

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. 5.—No. 58.

SEPTEMBER, 1891.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY

BACK TO THE LAND!

THE census of 1891 confirms what most of us knew all along, that the people of these islands are continually becoming more and more dwellers in large towns. In London alone there are now 5,656,909 inhabitants or about one seventh of the entire population of England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland. The other big centres show a similar increase, and it would probably be quite within the mark to say that half-a-dozen of the large towns of this country, with their suburbs, contain at least half the population. Everyone must see what an unnatural, abnormal condition of things this is, and how fatal it is to the health, the comfort and the happiness of our countrymen. But everyone does not realise the cause. If we are to believe the pens of the capitalist press and the mouths of the apologists of the capitalist system, this concentration of the population is very largely due to the attractions of the towns. The theatres, the concert halls, the parks, the more attractive life, bring the young people, it is said, up to the large centres of population, and thus the rural districts are losing their inhabitants and the large towns are swelling abnormally in size. This may be an ingenious way of explaining away the fact but it has not the merit of truth. The fact is that the will of the people has very little at all to do with their presence in London, Manchester, Glasgow, etc. It is the will of the capitalist which compels them to be there. There is very little demand for their labour in the country districts, and such work as is to be got is remunerated at the very lowest possible rate. The wage of the agricultural laborer is practically the bottom wage of laborers. Every other work is in a superior monetary position. Therefore it is that the young peasant with the slightest desire to better his lot makes his way to London or to some foreign country. Even if he does not improve his position much he thinks he will do so. He cannot help believing that the district in which he has had the misfortune to be born is the very worst on the face of the earth and he resolves at any rate to try his luck somewhere else. It is not that he wishes to leave the native village or the native country to live among strange faces and unfamiliar scenes; it is simply that he has an aspiration; often he has not any free will in the matter but is compelled by starvation staring him in the face to go somewhere, anywhere where he can get food.

On his arrival in the great city, the young countryman does not at first notice the unhealthiness of his surroundings but he soon realises that he is strong, much stronger than the men and women who are already on the spot to compete with him, and by his superior physical strength he is enabled to beat them in the struggle for work. At the dock gates, at the factory, or wherever the capitalist machine requires food, it is the young man from the country who stands the best chance. The townsman is crushed to the wall and is forced to join the "residuum," becoming maybe a loafer, a casual laborer, perhaps a thief or a beggar. For him to go to the country and get employment would be impossible. He is physically incapable of doing the work that the young countryman has left, and even if he were, there is none for him to do. Let any one of our readers, for the curiosity of the thing, enquire among his shopmates as to how many there are who are native born Londoners, and he will be surprised at the result of his investigations. The fact is that the physical condition of the people of this country is rapidly deteriorating under the baneful influence of the capitalist system and the consequent concentration of the people in large manufacturing centres. It is not natural for people to live under such conditions, and moreover there is no real attempt made to make the best of town life. Occasionally we hear some talk about the "housing of the people," but the homes of the poor remain just as bad as ever. The laws which are passed are never, or hardly ever, carried out. There are plenty of officials, the towns are nicely mapped out into districts, and medical officers, sanitary inspectors and suchlike are appointed at high salaries, but in the way of practical result there is very little to show. These people probably attend in an office for a few hours a day, but they never seem to stir out unless some complaint is received at head quarters, and everyone knows that the great majority of the workers do not make complaints for many very good reasons. The workers have not got the time to really see what ought to be done to their dwellings, even if they knew, and then it is very well known that the tenant who was the cause of a satisfactory inspection being made and the necessary alterations being ordered, would soon have notice to quit. But even if everything possible was done to make these large centres habitable, they would still be unhealthy, uncomfortable, and

unnatural. Unhealthy for a great many reasons. Medical men tell us that the mortality amongst children is greater in model dwellings and other barrack-like buildings because of the greater facility for the spread of infectious diseases. But this applies not only to model dwellings and to children, but to all crowded places and to individuals of all ages. Then there is the danger to life and limb through the high buildings, the bustle and the traffic, and the undoubted impurities of the air. Uncomfortable and unnatural, because man can only live comfortably and naturally when he is in daily communication with Nature, when he is able to breathe freely and lead a really varied life.

Why should all industry be concentrated in a few large crowded districts whilst the greater portion of the country is depopulated? For one reason alone. It is more economical for the purpose of capitalist production that work should be carried on in this manner; that factory should adjoin factory, that the coal and iron mines should fix the centre of the coal and iron industries; that the means of transit, the position with regard to a river, a seaport or a railway, should decide the site of a manufactory. In the mad competition going on between the exploiters this convenience of position is of paramount importance, and the health, the life, the happiness of the worker is of no account whatever. Just as he has to work in unhealthy, ill-ventilated workshops, so he has to work in crowded cities. Now there is not the slightest necessity for this. Most industries can be carried on practically as well in one place as in another. True, the expense of the carriage of raw material and manufactured articles may be somewhat increased, but what is that by the side of the happiness and well-being of the people? When that becomes the all-important question, when the happiness of each and the happiness of all is the watchword of humanity, when we shall all be doing our best to make work agreeable, pleasant pastime, or at least to make it as pleasant as possible, the workers will all be rushing back to the country, not for the purpose of all becoming workers in the fields, but in order to live there and to work there in the greatest comfort, surrounded by charming scenery, by happy homesteads and by Nature in all its variety. The old deserted towns and villages will spring into new life, and the monstrous conglomerations of men and women that we call London, Birmingham, Manchester, Leeds, and so on, will dwindle into comparative insignificance. It is pitiable to hear people talk about strikes driving the trade away from London, as they sometimes do, as if it were a primary necessity of our lives to live in such huge masses. England will be Merry England once again only when its people are scattered over the length and breadth of the land, and living not as factory hands but as men and women, spending probably part of their time in the factory and part in the fields; but no longer divorced from the soil which gives them the means of life and the conditions necessary to health and happiness. To the Anarchist, who places the happiness of men, women, and children, above all other aims, the freedom of the human race not merely from authority, but also from bad surroundings, bad conditions, and hard and uncongenial work, there can be no cry more fascinating and so full of hope as "Back to the Land!"

THE BRUSSELS CONGRESS.

"Has the Brussels Congress any right to take the name of Socialist?" A very needful inquiry addressed to the delegates and the public by the Brussels Anarchists at their meeting on the 22nd August. Any Socialist who understands more by his creed than the mildest social reform, can only answer it by an emphatic "No." A more deplorable exhibition of reactionary cowardice, intolerance, personal ambition, and betrayal of principle has seldom been witnessed. The rival Paris congresses of 1889 were earnest and revolutionary compared to the comfortable and respectable assembly at Brussels, which resembled nothing so much as a bourgeois parliament or a trades' union committee of the most dead and alive type. No need for the Congress to discuss article 6, The alliance of labor parties with existing middle-class parties. That alliance is already an accomplished fact, and the discussion of the subject was very discreetly dropped out of the agenda. As working men have many of them some silly prejudices against their exploiters it is as well not too openly to blazon the good understanding between social democratic and middle-class politics.

Passing over the multiplicity of junkettings, fêtes, banquets, and mutual compliments, the Brussels Congress has been mainly remarkable for two things: the extraordinary and outrageous intolerance shown to

the Anarchist delegates, and the reactionary tendency manifested in its attitude even toward labor legislation, the only labor question seriously discussed there.

Labor organisations and Socialist societies in general were invited to send representatives to what was understood to be a general Labor Congress, at which working men, and those engaged in active work in the cause of labor in all countries, might meet and discuss the best methods of freeing the workers from exploitation. Such has been in the past, and was supposed this year to be the object of the Congress. Will it be believed that this year the arrangements were made with the secret understanding amongst the organisers that no Socialists but democrats or other authoritarians should be admitted, that they would exact a confession of political faith from the delegates, whereby every partizan of government, however reactionary, should be admitted, and every man or woman who dared to acknowledge a conviction that authority was an evil and government unnecessary should be rigorously excluded? Yet this resolution was actually carried into effect. An effort was made to exclude every Anarchist, whatever working men's association he might represent. Two Spanish comrades, delegates from fifty-four Spanish labor organisations, were refused admittance, whilst the only other Spanish delegate, a democrat representing one association, was admitted. A Dutch comrade, representing a workman's club, was turned out, and all the Anarchist delegates from Belgian provincial trade unions, with those from the Brussels groups. At this four Anarchists representing Brussels trades were so indignant that they retired. Things were made as unpleasant as possible for Comrade Howe, representative of the Autonomie; Comrade Merlino, representing several Italian trade societies, would have been turned out but for the disturbance which would have been caused by all the other Italian delegates retiring with him. One enraged German deputy, however, threatened Merlino with his fists. We seem to be reading of some Council of the Catholic Church in the Middle Ages expelling heretics from its orthodox deliberations, rather than of a professedly Socialist congress meeting in the Nineteenth century to discuss the labor question. The inherent evil of the principle of authority is showing itself forcibly in the action of these saviours of mankind by governmental methods, and if the workers do not take the alarm in time, it will be their own fault.

The peculiar animosity shown at Brussels against the Anarchists was of course a signal of weakness. It was the result of the rapid spread of Anarchist ideas amongst the Belgian workers, especially the miners and others whose strikes have been lately discouraged and deserted by the Belgian official labor party. Anseele & Co., have lost ground in popular favour and having also received a smart check over the revision of the Constitution, they witness with much disfavour the springing up of Anarchist groups all over the country and the success of that admirable paper, *The Free Man*. The Knights of Labor, a Social Democratic organisation have forbidden their members to read this paper! And at the Social Democratic head-quarters in Brussels they refuse to have it on the table. It is not only the Pope and Mr. W. H. Smith who put advanced literature in the Index.

The extraordinary thing is that if you talk about Anarchism with a Social Democrat, he will very likely "quite agree" with you, admit not only that Anarchist Communism is the highest social ideal of the future, but even that Mankind are visibly on the road thither, and he will justify his democracy merely as a temporary expedient, or actually as a method of introducing Anarchy. And yet at a congress which boasts of being not only a meeting of labor representatives, but a distinctively Socialist gathering, these same social Democrats will vote to exclude Anarchists as having neither part nor lot in the social movement! The truth is, that however much sympathy a sincere and earnest Social Democrat may have with Anarchist-Communism he dare not betray it actively before his Commanders, whose motto, in Belgium and Germany at least, is Perish free thought, free action, all personal conviction of right and wrong, all principle if need be, but let us preserve the Discipline of the Party. And Anarchism is death to discipline, death to command.

Having rid itself of the idealists and men of principle, the Brussels Congress sat down comfortably to prose about labor legislation. In Paris, in 1889, hopes were high as to the benefits to the worker to be expected from the direct action of Governments. This year there was nothing to record but a confession of failure. The Paris Congress decided to agitate immediately for an eight hours' day, but this year in Germany Liebknecht could do nothing better than propose a measure for ten hours, in 1893, and nine hours, in 1898. In fact all reports agreed that there had been no serious legislation anywhere, and where labor legislation already existed it was largely rendered useless by the helplessness of the workers to enforce it, especially in face of the army of unemployed, whom by the introduction of machinery and by combination the capitalists can create almost at their pleasure in one trade and another. As to the Berlin Conference it had little result but giving certain manufacturing countries a pretext to arrest the development of labor legislation by appealing to the Berlin decisions, and pointing to the defective legislation of competing countries. In fact, as Herr Vandervelde said, the outcome of the experience of the last two years was to demonstrate (to most of us it was clear before) that "governments are neither willing to affect reforms nor conscious of their duty to the working classes." Yet after this the Congress found nothing better to suggest than commissions of enquiry and more M.P.'s! Said we not truly they might as well have been a bourgeois Parliamentary committee? The clearer and larger views expressed at Paris as to the means it might be possible

to use to relieve the sufferings of the workers even by legislative methods and the earnest realisation of the urgency of the social question, have shaded off at Brussels into vague generalities and shadowy projects of milk and water reform.

As to more M.P.'s. The worst of them is that by the time that with an heroic expenditure of money, energy, and principle, you have got a few new ones in, the older ones are already on the march towards reaction; witness, for example, the recent outburst of "patriotism" in Germany, and the exploits of M. Basly who votes for the flogging of sailors in France. The poor Germans did hope so much from that last election, and were so cock-a-hoop about its results. Will they be so keen about the next? The great and increasing demand for Anarchist literature of which German comrades tell us, hardly looks as if they would.

The remainder of the week was spent in tumultuous chatter, recalling the House on an Irish night; everybody trying to make himself heard, and the men in authority to shut up all they disagreed with. Amid much contention, resulting in part from the ill-concealed rivalry between French and Germans, war was declared an evil, an international federation of trades desirable, piece-work injurious, and several other vague generalities enunciated, which we fancy we have heard somewhere before. And so, amid the protests, not only of avowed Anarchists but the delegates of many labor societies also, against its authoritarian and anti-revolutionary spirit, the Labor Congress of 1891 talked itself out. By excluding the Anarchists it banished the living and progressive element from its counsels, and failed even to secure order and unanimity.

COMMUNISM AND PRIVATE PROPERTY.

DESPITE the arguments of the Individualists, man is born a Communist. Indeed, life itself, if we look deeply into our social relations, our everyday existence, teaches us that the better side of human nature could never have existed without Communism. But some people cannot see this. They view the industrial arena with a superficial eye. They note certain persons who have a knack of always being to the front, of always being heard. This self-assertion they confound with progress and development. Their summary of life is the struggle at the theatre-door, where the strong or the cunning contrive to secure a front seat, no matter who came first. Beneath all this, however, which is the mere froth and fume bred by our present system, there is a deep current of human feeling that is purely Communistic. This is why the very man who struggled hardest at the door cheerfully lends his neighbour opera glass or programme. This is why we all of us can and do perform those thousand and one little services for each other, which, when added, make up such an immense sum in life's happiness, but which we do not stop to reckon when we are engaged over private property and competition.

Therefore it cannot but seem strange that intelligent people should ignore or deny communism as an immensely beneficial, indeed an indispensable factor, in social development.

Is it necessary to say once more, we are speaking of FREE communism? That we do not mean compulsory division of products, nor any adherence to any mode of life but such as the individual judges best for himself?

A great point frequently made against Communism is that brought forward by Comrade Mella (see FREEDOM for April last). He says: "Unless you suppress the passions also, the glutton will always consume not merely what is necessary for him, but as much as he can, the indolent person will always think he has done too much, the covetous person will never think he has enough, whilst the modest worker will be compelled to work excessively and to deny himself the satisfaction of certain desires to meet their requirements."

Now, in the first place, Comrade Mella does not appear to notice that gluttony is a very difficult thing to define. We all vary so in our appetites that after all the only law in this matter is the natural one. He who offends must suffer.

As to indolence and covetousness, there are a thousand reasons why these exist to-day, and certainly some heritage of these diseases will be handed down to us after the revolution. But surely Mella's system would perpetuate these failings; for the covetous man would be a good individualist; he works only for himself. And the indolent man, I imagine, would try to live indolently without being found out; in other words, by his wits. For such folks there would be plenty of openings under your free competition, where scheming for various ends would certainly take place. You think free competition would find them out? Yes, but always when it was too late.

Now under Communism things would work quite differently, for the covetous man would have other people to think about besides himself; and if he was so very callous that the pleasures and advantages of such a social life were outweighed by his love of "property," he would probably leave us and join the Individualists. As to the indolent man, there is this to be said. He need not play the hypocrite as under a competitive system. He might have his taste of a lazy life, but not without its being known. However, that natural desire for occupation which is common to us all, and which the individualists seem to ignore, would probably soon urge him to be up and doing; especially where such a variety of employments were at his choice, with willing persons to help and instruct.

See what a different aspect life assumes under the two systems. Our friends the individualists are not like christians. They have shaken off the superstition that the devil and his imps are a necessary scourge to

compel man to act well. But they believe just as devoutly in the whip of competition as a kind of beneficent bogey-man to regulate human affairs.

Evolution is destroying these old "safeguards," and is making in quite another direction. On every hand the change is working in favour of the law of kindness, of mutual help and consideration; and although there is still very much to be done, there is no denying the new ideas which are replacing the old. We think only with horror now of the stake, the rack and the thumbscrew. We no longer flog the insane to bring them back to sanity. In hospital as in school, the new spirit is working its way; and now, in considering the anti-social feelings which are displayed to-day, we have to apply the new science of sociology, which is humanitarian. In the free commune human nature has every chance of the best development, every chance of the highest satisfaction of all its needs, of developing all the various traits which make the charm of social life.

As to private property in the individualist sense, we shall not need it. And, after all, what is this ogre of private property, which seems to dwell like a nightmare in the minds of the opponents of Communism? There is plenty of wealth to-day, the bulk of which is held as private property, with government to protect it. Davis and Mella of course do not mean this sort of property, although they do not tell us what they would have done with it if government were abolished,—a point they ought to make clear at the first opportunity. They are alarmed in case the producer should not get his product for himself. Now although a man would be very short-sighted who held this view of production, still it must be admitted that he would not be free if he could not do as he wished with his product. So that he does as he wishes; either going around seeking to exchange it, by which he must lose a deal of time and incur some anxiety, or putting it in the common store and having therefrom that which is at the moment most needful to him. We think he will not long hesitate as to which mode of production and distribution is most beneficial to him. But more than this, if in some particular instance he has a sincere desire to reserve for himself exclusively some special object of his own production, Communism secures him in his right to this. Competition, on the other hand, lays him open to the possibility, we might say the probability, of having to part with it for his bread. We might go on in this way enumerating the advantages to human freedom and happiness which Communism assures and competition destroys. We might point out how disastrously all the ills of life, disease, accident, misfortune, would fall upon us if Communism with its thousandfold resources did not exist to alleviate. However, space will not permit, as there is one more point to be noted before concluding.

Man never does produce solely and entirely for himself. His food is not so well relished if eaten alone. In clothing himself he thinks of other people. His house, his room, his garden, flowers, pet-animals, all must be admired by friends if he is to be really happy in them. This is what we see to-day where poverty and misery crush man down to the level of the animals. When he rises from his slavery it will be to enlarge his existence, to expand his faculties. Isolated instances of greed and savagery need not alarm us; only reactionaries would point to such examples as a proof that we have misjudged humanity. The perfect man is not forthcoming. Imperfection makes the whole world kin. If Communism is abused, it is because of what has preceded it; but its principle is really in the heart of mankind, and the ideal of free human nature is Free Communism.

M.

ANARCHY.

BY ENRICO MALATESTA.

ANARCHY is a word which comes from the Greek, and signifies, strictly speaking, WITHOUT GOVERNMENT: the state of a people without any constituted authority, that is, without government.

Before such an organisation had begun to be considered possible and desirable by a whole class of thinkers, so as to be taken as the aim of a party (which party has now become one of the most important factors in modern social warfare), the word anarchy was taken universally in the sense of disorder and confusion, and it is still adopted in that sense by the ignorant and by adversaries interested in distorting the truth.

We shall not enter into philological discussions, for the question is not philological but historical. The common meaning of the word does not misconceive its true etymological signification, but is derived from this meaning, owing to the prejudice that government must be a necessity of the organisation of social life, and that consequently a society without government must be given up to disorder, and oscillate between the unbridled dominion of some and the blind vengeance of others.

The existence of this prejudice and its influence on the meaning which the public has given to the word is easily explained.

Man, like all living beings, adapts and habituates himself to the conditions in which he lives, and transmits by inheritance his acquired habits. Thus being born and having lived in bondage, being the descendant of a long line of slaves, man, when he began to think, believed that slavery was an essential condition of life, and liberty seemed to him an impossible thing. In like manner, the workman, forced for centuries, and thus habituated, to depend upon the good

will of his employer for work, that is, for bread, and accustomed to see his own life at the disposal of those who possess the land and capital, has ended in believing that it is his master who gives him to eat, and demands ingenuously how it would be possible to live, if there were no master over him?

In the same way, a man who had had his limbs bound from his birth, but had nevertheless found out how to hobble about, might attribute to the very bands that bound him his ability to move, while, on the contrary, they would be diminishing and paralysing the muscular energy of his limbs.

If then we add to the natural effect of habit the education given him by his master, the parson, teacher, etc., who are all interested in teaching that the employer and the government are necessary; if also we add the judge and the bailiff to force those who think differently—and might try to propagate their opinions—to keep silence, we shall understand how the prejudice as to the utility and necessity of masters and governments has become established. Suppose a doctor brings forward a complete theory, with a thousand ably invented illustrations, to persuade that man with bound limbs whom we were describing, that, if his limbs were freed, he could not walk, could not even live. The man would defend his bands furiously, and consider any one his enemy who tried to tear them off.

Thus, since it is believed that government is necessary, and that without government there must be disorder and confusion, it is natural and logical to suppose that anarchy, which signifies without government, must also mean absence of order.

Nor is this fact without parallel in the history of words. In those epochs and countries where people have considered government by one man (monarchy) necessary, the word republic (that is, the government of many) has been used precisely like Anarchy, to imply disorder and confusion. Traces of this signification of the word are still to be found in the popular language of almost all countries.

When this opinion is changed, and the public convinced that government is not necessary, but extremely harmful, the word anarchy, precisely because it signifies without government, will become equal to saying Natural order, harmony of the needs and interests of all, complete liberty with complete solidarity.

Therefore, those are wrong who say that Anarchists have chosen their name badly, because it is erroneously understood by the masses and leads to a false interpretation. The error does not come from the word, but from the thing. The difficulty which Anarchists meet with in spreading their views does not depend upon the name they have given themselves, but upon the fact that their conceptions strike at all the inveterate prejudices that people have about the function of government, or the STATE, as it is called.

Before proceeding further, it will be well to explain this last word (the State) which, in our opinion, is the real cause of much misunderstanding.

Anarchists, and we among them, have made use, and still generally make use of the word State, meaning thereby all that collection of institutions, political, legislative, judicial, military, financial, etc., by means of which the management of their own affairs, the guidance of their personal conduct and the care of ensuring their own safety are taken from the people and confided to certain individuals. And these, whether by usurpation or delegation, are invested with the right to make laws over and for all, and to constrain the public to respect them, making use of the collective force of the community to this end.

In this case the word State means government, or, if you like, it is the impersonal expression, abstracted from that state of things, of which government is the personification. Then such expressions as Abolition of the State, or Society without the State, agree perfectly with the conception which Anarchists wish to express of the destruction of every political institution based on authority, and of the constitution of a free and equal society, based upon harmony of interests, and the voluntary contribution of all to the satisfaction of social needs.

However, the word state has many other significations, and among these some which lend themselves to misconstruction, particularly when used among men whose sad social position has not afforded them leisure to become accustomed to the delicate distinctions of scientific language, or, still worse, when adopted treacherously by adversaries, who are interested in confounding the sense, or do not wish to comprehend. Thus the word State is often used to indicate any given society, or collection of human beings, united on a given territory and constituting what is called a social unit, independently of the way in which the members of the said body are grouped, or of the relations existing between them. State is used also simply as a synonyme for society. Owing to these significations of the word, our adversaries believe, or rather profess to believe, that Anarchists wish to abolish every social relation and all collective work, and to reduce man to a condition of isolation, that is, to a state worse than savagery.

By State again is meant only the supreme administration of a country, the central power, distinct from provincial or communal power, and therefore others think that Anarchists wish merely for a territorial decentralization, leaving the principle of government intact, and thus confounding Anarchy with cantonal or communal government.

Finally, state signifies condition, mode of living, the order of social life, etc., and therefore we say, for example, that it is necessary to change the economic state of the working classes, or that the Anarchical state is the only state founded on the principles of solidarity.

and other similar phrases. So that if we say also in another sense that we wish to abolish the State, we may at once appear absurd or contradictory.

For these reasons, we believe it would be better to use the expression ABOLITION OF THE STATE as little as possible, and to substitute for it another clearer and more concrete—ABOLITION OF GOVERNMENT.

In any case, the latter will be the expression used in the course of this little work.

(To be continued.)

FREEDOM.

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

MONTHLY, 1d., POST FREE 1½d.

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

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

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

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

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

SPECIAL NOTICES.

NOW READY. "ANARCHIST COMMUNISM: ITS BASIS AND PRINCIPLES," a new pamphlet by Peter Kropotkin. 36 pp. Price 2d., post free, 2½d.; per quire of 25, 2s. 8d., carriage free within the United Kingdom.

"A TALK ABOUT ANARCHIST COMMUNISM BETWEEN TWO WORKMEN," by Enrico Malatesta; revised translation from the third Italian edition. 32 pages. Price 1d., post free, 1½d.; per quire of 25, 1s. 4d., carriage free within the United Kingdom.

Every Anarchist-Communist should provide himself with a copy of each of these pamphlets, and do his utmost to push them amongst his acquaintance.

A SOCIAL EVENING, arranged by the Freedom Group, to bid farewell to P. Kropotkin on his departure for the United States, will take place at the ATHENÆUM HALL, 73, Tottenham Court Road, on Saturday, September 26th, at 8 o'clock. Speeches will be delivered by Kropotkin and other comrades, and will be followed by a Concert and Dance. Admission by program 6d., to be obtained of all London groups. The proceeds to be devoted to the Freedom Pamphlet Fund.

NOTES.

PAMPHLETS.

We have been continually asked, why we did not publish as a pamphlet comrade Kropotkin's articles on Anarchist Communism in the "Nineteenth Century." "They are the best explanation of the basis and principles of Anarchy in the English language," comrades have said to us, "and they ought to be in a cheap handy form, so that they can be read by every one." But the articles were copyright, and, moreover, we were very short of funds. Now, however, we have got permission from the editor of the "Nineteenth Century" to republish the articles, and have advanced part of the money for printing from the scanty resources of the paper. We trust to our English-speaking comrades in all parts of the world to enable us to pay our remaining debt, and prevent the resources of the paper being crippled, by their energy in making the pamphlet known, and pushing its sale.

We are glad to say that Elysée Reclus' excellent pamphlet "EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION" has been reprinted, and may now be obtained of W. Reeves, 185, Fleet Street, E.C. Price 1d.

QUEER.

Though the term of imprisonment to which comrade Malatesta was condemned at his trial is over, he has never reappeared. He is still detained in a Swiss prison. He is kept in secret and unable to communicate with his friends. We have reason to fear that the Swiss Federal Council are debating whether after all they shall not deliver him over to the Italian government. Sounds more like Russia than the ideal democratic Republic, doesn't it? But where is government of any description, there is treachery, oppression, and wrong. And the sooner all men learn it the better.

THE ANARCHIST CONFERENCE IN BRUSSELS.

A Conference was held on Sunday, August 23rd, attended by delegates from all parts of Belgium, from Spain, Holland, Italy, and France. It was agreed that it would be desirable to organise Anarchist Workmen's groups and associations on the Spanish model.

KROPOTKINE'S AMERICAN TOUR.

Comrade Kropotkin leaves England in the beginning of October for a four months' lecturing tour in the United States. We are unable at present to give details as to dates and places, as these depend upon the arrangements which on arriving he will find have been made for him by the lecturing agency which invited him. He is to speak four times

a week, for ten weeks, in the various great towns of the Eastern States, and will probably go as far West as Chicago, where he proposes to be on November 11th.

A HIGH-HANDED PROCEEDING.

On Tuesday, August 18th, comrade Merlino was arrested as he left the Brussels Congress, taken to the police-station and given his choice between waiting in prison for legal formalities of expulsion (perchance extradition) or being immediately conducted on board an English steamer as "a person found without visible means of subsistence," in which latter case he would have to pay the expenses of the two policemen who went to see him off! Naturally he chose the latter course, and is in London.

"FREEDOM NEEDS ALL HER POETS."

LOWELL, "To the memory of Hood."

WHATEVER prejudices he may have retained from the ancient order of things, few men of the past generation had a braver and nobler conception of human freedom than James Russell Lowell. Every one knows the fine poem, three verses of which are published in "Songs for Socialists," beginning:—

"Men whose boast it is that ye
Come of fathers brave and free,
If there breathe on earth a slave,
Are ye truly free and brave?"

The same living appreciation of the social and cooperative nature of true freedom runs through all his writing.

"In the gain or loss of one race
All the rest have equal claim."

"Wherever wrong is done,
To the humblest and the weakest, 'neath the all beholding sun,
That wrong is also done to us; and they are slaves most base,
Whose love of right is for themselves, and not for all their race."

"Chain down your slaves with ignorance, ye cannot keep apart,
With all your craft of tyranny, the human heart from heart."

"The traitor to humanity is the traitor most accursed."

He has a living faith in the eternal progress and victory of truth—

"History's pages but record
One death-grapple in the darkness twist old systems and the Word;
Truth forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the Throne,—
Yet that scaffold sways the Future,
Then to side with Truth is noble, when we share her wretched crust,
Ere her cause bring fame and profit, and 'tis prosperous to be just;
Then it is the brave man chokes, while the coward stands aside,
Doubting in his abject spirit till his Lord is crucified,
For Humanity sweeps onward: where to-day the martyr stands,
On the morrow crouches Judas with the silver in his hands;
Far in front the cross stands ready and the crackling faggots burn,
While the hooting mob of yesterday in silent awe return
To glean up the scattered ashes into History's golden urn.
'Tis as easy to be heroes as to sit the idle slaves
Of a legendary virtue carved upon our fathers' graves,
Worshippers of light ancestral make the present light a crime."—
His poems abound with pregnant lines, phrases stirring like a trumpet note.

"They have rights who dare maintain them."

"The serf of his own lash is not a man."

"Freedom gained yesterday is no more ours."

"To put more faith in lies and hate
Than truth and love is the true atheism."

"The hope of truth grows stronger day by day;
I hear the Song of Man around me waking,
Like a great sea, its frozen fetters breaking."

"More men? More Man! It's there we fail."

"Think you Truth a farthing rushlight, to be pinched out when you will
With your deft official fingers, and your politicians' skill?"

And indeed Lowell, Ambassador though he was, was no admirer of American politics.

"Law is holy: ay, but what law? Is there nothing more divine
Than the patched up broils of Congress—venal, full of meat and wine?
Is there, say you, nothing higher? Naught, God save us! that transcends
Laws of cotton texture, wove by vulgar men for vulgar ends?"

Space forbids us to quote more now, but we advise those who have not done so yet, to dip into Lowell's poems for themselves.

SOCIETY ON THE MORROW OF THE REVOLUTION.

Translated from the French of JEHAN LE VAGRE.

CHAPTER XVI.—CONCLUSION.

If there is a doctrine that has been able to arouse the fury and induce the calumny of all the political parties, it certainly is the doctrine of Anarchy. Terrified at the progress which the new ideas make in the minds of the exploited, all those who live only by exploitation, whether it be industrial, financial, or political, have joined together fraternally for the purpose of falling upon these new comers, who venture to trouble their peace by putting forward theories subversive

of everything which they desire to have respected.

Not being able to refute theories that, for the most part, their intellectual weakness will not permit them to understand, they still feel that if the new ideas take root, exploitation, and the privileges they enjoy thereby, will be done away with. Their belly threatened, seeing no chance for their parasitism to be perpetuated in a new condition of things, they have recourse to the prison and to calumnies in order to reply to us.

"The Anarchists," they say in every variety of tone, "are not a party, they have no ideas of social organisation, they have only appetites, they wish to make us return to the time of brute force," and these insults and calumnies enable them to dispense with arguments. In their newspapers they have given the Anarchists such a name for insanity and unreasonable violence that all the imbeciles—and they are unfortunately very numerous—whose ideas are derived from the newspapers they have read, have accepted this heap of rubbishy lies as the truth, and see in the Anarchists only a band of madmen who do not know what they wish for.

It is indeed fine for these big bellies to come talking to us of appetites and covetousness; they who have kept for themselves all the joys of life and who have no appetite left.

They are so satiated with the enjoyment fortune has procured for them that they are almost sick of it, that they are reduced to seek further pleasures in unnatural and abnormal passions. Poor creatures!

Men of greedy appetite, these Anarchists who sacrifice their existence and their liberty in the endeavour to conquer a social organisation which will leave free play to the evolution of all! Men of appetite, when, with the absence of prejudices which characterises them, they might make an opening for themselves and carve out a large place in the institutions of existing society, open to every ambition, to every appetite, to every monstrosity derived from a false and corrupt education, provided that he who wishes to succeed pays no attention to those he upsets in his path, and stops his ears so as not to hear the cries and the complaints of those he tramples under foot in the mad chase after prey.

Men of greed and of appetite these Anarchists whom we have seen pass in numbers before the magistrates and receive sentences by which it was thought the party would be crushed: middle-class men who have thrown over their class and sacrificed their position (although these are not very numerous amongst us, it is true): workers, who after a day of toil and weariness have encroached on their time of rest in order to go to their brothers in misery and point out the better future they see dimly in their dreams, or to unmask their real enemies by showing them the true causes of their poverty. Are all these men of appetite, when for most of them it would have been sufficient to accept society as it is, and, with a little twisting, they would have been able to enter the ranks of our exploiters?

In short, are they men of greed and appetite all those workers who sigh after a better state of things, those who in the existing society produce all the articles of luxury and enjoyment for their exploiters and go short themselves all the year long? Men of greed and appetite all those who claim their share in the wealth which they produce?

But those who oppress us? They are far from being greedy, covetous men, are they not? Listen to them, when coming from a night of debauch, they preach to us of morality or of temperance and sobriety in a discourse punctuated by hiccups due to a too lengthy repast, at which each one has absorbed the substance of several families. Are they greedy men? The poor creatures, how badly you understand them. If they consent to stuff themselves in this way, at the risk of perishing through indigestion, it is certainly not for their personal satisfaction, oh dear no, it is for the sake of humanity! Is it not necessary that they should circulate the money they have gained in commerce and manufacture by the sweat of the brow—of their slaves of the soil, of the mine or of the workshop? Come, come, rejoice, you poor devils, who tremble, wan and ragged, in the biting cold which makes you shiver, with empty belly pressed by hunger, rejoice! In order to please you and to procure work for you, your exploiters cover themselves with fine clothes, muffle themselves up in furs, enjoy themselves in consuming expensive repasts, all on your account; and in the evening, when you stretch yourselves on your miserable beds, your limbs aching after a day of toil, they, after leaving their mistress, very often one of your own daughters, whom they have carried off and covered with gold and precious stones purchased with the fruits of your labor, or else leaving their club, where in gambling they may have lost the fortune of a family, will softly stretch their carcass disordered by excesses, upon a bed of down and will sleep happily. Have they not well gained their sleep? They have worked to chain you more and more to the land or to the factory.

Oh, we know very well what you Anarchists will say: it would be better not to exploit the workers and to leave to them the care of expending the fruit of their labors as they may think fit; but we know that you are only robbers, whose sole object is pillage, murder, and arson; you have only appetites, that replies to everything and dispenses with the need of good reasons.

That which makes all parties unite so touchingly to fall upon the Anarchists is that, forming part of the present exploiting class, or hoping to form part of it, they are compelled to undertake the defence of that from which they hope to draw an advantage some day, and to try and get rid of those who bar their way. Now, to stir up the simple against them, what can be better than to make the Anarchists pass for ambitious individuals whose sole aim is to throw themselves upon the wealth of "those who by their work and their economy have assured to themselves a little bread for their old age." Unfortunately this stereotyped phrase is no longer in accord with the workers' ideas.

The respect for private property is dying out, the worker no longer believes in capital as the "results of the savings of labor," when he himself is not able to put together enough to feed himself properly whilst working hard all the time.

The Anarchists have only desires! How do you hope to get this believed? When every day they say to the workers "This earth to which you are denied access belongs to you. No one has a right to monopolise it for his own wants and to say: This is mine, that belongs to me. The fruits of the earth belong to all. Everyone has the right to eat his fill so long as there is food provided at the banquet of nature." Men of desires! When they are always trying to make the workers understand that a society must be established where everyone can find the satisfaction of his physical and mental wants, a society in which we shall no longer see these monstrosities in which we are obliged to take part in the present society: individuals in the prime of life dying of misery and of want, or seeking in suicide a means of escape from the anguish of hunger, when at their side vast sums are spent in nameless orgies which would secure them a good living for the rest of their lives.

Are the Anarchists men of selfish greed when their principal propaganda is to make individuals understand that they must destroy the positions which enable intriguers to rule over the others, when every instant they are seeking to make it understood that whoever the men in power may be that power must necessarily be arbitrary, since it only serves the will of a few individuals who maintain the authority of divine right, of the right of the sword, or of the right to vote?

This is what really stirs you up against us. This is what really makes you cry out. That we teach the workers to attend to their own affairs, and not to hand over to any one else the work which has to be done. Not to delegate their sovereignty, if they wish to preserve it. You feel that in the propaganda we are making we leave no room for the gratification of the desires of the pack of starvelings who are hunting after places and honors and, above all, wealth. You feel, in short, that your position is being slowly undermined, and being too debased to put yourselves frankly on the side of the workers, you drivel against all those who seek to bring about their emancipation.

Very well, drivel as much as you please. Neither your insults nor your calumnies will stop us in our work of propaganda. Yes, we have desires. What of it? It is only a matter of coming to an understanding as to the signification of the word "desire." Yes, we wish a society in which everyone will be able to satisfy his physical and intellectual needs. Yes, we dream of a society where all the enjoyments of the body and of the mind will no longer be monopolised by a privileged class, but will be at the free disposition of all. Yes, we are men and we have the desires of men. We do not seek to be other than in accordance with our nature. But we have also such a thirst for justice and liberty that we wish a society in which there will be no judges, governors, or parasites, such as constitute the monstrous social organisation with which humanity is now afflicted.

As to the reproach of not having an ideal, the declarations made by the Anarchists in their journals, before your tribunals, and wherever they have been able to speak to the public, are sufficient to prove the falsity of your affirmations. We have endeavoured in the course of this book to prove that the society we wish for is not as impossible as you pretend, and in passing we have shown that all your institutions are only designed for the advancement of your private interests and your preservation against those who have been plundered. That, far from being normal institutions, they rest only on arbitrary will and are absolutely contrary to the laws of nature. Then, finally, we think we have proved that science and nature are in accord in proclaiming the complete autonomy of the individual.

To conclude, it remains for us to demonstrate that if we desire the Revolution it is not only because we recognise it as the only efficacious means of getting our freedom, but also because it is inevitable and because the bad social organisation under which we live leads us fatally towards it.

In fact, that which particularly frightens away a large number of workers and sets them against Anarchist ideas is this word Revolution, across which they see an horizon of struggles, battles and the shedding of blood, making them tremble at the idea that one day they may be forced to descend into the street and fight against a power that now seems to them as an invulnerable colossus against which it is useless to struggle violently and which it is impossible to vanquish.

The past revolutions, which have defeated their own end and left them as miserable as before, have also contributed greatly to make the people sceptical with regard to a new revolution. What, they say, is the good of fighting and getting ourselves knocked about so that a band of new intriguers may exploit us instead of those who are now in power. It would be very stupid. And whilst moaning in their misery, and grumbling against the braggarts who have deceived them by promises which have never been fulfilled, they close their ears to the facts which urge upon them the necessity of manly action. They shut their eyes so as not to have to face the uncertainty of the struggle which is being prepared. They hide away in their fright of the unknown, while wishing for a change which they recognise is inevitable. They know very well that the misery which is striking down individuals all around them will reach them to-morrow, and will send them and theirs to increase the number of starving poor who live upon public charity. But they hope for some providential interference which will make it unnecessary for them to descend into the street, and cling with all their strength to those who induce them to hope for this change without struggle and fighting. They cheer those who wage a petty war with authority, who lead them to hope for reforms and give them a glimpse of a complete legislative change in their favor, pitying their misery and promising to

alleviate it. Do they really believe more in them than in those who speak to them of Revolution? Probably not, but the half-and-half revolutionists have made them hope for a change without it being necessary for them to take a direct part in the struggle, that is enough for them at the present moment. They doze quietly, waiting to see the social reformers at work, and then recommence their complaints when they see them elude their promises or put further off the hour of their realisation. But on the day when they are brought to a standstill by hunger, disgust and indignation being at their height, those who at present seem the most opposed to revolt will descend into the street.

Indeed, for those who reflect and study social phenomena, the revolution is inevitable. Everything urges it forward, everything contributes towards it, and even the resistance of the government can only put the date a little further off, or check its results. It cannot prevent it. In the same way the Anarchist propaganda may hasten the explosion, or contribute to render it efficacious by instructing the workers in the causes of their misery and putting them in the way of suppressing these causes, but it would be powerless to bring it about if it was not the result of the vicious social organisation from which we suffer.

Therefore, when the Anarchists speak of revolution they do not delude themselves with the belief that it is their propaganda which will induce individuals to descend into the streets to uproot the paving stones and to attack power and property, and that their words alone will enflame the crowd to such a point that they will rise in a body and fall upon the enemy. The times are past when the people were enflamed by the voice of tribunes and revolted on hearing their accents.

Our epoch is more positive. There must be causes, there must be circumstances to induce the people to revolt. To-day the tribunes are very few in number, and are rather a representation—more or less faithful—of the popular discontent than the inspirers of it. Thus if Anarchists speak of their desire for the revolution it is not because they hope the crowds will descend into the streets on hearing their voices, but only because they hope the people will comprehend that it is inevitable, and will be induced to prepare themselves for the struggle, to no longer look upon it with fear, but to habituate themselves to see in it their emancipation. Now this positivism of the crowd is so far good that it detaches it from the mere talkers and boasters. If it becomes infatuated with them it quickly disengages itself; in reality it seeks only one thing, its freedom, and it discusses the ideas submitted to it. It is of little importance that occasionally it wanders. Its education is going on every day, and it becomes more and more sceptical with regard to those whom for the moment it cheers as its saviours.

The Revolution does not create or improvise itself: this is an ascertained fact for Anarchists. For them it is a mathematical certainty, resulting from the bad organisation of the existing society. Their only object is that the workers may be sufficiently instructed as to the causes of their misery, to know how to profit by the Revolution they will certainly be brought to accomplish, and not to let themselves be robbed of its fruits by the intriguers, who will seek to substitute themselves for the existing government, and to substitute an authority which would only be the continuation of that which the people will have overthrown.

Therefore the situation cannot be indefinitely prolonged, everything leads us to the inevitable cataclysm.

The State may go on augmenting its police, its army, its functions, but the perfections brought by science, the developments of machinery, throw every day an additional number of unemployed workers into the street, and the army of the starvelings grows more and more, life becomes more and more difficult, the periods in which men are out of work become more and more frequent and longer and longer.

As we said just now, many workers at present reject all idea of revolution. When they are told to take the land and the instruments of production violently from those who monopolise them, misled by hope, although always deceived, by concessions in their favor on the part of the possessing classes, unquiet, although they have nothing to fear from the results of a revolution of which they cannot perceive the advantages, many workers recoil terrified before this idea of revolt. "Your ideas are very fine," they say to us, "but they cannot be realised. A revolution is no longer possible." And nevertheless if they were to reflect, if they carefully considered this vicious organisation of society, which tends more and more to concentrate in the hands of a few all the social wealth—land and instruments of production—and to drive the workers more and more away from the workshop, to replace them by machines, by women, and by children!

Yes, if the middle-class society was to last a long time, if the middle-class were to succeed in imposing upon us for ever the yoke under which they now hold us, the element man would be seen little by little to disappear from amongst the workers. The middle-class society would preserve only a small number of men, charged to watch over their exploitation, and a certain number of women as machines of pleasure, and would devour whole generations of children whom they would take from the earliest years to throw as food to their machinery. Look at the industrial towns of France, principally in the East and North; look at the manufacturing towns of England, and tell us if we have overdrawn the picture.

Many workers, struck by this brutal fact—their replacement by machinery,—have come to hate it and to desire its suppression. They do not perceive that, in spite of its suppression, they would always remain in the condition of workers, in the condition of "producing machines," and that by the fact of this suppression they would see only a relative amelioration produced, very relative indeed, which would soon disappear altogether through the rapacity of the exploiters.

It is evident that in the existing society the machine does much harm to the workers; it augments the out-of-work periods by increasing the

rate of production; it makes the worker more dependent on his employer by confining him to a speciality, which makes him unfit for any other work outside his speciality and very often of the workshop where he is employed; it lowers wages by enabling the exploiter to more easily do without the assistance of the worker; for where he desires it, he finds, as we have said before, the means of replacing him by children. In fact, every improvement of machinery, every perfection of working is in the present society a cause of misery the more for the worker. And this state of things can only go on getting worse, for the improvement of machinery which has been going on for the last few years enables us to foresee the degree of perfection at which it will be able to arrive.

What do we see in fact in many trades? The worker disappears to make way for the specialist, who is no longer anything but an unskilled laborer, that is to say, a worker who has no need to be apprenticed to be able to do the work at which he is occupied; we see machines do with ten, twenty, thirty workers the same amount of work as formerly required thirty, forty, fifty, one hundred; in certain trades, indeed, we see the employer supply in a few days orders which formerly would have required months of preparation.

Heretofore, the manufacturer was obliged to have the goods for which he anticipated orders made in advance, so as to be sure of being able to deliver them in time; there was scarcely any want of employment then. To-day, the capitalist knows that by the aid of machinery he can supply at once any orders which are given to him, the unemployed workers guaranteeing the necessary staff to keep his machinery at work. He has, therefore no need to work in advance, he turns his staff adrift without any apology as soon as the order is completed, if no others arrive. Orders also are only given at the last moment, so that for a long time past we have seen continual want of employment, general misery.

We may be told that it is not merely within the last few years that machinery has been in existence, and that formerly there was work enough. Yes, certainly, but it must be admitted that in the beginning the machine produced much less quickly; production having become cheaper and consumption increasing, the equilibrium was maintained for a time.* The machinery having been gradually perfected, the thirst for speculation having urged individuals to produce beyond measure, or, to be more exact, in spite of this transitory improvement, the workers not having been able to consume according to their needs, overproduction has soon made itself felt. At the present time the warehouses are swollen with products, commerce perishes of plethora and the workers of hunger by the side of the products of which they alone are the makers.

Moreover, these colonial conquests to which the middle-class devote themselves, in order to create new markets, become more and more difficult, the old markets become producers in their turn, and contribute still more to the congestion of goods. Financial crises aid more and more to make capital flow into the hands of an ever-lessening minority, and to throw into the working-class the little capitalists and manufacturers. The time is not far distant when those who now fear the Revolution will begin to look upon it with less fear, and will begin to wish for it. And when this time arrives, revolution will be in the air. Every little thing will suffice to make it burst forth, bringing into its vortex, in the assault on power, in the destruction of privileges, those who at the present time look upon it only with fear and mistrust.

Yes, workers, it is evident that the machines have done you an injury, that they take away the work from you, that they occasion your want of employment and the reduction of your wages. And it is they that at a given moment, by turning too great a number of your fellows into the street, will compel you to undertake this Revolution which to-day you repel with all your strength... But is it really to them that you owe a grudge for all this evil? Is it really them that you should reproach for doing your work? Would you not be satisfied to have nothing more to do but to cross your arms and look at the machines producing all the objects necessary to your existence? Would it not be the finest ideal to give to humanity: to succeed in reducing natural forces to subjection so as to make them serve as a means of working the machinery and causing it to produce for men and in their stead?

Very well, comrades, that might be, that can be, that will be, if you wish it. If you know how to disembarass yourselves of the parasites, who absorb the product of your work. If you had not exploiters, who have known how to turn to their exclusive profit all the improvements that the genius and industry of man have made in the means of production, if these machines, in short, belonged to all instead of belonging to a few, you would consider them as a benefit.

Companions in misfortune, when enervated by long want of work, exasperated by privations of all sorts, you reach the point of cursing your situation and reflecting on the means of making it better, attack those who have monopolised the enjoyments of life, those who have made you the machine of machines, but do not curse the machinery itself, for that will give you freedom, that will give you well-being, if you know how to render yourselves masters of it.

THE END.

For the previous chapters of "Society on the Morrow of the Revolution" see FREEDOM for January, February, April, May, June, July, September, October, November, December, 1890, and January, February, March, May, June, and July of the present year.

[* This refers specially to France. In England the introduction of machinery was accompanied by even greater misery than is caused by it to-day, witness the Luddite Riots. Ed.]

A PLEA FOR ANARCHISM.

(Summary of a Lecture by H. H. Duncan, of Aberdeen.)

"Johnson has laid it down as a rule that anything which passes without criticism must really be unworthy of notice. Hence, we may, perhaps, infer that the severity of the criticism is some proof of the truth and justice of the ideas criticised. Heretofore, State Socialism and Collectivism had the whole world as critics. The parson thundered against them, the politician, unable to confute their arguments, or gainsay the justice of their claims, had to content himself with his usual method of losing sight of the subject in a mist of words. The journalist, chained down to his editorial chair by the golden links of his salary, was not able to offend his capitalist masters, and so condemned socialistic ideas and methods of action, and the more forcible his opposition the higher his gains.

Thus the war went on until these ideas, formerly wild and revolutionary, became, in a measure, fashionable. Now-a-days, such well-to-do persons as the Marquis of Huntly have no terror of State Socialism, though out-and-out Collectivists he would still rather keep at arm's length. But as for the Revolutionist, the Anarchist, the Communist, their ideas are still of such a dangerous nature, that with a little persuasion, he and his class, might be induced to revive the use of the thumbscrew and the rack, in order to bring such fellows to their senses. Unfortunately, however, the opposition to the Anarchist does not end here. For in addition to the opposition of the classes—whose opposition we heartily enjoy, we have to meet that of the two schools of Socialists already mentioned. We had expected treatment of a more sympathetic nature, but when we take into consideration the many temptations that they are subjected to, such as the honour of representing their fellows in the Town or County Council, or, as their ultimate ideal, their triumphal entry into Parliament, we see these temptations are strong; and as human nature is so weak, we can only wish that they may not block the way to further progress, nor propagate confused notions as to the meaning of Anarchism."

After giving the popular meaning of Anarchy, and showing that there is no warrant for the ordinary interpretation of the word, the lecturer continued: "The Anarchist certainly does object to being ruled, either by the representatives of privilege and monopoly, or the representatives of the people, *i.e.*, the majority. This, however, does not imply that he is either a believer in the shedding of blood, or in any way favourable to incendiarism, but rather that he wishes to put an end to the present capitalistic system, which is forcibly kept intact by the powers of government, and which requires the lives of thousands of men, women, and little children, every year, in order that the sacrifice of their lives may secure the ease and luxury of the governing classes. He recognises in government the beginning of all injustice. It makes law in the interest of the possessors of property, and enforces it in the same interests, and the result is the poverty of the defrauded. He is opposed to all forms of the rule of man over man. For this reason he is an Anarchist."

The lecturer then went on to show the points of agreement and of difference between Anarchist Communism and other schools of Socialism, how laws had always crushed individual initiative, and been a cause of crime, and how, if we were to work on the lines of evolution, we must get rid of arbitrary legal enactments and adopt Anarchist Communism.

"Looking backward, history shows plainly that, despite the progress made, the condition of the worker has remained unchanged. He is still a slave. By means of the fight for supremacy between the landlord and the capitalist, Tory and Liberal, the worker has now got a vote. He is thus free to change his masters, and the opportunity to do so has had very injurious results, in so far that he has gloried in his political liberty, and neglected his economic slavery.

The introduction of steam, and the great variety of mechanical appliances for lessening labour and increasing productivity, has not benefited the worker. Agriculture has been neglected, cotton spinning has taken its place. Instead of the green fields with their sweet fragrance, or the woods with the rustle of the leaves, and the song of the winged choristers, instead of the ever-active burn, gurgling down the hillside, eager to join the river and so flow gently to the sea, we now have huge factories, filling the air with smoke; instead of the wood we have the stifling alley. The song of the birds is gone, and instead we have the poor street singer. The happy burn is supplanted by the common sewer. The rivers are polluted, Nature in her marvellous beauty, is ruthlessly destroyed, all for the sake of the grasping landlord and the unscrupulous capitalist. Man no longer lives like a man, he is simply a machine-minding animal. He loses his powers of manhood when he enters the factory gate. His life there begets a craving for stimulants, and these in turn tend still further towards his destruction. Now it is only a question of time whether he can rise and conquer the present capitalistic system before it has undermined his strength, and he sinks under it, and gradually disappears from off the earth."

After pointing out to the Democrats the uselessness of the vote, the length of time it would require to secure our emancipation by its means, the inconsistency of majority rule with freedom, and that the wage system in any form is not in accordance with the principle of Equality and Fraternity, Comrade Duncan continued: "The Anarchist has certain fundamental principles that cannot be gainsaid. He is a believer in liberty in no mere sham fashion, but in stern reality. To him all forms of government are equally bad.

Thus he demands, as a means towards obtaining his ideal, free access to land, and free access to all kinds of tools, machinery, and the

means of transit. With this freedom class distinction would cease, the relation of master and servant would be relegated to the past, and voluntary co-operation would take its place. Production would then be carried on for use, instead, as at present, largely to satisfy the craving of a vitiated plutocracy. Thus poverty would disappear, and crime would cease. For science is teaching ever more clearly that the criminal is a man suffering from some disease, and that disease is largely due to unjust social arrangement. Accordingly the Anarchist would scorn the use of the prison, but would take the criminal and teach him by example; thus the well-springs of good in a man would gush forth responsive to the appeal to his better nature. Thus freed from government and laws, freed from the fear of poverty and the intrusion of the burglar, we shall enter into free relations with each other. A man's value will no longer be judged by his credit at the bank, but rather by his store of manhood.

Marriage will no longer be the commercial transaction it is to-day. The relations of the sexes will be voluntary, for a time, or for that period called natural life. Children under the new order will no longer be torn from their parents in their early years, so that their schooling may be finished, and they ready to go to the factory while they are yet mere children. The pale, care-worn child of to-day will give place to the ruddy-faced child that is to be.

Then when people look back on the Nineteenth Century they will scarcely be able to realise the struggle that life meant in those days to the vast majority. But they will see that even at that dark time there were men whose hearts were too big to work for themselves alone, men who sacrificed themselves for mankind, and on their graves they will cast wreaths of roses. The men who to-day are called 'bigots plotting crime,' will then be recognised as Humanity's real heroes and saviours."

JUSTICE IN THE UNITED STATES.

THE latest act of injustice perpetrated in the United States of America is the imprisonment of our comrade John Most, editor of *Freiheit*, for a twelvemonth in Blackwell's Island, for a so-called incendiary speech delivered on 12th November 1887, the day after the murder of our comrades in Chicago. According to the account of those present at the meeting who were capable of judging, Most's speech was merely expressive of his deep sorrow at the loss of our brave comrades, and was by no means of an incendiary nature—indeed, its moderation seemed to be studied. The capitalist classes were eager to lay hands on all prominent labour advocates at the time, and when our Chicago martyrs were tried they raised the cry that one had been forgotten—John Most. Luckily for him, he was then undergoing imprisonment in Blackwell's Island. As a way out of the difficulty, the *New Yorker Staatszeitung* proposed that Most should be "pardoned" by the Government of New York, and then immediately handed over to the State of Illinois to stand his trial. If this plan had been followed, Most like the eight Chicago men would undoubtedly have been found guilty by a venal jury of having incited to bomb-throwing. But some hitch occurred, or the plan had not been thought of in time. Nevertheless, the capitalists were not to be balked. They kept watch on Most. And a favourable opportunity showed itself in the Anarchist meeting on the day after the murders. Most knew what they were after, and was therefore particularly circumspect—but, in vain. A police reporter of very shady character from the *World* had instructions to concoct a speech, and he did it. On his evidence and that of two policemen, who were proved to have been absent when the speech was delivered and who, even if they had heard it, could not have understood it owing to their very imperfect knowledge of German, Most was found guilty, despite the fact that the judge had virtually recommended the jury to discharge him. It is a remarkable fact that this jury after three hours' consultation were 7 to 5 for "not guilty." This was at 11.30 p.m. At that hour the judge informed them that if they had not agreed within thirty minutes, he would lock them up for the night. Within ten minutes, the seven changed their minds, and the verdict of "guilty" was given. When asked how convictions formed during five days had changed in a few minutes, these noble specimens replied that they were not going to be shut up a night for a man like Most, and they added in extenuation that they expected a nominal sentence would be given. A year's hard labour in the smithy of an American jail! The judge granted a "stay of proceedings" to allow of the judgment being appealed against. The case was then hung up for three years, because the official in charge of it had a grudge against the *World*, which had managed the whole disgraceful affair. But his successor, a creature of that vile capitalist print, ferreted out the papers, and carried through the business for his friends. The Court of Appeal confirmed the judgment. It is almost certain that the governing classes would have been afraid to have done anything more in the matter, if the workers had shown greater spirit and a determination not to allow themselves or their advocates to be deprived of such a primary right as that of free speech. Recent events in the States prove beyond doubt that the boasted freedom of the Republic exists only on paper; and it is time the workers there were putting an end to such a state of affairs. They are, it is true, holding now large meetings to protest against Most's sentence, and are collecting funds to carry his case to the Supreme Court of the U. S. A., but something more is wanted. These acts of flagrant injustice will continue as long as the capitalist system lasts. The workers must learn that the task that lies before them is the destruction of that system, root and branch. John Most has written several letters from prison to the workers, and he keeps this central fact well before them. Health to

our comrade, and a speedy release! Meantime, *Freiheit*, which is a fine eight-page weekly, appears with utmost regularity, and champions the rights of labour with its usual vigour—a German translation of Kropotkin's "Anarchist Morality" is coming out in its columns at present and Malatesta's "Talk" is going to be published next. The Anarchist press generally seems to be thriving in the U.S.A. *Der Anarchist* of St. Louis, Mo., will henceforward be published in New York as a weekly paper. Hitherto it has appeared fortnightly.

THE PROPAGANDA. REPORTS.

LONDON.

St. Pancras Communist-Anarchist Group.—We have held open-air meetings in Regent's Park when the weather permitted. On Sunday the 23d, a good meeting was addressed by W. Wess and J. Turner, who denounced the wire-pullers and place-hunters who through cowardice had prevented the Anarchists from joining in the proposed solidarity of the workers at the Brussels Congress. Good sale of *Freedom* and Malatesta's "Talk."

Young Anarchist Group.—Unfortunately the weather has stopped the best part of our propaganda this month, but we have had two pretty fair Sundays and we have made the best of them. Good meetings have been held at Regent's Park on Sunday mornings, and at Hyde Park on Saturday evenings and Sunday afternoons. Saturday August 15th, we held a meeting in Hyde Park, together with the Individualist Group, Nicoll dealing with the Communist-Anarchist, and Attersoll with the Individualist ideal. We are glad to report that the Communist's ideal was far more favourably received than was the Individualist's. Sundays 16th and 23rd fair meetings were held in Regent's Park, also in conjunction with the Individualists, Oldman and Nicoll speaking. At the last meeting Nicoll showed that the Social Democrats, not only abroad, but also in England are fast becoming a mere political party full of place-hunters and wire-pullers. He argued that they have dropped altogether the revolutionary means that helped them so much at first to become a popular party. As a proof of this, there was the Brussels Congress, where they excluded all Anarchists, and denied their right to participate in a labor congress. *Freedom*, *Commonweal*, and pamphlets, especially Malatesta's "Talk," have sold well, and there is quite a boom for *Sheffield Anarchist*.—W. Mc. Q.

London Socialist League have held successful meetings lately. Besides the ordinary propaganda meetings they have held an Anarchist demonstration at the "Birdcage" right in the heart of the worst slum in London. The speeches of the comrades advocating propaganda by deed were received with great enthusiasm. As a practical result of this, after the meeting, several applications were made for the services of the moon-lifting brigade, which were promptly attended to. Altogether, there seems a likelihood of making the East End a strong Anarchist district.—W. Mc.

South London Socialist Society.—Meetings have been held at the corner of Larcom Street every Sunday evening this month, the 9th excepted, rain that day stopping all chance of open-air work. On the 2nd, Comrades Tochatti, Fox and Atterbury spoke to a good and very sympathetic audience. The 16th, we had the most successful meeting held up to the present. Tochatti being in splendid form, made a good rousing speech, Comrades Manghan and A. J. Smith assisting. The 23rd, we had Comrades Catterson, Smith and Bullock, and a very good meeting. Fair sales of literature at all meetings, also a growing interest in the subject. Next Sunday, John Turner.

PROVINCES—

Manchester.—During the last month good meetings have been held at our usual meeting-places—Phillips Park, Stevenson Square, and the New Cross. Especially good audiences have been gained at the latter place, our old foes the teetotalers helping us considerably by their unsuccessful attempts to smash us. "Old Collins," who has preached the virtues of cold water for over 30 years at this spot, till he has come to think he has a vested interest in it, and who is known to fame as the greatest local authority on "slang," made a most savage and abusive attack on us a few Sundays ago, and called on the crowd to throw us in the horse-trough close by. For a time the scene was pretty lively; but the sceptre had departed, and the monarch of the New Cross finally departed too amid the hisses and threats of his former subjects. Since then large and enthusiastic meetings have been held, the most anarchist and revolutionary utterances being applauded. The vigorous "No-Rent" propaganda which we are at present carrying on, is especially well received. A new open-air station has also been opened in the working-class suburb of Gorton to alternate with our Phillips Park meeting. Last Sunday a very good meeting was held there, much literature being sold and great interest shown. Besides the open-air propaganda, our comrades have attended meetings of the Fabian Society, and at their last meeting Comrade Stockton gave an address which was well received and provoked much discussion. Also the discussion meetings of the Knott Mill Mission Hall have been utilised to spread our views. A lecture against Socialism was given a few weeks ago by a well-known temperance lecturer, Mr. Gibson, in which he severely handled the State Socialists. As the Socialists, both Democratic and Anarchist, turned up in full force there was a most lively discussion. Since then we have attended other meetings of the same body, and taken part in the discussions, with good effect.

Yarmouth.—On July 26th large meeting in the morning on the Priory Plain, addressed by Comrades Kitching of London, Saunders and Headley. A large number of volunteers were present, who got rather excited when Headley called them hired murderers. In the evening, on the Hall Quay, Comrade W. G. Killick of the Socialist Stores, London, and the above. On the Sunday following no meeting in the morning owing to inclement weather, but a large one in the evening on the Hall Quay, speakers Kitching, Killick, and Headley. Opposition was again offered by Michel Diamant, who was ably replied to by Kitching. On August 4th Comrades Gustave Mollett and A. Moore, from Norwich, paid us a visit. In the Club Room in the evening Mollett sang "La Carmagnole," in French. August 9th we were again unable to hold out-door meetings. In the evening Headley read "The Forum" out of Munalog's Social Songs, in the Club Room. On the 16th a large meeting on the Hall Quay, addressed by Poyntz and Headley. Christian and Temperance opposition was offered by several opponents; the meeting was continued until a quarter to twelve: this is the latest that we have ever held a meeting in Yarmouth on a Sunday. 23rd, large meeting on the Hall Quay in the morning, to hear the debate between Mowbray and Diamant, but to the disappointment of all present Diamant did not turn up, so Mowbray gave an address on the Practicability of Socialism, after a challenge had been given to anyone present to take up the debate. The Blue Ribbon Army took up their pitch alongside of us and did their best to break up our meeting, but failed. Mowbray having lost the train for Norwich also spoke in the same place in the afternoon; plenty of opposition; two or three feeling inclined for a fight, they had to be put outside of the meeting. In the evening again on the Hall Quay large meeting addressed by Headley, who again received plenty of opposition; the meeting continued until 9.45. On Monday several of us went to Norwich to the opening of their new club. Headley has also been holding meetings at Caister and Potter Heigham during the month. Good sale of *Freedom*, *Commonweal*, and *Sheffield Anarchist*, besides the following pamphlets,

"A Talk," "Jones' Boy," "Was Christ a Socialist," and several others. Collections for the month 9s. 10d.—J. HEADLEY.

Sheffield.—Sheffield, with its 330,000 inhabitants, is one of our strongholds. Anarchy has hold of the place, and nothing else is spoken of. Not a day passes without mention either of Anarchist men or Anarchist doings in the local daily liars. In fact, Anarchy has got to that stage when men of "the enemy" fear it, and lately we have been mobbed, hustled, and knocked about; our club has been wrecked even by a mob of roughs stirred on by the police. The police would not dare to attack the club alone, as they are too chary of modern explosives. The meetings here each number some 1,000 to 1,500 of an audience, and we have huge sales of literature and our paper. As for Anarchist influence we have the following forces at work:—(1) Socialist Club (and Anarchist Communist Group) contains several speakers. The men are mostly Anarchist Communists, but a few are only destructive Anarchists, and have no constructive ideal (Nihilists). (2) This group publishes fortnightly the *Sheffield Anarchist*, the tone of which can best be judged from the fact that No. 1 brought with it an action for libel. The editors are now John Creaghe, a medical practitioner, and Cyril Bell, a medical student and school-teacher. The motto of the paper is "No god and no master," and it attacks law, religion, marriage, property, and patriotism. (3) The Central Radical Club is composed chiefly of Communist Anarchists, unadvised Anarchists, and Tarnist or Tarnation Anarchists. (4) The Jewish Club contains a large number of Communist-Anarchists. Other influences are at work in the town, such as the Ruskin Museum. The inhabitants are almost free from the filth and drink of more northerly towns. At the beginning of this month the Social Democrats came here to oppose us for the first time. We allowed them our platforms, and 12 meetings were held, at which both Democrats and Anarchists spoke. The impression made by Social-Democracy can be estimated by the fact that they could not get the seven requisite men to form a branch; and a paper they started in opposition to ours, the *Sheffield Democrat*, died after No. 1. Our own paper circulates about 800, and this is increasing as the paper becomes more widely known, besides which *Freedom*, *Commonweal*, and *Workers' Friend* circulate still as well as anywhere. You may hear of something further during the winter, as police, gasworkers, and tramway men are all discontented here and seem likely to rise.

Newcastle-on-Tyne.—Large meetings have been held every Sunday morning at the Quay Side, speakers, James and Pearson. Discussion meetings have been held every Monday evening at Lockhart's Cocoa Rooms, Bigg Market, discussions on "Anarchism," opened by James, Pearson, Kapper and Porter. July 5th, T. Woods read a paper on "The Worker's Faith" from a Social Democrat's point of view. T. Pearson read a paper on "Anarchist Communism" before the Secular Society's discussion class, many questions were asked and answered, and a good debate followed. Sunday, July 26th, Mrs. Besant lectured three times in Nelson Street Lecture Hall. The afternoon lecture was entitled "The Dangers Menacing Society." She pointed out that society was what men and women made it, and that to change society they must first change themselves, this could not be done by a thousand Acts of Parliament, but by self-sacrifice and good example. Our Correspondent remarks, that "since Mrs. Besant denounced the Chicago Anarchists, she has evidently been studying the fundamental principles for which they died." Sunday, August 1st, T. Pearson had another public discussion with the Social-Democrats, who were this time represented by Mr. Gills.

(Remainder of reports held over for want of space.)

NOTICES.

LONDON—

St. Pancras Anarchist-Communist Group.—Open-air meeting every Sunday (weather permitting) in Regent's Park, at 6.30 p.m.

Young Anarchists and Socialist League.—Sunday, Regent's Park and Hackney Triangle, 11.30 a.m.; Hyde Park and Victoria Park, 3.30 p.m.; Saturday, Hyde Park, 7.30. Commonweal Club, 273 Hackney Road, lectures on Sundays, 11 a.m. and 8 p.m. Autonomie Club, 6 Windmill Street, Wednesday, 8 p.m. A Young Anarchist requests us to say that several members of this group are working hard in the interest of the

INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL,

for which convenient and spacious premises have been taken at 10 Fitzroy Street, W. A good deal of interest has been shown in various quarters in this enterprise. P. Kropotkin lectures in its behalf August 31st, at the Athenaeum Hall, Tottenham Court Road, on "Brain Work and Manual Work," Walter Crane has kindly designed the front page of the school prospectus, the cost of engraving which has been defrayed by William Morris. Walter Crane has also sent a large number of his beautifully illustrated books for the use of the children; C. Walkden has sent flowers and fruit from the country, besides giving a liberal donation. Evening classes for adults will be opened in October, of which due notice will be given, and Dr. J. Barker Smith has offered to give a course of six Lectures on Botany. Boarders will be received for £20 a year, but it is hoped by the committee that they will be able to make the day school a free one, and to this end ask all who are interested to give as freely towards the expenses as their means will allow. Subscriptions will be thankfully received by J. S. Sparrow, 8 Stratford Place, Camden Square, N.W.

South London Socialist Society.—Open-air meetings every Sunday (weather permitting) 6.30 p.m. corner of Larcom Street, near Vestry Hall, Walworth Road, S.E.

Leytonstone.—We are glad to notice the formation of an Anarchist-Communist Group here. Meeting every Sunday, 7.30 p.m., at 1 West Street, Harrow Green.

Socialist Co-operative Federation, 7 Lamb's Conduit Street. Social evenings every Thursday and Lectures every Sunday evening at 7.30. Sunday August 30, lecturer J. Turner.

PROVINCES—

Manchester.—P. Kropotkin will lecture at Ancoats on "Mutual Aid a Law of Nature," Sept. 20.

Newcastle-on-Tyne.—Open-air meeting every Sunday morning on the Quay. Discussion every Monday at 8.30 p.m., Lockhart's Cocoa Rooms, Bigg Market.

Sheffield.—*Socialist Club*, 47 West Bar Green, open daily, pay what you like, women admitted and welcome. Dispensary and adult school attached, also good library. All literature in English and Yiddish languages kept, also the principal Spanish and French papers. Meetings: Sundays, Monolith (open-air) 11.30; West Bar Pump (open-air) 7.30; Monday, business at Club, 8; Tuesday, French class at Club, 8; Wednesday, Educational class at Club, 8; Thursday, Discussion class at Club, 8. Saturday, Gower Street (open-air) 12.

Comrade Cyril Bell, of Edinburgh University, asks us to announce that if enough support is given, he will open an Anarchist School at Sheffield in September. "Adults or children of either sex, taught all subjects, except the religious and patriotic frauds. Fees voluntary."

Dublin Socialist Union.—87 Marlboro Street, Thursday Sept. 3rd, at 8 p.m., M. Weichsleder, "Socialism, Spiritualism and Theosophy."