

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. 5.—No. 60.

NOVEMBER, 1891.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY

A PUBLIC MEETING

WILL BE HELD ON

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 11th, 1891,

AT 8 P.M., AT THE

SOUTH PLACE INSTITUTE, South Place, Moorgate, E.C.,

To commemorate the imprisonment and murder of the

CHICAGO ANARCHISTS,

Speakers: ALFRED MARSH, S. MERLINO, TOUZEAU PARRIS, TRUNK, PETER KROPOTKINE, MALATESTA, D. J. NICOLL, LOUISE MICHEL, JAS. TOCHATTI, S. YANOVSKY, C. MOWBRAY, W. WESS, CYRIL BELL.

Local evening Meetings will be held as follows:

Sat. Nov. 7, INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S CLUB, 40, Berner St., E.
Sunday, Nov. 8, AUTONOMIE CLUB, 6, Windmill Street, W.
Monday, Nov. 9, SCANDINAVIAN CLUB, Rathbone Place, Oxford St., W.
Tues., Nov. 10, FORWARD CLUB (Commonw'l Group) Charles St., Hoxton

Open air Meetings will be held on Sunday, Nov. 8, at 11 a.m., Regent's Park and Hyde Park; 3 p.m., Victoria Park.

WHO THE CHICAGO ANARCHISTS WERE.

FOLKS often ask: "Who were these Chicago Anarchists people talk of? They were hanged in Chicago in 1887 for being Anarchists, that we know, but where did they come from? How came they to be Anarchists? What were their previous lives like?" Some of the middle-class papers have actually asserted that whether it was just to hang and imprison these men as Anarchists or not, it was at all events a service to society to get rid of them, for they were dissolute ruffians. To answer such questions and show the shamefulness of such calumnies, we give below a brief account of the life of each of these men.

ALBERT R. PARSONS.

Parsons was an American, born in Montgomery, Alabama, June 24, 1848. Years previously his father had settled there and established a shoe and leather factory. His family were well-to-do people, descended from one of the earliest English settlers in America, and one of his brothers, General Parsons, is a man of some celebrity. Both Albert Parsons' parents died whilst he was quite a child and his eldest brother became his guardian. At twelve years old he was apprenticed to a printer. A year later the great war broke out between the Northern and Southern States, and the boy of thirteen joined a local volunteer company. Serving in various regiments, chiefly under two of his brothers who were officers, he went right through the war, fighting for the defeated cause of the slave-holding South. After the war he returned to school and type-setting. At twenty years of age he founded a weekly newspaper, the *Spectator*, wherein he espoused the cause of the newly freed slaves, and, as a republican, advocated their political rights. This change in his views caused him to lose many friends and the paper failed. Then he became travelling correspondent for the *Houston Daily Telegraph*. In 1871 he married the daughter of an Indian chief and shortly after settled in Chicago, where he lived till the day of his arrest, working for his living in newspaper offices, sometimes as compositor, sometimes as journalist. It was in 1874 that he first became interested in working-class questions, his attention being roused by the shameless misappropriation of the relief funds subscribed to succour the sufferers from the great Chicago fire in 1871, and the efforts made by the Chicago workers to expose the wrong. In 1875 Parsons joined the "Social Democratic Party of America," which a year after was merged in the new "Workingmen's Party," organised after the Labor Congress of 1876, and violently denounced by the capitalist press as a band of "Communists and robbers." The injustice of this attack exasperated Parsons and induced him to study more deeply, and attempt to explain to others the relation of poverty to wealth. In 1876 he joined the Knights of Labor. Taking part in the great railway strike of 1877, Parsons was arrested and brutally treated by the police. He lost his employment. For two years he could get no regular work and his family were often in need of the necessities of life. During the strike he saw the people fired upon and clubbed by the police over and over again, whilst the capitalist journals openly advocated the use of clubs, pistols, bayonets, hand-grenades and gatling guns against all laborers who agitated for shorter hours and better pay. The workers replied by military organisations, which sprung up all over the country. Meanwhile the working men of Chicago nominated

Parsons three times for Alderman, twice for County Clerk, and once for Congress. At the Alleghany National Convention he was nominated as Labor Candidate for the Presidency of the United States, but declined. In 1878 a law was passed in Illinois disarming working men, and confirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States, and during the elections of the two following years politicians began to practise ballot-stuffing and other outrages upon the workmen's party. Dissensions as to methods rose high amongst the Socialists, and Parsons began to realise the hopelessness of politics as a means of economic reform. He and many others lost faith in the potency of the ballot and the protection of law; they began to look on government as the agent of capitalism. In 1880 Parsons left the political Labor Party and turned his attention to the reduction of hours of labor, the existing Eight Hours law not being obeyed, even in government works! In 1881 Parsons was a delegate to the Labor Congress, where the International Working People's Association was founded on Anarchist-Communist principles. It was for belonging to this body that Parsons and the other Chicago Anarchists were indicted for "conspiracy" in 1886. In 1884 the I. W. P. A. started *The Alarm*, with Parsons as editor, and he continued to fill the post till the suppression of the paper in May 1886. When the Anarchists were arrested after the Haymarket meeting, Parsons, who was out of town, voluntarily returned and gave himself up to stand his trial with his comrades. He was hanged Nov. 11, 1887.

Parson's autobiography has been published by his wife since his death.

AUGUST SPIES.

August Spies was a German, born December 10, 1855, at Freidwald. His father was a government official employed in the Woods and Forests Department. August was educated for the Polytechnicum, which college he eventually entered, choosing the science of forest culture as his special branch of study. He was a remarkably intelligent youth and an eager reader of the classics of German literature. He soon learnt to think for himself and became a religious sceptic.

When Spies was seventeen his father died and he decided to go to America, where he had wealthy relatives. At this time he was no Socialist, but on the contrary, an admirer of Bismarck and the Emperor. Arrived in Chicago, he followed the trade of an upholsterer. Here what he saw of the life of the working classes and his observation of the course of economic development, caused him to turn his attention to Socialist literature, and in 1878 he entered into connection with the Socialist Labor Party. In 1880 he took over the management of the *Arbeiter Zeitung*, a Socialist newspaper. His energy and ability saved it from collapse, and he continued to edit it till the day of his arrest. In 1880 Spies came forward as a Socialist candidate; but a closer acquaintance with parliamentary manœuvring convinced him before very long that politics were a mere blind to the working men and he became an Anarchist. During his imprisonment he wrote and published his own biography, to counteract the false impression of Anarchism conveyed by the unscrupulous misrepresentation of the personal character and aims of the Anarchists by the capitalist press. He was hanged Nov. 11, 1887.

GEORGE ENGEL.

George Engel was born April 15th, 1836, in the city of Cassel, Germany. His father died while he was an infant, and his mother when he was only twelve years old. He had known what hunger was in his boyhood; now that the battle of life had begun in earnest, he soon learned what starvation meant also. After some cruel experiences he met with a kindly man, a painter in Frankfort. With him he stayed until he had learned the trade. In 1873 he went to Philadelphia. Here he soon learned something of labour troubles. He saw the militia march through the streets after having "restored order" among some starving miners. At this time he was no Socialist, but an admirer of the "free and glorious republic" of America. Soon, however, he saw that the workers were oppressed and miserable, that people actually died of starvation in America as in Germany. He was earning good money and saving something for a rainy day. "The rainy days came soon enough. I fell sick, my earnings were soon gone." He went to Chicago, learned something of Socialism from a fellow-worker in a factory, and studying it thoroughly, developed into an Anarchist. He saw the ballot box actually stolen and "corrected" after a Chicago election, wherein the Social Democrats had a majority of votes, and the courts refusing to quash the election thus secured; he saw that political corruption had crept into the Social Democratic party, and, disgust-

ted, he left them and joined the International Working Peoples' Association, becoming one of the most active workers in the cause. He was hanged Nov. 11, 1887. His last words were "Hurrah for Anarchy."

ADOLPH FISCHER.

Adolph Fischer was born in the city of Bremen in Germany. His father was a poor wage-worker, and Fischer's education was only what the law allowed to the poor in the common schools. When only fifteen he left home for the United States. Here he joined his brother who had a printing office in Little Rock, Arkansas. Fischer learned the trade of a printer, which he followed up to the time of his arrest. He married in 1881, and in 1883 went to Chicago, where he found employment as a compositor in the office of the *Arbeiter Zeitung*. He worked hard for the cause of Socialism in which he had been interested from his early youth. In fact his earnestness and determination were such as to make him a marked man by the enemies of the people. In his defence he boldly avowed Anarchist principles. He was hanged Nov. 11, 1887.

LOUIS LINGG.

Louis Lingg was born in Mannheim, Germany, September 9th, 1864. His father was employed as a lumberman, his mother did laundry-work. Life was pleasant enough for young Lingg in his boyhood's days, but when his father met with an accident at his work which ruined his health, hunger and want were soon experienced in the family, despite the strenuous efforts of the mother to keep the home going. The harsh treatment his father received from his master created in Lingg's heart a hatred of the present system which speedily turned his energies in the direction of Revolutionary propaganda.

Meanwhile, having served his apprenticeship as a carpenter, Lingg left home for the United States, in 1885. He went to Chicago, joined the union of his trade, and became one of the chief organisers of the eight-hour movement. He had an ardent belief that the great revolutionary struggle was close at hand, and that the people needed arms to meet the open violence of their oppressors. He therefore studied explosives, and made a supply of bombs to be ready in case of need. These, being discovered, lent some colour to the accusations of the prosecution, until it was shown by the medical evidence at the trial that the explosive thrown at the Haymarket was an infernal machine, causing cruel internal wounds, a missile of the kind used by troops, and not a simple dynamite bomb such as those made by Lingg. His figure stands somewhat apart from those of his fellow-prisoners, with whom he was very slightly acquainted, or not acquainted at all, until they met in the dock. They were propagandists, he a man of action. He died in his cell shortly before the execution, the prison authorities stated that he had blown himself up, the truth is unknown. A day or two before his death his mother wrote to him, her only son: "I, too, as you know, have worked hard to get bread for you, your sister and myself, and—true as I am alive—I shall be as proud of you after your death as I have been during your life. Woman as I am, I would have done the same had I been a man."

SAMUEL FIELDEN.

Samuel Fielden was an Englishman born on the 25th February, 1847, in the town of Todmorden, Lancashire. His father was a weaver by trade, a man of fine physique and of more than ordinary intelligence. Their house on Sunday was the meeting-place of an advanced group of persons who discussed various social subjects. This fact, Fielden says, first gave him his taste for the study of Sociology. In his youth he went through a phase of religious enthusiasm and perambulated the towns of Lancashire as a Methodist preacher. In 1868 he emigrated to the United States, where for some time he still continued to preach.

He went to Chicago in 1869. Here he began to see that in the economic conditions of the people "there was something wrong." But how to remedy it he did not know, till one day, he says, "a person said to me that Socialism meant equal opportunities." From that time he followed up the Socialist idea and soon became a most active speaker and worker for the cause. With all this he worked hard for his living. In his defence he says: "You can hardly go through a street in this city that I have not dropped my sweat upon."

He made an eloquent speech at the trial, the last sentences of which we quote: "To-day as the beautiful autumn sun kisses with balmy breeze the cheek of every free man, I stand here never to bathe my head in its rays again. I have loved my fellow-men as I have loved myself. I have hated trickery, dishonesty and injustice. The nineteenth century commits the crime of killing its best friends. It will live to repent of it." Fielden is now in prison under a life sentence, to which the death penalty was in his case commuted.

MICHEL SCHWAB.

Michel Schwab was born in Kitzingen, Central Germany, on August 9, 1853. His father was a small tradesman. By the time he was 13 he had lost both parents and the home was broken up. A year later he became a communicant, but at the end of a month his faith was so shaken by the worldly habits of his priest that it never recovered. At this time Schiller and the other German classics fell into his hands and finally dispelled all the illusions of the Catholic faith. Being compelled to learn a trade for his livelihood, he chose that of a bookbinder. He was apprenticed in Wuerrburg, where he lived a solitary life surrounded only by his books. In 1872 his apprenticeship having expired and he having by direct contact with the Socialist Labor Party learnt some-

thing of its principles, Schwab became a Socialist and travelled through Europe distributing literature, gaining his living by his trade. In 1879 he emigrated to the United States, and after visiting various cities he settled in Chicago, where he became reporter and assistant editor of the *Arbeiter Zeitung* until his arrest. He also was sentenced to death, and at the last moment relieved for life-long imprisonment.

OSCAR NEEBE.

Oscar Neebe was born in Philadelphia of German parents. At the time of his arrest he was not a wage-worker like his comrades, but a well-to-do business man, an yeast-pedlar. Nevertheless, his heart was wholly with the working people, and in their cause he exerted himself night and day with untiring energy. Although he knew nothing of the Haymarket meeting, such activity was enough to bring upon him the hatred of the capitalists who were managing the trial. For his good work in the cause he was sentenced to fifteen years' imprisonment. His wife who loved him very deeply, died of a broken heart while he was imprisoned in Chicago.

Lingg, Fielden, Schwab and Neebe, like their four comrades, boldly and clearly stated their anarchist principles in their speeches before the Court.

Such in brief outline are the figures—characteristic in their simplicity—of the first American martyrs in the Socialist and Anarchist cause.

They do not belong to one class. The workman, the writer, the handicraftsman, ruined by the development of production on a large scale, the ex-soldier, whose youth was sacrificed to the ideas of patriotism and glory, the ex-preacher, all these waifs of European society, flung pell-mell by the tempest of civilisation upon the soil of the North American Republic, found one another out, understood one another, united with the native born American citizen in one common thought, the thought of emancipation.

It is interesting to study in the biographies of these simple, ordinary men the processes which led them to Socialism, the apparently trivial facts which struck them, and out of mere every-day visitors to the New World made them declared enemies of middle-class society.

For one it was the sight of disinterested men working to spread the ideas of Socialism. For another, the sight of a regiment marching away from the bloody suppression of a miners' strike. Or it was a word, an exclamation falling from a neighbour's lips, or some other seemingly insignificant circumstance. The word or the impression evidently grafted itself upon a stock of preceding experiences; experiences more or less unconsciously received, and bearing chiefly upon the economic situation of the wage-slave. The economic question remains the basis; but moral feeling is the lever. It is the key to the solution of the social question.

And the minds of these workmen yesterday indifferent, of these believers in the inevitability of capitalism and the glory of the greatest of Republics, were suddenly pierced by a gleam of light, by a ray of sunshine from a far-off world, dimly seen amid the thick smoke of battle. Thus, may it be said, thus do men become Socialists.

No less interesting is the passage of these straightforward, sincere minds to Anarchism.

In 1878 our comrades were still amongst the most active members of the Socialist Labor Party. The number of votes which they were able to collect for the legislative elections of the following year, changed the character and direction of this Party. But professional politicians crept into the Socialist ranks. And ambition, corruption, and discord crept in too. Our comrades have described at length in their biographies the struggles and rivalries which sprung up within the Party and led to its dissolution.

Nevertheless the workers retained a certain amount of confidence in the elections; until Judge Gary, when refusing to condemn two individuals found guilty of electioneering frauds, declared that all means were justifiable to take votes from the "Communists." "Then it was," writes Parsons, "that I perceived the folly of wishing to gain from politics and politicians the reform of society."

Many workmen, he tells us, began to lose confidence in the elections and the laws. Some amongst them said that *political liberty without economic liberty is a hollow phrase*. Others added that poverty cannot struggle against wealth at elections; for the master in the workshop is master everywhere besides, and he can influence the votes of his workmen.

A discussion began upon the subject; and the conviction was acquired that the State, the Government and the laws, are but the instruments of capitalists and of their interests. . . . and that all the forms of government (monarchies, republics, and what not) are only a conspiracy organised by the possessing classes to despoil the workers and keep them in slavery. . . . In politics money can do everything; it rules the electorate even as it does the factory. . . .

The State, the Government and the law centralise the power which certain individuals have of ruling and exploiting other individuals, and all law and government is, in the last resort, but an organisation of force, a usurpation of the natural rights of man.

This current of ideas created Anarchism. Our comrades' refusal to submit to parliamentary trickery and lies, their attitude of straightforward opposition, the sense of the middle-class that they were helpless in face of such an attitude and their fear of the consequences—this it was which cost our comrades their lives; not the relatively unimportant event at the Haymarket meeting.

The present situation in this country resembles in many points that in the United States in 1886. The Socialist and labor movement is evidently inclining towards politics; the tide is setting, as it did before

in 1848, towards the House of Commons, that grand extinguisher of all reforms and all enthusiasms.

Clear-sighted and sincere men, who dread the responsibility of leading on the people to a fresh defeat, have only one attitude to take: to fight against the principle of government and against all measures the government may propose or promise wherewith to harness a portion of the proletariat to its chariot. We shall probably not have a serious agitation for the eight hours' bill; for the worker already understands how illusory and unreal such a reform would be. But we shall have agitations for other reforms no less futile, which will long keep up in a certain part of the working class the hope of getting themselves represented in Parliament and in the local administration.

The Government, without conceding anything worth having to the workman who works, will protect and cajole those workers who nibble at the political bait, and it will fight desperately with the Anarchists, the irreconcilables. The moment will come when it will be driven to plan a little terrorism to rid itself of the most importunate of its foes. It will seize upon some pretext to let loose its hired and its volunteer police upon the unarmed crowd and cause a massacre. The indignation which the crime will arouse amongst the friends of the people will serve as a justification for laying hands upon them, dragging them before a packed jury and demanding and obtaining their heads. It will choose the most devoted, the most sincere, for these are the most dangerous.

These will be our own martyrs, whom the whole world will honour as now it honours the martyrs of Chicago; and on no long distant day their blood will spring up from the earth in flames that will enwrap the execrable edifice of iniquity wherein we are living, and reduce it to ashes.

SPECIAL NOTICE.

Republication of the "SPEECHES OF THE CHICAGO ANARCHISTS BEFORE THE COURT," with a preface describing the trial and the events which led up to it, and extracts from the record of the trial prepared by the Chicago lawyers for the second trial on appeal before the Supreme Court of Illinois. A fourth edition of this most interesting and valuable pamphlet is about to be issued by the London Anarchist Communist Groups, the previous three editions being entirely sold out. It will be ready on Nov. 7th. Copies 4d. each. Orders to be addressed—"Chicago Martyrs," Autonomie Club, 6, Windmill Street, Tottenham Court Road, London, W. Every man or woman who cares about the labor movement should send for a copy.

ANARCHY.

BY ENRICO MALATESTA.

(Continued from previous number.)

In many countries, the proletariat participates nominally, more or less, in the election of the government. This is a concession which the BOURGEOIS (i.e., proprietary) class have made, either to avail themselves of popular support in the strife against royal or aristocratic power, or to divert the attention of the people from their own emancipation by giving them an apparent share in political power. However, whether the "bourgeoisie" foresaw it or not, when first they conceded to the people the right to vote, the fact is that the right has proved in reality a mockery, serving only to consolidate the power of the "bourgeois," while giving to the most energetic only of the proletariat the illusory hope of arriving at power.

So also with universal suffrage—we might say, especially with universal suffrage—the government has remained the servant and police of the bourgeois class. How could it be otherwise? If the government should reach the point of becoming hostile, if the hope of democracy should ever be more than a delusion deceiving the people, the proprietary class, menaced in its interests, would at once rebel, and would use all the force and influence which come from the possession of wealth, to reduce the government to the simple function of acting as policeman.

In all times and in all places, whatever may be the name that the government takes, whatever has been its origin, or its organisation, its essential function is always that of oppressing and exploiting the masses, and of defending the oppressors and exploiters. Its principal characteristic and indispensable instruments are the bailiff and the tax-collector, the soldier and the prison. And to these are necessarily added the lying professions of priests or teachers, as the case may be, supported and protected by the government, to render the spirit of the people servile and make them docile under the yoke.

Certainly, in addition to this primary business, to this essential department of governmental action other departments have been added in the course of time. We even admit that never, or hardly ever, has a government been able to exist in a country that was at all civilized without adding to its oppressing and exploiting functions others useful and indispensable to social life. But this fact makes it none the less true that government is in its nature oppressive and a means of exploitation, and that its origin and position doom it to be the defence and hot-bed of a dominant class, thus confirming and increasing the evils of domination.

The government assumes the business of protecting, more or less vigilantly, the life of citizens against direct and brutal attacks; acknowledges and legalizes a certain number of rights and primitive usages and customs, without which it is impossible to live in society. It organises and directs certain public services, as the post, preserva-

tion and constructions of roads, care of the public health, benevolent institutions, workhouses and such like, and it pleases it to pose as the protector and benefactor of the poor and weak. But it is sufficient to notice how and why it fulfils these functions to prove our point. The fact is that everything the government undertakes is always inspired with the spirit of domination, and ordained to defend enlarge, and perpetuate the privileges of property and those classes of which government is the representative and defender.

A government cannot rule for any length of time without hiding its true nature behind the pretence of general utility. It cannot respect the lives of the privileged without assuming the air of wishing to respect the lives of all. It cannot cause the privileges of some to be tolerated without appearing as the custodian of the rights of everybody. "The law" (and, of course, those that have made the law, that is, the government) "has utilised," says Kropotkin, "the social sentiments of man, working into them those precepts of morality, which man has accepted, together with arrangements useful to the minority—the exploiters—and opposed to the interests of those who might have rebelled, had it not been for this show of a moral ground."

A government cannot wish the destruction of the community, for then it and the dominant class could not claim their exploitation-gained wealth; nor could the government leave the community to manage its own affairs, for then the people would soon discover that it (the government) was necessary for no other end than to defend the proprietary class who impoverish them, and would hasten to rid themselves of both government and proprietary class.

To-day in the face of the persistent and menacing demands of the proletariat, governments show a tendency to interfere in the relations between employers and work people. Thus they try to arrest the labour movement, and to impede with delusive reforms the attempts of the poor to take to themselves that which is due to them, namely an equal share of the good things of life which others enjoy.

We must also remember that on one hand the "bourgeois," that is, the proprietary class, make war among themselves, and destroy one another continually, and on the other hand that the government, although composed of the "bourgeois" and, acting as their servant and protector, is still, like every servant or protector, continually striving to emancipate itself and to domineer over its charge. Thus this see-saw game, this swaying between conceding and withdrawing, this seeking allies among the people and against the classes, and among the classes against the masses, forms the science of the governors, and blinds the ingenuous and phlegmatic, who are always expecting that salvation is coming to them from on high.

With all this, the government does not change its nature. If it acts as regulator or guarantor of the rights and duties of each, it perverts the sentiment of justice. It justifies wrong and punishes every act which offends or menaces the privileges of the governors and proprietors. It declares just, LEGAL, the most atrocious exploitation of the miserable, which means a slow and continuous material and moral murder, perpetrated by those who have on those who have not. Again, if it administers public services, it always considers the interests of the governors and proprietors, not occupying itself with the interests of the working masses, except in so far as is necessary to make the masses willing to endure their share of taxation. If it instructs, it fetters and curtails the truth, and tends to prepare the mind and heart of the young to become either implacable tyrants or docile slaves, according to the class to which they belong. In the hands of the government everything becomes a means of exploitation, everything serves as a police measure, useful to hold the people in check. And it must be thus. If the life of mankind consists in strife between man and man, naturally there must be conquerors and conquered, and the government, which is the prize of the strife, or is a means of securing to the victors the results of their victory, and perpetuating those results, will certainly never fall to those who have lost, whether the battle be on the grounds of physical or intellectual strength, or in the field of economics. And those who have fought to conquer, that is, to secure to themselves better conditions than others can have, to conquer privilege and dominion added to power, and have attained the victory, will certainly not use it to defend the rights of the vanquished, and to place limits to their own power and to that of their friends and partisans.

The government—or the State, if you will—as judge, moderator of social strife, impartial administrator of the public interests, is a lie. It is an illusion, a utopia, never realised and never realizable. If in truth, the interests of men must always be contrary to one another, if indeed, the strife between mankind made laws necessary to human society, and the liberty of the individual must be limited by the liberty of other individuals, then each one would always seek to make his interests triumph over those of others. Each would strive to enlarge his own liberty at the cost of the liberty of others, and there would be government. Not simply because it was more or less useful to the totality of the members of society to have a government, but because the conquerors would wish to secure to themselves the fruits of victory. They would wish effectually to subject the vanquished, and relieve themselves of the trouble of being always on the defensive, and they would appoint men, specially adapted to the business, to act police. Were this indeed actually the case, then humanity would be destined to perish amidst periodical contests between tyrannical dominators and the rebellion of the conquered.

But fortunately the future of humanity is a happier one, because the law which governs it is milder.

This law is the law of SOLIDARITY.

(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.

Address "FREEDOM," 26, Newington Green Road, London, N.

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.

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. No. III., "A Talk about Anarchist Communism between Two Workmen," by Enrico Malatesta, 1d., post free, 1½d.; per quire of 25, 1s. 4d. No. IV., "Anarchist Communism: Its Basis and Principles," by Peter Kropotkin, 2d., post free, 2½d.; per quire of 25, 2s. 8d.

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

Received: Publication Fund—A. M., 8s. 7½d.; L. B. M., £1.; W. W., 19s.; E. R. (France), 2fr.

NOTES.

KROPOTKINE'S AMERICAN TOUR.

Our American Comrades will deeply regret to learn that Kropotkin has been forced to give up his lecturing tour in the States. At the very last moment, the agent who had engaged to arrange it notified him that he had failed to do so, and that the plan must be given up.

GREAT ANARCHIST TRIAL AT ROME.

The Italian government have got up their Roman First of May riot case at last, and sixty-two Socialists are standing in the dock accused of conspiracy to realise the Anarchist ideal by violently abolishing existing institutions, especially private property. Most of them are also charged with revolutionary speech-making, revolting against the civil and military forces, stone-throwing, and one of stabbing a policeman in self-defence. Such serious accusations ought in ordinary judicial fairness (such as it is) to be brought before a jury in a criminal court. But no, the authorities could not count upon twelve jurors ready to find the prisoners guilty, and therefore this Constitutional Government, "based upon the will of the people," has brought the case before its creatures the paid magistrates of the police court. The accused are assuming a very bold attitude; almost all declare themselves Anarchist Communists, those who were not so advanced before their arrest having, as they tell the court, become so in prison. They are protesting against being tried by the paid agents of the government, and the public show them hearty sympathy. The president has had the court cleared several times because the on-lookers persisted in applauding the prisoners. The proceedings will probably last about two months. They are making splendid propaganda.

THE BACKWARD MARCH OF GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRACY.

Herr Vollmar in his notorious war speech was not so much of a dissenter from the views of the other leaders of the German Social Democratic Party as its apologists would have had us believe. He was only the first sheep to pass the gap, the rest will follow; at least Bebel's Berlin oration looks like it. In the coming war with Russia, he said, German Socialists must fight in the German army cheek by jowl with the propertied classes. Now, as war with Russia means war with France, we have here the key to Liebknecht's fierce denunciation, at the Brussels Congress, of Domela Nieuwenhuis and his proposal of a general strike in case of war. German Social Democrats, it seems, are far on the road to becoming "loyal citizens" and "good patriots," having, as everyone who has read the unanimous proposals of the Erfurt Congress can see for himself, ceased altogether to be revolutionists. Their patriotic fervour may very likely provoke some reaction among French Socialists, and the upshot of it all must be to show the European working class in general that there is only one genuinely anti-military party—and that is the Anarchist. The Young Socialist Party, who have shaken the dust of Erfurt from their feet and seceded from the reactionaries, seem inclined to lay special stress on this point. It remains to be seen what they will make of their own position.

ANARCHISTS AS TRADE UNIONISTS.

In connection with the discussion on the above subject, which we report in another place, it is interesting to note that Anarchist Communists are already at work in three London Unions. In the Shop Assistants' Union we have many comrades, one of whom, Tochatti, has been recently bound over to keep the peace, in consequence of a disturbance, apparently created by the police for the purpose of arresting him, outside Haile's shop, in Harrow Road. This man Haile is a cheese-monger who, when the early closing movement was started in his neighbourhood, was one of the first to promise compliance, and then, when the other tradesmen had closed, he opened his shop again. The S. A. U. drew up a bill exposing his conduct, and distributed it to all persons passing his shop. He tried to get an injunction in Chancery to stop them, but the court for once was on the side of the exploited and refused it. Then came the police riot and Tochatti's arrest. Our readers may put two and two together....

A Mantle Makers' Union has just lately been organised by Comrade Morgan and another reader of *Freedom*, and our Jewish Comrades at the East End are now organising an avowedly Anarchist Tailors' Union. It looks as if this movement has life and wide possibilities in it.

FABIANS ON ANARCHISM.

At the second meeting of the Fabian Autumn Session, Oct. 2nd, Sydney Olivier read a paper entitled "Socialist Individualism," which, to judge by the tone of the debate on it, was not altogether to the taste of his fellow-Fabians. To outsiders, who had seen nothing but the Webbification of the Society, it was somewhat of a surprise, containing as it did a scathing criticism of the Society's work during the past year. A few quotations from the paper itself, kindly lent by the writer, will show our readers that Fabians may yet be noteworthy for better things than "the manipulation of politics," if they number among them thinking men like Mr. Olivier.

It was first explained that the fact of Mr. Olivier's being able to deliver this "altogether un-Fabian lecture" was owing to the Executive Committee's not having arranged the subjects for this session's papers, but leaving them to the lecturers themselves.

Mr. Olivier asked the audience to attach no importance to labels in general and the title of his paper in particular. "Individualism" is used in a dozen shades of meaning, and all sorts of people profess themselves "Socialists"; the result is a remarkable development of cross purposes. We find self-called Individualists who claim to believe both in the fundamental right of personal liberty and in the beneficence of an unregulated struggle for existence, and who yet demand the maintenance of State machinery for the protection of rights of property. These "rights" are day by day extending, they require corresponding extensions of the province of law and police, and automatically curtail and extinguish the potential or actual liberties of all but those in whose favor they operate. Mr. Froude is a sample of such an Individualist. When lecturing before the Liberty and Property Defence League, he said that he judged Liberty and Property incompatible, and so he elected for Property and its condition—Despotism. At the opposite pole are the Individualists who elect for Liberty, profess themselves Communist-Anarchists, and throw over private-ownership and all that guarantees it. Again, there are persons exhibiting all the characteristics of Individualists who come forward to advocate State-Socialism; just as there are among those calling themselves Individualists active apologists for the maintenance of class distinctions and supremacies, stringent legislation, Tories, slave-drivers. So much for "isms."

Mr. Olivier then contrasted the State-Socialist and Anti-Socialist thus. The State-Socialist regards society, or the State, as being simply the conscious application of power to enlarge the freedom and to multiply the conditions that create self-consciousness, which he maintains can only be attained through the existence and development of society. The Anti-Socialist looks on property as the indispensable matrix of freedom and self-realisation, and would have both society and the State done away with, except so far as they may be utilised for the maintenance and guarantee of property, and the protection of what may be called corporal integrity. Anything beyond this is apt to be denounced by certain Individualists as Socialistic, and so it is, as is all civil and criminal law, there not being, in the lecturer's opinion, a pin to choose in this respect between Mr. Berry and the vestry-man of South St. Pancras.* Be that as it may, Mr. Olivier declares that Socialism is at present the creed of those who are fighting for their own emancipation, of those who are most pressing concerned with the problem of personal freedom, the most definitely conscious Individualists. These [only some of them, surely!], whilst employing the State as the instrument of their conscious aims, contemplate the progressive absorption of its wholesome [?] external sanctions into social habits, so that every known or imaginable State-institution shall in time become superfluous, a condition which presents itself to the mind as pure Individualism or Anarchy. [Rather Anarchist Communism, we should say.]

But it is at the question of property, continued Mr. Olivier, that Socialists and Individualists, commonly so called, part company. The latter confuse personality with personalty. They begin by talking of the products of a man's labor, and of his natural right thereto, and are lost. Freedom in an elementary stage depended on the creation of property. One must appropriate and consume to live, and thereby exclude others from appropriation and consumption. In civil society, the free class has been the propertied one, but for all those whose freedom has been enlarged by property there have been at least as many [far more, we should say] whose freedom has been interfered with by it. This quality of property, its power to create slavery, to give its owner command over the service and earnings of other people, is the cause, more than any other, of its being regarded as an end in itself. In a rudimentary and unorganised society, where sustenance is precarious, man fights for his own position. With us the power of producing necessities is steadily outrunning the growth of population, and that not by individualistic methods, but by a social or co-operative system of industry. The difficulty now lies in the distribution and not in the supply. THIS ALSO MUST BE MADE SOCIAL AND CO-OPERATIVE. If enlightened self-

* There seems to be here some confusion between Socialism and State-Socialism, between Society and the State, which latter we take to imply a society under government. It is quite possible to hold that the complete freedom and self-realisation of the individual can only be obtained in society, and that therefore all conscious effort should be directed to maintaining and developing social existence, and yet to believe that government is useless as an agent in this all-important process, and therefore to regard civil and criminal law, and State interference generally, as Anti-Socialistic, i.e., tending to break up society by destroying the social feeling on which society is based. But as Mr. Olivier does "not understand what Anarchist Communism is," perhaps he has not yet fully grasped this. Ed.

interest has created a social system of production, it can teach us to complete the work on the other side as well. The Individualism that has identified its cause with the institution of property is beginning to pass away. The individual character expressed in Socialism finds its development thwarted by the existing conditions of industrial individualism. Socialism, as Mr. Olivier understands, has nothing to do with Altruism; it does not lead its exponents to regard the poor as a class whose condition can be softened, but as individual men and women with faculties for better self-development. The present age is rapidly producing in increasing numbers, men and women to whom the individualistic pursuit of property seems not only undesirable but repulsive.

The methods of Social Democracy, thinks Mr. Olivier, should be undisguisedly an attack upon the principle of private property through the machinery of political institutions, but to him the process involves much that is distasteful. It is like escaping from prison through a drain. [Pity these folks will persist in trying to escape the back way when they might force open the front door.]

Mr. Olivier invited the Fabians to consider that, should they succeed in vivifying the dry bones of Parliamentary, municipal and parochial political institutions, the average citizen would feel utterly hopeless about tackling the enormous mass of business details through which he must wade, or turn his back upon his duties. Also the enormous army of inspectors and officials which State Democracy will entail upon us, if we are to combat the pestiferous horrors of crowded cities. Will not the Socialist citizen of the future prefer to decamp into the country and so escape from district councils and the scavenging department? And will it not be found that those forms of property and material convenience, which are necessary to make life tolerable in crowded cities, can be dispensed with? In the simplicity of country life, will all this cumbersome administrative machinery be needed? The lecturer then made a trenchant attack upon "duty," as preached by the Fabians, deprecating the notion that the Society summed up in their tracts or otherwise the entire content of Socialism or that Fabian doctrine is quite tainted by any middle-class illusions. No action whatever performed on the compulsion of duty is one quarter so valuable or so enduring as that which takes form as the expression of natural propensity. The concept of duty or moral obligation is appropriate only to the society or period in which authority and servitude subsist. It is more important to promote the increase of Socialists than to multiply imitations of Socialist institutions. The legislative Eight Hours Day, and multiplication of State-regulations, needing inspectors, law courts, prosecutions and punishments to enforce them, if they are not a dead letter, may well do more to extend the jealousy and antagonism, already existing, between the public and its officials than towards the promotion of true Socialist Individualism.

In conclusion the lecturer made an eloquent plea for the return to nature and to a simple and wholesome life, and for a society in which we can meet all men and women on terms of equality and understanding.

In the course of the lecture Mr. Olivier alluded to the fact that since he began to write it he found that two other Fabians, Mr. Belfort Bax, in his last volume of essays, and Mr. Ritchie, in "Principles of State Interference," had written much on the same lines as his paper.

In the "Pioneer" for October, another Fabian, Mr. H. S. Salt, has published an article entitled "Is Socialism Slavery?" in which he seems much inclined to follow the same line taken in the lecture above summarised. The ultimate tendency of the present Socialistic movement is more likely, Mr. Salt believes, to afford satisfaction to the Anarchist than to the drill sergeant. But he sees in our present commercial individualism the most potent destroyer of intellectual individualism, and, from this characteristic standpoint of the man of letters, is disposed to underrate the danger of the submergence of the individual in the levelling uniformity of Social Democracy. He has not Mr. Olivier's wholesome disgust for "the drain." He believes that, to arrive at Anarchist Communism, we must pass through Social Democracy, "going from unjust laws to just laws, and from just laws to no laws." Surely, if we could arrive at just laws, it were impossible to desire to go further; but unfortunately justice and law are—and must always be—incompatible.

On October 16, the Fabians again returned to the subject of Anarchism, G. B. Shaw delivering a lecture on its "Difficulties." These appear to him to lie mainly in Individualist Anarchy, which leaves out of count altogether what the economists call "economic rent." As to the difficulties—nay, social impossibilities—of Individualist Anarchy, we agree with Mr. Shaw, and shall therefore say no more of this part of his lecture. To Anarchist Communism it would appear that he has no serious objections in theory; in fact, he thinks something like it eventually inevitable. The difficulties lie in attaining thereto; and Mr. Shaw apparently also favors "the drain" as the only practicable route.

On the whole, it appears that the vital forces of the Fabians are not yet entirely swallowed up in political manœuvring, that some of them have a vision of better things, and are striving to find a way out. We can only advise them to take to heart Bunyan's immortal allegory of the man with the muck-rake; if they will raise their eyes a little, they may see a less pestiferous exit from the prison of our present social conditions than by the political sewer.

Two things do all we Socialists—Fabians and Anarchist Communists alike—need at this present crisis: moral and intellectual courage to face the whole situation; uncompromising adherence to our own inmost convictions in means as well as in ends.

A correspondent who was present at Mr. Shaw's lecture sends us the following remarks upon it and Fabianism in general.

It was, I confess, not without apprehension that I sat out, one Friday night, Mr. Bernard Shaw's Lecture on the "Difficulties of Anarchism," and I certainly

felt relieved at the end of the speech. If the difficulties of Anarchism, thought I, are no greater than Mr. Bernard Shaw holds them to be, then we may exclaim: Eureka! For really no new doctrine purporting to imply a thorough change in social organisation was ever beset with so few difficulties.

Mr. Shaw's chief objection to Communist Anarchism was about lazy people. But then this objection has been brought forward against State Socialism, in fact every system of social reorganisation. That there will be lazy people in a Communist Anarchistic society, is a sufficiently gratuitous assumption. But that society, however it may be organised, will not find means to avoid being annoyed by lazy people without having resort for the purpose, and for this sole purpose, to the old machinery of coercion and repression—a machinery which is the very source of laziness in society—is to me inconceivable. So far from government being needful on this account, it is the fact that no government can coerce one single man into working in an efficient manner, or indeed into working at all.

Thus Mr. Shaw's great argument against Communist Anarchism falls to the ground, and what remains of his paper is the very important admission that labor is not the measure of cost, that man's share in the social product cannot and ought not to be measured by his particular exertions (Mr. Shaw put that idea in a very forcible way, I wish I could remember his own words). Then there is no other solution of the distribution problem but solidarity and free agreement—that is Communist Anarchism.

But here I must shrink back and express my amazement at one of Mr. Shaw's contentions. The question concerns rare things, say, to employ Mr. Shaw's example, Richmond Hill residences. What shall we do with them in the new society?

Mr. Shaw—and I presume Fabians generally agree with him—would have them let to rich people. Are there, then, to be rich people in a Socialist society? "Yes, there are," said Mr. Shaw. "What will their wealth consist of? what would they live upon?" They would not go eating stale bread and sour butter for years; they would live on the products of actual labor, and their wealth would consist of means of production. Then, if the right be recognised to accumulate wealth, what guarantee will there be that they will be satisfied with Richmond Hill residences, and not try to make use of their accumulated wealth to "buy services?" I think Mr. Shaw admitted the legitimacy of "buying services," and he also admitted the right to start private enterprises, which would exist side by side with State enterprises. If so, who does not see what the end of all such accumulation and exploitation would be? Well, it must be a complete relapse into the capitalistic system.

Of course the question remains, what to do with Richmond Hill residences. Mr. Shaw and his friends would let them to rich people: a Social-Democratic Government would, I am inclined to think, reserve them as an appanage for the Chief Director of Works and Exchanges, or some other high official of the Social-Democratic State. Communist Anarchists think they had better be left to the people who inhabit the place—other people contriving to create equally desirable residences in other parts of the country. If this solution should not prove satisfactory, well, let people agree together and set apart Richmond Hill and other specially healthy places for guest houses where all in turn can get their share of beauty and fresh air, or for convalescent homes and other purposes of that kind—there will be no lack of employment for them to the common advantage.

Thus the two great objections to Communist Anarchism—lazy people and Richmond Hill residences—are disposed of, and, although I am the last man to presume that the difficulties of the system are ended here, yet I may take as proved that, whatever difficulties there are, they may be, with a little good will, easily overcome.

Now I would rather stop my criticism here, and leave my readers under the impression that Fabians are rapidly converting themselves to Anarchism. In a certain sense they are. Unfortunately, in proportion as their doctrines approach ours, their tactics go the opposite way. They resemble such bourgeois writers as Max Nordau, Schaffle, Spencer, Laveleye, etc., who criticise in the most thorough manner existing institutions, only to arrive at some reactionary or paltry-reformatory conclusion. Thus Mr. Shaw and his friends, after having passed the most condemnatory judgment on the present society, even repudiating the eight hours' humbug, conclude with the usual electioneering catchwords—labor representation, payment of members, etc.

Perhaps I am over-bold, but I cannot help remarking the lack of a political Essay beside the Economic, Historic, Industrial and Moral ones in "Fabian Essays on Socialism." It appears to me that Fabians have not gone so deeply into political science as into others.

Mr. Shaw, admitting the possibility of paid members changing their minds and betraying the people, said: if so, one should begin again.

A very hopeful prospect! Mr. Shaw, of course, did not realise the fatal necessity of that event and of its reproduction ad infinitum. Power is, by its very nature, oligarchic; like capital, it tends to accumulate in a few hands. A summary review of the political organisation will prove: 1st. That the centre of political organisation lies not in Parliament, as is generally believed, but in the Executive, in the Government backed by the propertied classes; 2nd. That Government secretes power, just as Capital secretes wealth. Men called upon to represent other people, soon feel a very strong inclination to stick to power and use the opportunity for themselves and their supporters. As a result, no Government ever has been or will be managed either by the people or for the people. This is the very law of gravity in politics.

Local Governments are obviously as bad, if not worse, than central ones. There is only one alternative, abolition of Government, supplying its place by free Associations of Workmen, possessing their own means of labor, regulating their own labor, protecting themselves and distributing the products of labor as they like, with no control whatever by a central committee, with no bureaucratic army or any other army; which is precisely the Communist Anarchist position.

Now Mr. Shaw may call that system "Free Democracy," if he likes; but he will be bound to admit that, thus understood, "Free Democracy" is a quite different thing from what is called Social Democracy or State Socialism; indeed the very reverse of it!

I am far from denying the services which Fabians have rendered to the working classes in this country. We may all learn by Fabian lectures and literature. But I am afraid they are being spoiled by approaching what is called practical, that is electoral politics. Just look at one tract of theirs: "Facts for Londoners." What is proposed there is nothing else than a scheme of conversion of certain businesses now trusted to private Companies, into public enterprises. The City of London should pay the full amount of the capital invested, or pretended to have been invested by the Companies. Such a financial operation might have been proposed by any Liberal or Conservative statesman, even for a less avowable interest than popularity or office. In fact the scheme would have a very dark back side, the rise in the shares, inflation of the nominal capital of the Companies, the speculation in the new loans, etc. Ultimately people would pay more than the actual benefit of a few pennies in the pound off taxation, which is all Fabians promise to them. Then the cost of working up the enterprises by public officials would gradually rise; any diminution of expenses on some such affair would be more than compensated by increased expenditure in other directions. Statesmen have always proposed reduction, and ultimately attained increase of budgets. Finally, would any diminution of taxation benefit the working class, or be taken advantage of by capitalists to increase wages and prices?

These questions Fabians ought to have discussed; and they would have realised that utter futility of reforming schemes under the capitalistic régime, which is (let it not be forgotten) the keystone of Socialism.

S. M.

ANARCHIST MORALITY.

By P. KROPOTKINE.

(Continued from previous number.)

II.

When our ancestors wished to account for what led men to act in one way or another, they did so in a very simple fashion. Down to the present day, certain Catholic images may be seen that represent this explanation. A man is going on his way, and, without being in the least aware of it, carries a devil on his left shoulder, and an angel on his right. The devil prompts him to do evil, the angel tries to keep him back. And if the angel gets the best of it and the man remains virtuous, three other angels catch him up and carry him to heaven. In this way everything is explained wondrously well.

Old Russian nurses, full of such lore, will tell you never to put a child to bed without unbuttoning the collar of its shirt. A warm spot at the bottom of the neck should be left bare, where the guardian angel may nestle. . . . Otherwise, the devil will worry the child even in its sleep.

These artless conceptions are passing away. But though the old words disappear, the essential idea remains the same.

Well brought up folks no longer believe in the devil; but, as their ideas are no more rational than those of our nurses, they do but disguise devil and angel under a pedantic wordiness, honored with the name of philosophy. They do not say "devil" now-a-days, but "the flesh," or "the passions." The "angel" is replaced by the words "conscience" or "soul," by reflection of the thought of a "divine creator" or "the Great Architect," as the Free-Masons say. But man's action is still represented as the result of a struggle between two hostile elements. And a man is always considered virtuous just in the degree to which one of these two elements—the soul or conscience—is victorious over the other—the flesh or passions.

It is easy to understand the astonishment of our great grandfathers when the English philosophers, and later, the Encyclopedists, began to affirm, in opposition to these primitive ideas, that the devil and the angel had nothing to do with human action, but that all acts of man, good or bad, useful or baneful, arise from a single motive: the lust for pleasure.

The whole religious confraternity, and, above all, the numerous sects of the pharisees shouted "Immorality." They covered the thinkers with insult, they excommunicated them. And when later on, in the course of this century, the same ideas were again taken up by Bentham, John Stuart Mill, Tchernischevsky, and a host of others, and when these thinkers began to affirm and prove that Egoism, or the lust for pleasure, is the true motive of all our actions, the malediction redoubled. The books were banned by a conspiracy of silence; the authors were treated as dunces.

And yet what can be more true than the assertion they made?

Here is a man who snatches its last mouthful of bread from a child. Every one agrees in saying that he is a horrible egoist, that he is guided solely by self-love.

But now here is another man, whom every one agrees to recognise as virtuous. He shares his last bit of bread with the hungry, and strips off his coat to cloth the naked. And the moralists, sticking to their religious jargon, hasten to say that this man carries the love of his neighbour to the point of self-abnegation, that he obeys a wholly different passion from that of the egoist. And yet, with a little reflection, we soon discover that, however great the difference between the two actions in their result for humanity, the motive has still been the same. It is the quest of pleasure. If the man who gives away his last shirt found no pleasure in doing so, he would not do it. If he found pleasure in taking bread from a child, he would do that; but this is distasteful to him, he finds pleasure in giving, and so he gives. If it were not inconvenient to cause confusion by employing in a new sense words that have a recognised meaning, it might be said that in both cases the men acted under the impulse of their egoism. Some have actually said this, to give prominence to the thought, and precision to the idea, by presenting it in a form that strikes the imagination, and at the same time to destroy the myth which asserts that these two acts have two different motives. They have the same motive, the quest of pleasure, or the avoidance of pain, which comes to the same thing.

Take for example the worst of scoundrels: a Thiers, who massacres thirty-five thousand Parisians, or an assassin, who butchers a whole family in order that he may wallow in debauchery. They do it because, for the moment, the desire of glory or of money gains in their minds the upper hand of every other desire. Even pity and compassion are extinguished for the moment by this other desire, this other thirst. They act almost automatically to satisfy a craving of their nature. Or again, putting aside the stronger passions, take the petty man who deceives his friends, who lies at every step to get out of somebody the price of a pot of beer, or from sheer love of brag, or from cunning. Take the employer who cheats his workmen to buy jewels for his wife or his mistress. Take any petty scoundrel you like. He again only obeys an impulse; he seeks the satisfaction of a craving, or he seeks to escape what would give him trouble.

We are almost ashamed to compare such petty scoundrels with one

who sacrifices his whole existence to free the oppressed, and, like a Russian Nihilist, mounts the scaffold; so vastly different for humanity are the results of these two lives; so much do we feel ourselves drawn towards the one and repelled by the other.

And yet were you to talk to such a martyr, to the woman who is about to be hanged; even just as she nears the gallows, she would tell you that she would not exchange either her life—of a wild beast hunted by the hounds of the Tzar—or her death for the life of the petty scoundrel who lives on the pence stolen from his work-people. In her life, in the struggle against monstrous might, she finds her highest joys. Every thing else, outside the struggle, all the little joys of the bourgeois and his little troubles seem to her so contemptible, so tiresome, so pitiable! "You do not live, you vegetate," she would reply; "I have lived."

We are speaking, of course, of the deliberate, conscious acts of men, reserving for the present what we have to say about that immense series of unconscious, all but mechanical acts, which occupy so large a portion of our life. Well! In his deliberate, conscious acts man always seeks what will give him pleasure.

One man gets drunk, and every day lowers himself to the condition of a brute, because he seeks in liquor the nervous excitement that he cannot obtain from his own nervous system. Another does not get drunk; he takes no liquor, even though he finds it pleasant, because he wants to keep the freshness of his thoughts and the plenitude of his powers, that he may be able to taste other pleasures which he prefers to drink. But how does he act if not like the judge of good living who, after glancing at the menu of an elaborate dinner, rejects one dish that he likes very well to eat his fill of another that he likes better?

Whatever he does, man seeks a pleasure or shuns a pain.

When a woman deprives herself of her last piece of bread to give it to the first comer, when she takes off her own scanty rags to cover another woman who is cold, while she herself shivers on the deck of a vessel, she does so because she would suffer infinitely more in seeing a hungry man, or a woman starved with cold, than in shivering, or feeling hungry, herself. She escapes a pain of which only those who have felt it know the intensity.

When the Australian, quoted by Guyau, wastes away beneath the idea that he has not yet revenged his kinsman's death; when he grows thin and pale, a prey to the consciousness of his cowardice, and does not return to life till he has done the deed of vengeance, he performs this action, a heroic one sometimes, to free himself of a feeling which possesses him, to regain that inward peace, which is the highest of pleasures.

When a troop of monkeys has seen one of its members fall in consequence of a hunter's shot, and comes to besiege his tent and claim the body, despite the threatening gun; when at length the Elder of the band goes right in, first threatens the hunter, then implores him, and finally, by his lamentations, induces him to give up the corpse, which the groaning troop carry off into the forest, these monkeys obey a feeling of compassion stronger than all considerations of personal security. This feeling in them exceeds all others. Life itself loses its attraction for them whilst they are not sure if they can restore life to their comrade or not. This feeling becomes so oppressive that the poor brutes do everything to get quit of it.

When the ants rush by thousands into the flames of the burning ant hill, which that evil beast, man, has set on fire, and perish by hundreds to save their larvæ, they again obey a craving to save their offspring. They risk everything for the sake of bringing away the larvæ that they have brought up with more care than many women bestow on their children.

Finally, when an infusor escapes a too powerful ray of heat, and goes in search of a tepid ray, or when a plant turns its flowers towards the sun, or closes up its leaves at the approach of night, these beings still obey the need of shunning pain and seeking pleasure; just like the ant, the monkey, the Australian, and the martyred Christian or Anarchist.

To seek pleasure, to avoid pain, is the general line of action (some would say, law) of the organic world.

Without this quest of the agreeable, life itself would be impossible. Organisms would disintegrate, life cease.

Thus whatever a man's actions and line of conduct may be, he does what he does in obedience to a craving of his nature. The most repulsive actions, no less than actions which are indifferent or most attractive, are all equally dictated by a need of the individual who performs them. Let him act as he may, the individual acts as he does because he finds a pleasure in it, or avoids, or thinks he avoids, a pain.

Here we have a well established fact. Here we have the essence of what has been called the Egoistic theory.

Very well, are we any better off for having reached this general conclusion?

Yes, certainly we are. We have conquered a truth, and destroyed a prejudice which lies at the root of all prejudices. All materialist philosophy in its relation to man is implied in this conclusion. But does it follow that all the actions of the individual are indifferent, as some have hastened to conclude? This is what we have now to see.

(To be continued.)

CRIME AND ITS ABOLITION.

ONE of the ordinary objections to Anarchism is this: "What are you going to do with robbers and murderers?"

If we answered that we were going to make honest folks of them under Anarchy, people would laugh in our faces. Yet what else is there to do? To murder them, as was so constantly done in the past and is still done now and again to-day, is useless. To fling them into a cell and leave them there to rot, to ferment, and to communicate the germs of criminality to younger persons is not a course to be recommended either. More especially as with the wrong-doers, and more than the wrong-doers, innocent creatures are thereby smitten; creatures who depend upon the criminals for their subsistence or are attached to them. And still more especially as after taking from the unhappy wretches themselves all human sentiments by isolating them from society, these sentiments must also be taken from the wardours, judges, police, detectives, pettifoggers, and all the crew who live at the expense of the criminals.

What then is to be done with criminals? Set them to work in prison or send them to cultivate the soil in some distant land? But in this case a number of people would be tempted to commit crimes to escape hunger and lack of employment. There is then no other alternative; we must resign ourselves to converting criminals into honest folks. How?

Oh, it would not be so very difficult, if we had only to consider the criminals who appear before the law-courts. Merely the sum now spent on trials, police and prisons, would more than suffice to redeem from poverty and ignorance the men, whom to-day we are so eager to punish and thus rivet closer and closer the links of crime.

The evil is that the number of criminals is far greater than appears from judicial statistics; in truth it is almost as great as that of the members of society.

Applying the same criticism to the poor and the rich, calling murder murder and theft theft, as bread is called bread and wine wine, the deed of the capitalist who knowingly sacrifices the lives of his workmen by exposing them to accidents or forcing them to toil which consumes their strength or paying them starvation wages; the deed of the landlord who takes rent for filthy dens or turns out a poverty-stricken family into the street; the deed of the usurer who hunts to death the wretches who fall into his clutches; the deed of the shop-keeper who sells damaged goods, or profits by the poverty of the worker to exact more for the goods he lets him have on credit; the deed of the wealthy sensualist who buys a girl to ruin her, and of the voluptuary who deserts her whom he has seduced—well the deeds of all these persons, and many others, do not differ from the deed of the criminal who kills some one for the sake of some meagre booty. Or if they differ, it is by the former being still less excusable.

Crime is not, as is generally believed, an exception in our existing society; it is the rule. We have all sinned and are sinning; no one has a right to cast the first stone at the criminal. Whence it follows that the remedy for crime must not be sought in the suppression nor even in the regeneration of a class, but in the reform and in the renovation of the whole of society.

For a long while men have maintained that criminals could be terrorised and eliminated by penalties; but crime is perpetually reproduced. The reason is that the germ of criminality is in ourselves, in our feelings, in our prejudices, in the institutions we have given ourselves. Have we ever realised how criminal is public opinion? Is it not public opinion, that is to say all of us collectively, who steel the hands of the mother against her illegitimate offspring? Is it not we who inculcate revenge upon the husband disturbed in the peaceful possession of her whom he considered his property? Is it not we who day by day do homage to more or less shady smartness in business amongst the wealthy, to their ambition, their pride, their idleness? Is it not we who often exact lying and untrustworthiness in our social intercourse? We who every day, by word and example, throw contempt upon the weak and do honour to the powerful, thus inspiring others with a contempt for justice, truth and solidarity, with selfishness, hatred, envy and the vilest sentiments?

In truth, those who sit in the jury-box at assizes are more responsible to those at the bar than *vice versa*; the former should shrink from the very thought of making the latter responsible for crimes in which all society has been instigator and accomplice.

In ninety cases out of a hundred the crime was absolutely an inevitable necessity for him who committed it. A man is insulted. If he takes the insult patiently his mates will be the first to blame him; worse still they will look upon him as a coward. If he submits peaceably to a second insult, they will despise him, they will be all set against him, they will make him their butt. On the Continent a gentleman who is insulted *must* fight a duel (not very long ago this was the case in England also), and a poor man must fight too, in the poor man's fashion. Only the law practically allows gentlemen to fight their duel with impunity, whereas the like offences of poor men are punished.

Yet the poorer a man is the more need he has to insist on respectful treatment, by showing himself resolved to avenge insults which the law cannot punish, or which it punishes too tardily, or which the rich may always venture upon with impunity. In countries which are not yet entirely corrupted by civilisation it is the young man who guards the "honour" of the family; it is he whom public opinion charges with the defence of his sisters' inexperience from the attempted seduction of the rich idler, and the old age of his parents from the insults or trick-

eries of those who have to do with them. In Italy this feeling has given birth to the associations known as Mafia and Camorra, and has been one cause of brigandage.

There is no doubt that in our present society crime often acts as a check upon injustice; that is to say legal crime serves to hinder a far greater amount of non-legal crime. A workman who is so badgered by his overseer that he ends by killing him, may lay some claim to have acted as the executor of social justice. Which proves that to suppress crime the constitution of society must be changed from top to bottom.

THE PROPAGANDA.

REPORTS.

London.—Successful open-air meetings have been held in Regent's Park, on Sunday mornings and afternoons, addressed by Barlas, Nicoll, and others; also in Walworth, Tottenham, etc. At the Co-operative Hall, Touzeau Parris has lectured on "Bakouninism" and on Anarchism. A lecture by Quelch, S.D.F., on the Brussels and Newcastle Congresses, at Phoenix Hall, elicited a vigorous discussion. The lecturer's criticism of Anarchism being severely handled by several nominal Social Democrats, who considered his treatment of the subject ignorant and unfair, and by Comrade Hyde. The Berner Street Club have held several very successful meetings last month. Oct. 12 (Jewish Day of Atonement) a large freethought meeting was held at the Hall of Science, addressed by Standing, Foote, etc., and by our comrades W. Wess, and Yanovsky, who took occasion to press Anarchism upon the audience, as true freedom of thought.

Leytonstone.—Towards the latter part of July, several Anarchists in Leytonstone thought they would form an agitation group. By the time August arrived they were in a good organised position. Meetings were held at Ilford, a town about four miles from Leytonstone, at Wanstead, a town about a mile and a half away, and Woodford Bridge. These meetings kept up for about a month, whole piles of Anarchist literature was distributed amongst men while at work and when they had done slaving. People began to wonder what it was that was invading the district. They however soon understood what was being said: "Anarchy, disorder, confusion," etc. One Sunday, while I was at Woodford, comrade Jane held a meeting on Wanstead Flats on the prohibited portion. He was eventually summonsed, but owing to a technical error he did not appear and the summons was not enforced. The week following another meeting was held in the evening, at which Goulding and Jane spoke. No notice was taken of this by the authorities. The succeeding Sunday another meeting was held on prohibited ground. Goulding spoke first; when he got down he was asked his name and address; he refused, but he was sufficiently known; he was not arrested but summonsed. Andrews followed. He got down while the squabble was on between Goulding and the forest keeper and no notice was taken of him. Jane next made a good speech. He was asked if he still lived at the same address; he refused to say, was arrested, was brought up on the following Monday and remanded till Saturday, when both charges were heard. Good speeches were made by our two comrades. Reports appeared in most of the Sunday papers, and in all the dailies on Monday, as well as in the locals. Jane was fined £5 and costs or two months. He is doing the two months, one has already elapsed. Goulding was fined 40s. and costs, or one month. On the following Sunday sufficient money was collected to get Goulding out; he had two nights and one day at the expense of the State. Meetings are still being held on the prohibited ground. Ordinary meetings at Ilford, Wanstead, and other places have dropped through lack of speakers.—H.A.

PROVINCES—

Norwich.—Sunday, Sept. 27, a good meeting was held at St. Faith's. Comrades Chapple, White, and Poynts were present and took part. In the afternoon comrade Merlino spoke in the Market Place to a good audience, assisted by Lenney and Poynts. Comrade Merlino dealt with the question of Anarchism at some length. The evening meeting at the Club had been looked forward to with interest by all comrades, when it was known that Louise Michel would be present. Our comrade entered the hall at half-past seven, where a large audience was assembled, notwithstanding a charge being made for admission, her appearance causing an outbreak of enthusiasm. Comrade Poynts, as chairman, having made some introductory remarks, called upon Louise Michel, who ascended the platform amidst great applause, and spoke at considerable length. Every attention was paid to our comrade during her speech, which was translated by Dr. Merlino who said he was proud of the splendid address just delivered, but that it must of necessity suffer in translation from his limited knowledge of the English language. Louise Michel during her speech said that there was no doubt about the possibilities of Revolution, but if we were not prepared for it, we would after its accomplishment fall into the same mistake which had come about after all attempts at reform. It was in order to prevent this, and to ensure the bringing about the new system of society, that she and her comrades were engaged in the work, and were prepared to advance their cause, which was for the good of the people, at the risk of their liberty and lives. She was content to live and die so that those who came after her might experience the blessings of Anarchy. It was a good sign to see so many young men joining Anarchist societies, for it showed a spirit of humanity. The work was rapidly going forward, and would be in good hands if the young continued to be to the front to carry on the work when she and others were gone. She was forced to advocate revolution owing to the present state of things, it was no choice of hers, but a necessity. She did not advocate crime and bloodshed, but owing to the present state of society, she advocated force to carry out the principle of revolution. Anarchy, she said, meant brotherhood, etc., no more crushed classes. War, yes, against the master, not against their brethren; she believed that they were right, and that truth would triumph. Comrade Poynts then asked for criticism, but met with no response. Louise Michel then spoke a few words in conclusion, and accepted a large bouquet of flowers as a souvenir of her visit. Merlino then spoke, followed by Gustave Mollet, comrade Poynts bring the meeting to a close. Louise Michel has promised us another visit later on, this one having been so very successful.—Our club goes on well, over sixty members belong to it now. But at Christmas we shall have to look out for new premises, as our ideas do not suit a Tory Landlord. We expect to get it warm here shortly through Mowbray's attack on the Labour Candidate for Norwich. The Liberal party are afraid that they will lose the seat at the next election through us. We are going to give the Candidate a warm reception on his appearance in public.

Hull.—Again we have astonished many people in Hull by the extensive and practical propaganda which a group of earnest men can carry on. The Sunday Association has held five large meetings, in one of the largest halls in the town, on Social questions. Their speakers being Cunningham Graham, T. Wing, and DeMattos. Ben Tillet also lectured twice, and in his evening lecture on "Man's Individual Responsibility," advocated decentralisation in politics, and mutual aid, in grand style. No Anarchist could plead more powerfully against the doctrine of payment "according to deeds." Ben certainly leaves many professed Socialists in the rear. It seemed to us that he spoke under the direct influence of Kropotkin's writings. We followed by organising a meeting in the same hall, the Alhambra; Comrade Chas. Reynolds lectured on "Revolutionary

Socialism," and gave a first-rate address. George Cores and Gustave Smith then spoke in favour of the following resolution, which was carried without one dissentient amidst great applause. "This meeting of Hull workers being of opinion that nothing short of the entire abolition of the present system of capitalistic monopoly will benefit the toilers, pledge themselves to do all in their power to bring about the Social Revolution, thereby destroying both master and slave, and giving to all the enjoyment of the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Our collection amounted to £2 14s. Our string band played during the evening and concluded the meeting with the "Marseillaise." Comrades George Cores, C. Reynolds, and others, have held good outdoor meetings during the month on Drypool Green.

Gt. Yarmouth Socialist Society.—On Sept. 27th Comrades Louise Michel and Dr. Merlino came to cheer us up a little, in the morning on the Hall Quay. There was a very good attendance, considering we did not know our comrades were coming until Saturday 26th, and therefore had no time to advertise them. Meeting began by Headley introducing Louise Michel to the audience, giving a brief account of her famous life and heroic action in the Paris Commune. Louise Michel, who spoke in French, was well received, her address being afterwards translated by Merlino, who also gave a short account of Anarchism on the Continent. In the evening on the same place, a surprise awaited us in the person of Comrade Tipping, of Merton Abbey, who, assisted by Headley, addressed a meeting of 500 or 600 persons. Sale of papers for the day, 3/4; Collection 3/-. On Tuesday Merlino lectured in the St. George's Board School on "Trade Unionism on the Continent, there was a fair attendance. Several papers gave very good reports of the lecture, which will help to spread discontent. Poyns was in the chair. Several questions were asked at the close. Oct. 4th, free distribution of revolutionary literature in the morning and afternoon. In the evening large and interesting meeting on the Hall Quay addressed by Paul Pry and Headley. Plenty of opposition by Scotch fishermen of the Leatham type. One contended that we could not do without policemen. On being asked if he would do any harm to the community if there were none, he said, "No, but other persons would." Nothing like plenty of self-esteem. Oct. 11th, inclement weather, large attendance in the club. 17th, Social Gathering in the Club Room, Comrade Thorpe supplied the music, revolutionary and other songs were sung by Messrs. Thorpe, Moody, Beales, Copley, Headley, and H. H., until 3 a.m. On the 18th, as the weather was far from favourable, we renewed the concert, which was again continued until a late, or rather, early hour. Six new members have joined during the month. During the last three weeks we have had Comrade Thorpe with his dulcimer in the Club Room every evening, which has drawn the members together a little better; the music will be continued during the winter months. Fair sale of *Freedom*, *Commonweal*, *Sheffield Anarchist*, and other literature. We are also getting an increased sale of the *Freethinker*.

Aberdeen.—In-door work has commenced here in earnest. The Large Odd-fellows Hall has been engaged for three months of Sunday night lectures. Sunday Oct. 4th, Comrade Creaghe of Sheffield, visited us and delivered a splendid address on "Home Rule or No Rule" to an audience of over 200. At this meeting the Social Democrats were in great force and did their level best to spoil the discussion, but only succeeded in parading their ignorance. The following Monday we had an enjoyable social meeting. Sunday Oct. 11, Comrade H. H. Duncan lectured on "Why the Working Class is the Poor Class," and was well received, as was also Comrade Adder's lecture on "Better Days for the Working People" the following Sunday. The discussions following each of the above-named lectures tended to show that, whatever it may be elsewhere, in Aberdeen at least the opposition to Anarchy is of a very shallow character indeed. Every time we have had to oppose the Social Democrats we have been successful. In fact we have succeeded so well that our opponents have begun to fling mud, i.e., they say, "The Anarchists won't be able to pay for their Hall" (which after all would not be a serious crime, but we are both able and willing to pay for it). "They have taken the Hall by underhand means, etc., etc.," and when publicly asked to prove their assertions, they distort and wriggle among big words, using the double shuffle which goes with Parliamentary action, and threaten to chuck into the dock the questioning Anarchist who stands alone in the centre of a howling crowd. We are, nevertheless, and we are proud of it, surely and rapidly undermining the Social Democratic position. Our open-air work goes on as usual, good meetings being held in Castle Street, on Thursday nights and Sunday afternoons.

Dundee.—Oct. 4th, Comrade William Cameron opened an adjourned debate on Socialism v. Individualism in Lally Street Hall. During the debate some of the State Socialists declared that some individuals would have £50 per week under their system, others more and others less. Cameron asked them who was to decide that the labour of the architect was of more value to the community than that of the mason, or whether the labour of the man who wrote a book was of more value than that of the man who swept a street, but received no answer; he also pointed out that State Socialism was majority rule, and if masons, bricklayers, labourers, etc., were in the majority and declared that they should be higher paid than artists, architects, musicians, etc., the latter would have to submit to it. In reply to a question put by Cameron, an individual namer Aimer said that under State Socialism a man might save a £1000 or more, but would not be allowed to leave it to any person and that when he died his money must go back to the State. On being asked if rent was robbery he said "yes, but not when paid to the State." Another State Socialist named Guthrie, declared that the "Wage System" (Kropotkin's) had shown him the absurdity and impossibility of estimating the value of a man's labour by money payments or labour checks. The same individual thought there would be a difficulty under Anarchism to get men to work at disagreeable and dangerous occupations, but Cameron pointed out to him, that even under the present system, there was no lack of volunteers to run the risk of going down a coal-pit to rescue those who had been buried alive when an explosion occurred. The discussion on the whole was very lively.

Dublin.—At Socialist Union, Oct. 1st, M. Weichsleden delivered an address on the "Social Question" to a good audience, King, T. Fitzpatrick, Hamilton, Kavanagh, and others, took part in the discussion. The recent death of the ex-leader of the Irish Parliamentary Party has resulted in a gush of sentimentality, which when past we hope may leave room for a little thought concerning serious questions in Ireland.

Cyril Bell writes from the International School, London:—

"Your Leicester correspondent seems to be offended at the 'Bakounism' with which our Sheffield comrades are smitten. I think he is wrong. Our Sheffield comrades are not smitten with any 'ism' but with Anarchy; we are Anarchists, and to be logical Anarchists we must be also Atheists. God is but a supernatural symbol of forced rule down here. Personally, if I could believe in a God, I should logically also believe in an earthly ruler. Anarchy on earth and in heaven, hell also for the matter of that. Our Sheffield comrades are also free lovers, believing in natural marriage. Free love may be Bakounism, but it is Anarchy. Anarchy means no law, and therefore includes no marriage law." "Atheism and free love then being logically included under Anarchy how can the Sheffield comrades, who only profess to be Anarchists, be 'discussing topics unconnected with Socialism,'—Anarchy being a form of Socialism." "Materialism is the logical religion of Communism, as it is typical of (all

things being one universe) all men being one brotherhood. Free love is also Communism, as it does away with property in female flesh."

"It may be hard for some comrades to give up all their old superstitions about law, property, marriage, gods, and such like baubles, but I wish my Leicester comrades *Bon Courage*, and write in no spirit of anger. By-the-bye, I should say the Sheffield men introduced A-theology, not theology."

CONFERENCE OF LONDON ANARCHIST COMMUNISTS.

On Sunday, October 25, about 60 Anarchist Communists from different parts of London, assembled in the Socialist Co-operative Hall, 7 Lamb's Conduit Street, by invitation of the London Socialist League and the Freedom Group, to discuss the following Agenda:—I. Our attitude towards existing trade and labor unions. Is it consistent and advisable for Anarchist Communists to join them? If yes, what position is best to be taken up by comrades within such organisations? II. What use can we make of the coming election? III. The carrying on of Anarchist Communist propaganda by means of lectures, discussions and literature in the various workmen's clubs; the issue of an Anarchist Communist Lecture List. IV. The desirability of comrades proclaiming themselves everywhere Anarchist Communists. V. The advisability of having a monthly meeting of London Groups.

The discussion was opened by W. Wess, who urged the desirability of taking up active work amongst trades unions. A workman's best chance of spreading his ideas must necessarily be amongst his mates. At present an Anarchist Communist who belongs to a union merely sends up his subscription by post, and does not even take the trouble to enquire whether the money is used for a parliamentary committee or making a god of some leader by sending him into the House. Those Anarchist Communists who have taken an active part in organising labor unions have even been cried down by comrades as reactionaries. But as a matter of fact trade unions did originally adopt revolutionary tactics and theoretically they are based on the principle of self-reliance. Lately they have been turned aside by Social Democratic influence and there is a danger they may be converted into mere electioneering engines. S. Merlino pointed out that the aloofness of English Anarchists from the main current of the English Labor Movement had been visible in the indifference of the English Labour delegates about the Anarchist question at the Brussels Congress; whereas the wire-pullers did not dare to exclude him (Merlino), knowing that the Italian delegates identified the Anarchist cause with the Italian Labor Movement and would have retired with him. E. Malatesta gave a short sketch of the Spanish Labor Movement, saying that in all the great towns but two it was identified with Anarchism; and Kropotkin added some details and remarked upon the readiness to be interested in Anarchism which he had noticed amongst Trade Unionists in the North of England.

Mowbray dwelt on the arbitrary and despotic elements which had crept into and depraved Trades Unionism and the need to counteract them. Nicoll, Cantwell, Turner, Tochatti, and other comrades followed up the line taken by the previous speakers. After an earnest discussion, it was unanimously agreed that Anarchist Communists would do well to belong to their respective trades unions, just as they belong to their respective propagandist groups, and to take every opportunity to spread their views amongst their fellow workers. In cases where they find no possibility of doing this, it would be best to work up a new union on definitely Anarchist lines. It was suggested that the best thing an Anarchist Communist could do would be to take part in all serious discussions and meetings within his union, about matters affecting its special aims and tactics, handling each subject from a distinctly and avowedly Anarchist standpoint; and further to do his best to promote weekly or fortnightly educational discussions upon labor questions amongst the members of his union; but above all to lose no opportunity of combating the evil principle of authority, the rule of the executive, election of presidents, etc. It was also agreed that Anarchists would do wisely to avoid office. It was settled that a manifesto should be drawn up to set forth Anarchist Communist views upon Trades Unionism, the Eight Hours Bill, and other matters now agitating the Labor movement. The draft will be published in *The Commonweal* (it is not ready in time for this number of *Freedom*) that all comrades may consider it carefully before the next Conference, which will be held on Sunday, Nov. 22, at 3 p.m., in the Hall, 7 Lamb's Conduit Street, W.C. Comrades unable to attend the Conference, who wish to make any suggestions, are invited to write to W. Wess at the *Freedom* office, or T. Cantwell, 7 Lamb's Conduit Street, W.C.

The rest of the agenda was held over for full discussion at the next Conference, but it was decided that a leaflet should be drawn up to deal with the coming general election; also that a lecture list should be published. Comrades able and willing to lecture are invited to send their names and subjects to W. Wess, *Freedom* office.

Seven shillings was collected, of which three shillings went to defray expenses and four shillings was given towards the expense of sending an Anarchist speaker to Brighton.

NOTICES.

Chicago Commemoration Meetings.

London.—See front page.

Yarmouth.—Nov. 7, Hall Quay, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m. Fish Wharf, 3 p.m. Nov. 11, Club Room, 8 p.m. Address by Headley—"Our Comrades," to conclude with appropriate songs.

Hull.—Nov. 8, Alhambra, Porter Street, 7 p.m. Speakers, G. Smith, G. Cores, A. Hall, C. Reynolds, G. Naewiger.

Dublin.—Nov. 12, 87 Marlboro' Street, 8 p.m.

London.—Open Air, Sunday, Regent's Park, 11 a.m. and 3 p.m. Hyde Park and Victoria Park, 3.30 p.m. Walworth, 7.30 p.m. Saturday, Hyde Park, 7.30 p.m. Thursday, Hoxton, 8.15 p.m. The Hall, 7, Lamb's Conduit Street, lecture, every Sunday at 8 p.m. A ticket benefit for the Berner Street Club will take place at the Pavilion Theatre, Nov. 19. "East Lynne" will be performed. Tickets, 6d., 1s., and upwards, can be obtained of Anarchist Clubs.

Hull.—Cobden Hall, School Street, Nov. 1, 2.30, J. Sketchley "Evolution and Revolution." 6.30, G. Cores "The Coming Revolution in England." Nov. 8, 2.30, Mrs. Sanderson, "The Position and Prospects of Women." Nov. 15, 6.30, Mrs. Sanderson, "The Claims of My Sex." Nov. 29, 2.30, G. Smith, "Anarchism: Order Without Government." Open-air meetings on Drypool Green, at 11 a.m.

Aberdeen.—Large Odd Fellows' Hall, Lecture every Sunday at 6.30 p.m. Business Meeting, Small Hall, Sundays 8 p.m. Open-air meetings in Castle Street, Sundays, 2.30; Thursdays, 8 p.m.

Dublin.—87, Marlboro' Street, Nov. 5, A. J. Kavanagh.