

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. 5.—No. 57.

AUGUST, 1891.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY

THE LABOR COMMISSION.

THE Labor Commission is a farce. As means of righting the wrongs of the worker, and introducing a state of things approaching to economic justice, Labor Commissions and Labor Legislation are utterly futile. Even if the workers of every class really could lay bare all their sufferings and all the wrongs that are done them before the whole assembled legislature, the gentlemen of that body, lords and commons together, would not relieve and right them; and it is not so much that they would not as that they could not. You cannot alter an economic system, the agelong growth of a complex society, by making laws about this or that particular result of it. The Workers of England, and indeed of the civilised world, are slaves, toiling for longer hours than any human creature can toil and enjoy either health or happiness; toiling to embody the creations of other men's brains, for a miserable pittance which by no means represents their fair share of the product. And this because certain persons have got hold of the land and means of production and pretending they have an exclusive property in them, will only let the rest use them on their—the pretended owners'—terms. But this is a state of thing which no law-givers, tinkering away, even with the best intentions, at the evil results and not the causes of them can ever set straight. No one can do that but the men who suffer and see that they are wronged. They can say to the men who profit, or fancy they do, by the present system of production and distribution: "We decline to do a stroke of work again under these shameful conditions. Drop your ridiculous pretensions to private property in things which are no creations of yours, things you found ready for you when you were born, things nature made or the collective labor of numberless men; come to an honourable mutual understanding with us to co-operate with us on equal terms in working, and share and share alike in the results, or begone and make room for human beings worthy the name." When the men who suffer and are wronged say that to those who are living on them and depriving them of the birthright of free men, the system of injustice under which we groan will be cut off at the roots, and wither away. But legislators can do nothing but lop a bough here and tie down a twig there of the poison tree which is blighting all our lives.

Nevertheless, though Parliamentary Commissions are a farce as preliminaries to legislation that may be a stepping stone to social justice, the evidence they elicit as to the condition of the workers in different trades is interesting and suggestive. How plainly one sees in the evidence of the Cleveland miners, for instance, the way in which our present system of producing by means of hired labour, for the sake of selling at a profit, makes the most valuable mechanical inventions into a cause of misery to the very men they ought to benefit. What toil can be more exhausting than a miner's? When one first goes down into a coal pit, and sees the men crammed into the horrible dark crevices of the mine, their bodies contorted into the most unnatural positions, picking away at the black masses of coal above, below, beside them, the rock pressing into and bruising them, the coal dust falling into their eyes and mouths, one can hardly believe that it is possible that human beings can endure such terrible labor for seven or eight hours every day. Lately a drill has been invented which does the work of ten men,—just the hard, laborious work which invention should be directed to saving human beings. What could be better than that mechanical invention should free human beings from such distressing drudgery, and at the same time secure the desired results faster than human labor can secure them? What indeed, if we were free workers employed in getting as much coal or iron as might be, with as little trouble as possible, for the general use. But, unfortunately, we are doing nothing so rational. We are wage slaves getting as much coal and iron as the mine owners can sell at a profit. If with a drill they can get it without nine-tenths of us, the nine-tenths must set out on a weary tramp to find work, perhaps be pinched and starving, we and our wives and children, for weeks and months before we get anything. Perhaps we shall be thrown out of the mining trade altogether, and have to get on as we can with the uncertain work and uncertain pay of an unskilled laborer. Naturally we look on the drills as our enemies, and would rather be crammed into a stifling crevice in the rock to pick for eight hours a day than be thrown out of work. Work for us in making the machinery? No; we are not mechanics and engineers! Perhaps our boys may be;—but these "economic adjustments" which look so easy on paper take years, and we cannot sleep like toads in a stone until

adjustments have had time to take place. No wonder Mr. Taylor of the Cleveland Miners' Federation expressed no partiality for the new drills, and yet under a commune how they would be welcomed by the miners.

The unhealthy condition of the cotton weavers is another result of this same production for profit system. There is no reason in the nature of their work why the weaving sheds should be heated above 60°. But they are heated by steam to 90°, merely to increase the weight of the cotton, which is none the more useful for that, only sells better. One is reminded of the lead "tea-tasters" which intelligent Sheffield men are forced to waste their time and outrage their sense of honesty by putting every day and all day into the spouts of metal tea-pots, so as to increase the weight and selling-value. For the Lancashire cotton weavers the process of weighting often means disease and death. Working in such a temperature, they continually suffer from chest disorders. The factory acts order ventilation, but, of course, are not carried out in a case where they would interfere too seriously with profits. (Evidence of Barker, Blackburn Weavers' Association).

But after all, such unhealthy conditions are by no means the only or even the greatest of the evils brought upon the workers by the production for profit system. It is not only the chance of disease and an early death they suffer from, but the cramping and crushing down of their whole lives. Amongst the cotton operatives children only attend school for half a day after they have passed the third, or in some localities even the second standard, and thus at the age of from eight to ten years begin their career as wage-slaves in the mill. They must learn the work young, it is said, or they would never be skilful. But is there not all the difference in the world between such technical instruction for an hour or two daily as would teach them to be skilful and the hard-driven, dreary experience of a child mill-hand? Beginning thus early a life of monotonous routine-work, which cramps the faculties of mind and body and leaves both undeveloped, the cotton operatives have no chance to catch a glimpse of what a free, full human existence might be. "What do you think about whilst you are doing that all day?" said a comrade to a man whose business it was to tie the ends of the warp for ten hours daily, to sit moving his arms up and down with a motion like clock-work. "Of how much money I can make," replied he. And indeed what chance had he to think of anything else? Work to such a man can be nothing but a drudgery whereby he makes a little—a very little—money. He has no interest and can have none in what he is doing for its own sake. And when his hours of labour are over, he has no mental or bodily resources to turn to except such rough and ready amusements as profit-seekers in the amusement-catering line can bring to tempt his jaded senses. The whole family, father, mother and children, spend the best part of their lives in the mill. Naturally living in this narrow round they are only vaguely dissatisfied, if they have the spirit and imagination to be discontented at all. When trade is good and they earn regularly the wages they are accustomed to, they do not see that their condition can be bettered. They would like more wages, but think the employers cannot afford more. And they would like not to be so driven by the overlookers who get 5 per cent on the output of their operatives. Beyond this they, as far as their representatives before the Commission fairly represent them, have very little to say. Probably the only thing to rouse them out of their deadly apathy and open their eyes to their real capacities and just claims as human beings would be a crisis in the cotton trade. In the cotton trade? Nay, what could Englishmen ask better for the deliverance of the whole nation than a crisis which should so effectually check all trades and industries as to divert the energy now expended in the mad struggle for commercial supremacy and individual wealth into a healthier channel? What could be better for the English race than some shock which should bend all their force to the socialisation of industry and the enfranchisement of the worker? While England

"Stupidly travels her round
Of mechanic business, and lets
Slow die out of her life
Glory, and genius, and joy,"

what hope for a better society, a free and satisfying relation between man and man? Down with English industry, say we; down with the shameful prosperity which blinds the eyes of so many of our skilled workers to the miserable narrowness and degradation of lives which might be those of true freemen.

The same narrowness of aim, and want of imagination to see and

aspiration to attain to a higher level of social co-operation is painfully prominent in the evidence relating to the trade organisations in the textile and mining industries. The more intelligent masters have formed themselves into associations to take common action and look after their own interests in the way of profit-getting and wage-lessening, and the men, on their side, have trade societies to watch their interests and look after every chance of increasing wages. The objects of these latter associations are as short-sighted and limited as can well be, and in their administration the old deep-rooted tendency to domination and red-tape of course crops up continually. With the example of government always before their eyes, and the inherited prejudice about submission and obedience in the minds of their officers and members, it could hardly be otherwise; especially as their main object is to contend with opposing interests. Nevertheless these associations are extremely interesting to Anarchists. In spite of all that is petty in their aims and unfree in their methods, they are essentially voluntary associations of workers, and the method of organisation they have adopted is remarkably sensible and characteristic of spontaneous popular grouping. They have begun at the bottom and worked upwards. First there are the small local societies, and then these are federated into Amalgamations. Finally, for special business the Amalgamation send certain delegates to a joint committee to meet the delegates of the Masters' Association. Matters at issue are first referred to the Secretaries of Men's and Masters's Associations. If they do not settle them to the mutual satisfaction of both parties, the question comes before the Joint Committee. If they do not decide it to the general satisfaction, it is referred (amongst the Cleveland miners for example) to the men in their local meetings (lodges). In this way matters in dispute, even though they refer to the divided interests of two opposing classes, are almost always settled without anger and quarrels. If this is possible in a society like ours, amongst men divided by property and class, why is it utopian to believe that voluntarily federated groups of workers, who are equal and free, will be able to manage their own affairs peaceably and harmoniously when a central government is a thing of the past? If the central government and the employers to boot were spirited away to-morrow, the miners and cotton operatives, not to speak of other trades, are organised in a fashion that would enable them to carry on their branches of production with very little delay or confusion. And however their organisations might need to enlarge their aims and scope and to purge themselves of a tendency to admit authority and to cramp individual initiative, born of the warfare and oppressive atmosphere of to-day, they would be ready in their essential framework to take their place in the new society of free and equal industrial co-operators. Older than government, older than centralised authority, this system of local groups, federations of groups, delegate meetings for special purposes, final reference of moot questions to those directly concerned for arrangement by mutual consent or arbitration, will survive the overthrow of centralisation and authority. It is alive yet amongst the people, and with the freedom of the people from class-rule it will again assert itself as the rational method of social organisation. At least so we Anarchists are persuaded.

FREEDOM AND PROPERTY.

V.

We have been analysing the claim of the producer to the produce and to enable us the better to estimate it, we have been examining the nature of the relation between an individual producer and a special product. Taking the simple example of a young fellow making himself a walking-stick, we have seen that he expends energy of nerve and muscle in the process, and also energy of will. Nor is this all. In the simplest productive process, more especially when *freely initiated*, there is an expenditure of brain power. This it is which we have to-day to consider.

Harry, as we have seen, has received, in common with other folks of his day and generation, the general idea of a walking-stick, as it has been elaborated by past and present producers of such articles. He has received impressions about this sort of object, as about carts, houses, chairs, and thousands of other things that fall under common observation. About all of them his mind, without any conscious endeavour on his part, has been sorting and grouping its impressions and the ideas it has put together. For the brain is a wonderful sorting machine, constantly at work selecting and combining the material conveyed to it. And a great part of this work it does without our being conscious that our brain is working at all, just as we are unconscious of the continual working of our heart and lungs. Yet like them our brain is constantly expending energy, and we can realise it as we remember how dull and stupid we feel when we are ill or tired or have been too long without food, when, in fact, our brain is working sluggishly because our usual supply of energy has run down. But a man's mind may go on all his life automatically receiving, sorting, grouping and storing the information that floats his way about any given subject—say walking-sticks—and no new walking-stick be the result. The automatic action of his brain in relation to the walking-stick idea plays a very great part in enabling Harry to produce the stick. It is a primary factor in the mental process which the production implies, but by itself such brain action would not initiate the productive process.

Yes, you say, his interest must of course be roused, so that he begins to think consciously and intentionally about the subject. Some stimulus or series of stimuli must so act upon his brain that more and more energy will be expended along that special channel. He must intelli-

gently look for and classify facts and ideas relating to the matter, study it practically or theoretically. Certainly he must; but is this all? A man's mind may be, in fact our minds constantly are, consciously occupied with a variety of subjects. On some of them we dwell a great deal perhaps, read about them or acquire knowledge by intentional observation, classify and arrange all we obtain, carry on long trains of thought whereof these ideas are the subject. In such conscious and deliberate mental work a man expends a far greater degree of energy than is expended in merely automatic brain action; just as he expends far more energy when he is busied with bodily labour than is expended by the automatic functions of his heart, lungs, stomach, etc. But this brain labour, though it plays a most essential part in production, does not initiate it. Harry might for some reason or another be interested in sticks, learn and think a lot about the history of such articles in past ages, and their uses, forms and methods of manufacture in this, and yet never make a stick or have any single idea on the subject which was truly his own. He might even, say for the sake of earning money, write an account of all he knew on the subject, or go to work at stick making, doing exactly what he was taught, and of course, intentionally and consciously thinking about the process meanwhile, and yet, if his mind did nothing more than thus reproduce what was acquired by it, he would never accomplish what we have supposed in our example, *i.e.*, initiate and carry out a productive idea.

How came Harry to make that stick? If you asked him, he would probably say: "Well, the idea came to me. I felt all of a sudden that I should like to make a stick. . . . You see I admired very much that stick of Tom's. He got it in Switzerland and I have not the chance to go there to buy one like it. And then the other day, when I was out for a long walk across country, I got a nasty fall climbing up a steep clay bank, and I thought at the time that I shouldn't have slipped if I had had a stick like Tom's. I forgot all about it for a bit, and then, one night when it was late and I couldn't sleep, and all sorts of things were running in my head, I recollected I had seen some capital, stout stems of the same wood as Tom's stick growing in a lane, and I thought that next time I got a holiday I'd walk that way, and have a look at them. It was only when I was going down the lane and looking hard at the bushes, that all of a sudden the idea came into my head: Why shouldn't I make myself a stick every bit as good as Tom's? I was as pleased as Punch, and thought I was a fool not to have thought of that before; why I didn't I'm sure I don't know." No, Harry, nor can any one tell you in the present imperfect state of our physiological and psychological knowledge. The formation of creative ideas by the brain is spontaneous, as far as our will and deliberate intention are concerned. After they are born we can look back and, like Harry, trace more or less what has set our mind to work in that direction, but by intentionally thinking of any subject we cannot ensure the birth of a creative idea. Having the conception, we can deliberately set about developing it, work it out in thought and action; but first the idea must "come." Suddenly, so suddenly that a flash of lightning seems an age in comparison, it springs to life in our consciousness; like an illumination tracing in vivid flame what a second before were merely cold black lines. It is an idea which is also an impulse, a thing of life craving development. May be it is feeble, and if circumstances are against it, dies again, leaving no trace. May be it is passionate and strong, striving with all the energy of the whole conscious being for fullness of expression, and if adverse fate is stronger and it is crushed and broken, our whole energy seems broken and crushed with it. Such a creative idea may relate to the highest and most complex abstractions of which the human intellect is capable, or to the smallest details of every-day existence. It may be the conception of a poem, of a scientific generalisation, of a mechanical invention, or the idea of a lad that he will make himself a stick. It may be the grandest discovery of the most profound and advanced thinker of the age, or a common-place which, having been born before in the brains of million of men, is born again this moment in you or me. But whatever the subject-matter of the creative idea, or the intellectual capacity of the brain wherein it is conceived, in that it is creative it is the same in character. In this common human experience a Shakspeare, a Darwin, a Watt, and the Harry of our example are brothers. Every mind not utterly crushed down and enslaved, or utterly debased and besotted, creates such ideas now and again, but in millions of human beings they are perpetually stifled, or left to wither from want of opportunity. Mankind have yet to realise the supreme value of free scope for individual initiative, have yet to learn that it means room and a chance of development for the creative power of man.

(To be continued.)

THE CHRISTIAN REVOLUTION AND THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION.*

THE book which has just been published by our comrade and friend Charles Malato, having the above title, is one of great merit and much interest not only for his fellow Anarchists, but for all those who believe in a coming Social Revolution. The central idea on which the book is based consists in a comparison between the condition of the Roman world at the time of the popularisation of Christianity, some three hundred years after the death of its founder, and the condition of the middle-class world of to-day, in which the capitalist fills the place of Cesar and the plutocratic will is substituted for the Imperial power.

* "Révolution Chrétienne et Révolution Social." By Charles Malato. Paris: Albert Savine, 12, rue des Pyramides. Price 3 fr. 50 c.

We are not of those who believe much in the proverb that history repeats itself. It never does, except in special cases and particular relationships when it is obeying some special law which governs in the actions of men towards each other, just as similar laws do in the action of chemical bodies. Of course, we are using the word "law" here in its scientific sense, as an infallible consequence which follows a certain definite action. If you lower the temperature of water, sufficiently ice is formed; if you increase the temperature of ice above a certain point, water is formed. There is no getting away from that fact; it is a scientific or, if you like, a natural law. It does not matter whether this alteration of temperature is affected by the agency of man or the agency of nature, the result is invariably the same. The same elements and the same treatment give the same result. Just in the same way, when a certain condition of things arises in the relationship of men with each other a certain definite result must inevitably follow. But in history the conditions are almost always varied, and for this reason the result is almost always varied. In certain of its leading features one period of history may resemble another, but in other of the leading features and in most of its secondary characteristics the difference is vast. We do not therefore altogether agree with our comrade as to the great resemblance existing between the society of to-day and the society of the Cæsars, but we readily admit that it is extremely interesting to study the two periods side by side; and for the worker, whose time is limited and who cannot read through a number of books dealing with the two periods and compare them himself, such a book as Malato's is invaluable.

Over and over again in history, attempts have been made to bring the world, as far as it was known, under a single rule. Over and over again, a clever soldier or an ambitious and powerful race of people have endeavoured to obtain the supremacy of the world, and have succeeded to a certain extent for a time. But invariably, and as a necessary consequence of historical law, the edifice of power, raised with so much trouble and generally with such a vast expenditure of blood, has crumbled into pieces on the death of this soldier or the exhaustion of this people. Alexander's empire died with Alexander, Napoleon's was smashed to pieces at Waterloo. Charlemagne and Louis le Grand, Canute and Charles Quint are but instances of the many who have tried their hands at building a house of cards which hardly survived their death. The vast power of the followers of Mahomet, which at one time threatened to extend over the whole of Europe, was split up from within rather than overthrown from without. Centralisation is an impossibility so long as there are any intelligent and courageous men and women left on the planet. But the authoritarians never learn anything from history, and if to-day we have no one ruler over the world, or a man who shows himself anxious to fill that post, it is simply because the job is so very much bigger now and that nobody feels precisely strong enough for it, and, strongest reason of all, that they all fear in a greater or lesser degree the coming Social Revolution. But the authoritarians have only altered their tactics, the old ambition still remains, and the kings and presidents are stretching out their hands towards one another with the view of forming a sort of joint stock company for the purpose of carrying out their plans. As it is impossible now for us to be ruled by one man, the tendency is that we shall be ruled by a sort of oligarchy, which is pretty much the same as far as we are concerned. The supremacy of the Romans only differs from that of Napoleon, Alexander and the others in being the supremacy of a people instead of an individual; and for this very reason it was so much more powerful, and had so much greater an effect upon the world. The history of the world has probably never seen anything to equal it, even the supremacy of the Greeks, much as that had to do in changing the condition of mankind and in moulding the Roman civilisation, was but trifling compared with it. Rome dominated everywhere and left its impress upon all European language and civilisation, so much so that to-day five European countries (France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, and Roumania) speak different varieties of what is practically only a vulgarisation of the Roman tongue, and the millions of English-speaking people all over the world use a vocabulary in which probably half the words are of Roman origin. One might even go farther than that and say that to Rome and the Roman influence we owe the capitalist system of the present day. Certainly the condition of man would have been very different but for the Roman invasion of the European countries, and the institutions prevailing in Britain, Gaul, and elsewhere, before the Roman invasion would have led in a very different direction.

But Roman supremacy, long as it lasted and great as its effects were upon the world, was destined to perish just as surely as the block of ice becomes water in a heated temperature, aye, just as surely as the present reign of the capitalists and landlords is destined to perish. The oppressed nationalities, the slaves, and all those who were writhing under the yoke of the Cæsars, together with the outer barbarians who were kept within certain limits by the Roman domination, all felt a yearning to overthrow "the powers that be" of the time. And by dint of undermining and by direct attack the Empire was at length destroyed, split up rather than conquered, and the suffering millions found themselves with many rulers instead of one. This was inevitable. Christianity had nothing whatever to do with it, except that the Christian sect was among those who were persecuted under the Roman laws. If there had been no Christians, this revolution must have taken place just the same. But what a powerful weapon religion has always been in the hands of the oppressors of humanity! Constantine, who, as our comrade shows in the sixth chapter, was one of the biggest scoundrels ever born, having murdered, amongst others, his own wife and child and a nephew, thought it was a good move to become a Christian, just as Clovis, the leader of the Salien Franks, did a little later on. In both cases it turned out as they expected. The Church and the State were

wedded. All that was good in the former was abandoned by the priesthood, who, having arrived at power, could afford to laugh in their sleeves at the humble followers of the Carpenter of Nazareth. The Christian revolution was accomplished. But all the Christianity had disappeared and the only revolution was a shifting of the balance of power. The condition of the people was precisely the same, perhaps worse. The rulers of Rome had gained over to their side a new army of followers, and things went on just the same. If there had only been the Christians to consider, the Roman empire would have continued. Fortunately, there was something far more powerful than Christianity working for the downfall of the Roman supremacy, the desire of the people to secure greater autonomy.

To-day, as Malato shows, a supremacy is again threatened, but this time it is the supremacy of a class rather than of a race. In the centuries which have passed since Rome fell, the balance of power has changed again, and it is no longer the kings but the men of wealth who rule. Unlike the Roman Emperor, they have no new religion to fly to. They have done their level best to utilise the existing religion, but they find that even that cannot put off the coming revolution for long. And so now they are following Constantine in his successful dodge, but with a variation: instead of becoming Christians they are becoming Socialists. With Constantine the cry was "We are all Christians now," with our capitalist friends to-day it is "We are all Socialists now." And if there were only a few Social Democrats to be considered, a few constitutional agitators, believers in a slight amelioration of the condition of the workers, or seekers after power, such as the German Socialist deputies have shown themselves to be, the empire of the capitalists might very well continue. Luckily, however, there are other causes at work; there are the "barbarians" to be considered, and this time they are not without but within the empire; and there are those most dreaded enemies of all, the Anarchists, those clear thinkers who see through all their little schemes and, by throwing day-light upon them, are beginning to make the workers understand what a trifling unimportant thing a mere change of a name would be; that we do not want to rechristen our authority, but to do away with it altogether. The capitalist empire must fall as the Roman empire had to fall, because an historical law compels it. Anarchists and proletarians generally are only made what they are by the conditions which capitalism has evolved: they are but following out the historical law which compels them to act against and overthrow the domination of the few. The result is certain. We cannot tell when the supremacy of capital will be overthrown, but that it will be overthrown no student of history can for a moment doubt. And this time it will not be merely the autonomy of the clan or the nation that will be secured, but the entire freedom of the individual.

Referring to the movement of 1789, Malato says it was an individualist revolution. He might almost have said that it was the beginning of the present universal movement. The advantages of '89 were monopolised by a few, that is true. But it was only because the rest were stupid enough to be juggled out of their rights. They had not yet acquired knowledge sufficient to make themselves free. And never will they be free until they have acquired that knowledge, until they have learned to rely on themselves, to fight for themselves, to preserve their own liberties, and to live as free men. That they are beginning to do this is just what makes the present situation so acute. It is just this which presages the speedy fall of capitalism. Malato does not confine his attention merely to the Europeans. He looks beyond and fears the advent of an Asiatic invasion. Here we differ from him very considerably. We think the "teeming millions" of China and India exist rather in the imagination of certain writers and in the fears of European work-people who are brought into contact with Asiatic competition than in reality. It is doubtful if anywhere the population is more dense than here in England or in Belgium, and yet we know that there is land enough in those countries to supply a far greater population than at present exists in them. Let the Chinaman and the Hindoo or anybody go and come where they please, and let us do the same. If their rich and fruitful lands will not supply their wants as well as our European countries could do it, is a matter for great surprise. No doubt, in the future there will be a very much greater mingling of races than has ever been the case before, and it is probable that the divers races may develop into one which will possess all the qualifications, without the disqualifications of the others. If the enduring power of the Chinese can be added to the energy of the Anglo-Saxon, or the Frenchman, why should not this new race eventually eliminate by the process of natural selection all the others? Not the least remarkable of the changes brought about by the Social Revolution will probably be the settlement of these differences of race. But we Anarchists can look forward to it without fear. Not being patriotic, it matters not two straws to us as individuals. The Chinaman and the Hindoo is just as much a brother as the man next door. His future and his emancipation is just as dear to us as that of the European. And if we do not strive so much for him as for ourselves in the Social Revolution, it is because every one can best work for the cause of humanity according to the surroundings in which he lives. The most far-sighted of us can see only a very little way ahead. But this we know, that the enfranchisement of the world demands first of all the destruction of property and authority. And here is a task before us to which we can devote all our time and all our efforts, without taking the trouble to peep into the future.

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.

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.; R., 2s. 8d.

SPECIAL NOTICES.

Now ready Freedom Pamphlet No 3, A TALK ABOUT ANARCHIST COMMUNISM, by Enrico Malatesta, a translation of the famous propagandist pamphlet which has been reproduced in almost every European language. Revised and enlarged from the third Italian Edition. A clear statement of the principles of Anarchist Socialism in simple language. Specially suitable for sale at open air meetings. Thirty two pages. Price ONE PENNY; per quire of 25 copies, 1s. 4d.

As the expense of bringing out this large pamphlet so cheaply is very heavy, we beg comrades to help us by sending remittances with their orders where possible.

TWO SPECIAL ENTERTAINMENTS will be given in the hall of the I. W. M. Club, 40, Berner Street, Commercial Road, E., on Sat. the 1st and Sunday the 9th August, for the benefit of the "Freedom Pamphlet Fund" and the "Workers' Friend." The Concerts will begin at 8 p.m. and will be followed by a ball. Tickets, available for either evening, may be obtained at the Club; of W. Wess, Freedom Office, 26, Newington Green Road, N.; and of all the London Anarchist Groups.

American Groups who, in view of Comrade Kropotkin's lecturing tour in the States, details of which we hope to be able to give our readers next month, wish for extra supplies of FREEDOM, and pamphlets are invited to send in their orders as soon as possible. We hope that our American comrades will make a special effort to push Anarchist Communist literature on this occasion. Comrade Kropotkin will arrive in New York the second week in October.

In the October number of FREEDOM we propose to begin the serial publication of Kropotkin's new pamphlet "ANARCHIST MORALITY," in an English translation specially revised by the author. American comrades please note.

NOTES.

GOOD NEWS.

The Swiss nation have spared themselves the disgrace of handing over Malatesta to Italy. The Italian government demanded his extradition on the ground that he instigated the Copolago Congress, which organised the manifestation of May 1st, which ended in riots at Rome and Florence. A still more ingenious example of the device of constructive criminality than that by which the American lawyers hunted down our Chicago comrades. Malatesta is to be held morally responsible for acts in which he had no part, because on previous occasions he had said or done something else which may have indirectly led up to the acts complained of! In other words, it is naturally a crime in the eyes of rulers and ruling classes to be an Anarchist and spread Anarchist ideas. But as governments which profess constitutional freedom do not quite dare to say this openly, they are trying to work up the old doctrine of constructive treason, and apply it to modern requirements. In Chicago they succeeded. We rejoice that in Malatesta's case they have failed. Our comrade was tried at Lugano, July 21, for his breach of Swiss law in returning to Switzerland, whence he had been expelled in 1879, and was sentenced to forty five days imprisonment, dating from the time of his arrest. He is therefore now at liberty.

A MISTAKEN SUSPICION.

We hear from Italian comrades intimately connected with the movement that the speaker whose words gave a pretext to the charge of the troops upon the people in Rome, described in our correspondent A. H.'s letter last month, was no spy. He was Comrade Pella, a most earnest and devoted worker in the cause. If his hot words were unfortunate in their result on this occasion, they were prompted by the zeal of a man ready himself to fight to the death if by any act of revolt the workers might be roused from their dull and despairing apathy. Com-

rade Pella is now in prison awaiting trial, and it is expected that the principal vengeance of the government will fall upon him.

A FIRST-RATE ANARCHIST PAPER.

"L'Homme Libre" (The Free man), which we are glad to say is now well on in its first half year of existence, is published by an Anarchist Communist group at Brussels; and a capital paper it is. The articles are plainly and brightly written, and treat a variety of topics in a truly free and revolutionary spirit. Readers of the "Sheffield Anarchist" may see an example in the interesting article on "Woman and the Family" translated in No 3 of that paper. We advise every one who reads French to subscribe to our brave and able Belgian contemporary. Subscription, 5 francs (4/2) a year. Address, T. Pintelon, Rue de Tilly, 22, Brussels.

THE BRUSSELS CONGRESS.

A Socialist Congress will be held at Brussels on August 16th, organised by the Social Democrats. Our Anarchist Communist comrades in Brussels propose to convene a Conference for the same date, specially to discuss what kind of Workmen's Association is consistent with Anarchist principles. Comrades from all countries are invited. Comrades from English groups will be very welcome, and any one who can manage a holiday cannot do better than run over. We advise English groups who think of sending delegates to write at once to the office of "L'Homme Libre"; address given above.

THE DECLINE OF SOCIAL DEMOCRACY.

It is now almost a matter of certainty that the principal result of the German Social Democratic Congress, to be held on the 10th of October, will be the splitting of that party into several fragments. The ex-officer of the Bavarian army, Herr Vollmar, will of course be the leader of one of these sections, as the indignation caused by his recent patriotic utterances must render it impossible for the bulk of the party to work any longer with him and his Bavarian followers. But the discussion which will arise upon the new programme to be submitted to the conference is likely to lead to still more important changes in the position of the party. If this programme is adopted, it will reduce the German Social Democrat to the same level as the English radicals. As the London "Daily Chronicle" says, "The new programme, which has been transmitted this week from Berlin, is much more in harmony with what we know as the new radicalism than it is with Revolutionary Socialism. Compared with the Gotha programme, it is distinctly moderate. It rather seeks to develop existing institutions in a fully democratic direction than to break with the past." We do not believe that a party which has shown some considerable revolutionary spirit in the past can be entirely mastered in this way by its fossilised leaders. There must be many amongst the rank and file of this huge organisation who, notwithstanding the boast as to their "discipline" made by the leaders, will bitterly resent this weakening of the aims and methods of the party. We look to these to come forward and strengthen the efforts of the Anarchist party in Germany, so as to let young William the Artful see that he has a real revolutionary force to deal with, despite the fact he has divided and conquered the host of Social Democracy.

ANARCHISM IN SHEFFIELD.

We are pleased to welcome the first provincial Anarchist paper in England, the "Sheffield Anarchist," which is published for the Sheffield Anarchist Group by Dr. John Creaghe, at 47, Westbar Green, Sheffield. It is the same size as the "Commonweal," and its price is "Pay what you like." A novel feature in the paper consists in the Anarchist advertisements. One of these offers £50 reward for an honest lawyer. We know there is an HONEST LAWYER somewhere in the East End of London. He is to be seen painted on the sign of a public house with his head under his arm. We would suggest that some of our East End comrades should claim the reward from Mr. Diogenes and apply it to the East End Propaganda. Another advertisement is that of a poacher, who advertises for a few comrades to join him in his business, which we understand is principally night work. In addition to their paper the Sheffield group has started a No Rent campaign. It began with a dispute between Comrade Creaghe and his landlady. She sent bailiffs to remove his furniture and he resisted. Finally he was summoned and fined 21s., and vilified as a thief, etc., by one lawyer Wilson, the hired defender of property. Creaghe retorted by a letter in No I of the "Sheffield Anarchist," in which he spoke somewhat plainly of the limb of the law. In consequence this worthy has brought a criminal libel action against our comrade. On the 20th of July he was brought before the local beak and committed for trial. He took the opportunity of saying a lot of truisms which must have been exceedingly unpalatable to our enemies, and which we are glad to find have been given pretty fully in the "Sheffield Daily Telegraph." At the trial, on the 28th of July, Creaghe said that he had attacked Wilson as a member of a class who make their living by lies and chicanery and by evading the law, and are so many gladiators fighting for a verdict, caring nothing for justice and right. He also told Justice Grantham that he was infamous for his sentences upon those who attacked property, Grantham, to prove that the devil is not so black as he's painted we suppose, sentenced Creaghe to pay costs and come up for judgement when called for. Meanwhile the poorer districts of Sheffield have been so much influenced by our comrades' No Rent propaganda, that the local property-owners have found it necessary to form a league to defend their monopoly. Our comrades have replied by the formation of an Anti-Property League, to help those who cannot pay rent, and support the families of workers who are imprisoned by it.

Last month a little boy, seven years of age, the son of an esteemed comrade, was struck on the head by his teacher at one of the London Board Schools. At the end of three days the child died of inflammation of the brain. An inquest was held and a verdict of death from meningitis returned. A few weeks before the child's death he returned from school with his ear cut open by the same hand which afterwards dealt the fatal blow. Upon such facts comment is needless. Horrors like this must always be liable to occur when teachers are hired wage-slaves, toiling to gain a living, instead of volunteers, freely devoting themselves to education for love of the thing.

"WHO WOULD BE FREE, HIMSELF MUST STRIKE THE BLOW!"

Brothers, rise, the dawn is breaking!
We're not fit men to be free,
If we sleep whilst labour sickens
In death grips for liberty.

We have learn'd in better travail,
Justice waiteth on the strong;
Self-reliance, brave resistance,
These will speed our cause along.

Think of all the wrongs we've suffered,
Must our children bear them too?
Shall they wander in the desert
With our Palestine in view?

Hark! the battle call is sounding!
Shall we craven laggards be?
Brothers, up! time's past for dreaming,
Up, and strike for liberty.

H. C. T.

Correspondence.

PARSONS' ANARCHY AND EDINBURGH ANARCHY.

AN ENQUIRY.

DEAR COMRADES—Anarchist Greetings.

Lately I, myself a "naturalist" or Anarchist-Communist, and three comrades have had some lively discussions on Anarchy and Communism with the Statists here. Since, however, some of the Statists have read (or run through) "Parsons' Philosophy" they say that (1) his Anarchy is much the same as their Socialism, and (2) that we (of Edinburgh) are much more advanced. I very much doubt this, to put it mildly; and I should like any comrade to shew a point where I am more advanced than the Anarchists of Britain, America, Spain, or France. My last lecture can be summed up as follows, in three divisions:—

International Socialism (Division I.)—(1). No man owns the land. (2). No nation owns the land. (3). No man has the right* to tax the land. (4). No nation has the right* to tax the land. (5). All men have the right* to use the land. (6). All nations have the right* to use the land. (7). No man has the right* to misuse the land. (8). No man owns capital. (9). All men have a right* to use capital. (10). Land and labour being the creators of all wealth, they are the creditors thereof.

Communism (Division II.)—(11). The value of an individual's labour cannot be determined. (12). A fair share of work is that which the individual chooses to do. (13). A fair remuneration for work is that which the individual wants. (14). Competition is no incentive to work for the common good, but emulation sometimes may be.

Anarchism (Division III.)—(15). Freedom and Law are incompatible. (16). Freedom and Government (the executive of law) are incompatible. (17). Punishment and freedom are incompatible. (18). Marriage (legal) and freedom are incompatible. (19). Co-operation is possible with codes of advice instead of law. (20). Freethought is the only religion compatible with Anarchy.

I may state that I am prepared to debate on paper, or vocally, if not too far off, on any of the above points with any Anarchist Group in French or English.

Yours in Revolution,
CYRIL BELL.

Medical Students' Group "Liberty" and
"Scottish Socialist Federation," Edinburgh.

A T A L K

ABOUT

ANARCHIST COMMUNISM

BETWEEN TWO WORKERS.

BY ENRICO MALATESTA.

—o—

(Continued from previous number.)

William. Then you are a Socialist, that's sure. But what do the words COMMUNIST and COLLECTIVIST mean?

Jack. Both Communists and Collectivists are Socialists, but they have different ideas as to what ought to be done when property shall be put in common. The Collectivists say: Each worker, or rather each association of workers, has a right to raw material and the in-

struments of labour and each man is master of the produce of his own toil. Whilst he lives he does what he likes with it; when he dies anything he has put on one side returns to the association. His children, in their turn, have the means of working and of enjoying the fruit of their labour; to let them inherit anything would be a first step towards inequality and privilege. As regards instruction, the education of children, the maintenance of the aged and infirm, and public works in general, each association of workers must give what is needed to supply the unsupplied wants of the members of the community. The Communists say: Men must love each other and look on each other as members of one family, if things are to go well with them. Property ought to be common. Work, if it is to be as productive as possible and the aid of machinery employed to the uttermost, must be done by large parties of workers. If we are to make the most of all varieties of soil and atmospheric condition and produce in each locality what that locality can produce best, and if, on the other hand, we are to avoid competition and hatred between divers countries, it is needful to establish perfect solidarity between the men of the whole world. Therefore, instead of running the risk of making a confusion in trying to distinguish what you and I each do, let us all work and put everything in common. In this way each will give to society all that his strength permits until enough is produced for every one; and each will take all that he needs, limiting his needs only in those things of which there is not yet plenty for every one.

William. Not so fast! First of all, what do you mean by SOLIDARITY? You say there ought to be solidarity between men and I don't know what you mean.

Jack. Look here: in your family, for instance, all that you and your brothers, your wife and your son earn you put in common. You get some food and you eat altogether, and if there is not enough you all pinch yourselves a bit. If one of you is lucky and gains rather more than usual, it is a good thing for every one. If, on the contrary, one is out of work or ill, it is a misfortune for you all; for certainly amongst yourselves the one who is not working eats all the same at the common board, and the one who falls ill costs more than any body else. So in your family, instead of trying to take work and bread away from each other, you try to aid each other, because the good of one is the good of all, and the ill of one the ill of all. Thus envy and hatred are kept afar off and a mutual affection is developed, which never exists in a family where there are divided interests. That is what is called solidarity. We must establish amongst mankind the same relations as exist in a truly united family.

William. I understand that. But let us return to what we were speaking of. Tell me, are you a Collectivist or a Communist?

Jack. As for me, I am a Communist, because if people are going to be friends, I believe they ought not to be friends by halves. Collectivism leaves the germs of rivalry and hatred still in existence. But I go further. Even if each could live on what he produces himself, Collectivism would be inferior to Communism, because it would keep men isolated, and so lessen their strength and their sympathy. Besides, as the shoe-maker can't eat his shoes, nor the blacksmith live on iron, and as the agriculturalist cannot till the soil without the workers who prepare iron, manufacture implements, etc., it will be necessary to organise exchange between the various producers, keeping a reckoning of what each does. Then it will necessarily happen that the shoe-maker, for instance, will try to puff the value of his shoes and get as much money as he can in exchange, whilst the agriculturalist, on his side, will give him as little as possible. How the devil can we manage with all this? Collectivism seems to me to give rise to many difficult problems and be a system likely to lead to confusion. Communism, on the contrary, will not give rise to any difficulties. If all work, and all enjoy of the work of all, it only remains to see what are the things needed to satisfy every body and to arrange that these things shall be produced in plenty.

William. So that under Communism no money would be wanted.

Jack. Neither money nor anything in its place. Nothing but a register of what is needed and of what is produced, so that production may be kept up the level of need. The only serious difficulty would be if many men refused to work. But I have already told you the reasons why work, which to-day is a hardship, would then become a pleasure, and, at the same time, a moral obligation from which very few would wish to relieve themselves. Besides, if, in consequence of the bad education we have had, some individuals should refuse to work when the new society begins, they can be left outside the community and given raw material and tools. Then, if they want to eat, they will set to work. But at this moment what we have to realise is that the soil, raw material and instruments of labour, houses and all existing wealth must be put in common. As for the method of organisation, the people will do as they please. Practice only will show them the best system. It is easy to foresee that in many places they will establish Collectivism and in many others Communism. When both have been put to the proof, the better will be widely adopted. But mind, the chief thing is that nobody should begin to order the others about or to appropriate the soil or instruments of labour. It will be necessary to be on the watch, and if this is attempted, to prevent it, even by force of arms. The rest will follow naturally of itself.

William. That too I understand. But, tell me, what does the word ANARCHISM mean?

Jack. ANARCHY MEANS WITHOUT GOVERNMENT. I've told you already that government is good for nothing but to defend the middle-class, and that, where our interests are in question, the best thing we

* All rights mean natural rights, i.e., by any law of nature.

can do is to look after them ourselves. Instead of electing M. P.'s and County Councillors to make and unmake laws for us to obey, we will discuss our affairs ourselves, and when it is needful to commission someone else to carry out our decisions, we will ask him to do so and so, and not otherwise. If there is something which can't be done right off, we will commission capable persons to look into it, study it and let us know what they think had better be done. But, at all events, nothing will be done on our behalf without our will. And thus our delegates will not be individuals to whom we have given the right to command us and impose laws upon us. They will be persons chosen for their capacity, who will have no authority, but simply be charged with the duty of executing what the people have decided upon. For example, some will be charged to organise schools, others to make streets, or look after the exchange of produce, just as to-day a shoe-maker is asked to make a pair of shoes.

William. Pray explain a little more. How could I, a poor, ignorant old fellow, undertake all the business which is done by M. P.'s and ministers?

Jack. And what good do these M. P.'s and ministers do, that you should bemoan yourself for not being able to do the like? They make laws and organise the public might to keep the people down, in the interest of the property-owners. That's all. It is a skill we do not need. True, the ministers and M. P.'s do busy themselves about good and useful things, but only to turn them to the profit of a class and hinder progress by means of useless and vexatious enactments. For instance, these gentry busy themselves about railways; but why should they? Would not the engineers, mechanics, and workmen of all sorts be enough? And would not the locomotives run just the same if ministers, M. P.'s, shareholders, and other parasites disappeared? It is just the same with the post and telegraph office, navigation, education, hospitals, all things carried on by workers of one sort or another, with whom the government only interferes to do harm. Politics, as they are understood by politicians, are a difficult art for us, because in good earnest they have nothing to do with the people's real interests. But if their end was to satisfy the actual needs of the population, then they would be more difficult for an M.P. than for us. What can M.P.'s residing in London know of the needs of the country districts? How can these folks, who have mostly wasted their time in trying to learn Greek and Latin, which they don't know after all, understand the interests of the various crafts and industries? Things would go very differently if each busied himself with what he knows about and the needs he has ascertained on his own account. When once the revolution has taken place, we shall have to begin at the bottom, so to speak. Under the influence of the propaganda and the enthusiasm of the time, the various trades in each district, parish, or town, will form associations. And who can understand better than you the interests of your own trade and your own locality? Afterwards, when it is desirable to bring several trades or several districts to a common agreement, delegates from each will carry the wishes of those who have sent them to a special congress, and do their best to reconcile the divers needs and wishes. But their deliberations will always be submitted to the control and approbation of their principals, so that the interests of the people will not be neglected. Thus gradually the human race will be brought into harmony.

William. But how shall we manage if in a country or an association there are some who are of a different opinion from the rest? The larger number will be sure to have the upper hand, won't they?

Jack. Not by right. For as regards truth and justice numbers ought to go for nothing. One may be in the right against a hundred, against a hundred thousand, against every body. Practically, we must do as best we can. If we cannot obtain unanimity, those who agree and are the majority will carry out their idea, within the limits of their own group, and if experience shows they were right, there is no doubt but that they will be imitated. If not, it is a proof that the minority were in the right, and action will be taken accordingly. Thus the principles of equality and justice, upon which society ought to be founded, will not be violated. But remark that the questions upon which people cannot come to an agreement will be small in number and importance, because there will no longer be the division of interests which exists to-day. For each will then be free to choose his country and the association, i.e., the companions with whom he likes to live. Also the matters to be decided will be things every one can understand, belonging rather to practical life and positive science than to the domain of theory with its endless differences of opinion. When the best solution of such and such a problem has been arrived at by experience, the question will be how to persuade folks by practically showing them the thing, not how to crush them under a majority of votes. Would you not laugh if to-day citizens were called upon to vote the season for sowing seed, when it is a matter already settled by experience? And if it were not yet entirely fixed, would you have recourse to a vote to decide it, rather than to experience? All public and private affairs will be treated like this.

William. But what if some out of mere pigheadedness and self-will should oppose a decision made in the interests of all?

Jack. Then, of course, it would be needful to take forcible action. For if it is unjust that the majority should oppress the minority, the contrary would be quite as unjust; and if the minority has a right to rebel, the majority has a right to defend itself. But do not forget that always and everywhere all men have an undeniable right to the materials and instruments of labour. Though it is true that this solution is not completely satisfactory. The individuals put out of the association would be deprived of many social advantages, which

an isolated person or group must do without, because they can only be procured by the cooperation of a great number of human beings. But what would you have? These malcontents cannot fairly demand that the wishes of many others should be sacrificed for their sakes. Given solidarity, fraternity, mutual aid, and, where needful, mutual consideration and support, and you may be convinced that civil tyranny or war will not arise. Rest assured rather, that men will hardly have become masters of their own destinies before solidarity will grow up amongst them. For tyranny and civil war work evil to all, and solidarity is the only condition in which our ideals can be realised, and which will bring with it peace, prosperity, and universal freedom. Note too that progress, while it tends always to unite men, tends also to render them more independent and self-sufficing. For example, to-day, to travel rapidly over land, it is necessary to make use of the railway, the construction and working of which require the collective labour of many persons. Therefore the traveller will still, under Anarchy, be obliged to adapt his arrangements to the hours and regulations which the majority have thought best. If, however, someone invents a locomotive which one man can guide, without danger to himself or others, on any street, then he will not need to adapt himself in this matter to the arrangements of other folks, and every one will be able to travel where and when he pleases. So it is with thousands of other things that are, or that will be in the future. Thus it is clear that the tendency of progress is towards a certain relation between men, which may be defined by the formula MORAL SOLIDARITY AND MATERIAL INDEPENDENCE.

William. That is just it. So you are a Socialist, and amongst Socialists you are specially a Communist and an Anarchist. But I have heard say too that you are an Internationalist. What does that mean?

Jack. Did you ever hear of the International Working Men's Association? About thirty years ago, a great association was formed amongst the workmen of all civilised countries, to take counsel together about the wrongs which the workers of every land alike suffer from the exploitation of property-owners, and to act together so as to bring about a universal social revolution. For, in every country which has reached our stage of civilisation, the workers are exploited in much the same way, and the ruling classes are banded together to keep the masses down. Therefore, the common interests of the workers of all lands are far stronger than their national differences, and it is only by acting in common, as their exploiters act in common, that they can throw off the yoke of capitalism. The International Working Men's Association no longer exists. Nevertheless, the great labour movements which agitate the world have arisen from it. Also the various Socialist parties in different countries, specially the International Socialist Anarchist Revolutionary Party, which is now organising to give the death blow to the middle-class society of to-day. The aim of this party is to do everything to spread the principles of Anarchist Socialism; to show how hopeless it is to look to voluntary concessions from property-owners or governments, or to gradual constitutional reforms; to awaken the people to a consciousness of their rights, and rouse in them the spirit of revolt; to urge them on to make the social revolution, i.e., to destroy all government and to put all existing wealth in common. Any one who accepts this programme and wishes to join others in striving for it, belongs to this party. The party has no head, no authority; it is entirely founded on spontaneous and voluntary agreement amongst those who are fighting for the same cause. Therefore, each individual that belongs to it is completely free to join in intimate companionship with those he prefers, to use such means as he thinks best, and to spread his own particular ideas in his own particular way, so long, of course, as he does not thereby oppose the general programme and tactics of the party.

William. Then are all who accept Socialistic, Anarchic, Revolutionary principles members of this party?

Jack. No. A man may perfectly agree with our programme, but, for one reason or another, may prefer to act alone, or with a few others, without forming connections of effective solidarity and co-operation with the mass of those who accept the programme. This may be suitable for certain individuals, or for certain special purposes, but it cannot be the general method, because isolation is a cause of weakness, and creates antipathy and rivalry where there ought to be fraternity and concord. Still in every way we always consider as friends and comrades the men and women who are striving in any fashion for the idea for which we strive. But again there may be folks convinced of the truth of the idea, but keeping their convictions to themselves, not taking the trouble to spread what they believe is right. One can't say that such folks are not Socialists and Anarchists theoretically, because they think as we do; but their convictions certainly must be very weak, or they themselves very poor-spirited. When a man sees the terrible evils that afflict himself and his fellows, and believes he knows a remedy which would cure them, how can he stand inactive, if he has any heart at all? If a man does not know the truth, he cannot be blamed; but the man who knows it and set it on one side is a heartless coward.

William. You are right. I'm going to think very seriously indeed over what you've said. And when I'm thoroughly convinced in my own mind that it's true, I shall join the party, and do all I can to spread the sacred truth. And if the gentlefolks should call me a scoundrel or a fool, I will tell them to work and suffer as I do, and then they will have a right to speak.

VALUE IN USE AND VALUE IN EXCHANGE.

[Concluded from previous Number.]

WE have now seen how Jevons and his school deduce their theory of value. But we have still to consider their criticism of the "old school." The first fault they find with Ricardo's more or less logical theories of value is, that they are not based upon an analysis of consumption, and therefore lack the extremely important conception of "quantitative utility", without which every theory of value is metaphysical. Further, they insist that a disastrous confounding of cause and effect is betrayed in these theories of value by their contention that the exchange-value of a commodity is determined by its cost of production or by the amount of labour socially necessary for its production. It is indeed admitted that the exchange values of an enormous number of commodities—for example, almost all manufactured articles—are always very nearly equal to the cost of production; but it is held that this is not because the exchange values of these depend on the cost of production, but because the producers, knowing that the exchange-values of the finished commodities are not or probably cannot remain below the cost of production, are willing to expend what is necessary to produce them.

Let us now see in what way the exchange value of a commodity depends on the *quantity* of that commodity in the market; and under what circumstances its exchange value can be equal to its cost of production; and let us take, as an example, a commodity of the above-mentioned class, a manufactured article—say, a sewing-machine. This belongs to the class of commodities that can be increased at will through the employment of more labour, without a reduction of the productivity of that labour being thereby caused; nay, thanks to division of labour and to the improvement of machinery rendered possible by the increased production, the productive power of that labour can even, in a certain degree, be increased by the production of large quantities. In order to make our reasoning as brief and as clear as possible, we shall suppose that we have only to do with one community, that there is only one kind of sewing-machine, that the cost of production is the same for all producers, that the conditions of production and of the market change but once a year, and that there is absolutely free competition in the sewing-machine market. By these suppositions we exclude, on the one hand, the possibility of sewing-machines having more than one price in any given circumstances, and, on the other hand, the possibility of producers being able by agreement to diminish at will the total quantity produced. Suppose now that the first manufacturer of sewing-machines brings 1000 machines per annum into the market, and that the cost of production is £6 each. The machines have a concrete utility, not for all the members of the community, but for many—say, 80,000 per annum during the period we are concerned with. But the quantitative utility is by no means the same for all these 80,000. For 5000 individuals the quantitative utility of a machine is equal to the quantitative utility of £18, for 20,000 equal to £6, for 30,000 equal to £4, for 10,000 equal to £3, and for the remaining 15,000 citizens requiring sewing-machines, it is equal only to the quantitative utility of £1. We shall suppose that the composition of the 80,000 annual consumers is always like this at the beginning of each year. How then is the exchange-value of the sewing-machines affected when 1000 machines per annum are produced? The producer is in a position to get £18 for every machine he has for sale. The marginal utility of the machine, which finishes the sale of the whole stock for the year, is £18; therefore, the sewing-machine's exchange-value is in this case £18. We must of course suppose that our producer desires to sell in the dearest market, and that he knows where to find it. Sewing-machines, then, are so few in number, that, as in the case of commodities which cannot be produced in large quantities or which, like old porcelain and the artistic work of the old masters, are scarce, they have as their exchange-value just what the richest and most eager consumers offer. Meanwhile these high prices stimulate not only the above-mentioned producer, but, the market being "open," many others besides; and the following year we find 20,000 sewing-machines per annum in the market, the cost of production of which has sunk to £4 each. Now there certainly can always be found 5000 individuals willing to pay as much as £18, but if the producers demand £18 for every machine, they will necessarily find themselves with 15,000 machines a-year unsold. This, however, is precluded by our supposition that the producers must offer the *whole* quantity at one time in the open market, and that *all* the commodities offered must be sold. In this case the sellers of sewing-machines, in reckoning the *only* price the commodity can have, must take into account at least 20,000 consumers. There will be 5000 who would pay £18, plus 20,000 who would not give more than £6; and there will thus be consumers who are willing, when all but the last of the 20,000 machines are sold, to pay £6 for the last machine in the market. Expressed in terms of money, the marginal utility will thus be £6, and the exchange-value, *i.e.*, the price, £6 also. This is good "business" and steady—that is, the exchange-value of the sewing-machines keeps, of necessity, considerably higher than the cost of production. We must therefore suppose that the sewing-machine industry will continue to attract capital and producers. Consequently the next time we survey the sewing-machine market, we find an annual supply of 60,000 machines. The cost of production has now sunk to £3, and cannot be supposed to sink lower under any circumstances. Who are the consumers of these 60,000 machines? There are 5000 of the class who would if necessary pay £18, 20,000 of those who would give as much as £6, and 30,000 of

those who would not pay more than £4 for a machine—in all, 55,000 consumers. The price may thus be £4, if the producers can keep out of the market during the year exactly 5000 of the machines produced. This is however incompatible with the supposition. Therefore, among the consumers there must be included 5000 of the 10,000 consumers who would not under any circumstances pay more than £3 for a sewing-machine. If 5000 machines are sold for £3, then according to the supposition that there is free competition, all the other 55,000 are sold for the same price. Expressed in terms of money, the lowest quantitative utility of a machine is therefore now £3, and this is also its exchange-value. Thanks to free competition and the desire for profit, so many sewing-machines are produced that their exchange-value has sunk to the cost of production. This happens when 60,000 machines a year are produced, and will continue to be the case when 65,000 are brought into the market. But what will happen if 70,000 new machines a year come into the market? Those requiring sewing-machines are still numerous enough, for according to our supposition there were 80,000 a year. But since only £1 expresses the quantitative utility which would now be a factor in the market, the price would sink lower than the nature of production could allow it to sink. In a capitalistic society what impels producers to manufacture sewing-machines is not the desire to satisfy the requirements of certain members of the community, without thought of profit. When the cost of production* is, as supposed, £3 at the lowest, profit must vanish when the price sinks below £3, and therewith, likewise the desire to produce a greater number of sewing-machines. With regard to that class of commodities to which sewing-machines belong, the desire to *increase* the quantity of the product ceases the moment the quantity is so great that the price (exchange-value) sinks to the cost of production—but never before that time, *if competition is absolutely free*. Accordingly, the proposition that the exchange-value of a commodity is equal to its cost of production is *only* true for commodities like manufactured articles, and *only* true on the supposition that there is absolutely free competition† in the market in question. If in our example we had had to deal with a commodity which cost nothing in production, however great the demand for it might be, we should have found that the price would necessarily have sunk to *zero*. Suppose we take for illustration natural mineral water, (drunk at the spring), and that there are, in conditions of absolutely free competition, two owners of similar and adjacent springs, each of which could supply the total demand for mineral water. The two competitors would evidently undersell each other till everybody who wished mineral water could get it for the sum of money which expressed the abstract utility of the water to that person, who *least* required it, but who took the trouble to drink it. The limit to the lowest exchange-value, as arrived at in this way, is *zero*. The cost of production, therefore, far from being the cause of exchange-value, is only one of the obstacles lying in the nature of capitalistic production, which prevent the exchange value of certain commodities from sinking right down to *zero*.

As the exchange-value of a commodity is its quantitative utility, and the quantitative utility varies with the quantity of the commodity, and inasmuch as labour can in the case of certain commodities arbitrarily increase or diminish the quantity, so can labour indirectly affect the exchange-value of a commodity. But its abstract utility never varies with the quantity of the commodity *alone*, but also with the demand, which in its turn may vary because of circumstance that have nothing whatever to do with the commodity in question. This is why variations take place in the exchange-values of commodities that labour cannot reproduce, for example, old porcelain, works of art by the old masters, as well as in a higher or lower degree all natural monopolies. Before people became unprejudiced and enlightened enough to see clearly that the pictures of the old Dutch masters are aesthetically valuable or have an aesthetic utility, the exchange value of these pictures was very low; but as there spread a keen perception of their high aesthetic value, their exchange-value rose. Their quantitative utility has fluctuated with the nature of the spirit of the times, and so has their exchange-value. No theory that bases exchange-value on labour, can interpret that phenomenon.

Value in exchange is only the historical form of existence, peculiar to our social system, of the phenomenon characteristic of *all* human economy, *equivalents between the quantitative use-values of a commodity*. Political economy is thus pre-eminently the science of *measuring* human wants. To investigate the way in which exchange-value *measures* human wants, is the most necessary task for a political economist in our time. At bottom it is the result of *this* investigation which accounts for the attitude of sociologists against the existing order. The ideal is that in a community with a given population, given wants, and given natural, human, and technical powers of production, production and distribution should be so directed that the products by their consumption would have the *greatest possible utility for the community*; in other words, that they would supply the greatest wants of *all* citizens in exactly the same degree of subjective satisfaction. One pound of meat has not, from the social point of view, had its greatest possible utility in consumption, if instead of satisfying the want of one family for the first pound of meat per diem, it is used to satisfy the far less urgent want for the sixth pound of meat per diem of another family of the same size, who perhaps only require it for their dog.

In view of the helpless confusion of the older theoretical political economy which has caused this most important science to fall into deep

* In this are included interest on capital and the usual business profit.

† Which strictly speaking is never the case.

disrepute, the value of Jevons' lucid and significant theory can hardly be overestimated. It not only clears up our former confused ideas regarding the existing economic order, but opens up a completely new and attractive field for economic investigation.

THE PROPAGANDA. REPORTS.

LONDON.

St. Pancras Communist-Anarchist Group.—We have held open-air meetings in Regents Park every fine Sunday during July, at 6.30 p.m. On July 5 Comrade Turner delivered an interesting address, of over one hour, upon the labor movement. Comrade Wess closed the meeting with a few remarks upon the carpenters' strike. July 12, W. Wess delivered a glowing speech on "Communist Anarchism," which was received with great interest by the good audience who had been attracted by our new scarlet flag, whereon "Freedom" has been effectively painted by Comrade Schütz of the Autonomie Club. Opposition from a bystander who "objected to foreigners," enlivened the close of the meeting, and was conclusively met by Comrade Wess, to the evident satisfaction of the audience. The following Sunday, being wet, no meeting took place, but some interesting private discussions were held with individuals and small groups sheltering under the trees. On July 26, we had a lively meeting. Comrade Milburn opened with a speech about the carpenters' strike. J. Blackwell showed how Anarchism is the only cure for exploitation and poverty. W. Wess dealt with the objection that the workers are not yet ripe for Anarchy, and pointed to the Millard case and other outrages and immoralities of the police and so-called guardians of public morals, as showing that the peace of society is not maintained by the Government, but by the social feeling of the people. Milburn supplemented this with instances of police brutality, as shown in the carpenters' strike, and said that the police are in fact paving the way for revolution. An opponent, who seemed to hail from some Young Men's Christian Association, said that it was impudence for a foreigner to come to England and preach Anarchy. J. Blackwell conclusively showed him that it was the condition of the English workers that led them to see the need for Anarchist-Socialism. W. Wess added that as far as he was concerned he had learned Anarchist principles since he came to England, from English writers and thinkers. Both invited the opponent to come next Sunday to debate the question, which he promised to do.

Young Anarchist Group.—Good meetings have been held by this group on Saturdays at Hyde Park, 7.30, on Sundays at Regent's Park, 11.30, and Hyde Park, 3.30. Speakers, Nicoll, Mowbray, Turner and Mainwaring. Good sale of *Freedoms*, *Commonweals*, and pamphlets.

London Socialist League has held good meetings during the month on Sundays at Hackney Triangle, 11.30, and Victoria Park, 3.30; also street-corner meetings on week nights. Sunday July 26th, they took part in the no-rent demonstration organised by the United Anarchist groups, the no-rent doctrine being well-received.—W. Mc.

South London Socialist Society.—A new group has been started in South London and three very good meetings held at the corner of Larcom Street, Walworth Road, at which Tochatti, Nicoll, Davies, Atterbury and Fox spoke and Mrs. Tochatti sang some rousing Socialist songs.

PROVINCES—

Norwich.—We commenced our open-air propaganda on Sunday June 7th, when Comrade Wess was with us and delivered good addresses at two open-air meetings, assisted by Poynts and Darley. On the 21st Comrade Sparling assisted and spoke in the Market Place with A. Moore and Swash. On the Monday evening Sparling lectured on "Blind Samson" to a large audience in one of the local schools. The lecture was very fairly handled by our comrade and seemed to meet with the approbation of the audience. Poynts took part and Darley acted as chairman. Saturday, June 27th, we welcomed amongst us a comrade who has just escaped from France, Gustave Mollet, whose name is familiar to the readers of the *March No. of Freedom*. He is still with us, and we hope he will be able to assist the Anarchist propaganda in a short time. Sunday the 28th, comrades Mowbray and Emery addressed two large open-air meetings. Mowbray delivered capital addresses. The following Sunday Coulon came down and spoke in the Market Place to a good meeting in the afternoon. During his address he urged the workers not to pay rent. Gustave Mollet also spoke in French, which was translated by Coulon. In the evening Coulon spoke in the open-air to a good audience; comrades Emery and Poynts assisted. Sunday, July 19th, Comrade R. Harding lectured in the afternoon on Anarchism, dealing with the subject very well. In the evening Harding lectured on War; Emery also spoke. We have had good audiences at all meetings, very fair collections and sale of papers.

Socialism in Gt. Yarmouth.—Our summer propaganda has commenced in downright earnest. Now, in face of all obstacles, such as boycott, prosecution, and persecution, we are determined that Yarmouth shall not be in the rear in the social revolution. On June 28, in the afternoon, on Colman's Quay, a good meeting was addressed by Pointz of Norwich, Saunders and Headley. In the evening a large meeting on the Hall Quay was opened by Saunders, who took for his subject—"England expects that every man this day will do his duty." Needless to say, our idea of an Englishman's duty was vastly different to the murderer Nelson's. Pointz and Headley spoke also. The meeting continued for over two hours. On Saturday, July 4, the following comrades paid us a visit—Tarleton and Bullock of the Hammersmith Socialist Society (who stayed until Tuesday), Coulon, of the International Socialist School London, Gustave Mollet, who has just escaped from the tyranny of the so-called "Free" Republic of France, Pointz, and Freeman of Norwich Freedom Group. A meeting was held in the Market Place in the evening, addressed by Saunders and Pointz; plenty of opposition. On Sunday, July 6, in the morning on Priory Plain (the place whereon Headley was summoned for causing an obstruction) fair attendance, and good attention to Comrades Tarleton, Bullock, and Headley. Afternoon on Colman's Quay, above speakers, and Saunders; slight opposition at close. Large meeting in the evening, on Hall Quay, close on 500 people present; splendid addresses delivered by Tarleton and Bullock, assisted by Saunders and Headley. The large audience gave the greatest attention to all speakers; collection for the day 3s. 1d., which just covered cost of bills; sale of *Freedoms* and *Commonweals*, 2s. 7d. July 12, in the morning on Priory Plain, small meeting addressed by Pointz and Mills of Norwich, assisted by Headley. In the afternoon on Colman's Quay, same speakers and Saunders; slight opposition at both meetings. In the evening, on Hall Quay, a "never to be forgotten" meeting was held, addressed by Pointz, Mills, Saunders, and Headley. Opposition and questions were continued from the commencement of the meeting, which were ably answered by Pointz and Saunders, at 9-10 p.m. Pointz and Mills had to run for the train, but our meeting had become so large by this time, and so many questions were asked, that we had to split the audience into three groups; Paul Pry took one; his opponent was a militia sergeant, who objected to being called a hired murderer. H. Saunders took another, his opponent contended that drink was the only cause of poverty. Headley took the third, and his opponent was Michel Daimont, who contended that Socialism was a splendid theory but not practicable. The

meetings continued amidst general excitement until 10-30 p.m., having continued for 3½ hours. On Monday, July 13, Comrade Drane commenced operations at the Socialist Co-operative Bakery, about which more anon. Several Comrades from Norwich visited us, and an enjoyable evening was spent in the club-room, singing revolutionary songs, etc. July 16, no out-door meetings were held, owing to inclement weather. Good attendance in the club-room during the day, which was spent in discussions, etc.—J. HEADLEY.

Manchester Socialist League.—During the past few weeks we have been engaged in the steady propaganda of our principles, and large and sympathetic meetings have been held every Sunday at Phillip's Park, Stevenson Square, and the New Cross, addressed by Comrades Stockton, Barton, and Bailie. Our first meetings on Sunday night, at the New Cross, were of a rather noisy character, as this is the sacred ground of teetotalism, and they resented the intrusion of commonsense. We, however, made such a stand, that at present the greater part of their former audience prefer to understand their social condition, and the possibilities of altering it, rather than the question of whether it is better to drink weak tea or bad beer. Our great drawback, especially since the departure of Comrade Bailie, is a want of out-door speakers.

Aberdeen Revolutionary Socialist Federation.—A heavy month's work has been gone through here. Good open-air meetings being held in Castle Street on Sundays and at the foot of Marischal Street on Wednesdays. At the latter meeting the audience is chiefly dock labourers, who are greatly interested in the speeches of Comrades Duncan and Addie. Stonehaven was again visited, and in spite of a number of counter attractions an excellent meeting was held. Duncan spoke in very strong terms of the tyranny of Capitalism and Law, and vigorously propagated the Anarchist-Communist ideals. There was a slight interruption about the middle of the meeting by a swell, who wanted to know who, when all worked, would circulate money! We have every reason to be pleased with the result of our propaganda in Stonehaven. Four comrades went to Dundee on the 18th, and held, along with our Dundee comrades, a series of good meetings in the open air—Saturday, 18th, in the Greenmarket; Sunday, 19th, in the Barrack Park, at 3 p.m., and at Hilltown at 12 noon. Duncan, of Aberdeen, and Cameron, of Dundee, spoke at all these meetings. At the meeting in the Barrack Park there was some opposition of a Social-Democratic character, from Mr. Saunders, of London, and Mr. Horton, of Glasgow, which was easily disposed of. In the evening, at 7, a debate between Comrade H. H. Duncan, of Aberdeen, and Mr. Jas. Duncan, of Dundee, on "Anarchist-Communism v. State Socialism," came off before an audience of about 200 in Tally Street Hall. Comrade H. H. Duncan opened the debate with a half hour's speech, in which he traced the development of government, and declared it wrong in principle, and dangerous in practice. Laws made liberty impossible, and were wasteful, as for their support soldiers, sailors, policemen, judges, etc., etc., had to be maintained. State management of industry had always been accompanied by waste, jobbery, and corruption. Men in the employment of the State were at present underpaid, whilst ignorant but aristocratic "superintendents" drew large salaries. Anarchist-Communism recognising that government was a failure, advocated freedom, the abolition of laws, and the substitution of mutual agreement. Recognising the impossibility of finding the real claim of the individual to the product of labour, it advocated the common possession of all. Anarchist-Communism would give to all the full freedom to produce and consume. The ideal conveyed by the words Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, could only be caused by the preaching of the Revolutionary idea, &c. Mr. James Duncan said he did not believe in Freedom so long as man was weak and crooked. Primitive man had, as far back as science takes us, government of some kind. The nature of man compelled him to associate with his fellows, and out of this combination a complexity of relationships between man and man had arisen, which necessitated the making of laws for protection. The few had made a good thing for themselves by government, and he saw no reason why the workers could not do the same. Comrade H. H. Duncan in his second speech objected to his opponent not having spoken to his position, and then he proceeded to defend his position, which he did and more, by taking his opponent's arguments up point by point and disposing of them in grand style. After the Debate it was the almost unanimous opinion that Mr. James Duncan never had such a severe handling in all his life as he got from his Aberdeen namesake. Comrade Cameron of Dundee made all arrangements for our visit, which was greatly enjoyed as a holiday and was very satisfactory as a bit of propaganda. At all the meetings our literature sold well.—E.S.

Dublin.—At Socialist Union, A. J. Kavanagh delivered on the "Ideals of the Revolution," which in his view were a mixture of the Earthly Paradises of Gronlund and Bellamy. A vigorous debate followed, Landye, Toomey, and Fitzpatrick dealing roughly with the lecture.

NOTICES.

LONDON—

St. Pancras Communist Anarchist Group.—Open air meeting every Sunday (weather permitting) in Regents Park at 6.30 p.m.

Young Anarchist Group.—Open-air meetings, Sunday, Regents Park, 11.30 a.m.; Hyde Park, 3.30 p.m. Saturday, Hyde Park, 7.30 p.m.

Socialist League.—Open-air meetings, Sunday, Hackney Triangle, 11.30 a.m.; Victoria Park 3.39 p.m.

South London Socialist Society.—Open-air meeting every Sunday (weather permitting) at 7.30 p.m., corner of Larcom Street, near Vestry Hall, Walworth Road.

Great Yarmouth Socialist Society.—Open-air propaganda, weather permitting. —Sunday at Bradwell 11.30 a.m.; on Priory Plain, 11 a.m.; Colman's Quay, 3 p.m.; Hall Quay, 7 p.m. Monday at Belton at 7.30 p.m. Business meeting in the Club on Tuesday, 36 Row, Market Place. On Saturday on Priory Plain, after Salvation Army meeting, about 4.30 p.m., speakers, Brightwell, Saunders, Paul Pry and Headley, assisted by other Socialists and Anarchists from all parts of the country.—J. HEADLEY.

Norwich.—Sunday, August 23rd, a big Demonstration will be held in the Market Place at 3 p.m. On Monday, 24th, opening of our new Hall will take place, with a public Tea at 7 p.m., tickets 1s. each. Comrades Louise Michel, Mowbray, Coulon, Mrs. Schack, Gustave Mollet, and others, will take part. Any comrade in London or the provinces wishing to take part should communicate with A. T. Sutton, St. Augustine's, Norwich.

Manchester Socialist League.—The M. S. L. will in future cast in its lot with the International Working Men's Educational Club, 25, Bury New Road, Strangeways. Weekly meeting, Tuesday at 8 p.m.

Newcastle Communist-Anarchist Group.—Open-air meeting every Sunday morning on the Quay. Discussion every Monday at 8.30 p.m., Lockhart's Cocoa-rooms, Bigg Market. (Report held over for want of space).

Dublin Socialist Union.—87, Marlboro' Street, Thursday August 6, 8 p.m. King.—"Social Democracy."