

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. 5.—No. 61.

DECEMBER, 1891.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY

EQUAL FREEDOM.

"ANARCHISM is equal freedom" most truly writes the Newcastle correspondent, whose essay on "Anarchism and Trades Unionism" we print in another column. But can we ever reach equal freedom, as he seems to imply, by a system of limitations, by preaching "Hands off?"

We are social animals living in society; can we ever attain the fullest possible scope for our thoughts, feelings, and actions by drawing, as it were, a little circle of exactly the same size round each and saying: "Inside this line you have absolute license; it is only by putting your foot over the line and trespassing inside your neighbour's boundary that you will do wrong?" If everybody could be persuaded to adopt this attitude, should we secure the greatest amount of freedom possible? Nay, should we secure even equality?

If this conception of the position of individuals in society corresponded to fact, its necessary consequence would be that the more the population grew, the less liberty could there be for individuals. The more folks on the ground, the narrower the circle of limitation round each. We have frequently heard Social Democrats arguing in favour of government on this ground, and, apparently, our Newcastle correspondent accepts it, as he argues that two have necessarily less liberty than one. A wretched prospect! For as human nature evolves, it demands more and more space for development, and never have men been so impatient of restraint as to-day.

But before we lament this narrowing of life as inevitable, let us look at the facts of experience. A little reflection will show us that as individuality develops and demands a wider scope for individual initiative in all directions, the evolution of social life continually opens up fresh possibilities of individual self-realisation, continually makes more and more room for the individual to be himself.

We have not too much liberty to-day, but what would the man of to-day feel if he were not allowed to speak as he likes about his ideas, nay to think as he likes, if his fellow-men should find out about his thoughts? Yet it is not so many centuries since the individual was forced, on pain of death, to speak and think along a given line; since men and women were burnt in London streets for their opinions. Still more, what would the man of to-day feel if he found himself in a savage horde, where almost every action of his life was regulated by a tyrannous code of custom, and the smallest breach of tribal etiquette might cost him his life or expulsion from the little community in which alone he could find safety? Insupportable slavery we should say. But in the earliest stages of social life each little group of human beings found itself in face of the ill-understood and unsubdued forces of external nature like an outnumbered army in face of the foe. The only safety lay in cohesion, and dread made men cruel in their suppression of individual initiative. It was only as the development of co-operation, brought a sense of power and security, that the terms of association became more and more voluntary, allowing larger and larger scope for individuality.

Larger scope, not only in the absence of arbitrary restraint, but in the increase of opportunity. The primitive man, as compared with the man of to-day, is like a spider with only one thread to run on, as compared to a spider, who across the same space has a great web of numberless threads, and can go in any direction he pleases. For every fresh line opened up by human activity makes fresh opportunities for new developments. The more people the greater variety of companionship, of occupation, of interest; the larger the possibilities of human life for each.

It is only by co-operation that social animals attain to freedom, and the more intelligent and thorough-going the co-operation, the fuller the freedom. Freedom to the gregarious animal does not mean being placed in an empty void, it does not mean absence of contact; that would wholly cut off its possibilities of living out its life. And freedom means living out one's life to the fullest extent of the possibilities of one's nature. It means opportunity for self-development. The greater the opportunity, the completer the freedom.

It is plain, then, that to create and develop freedom, we human beings must actively co-operate, not passively leave each other alone. And this becomes only the more apparent when we consider the utter failure of the "Hands off" policy in securing equality in such freedom as has been gained.

The early Radicals (see, for instance, Mill's fine essay on "Liberty") believed in drawing the little circles we were talking about. There are

actions, they said, that directly concern only the individual—"self-regarding" actions—wherein justice to his fellows only demands that he shall allow every man the same license as himself. If he does so, the equal liberty of all is secured. The Radicals thought, however, that governments would be always needful to keep each man within his circle, and also to regulate those actions which directly concern public interests. Our Newcastle comrade does not see this necessity, but herein seems to us to lie the only difference between his moral and political theory and theirs.

Now, in our opinion, he could hardly have chosen more instructive examples of the inadequacy of this position than two of those he has taken to illustrate it.

The Luddites, he thinks, were morally wrong in forcibly protesting against the action of the initiators of industrial machinery, because every man is free to invent, and they might have gone and invented too—if they could.

In like manner the trades unionists are wrong to protest against blacklegs, because every man is free to work, and the unionists might go and work on starvation wages too—if they chose.

Now, we have had about a century in which to observe the outcome of the action of those men who introduced industrial machinery, and I suppose there is not a thoughtful man in the country who will not admit that it has been most disastrous. There is no one who will not admit that the immense increase of man's power over nature has been accompanied by a terrific and a needless crop of human misery. In other words, the exercise of what our correspondent calls the "equal freedom" of the introducers of the new methods of working has brought about the slavery of the workers. It has been one main cause of the conversion of self-employed workmen into wage-slaves and of all the resulting social evils.

And this happened because these men (the inventors and the capitalists who ran their inventions) ignoring the enormous debt they owed to their fellow workers past and present, without whose labours they could neither have made their inventions nor utilised them, said to themselves: "These improvements are ours; we have made them, we have a right to monopolise them, to make all we can for ourselves out of them, and no one else has a right to say a word. What if the new methods which we thus keep in our own hands cut the ground from under our fellow workers' feet; are we our brothers' keepers? Let them find new methods better than ours, or become our slaves: that is their look-out."

But the results are likely to be the look-out of all society, to press like a burden of lead upon the shoulders of the descendants of these men, who enslaved their fellows by their actions as surely as if they had put fetters on their limbs by armed force.

Who, think you, were really standing for the equal freedom of all individuals—the men who introduced the monopoly of machinery, or the Luddites who rose and protested: "You are unsocial. You are setting at naught the co-operative relation between human beings, and taking advantage of our necessities to climb on our shoulders!"

Or, take the blackleg. He is a man who not only asserts his equal freedom with all other men to work, but, stifling his social sense of solidarity with his fellows, chooses to go and work at such a time and place as will prevent them from being able to arrange decent conditions of work for themselves. Nay, more, he is a man who, under pretence of asserting his undoubted claim as a human being to work, deliberately ranges himself on the side of the very men who, more than any others, prevent their fellows from being able to work as they choose—i. e., the monopolists of capital—and against the men who, however, short-sightedly, are struggling for the equal freedom of labour.

Who, think you, is standing for the equal freedom of all men—the trade unionist on strike, or the blackleg?

Assuredly, every one is free to invent; assuredly, every one is free to work; assuredly, every one is free to join a trades union, or not to join it. But if any man invents, or works, or associates, or does not associate himself with others in such a manner as callously or deliberately to take his fellow men's opportunities from them and leave social feeling out of his conduct, most assuredly he does not know what personal freedom means. And those he injures, be they one or many, are in the right to tell him so. For there is no such thing as "self-regarding action." Not only every act, but every word, every thought, every feeling of each man tells upon the lives of all around him. And it is only by mutually agreeing to aid one another in every possible way to expand our lives that equality in freedom—or any freedom worth the name—can be secured to each and to all.

THE CHICAGO ANNIVERSARY.

THE fourth anniversary of the martyrdom of the Chicago Anarchists has been celebrated in Great Britain by a series of meetings in London and the provinces.

LONDON MEETINGS.

These were this year, as last, entirely organised by the Anarchist Groups, the platforms occupied by Anarchist speakers, and chairmen and formal resolutions dispensed with. The vile weather greatly interfered with the open-air meetings on Sunday, Nov. 8; but all five indoor gatherings were well attended and successful. The meeting at South Place Institute

on Nov. 11th was crowded and most enthusiastic. The platform was draped with red, the "Freedom" and Leytonstone group flags hanging on either side and our new banner, whereon Comrade Schütz has so artistically painted "Anarchist Communism", occupying the centre. The meeting was opened by the reading of the letters and telegrams given below. Then the speeches began.

W. WESS: It is remarkable how these meetings become more and more thoroughly Anarchist every year. At first those assembled were mostly moved by a feeling of generous sympathy with the murdered men; now throughout the world large audiences meet with a sense of conviction to uphold and spread the ideas for which those men died. And right through the history of the Labor movement no events are more suited to propagate Anarchist-Communism than those of the 11th November, 1887. During their whole lives our Chicago comrades acted like men worthy of the ideal of Anarchism. They began, as most of us have done, as Social Democrats, thinking the people might hope some amelioration of their lot from elected representatives. But before long, thought, insight, and bitter experience showed them the utter illusion of such notions and that the people must trust only their own united might to achieve their own salvation. So our comrades crystallised their Socialism and became thorough Anarchists; for Anarchism is but a crystallisation of Socialism from which every vestige of dishonesty, of politics, of domination and of wire-pulling is squeezed out. And as true Anarchists they have shown us that to realise our ideal we must work on and on, persistently, regardless of obstacles. Our comrades had the confidence of the Chicago workers; not obtained by high-flown promises of useless palliatives to be gained by putting Socialists in office. None of the Chicago Anarchists were presidents, officers or committee-men even of labor societies. They fought like loyal soldiers in the ranks in the great labor battle, and it was their unflinching, uncompromising attitude, their earnestness, activity, devotion, that so recommended their ideas to their fellow-workers. They have shown us that the most effective means of advancing Anarchism is to prove by deeds our sincerity to its cause, and when the opportunity comes to seal our deeds by giving our lives as heartily as they did.

S. MERLINO: On the 11th November, 1887, when the news of the execution came from Chicago, it was felt that an important event had taken place. Many people who didn't care about Anarchy, at once realised that a cause for which these men had given and others were prepared to give their lives must win. The life of Engel (of which the speaker gave a short outline) is representative of the life of thousands and thousands of workmen. He became firstly a Socialist, then an Anarchist, always remaining the same straightforward, sincere man, who wished the emancipation of the working classes, and nothing for himself. There is a tendency to accuse the police and capitalistic class of throwing the Haymarket bomb. But they are so overburdened with every-day murders, that five or eight more or less don't condemn or save them. There is no need of legal quibbles: if our comrades had thrown not one but 200 bombs, and had been killed in the battle, we should honour them as we honour the people who fought in the Paris Commune. The feeling of indignation and revenge, which the sight of wrong awakens in sensitive men, is a social progressive force, and must be made use of. When a man is prepared to give his life for the cause, he should be left to choose his own opportunity, especially as we do not know what may come out even of a small beginning.

TOUZEAU PARRIS: We have met to-night to commemorate not the dead but the living. Our comrades live in the principles for which they died and for these principles it is ours to live, by speaking them and by acting them. They lit the torch of enthusiasm, we pass it on. Their work was short, ours may be longer. Those who put them down lived for property, we live for men. Is it not a task greater than that of ruler, poet, or artist, to lift the downtrodden, the deformed, the poor into a higher plane, and to bring happiness to them also. There is a parable which tells how the sick waited beside the pool till the angel should come and trouble the waters. Our dead martyrs have troubled the commercial pool. Their life and death have proclaimed to us anew that the real secret of religion is to tie men not to God, but to men. There is part in this work for all; all can help to bring love and fellowship and happiness into the lives of men. They talk of an eight hours day. Let us see to it that less than eight hours shall buy food and leisure and time for thought. We have had enough of government. The task of the thoughtful is not to govern but to teach. We will have not the spirit of lordship but of humanity. Is it a small thing to live for such a cause? It is not too much to die for it. Read, think, live out the best thoughts and the victory shall be yours.

P. KROPOTKINE: The longer we live, the nearer we approach that supreme moment—the Social Revolution—when civilised mankind will have to make a new departure in civilisation, and the more we see how right were our brothers when they gave their lives for the grand ideas of Anarchy. Socialists who have adopted a different policy are continu-

ally driven by the force of circumstances to become the tools of the ruling classes in keeping things as they are. The International Working Men's Association was formed for the economic struggle against capitalism, but at the Hague Congress, in 1872, the very Socialists who had helped to form it proclaimed that it must consist of national parties, for political struggles, instead of one international party for the direct economic struggle. That was the death of the old International. Again a great international economic movement has begun amongst the workers with the general strike for its aim. Again this year, at the Marxist Congress at Brussels, political socialist leaders have put their foot on the direct struggle against capitalism, and have done their utmost to turn the International labor party into a number of mercenary political factions, ready to sell themselves to Conservatives or Liberals, or to the German Emperor, for the promise of some petty reform. A war, not for bread, but for seats. Instead of the great principle of international solidarity, the German Social Democrats are preaching war against the starving millions of Russia. Where is the Socialism in all this? Thrown to the winds. Were not our Chicago Comrades right in despising politics, and saying the struggle against robbery must be carried on in the workshop and the street, by deeds not words? Were they not right in their conviction that Anarchy is the only possible revolutionary program? That a revolutionary idea may grow, the revolutionists must be free in thought and word, not hampered by the necessity of pleasing leaders, or politicians, or they will form their ideal on the past with some slight reforms, retaining past institutions, like representative government, wage-system, etc.? That revolutionary action may grow, there must be no discipline to hinder initiative; but no party can be the party of the future whose members—while each acting upon his own responsibility—do not bear always in mind the interests of all. Mistakes may and will be made, but such mistakes are a thousand times preferable to the timidity of time serving, disciplined parties seeking power. Exaggerations will be toned down by time and experience, but the habit of thinking and acting, each for himself but always combining consideration of the interests of all with his thought and action, will remain. It is this which has been the soul of past revolutions. It is this which will make that great Social Revolution to which we look forward for the satisfaction of the deepest cravings of human hearts.

A. HENRY: We are here to-night to commemorate the murder of the Chicago martyrs and to propagate the cause for which they suffered death. They were murdered for what the world calls a "crime." From the Anarchist point of view a crime is either some wrong done by one who is naturally too weak to withstand the evil influences by which he is surrounded, and then he is more sinned against than sinning; or it is rebellion against the state of things which now exists, against injustice, tyranny and oppression. This rebellion is right and the Chicago martyrs were such rebels. So long as there have been wealth and luxury on the one hand and poverty and misery on the other, there have been rebels. When a man rebels for a common cause, for and with his fellows, and with a sure hope and faith in the possibility of a better state of life, the rebellion in the end is sure to conquer. It is manly to rebel, and slavish to submit, but we shall never get the masses to rebel until we have shown them what it is they have to fight against. There can be no equality or brotherhood until *private property*, the root of all material inequality, and *government* have been abolished. What does government do for us? Does it help to till the land? or procure us food or clothing? or social enjoyment? or any good thing? No. It simply taxes us to provide the propertied classes with policemen and soldiers to protect that property of which they have robbed the workers. Policemen are men like ourselves, merely the slaves of the system based on private property. Why not make Anarchists of them? and of the soldiers too? I honour the man who becomes a soldier simply that he may spread Anarchism.

D. J. NICOLL: The Chicago men were murdered for their honesty and Anarchism, for disregarding political shams, and telling the people to boldly help themselves by taking possession of the means of production. Politics and political leaders only diddle and betray the workers. [Here some Social Democrats objected to the instances of the like given by the speaker.] Our Chicago comrades did their best to spread the spirit of revolt. If they had thrown the bomb, they would not have been to blame, nor would anyone who had thrown one at the police in Trafalgar Square.

LOUISE MICHEL (translation from the French): The dead who cry to us to-day are the unknown masses dead from misery, from starvation of mind and body. It is they whose cry stings us to revolt. The little band of martyrs who died in Chicago died gloriously for a grand cause. The grim monster of capitalism must perish, his gold must be flung to the wretched. It is from a feeling of humanity that I tell you that the time is come to crush the monster—or the monster will kill mankind. We have talked too much, we have lulled ourselves with our own words; we must act. Like our martyrs, like the Russians who have fallen in the struggle against the Tzar, like Reinsdorf who fell beneath the axe, like those of Chicago, whose blood has spread throughout the world and will raise up hosts to fight the battle of humanity. Anarchy is humanity. Let each one of us act. In the Great Day women will have as much to do as men. Let every one take on himself the responsibility of his actions. For all there is work.

S. YANOVSKY (translation from Yiddish): The Chicago Anarchists were Internationalists, hence we may well speak of them in the International Yiddish tongue, which may be considered indeed cosmopolitan since the Tzar has driven forth the Jews who speak it to wander through the world. We celebrate to-night not only the death of our comrades but the birth of Anarchy; since they died Anarchy is being

recognised everywhere. They were murdered not as criminals, but simply as Anarchists; and their murderers hoped to kill Anarchism, but the workers are learning more and more to whistle at all laws and follow the teachings of their martyrs who knew neither law nor government. It was our comrades' experience of the misery of the people which made them Anarchists, and whilst that misery lasts their ideas will live and prosper. An instance of the barbarity bred by commercialism: A poor servant girl, weary of her life, flung herself to a bear, and then, horrified at what she had done, struggled to escape. The owner, standing by with a gun, let her be torn to pieces, because, as he explained at the inquest, he did not care to kill an animal worth more than the girl's life! As Anarchists our comrades strove for equal freedom, and not to enslave one class for the sake of another, like the Social Democrats. If any one comes to you preaching moderation, point to the gallows of Chicago. It is for us to spread the ideas for which our comrades died; and before long we shall be meeting, not here, but in great masses in the streets, to strike the final blow for the liberation of humanity. But beware of new rulers.

C. W. MOWBRAY: We have heard much of brotherhood here to-night, but hate and vengeance are as necessary. The soldier is taught to hate the enemies of his country; let us teach our children to hate the rich and the rulers. It is not the rank and file of the Social Democrats whom we attack, but the leaders in high hats. That these may not betray the movement we must teach the people not to let their own work be done by others. Those who leave the work to a few propagandists have not learnt the lesson taught by the death of our heroic comrades.

CYRIL BELL (Autonomie French Group): If a man is well off, an aristocrat of labour, a bourgeois, or a brain worker, he can afford to say, "Right, and justice will prevail." But some of us have wives and little ones crying to us for house, clothes, and bread; some of us do not know what regular work is. We have stomachs, and when empty they tell us to think. We think, and we find that, on the whole, right and justice are nothing without might on their side. All in this hall believe that Anarchy is right, but yet it does not prevail, for capitalism has might on its side at present. We of the hungry lot do not look forward to a revolt in the future, but a revolt to-day—a revolt from the moment we become Anarchists. We know that all men can revolt by refusing rent to robber landlords, by refusing payment to robber shopkeepers whose goods we take when we want them, by refusing to be married before the law, and by many other means. Revolt begets imitators. In towns like Edinburgh Anarchist speeches are mild and philosophic, and few are Anarchists; but in places like Sheffield, Aberdeen, and Hull, where men set a good example and speak in an inflammatory style, the people listen more readily. The man who threw the bomb at Chicago should be celebrated rather than those who did not; that bomb echoes round the world. Many of us are hypocrites, denouncing law and property, and yet having property or not taking what we need. Why not celebrate Pini or Duval? This very day, 11th Nov., 1891, there is a far more terrible murder, which we never think of enough, and which we encourage by not individually revolting against it. This murder is caused by fever slums, by overwork, by want of food, by the general misery of the workers who live to 29 years instead of 70. Some men have an idea that the revolution will be an affair of a day, but we Nihilist Anarchists think the revolution is in each individual, and that it is an affair of years. Do not hope for a future rising, but live to-day up to the motto, "If you want liberty, act as if you had it."

J. TOCHATTI: I protest against wild and reckless talk about dynamite and pillage. Self-defence is justifiable, but not the needless use of violence. Let us have the fierce love of liberty our Chicago comrades had, and explain our noble principles in the clear and telling way they did, so that in the event of a crisis we can strike with confidence.

After a few words from Comrades LEGGATT and FROELICH, the meeting ended with some hearty cheers for Anarchy.

LETTERS AND TELEGRAMS RECEIVED AT THE MEETING:

Comrade Marsh, being prevented by illness from speaking at South Place, wrote as follows:—"We do not meet here only to commemorate an act of capitalistic barbarity, however much our indignation may be aroused by the remembrance of that unspeakable crime of 1887. If our only aim was to denounce the crimes of the present system, we should meet here every day of our lives. The truth is the present system is past denouncing; no honest man feels satisfied with the state of things around him. We find people are turning in all directions to find some loophole of escape from the tortures of our present life. There is no peace to-day for those who care anything for humanity. Let us, then, without fear, examine the causes of the misery which surrounds us, and decide for ourselves what is best to be done. We ask you, therefore, who are not Anarchists to watch in your everyday lives the evil workings of Government; to watch how its stupid laws stifle human development, driving it into crime; to watch how it helps the strong and crushes the weak; to note how those who are "wrapped in a little brief authority" not only make the angels weep, but make poor humanity bleed. Then you will see that freedom—a life without government and law—must be our aim, because man lives best where he is freest."

The English-speaking group of Anarchists in Paris wrote:—"Fraternal greetings to our comrades on the other side of the Channel, who, like us, will celebrate the event which took place four years ago on the other side of the Atlantic. The meeting of the English-speaking group here will not, of course, be very large, but they will console themselves with the knowledge that so many larger ones are being held elsewhere, and that the memory and the effect of the event they celebrate are growing stronger every year. Their meeting will not be the only meeting held in France. The ideas, for preaching which the men of Chicago were martyred, are being rapidly spread and eagerly accepted, not only in Paris but all over France. Ere long they hope the workers all the world over will burst and throw aside their chains. Vive la Revolution Sociale! Vive l'Anarchie!"—Paris, Nov. 10.

"Hail to the pioneers of liberty. They lead the way, the world will follow."
—Manchester Anarchist Groups.

"Walsall Anarchists join in remembering murdered Chicago comrades, and look hopefully for speedy success of social revolution and triumph of Anarchy."

"Sheffield comrades join in celebrating the despicable murder of our comrades in Chicago. The rope that strangled them is now strangling their murderers. Hurrah for Anarchy!"

"A greeting from Newcastle. The voice of freedom strangled in Chicago will yet thunder through the world. Vive l'Anarchie!"

"Hurrah for Anarchy; down with tyranny! Greetings from Anarchists of Hull."

"Dublin comrades join with you in commemorating the legal murder of our Chicago martyrs. Vive la Revolution Sociale!"

Collection, £3 2s. 4½d. Expenses, £5 10s. 10d. Received towards deficit: Club Autonomie, £1; Group Vorwärts, £1.

Local Meetings

were held at the International Working Men's Club, Berner Street, Nov. 7th; Autonomie Club, Nov. 8th; Scandinavian, Nov. 9th; Forward Club, Hoxton, Nov. 10th, where good meetings were addressed by Comrades Wess, Barlas, Henry, Weinberg, Rutenberg, Yanovsky, Nicoll, Trunk, Gunderson, Mowbray, Bell, &c., &c.

PROVINCIAL MEETINGS.

Edinburgh.—Nov. 11th, Scottish Socialist Federation. James Connelly opened the proceedings with a sketch of the events that led up to the Chicago tragedy. He concluded with a truly eloquent appeal to those present to put their heart and soul into the great work that lay to their hands, and by their efforts for the cause raise the grandest possible monument to those who had given up their lives for it. Comrades John Smith, Glassey, Gilray, Mellet, Campbell, Leslie, and Hamilton also spoke. "Annie Laurie," "The Carmagnole," Pierre Dupont's "Song of the Workers," and other Revolutionary songs were sung. A Russian comrade rendered "The Marseillaise."

Dublin.—Owing to the inclemency of the weather, the Chicago Anniversary was not so successful as in previous years. Nordbohm, O'Gorman, T. Fitzpatrick, and N. H. Fitzpatrick delivered addresses.

Bristol.—Two meetings have been held in commemoration of the death of the Chicago Anarchists. On Monday 9th Nov., a large and enthusiastic meeting was held in the Shepherd's Hall, when Comrades Maur King, D. Irving, J. Wood (S.D.F.), and E. J. Watson delivered addresses. On Monday Nov. 16th, another large meeting was held in the Maudlin Street Schools. The room was packed to overflowing. Speeches were delivered and revolutionary songs given, Watson's commemoration chant, "The Martyrs," being sung by the entire company.

Aberdeen.—The murder of the Chicago Anarchists was commemorated Nov. 8th by a splendidly large meeting in the large Oddfelloes Hall, where Comrades McFarlane, Oddie, Duncan, and Shepherd spoke. Comrades Fraser and Duncan sang appropriate songs, and others recited.

Great Yarmouth.—Tuesday Nov. 10th, a large meeting was held in the Market Place, at 7 p.m., addressed by Comrades Creaghe, Poyntz, Emery, and Headley. The meeting continued until 8, when we adjourned to the Gladstone Hall, where we had a most successful meeting, although the audience was not so large as we expected. Speeches were made by Emery of Norwich, Poyntz of Norwich, and Creaghe of Sheffield, who, in a splendid address, denounced the capitalist tyranny of the so-called Free Republic of America. (Rest of report held over.)

Hull.—On Sunday, Nov. 8th, we had the most successful meeting ever held by our party in Hull. More than 1800 workers had assembled in the Alhambra Palace, which is one of the largest halls in Hull, to listen to speeches delivered in vindication of the principles of Anarchism, for which, as was pointed out, our Comrades of Chicago were murdered. Comrade Charles Reynolds opened the meeting with a lengthy and impressive speech, then Comrade Gustave Smith moved the following resolution: "That this meeting of Hull workers expresses its entire sympathy with the relatives and friends of the Chicago Anarchists—George Engel, Adolph Fischer, Albert R. Parsons, August Spies, and Louis Lingg—who, while working in connection with the eight hours' movement of 1886, were seized and brutally killed by the Democratic Government of America, on November the 11th, 1887, protests also against the continued imprisonment of three others—Samuel Fielden, Michael Schwab, and Oscar Neebe. And, while believing in the innocence of those men, so cruelly murdered in cold blood, and imprisoned for daring to take the side of the workers against their enemies the capitalists, applauds all resistance, whether individually or collectively, to physical force attack on the peoples' liberties. This meeting further pledges itself to vindicate the memory of those martyrs of labor by studying those principles and teachings for the propagation of which they were killed and imprisoned. This meeting is also of opinion that the poverty and enslavement of the working classes is the consequence of the present unjust system of society, whereby an idle landlord and capitalist class enriches itself at labor's expense. This meeting also takes the opportunity of commemorating the four men—Linnell, Camel, Curwen, and Harrison—mortally wounded by the police in Trafalgar-square on November the 13th 1887, while asserting there the right of the people to hold meetings in London's great open air town-hall"—which was carried unanimously.

Correspondence.

A comrade from the Leytonstone group sends us some remarks upon Anarchy, from which we quote the following:—

"Anarchists are generally accused of being illogical fanatics, inconsistent and individualistic. Anarchists are more or less individualistic."

Are all men's minds the same?

No! Man has control over his own mind, over his own thoughts, not over the minds or thoughts of others. The mind is the foundation of the man; all actions take place through the mind; no man can tell what another intends doing, he only knows what he himself intends doing. Man's most essential thing is his individuality.

Anarchism, we are told by persons who know nothing about it, has no foundation, it emphasises the individual too much. What foundation is required for building a house? The earth. What foundation is required for the building of society? The answer is the individual.

Anarchists are only called illogical because they say it is impossible for political parties to solve the economic condition of the people. It is a well-known fact that for hundreds of years men have formed parties, and they have said that parties must exist in order to solve the social problem. Political parties in some cases have been persecuted, in others have flourished; but in all cases they have failed to do any good. Look at the large number of parties in existence now; what are they all doing? Fighting and abusing one another instead of working for the better and higher social condition of man as a social animal, hence Anarchists need not be afraid that they cannot prove their case. Facts have proved it for them, the very state of society to-day shows that Anarchists are logical in their contentions.

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.

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., 1s.; H. G., Cape Colony, 10s. Pamphlet Fund—H. G., 18s.

NOTES.

THE ANNIVERSARY IN CHICAGO.

Despite the pouring rain, 3000 persons assembled outside the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* office on Nov. 8th, and marched to the Waldheim cemetery, with red flags flying. Henry Weissman, editor of the *Bäcker-Zeitung*, and Moritz Schultze, editor of the *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, spoke fervently and eloquently, in English and German, beside the Martyrs' graves. The capitalist clique were disgusted to find sympathy with Anarchy so much alive. With the Great Exhibition coming on, they don't wish Chicago and Anarchism identified. Their press expressed much surprise, and on the 11th the police surpassed themselves. They invaded a most orderly and magnificent commemoration meeting at Turner Hall, and broke it up by insisting—with pointed revolvers and clubs—on hoisting the blood stained "stars and stripes" above the red flag. The next evening they burst into Greif's Hall, where two ordinary business meetings were going on: the Socialist Publishing Society ("Arbeiter-Zeitung" Group) up stairs, and the Branch 160 of the American Brotherhood of Painters and Decorators below. Regardless of Mrs. Greif's agonised entreaties that they would not terrify her sick daughter, the police smashed the doors and windows, broke open the drawers where various trade societies kept their banners, books, &c., torn up the flags, and after shamefully insulting and illtreating all present (18 up stairs and 20 below) at both meetings and searching them, they arrested 23, three of whom were found to carry pistols. All this without any provocation. The sick girl has since died. The prisoners are being brought before the magistrate as we go to press.

THE EVOLUTION OF AUSTRALIAN SOCIAL DEMOCRACY.

The Labor Party achieved a sweeping victory lately in New South Wales. They have a virtual majority in the House; nevertheless, the new Minister has succeeded in choosing a whole Cabinet of capitalists, the Finance and Trade Secretary being the shipowner who helped to defeat the last maritime strike. How does this come about? Just because in New South Wales they have already one of those "Safeguards of Labor and of Liberty" for which our Radicals and State-Socialists are clamoring. Their M.P.'s are paid each £300 a year, and now the Labor Members, majority though they be, dare not lift a finger, for fear the Minister should dissolve Parliament and they lose their salaries, and they have no fancy for a return to the workshop.

Meanwhile, the Socialist party, completely demoralised by its political success, has turned its back on the Social Revolution. The Socialist League has evolved into the Labor Electoral League, and voted that all known Anarchists be turned out; that all revolutionary speaking at League meetings be forbidden; that no further part be taken in the unemployed agitation; that no worker who has a "criminal record" (no matter how obtained) shall be allowed to speak in public!

ANARCHIST COMMUNISM IN AUSTRALIA.

The unabashed retreat of the Social Democrats has been of good service in clearing the ground for Anarchist Communism. Andrews and other comrades are forming an energetic group and preparing to start a paper. Good luck to their efforts.

SOCIALIST LITERATURE FOR POLAND.

There is a considerable Socialist movement amongst the Polish workers, though we regret to say it is still trammelled by the superstition of democratic government. "The Dawn," a Polish Socialist paper, very revolutionary in its teaching, is now published weekly in London, and a society has been formed amongst the Poles in London for secretly introducing this paper and other Socialistic literature into Poland. They ask us to draw attention to their appeal addressed not only to their own country men abroad and to all Russian revolutionists, but also "to all friends of liberty, in the name of the development of European culture, to aid in overturning the foulest band of miscreants who have ever usurped the name of government." All who are interested helping in the work are desired to communicate with Stanislaus Mendelson, editor of "The Dawn," 27, Stonor Road, West Kensington.

A FABIAN ON "THE DRAIN."

H. S. Salt writes concerning the article "Fabians on Anarchism," in our Nov. issue:—"I affirm that my detestation of 'the drain' is not less than Olivier's or anyone else's, but it is no question of choosing between the drain and the front door, for we are in the drain already,

and the alternative appears to be to creep onwards (painfully and even ignominiously, I admit) down the ever-widening passage, or to rise suddenly to one's full stature and crack one's crown against the ceiling. I deprecate the latter method as injudicious; though I have more sympathy with the spirit of those who practise it, than with those who crawl contentedly and snuff the miasma as they go." Mr. Salt is very smart; but for our part we feel dubious as to the growing width of the passage or of its ever leading into the pure air, and prefer to risk a few knocks in our search for a "main hole."

LIBERTY OF OPINION IN THE GREAT REPUBLIC.

The Boston capitalists threaten to boycott Walter Crane's picture exhibition and himself because he spoke at a Chicago Commemoration.

THE NOVEMBER CONFERENCE.

The second monthly meeting of London Anarchist Groups was held on the 22nd Nov., and was well attended. The draft of the proposed manifesto, which is now being published in the *Weal*, was read, and after some discussion it was agreed that all comrades who have additions or alterations to propose should bring them to the next meeting. On the suggestion of Comrade Pearson (Newcastle Com. An. Group) it was decided to hold the next meeting on Dec. 27th, so that country comrades in town for the Christmas holidays might be able to attend. Time, 3 p.m. Place, Hall, 7, Lambs Conduit Street, W.C.

REVOLT OF TENNESSEE MINERS.

The coalminers of Briceville, Tennessee (United States), have recently shown how Giant Labor *can*—if he *will*—attain his right demands. Here is the plain story. Briceville is a place where there are neither avowed Anarchists, nor so-called Social Democrats who are unconscious Anarchists, nor are there any conscious Social Democrats beating away the political drum. There is, however, greedy capitalism.

Two coalmining companies, the "Tennessee Mining Company" and the "Knoxville Iron Company," arranged with a contractor, who had hired the lease of the whole of Tennessee, to employ his convicts in their pits, in place of their ordinary miners—naturally at a much lower rate of pay. Barracks and palisades were erected, and the convict laborers introduced, with the result that no less than 3000 miners lost their daily bread. About the middle of July last, the miners threatened to release the convicts, whereupon the Mayor of Tennessee intervened and promised to call a special sitting of the legislature, expressing his assurance of a decision in the men's favor. So they agreed to wait.

The Mayor and legislature, however, decided they could not interfere with the contractors, and that there was no disadvantage in employing convicts; furthermore, they severely censured the men for daring to complain at the action of the companies.

"Well," said the starving miners, "you were mean and brutal enough to take away our only means of subsistence with your criminals—thieves, burglars, and robbers—now we answer a 'tooth for tooth,' set them free, let them loose upon yourselves!"

And on the evening when their Union committee brought them the result of the appeal to the legislature, and counselled them to go patiently and quietly home, the men dispersed without a murmur; but in the middle of that very night, a couple of thousand miners, summoned by signal torches, assembled round the palisades and barracks, armed with guns and determination, and without much ado set at liberty all the convicts, supplying each one with civil clothing. Then they drove away the guards without injuring them, and burned down completely the barracks and palisades.

The miners' action has met with general sympathy. And indeed it is the very type of true revolutionary action; at once direct, united, bold, and humane.

ROMAN "JUSTICE."

(From an Italian Correspondent.)

It would be hard to find in the judicial records of any country more scandalous proceedings than those of the magistrates who, during the past month have been trying our comrades at Rome.

Here are the facts.

Let us bear in mind that the chief accusation against the prisoners is the formation, before May 1st 1891, of a criminal conspiracy against government and property. The main piece of evidence as to this is the Anarchist Conference held in December, 1890, at Capolago.* And yet it is denied that this "crime" is POLITICAL in character!

Of course, only very few of the accused attended at Capolago at all: and it is proved that there was no proper Anarchist organisation in Rome. A few of the accused actually kept entirely aloof from the movement, as for example the student Spadoni, who, although an Anarchist and formerly the editor of an Anarchist paper, "La Campana," was at the time entirely absorbed by University work. To meet this case, the police have instituted a special category of members of the organisation; i.e., "isolated members"! Thus Frattini—the man who threw a bomb some time ago and declared himself an Anarchist, although he had no connection at all with the Anarchists—is represented by the police reports as an "isolated member" of the pretended anarchistic organisation!

Space fails to relate all the stupid devices of the police to excuse, if possible, the gratuitous persecution of our comrades.

Such devices are so flat, so foolish, that they only show up the game of the government, and increase public indignation.

As to the accused, they have taken the only attitude which suited them under the circumstances; they have tried to make the position of their

* See *Freedom of March*, 1891, for full report of Congress.

paid judges as uneasy as possible, to let them feel that they were the vile instruments of a political vengeance. Day by day, during their examinations, they have vindicated the principles of Anarchy, shown reasons why the present system must be overthrown, and declared their own readiness to use every means in their power to make room for a better society. Their speeches, reported at length in the bourgeois papers, have made such an extensive propaganda all over Italy, that at present it may be said of almost the whole country as one of the accused said of the province of Carrara: "even the marbles in the mines are Anarchists."

Of course, this result could not please the government; and it was stated that in the future more forbearance would be enforced upon the accused.

But, when the hearing of the witnesses for the prosecution began, it was felt that the excitement was only likely to increase. In fact, those witnesses—all police-agents—were not satisfied with swearing falsehoods as to the events of the 1st of May, but actually tried to convey the idea that the Anarchists might have, if not concurred in, at least benefited by crimes against property (especially, falsification of notes) which had often been committed in Rome.

Such very gratuitous insinuations the accused would not let pass without strong protests; and the scene that followed, in which, as usual, the public as well as counsel for the defence took the part of the accused, was one of so wild a character that the sitting had to be closed.

Next day, when the court opened, the prisoners' dock was empty. Counsel for the defence asked what had become of their clients, and to their astonishment they learnt that the court intended to proceed with the trial in the absence of the accused.

The President even explained that a decision in that sense had been come to by the court at the end of the preceding sitting and had been read out in the presence of all parties concerned.

This statement was denied by counsel for the defence (some of whom are well known public men, M.P.'s, and so on) and by the public; nobody in fact had any suspicion of any such decision, nor was there any trace of it in the press-reports. Moreover, the counsel for the prosecution had to admit that he had not heard it read, although he remained to the last moment in the court. But a more stringent proof of the non-existence of such a decision was that, as one of the accused had been confined to his cell by illness, he had the *procès-verbal* of the sitting read to him, and no mention was made of the decision.

Therefore it was a falsehood palmed off by the judges upon the very men they were called to try and condemn.

Astounding as the fact may appear to those who still believe in Justice, there is no other meaning to be put on it.

Even the bourgeois papers have been obliged to recognise the exceptional gravity of this proceeding.

However, the court persisted in their intention to try the case out of the presence of the accused; but counsel for the defence withdrew, at the same time, putting in a formal complaint of forgery against the judges and the clerk. And the trial had to be adjourned to another session, counsel for the defence being personally sentenced to bear the costs.

It is said that further criminal proceedings will be taken against the accused and their counsel for insulting language; but on the other side Parliament will be called upon to deal with the affair.

And now contrast this trial with that which has just taken place at Massana. There some officers and government officials were accused of wholesale massacre and plunder of poor natives under the most frightful circumstances. The facts have been ascertained by a Parliamentary Commission: yet the court has acquitted every one. Oh, Anarchy of Justice! Oh, justice of Anarchy.

ANARCHIST MORALITY.

By P. KROPOTKINE.

(Continued from previous number.)

III.

We have seen that men's actions (their deliberate and conscious actions, for we will speak afterwards of unconscious habits) all have the same origin. Those that are called virtuous and those that are designated as vicious, great devotions and petty knaveries, acts that attract and acts that repel, all spring from a common source. All are performed in answer to some need of the individual's nature. All have for their end the quest of pleasure, the desire to avoid pain.

We have seen this in the last chapter, which is but a very succinct summary of a mass of facts that might be brought forward in support of this view.

It is easy to understand how this explanation makes those still imbued with religious principles cry out. It leaves no room for the supernatural; it throws over the idea of an immortal soul. If man only acts in obedience to the needs of his nature, if he is, so to say, but a "conscious automaton," what becomes of the immortal soul? What of immortality, that last refuge of those who have known too few pleasures and too many sufferings, and who dream of finding some compensation in another world?

It is easy to understand how folks who, having grown up in prejudice, and with but little confidence in science, which has so often deceived them, folks who are led by feeling rather than thought, reject an explanation which takes from them their last hope.

But what are we to say of those revolutionists who, from the last century down to our own day, each time that they have heard for the first time of a natural explanation of human actions (the egoistic theory, if you like), hasten to draw from it the same conclusion as that young Nihilist we were speaking of, and eagerly cry: "Down with morality!"?

What are we to say of those who, on being persuaded that man only acts in one way or another in answer to a need of his nature, hasten to conclude that *all his actions are indifferent*; that there is no longer either good or evil, that to save a drowning man at the risk of one's life, or to drown a man for the sake of his watch are two equally worthy acts; that the martyr dying on the scaffold after laboring for the freedom of mankind and the petty scoundrel stealing from his comrades are one as worthy as the other,—as both are seeking to please themselves.

If they further added that there must be no good and evil odours; neither perfume of the rose nor stink of *assa fetida*, because both are nothing but vibrations of molecules; that there must be no good and bad tastes, because the bitterness of quinine and the sweetness of the guava are also nothing but molecular vibrations; that there is neither physical beauty nor physical ugliness, neither intelligence nor imbecility, because beauty and ugliness, intelligence and imbecility are again but the results of chemical and physical vibrations operating within the cells of the organism; if they added this, we might say that they were raving, but that at least they possessed a madman's logic.

But as they do not say this, what must we conclude?

Our answer is simple. Mandeville, who reasoned in this way in 1724 in his "Fable of the Bees," the Russian Nihilist of 1860—70, and some Parisian Anarchists of our day reason thus, because all unconsciously they are still sticking fast in the mire of prejudice, the prejudice of their Christian education. However atheistic, however materialistic, however anarchistic they believe themselves, they are reasoning exactly as the Fathers of the Church or the founders of Buddhism reasoned.

This, in effect, is what those worthy elders used to say: "An action will be good if it represent a victory of the soul over the flesh; it will be evil if the flesh has overcome the soul; if neither, then it will be indifferent. *Only by this can we judge if the action is good or bad.*" And our young friends go on repeating after the Christian and Buddhist Fathers: "Only by this can we judge if the action is good or bad."

The Fathers of the Church said: "Behold the beasts; they have no immortal soul; their actions are performed simply in answer to the needs of their nature; *this is why* there can be neither good nor evil actions amongst beasts; all are indifferent; and this is why for beasts there is neither heaven nor hell, neither reward nor punishment." And our young friends take up the refrain of St. Augustine and Cakyamouni, and go on saying: "Man is but a beast, his acts are simply performed in answer to the needs of nature; *this is why* there can be neither good nor evil actions amongst men. All actions are indifferent."

It is still this accursed idea of punishment and penalties that comes athwart the reason; it is still this absurd legacy from religious instruction, teaching that an act is good if it springs from a supernatural inspiration, and indifferent if the supernatural origin is wanting. It is still the same old idea, even amongst those who laugh at it the loudest: the angel on the right shoulder and the devil on the left. "Drive away the devil and the angel, and I cannot tell you if such and such an action is good or bad, for I do not know of any other test to judge it by."

The parson is everlastingly there with his devil and his angel, and all the materialistic varnish does not suffice to hide him. And, what is still worse, the magistrate is everlastingly there too, with his award of the lash to one and his civil recompenses for another, and even the principles of anarchism are not enough to uproot the idea of punishment and reward.

Well now, we want neither parson nor magistrate. And we say simply: Does *assa fetida* stink? Does the snake bite me? Does the liar deceive me? And the plant, the reptile, and the man are obeying a need of their natures? So be it! Well, I, for my part, also obey a need of my nature in hating the plant that stinks, the reptile that kills with its venom, and the man who is still more venomous than the animal. And I shall act in consequence, without addressing myself for that purpose either to the devil, with whom I have not the honor of being acquainted, or to the magistrate, whom I detest even more than the snake. I, and all those who share my antipathies, also obey the needs of our natures. And we shall see which of the two has reason, and therefore force, on his side.

This is what we are going to see, and by this very investigation we shall discover that if the Saint Augustines had no other basis whereon to distinguish between good and evil, the animal world have another which is far more efficacious. The animal world in general, from insects to men, know perfectly what is good and what is bad, without consulting Bible or philosophy. And if it be thus, the cause is still in the needs of their nature; in the preservation of the race, and, therefore, in the greatest possible sum of happiness for each individual.

(To be continued.)

ANARCHY.

BY ENRICO MALATESTA.

(Continued from previous number.)

I.

Man has two necessary fundamental characteristics, THE INSTINCT OF HIS OWN PRESERVATION, without which no being could exist, and THE INSTINCT OF THE PRESERVATION OF HIS SPECIES, without which no species could have been formed or, have continued to exist. He is naturally driven to defend his own existence and well-being and that of his offspring against every danger.

In nature living beings find two ways of securing their existence, and rendering it pleasanter. The one is in individual strife with the elements, and with other individuals of the same or different species; the other is MUTUAL SUPPORT, or CO-OPERATION, which might also be described as association for strife against all natural factors, destructive to the existence, or to the development and well-being of the associated.

We do not need to investigate in these pages—and we cannot for lack of space—what respective proportions in the evolution of the organic world these two principles of strife and co-operation take.

It will suffice to note how co-operation among men (whether forced or voluntary) has become the sole means of progress, of improvement or of securing safety; and how strife—relic of an earlier stage of existence—has become thoroughly unsuitable as a means of securing the well-being of individuals, and produces instead injury to all, both the conquerors and the conquered.

The accumulated and transmitted experience of successive generations has taught man that by uniting with other men his preservation is better secured and his well-being increased. Thus out of this same strife for existence, carried on against surrounding nature, and against individuals of their own species, the social instinct has been developed among men, and has completely transformed the conditions of their life. Through co-operation man has been enabled to evolve out of animalism, has risen to great power and elevated himself to such a degree above the other animals, that metaphysical philosophers have believed it necessary to invent for him an immaterial and immortal soul.

Many concurrent causes have contributed to the formation of this social instinct, that starting from the animal basis of the instinct for the preservation of the species, has now become so extended and so intense that it constitutes the essential element of man's moral nature.

Man, however he evolved from inferior animal types, was a physically weak being, unarmed for the fight against carnivorous beasts. But he was possessed of a brain capable of great development, and a vocal organ, able to express the various cerebral vibrations, by means of diverse sounds, and hands adapted to give the desired form to matter. He must have very soon felt the need and advantages of association with his fellows. Indeed it may even be said that he could only rise out of animalism when he became social, and had acquired the use of language, which is at the same time a consequence and a potent factor of sociability.

The relatively scanty number of the human species rendered the strife for existence between man and man, even beyond the limits of association, less sharp, less continuous, and less necessary. At the same time, it must have greatly favored the development of sympathetic sentiments, and have left time for the discovery and appreciation of the utility of mutual support. In short, social life became the necessary condition of man's existence, in consequence of his capacity to modify his external surroundings and adapt them to his own wants, by the exercise of his primeval powers in co-operation with a greater or less number of associates. His desires have multiplied with the means of satisfying them, and have become needs. And division of labor has arisen from man's methodical use of nature for his own advantage. Therefore, as now evolved, man could not live apart from his fellows without falling back into a state of animalism. Through the refinement of sensibility, with the multiplication of social relationships, and through habit impressed on the species by hereditary transmission for thousands of centuries, this need of social life, this interchange of thought and of affection between man and man has become a mode of being necessary for our organism. It has been transformed into sympathy, friendship, and love, and subsists independently of the material advantages that association procures. So much is this the case, that man will often face suffering of every kind, and even death, for the satisfaction of these sentiments.

The fact is that a totally different character has been given to the strife for existence between man and man, and between the inferior animals, by the enormous advantages that association gives to man; by the fact that his physical powers are altogether disproportionate to his intellectual superiority over the beasts, so long as he remains isolated; by his possibility of associating with an ever increasing number of individuals, and entering into more and more intricate and complex relationships, until he reaches association with all humanity; and, finally, perhaps more than all, by his ability to produce, working in co-operation with others, more than he needs to live upon. It is evident that these causes, together with the sentiments of affection derived from them, must give a quite peculiar character to the struggle for existence among human beings.

Although it is now known—and the researches of modern naturalists bring us every day new proofs—that co-operation has played, and still plays, a most important part in the development of the organic

world, nevertheless, the difference between the human struggle for existence and that of the inferior animals is enormous. It is in fact proportionate to the distance separating man from the other animals. And this is none the less true because of that Darwinian theory, which the bourgeois class have ridden to death, little suspecting the extent to which mutual co-operation has assisted in the development of the lower animals.

The lower animals fight either individually or, more often, in little permanent or transitory groups against all nature, the other individuals of their own species included. Some of the more social animals, such as ants, bees, etc., associate together in the same ant-hill, or beehive, but are at war with, or indifferent towards, other communities of their own species. Human strife with nature, on the contrary, tends always to broaden association among men, to unite their interests, and to develop each individual's sentiments of affection towards all others, so that united they may conquer and dominate the dangers of external nature by and for humanity.

All strife directed towards obtaining advantages independently of other men, and in opposition to them, contradicts the social nature of modern man, and tends to lead it back to a more animal condition.

SOLIDARITY, that is, harmony of interests and sentiments, the sharing of each in the good of all, and of all in the good of each, is the state in which alone man can be true to his own nature, and attain to the highest development and happiness. It is the aim towards which human development tends. It is the one great principle, capable of reconciling all present antagonisms in society, otherwise irreconcilable. It causes the liberty of each to find not its limits, but its complement, the necessary condition of its continual existence—in the liberty of all.

"No man," says Michael Bakounine, can recognise his own human worth, nor in consequence realise his full development, if he does not recognise the worth of his fellow-men, and in co-operation with them, realise his own development through them. No man can emancipate himself unless at the same time he emancipates those around him. My freedom is the freedom of all, for I am not really free—free not only in thought, but in deed—if my freedom and my right do not find their confirmation and sanction in the liberty and right of all men my equals.

"It matters much to me what all other men are, for however independent I may seem, or may believe myself to be, by virtue of my social position, whether as Pope, Tsar, Emperor, or Prime Minister, I am all the while the product of those who are the least among men. If these are ignorant, miserable, or enslaved, my existence is limited by their ignorance, misery, or slavery. I, though an intelligent and enlightened man, am made stupid by their stupidity; though brave, am enslaved by their slavery; though rich, tremble before their poverty; though privileged, grow pale at the thought of possible justice for them. I, who wish to be free, cannot be so, because around me are men who do not yet desire freedom, and, not desiring it, become, as opposed to me, the instruments of my oppression."

Solidarity then is the condition in which man can attain the highest degree of security and of well-being. Therefore, egoism itself, that is, the exclusive consideration of individual interests, impels man and human society towards solidarity. Or rather egoism and altruism (consideration of the interests of others) are united in this one sentiment, as the interest of the individual is one with the interests of society.

However, man could not pass at once from animalism to humanity; from brutal strife between man and man to the collective strife of all mankind, united in one brotherhood of mutual aid against external nature.

Guided by the advantages that association and the consequent division of labor offer, man evolved towards solidarity, but his evolution encountered an obstacle which led him, and still leads him, away from his aim. He discovered that he could realise the advantages of co-operation, at least up to a certain point, and for the material and primitive wants that then comprised all his needs, by making other men subject to himself, instead of associating on an equality with them. Thus the ferocious and anti-social instincts, inherited from his bestial ancestry, again obtained the upper hand. He forced the weaker to work for him, preferring to domineer over rather than to associate fraternally with his fellows. Perhaps also in most cases it was by exploiting the conquered in war that man learnt for the first time the benefits of association and the help that can be obtained from mutual support.

Thus it has come about that the establishment of the utility of co-operation, which ought to lead to the triumph of solidarity in all human concerns, has turned to the advantage of private property and of government; in other words, to the exploitation of the labor of the many, for the sake of the privileged few.

There has always been association and co-operation, without which human life would be impossible; but it has been co-operation imposed and regulated by the few in their own particular interest.

From this fact arises a great contradiction with which the history of mankind is filled. On the one hand, we find the tendency to associate and fraternise for the purpose of conquering and adapting the external world to human needs, and for the satisfaction of the human affections; while, on the other hand, we see the tendency to divide into as many separate and hostile factions as there are different conditions of life. These factions are determined, for instance, by geographical and ethnological conditions, by differences in economic position, by privileges acquired by some and sought to be secured by others, or by suffering endured, with the ever recurring desire to rebel.

(To be continued.)

ANARCHISM AND TRADE UNIONISM.

(From a paper read before the Newcastle Anarchist Communist Group.)

For me Anarchism means the recognition and strict application of the principle of equal liberty. I wish it to be observed that I define Anarchism as equal freedom, and not simply as freedom. The idea of freedom alone without qualification is vague and indefinite, and may mean anything. Taking freedom alone for a guide, there is no saying how far you may go, or what, if any, are the limitations of right action. Where two dwell together, there you will find some limitation of freedom of action, and in densely populated countries it becomes more than ever necessary to determine what these limitations are. Granted that some limitation is required, it will be evident to all that the amount of liberty possessed by every individual must be either equal or unequal.

I think no one will have the hardihood to assert that freedom of action ought to be distributed in unequal amounts. But whether or not you are prepared to allow to all men as much liberty as you claim for yourself, it is certain that all men will claim as much as you, and will, most of them, be prepared to fight for it. Therefore, I wish to claim for myself no more liberty of action than is consistent with the equal liberty of others, at the same time I object to others invading my liberty of action. The fairness of this division of liberty will appear so evident to some that they will at once assent to it; those who do so may not be aware of all that is involved in that assent. Those only can be said to accept a principle who are prepared to stand by all that it allows and admits of. "It may, indeed, be difficult for those who have but little faith in the invisible to follow out a principle unflinchingly, in spite of every threatening evil—to give up their own power of judging what seems best, from the belief that that only is best which is abstractedly right—to say, 'although appearances are against it, yet will I obey the law.' Nevertheless, this is the true attitude to assume: the conduct which it has been the object of all moral teaching to inculcate—the only conduct which can eventually answer.*

Admitting the principle of equal liberty, it remains to show its application—to show how it may be used to determine the rightness or wrongness of any given action. Let us take trade unionism. Here, some persons, usually of the same trade, voluntarily come together and subscribe money to form a fund to be used for certain specified purposes. Have they a right to do this? Clearly they have. By coming together and paying into a common fund they do not prevent others doing the same thing. They allow to others as much liberty as they exercise themselves. Therefore, people may form trade unions. This particular case may be used to show the position of Anarchists with respect to organisation in general. I know that some State Socialists think that Anarchism means the negation of organisation, and that an Anarchist cannot consistently belong to a trade union. But we have seen that the law of equal liberty allows of two or more persons coming together to carry out a common purpose, therefore, my Anarchism, at least, admits of organisation. But organisation must be voluntary; you may organise, but you may not compel it. By remaining outside a trade organisation, one man allows the same liberty to all other men—to remain outside the organisation. "His position is a passive one, and whilst passive he cannot become an aggressor." Therefore, a man has a right not to belong to a society. Therefore, you may not compel him to belong to it. Thus also you establish the right to ignore the state—the right to refuse to pay taxes. The acts of an organisation, to be right acts, must, equally with those of an individual, be within the limits of this law. A crowd has no more rights than the humblest individual in it. Suppose the trade unionists propose a strike. May they do this without transgressing equal liberty? Certainly; for, like that of the non-unionist and anti-taxationist the position of the non-worker is pre-eminently a passive one, and "whilst passive he cannot become an aggressor." But suppose the trade unionists attempt to prevent other men from working; do they in this assume more liberty than they allow to those others? Clearly they do. If to work was a right act before the strike, the strike has not made it a wrong one.

Therefore, the non-unionists have a right to work, and you establish the rights of blacklegs on a logical and scientific basis. There are but two principles—the principle of liberty and the principle of majority rule. If a person have no right to work independently of the wishes of other people, then must that right be dependent upon the will of the majority. If the majority work, then it is right to work; if the majority go on strike, then it is wrong to work. If it be said that force is justified because of the continuance of low wages that would result if the minority got its way in the case of the majority deciding to strike, this reason would hold equally true if the majority were against the strike; in which case the force would be equally justified though exercised by the minority. This principle of equal liberty allows of actions which, as society is at present constituted, have undoubtedly injurious effects upon certain sections of the community. For example, the invention of the machinery which created the cotton trade in this country occasioned great destitution among the cotton spinners of the time; yet Arkwright and the other inventors were quite within their liberty both in making these inventions and in putting them in operation. In doing so they allowed all other men to make the same inventions—if they could. Another case of which I remember to have read, is that of the introduction of cabs into London. This threw idle a great

many river boatmen, who, I believe, went so far as to petition parliament to suppress the cabs. Now, both these cases are cases of acts which fall within the limits of equal liberty—that is, in both cases the same liberty is allowed to all other persons to go and do likewise. Yet in both cases the acts had, undoubtedly, injurious consequences for a time to certain sections of the community. Similarly blacklegism tends to keep wages low and hours long, yet, as we have seen, the blackleg is entirely within his liberty, and, consequently, those persons are exceeding their liberty who attempt to interfere with his.

It may be replied that all this is admissible when we get rid of the landlords and capitalists, but that it is not expedient to observe this principle under present circumstances. I hold it is always expedient to allow equal liberty to all men. It is really the question of the unemployed. By this law all men have equal claims to life and liberty. But life and liberty being dependent upon the opportunity to do wealth-producing work, this means that all men have equal claims to such opportunity. Now, the employed portion of the community have practically a monopoly of all the opportunities to do work, and if they are too selfish, apathetic, or ignorant either to share their own work or create new opportunities as far as in them lies, then it is unreasonable to expect the unemployed to show any regard for the interest of any but themselves. It is unreasonable to expect them to starve that others may have higher wages when those others will do nothing to help them to earn a living.

It is the limitation of these opportunities to do work which is the difficulty. This limitation is the result of the present property system as backed up by the forces of government. Let these be removed, then people will have free access to the land and the use of machinery, and we will be in a position to begin that reorganisation of industry which shall aim at supplying work for all.

C. P.

THE BERLIN RAGPICKER.

[SCENE.—Eighty-eighth Divisional Police Court, Berlin. A ragged woman of erect bearing steps up to the dock.]

Presiding Magistrate. Who are you?

Prisoner. A woman accused, but innocent.

Magistrate. I meant, what is your name?

Prisoner. That the beadle knows who summoned me. I have no other name than that of the Ragpicker of Berlin.

Magistrate. You seem to indulge in pleasantries. We must request decidedly to be excused from such.

Prisoner. I am too little to do the one, and too poor to grant the other.

Magistrate. What are you?

Prisoner. (with a dark look from black eyes which are nevertheless not devoid of a certain charm.) Avenged.

Magistrate. In heaven's name . . . You seem out of your senses. Are you drunk?

Prisoner. (with a harsh laugh.) Drunk! I thank your worship for the epithet. In earlier days, I might often have been so, when the popping of champagne corks used to deafen me; but now?—No! pure water is not strong enough to make a ruined creature forget herself.

Magistrate. We must beg you not to resort here to the style of the theatre.

Prisoner. Oh, it's long since I played. Now life is playing with me.

Magistrate. What were you then in early days?

Prisoner. (with a sigh from the heart.) I was deceived from earliest youth upwards.

Magistrate. I see now, to get anything out of you, we must proceed differently. Let us go by acts then. You were in early days then a governess?

Prisoner. Yes,—until my honorable employer seduced me.

Magistrate. What were you then?

Prisoner. When truth left me in the lurch I fled to pretence, and became an actress.

Magistrate. In that position too did you find no abiding place? Why did you leave the stage?

Prisoner. Because I wished to return to truth. A noble lord wished to teach it me again, and he did in the clearest meaning of the word—he made me a prostitute.

Magistrate. It may be that you have an unhappy life behind you, but it is not necessary to detain us with describing it. How old are you?

Prisoner. Nearly old enough to despair of justice—human or divine. I reckon 37 years.

Magistrate. You have been convicted before this. On what grounds?

Prisoner. My offences were love and despair.

Magistrate. That's no answer. You have already been imprisoned a dozen times for offending against the regulations of the *police des mœurs*.

Prisoner. It's a pity I have not been locked up oftener and longer. I should have been most pleased had I not come out.

Magistrate. You are now a rag-collector?

Prisoner. Just so, thank God. I now gather up the waste from the yards of rich young gentlemen. At one time, I was treated as such. Every fellow that had a shilling to jingle in his pocket thought he could make me the sport of his insolent whims. Now I have grown proud, and look for truth there where it is divested of all deceit. I am a ragpicker, and say it with satisfaction.

Magistrate. We will now proceed to the charge. You are now accused of having, in B—A—street, beaten Count— with your sorting-crook.

Prisoner. I did do so, and thereby fulfilled an oath I took in my heart fourteen years ago.

Magistrate. Also with having wilfully inflicted bodily injury.

Prisoner. Sorry to hear it. I should have been better pleased had I been able with a blow to extinguish his life.

Magistrate. Woman, you are indeed terrible! And you say all this with no impulse to repent?

Prisoner. I repent! I wanted to kill the man that betrayed me out of my happiness, left me like a pitiful scoundrel, and yet had the baseness, when he was weary of me, to hand me over to the *police des mœurs*. Your worship, there are crimes to be atoned for only by the inexorable hand of despair, because the vengeance of law does not reach that height where wealth and birth can murder unchecked. Murder!—yes, I use the word advisedly, for he who without concern treads in the mud a human soul, and destroys the honor of a human creature without a stirring of compassion, is a murderer—ten times more guilty than the brutal wretch who destroys the frail body. The Noble Count who once lay at my feet and in my arms, and swore oaths of everlasting fealty, bent in terror to one side when he caught sight of the poor ragpicker. He, the haughty cavalier that once would protect me with his sword, screamed like a cowardly craven for the police, when I—his victim—was settling accounts with him. A pity I could settle so few. There is my confession, and I ask you to pass sentence without mercy or ruth.

The Court, however, felt sympathy for the unhappy woman. Although there was no gainsaying the fact of the severe bodily injury inflicted, the legal authorities moved that extenuating circumstances should be allowed, and the ragpicker was sentenced to a week's imprisonment. With this the accused was content, and begged to enter forthwith on her punishment. (Chicago *Vorbote*.)

Truly did the writer of the article on "Crime and its Abolition," in last month's *Freedom*, say that the worst criminals are not those in the dock, and that what there appears "crime" is often but the natural and inevitable re-action of human nature from the wrongs committed against it. It is not the victims of our social system who should be hauled over the coals, but that system itself.

THE PROPAGANDA. REPORTS.

LONDON—

Leytonstone.—Some lively scenes have been witnessed since sending our first account. A poor unintelligent blackleg got some boys and tried to break up our meetings, but it was a miserable failure. Nov. 8th, small boys and lads came to the meeting about 70 strong, for the purpose of breaking up the meeting, but did not succeed. If they turn up many more Sundays, we shall certainly convert them, because once Anarchism is hurled at them it penetrates to the brain and stops there till it matures itself. Comrade Andrews is reorganising the group, which is getting very strong now. The authorities are trying to stop our parades and flying speeches (as they call them). The newspapers state that these tactics are worse than ever. We are determined not to give in. Wanstead Flats is our best station. We intend to carry on a vigorous winter agitation in various parts of Essex. I might mention that the Leytonstone Group does not confine its energies to Leytonstone alone. Comrade Andrews made a visit to Edison's Electric Light factory, Ponders End, on Nov. 10th; he found the wealth producers there slaved from 10 to 14 and 16 hours per day, some at very dangerous work. On Thursday the 12th he paid a visit to Grays, Essex, and saw the quarry slaves. He afterwards looked round the town and saw that these quarry slaves lived in houses worse than stables; the place was quite as bad as any East London slum.—H. A.

PROVINCES—

Manchester.—The cause is moving; even sleepy old Manchester is opening its eyes! We have a Labour Church, with much socialism and little religion, carried on by a Unitarian minister, and held in a music hall, which is thronged every Sunday, and though it is not "extreme" in its views, it is a sign of the times. It is a suggestive fact that the Socialist pastor wailed to Socialism through some of our members who attended the discussions in connection with his church last winter. Nor have the Manchester Anarchists been idle. Meetings have been held by them at the New Cross every Sunday, and in spite of the cold and wet weather, large and interested audiences have gathered to hear the gospel of Anarchy. Opposition has been plentiful, and given spice to the speeches. Accused of desiring to rob the industrious and thrifty, of having no settled plan of action, of wishing to foment civil war and bloodshed for their own sake, we have had opportunity of stating our position more clearly, and apparently to the satisfaction of most of our listeners. Indoor meetings have been well attended at the Knot Mill Mission Hall. At a discussion on "Mrs. Grundy" the marriage question was brought forward, and the good people were horrified at our audacity in demanding free and natural relations between the sexes. A Social Democrat present actually protested against our views, and disclaimed all responsibility on the part of the S. D. F. for such teachings. To this has Social Democracy fallen here; the defender of legalised prostitution. Meetings of the Fabian Society have also been attended for the purpose of propagating our principles, but we are tired of hearing De Mattos and his crew protest against equality of income, and proclaim the necessity for highly-paid organisers of industry, though they call this Socialism. Debates are carried on weekly at a place termed the Dalton Inn. Here also irrepressible Anarchy has entered. Comrade Barton gave a lecture, Nov. 16th, on "The Chicago Anarchists, and what they died for," which evoked an animated and interesting discussion on the principles of Anarchist Communism. Comrade Stockton gave one the following week on "Crime: Its Cause and Cure," which excited much debate. No special meetings were held Nov. 11th, but the subject was broached at all our meetings. We have disposed of seventy copies of the "Speeches" already, besides other literature, which is encouraging for Cottonopolis, to say the least. "We are all Socialists now," as Sir W. Harcourt said; and the question of the future is simply "Anarchy or State Socialism." The prospect brightens! To work, comrades, the promised land is before us; energy, unity, and courage, and the future is ours!

Aberdeen.—Large Oddfellows' Hall, Sunday, Nov. 1st, Comrade Addie lectured on "The Shams of Aberdeen." Nov. 15th, Comrade H. Duncan lectured on "Communist Anarchism: Its Meanings and Teachings." Nov. 22nd, Comrade Shepherd lectured on "Past and Present Leaders of the Socialist Movement." Open-air work goes on as usual; meetings held on Thursdays and Sundays in Castle Street, with good audiences listening to Duncan and Addie. The sale of literature which fell away last month has revived considerably. Two dear old ladies persist in giving us a help in the way of getting a crowd on Sunday afternoons

by singing alternately solos and duets, and whilst we form into singing order, telling us of the danger in which our souls are. Whether it is our black souls or the good looks of our unmarried comrades that attract these ladies is unknown; however, we are obliged for their assistance anyway.—Yours for the revolution, Eglan Shepherd.

Dundee Anarchist Communist Group.—Nov. 21st we had a visit from Comrade H. Duncan, of Aberdeen. We held a meeting in Greenmarket at eight. Comrade Cameron opened, and Duncan afterwards addressed the meeting for upwards of an hour. We were much interrupted by a half-drunken Home Ruler. It was pointed out to him that the majority of the audience were against his interrupting the speaker, but he persisted in his interruptions, at the same time declaring that he believed in majority rule. At the end of the meeting we were somewhat surprised to see him coming forward to purchase some of our literature, which we hope will do him good. On Sunday, Nov. 22nd, at twelve, Duncan spoke to a large meeting at the foot of Hilltown, our most attentive auditor being an ex-prison warder. No opposition, and fair sale of literature. Another meeting was held at six, in Barrack Street; and we afterwards went up to Tally Street Hall, where Duncan delivered a stirring address on "Anarchist Communism: Its Meaning and Teaching." We had some very frivolous opposition from the smaller fry of State Socialists, their big guns all being absent, although we were told before the meeting took place that we were to be scattered in all directions by the sheer force of their superior intelligence. A Conservative working man wanted to know if we wanted a bloody revolution? and he was told that if anybody stood in the way of the people taking their own, he would very likely be treated in the same manner as the stupid cow that stood in the way of the express engine. The rest of the opposition was of the same frivolous nature, and it was easily disposed of by our comrade Duncan. At all our meetings the audiences appeared to be highly delighted with our comrades' eloquent speeches.

Bristol.—Two or three meetings are held weekly, and the public feeling is drifting towards the acceptance of Socialist ideas. Considerable excitement has been caused of late by the decision of the Town Council to prohibit meetings in the public park. The Socialists have been in the habit of holding meetings there every Sunday, and they are resisting this encroachment to the utmost. A committee is working to expose the tyranny of the aldermen and other reactionary members of the Town Council, and five or six meetings are being held each evening. Foremost in the fight are Comrades Gilliard, Weare, Watson, R. Sharland, Irving, and other well-known revolutionists. The police have interfered at many of the meetings, but the wholesome advice that Watson gave them at one of the meetings, at which several police officers were present, will, we hope, strike home and do its work. It is the intention of our Bristol comrades to fight for the right of meeting to the bitter end, even if a plank bed be the result. Better that park gates be thrown down than liberty trodden underfoot. . . . The question of meeting in the parks has been settled. The Socialists, by their determined behaviour, have forced the Town Council to allow assemblies to gather in the parks at all times. Our comrades won the triumphal battle by defying the authorities all round, and their conduct is a proof that no half-measures will weigh seriously with such jacks-in-office as are to be found in all cities. The course of indoor lectures given by members of the Bristol Socialists Society has so far been exceedingly successful. In fact, the difficulty has been to find room for the audience. Up to the present twelve lectures have been given, the subjects embracing all the important points of the great social question. Edward Carpenter, Gore, Oxley, Watson, Conway, Irving and others have been very successful with their audiences. These lectures will be given weekly until the Spring, when outdoor propaganda will be renewed.

Dublin.—At Socialist Union, Nov. 5th, A. J. Kavanagh delivered an address on the "Political Outlook in Ireland." All the reactionary elements that make up Irish society, the *sagart aram*, the gombeen man, the toady shopkeeper, the God-fearing peasant, were ably reviewed. Fitzpatrick, Toomey, Collier, and Kelly supported the lecturer.

ANARCHISM AND ATHEISM.

SIR,—In your November issue Cyril Bell says, referring to my report from Leicester, "to be logically Anarchists, we must also be Atheists" [because] "God is the symbol of . . . rule down here" . . . "if I could believe in a God, I should also believe in an earthly ruler" . . . "The Sheffield men introduced A-theology, not Theology."

Let me say that I am an Anarchist, Atheist, and free lover myself, with a strong tendency lately to Pessimism; the latter quality being partly occasioned by the failure of Civist, Positivists, Anarchists, Marxists, and Christian Socialists to agree among themselves.

I went from Roman Catholicism to Atheism ten years ago, and shall not go back unless my brain softens. As to Free Love, why bother about it if it is bound to follow Anarchism? You will only establish it by establishing Anarchism.

To take Bell's statements in their order, I hold that Anarchism no more involves Atheism than Atheism involves Anarchism. It all depends what view one takes of God; there are more conceptions of that unproved Being than the tyrannical one. There is the Lucretian for instance, sitting in a corner of the Cosmos, minding his (or her) own business, and letting us shift for ourselves. There is also the Christian Socialist conception of a fatherly God, who only directs, like the captain of a ship, or a *chef d'orchestre*. It is nothing to the question to say the directing is defective. Anarchists, I take it, do not call organisation rule; direction by the captain of a cricket club is not tyranny. The Theistic Anarchists' superstition of a fatherly God does none of us harm any more than a child's belief that there is a man in the moon.

Anarchists are for kicking out God because they conceive him a tyrant; and a Free Society is incompatible with the existence of a tyrant. But Christians believe God is the opposite of a tyrant. Christian Socialists believe in a God, and they do not derive sanction for earthly authority from him. They disbelieve in authority as much as Anarchists. We could have an Anarchist state of society then, and yet believe in a God: *au contraire*, we could all become Atheists and cling to the present damnable system. I know scores of Atheists, but their creed does not help them one whit towards Anarchism. Some of the leaders of Secularism in England are our bitterest enemies. I had rather be a Roman Catholic Socialist than an Atheistic Individualist. I make this question entirely one of values and policy. While propagandists are inculcating Atheism, they must be neglecting Anarchism. Who is our greatest foe, God or the monopolist?

If the monopolist, pitch into him, and let God alone until you are challenged by him, then you will frighten away no timid soul. If you must discuss God to satisfy someone in the crowd, take the agnostic attitude, never the aggressive. We may well leave the propagandism of Atheism to the National Secular Society. I've dropped preaching Secularism and Atheism nearly altogether since I became a Socialist, sticking to the infinitely more important question. And though Bakounine may be against me, and though Robert Owen was, in the last part of his life, of the same opinion as Bakounine, I am determined to go on as I am until I am convinced to the contrary.

As regards the question being A-theology instead of Theology, what difference does it make to my contention that we are diverted from our business of instilling Socialism? It takes as much time and energy to discuss a God that *non est* as if he were as visible and tangible as a pike-staff.—Yours fraternally, Leicester.

THOMAS BARCLAY.