

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. VI.—No. 67.

JUNE, 1892.

MONTHLY ; ONE PENNY.

EIGHT HOURS AGAIN.

ONE of the largest demonstrations ever held took place in London on the first of May. There were sixteen official platforms and several unofficial platforms, and the number of those present has been estimated by the capitalist press at from a quarter to half a million. All present, notwithstanding their differing views as to methods and details were, unanimously of opinion that the number of hours during which the workers have to toil every day should at least be reduced to eight. Of course those who went to Hyde Park were the most enthusiastic in favor of the reform, and those who believed that some good might be done by their presence there. They came from all parts, not for pleasure, but to show their great desire for an amelioration of their lot. To most of them it meant considerable expense, a long walk, and in many cases no dinner. Those who came were in a sense representative of the hundreds of thousands who could not come. It is pretty safe to say that if working London was polled it would be almost solid in favor of this small reform, only differing as to its value. It is no joke to the workman to give up his weekly day of rest, and trudge from Woolwich, Deptford, Kennington, Mile End, and other remote districts, even when accompanied by bands and banners.

This colossal declaration of working class opinion in London was backed up by similar meetings in all the big provincial towns. In Manchester, Bradford, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Hull, Northampton, Plymouth, Wolverhampton, Dublin and many other places, large gatherings were held, ranging from 20,000 downward according to the size of the different towns.

But what has been the result of all this demonstrating and speechifying? As far as London is concerned, it has ended in a meeting of delegates of the various metropolitan trade societies, held at Westminster Palace Hotel the following day, to choose a deputation to wait upon the leading statesmen in support of the legal Eight Hour Day! Gladstone, in his usual circumlocutory fashion, refused to receive the deputation. Salisbury and Balfour also refused at first; and the delegates were left buzzing like a hive of angry bees. One delegate very sensibly moved that the letters of refusal be put in the W. P. B. Another proposed that the Labor Party should cut themselves off entirely from the existing political bodies. Yet another suggested that the deputation should wait upon the London Members of Parliament. Eventually, however, on the motion of the well known opportunist Social Democrat, Quelch, it was decided that the meeting should adjourn for Shipton might again try to move the stony hearted statesmen! In the end, Salisbury and Balfour consented to meet the deputation a few days later. Result: the usual empty speechifying. S. and B. would be only too pleased to grant the wishes of the workingmen, but doubted if the majority of workingmen really wanted to work shorter hours; and if they did, was it good for them? Think of the awful foreign competition! Of course S. and B. have never heard that the foreign worker wants his hours shortened too. We hope the deputation, and those they represent, are satisfied now they have talked to and been talked at by the leaders of the men in possession. The capitalists and the more intelligent among the workers will, however, agree with that organ of the Manchester school of politicians, the *Daily News*, that they "did not get much for their pains."

Even when the Eight Hour Day has been realised, the same thing may be said with equal truth. They will not have got much for their pains. Considering the years spent in this agitation, and the immense effort expended, the result aimed at is marvellously small. And even now they do not seem to be much nearer the goal. Like the army of the famous Duke of York—

When they are up they are up,
And when they are down they are down,
And when they are only half way up
They are neither up nor down.

The size of the meetings, the enthusiasm, the numbers, count for little or nothing to the Gladstones, Salisburys and Balfours. What they consider is the intention. If the workers even said boldly: "We are going to have the Eight Hour Day; if Parliament won't give it us, we shall strike," the probability is that our statesmen would see things in a different light. But the mildness of the mob makes them little to be feared. It is true that John Burns hinted at a Universal Strike, but the spirit of the speeches in Hyde Park was on the whole thoroughly parliamentary.

In the meantime, whilst labor humbles itself, begs for better conditions, invention is progressing with giant strides, every day making the capitalist more independent of the worker. A few days ago the Lino-type

Company held their annual general meeting and boasted of one or two of their victories over the compositors. One case mentioned was that of the *Scottish Leader* newspaper office, where the machines have been introduced with great success from the capitalist point of view. The wages for setting 250 columns of type are now less than the amount paid for fifty columns set up by hand. In other words, four fifths of the wages formerly paid to the workers went to the proprietors of the newspaper, less only the cost of the machinery. Any attempt which the worker may make to improve his condition is invariably met by the capitalist calling to his aid more machinery. He takes it as an excuse. The workmen endeavour to thwart his will by a strike or by the limitation of their slavery, and he retaliates at once by the introduction of a machine, which is almost always waiting in the background for its opportunity. Some time ago we saw an article in the *Engineer*, in which two cases of the introduction of machinery were mentioned. In one case a very considerable trade was done in the manufacture of rivetted girders. Formerly boiler makers belonging to the union were employed to do the rivetting. Now it is all done by boys with rivetting machines. A very few men are employed to look after the boys, and these are paid good wages and will have nothing to do with the union. The boys are not recognised by the unions at all. They are not apprentices. They have no trade. They have nothing to do but stick hot rivets into holes and close them up with the machine. This costs very much less than if skilled men were employed, so the system is extending. In the other case, large quantities of machinery of rather small dimensions is turned out. There is scarcely a man employed in the trade, in the union sense of the term, except as heads of departments. The subdivision of labor is extreme. A very large proportion of the work is done with rotary cutters. The remainder in small lathes and shaping machines. Intelligent lads are taken into the works and taught to do one thing and nothing else, and they very quickly become proficient. Thus for example, a boy of sixteen who has nothing to do but bore out small wheels from morning to night very quickly learns to bore with accuracy and dispatch. There is not one skilled man in the place for every ten lads. At one time only men were employed, but the union became vexatious, and non-union labor and machine tools were gradually substituted in the way we have indicated.

If the eight hour enthusiasts would only take such facts as these into consideration, they would soon see how ridiculous it is for them to go on spending their energy on this half measure. Because we estimate it at its true value, we are often considered as opponents of the Eight Hour Day. As a matter of fact we are nothing of the kind. If the workers can get it, by all means let them have it, but is it worth their while?

REIGN OF HUNGER.

IV.—CAUSES (Continued).

On the other hand, the possessors tend more and more to become a class divorced from that actual contact with the struggle with nature for existence and all those strenuous necessities of a simple natural life, which stimulate and keep alive the desire to be up and doing, and the knowledge of how to work to some real purpose. Consequently they degenerate into a sort of busy idleness, thrusting all the burden of providing for their needs upon others, and, in exchange for their injustice, losing on their side also a great part of the pleasure of life. At every turn man's natural joy in making and acting is ruined by social inequalities, which act and react on one another, hampering each individual in one way or another in that free scope for initiative which is the first necessity of the creative spirit.

As for love, the continual consciousness of such tremendous differences of circumstances as now exist between individuals, quite independently of any merit on their part, can only breed continual bitterness. The man who, being poor, despised, oppressed, can love and feel fellowship with beings of the same flesh and blood who not only have abundantly all he lacks and make no attempt to aid him, but regard him with contempt merely because he is poor, has a greatness of soul which falls not to the common lot of humanity. In spite of all the best efforts of the best hearted among poor and rich, there cannot fail to be a continual brooding bitterness between haves and have-nots, which is in itself a cause of wretchedness to every feeling person. Then again that lack of love and growth of enmity between those who are competing for living, wealth or power, is a direct outcome of inequality. To endlessly struggle with one's neighbours for chances, is not the way to stimulate or satisfy one's affection for them, but to kill it rather. Yet in a society organised on a footing of inequality like ours, such a struggle is sure to take place. Our inequalities of

class, of possessions, of sex, each breed some sort of enmity and selfishness; each is in its own way fatal to love. Each therefore plays its own part in causing that unsatisfied craving for loving fellowship on which we have dwelt as one active cause of misery to-day.

No, it is impossible to try to realise the causes why our present method of social co-operation yields us so little satisfaction, and to doubt that it is inequality which is its bane. But can inequality be got rid of? or is it the natural and inevitable outcome of the natural and inevitable diversity of personal gifts and capacities?

The first answer to this is that though marked personal differences exist wherever man is to be found, social inequalities, though they tend to crop up everywhere, vary enormously in extent. To any one accustomed to the wide gulf between the chances given by birth to various individuals in England, for instance, there seems to be scarcely any social inequality worth mentioning amongst our cousins across the North Sea, who are afflicted with no hereditary nobles and very few capitalists, and amongst whom so large a portion of the people are still what we English used to know as yeomen, farming their own land, and calling no man master. The Norwegians have plenty of hardships and social grievances of their own, but from inequality they do not suffer anything like so sharply as we do, and yet assuredly their individuality is at least as strong as ours. This instance happens to be the first to come to hand, but every reader of travels and history will be able to make out for himself a long list of the variations in social inequality at different periods during the history of the most advanced nations, and in the actual conditions of less civilised peoples. Such extreme social inequality as we suffer from is therefore not the inevitable result of the natural variations in people's capacities.

There is, however, a further form of the same objection more difficult to meet. It may be urged that even if social inequality is not inevitable among little-developed, stationary, or slowly-developing communities, it is a necessity of human existence, when the power of man over nature is rapidly developing, and the possibilities of wealth growing day-by-day. In such a state of things as this—in the England of a hundred years ago, for example,—the possession of certain special sorts of capacity enables a man to gain wealth for himself, and the want of them obliges others to put up with the crumbs from the rich man's table. Social inequality, in fact, grows apace and cannot do otherwise.

Frankly we admit this has been so; what we deny is that it is for ever and ever inevitable.

That the civilised nations of this century should have plunged headforemost into the slough of a deepening inequality was inevitable when they started forward on their new industrial career, because they were already in the bog. Their feet were already fast in the mud in most unequal degrees. They were hampered by the broken fetters of feudalism, and many ancient oppressions and monopolies. Natural capacities apart, individuals did not start fair in the industrial competition. There were privileged classes with superior wealth and opportunities; courtiers, soldiers, merchants, bankers, to use their money and power to get the land into their grasp, and take advantage of every opportunity opened up by circumstances, and especially of the new inventions on the one hand and the ignorance and distress of the small farmers and self-employing artisans on the other. Under such conditions it was impossible but that the increase of human knowledge, power and wealth should produce a terrible increase of social inequality, for scarcely anyone at first recognised the danger, much less took effective means to counteract it.

But now that we look back and see the road by which we have reached our present pass; now that we look round and see the depth of the misery which the social inequality in our present society produces; when we see that even those who have are unsatisfied, while those who have not or have precariously are pinched with hungry need, are we to fold our hands and say that what has been must be? or is there any thing we can do?

Social inequality, we have said tends to crop up everywhere where there are human beings co-operating together for existence, but in very various degrees. If we look close at any group or community where it shows itself, we can hardly fail to see that it springs not from diversity of gifts among the co-operators, but mainly from three perverted tendencies of the human mind, three diseases of natural faculties to which mankind are as liable as they are to certain bodily illnesses. These are the tendencies to monopolise, to exploit, to dominate.

The first is the exaggerated and monstrous form of the perfectly natural and reasonable appropriation by the individual of what he requires. Every living being must take and keep the necessities of life or it cannot live; but the monopolist is the animal who piles up stores of what he is not needing or using and keeps them away from others who need and would use them.

Exploitation is a mean and disgusting abuse of the mutual give and take of social co-operation. It consists in getting all you can out of your fellow man, and giving him as little as you can in return; and it may be done in a thousand ways besides in the bargain between capitalist and wage-slave. There are millions of exploiters, besides employers of labour.

Domination, the rule of man, over man, is the miserable perversion of that kingly instinct, which, at its best, leads a human being, either singly or with others, to struggle against and overcome adverse circumstances, and to master the dumb forces of nature.

Imagine any human society in which each member only appropriated what he required; took from others only in return for his own generous aid-giving, and exercised his desire for mastery only in the

effort to bend natural, non-human forces to his will; and it would be impossible to imagine any social inequality as existing in that society, however varied might be the diversities of gifts and capacities among its members. Indeed, a comparative examination of several different human societies will show anyone that social inequality does actually increase in proportion to the development of monopoly, exploitation, and domination, changing its forms as one or other of these diseases of the human mind spreads and increases in virulence.

But if this be so, is it more irrational of social reformers to hope to stamp out these moral diseases by destroying the conditions which produce and foster them, than for doctors to hope to stamp out certain diseases of the body? The great point is to recognise the disease for what it really is, and find out what does specially produce and foster it. If we can do this, we believe the vital energy of the human mind will restore it to a healthy track, just as the vital energy of the body causes it to recover tone in an illness.

In other words, if we are convinced that monopoly, exploitation and the rule of man by man are the evils which introduce into and keep up inequality in our present social co-operation, making it so bitterly unsatisfying in its results, then our one main object must be so to alter the existing plan of co-operation as to discourage and exclude these diseased tendencies in every possible way; whilst on the other hand we stimulate the healthy exercise of the faculties of which they are a perversion. This is the object we Anarchist-Communists have set before us.

ANARCHIST MORALITY.

By P. KROPOTKINE.

(Continued from previous number.)

IX.

That which mankind admires in a truly moral man is his energy, the exuberance of life which urges him to give his intelligence, his feeling, his action, asking nothing in return.

The strong thinker, the man overflowing with intellectual life, naturally seeks to diffuse his ideas. There is no pleasure in thinking unless the thought is communicated to others. It is only the mentally poverty-stricken man, who, after he has painfully hunted up some idea, carefully hides it that later on he may label it with his own name. The man of powerful intellect runs over with ideas; he scatters them by the handful. He is wretched if he cannot share them with others, cannot scatter them to the four winds, for in this is his life.

The same with regard to feeling. "We are not enough for ourselves: we have more tears than our own sufferings claim, more capacity for joy than our own existence can justify," says Guyau, thus summing up the whole question of morality in a few admirable lines, caught from nature. The solitary being is wretched, restless, because he cannot share his thoughts and feelings with others. When we feel some great pleasure, we wish to let others know that we exist, we feel, we love, we live, we struggle, we fight.

At the same time, we feel the need to exercise our will, our active energy. To act, to work has become a need for the vast majority of mankind; so much so, that when absurd conditions divorce a man or woman from useful work, they invent something to do, some futile and senseless obligations whereby to open out a field for their active energy. They invent never mind what—a theory, a religion, a "social duty"—to persuade themselves that they are doing something useful. When they dance, it is for a charity; when they ruin themselves with expensive dresses, it is to keep up the position of the aristocracy; when they do nothing, it is on principle.

"We need to help our fellows, to lend a hand to the coach laboriously dragged along by humanity; in any case, we buzz round it," says Guyau. This need of lending a hand is so great that it is found among all sociable animals, however low in the scale. What is all the enormous amount of activity spent uselessly in politics every day but an expression of the need to lend a hand to the coach of humanity, or at least to buzz round it?

Of course, this "fecundity of will," this thirst for action, when accompanied by poverty of feeling and an intellect incapable of creation, will produce nothing but a Napoleon I. or a Bismarck; wiseacres who try to force the world to progress backwards. Whilst, on the other hand, mental fertility, destitute of well developed sensibility, will bring forth such barren fruits as literary and scientific pedants, who only hinder the advance of knowledge. Finally, sensibility unguided by large intelligence will produce such persons as the women ready to sacrifice everything for some brute of a man, upon whom they pour forth all their love.

If life is to be really fruitful, it must be so at once in intelligence, in feeling and in will. This fertility in every direction is life; the only thing worthy the name. For one moment of this life, those who have obtained a glimpse of it give years of vegetative existence. Without this overflowing life, a man is old before his time, an impotent being, a plant that withers before it has ever flowered.

"Let us leave to latter day corruption this life that is no life," cries youth, the true youth full of sap that longs to live and scatter life around. Every time a society falls into decay, a thrust from

such youth as this shatters ancient economic, political and moral forms to make room for the up-springing of a new life. What matter if one or another fall in the struggle! Still the sap rises. For youth to live is to blossom, whatever the consequences! It does not regret them.

But without speaking of the heroic periods of mankind, taking every-day existence, is it life to live in disagreement with one's ideal?

Now-a-days it is often said that men scoff at the ideal. And it is easy to understand why. Buddhist or Christian mutilation has so often been confounded with the ideal; the word has so often been used to cheat the simple hearted that a reaction is inevitable and healthy. We too should like to replace the word "ideal," so often blotted and stained, by a new word in more conformity with new ideas.

But, whatever the word, the fact remains: every human being has his ideal. Bismarck had his—however strange—i.e., a government of blood and iron. Every philistine has his ideal, if it be but Gambetta's silver bath and cook-Trompette, with plenty of slaves to pay for Trompette and the bath without a troublesome amount of coercion.

But, besides these, there is the human being who has conceived a loftier ideal. The life of a beast cannot satisfy him. Servility, lying, bad faith, intrigue, inequality in human relations fill him with loathing. How can he in his turn become servile, be a liar, an intriguer, lord it over others? He catches a glimpse of how lovely life might be if better relations existed among men, he feels in himself the power to succeed in establishing these better relations with those he may meet on his way. He conceives what is called an ideal.

Whence comes this ideal? How is it fashioned by heredity on one side and the impressions of life on the other? We know not. At most we could tell the story of it, more or less truly, in our own biographies. But it is an actual fact—variable, progressive, open to outside influences, but always living. It is a largely unconscious feeling of what would give us the greatest amount of vitality, of the joy of life.

Well, life is vigorous, fertile, rich in sensation only on condition of answering to this feeling of the ideal. Act against this feeling, and you feel your life bent back on itself; it is no longer at one, it loses its vigour. Be untrue often to your ideal, and you will end by paralysing your will, your active energy. Soon you will no longer regain the vigour, the spontaneity of decision you formerly knew. You are a broken man.

Nothing mysterious in all this, once you look upon a human being as a compound of nervous and cerebral centres acting independently. Waver between the various feelings striving within you, and you will soon end by breaking the harmony of the organism; you will be a sick person without will. The intensity of your life will decrease. In vain will you seek for compromises. Never more will you be the complete, strong, vigorous being you were when your acts were in accordance with the ideal conceptions of your brain.

(To be concluded.)

CHOICE SAMPLES FROM THE AUTHORITARIAN PRESS.

THE public have heard a good deal lately about the violence of Anarchists in speech and writing, and the desirability that social reformers should put forward their views in temperate and humane language. Well and good; but example goes further than precept. Here are a few typical samples of the style in which the accredited organs of middle class respectability speak of those among their fellow mortals who, conscientiously believing that government and private property are evils, agitate against these particular methods in human co-operation.

The "Times." Leading articles, April 5, 7, 25, 28:—Anarchism is a "crude and monstrous creed." "Most of them (Anarchists) use it as a mere cloak under which to sate the vilest passions that fill the human heart. Hate, envy, lust of plunder, lust of blood, . . . inordinate vanity and overwhelming love of power." We Anarchists are "audacious miscreants," "common criminals banded together to commit a crime." "That robbery, arson and murder are acts, not only innocent, but virtuous when perpetrated with the design of benefiting humanity sounds marvellously comfortable to those who have a natural propensity to commit them. Accordingly such person flock to the Anarchist standard." We are therefore "a fraction of the criminal classes," having "no capacity for the steady and sustained pursuit of a common object, saturated with a distrust of each other as profound as it is just." We are "enemies of the human race," "desperadoes," "as reckless, unscrupulous and ignorant of the real events of things as was Marat," "an insignificant gang of criminals or madmen," "persons of low intellectual organisation," "scoundrels" of "immeasurable inferiority in all physical and moral qualities." There may be among us "a sprinkling of more choice spirits, who are looking forward to some hare-brained scheme of political reform"; nevertheless, our propaganda is "anti-social," and consists in "idiotic ravings," "imbecile folly," "the production and distribution of murderous literature." Soon the hunt against the 'wolves' will begin, and it will be carried on with all the 'resources of civilisation.'

The minor London dailies follow suit.

The "Daily Telegraph" of May 7th:—

"It is quite logical that an Anarchist, who desires to see all society and government destroyed, should demand for himself the licence of savagery; but civilisation has a perfect right to recognise him as its bitterest foe and to use

all its resources for his punishment. The prisoner Nicoll, however, not only claims what his anarchical theory involves, but when he finds himself confronted by outraged society he shifts his ground and whines for the liberty which he has forfeited—the liberty of the citizen, in which the Anarchist can have no share."

The "Standard" of April 22nd:—

"In Chicago the Anarchists are preparing to take advantage of the occasion to stimulate bitter feeling and class hatred. It will not be the fault of these reckless fanatics if the day closes without a disturbance that might possibly end in bloodshed. In language of the most incendiary character, they call upon the workmen to 'rise en masse,' and protest against the oppression of the police; and they recall, as they have done so often, the memory of the local 'martyrs'—meaning the ruffians who threw dynamite cartridges among a crowd, and were most righteously hanged for the massacre that followed."

The "Daily Chronicle" of April 11th:—

"What is anarchy but individualism run mad, when it is not made a pretext for savage rapine or wanton blackguardism."

A correspondent of the "St. James's Gazette":—

"What a pleasure it would be to mete out to dynamitards the measure that they deal to us. We might take a dozen or a score and confine them in some disused building, with plenty of food and drink to relieve the tedium of manacles. They would be informed that at some hour not fixed, on a day not yet arranged, an explosion would occur in the building they were occupying. To fill up what might be otherwise an uneventful interval, a few select members of the company might have small canisters attached to them, with ominous clock-work tickings—some charged with combustion and others empty. But which were which, that would be a secret for the dynamitards to discover by experience."

(In fiendish ingenuity of revengeful torment surely this beats the "Feast at the Opera" horror.)

We might fill a paper twice the size of *Freedom* with such quotations; but these are amply sufficient to show of what spirit are the hired apologists of middle-class rule, and the hypocrisy of the contention that when Anarchists are prosecuted it is not for their opinions, but merely their violence of expression.

There is, however, one more authoritarian organ to whose attack we must allude, because the paper in question professes a sort of Socialism, and strikes at us under an ostentatious affectation of quasi-comradeship.

Justice, "The Organ of the Social Democracy," April 16, writes under the heading "Ravachol, the Anarchist Hero":—

"Whenever we have met Anarchists, and we have met a good many, in public and private, they have openly proclaimed that all means are fair against our present society." Here follows a quotation from Bakounine, "whom Anarchists regard as their chief theorist and teacher," to the effect that destruction by all and any means is the sole end of the social revolutionist. "Anarchists denounce organisation." (Where and when have we denounced it?) Ravachol has successfully proclaimed the principles laid down by Bakounine and the 'Révolte' (When did the 'Révolte' advocate robbery and murder?), but is now 'repudiated' by the Anarchists, who had better therefore, 'publicly' confess that they have given up their theories."

No Anarchists having been drawn by this farrago of misrepresentations and lies, "Justice," of April 30, proceeds to name individually several Anarchists, including Mr. Tucker of Boston, for whom it feels "something" akin to contempt in that all "Anarchist theories of necessity lead to terrorism," and the Anarchists, "while denouncing discipline, deriding elected authority, and upholding the absolute supremacy of the individual—which is the creed of the most complete individual selfishness—at the same time repudiate those who put their theories into practice."

Finally, Comrade Burnie having written to "Justice" for May 7, explaining his position, the Editor takes the opportunity to repeat in a foot-note the names of various Anarchists, English and foreign, now in England, and to state that he has "heard 'propaganda by deed' vehemently defended by the best known Anarchists in Europe," the context clearly implying that deeds à la Ravachol is meant. [Is our comrade the Editor of "Justice" afraid that Inspector Melville may forget to lock some of us up?]

Now we had as soon answer seriously the ravings of the "St. James's Gazette" as the lying insinuations of "Justice," were it not just possible that some ill-informed, but honest Social Democrat may have been misled thereby. To avoid this we briefly note and expose the most glaring misstatements.

In the first place, we absolutely deny that we, or, as far as we are acquainted with their opinions, any of the Anarchists named, believe or have ever published or privately stated that "ALL means are fair against our present infamous society." We doubt if there be an English Anarchist group who would make such a statement. The most headlong and fiery would at all events draw the line at Parliamentary action; and the greater number would oppose inhumane or underhand methods in offensive tactics as contrary to the very essence of Anarchism.

Secondly, we deny that the pretended quotation from Bakounine is in any sense a fair expression of his views as recorded in his public writings. It purports to be taken from "The Revolutionary Catechism." This, it appears, is a Russian manuscript written in cipher and, as far as we are able to learn, never published! It was read by the police at Netchaieff's trial, in 1871, as being Bakounine's, though most probably it was one of Netchaieff's many forgeries in Bakounine's name. Certainly it holds much the same relation to Bakounine's authentic expressions of his views as the "Feast at the Opera" to the opinions of the rational and bona fide Anarchists of to-day as set forth in their recognised organs. And this obscure and questionable document, which none of us have seen, and most of us never heard of, is quoted by "Justice" as a sort of text book of Anarchist theory!

Thirdly, we deny that Bakounine, greatly as we honour the man and admire his work, is our "chief thinker and theorist." Anarchism has developed and expressed itself more fully in many directions since his time, and it would be misleading to take a phrase or two even from his

acknowledged writings as an adequate summary of the views of living Anarchists. The Anarchists named by "Justice" are most of them public speakers and writers. Why are their own words not quoted as expressing their views?

Fourth. When, where and how has "Justice" found the public organs of the Anarchists mentioned "denouncing" and "repudiating" Ravachol, or any sincere man who rebels against the present social disorder and oppression? They may think certain actions regrettable or ill advised, but when have they denounced any man who was driven to rebel even ill-advisedly against the social wrongs of to-day? We keep our denunciations for the cowards who lie down under oppression, the indifferent who pass by on the other side saying "am I my brother's keeper?" the exploiters and tyrants, who grind the faces of the poor, and those miserable apologists who, with tongue and pen, play into the hands of the oppressors of mankind.

FREEDOM.

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.
MONTHLY, 1d., POST FREE 1½d.

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

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

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

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

Freedom Pamphlets.—No. I., "The Wage System," by Peter Kropotkin, 1d., post free, 1½d. No. II., "The Commune of Paris," by Peter Kropotkin, 1d., post free, 1½d.; per quire of 25, 1s. 4d. No. III., "A Talk about Anarchist Communism between Two Workmen," by Enrico Malatesta, 1d., post free, 1½d.; per quire of 25, 1s. 4d. No. IV., "Anarchist Communism: Its Basis and Principles," by Peter Kropotkin, 2d., post free, 2½d.; per quire of 25, 2s. 8d.

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

Received: FREEDOM PUBLICATION FUND—R. H. Fitzpatrick, Dublin, £1; H. G., Cape Colony, 10s. For Walsall—J. B., 10s.; H. G., 10s.

SPECIAL NOTICE.—"Anarchy" finishing this month, we intend to publish it in pamphlet form as soon as we get the funds necessary for it. We shall be glad to receive donations towards this, or orders paid in advance.

Next month we propose to publish a translation of Elie Reclus' preface to Kropotkin's new book "Le Conquête du Pain."

NOTES.

MAY DAY IN HYDE PARK.

Any person in the Park on 1st of May, accustomed to look a little beneath the surface, would have come to the conclusion that the "labor movement" had fallen into the hands of the wire-pullers and officials of the trade unions. From the platforms went up the cry "Legalise our claim for less toil." "Legislate in our interest, ye mighty mediocrities." "We have organised ourselves, but in our strength we bend our backs to thee." "O legislators, give us a little more leisure, we will waive the question as to the right to judge what is best for ourselves," and so on. There was a very apparent stamp of insincerity about the whole of the proceedings. The people generally cannot be expected to go into ecstasies at the prospect of fresh laws, their confidence in the wisdom of the "human humbugs" having been rudely shaken of late. The whole thing was more of a Sunday outing than anything else. And besides, as Hyndman has said, "one cannot be expected to work up much enthusiasm over an eight hours bill." The Commonweal and Freedom groups held two very successful meetings, which were attended by large and attentive audiences. The meetings were kept up for about four hours, and we do not know whether or not it is conceit on our part, but certainly there seemed to be a truer ring in the tone of the proceedings than in the wishy-washy stuff preached across the way. Among those who spoke were Tochatti, Leggat, Samuels, Turner, Morton, Louise Michel and others. Several of the speakers took great care to show (by reason of recent events) that Anarchy did not mean violence and dynamite, but that it possessed a philosophy based upon the efficacy of natural (not man-made) law. This May-day movement will develop into something more, we hope, than a mere "legalist" agitation, and we may yet see the May-day of the Anarchist, no master over men, no government of man by man, but freedom and individual liberty for all. We must not forget to remind our readers that, in spite of the attempts of the government and the press to blacken the Anarchists in the sight of the public, our speakers were never more attentively listened to as on last May-day.

RAVACHOL.

We hear from a reliable source that Ravachol's murder of the miser at Charnes was entirely unpremeditated. Driven to action by his intense feeling for the misery he saw around him, and unfortunately influenced by the (as we believe) wholly mistaken idea that in a society where exploitation is the order of the day there is no harm in

getting money for the cause by violent or underhand means, Ravachol went to help himself to the old man's hoard at a time when he believed its owner to be out. But the poor old fellow returned while the robber was in his room, and Ravachol seized him by the throat, intending merely to push him back that he himself might escape. Unhappily the young man's grasp was rougher than he knew. The old miser was very feeble. To Ravachol's horror he fell back dead. The money stolen was used entirely for the propaganda.

All reliable information with regard to Ravachol goes to show that he is no "hardened, low-minded criminal," as the "Times" expresses it, but rather a disinterested fanatic, an enthusiast whose errors result from lack of mental and moral breadth of vision. His fearlessness and energy are a reproach to every Socialist. If we think him and such as he ill-advised, the remedy is to go forward ourselves with equal energy along what seems to us a wiser path. Anarchists, above all, Anarchist-workmen, it is for you to open up a way of direct revolutionary action in which fearless energy may find a healthier scope.

THE MURDER OF THE INNOCENT.

A woman named Conolly, at Belfast, on April 29, hearing suddenly that her son had been sentenced to three years penal servitude for assaulting a policeman, dropped down dead in her kitchen. Is this instance of the unmerited suffering inflicted by legal penalties an isolated case? Are the blunders of a Ravachol the only sort of blind human violence which results in the suffering or death of innocent persons?

EQUALITY BEFORE THE LAW.

Side by side with the report of the "Commonweal" trial there appeared, in the daily papers for May 7, an account of a speech by the Prime Minister before the Grand Habitation of the Primrose League, at the Royal Covent Garden Opera House. In this speech Lord Salisbury openly suggested to the Protestants of Ulster that, if Home Rule were granted to the rest of Ireland, they who prefer Union would have a sufficient cause of civil war, and recalled to their recollection how their forefathers had met James II. when he stepped outside the limits of the constitution. The parallel between these utterances and those for which Nicoll was being tried by the very government of which Salisbury is the head suggests to "Truth" a very pretty parody:

SENTENCE ON LORD SALISBURY AT THE OLD BAILEY.

In passing sentence of eighteen months' imprisonment on Lord Salisbury at the Old Bailey the Lord Chief Justice said:—

I have hesitated long, Salisbury, as to what punishment I should give you, for you have shown marks of considerable education and force of character, and still you have been guilty of what I cannot but regard as a very grave offence indeed. Suppose—a thing by no means impossible, or, indeed, improbable—some of the hot-headed Orangemen, acting on your advice, had rebelled, and had taken the lives of Nationalists, you would have been guilty morally for these murders. You would have taken part in them, and really have been a party to them—nay, your conduct would have been worse than theirs, for you have had the meanness to urge others to incur risks from which you yourself shrink. I do not wish to send you to penal servitude, although I could. I think it possible you acted in heat, and without considering the very grave consequence of what you were doing. If you desire to prevent Home Rule, you are going the wrong way about it. You are setting right-minded men against you; you are turning away all sympathy from any wrongs which you may honestly think Orangemen have. You were warned by your associate, Sir Henry James, that the advice that you tendered to them was base and disgraceful, but you spurned this advice. For the sake of the law, for the sake of yourself, you must not be encouraged to think that you can do these things with impunity. I must pass a severe sentence. The sentence of the court is that you be imprisoned and kept to hard labor for eighteen months. During the delivery of the sentence, the prisoner preserved a sullen demeanour. Before his removal from the dock he was allowed to shake hands with the Duke of Devonshire, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Johnston of Ballykilbeg, Mdme. Louise Michel and Mr. Mowbray, who loudly expressed their sympathy with him. On their raising shouts, however, of "Vive l'anarchie," the ushers interfered, and, by the direction of the judge, turned them out of court.

("Truth" May 11.)

LONDON SOCIETY.

In the "North American Review" for May, Lady Jeune gives a microscopic sketch of a certain section of London society, the "smartest set," which she denounces as creating a condition of things that respectable English opinion considers a reproach and a danger to the country. The only passport needed to gain admission to the "smartest set" is wealth, it seems, as its members are summed up as being idle, vicious and vulgar. Some of their other characteristics are "to have a good cook, to be the smartest dressed woman, to give entertainments, when a fortune is spent on flowers and decorations, to be the last favored guest of royalty, or to have sailed as near to the wind of social disaster as is compatible with not being shipwrecked." In this set the old nobility and even royalty may be found at least as guests at the magnificent entertainments, but the members are for the most part the "new rich," i.e., the latest successful gamblers on the Stock Exchange or those who have profited only too well by the sweat of the workers. It is good for the workers to learn through the pen of one who has rubbed shoulders with these leaders of fashion and entertainers of royalty how the fruit of their labor is spent. Lady Jeune says, "Luxury, Ease and Comfort" are the watchword of this section of London society, to which those who have created the means that enable the "smartest set" to have its fling must answer with the cry of "Hunger, Poverty, Dirt."

A SPOILT MARKET.

One charge of Lady Jeune against these smart folk is that they are spoiling the marriage market for the aristocratic spinster. A season in

London is no longer a happy hunting-ground where wealthy and titled husbands may be captured by manœuvring mammas with marriageable daughters. The standard of luxury raised by the smart set is beyond the reach of the marrying young man, and we are given a picture of the fashionable ballroom, where "patient rows of sleepy chaperons and anxious girls await the arrival of the young Adonis, who, after surveying the serried ranks scornfully through his eyeglass from the end of the ball-room, retires below to partake of the hospitality provided by his thoughtful host; and having thus done his duty goes back to his club." So the universal cry is "The men won't marry," and why should they, when in the "smartest set" a man can get all the pleasures and none of the anxieties of matrimony, if he be so minded. The young married women have become as formidable rivals to girls on their promotion as they are also said to be "to another and an entirely different class of female society," so Lady Jeune politely puts it. Men who marry on small means "suddenly find their whole surroundings changed by the addition of horses and carriages, French cooks, and all the modern luxuries," but they open their mouths and shut their eyes, and accept the miracles without enquiring who wrought them. Lady Jeune predicts that, "unless some unforeseen event occurs which will change the direction in which society is moving, public opinion will insist on its reconstruction on a firmer and entirely different basis, and the lines of demarcation which now divide society will become more clearly defined." It may be that Lady Jeune's vision of a new society does not correspond in every point with our ideal, but we concur with her in thinking that public opinion every day more loudly expresses dissatisfaction with things as they are, and we furthermore think the event which could bring about a change is not altogether unforeseen. It must always be borne in mind that the scum floats on the top, and in the refining process of progressive civilisation the scum of society must be from time to time cleared off.

A BAD QUARTER-OF-AN-HOUR FOR HERREN BEBEL AND SINGER.

Bebel and Singer, the Social Democratic members of the German Reichstag are now in London, "for the good of their health." At the meeting in the Communist club, Tottenham Street, on May 21st, they were confronted by serious charges as to their present attitude in the Socialist movement. After a very bad quarter-of-an-hour, they hastily closed the meeting, declining to discuss matters with Anarchists at all, but expressing a wish to hear more about the matter and to debate it with the Independent Socialists. This was taken up, and a meeting was convened, to discuss the Socialist Labor Movement, on May 24th, at the Athenæum Hall, Tottenham Court Road, which Bebel and Singer promised to attend; but at the last moment they felt a little sick and sent the usual parliamentary apologies. However, our Anarchist comrades who were there took advantage of the big crowd and held a splendid meeting.

JOHN MOST AT LIBERTY.

After a year's imprisonment, Most has again gained the outer world, and has met with a tremendous welcome from the New York workers at Cooper's Institute. So far from his persecution by the government having diminished his popularity, it has had just the reverse effect, as was shown by the workers' clamouring for him to make a speech at the May-day Demonstration, in spite of the decided objections and opposition of the leaders of the Central Labor Federation to the appearance of any Anarchist upon the platform. Most and our comrade S. Merlino are now doing good propaganda together in the States. We have no doubt their work will bear fruit a thousandfold. Already we are glad to see that, as a result of Anarchist propaganda, the New York Labor Unions have decided to strike out political action from their program as a first step towards a common basis.

THE COMMONWEAL TRIAL.

On the 7th of May, Comrades D. J. Nicoll, editor of the "Commonweal," and C. W. Mowbray, former publisher of the same, were tried before Chief Justice Coleridge, at the Old Bailey, for, in their paper, "maliciously soliciting and encouraging certain persons unknown to murder the Right Hon. Henry Matthews, Secretary of State for the Home Department, Sir Henry Hawkins, of the judges of the High Court of Justice, and William Melville, an inspector of Metropolitan Police." Nicoll was also charged with, "in a certain public place, inciting and encouraging Her Majesty's liege subjects to injure and kill certain other of Her Majesty's subjects." The prosecution was brought under an act passed in 1861, making all persons guilty of a misdemeanor who may "conspire, solicit, persuade or endeavor to persuade any person to murder any other person." What a number of innocent-seeming enactments, capable of being twisted into weapons of attacks against political adversaries, have crept, unknown to the people, into the statutes of constitutional England, where the law is "the expression of the people's will"!

As to the first charge, there was very little scope for the lawyers. Comrade Nicoll boldly avowed having written the article on the Walsall sentence in the "Commonweal" for April 9th, which demanded if such men as Matthews & Co. were "fit to live," and in a previous paragraph, when warning Anarchists against the folly of letting themselves be entangled in such mere police traps as "plots" and "conspiracies," said that if any one did feel called upon to strike a physical blow at the tyrants of society, he had far better do as John Felton did, strike that blow himself, without involving any one else needlessly in his responsi-

bility. Nicoll denied that this article was intended by him as an incitement to any one to commit murder; it was written in hot blood, when the news of the issue of the infamous Walsall police plot reached him, and with a similar provocation he should probably write as hotly again. His opinion of the conduct of the persons he had denounced was in no way changed, and he suspected that this charge against him was brought to get him out of the way, because the police knew that he was collecting evidence of the vile means they had used in concocting their Walsall plot in conjunction with the provoking-agent Coulson. The remainder of his speech was an eloquent denunciation of the existing state of society and the criminal folly of attempting to silence by force those who were honestly expressing their convictions about it. Unhappily, we are unable to reproduce this speech. Our comrades had the greatest difficulty in obtaining admittance to the court, which nevertheless is supposed to be public and was by no means full. The two or three who did get in were prevented by the police from taking any notes. The request of the Commonwealth Group to buy a copy of the official report has been refused.

With regard to the first charge against Nicoll, the prosecution had thus nothing to prove, but the Attorney General could not resist the temptation to practise the usual tricks of the trade and go out of his way to endeavour to prejudice the jury against the prisoner by reading carefully selected miscellaneous extracts from the "Commonweal," calculated to show the general ferocity of Anarchists. But Lord Coleridge, the impartiality and courtesy of whose behaviour was a striking contrast to the conduct of the Bow Street Magistrate Vaughan, said that he could not admit arbitrarily selected extracts; if read at all, the whole articles must be given, and if this were done, he feared he should have to keep the jury over Sunday. Failing in this, the Attorney General tried to put in evidence letters referring to the Walsall affair found upon the prisoner. "But you or I might have letters referring to Walsall, Mr. Attorney General," said his lordship, and the prosecution subsided under another snub from the bench. To prove Nicoll's handwriting, a letter was produced. That letter, explained Nicoll, was obtained from me by a policeman who came into my cell, pretending great sympathy with me, and offering to get a letter conveyed to my family. The letter was never delivered; it had merely been a trick to obtain the writing!

The second charge rested merely on the evidence of a policeman, Francis Powell, and a detective in the Criminal Investigation Department, one John Sweeney. These worthies swore that each of them independently had heard and afterwards noted down a speech by Nicoll, in Hyde Park, April 10, in which he had said of Matthews & Co. that "two of them must die."

Four non-Anarchist witnesses, who had been present at the Hyde Park meeting and on hearing of the accusation had written volunteering to give evidence as to what they have heard there, besides several other persons, who had also heard Nicoll's speech, then swore that he had certainly never used the words charged against him and sworn to by the police. The prosecution now tried to discredit the evidence by asking one of the witnesses, Henderson, if he had not been imprisoned for the Norwich riot and been bail for a Walsall man, his brother-in-law, Charles. "But you are now a member of the London County Council," said Burnie, one of Mowbray's counsel. "Yes," replied Henderson. Whereupon the Attorney General tried another dodge, and for the first time stated that Nicoll had delivered two speeches on April 10. Here the judge again interfered: What right had the prosecution to spring this mine on the prisoner? Nothing had been said at the examination in chief to direct the attention of the defence to this theory. The police witnesses must be recalled. "Sweeney [we quote from the "Star" of May 7.] got a tremendous roasting from the judge for concealing, when in the box before, the fact that two speeches were made." He now said there were two speeches, but the second was a repetition of the first. Reminded by the judge that he had said "A speech" and "I took a note of it," he replied: "I took a general note." His lordship: "A general note!!" And the unlucky witness went floundering from one confusion to another. Powell got into an equally sad mess. He took his note "an hour after the last speech," and apparently it too was a "general" one. "I meant in the sense, my lord"—The judge: "The sense!!" "My lord, this is clearly a case of perjury on the part of the police," said Nicoll, and the two ingenious couple slunk away like beaten hounds. We have not, however, heard that they are to be prosecuted.

Mowbray was defended by two barristers. They had no difficulty in proving that his connection with the "Commonweal" was severed, and that he disapproved of the article in question, for which, moreover, Nicoll frankly took full responsibility. Under these circumstances it was surely needless for one of the said counsel, Mr. Grain, to dwell in so hostile a tone on Nicoll's hot-headed style, and the same advocate's plea for Mowbray as a sort of quaker in his horror of all appeals to force sounded rather odd to comrades who remember speeches certainly not lacking in a strain of hardy defiance of the foe.

Summing up, Lord Coleridge said: "If the accused persons thought the sentence passed by a learned judge was too severe, that his demeanor was hostile to the prisoners, that he had in any way misconducted himself as a public man, they had a perfect right to comment upon such conduct, but the liberty of the press must not be degraded into licence. Considering that a thick volume of statutes were passed every year, and that a great number of these were intended for amendments of the law, it would be absurd for any fair-minded man to say that the state of the law was not matter for attack, in the hope of changing it. We should all have been in a very different position had it not been for men, not very mealy-mouthed and not very submissive to the then

existing state of things, who had gone sometimes with their lives, often with their liberties, in their hands to draw attention to the iniquities and inequalities of the law, and had thus brought about a better state of things." This is a good deal for a judge to admit, and Lord Coleridge added that, in the course of his own life, he had seen 160 capital offences struck off the English statute book. He even allowed that many abuses still existed, and that the Anarchists complained of them "perhaps justly." Nevertheless, on the jury finding Nicoll guilty, the Chief Justice condemned him to eighteen months imprisonment, "that the law might be upheld," whilst at the same time he complimented our comrade on his ability and his brave and manly bearing before the court. Mowbray was acquitted.

In a letter to a friend, dated 7th May, Pentonville Prison, Nicoll says:—

I didn't expect quite so heavy a sentence, but I am still cheerful and hopeful. A remission is not impossible, and even if I have to serve the whole of the time I am young and strong and I can bear it. It is as well to make the best of it, and let all do the same. . . . Believe me my fate is not so hard as some might imagine, and I do not think my imprisonment will hurt me, so there is no need for anyone to be distressed on my account.

The courage and earnest sincerity of Nicoll's attitude and the cleverness with which he exposed the tricks of the police have made an excellent public impression, and served to quicken the general interest in Anarchism. The "Commonweal" has received extra support on all hands. At the time of the arrests it sold in the parks at 6d. a copy, and 20 quires were sold in Manchester on May Day. With other Anarchist literature the same. Reeves has already sold out his new edition of Reclus' "Evolution and Revolution." And as to *Freedom*, of which we stupidly only printed our usual 2000 copies, the May issue was completely exhausted during the first week in the month.

Here as in other countries governments make excellent propaganda by their attempts at repression.

ANARCHY.

BY ENRICO MALATESTA.

(Continued from previous number.)

In fact, a program which would touch the basis of the new social constitution could not do more, after all, than indicate a method. And method, more than anything else, defines parties and determines their importance in history. Method apart, everyone says he wishes for the good of mankind, and many do truly wish for it. As parties disappear, every organised action directed to a definite end disappears likewise. It is therefore necessary to consider Anarchy as, above all, a method.

There are two methods by which the different parties, not Anarchistic, expect, or say they expect, to bring about the greatest good of each and all. These are the authoritarian or State Socialist and the individualist methods. The former entrusts the direction of social life to a few, and it would result in the exploitation and oppression of the masses by that few. The second party trusts to the free initiative of individuals, and proclaims, if not the abolition, the reduction of government. However, as it respects private property, and is founded on the principle of each for himself, and therefore on competition, its liberty is only the liberty of the strong, the licence of those who have, to oppress and exploit the weak who have nothing. Far from producing harmony, it would tend always to augment the distance between the rich and the poor, and end also through exploitation and domination in authority. This second method, Individualism, is in theory a kind of Anarchy without Socialism. It is therefore no better than a lie, because liberty is not possible without equality, and true Anarchy cannot be without Solidarity, without Socialism. The criticism which Individualists pass on government is merely the wish to deprive it of certain functions, to virtually hand them over to the capitalist. But it cannot attack those repressive functions which form the essence of government, for without an armed force the proprietary system could not be upheld. Nay, even more, under Individualism, the repressive power of government must always increase, in proportion to the increase, by means of free competition, of the want of inequality and harmony.

Anarchists present a new method; the free initiative of all and free agreement, then, after the revolutionary abolition of private property, every one will have equal power to dispose of social wealth. This method, not admitting the re-establishment of private property, must lead, by means of free association, to the complete triumph of the principles of solidarity.

Thus we see that all the problems put forward to combat the Anarchistic idea are on the contrary arguments in favor of Anarchy, because it alone indicates the way in which, by experience, those solutions which correspond to the dicta of science, and to the needs and wishes of all, can best be found.

How will children be educated? We do not know. What then? The parents, teachers and all, who are interested in the progress of the rising generation, will meet, discuss, agree and differ, and then divide according to their various opinions, putting into practice the methods which they respectively hold to be best. That method which, when tried, produces the best results will triumph in the end.

And so for all the problems that may arise.

According to what we have so far said, it is evident that Anarchy, as the Anarchists conceive it, and as alone it can be comprehended, is based on Socialism. Furthermore, were it not for that school of Socialists who artificially divide the natural unity of the social question, considering only some detached points, and were it not also for the equivocations with which they strive to hinder the social revolution, we might say right away that Anarchy is synonymous with Socialism. Because both signify the abolition of exploitation and of the domination of man over man, whether maintained by the force of arms or by the monopolisation of the means of life.

Anarchy, like Socialism, has for its basis and necessary point of departure EQUALITY OF CONDITIONS. Its aim is SOLIDARITY, and its method LIBERTY. It is not perfection, nor is it the absolute ideal, which, like the horizon, always recedes as we advance towards it. But it is the open road to all progress and to all improvement, made in the interest of all humanity.

There are authoritarians who grant that Anarchy is the mode of social life which alone opens the way to the attainment of the highest possible good for mankind, because it alone can put an end to every class interested in keeping the masses oppressed and miserable. They also grant that Anarchy is possible, because it does nothing more than release humanity from an obstacle—government—against which it has always had to fight its painful way towards progress. Nevertheless, these authoritarians, reinforced by many warm lovers of liberty and justice in theory, retire into their last entrenchments, because they are afraid of liberty, and cannot be persuaded that mankind could live and prosper without teachers and pastors; still, hard pressed by the truth, they pitifully demand to have the reign of liberty put off for a while, indeed for as long as possible.

Such is the substance of the arguments that meet us at this stage.

A society without a government, which would act by free, voluntary co-operation, trusting entirely to the spontaneous action of those interested, and founded altogether on solidarity and sympathy, is certainly, they say, a very beautiful ideal, but, like all ideals, it is a castle in the air. We find ourselves placed in a human society, which has always been divided into oppressors and oppressed, and if the former are full of the spirit of domination, and have all the vices of tyrants, the latter are corrupted by servility, and have those still worse vices, which are the result of enslavement. The sentiment of solidarity is far from being dominant in man at the present day, and if it is true that the different classes of men are becoming more and more unanimous among themselves, it is none the less true that that which is most conspicuous and impresses itself most on human character to-day is the struggle for existence. It is a fact that each fights daily against everyone else, and competition presses upon all, workmen and masters, causing every man to become as a wolf towards every other man. How can these men, educated in a society based upon antagonism between individuals as well as classes, be transformed in a moment and become capable of living in a society in which each shall do as he likes, and as he should, without external coercion, caring for the good of others, simply by the impulse of their own nature? And with what heart or what common sense can you trust to a revolution on the part of an ignorant, turbulent mass, weakened by misery, stupified by priestcraft, who are to-day blindly sanguinary and tomorrow will let themselves be humbugged by any knave, who dares to call himself their master? Would it not be more prudent to advance gradually towards the Anarchistic ideal, passing through republican, democratic and socialistic stages? Will not an educative government, composed of the best men, be necessary to prepare the advancing generations for their future destiny?

These objections also ought not to appear valid if we have succeeded in making our readers understand what we have already said and in convincing them of it. But in any case, even at the risk of repetition, it may be as well to answer them.

We find ourselves continually met by the false notion that government is in itself a new force, sprung up one knows not whence, which of itself adds something to the sum of the force and capability of those of whom it is composed and of those who obey it. While, on the contrary, all that is done is done by individual men. The government, as a government, adds nothing save the tendency to monopolise for the advantage of certain parties or classes, and to repress all initiative from beyond its own circle.

To abolish authority or government does not mean to destroy the individual or collective forces, which are at work in society, nor the influence men exert over one another. That would be to reduce humanity to an aggregate of inert and separate atoms; an impossibility which, if it could be performed, would be the destruction of any society, the death blow to mankind. To abolish authority means to abolish the monopoly of force and of influence. It means to abolish that state of things by which social force, i.e., the collective force of all in a society, is made the instrument of the thought, will and interests of a small number of individuals. These, by means of the collective force, suppress the liberty of everyone else, to the advantage of their own ideas. In other words, it means to destroy a mode of organisation by means of which the future is exploited, between one revolution and another, to the profit of those who have been the victors of the moment.

Michael Bakounine, in an article published in 1872, asserts that the great means of action of the International were the propagating of their ideas, and the organisation of the spontaneous action of its members in regard to the masses. He then adds:

"To whoever might pretend that action so organised would be an outrage on the liberty of the masses, or an attempt to create a new authoritative power, we would reply that he is a sophist and a fool. So much the worse for those who ignore the natural, social law of human solidarity, to the extent of imagining that an absolute mutual independence of individuals and of masses is a possible or even desirable thing. To desire it would be to wish for the destruction of society, for all social life is nothing else than this mutual and incessant dependence among individuals and masses. All individuals, even the most gifted and strongest, indeed most of all the most gifted and strongest, are at every moment of their lives, at the same time, producers and products. Equal liberty for every individual is only the resultant, continually reproduced, of this mass of material, intellectual and moral influence exercised on him by all the individuals around him, belonging to the society in which he was born, has developed and dies. To wish to escape this influence in the name of a transcendental liberty, divine, absolutely egoistic and sufficient to itself is the tendency to annihilation. To refrain from influencing others would mean to refrain from all social action, indeed to abstain from all expression of one's thoughts and sentiments, and simply to become non-existent. This independence, so much extolled by idealists and metaphysicians, individual liberty conceived in this sense would amount to self-annihilation.

In nature, as in human society, which is also a part of this same nature, all that exists lives only by complying with the supreme conditions of interaction, which is more or less positive and potent with regard to the lives of other beings, according to the nature of the individual. And when we vindicate the liberty of the masses, we do not pretend to abolish anything of the natural influences that individuals or groups of individuals exert upon one another. What we wish for is the abolition of artificial influences, which are privileged, legal and official."

Certainly, in the present state of mankind, oppressed by misery, stupified by superstition and sunk in degradation, the human lot depends upon a relatively small number of individuals. Of course all men will not be able to rise in a moment to the height of perceiving their duty, or even the enjoyment of so regulating their own action that others also will derive the greatest possible benefit from it. But because now-a-days the thoughtful and guiding forces at work in society are few, that is no reason for paralysing them still more, and for the subjection of many individuals to the direction of a few. It is no reason for constituting society in such a manner that the most active forces, the highest capacities are, in the end, found outside the government, and almost deprived of influence on social life. All this now happens owing to the inertia that secured positions foster, to heredity, to protectionism, to party spirit and to all the mechanism of government. For those in government office, taken out of their former social position, primarily concerned in retaining power, lose all power to act spontaneously, and become only an obstacle to the free action of others.

With the abolition of this negative potency constituting government, society will become that which it can be, with the given forces and capabilities of the moment. If there are educated men desirous of spreading education, they will organise the schools, and will be constrained to make the use and enjoyment to be derived from education felt. And if there are no such men, or only a few of them, a government cannot create them. All it can do, as in fact it does now-a-days, is to take these few away from practical, fruitful work in the sphere of education, and put them to direct from above what has to be imposed by the help of a police system. So they make out of intelligent and impassionate teachers mere politicians, who become useless parasites, entirely absorbed in imposing their own hobbies, and in maintaining themselves in power.

If there are doctors and teachers of hygiene, they will organise themselves for the service of health. And if there are none, a government cannot create them; all that it can do is to discredit them in the eyes of the people, who are inclined to entertain suspicious, sometimes only too well founded, with regard to every thing which is imposed upon them.

If there are engineers and mechanics, they will organise the railways, etc.; and if there are none, a government cannot create them.

The revolution, by abolishing government and private property, will not create force which does not exist, but it will leave a free field for the exercise of all available force and of all existent capacity. While it will destroy every class interested in keeping the masses degraded, it will act in such a way that every one will be free to work and make his influence felt, in proportion to his own capacity, and in conformity with his sentiments and interests. And it is only thus that the elevation of the masses is possible, for it is only with liberty that one can learn to be free, as it is only by working that one can learn to work. A government, even had it no other disadvantages, must always have that of habituating the governed to subjection, and must also tend to become more oppressive and more necessary, in proportion as its subjects are more obedient and docile.

But suppose government were the direction of affairs by the best people. Who are the best? And how shall we recognise their superiority? The majority are generally attached to old prejudices, and have ideas and instincts already outgrown by the more favored minority. But of the various minorities, who all believe themselves in the right, as no doubt many of them are in part, which shall be chosen to rule? And by whom? And by what criterion? Seeing that the future alone can prove which party among them is the

most superior. If you choose a hundred partizans of dictatorship, you will discover that each one of the hundred believes himself capable of being, if not sole dictator, at least of assisting very materially in the dictatorial government. The dictators would be those who, by one means or another, succeeded in imposing themselves on society. And, in course of time, all their energy would inevitably be employed in defending themselves against the attacks of their adversaries, totally oblivious of their desire, if ever they had had it, to be merely an educative power.

Should government be, on the other hand, elected by universal suffrage, and so be the emanation, more or less sincere, of the wish of the majority? But if you consider these worthy electors as incapable of providing for their own interests, how can they ever be capable of themselves choosing directors to guide them wisely? How solve this problem of social alchemy: To elect a government of geniuses by the votes of a mass of fools? And what will be the lot of the minority, who are the most intelligent, most active and most advanced in society?

To solve the social problem to the advantage of all, there is only one way. To expel the government by revolutionary means, to expropriate the holders of social wealth, putting everything at the disposition of all, and to leave all existing force, capacity and goodwill among men free to provide for the needs of all.

We fight for Anarchy and for Socialism because we believe that Anarchy and Socialism ought to be brought into operation as soon as possible. Which means that the revolution must drive away the government, abolish private property, and entrust all public service, which will then embrace all social life, to the spontaneous, free, unofficial and unauthorised operation of all those interested and all willing volunteers.

There will certainly be difficulties and inconveniences, but the people will be resolute, and they alone can solve all difficulties Anarchically, that is, by direct action of those interested and by free agreement.

We cannot say whether Anarchy and Socialism will triumph after the next revolutionary attempt, but this is certain that if any of the so-called transition programs triumph, it will be because we have been temporarily beaten, and never because we have thought it wise to leave in existence any one part of that evil system under which humanity groans.

Whatever happens, we shall have some influence on events, by our numbers, our energy, our intelligence and our steadfastness. Also, even if we are now conquered, our work will not have been in vain; for the more decided we shall have been in aiming at the realisation of all our demands, the less there will be of government and of private property in the new society. And we shall have done a great work, for human progress is measured by the degree in which government and private property are diminished.

If to-day we fall without lowering our colours, our cause is certain of victory tomorrow.

THE END.

A PLEA FOR COMMUNISM.

WHAT right has an individual member of a community to the satisfaction of his needs and desires?

The general supposition in present society is that a man has a right to what he has "earned." And by what is "earned" is meant that which a man succeeds in obtaining in return for his labor. The idea whether the earning is a fair return for the labor done does not enter here. When a woman, born in poverty, by excessive toil can hardly "earn" enough to keep body and soul together, and a high church dignitary or court official, brought up in luxury, "earns" his thousands a year, there can be no question of their respectively deserving just what each receives.

It may, however, be held by some that it would be possible so to adjust earnings that they would be in proportion to the work done. That this might be possible, it would be necessary to calculate the exact value to society of all kinds of work, or, in other words, the respective utility of different products obtained by work. This, it seems to us, would be simply an impossibility. Judged by the demand for certain products, these vary from time to time, according to circumstances, both on the part of society taken collectively and on the part of the individuals who make up society. A product of great value in one locality is little valued in another; things highly prized by one individual may be of no use at all to another. Consequently it would be impossible to determine the respective values of different products, and so to apportion the just reward deservedly earned by each in producing them.

Again, if we take TIME as the measure by which to apportion the deserts of an individual, would that in the end be just? In this case the strong, energetic man engaged on some easy employment might work possibly twice as long as the weak man, simply from the fact that he had inherited a stronger physique, not at all a matter of personal desert. Or even two individuals equally vigorous, engaged on different kinds of labor, varying in intensity of effort required, would not both be able to work an equal number of hours without injury to one of them. Time can, therefore, hardly be taken as a just criterion by which the deserts of labor could be determined.

The QUALITY of labor would also be as impossible to calculate as the

relative utilities of the products of labor. Even were it possible to judge fairly of the respective qualities of different kinds of produce, it would still be an injustice to compare the work of the inexperienced with the experienced, or that of the weak with the strong. Therefore quality would be as absurd a ground of adjusting deserts as time.

Consequently, as it is impossible to say what amount a man can earn, in the moral sense of deserving, either on the ground of the quantity or utility of his individual labor, there is no moral sense at all in the assumption that a man has a right to what he has earned.

In so far as wealth, i.e., the means for satisfying everyone's needs and desires, can only be procured in a civilised society by collective effort, it is just to expect that every able-bodied individual should contribute his part, according to his abilities, in the necessary production of wealth, although it is at same time impossible for the society, taken collectively or any elected portion of it, to say what proportion of wealth should fall to any one individual. To start with, every member inherits in common with all the others many advantages, which are the fruits of the labor of past generations, and in addition he receives gratifications which are the result of the labor of countless numbers of his fellow-men, against which it would be impossible to weigh the labor which he individually is able to perform.

Consequently we conclude that it is impossible to mete out to each individual of a community his exact share in the wealth collectively produced. This being so, what other criterion of individual rights can there be in a society of moral human beings than those which are now looked upon as in their place in family life?

In regard to children, and even to the adult members of one household, the fact that each has needs and desires is considered as sufficient ground for each claiming their portion, according to their needs, of what the family as a whole has to be shared. The helpless, weaker and less efficient members call forth a greater amount of sympathy and care from the others and do not meet with neglect or short-comings on the ground of their smaller deserts. This principle of fellowship, which makes the existence of a need, the true ground for its satisfaction, also works best for the general good, for it is an evident fact that in those families, where such a spirit most prevails, there every member, even the weakest, most readily and conscientiously renders what assistance he or she can. Any one who knows anything of the lives of thousands of hard working poor will be able to testify abundantly to this fact.

A society or community can then only reach its highest possible development, and can then only be moral and humane when it also is permeated with this spirit of true fellowship. This brings us to a clear perception of the truth that an individual of a community has a right to the satisfaction of his needs and desires simply because he is one of a community of moral human beings and has such wants. Also we shall see that, as in a family where mutual good will reigns, there is more joy and prosperity than in others, so in a community the general happiness and welfare will necessarily be in proportion to the spirit of fellowship. In such a society we shall have done with "an eye for an eye," "a tooth for a tooth," or a pound's-worth for £1. Its organisation will aim at the best possible manner of providing for the individual wants of each and all, by the mutual co-operative and individual efforts of all, prompted as much by a true understanding of all general and individual interests as by mutual good-will. Every one will recognise that where material inequality exists, intellectual and moral inequalities must be fostered and intensified, to the great bane of humanity.

If these views be correct, where does a study of the science of present Economics come in as an element in the emancipation of the human race from its horrible social conditions of the present time? How can a knowledge of a system based on such an injustice as individual private property to the injury of others, on the principle of EACH FOR HIMSELF AND THE WEAKER GO TO THE WALL, tend to the recognition of the immorality on which it is founded?

A. H.

THE PROPAGANDA.

REPORTS.

LONDON—

On Saturday April 30th, A. Marsh lectured at the Central Hall, Strand, on the differences between Individualist and Communist Anarchism. Marsh pointed out that we must first of all be Anarchists if we really desired to be free, but he argued that Communism, not only agreed with an anarchist condition of society, but was the great safeguard against a return to those gross inequalities which had bred slavery and oppression. There was a good discussion in which Fawcett, Attersoll, Harrigan, Seymour and others took part. It was clear that we were at one with the individualists so far as anarchism was concerned. The vital point was which is the best basis of economic life, communism or mutual banking?

Comrade Marsh wishes us to state that although it was not entirely his fault the lecturer did not turn up on May 7th, still an apology is due to the S.D.F. and to the audience who were present on that occasion for the inconvenience caused.

On Sunday May 22nd, H. Quelch lectured at the Central Hall, Strand, on a Social Democrat's view of Anarchism. His "view" did not seem to differ much from the views, for example, of the "St. James's Gazette." For Quelch anarchism means bloodshed, disorder etc. And although Neilson and Samuels tried to enlighten him a little on the subject, we doubt if Quelch took it in good part. If he really wishes to upset Anarchism argumentatively, he should at least take some little trouble to understand what it means.

"La Carmagnole" is the name of a new Anarchist Communist group recently formed in Hammersmith, the members of which are energetic propagandists, and are actively pushing the cause not only round the western district, but they also avail themselves of the opportunity of the cheap Sunday League excursions to spread our ideas outside London as well. Comrades in that district willing to help, apply to J. Tochatti, Carmagnole House, Railway-approach, Hammersmith.

PROVINCES—

Aberdeen.—Thanks to the 'Weal' prosecution, Anarchy is on the boom here, our Sunday evening meetings in Castle St. surpassing by far any we had previously held, and this month we have sold three times as much literature at our meetings than ever we did during any month before. On May-day we held a meeting which was not advertised in the least, yet there was about 1000 present who listened attentively to Comrade Duncan. The meeting broke up with three cheers for the revolution which were heard afar off.

Birmingham and Walsall.—The propaganda of Anarchism is going on steadily in Birmingham and Walsall. Meetings have been addressed every Sunday in both places by comrades W. Rooke, J. Emery and G. Cores. In Birmingham a group is being formed, and arrangements have been made to carry on a series of meetings on Sundays in Birmingham (morning, in the Bull-ring), Wolverhampton (afternoon, in the Market Place) and Walsall (top of Park Street, at 6.30 p.m.). Thomas Barclay has arranged with local comrades to speak on May 29th. It is to be hoped that comrades in neighbouring towns will give all the assistance they can in way of providing speakers etc., and that local readers of *Freedom* will turn up and work actively for the cause. On May 1st comrades Cores and Emery addressed a large number of people on Gosta Green, and a resolution condemning the police plot against our Walsall comrades and the iniquitous sentences passed on them was carried unanimously. The audience were thoroughly in sympathy with the speakers. Although the branch of the S.D.F. had agreed at several previous meetings to the resolution's being put, and invited Cores to speak, the chairman and a man whose socialism seems to consist in repeated attempts to obtain a seat on the City Council tried, in a most cowardly and dishonorable fashion, to prevent the resolution being put, and, failing that, to talk the meeting away. Happily they failed, and, although it was a quarter to one o'clock, the people remained (and increased in number) till Emery had seconded the resolution. The papers all gave it the most prominent position in their reports the other day. It is only fair to add that the rank and file of the S.D.F. do not endorse the action of the two individuals before-mentioned.

Bristol.—One of the most successful meetings ever held in Bristol was that which took place in the Horsefair on Sunday May 1st. A crowd of some 6000 persons assembled and listened with interest and delight to the speeches, that were delivered. Hugh Holmes Gore, D. Irving, E. J. Watson, J. R. MacDonald (London) and Paul Stacy spoke fearlessly and with excellent effect, the people cheering them to the echo during the progress of their speeches.

Cardiff.—The Cardiff Socialists demonstrated on May 2nd, taking part in a Trades fete held in Roath Park. E. J. Watson of Bristol went specially down to help the comrades of the sister town. Although Sir Charles Dilke and other stars were shining on the Trades Unions' platform, yet the Socialists kept their crowd the whole time and attracted the most attention of any of the platforms. S. G. Hobson, J. R. MacDonald (London) and Watson were wonderfully effective in their speeches.

Dublin.—On May 1st, there was a big meeting, procession, lots of bands, banners and the other tiggery so dear to the Irish heart. The meeting was an orthodox Trade Union one. The papers complimented the speakers on being so "moderate and practical." So no more need be said. Some of the ladies of the Theosophical Society have been trying to start a branch of the Fabian Society, but so far have not succeeded much.

Glasgow.—Our May Day Demonstration proved a great success. The "Press" estimate the attendance at from 6000 to 10,000. A resolution was unanimously carried condemning the action of the police in the recent Walsall Plot. Stirling speeches were delivered; a large quantity of literature sold, and £3 1s. collected to defray expenses. Comrades Glasier, Jim Robb and Anderson opened a new outdoor station at Goven Cross, on Wednesday night the 18th May. We hope comrades in that district will turn up and assist. Comrade McLaughlan continues to receive plenty of encouragement from his audiences at St. George's Cross.

Leicester.—Since our last report we have been very busy. The local police tried at first to stop our meetings, but through our being determined to hold them they have left the matter alone, anyhow for the present. We are feeling here the effect of the "Anarchist boom," on an average we have the honour (?) of having some 10 or 12 detectives present at our meetings. They have a way of standing behind comrades to hear their conversation—no doubt in hope of hearing more about the "chloroform mystery." We have made arrangements for a number of speakers from other towns to visit us. Comrade Barton of Manchester opening the campaign for us with a couple of vigorous speeches. The prospects of Anarchism in Leicester are very much better than the S.D.'s who, by the way, are very weak here. Indeed Anarchism is so strong here that we have found it necessary to form several new groups, in order to cope with our growing propaganda.

Manchester.—On May 1st the Fabians and some of the Trades Unionists held a Demonstration in Alexandra Park. It was a great success, fully 100,000 persons taking part. We took advantage of it to sell our literature, and disposed of 20 quires of 'Weals' besides many *Freedom*s and pamphlets. Since then three good meetings have been held every Sunday, at the New Cross especially. Splendid crowds have gathered to listen to our exposition of Anarchy. It goes! Soon will come the joyful time; happy is he who lives to see it.

Newcastle-on-Tyne.—A comrade writes: In conjunction with several members of the Secular Society, we have taken a room as a club at Yelder's Cafe, New-bridge Street. We hold French and Logic classes there, and the room has been provided with the nucleus of a Library. A Jewish comrade, lately arrived, is going to endeavour to interest the Jews in our principles.

NOTICES.

PROVINCES—

Great Yarmouth.—On Sunday June 26, a great Socialist Demonstration will be held in Yarmouth. Comrades from London willing to take part in the same will have a splendid chance of helping us and seeing the sea-side, as a five shillings Excursion train will leave Liverpool Street Station on the 25th, available to return by any train for a week after that date. Comrades who can come will kindly communicate with J. Headley, Carmagnole House, 76 George St., Gt. Yarmouth, and arrangements will be made for their obtaining board and lodging at as reasonable a price as possible.

The Leicester Anarchist Communists, Fabians and S.D.F.s are organising a picnic for bank-holiday, August 1st. Comrades wishing to join are invited to communicate with Archibald Gorrie, 18, Princess Street, Leicester, on or before June 22nd. It is proposed this year to foregather at Rowsley, Derbyshire, in order to visit Chatsworth and Haddon Hall.

Thanks to the kindness of the Berner St. comrades who lent us the necessary brevior for reports we have been able to print what came in as usual. We are now doing our own printing owing to lack of funds. Friends and comrades are invited to contribute to the printing fund.

Our best thanks to comrade T. Bolas who has kindly given us a capital printers' Imposing Surface, of which we were in great need.

Printed and published by C. M. Wilson, at the "FREEDOM" Office, 26, Newington Green Road, London, N.