to know one another only when they fell under the yoke of the same master. Is the independence of individuals and groups lessened by this interdependence? We do not think so in the least, considering that steam and mechanism, in putting at the service of man tremendous forces which enable him to conquer distance and time, have come to increase this independence, by reducing the amount of time necessary to be expended in the struggle for existence (we mean the struggle against nature; do not confound it with the struggle for life of the self-styled followers of Darwin) and thus enables him to expend the greater part of his time in a recreative employment in the midst of a society based on justice and equality.

Yes, we fully recognise it, the scientific discoveries of man lead him more and more towards the association of efforts and the solidarity of interests. It is precisely on that account that we wish to destroy the present state of society, based as it is on the antagonism of interests. But between that and admitting the necessity of an authority there is a great difference. Whence then have the authoritarians arrived at the conclusion that there can ever be solidarity of interests between those who command and those who obey?

Is not the interest of the one entirely opposed to that of the other? And the progress of humanity, is it not entirely due to that spirit of insubordination and rebellion to discipline which has urged man to free himself from the obstacles that injure his development, to that sublime spirit of revolt that has led him to struggle against custom and the STATUS QUO, to investigate the most obscure corners of science, to get a knowledge of the secrets of nature, and to learn to triumph over them?

In fact, who can tell what degree of development we should have attained to-day if humanity had been able to freely evolve? Who does not know that many of the discoveries of which the nineteenth century is so proud were made long ago but that the learned men had to keep them secret in order to avoid being burned as wizards? If the human brain has not been bruised in this vice of authority with its two jaws, temporal and spiritual, if progress has been possible in spite of this oppression under which humanity has existed since man began to be a thinking being, it is because the spirit of insurrection has been stronger than the compression itself.

The authoritarians say that they desire an authority only for the purpose of guiding this evolution of ideas and of men. But do they not then see that in wishing to compel all men to undergo the same process of evolution (which will inevitably be the case if any authority is charged with the task of directing it) they will stereotype civilisation as it is to-day? Where should we be now if among the un-selfconscious beings of the first ages of humanity there had been some "scientific" minds strong enough to direct the evolution of humanity according to the knowledge which they possessed at that period?

It must not be imagined that our own ideal is that which the partisans of Darwin in sociology have called the "struggle for life." No, the destruction of the weakest species by the the strongest may have been one of the forms of human evolution in the past, but to-day when man is a self-conscious being, to-day when we begin to see and understand the laws by which humanity is ruled, we think that evolution should take a very different form. As we have said before, this form is the solidarisation of individual interests and efforts in order to arrive at a better future. But we are convinced also that this solidarisation of aim and of efforts can only be the outcome of the free autonomy of individuals, who, free to choose amongst themselves and to unite their efforts in the sense which will best respond to their aptitudes and their aspirations, will no longer need to be a burden upon anyone, since nobody will be a burden upon them. And as man is sufficiently developed to-day to recognise the good or the bad side of a thing, it is evident that in a society where authority does not exist the groups or the individuals who get into a bad way of doing things, seeing at their side groups better organised, will know how to abandon bad methods and to adopt methods of action which appear to them the best. In this way the progressive development of humanity being disembarassed of the obstacles that have hindered it up to the present time, the evolution of ideas and individuals will present to us in future merely a pacific struggle in which the only rivalry will consist in a zeal to produce better than the others and will lead us to the final end: the Happiness of Humanity.

VALUE IN USE AND VALUE IN EXCHANGE.

[Continued from previous Number.]

We have now analysed Consumption as far as at present necessary. To arrive at a theory of value in exchange, we must here give some attention to another economic phenomenon—Exchange.

The fact of two commodities being exchanged in the market implies that they are unlike in one respect, but alike in another. No one will exchange a pound of meat for a pound of the very same kind of meat, or one commodity for another of exactly equal qualitative and quantitative utility. On the other hand, no one will exchange in the market a pound of meat for a quart of cider, if he considers the quantitative utility of what he gives, one pound of meat, is greater than the quantitative utility of what he gets, one quart of cider. When two commodities are exchanged in the market, it signifies that they are dissimilar with regard to qualitative utility, but are of equal quantitative utility to the individuals exchanging them.

We have been using the expression "to exchange in the market." This is an economic phrase meaning to exchange under free competition. One commodity, meat, is exchanged for another, gold, under free competition, when *all* the sellers of the first commodity come into intimate business relationship with *all* the possessors of the latter who are desirous of purchasing meat, under absolutely similar economic conditions. From this definition it follows that in the same market at the same time equal quantities of the same commodity* must have the same price.† For if one seller demanded more than another, the buyers would not, according to our supposition, have the least difficulty in going to those who were selling cheaper.

Let us now see what happens when our purchasers of meat transact business with the sellers in the open market. Meat has qualitative utility for all the purchasers of meat. But has it the *same* quantitative utility for them all? If it had, it would mean that everybody required the very same quantity of meat to satisfy them, and that every one possessed an equal quantity of that commodity, say, gold, or labour-power, which according to the custom of market must be exchanged for meat. As things are in civilised societies, the quantitative utility of one pound of meat varies greatly in relation to different purchasers.

If there were only one buyer and one seller, the latter could of course demand, to begin with, an unreasonably high price which he could gradually reduce until he found the measure‡ of the quantitative utility of the meat to the buyer; and the latter would naturally rather pay that price which expresses its quantitative utility to him, than live without meat. At present, however, we have not to deal with an isolated pair like these, but with a market, that is, an indefinitely large number of freely competing buyers and sellers. The latter compete with each other in trying to dispose of all the meat in the market, and of the former, each individual wishes to satisfy his wants before the whole is sold. This is the difference, and as far as we are now concerned, the *only* difference between exchange effected between an isolated couple, and exchange in the open market.

How would the theory of exchange-value run, if we deduced it from the case where an isolated pair, a buyer and a seller, absolutely selfish, makes the exchange? Obviously thus: the value in exchange of the commodity is its quantitative utility to the buyer. Now what is the *only* modification of this theory necessary to adapt it to exchange-value in the open market? The circumstance that exchange is effected in the open market obviously *cannot* alter the fact that exchange-value is a quantitative utility—this is evident the moment we have considered the difference between exchange effected between an isolated couple, and exchange in the open market. The difference consists *solely* in this, that as the sellers in the market must compete with each other in their endeavours to get all their commodities disposed of, there cannot be more than *one* exchange-value for the same goods in that market. The problem has now narrowed itself down to this question: *Which* among a commodity's many quantitative exchange-values will, in a given market, and in given circumstances, necessarily become the exchange-value of the commodity? The answer is simple. What necessarily becomes the exchange-value of the commodity is the quantitative use-value, which the sellers, by beginning at the highest and reducing, find to be low enough to result in business with the *last* buyer necessary to complete the number required to buy *all* the goods offered. In other words, the exchange-value of the commodity is the *lowest* quantitative use-value, which *must* enter into calculations as to the demand in the market. If the *quantity* of the commodity in the market changes, that is to say, if that quantity which the sellers think they *must* dispose of, changes, then all other circumstances remaining the same, the *lowest* quantitative use-value also changes, and becomes the exchange-value. Thus it is the *quantity* of the commodity offered that decides which of the many different quantitative use-values shall be the exchange-value of the commodity. If this lowest quantitative use-value, or lowest quantitative utility which operates in the market, is briefly called the

commodity's final utility, the following formula expresses Jevon's theory of value:—

Value in exchange is marginal utility of a commodity, and its magnitude is determined by the quantity offered of the commodity. In other words: the value in exchange of a commodity is its value in use on the margin of supply.

(To be continued.)

ANARCHY, COMMUNISM, AND COMPETITION.

THE fact that there is still a misunderstanding and confusion about these three words, and their relation to each other, amongst thinking men, and especially among some even professed Anarchists, after years of Socialist propaganda, is not only remarkable, but is also most deplorable, when we reflect upon the importance of their character, and their essential bearing on the coming Social Revolution. And the more so, when we find among those in obscurity and confusion about the above, words such as H. Davis, once an avowed Anarchist-Communist comrade. But instead of "replying" to one another's arguments—or rather *words*—in a manner like Davis's, it would be far more beneficial if comrades who feel on the subject were to lay down their own views in a clear and concise form. By this we shall far sooner arrive at a common understanding than merely by wrangling over words, or by building up towers of Babel in order to overthrow them, or by self-contradictory statements, made simply to "reply" (*vide* Davis's last letter in *Freedom* of June; particularly the 7th, 9th and 10th paragraphs).

Now, to begin with, Anarchy implies the complete freedom of the individual: not only free from all governmental restraints, law, its administrative power, and all kinds of political authority and coercion, but also entirely free from economic masterdom, free from the yoke of landlordism, capitalism, and commercialism; man is to be free not only to guide his own conduct in life, his relations with his fellow-beings, without being commanded, hindered, or interfered with in any way by any arbitrary power or influence, but also to be free to maintain himself physically in the best possible manner, according to the state of development of the people he is surrounded by, without being robbed or exploited by any one. Anarchism dismisses the notion that man is free, or can be free, under a state of economic servitude, such as the present; and while it contends for the complete destruction of all kind of restrictions, laws, and authority, political as well as economical—it proclaims the right of every individual to live in accordance with the laws of nature, and to satisfy his demands and requirements from nature's abundance by using the soil and all raw materials to the best of his capacity; and not only that, but also his absolute freedom of access to wealth and capital—tools, and the rest of the means of production and transportation—as the common heritage of all living humanity; for these are the result of centuries of toil, which now forms the stock of the universe. In short, Anarchism recognises in every individual an equal heir, with the perfect right to help himself to everything he feels in need of; and, like a child in a family, without any account or measure, but to the utmost of his capacity. For nature, which has made man without chains—to be free, an Anarchist—has also made him without any precise or uniform measure of ability or capacity of producing or consuming, while at the same time, it supplies him with its unrestricted abundance—and so has fashioned him to be a Communist.

But apart from this, with the constant development of mankind and its growing tendencies, Communism has become a natural necessity for the achievement and maintenance of the freedom and happiness of humanity. Not only have men learnt that by associating their efforts together, they are better able to conquer the obstacles of nature and increase their happiness, but also they are finding out more and more with every day that by combining strength they can more safely and effectively protect their freedom and safeguard their interest against all emergencies and encroachments. Thus we see humanity developing more and more for the adoption of Anarchist Communism.

"But Anarchist-Communism is a contradiction in terms," cry out our Individualist-Anarchist friends; "for while Anarchism means liberty, Communism implies coercion!" And again, "Communism is a negation of private property, whereas we, consistent Anarchists (save the mark!) strive to even extend private property."

Well, had this come from a thick-bellied representative of the "Liberty and Property Defence League," we could well afford to treat it with the scorn it deserves. To them liberty means the "right" to monopolise everything and enthrall everybody. But it is the few working men who thus blindly repeat such contentions that cause us to take the "arguments" up.

Now, as to their consistency, to plead for the "right" of private property in a state of Anarchy is anything but consistent; for, as was already pointed out, while Anarchy proclaims the right of every individual to help himself out of the common stock to what he needs, it denies the right—or rather the privilege, for that is what it means—of any one to appropriate to himself any portion of wealth which he can not personally use, and thereby enslave those who are in need of the same. Private property is the basis of the present state of society, and we know what sort of freedom it supplies us with. We thus see, likewise, that so far from Anarchy and Communism being contradictory to each other, the one is the necessary condition of the other; and it requires but little common sense to foretell, from an analysis of the tendencies of human evolution, that at the coming social revolution no other Communism will be realisable but Anarchist-Communism.

* A commodity is a product which has exchange-value.

† Price is the exchange-value of a commodity expressed in the exchange-value of gold.

‡ This is naturally expressed in money, that is to say, the purchaser makes clear to himself what quantity of coined gold has for him the same quantitative utility as one pound of meat; and this quantity of coined gold, this sum of money, expresses the highest price he will offer.

where man is free from all fetters of slavery; and no Anarchy will be practicable but Communistic Anarchy, where man will be able to satisfy his needs abundantly. Besides, even our Individualist Anarchist friends themselves admit that there is no other way of maintaining and securing the liberty of the individual than by association. And once you have an association, you have the principle of Communism established, and the more you extend it the better results will it produce,—the more fraternity, the more harmony, and the more happiness. We must not confound the goose with the pig. Communism, in itself, like marriage, for instance, is most conducive to human happiness, but it must be natural, free, unrestrained.

"But Communism," it is argued, "would not permit competition." Well, it has been already repeatedly pointed out that Anarchy frames no laws, appoints no judges, and builds no prisons. To use the term "not permit" is rather beside the question. But to talk of competition when government and private property are got rid of, is as much as to argue that people would bite each other's noses if they had plenty to eat. Competition (underbidding, underselling; not like emulation, excelling) is not the cause, but the effect of the present system of private property. It is carried on not for motives of pleasure but of necessity. One man would not fight another for something of which he has plenty for himself to-day, and is sure to have as much as he is likely to want to-morrow. We need not dwell hereon much more. Every common-sense man can easily find out that competition (we do not mean a match merely for the pleasure of a mutual trial of strength or skill) is the result of scarcity of the thing required. For instance, let us suppose there is an advertisement offering a situation for two mechanics. A and B are the only two in want of a situation. In applying for the same neither of the two would have any reason to underbid his fellow man. Whereas, on the other hand, supposing there are more men in want of employment, then of necessity, a fierce competition would take place.

Thus we see clearly that competition, being the necessary corollary of the present system of private property, will vanish with it.

Anarchy, then, being synonymous with Communism, means freedom and plenty for all; there is not only no place in it for competition and struggle between man and man, but every opportunity to live as free and happy brothers.

DIABOL.

The Propaganda.

NORTHERN NOTES.

In Edinburgh the Scottish Socialist Federation, which consists of all schools of Socialists and Communists has lost two of its best speakers, T. H. Bell (Anarchist-Communist) and Hamilton (S. D.); we have still the pleasure of hearing Davidson and Smith (A. C.) and Pearson (S. D.) and our new speakers are Cyril Bell (A. C.) and Conolly (Socialist). There have been several conversions from Opportunism to Revolutionary Anarchism; and our out-door meetings have been strengthened by visits of Campbell (London S. D. F.) and Glasier (Glasgow S. L.). Our meetings have been held in Links and Meadows, one in Chambers Street and one on Grassmarket. We have given up Labour Hall and taken a new club-room at 333 High Street.

Some of the Edinburgh students have formed a small and sleepy "Group Liberty" for propaganda amongst students; this group only discusses and reads literature, and as all the members except two are "fourth year," they will be dispersing all over the world in July.

At Edinburgh we have a "labour" candidate who does not know what labour is, a certain A. K. Connell of London; his programme is much the same as that of King Henry VIII. Socialists, Anarchists and Nationalists made it pretty hot for him in one meeting which ended in riot. In Banffshire, however, we have quite a different stamp of labour "candidate"; a "Tory-Republican-Democrat-Independent-Socialist," or some such thing he calls himself; he goes by the name of Maltman Barry! His programme is much like that of the S. D. F., yet they revile him. At Aberdeen some of the labour "leaders" have got Champion up as "candidate"; of course Champion is a Social Democrat, though independent, yet the S. D. F. sends Herbert Burrows to "show him up."

Next item. More like Anarchism! Kenmuir wood is near Carmyle, and the landlord thereof thought he had had enough of the pic-nic parties from the neighbouring villages of Glasgow, Baillieston, etc.; so he arose and girded up his loins—no, his land, with barbarous—I mean barbed wire fences. And the villagers of Glasgow and the villages throughout Strathclyde, waxed wroth, and they arose and collected a band of 600 men, the men of Wallace, and the men of Bruce, and they marched forth to Carmyle, and they speeched much, and the "moderate" men said "do ye no violence"; but the people heeded not these words, or they took them "sorter sarcastic," as the people of America would say, and straightway they levelled those barbed wire fences, and declared Kenmuir wood to be open to the public. That is more the way things should be done. It was much more decisive than all the law courts in the land.

On Saturday 20th, I went to Dundee, and in conjunction with Dempster (of the Ploughman's Union, Alyth) held a large meeting on Greenmarket. This town was once a great stronghold of Socialism, but was spoilt by certain swindlers who got the cause a bad name. On calling for opposition we had a man who said we opposed Shakespeare in every word we said! Also a flunkey of the type army-pensioner, and then Robertson (of piano fame) who gave up the discussion in disgust; and finally a man who wanted my advice as to whether he should vote liberal or tory!! We told him he might as well ask a teetotaler as to whether he should drink Irish or Scots whiskey. On the 21st, in the morning I spoke at Hilltown; large meeting and no opposition. In the afternoon Barrack park was shouted on; here we found a large crowd, and a State Socialist who was to give the opposition, acknowledged that he could only agree with us. Afterwards two boasted Socialists began a debate between themselves on Parnell! Nice occupation for Scotch Socialists! In the evening we went down to Commercial Street and had a very big and attentive meeting. Cameron (Dundee) opened by denouncing the "workingmen town councillors," and after my address, we got some amusing opposition from a "Christian Democrat," who talked more about Godalmighty than anything else. Following him came Duncan a State Socialist, and he had to see the possibility of voluntary co-operation as an antidote to government.

In the campaign we got rid of 3 quires of *Commonweal* and other literature. An Anarchist-Communist Group has been formed at Dundee, and all wishing to join or help it, either in the Jute-city or out of it, should write to Wm. Reekie, 15 Ann Street, Dundee. This town is very advanced and it will not take long to make a stronghold of it.

CYRIL BELL, Edinburgh.

REPORTS.

London—St. Pancras.—Discussions have been held on Sunday evenings at the N. W. Coffee Tavern, Great College St. On June the 7th, J. Turner gave an interesting lecture on Trades Unionism. On the 14th and 21st, a translation of Kropotkin's essay on "Anarchist Morality," was read. Audiences were small, but an animated conversation followed lecture and readings. Next Sunday we hope to start our open-air meetings.

London Socialist League. Meetings held in Hyde Park on Saturdays, at Finsbury Park Sunday evening, and Regents Park Sunday morning. Big meeting on strikes in Hyde park on Sunday, 14th June (Laundress demonstration)

Leicester.—We have nothing exciting to report since last month. Our work has gone on quietly and steadily; three meetings each Sunday and an occasional one on week-days. George Cores came down on May 30, calling at Derby on his way and speaking in the Market Place there on the Saturday evening. He gave three excellent addresses on Sunday and remained on Monday to speak at Ansty, a village near Leicester, in which several meetings were held last year with good result. Dr. Craghe of Sheffield, was here and spoke three times on June 14.

Aberdeen Revolutionary Socialist Federation.—The undernoted is our report. Our weekly meetings on the Castlegate on Sunday evenings still keep on being successful in spite of the opposition of the teetotalers who now, from a very conspicuous platform, hurl damnation at the publican and faulty economics at the Socialists. Comrade Addie has now taken to outdoor speaking and is quite a success, his special knowledge of figures of almost every description, makes him quite an effective speaker, and between him and Comrade Duncan we can say that a good month's work has been done in the open air. Our educational meetings, held in the small Oddfellows Hall, are doing what they were began for splendidly. The members showing a decided improvement in speaking ability, and it is hoped that in the near future we shall have a still further supply of outdoor speakers. Our list of members is slowly but steadily increasing. Stonehaven, a village 16 miles south of Aberdeen, was visited by a number of comrades on Saturday the 20th, who held a meeting in the Square, which exceeded the most hopeful expectations. The meeting started under very adverse circumstances, few people were in the Square, and these showed no signs of even curiosity about us for a time; but after Duncan had spoken for about a quarter of an hour a crowd, which, as an old man said, was the largest he had ever seen in the Square, assembled and kept together for over an hour, giving us an apparently sympathetic hearing. One stalwart labourer, who would be of very great use at the Revolution, said that he had heard many speeches, but never heard the truth spoken in the streets or anywhere else before. We promised to make a return visit on Saturday 11th July. Altogether we could not possibly have done a better day's propaganda. Inverurie, a town famed for its narrow-mindedness and general bigotry, is booked for Saturday 4th July, when we hope, if not to be received as we were in Stonehaven, to be able to set some of the workers a-thinking.

Great Yarmouth Socialist Society.—Owing to inclement weather, and several Comrades being laid up with the influenza, very little out-door propaganda has been done during the past month. But on June 7th Comrades Saunders, Baker, Hindes, Coney, and Headley, went on a tour through several of the surrounding villages, including Burgh, Belton, and Bradwell, with large bundles of old *Freedom*s, *Commonweals*, and other literature. We found that our propaganda amongst these villages during the past two or three years is bearing fruit. Belton and Bradwell will bear comparison with any other villages in Norfolk for their spirit of discontent with the present system. At a political meeting at Bradwell, in the last week of June, the speakers expressed their surprise at the questions asked them by the countrymen. Be they Liberal or Tory they find that it is no use going there for votes, as the men have lost all faith in either altering their conditions. Good meetings have been held in the Club Room every Sunday evening. Amongst other subject last month have been Socialism, Secularism, Anarchism, and Spiritualism. Fair attendance and interesting discussions. On May 27th, Headley appeared before the Great Unpaid, for "wilfully and unlawfully obstructing a certain highway of the Borough, to wit, the Church Plain, by lecturing thereon, and causing a crowd to assemble," but so rotten was the police evidence that our Comrade was only fined one shilling, including costs. One policeman said two carriages were stopped by our audience. The second policeman said he never saw any carriages at all. The fact is there were three, but none of them stopped. Another policeman said he could hear Headley speaking at a distance of about 200 yards, with three battalions of militia between him and the speaker! On cross-examination he said he could "see Headley's arms going," and thought he was speaking. So much for police evidence. Some of the local newspapers had the following on their contents sheet: "Socialistic obstruction on the Church Plain; spreading the spirit of discontent." Needless to say, none of them gave a correct report. We have been compelled to leave the large premises in Howard Street, and go back to the old shop in 56 Row, Market, where we hope to be as successful as we were last summer. Fair sale of *Freedom*, and *Commonweal* and other literature during the month.—J. H.

Newcastle on Tyne Anarchist Communist Group.—Outdoor meetings have been held on the quay on Sunday mornings; speakers, James and Pearson. The beginning of last month a debate was held at the Sandhill, between T. Pearson and Mr. Thornton, a local Radical, the subject for discussion being "Anarchist Communism v. Radicalism." There was a large audience, who listened to the arguments of both sides with great attention. Last Sunday, June 21, was a very busy day here, being the commencement of the holidays, and the Temperance festival. In the morning we had a good meeting on the quay, which was addressed by Pearson and James. In the afternoon Pearson spoke on the Secularist platform, Town Moor. We distributed a large amount of *Commonweals* and *Freedom*s. In the evening a debate was held between T. Pearson and H. Sinclair, the subject being, "Social Democracy v. Anarchist Communism." There was a large audience, who frequently applauded the arguments of our comrade. We feel the want of another speaker here. A mutual education class has been started here. It is composed of Secularists, Spiritualists, Christians, Social Democrats, and Anarchists. Papers on "Anarchism" have been read by Pearson and James. Pearson's paper being "Mutual Aid among Animals," and James', "The Cause of Crime." These meetings are held every Thursday night at Lockhart's, Bigg Market. Application for membership must be made to W. Torgie, Hon. Sec.

Dublin Socialist Union.—Meeting June 4, at 87 Marlboro' Street, J. Landye, the veteran Internationalist, delivered an address on "Are Socialism and Christianity opposed." A vigorous discussion ensued, in which Collins, Toomey, O'Gorman, Kavanagh, and a Salvationist took part.

NOTICES.

London—St. Pancras Communist-Anarchist Group.—Regents' Park, every Sunday at 6 p.m.

Newcastle Communist Anarchist Group.—Open-air meetings on the Quay every Sunday, 11.30 a.m. Discussions at Lockhart's Cocoa Rooms, Bigg Market, every Monday at 8 p.m.

Dublin Socialist Union.—87 Marlboro' Street, Thursday July 2, at 8 p.m. A. J. Kavanagh, "The Ideals of the Revolution."

Printed and published for the proprietors by C. M. Wilson, at the New Fellowship Press, 26 Newington Green Road, N.