

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. VII.—No. 78.

JULY, 1893.

MONTHLY ; ONE PENNY.

ANARCHIST REPLY

TO THE

Manifesto of the Joint Committee of Socialist Bodies (London).

"The doctrine and tactics of Anarchism . . . though advocated as revolutionary . . . are really reactionary both in theory and in practice."—THE MANIFESTO.

ANARCHISM (by which term we mean Communist or, generally, *Socialist*, as distinguished from *Individualist*, Anarchism) is usually disposed of by Socialist Democrats in one of three ways. Either it is taken as too perfect an ideal, the ultimate goal of the Social Revolution, the crowning of the work, and therefore dismissed as too remote and of no concern to humanity. Or it is considered as a return to barbarism, or, at least, as a new form of the old and discredited *laissez faire* doctrine, and repudiated as reactionary. Lastly, it is sometimes argued, that what Anarchists want—*free federated Communes with no military or bureaucratic government above them*—is really what Social Democracy, rightly understood, amounts to: and consequently Anarchism and Anarchy are rejected as bad neologisms.

The first and third line of argument are generally taken in private conversation with Anarchists. The second is used in public utterances, especially in those addressed by the "leaders" to their followers; and it may be assumed without injustice to be intended rather to foster prejudice in the latter's minds, than to instruct them as to the real aim and object of Anarchism.

In the late Manifesto of a Joint Committee of three London Socialist bodies, Anarchism is represented as being only apparently revolutionary, in fact, reactionary—theoretically the antithesis of, practically an obstacle to, Socialism.

One peculiarity of this latter day attitude of English Social Democrats towards Anarchism is their apparent effort to confound, in spite of our repeated remonstrances, two different and opposite kinds of Anarchism—Communist (or Socialist) and Individualist.

Communist Anarchists claim as the basis of the new social order *common property*, whereas Individualists defend private property as the necessary foundation of society. This distinction is, to say the least, as important as the distinction which Social Democrats draw between themselves and mere radicals advocating, like themselves, free education, payment of members and annual Parliaments.

Nor is that the only difference between Communist and Individualist Anarchists. Communist Anarchists maintain that the necessary accompaniment of private property is government; a government of some kind, whether a parliamentary one or a sort of East India Company, or a Pinkerton police force salaried by the capitalists. And as to the "voluntary" taxation and other "voluntary" things advocated by Individualists, we fail to see how, in a society based on private property and individual competition, the people who "voluntarily" submit to a tax could be prevented from shifting the burden on to their neighbors; or how those who join in a Defence Association would be prevented from using this organised force against others than themselves. Finally, Individualists are strongly opposed to revolutionary action.

Consequently, although of course we cannot forbid to Individualists the use of the word Anarchy, we have reasonable grounds to deny that they take it in its true sense.

On the other hand, by laying down common property as the foundation of the new society, Communist Anarchists clearly imply the necessity of co-operation and of a thorough organisation of labor in the interest of all.

On this point they and Social Democrats are agreed; but they disagree in the following ways. Social Democrats are eager to establish a central government, modelled on the present parliamentary system, propose to hand over to the same all the land and wealth of the country and trust it with the complicated task of organising, by means of laws and bye-laws, the whole industry and trade—besides discharging the ordinary governmental functions of keeping order and administering justice.

We believe such a scheme to be utterly impracticable and extremely dangerous. No government, least of all a parliamentary one, can safely be entrusted with such immense power. No parliament, to be sure, can organise trade throughout a country; and, what is more significant, no working community can have any control over such a powerful government. Whatever safeguards may be devised, however short the term of office of the legislators be made, or large the electorate, the people who will have to work and vote will be powerless against their representatives and Executive.

Most Social Democrats are aware of this gigantic difficulty, and dis-

claim any centralising tendency; yet this Manifesto, which is issued in their name, repeatedly emphasises the national, as distinguished from the communal, character of the proposed industrial organisation, and points to the direct absorption by the State of great private monopolies as the inevitable outcome of the development of Capitalism.

It maintains, however, that the government which it anticipates will not be a class government, but "an organised democracy"; and that even nowadays "the people have increasingly at hand the power" of dominating and controlling the whole political and, through the "political, the social forces of the Empire."

This bold assertions follows upon a long description of the destitution, ignorance and helplessness of a large portion of the working classes, and the statement that "half a century of ameliorative regulation" by means of factory legislation and the like has failed to weaken the "force of former exposures of Capitalism."

We Anarchists affirm that neither under the present nor under any other government the people are or will be able to control and dominate the political machine by their votes: we demand therefore the suppression of the machine and thorough self-government. To our thinking, the real centre of gravity in the political system is not and cannot be Parliament—a mere talking machine—but the Executive, which is necessarily subservient to the interests of the possessing classes. Elections are made under the combined influence of capitalism and political caucuses; and it is as impossible for the workmen to vote the capitalist out of existence as it is for them to overcome him by means of conciliatory deputations and strike funds. Government is as bad as Capitalism: the politician as useless and as parasitical to society as the employer; no true society can live and prosper where either of them exists.

Hence the great theoretical chasm between Social Democracy (not Socialism) and Anarchism—a chasm which grows wider as from principles we pass to tactics.

Communist Anarchists repudiate political action. They are an essentially revolutionary party. Not that they advocate violence as an end in itself, or advise the daily use of explosives. What constitutes a revolutionary party is the fact that it is directly opposed to the government, and that it looks to a general uprising as the only means to carry out its principles.

Social Democrats used to be strong revolutionists themselves, and many undoubtedly still are so. Yet the Manifesto is a tacid but unmistakable and peremptory repudiation not so much of Anarchism as of Social Revolution.

There is in the Manifesto not a single reference to the necessity of an ultimate popular outbreak. There is not the least show of sympathy for individual acts of revolt—certainly a great factor in political movements. Nay, the reticence includes strikes, no-rent campaigns and agitations of unemployed. Evidently such agitations are considered dangerous, perhaps anarchistic. The only alternative offered, the general panacea recommended, even to starving men and to locked out slaves, is to vote, vote, vote, and wait for the gradual "moralisation" of capitalism by the paternal laws of a converted Parliament.

We esteem this to be a suicidal policy, one fraught with great dangers, a policy which would, if it prevailed, strangle the movement and divert it to the benefit of a few politicians.

To serve this very policy, an electoral platform has been concocted, which we need not discuss, since those who propose it betray no great confidence in its practical results. It suffices to remark that to pretend to abolish sweating and sub-contracting within the capitalist system is an utter absurdity.

We Anarchists are far from opposing or begrudging the ameliorations which the working classes may obtain under the present system. Our contention is that it would be folly to concentrate our efforts on the hopeless task of influencing, controlling and dominating our rulers. Furthermore, we believe that no possible pressure brought to bear on Parliament could extort from it more than merest shams of reform; and that the greatest problem of today, the unemployed question, and other fundamental evils are entirely out of the pale of legislation, and admit of no other solution than the breaking down of the present system.

Is it, then, because we object to the electoral panacea that we are supposed not to be Socialists? Is it because we regard the Social Revolution as unavoidable, and think it is our duty to see that the masses are prepared for the event that we are called "reactionaries"?

Of course we do not complain of having been "repudiated." We could hardly have worked with our friends the Social Democrats, the Fabians and the Hammersmith Socialist Society "as a distinct political party" "for the capture and transformation of the great social machinery."

Yet the allied parties could have couched their "repudiation" in

somewhat different terms. They might have said:

"We know the Communist Anarchists are sound Socialists, perhaps sounder than we are, since they stick to the fundamental principles of Socialism, that no change short of the abolition of the capitalist system can be of any benefit to the working classes.

"We believe, in spite of existing differences of opinion, that they are doing good work; they are sapping the foundation of the present social organisation—or disorganisation—i.e., the belief of the workers in the usefulness of their masters, political and economical.

"There have been, and probably there are, among Anarchists men who have given their liberty or life for the very cause we fight for—the emancipation of the wage-slaves.

"We respect and honour them, and we are glad that they remain faithful to their convictions.

"After all, it is necessary that there should be anti-parliamentarian Socialists, just to remind us, who wish to "capture" Parliament, that whatever concessions we may obtain (and we know they cannot be very considerable), we shall never be satisfied, and that the battle will have to be fought and won, ultimately, on another ground.

"We do not deny the dangers attending political action. We—most of us having been till now strongly opposed to any action of that kind—repeat at this eleventh hour that the entering of Socialists into Parliament, and the diverting of an essentially revolutionary agitation into constitutional channels, are very hazardous steps. We have facts and examples before us which make us tremble for ourselves and for our cause; for it is just possible that the captors may be captured. Therefore, we are glad that there are uncompromising people who will stay outside, watch us, and even denounce us if we betray the confidence which may be put in us. We are glad that there are men who will preach No Rent to the victims of the rack-renter; to the unemployed, the right to live; to the strikers, active resistance; and to all, revolt;—things which we are no longer able to preach ourselves; and we hope that some of those Anarchists may even act according to their preaching.

"We are no Anarchists. We are not revolutionists any more. We advocate palliatives, though we have no considerable faith in them, because we must promise something to the people who will vote for our candidates. But there is danger that in time means may be taken for ends; and the existence of Anarchists is a guarantee that that shall not be case."

Such language would not have been above criticism; but it would have been honest and fair. And if the allied Socialists had added that Anarchists have done and are doing useful work even in the theoretical propaganda; that they have reconciled to Socialism numbers of people who regarded with alarm the authoritarian and centralising tendencies of Social Democracy; and that they have been instrumental in widening the views of Social Democrats themselves;—well, if they had said so, they would have told the truth; and they would not have appeared to wish to climb to power by trampling upon their nearest friends.

It is proposed to reprint the above as a penny pamphlet. We invite all comrades to send us AT ONCE any criticisms and suggestions for its improvement which may occur to them; also orders for the pamphlet, which we hope to print in about a fortnight.

The Age of Cant.

ENGLAND has long been regarded as the Hypocrite of nations. In England there is a complete severance between profession and practice. No one dreams of uniting thought and action. In England we behold religion without faith, society without morality, government without justice. All is morally dead. Bury it quickly, and give us a glorious resurrection.

In nothing is our cant and hypocrisy seen more clearly than in reference to the so-called "Royal Wedding." Read in the public press, from day to day, the sickening twaddle about the coming event, in which, we are told, we are all so deeply interested. The classes would like a national holiday in honour of the occasion, and the official world would be delighted with a liberal expenditure of public money and a grand display of bunting.

In connection with the general movement to raise some little enthusiasm, we see a complete indifference to the general condition of the country. There is no thought about the people, except to get their shouts and cheers when it seems desirable; no regard whatever to the extensive depression of trade, or to the tens of thousands out of employment; no sympathy for the sufferings of the starving workers. By some, we are told that royalty costs only three farthings per head of the population, and that its abolition could not make any appreciable difference to the mass of the people. By others, we are assured that the Crown in parting with its lands gave up far more than it receives. And there are working men foolish enough to believe these statements. Others will allege, as an excuse for their criminal apathy, that if the royal family did not have the money they should not, and therefore it is of no use bothering.

Yet it is well to look at this question of the cost of royalty. We are told that the Civil List is £385,000, which is nothing for a nation like England. But there are other items. During last year, the Queen received from the Duchy of Lancaster £48,000. In connection with the same Duchy, there is an annuity of £27,000; also an ancient fee of £101 per annum. In 1888, according to a Parliamentary paper, the cost of royal palaces, on the average of seven years, was £40,030 a year; that of royal parks, £116,000. When Victoria came

to the throne in 1837, £300,000 was spent on a new ball-room at Buckingham Palace, and £70,000 on new stables and dog-kennels. Early in 1850 we read the following:—"The sleeping beds occupied by the dogs of her Majesty and the Prince Consort, are in five compartments at the extremity of the building, the latter well supplied with water and paved with asphalt, the bottoms having good falls, to ensure their dryness and cleanness; the building enters into three green yards, roomy and healthy." The sanitary arrangements all good. No overcrowding, no lack of fresh air; plenty of room for exercise. Compare the accommodation for the dogs with the miserable dens in which hundreds of thousands of the workers have to live. Again: "Each horse of her Majesty's stud has two sets of clothing—one for day, and one for night. Hot-air is supplied to the carriage houses, in order to keep the royal carriages well-aired, during the cold, damp weather in winter." And this appalling contrast between the thought and care taken by the rich and powerful for their possessions, and their indifference to the masses of miserable fellow-men by whom they are surrounded, can exist in Christian England, at the close of the 19th century—in the land of the wise, the brave, and the free!

But her Majesty has her royal yachts, four in number, for which the nation paid £275,528, the annual maintenance of which is returned at £34,656, and the total cost of which is not less than £100,000. Again, let us take the tradesmen's bills for the royal household:—For bread, £2,050; milk and cream, £1,478; butter, cheese, eggs, and bacon, £4,976; fish, £1,070—would buy 39,580 lbs. at 1s. a lb.; poultry, £3,633—36,330 fowls at 2s. each; butcher's meat, £9,472—equal to 100 oxen at £30 each, 150 calves at £4 each, 1,500 sheep at £2 each, and 314 lambs at 30s. each; grocery, £4,044; oilery, fruit, etc., £3,534; ale, £2,811—31,612 gallons at 2s. per gallon; liquors, £1,843; wines, £4,850—19,400 bottles at 5s. each; lamps and candles, £7,307; coals, £6,846—4,324 tons at 30s. per ton; table linen, glass and china, £5,543; new furniture (yearly), £12,000; new horses and carriages, £7,800; etc., etc.

If we turn to the Prince of Wales, he has from Parliament £40,000 for himself; from the Duchy of Cornwall, from £60,000 to £70,000 a year; an annuity of £16,216. Then Parliament gives him £10,000 a year to support his wife, and £36,000 to support his children, as well as the salaries for the offices he holds, the duties of which he never performs.

The total cost of royalty is over one million per annum, and would give a pound a week to each of twenty thousand families. And a starving people tolerate it.

But royalty is the centre around which rally all the vampires that prey upon the vitals of the people. It is the central institution of the system of wholesale plunder by which the people are reduced to slavery, want, and misery. The throne, the altar, privilege, and usury, are the corner stones of the present system of robbery.

But royalty is an essentially barbarous institution, and depends partly on the splendour of its saturnalia, partly on an unreasoning superstition, and partly on the element of brute force. Its existence is a violation of the principle of equal liberty, as well as an insult to the intelligence of the age. Royalty is essentially degrading to all concerned. It destroys the dignity of all within the sphere of its influence.

We have seen the handsome provision made for the welfare of the royal dogs. But even royal dogs are not immortal. In the *Weekly Dispatch* of August 18th, 1844, we read of the death of the royal dog Eos. It died on the 1st of August. A *post-mortem* examination was made by Dr. Brown, house-surgeon. The dog died of old age. The next day, Mr. Whiteman, clerk in the office of Woods and Forests, received orders to make the necessary arrangements for the funeral. Mr. Bate, undertaker, Mr. Lawrence, bricklayer, and Mr. Harley, stone-mason, received orders to make the coffin and the tomb. The coffin was thickly studded with silver-gilt nails, and tastefully lined with Salisbury flannel. A marble monument was erected over the mortal remains of Eos, with a suitable inscription. No reference need be made to paupers' burials.

In the *Dispatch* of August 25th of the same year, we read of the death of the royal dog Dash, which died on the 20th of December, 1840. It was buried with all the honours due to its exalted station. "A very beautiful and rather expensive monument has been erected over the last resting place of Dash, and on the top of the pedestal is a very elaborate portrait of the dog in a recumbent position, to which is appended the following inscription, written by her Majesty herself:—'Here lies Dash, the favorite spaniel of her Majesty, Queen Victoria, by whose command this memorial was erected. He died on the 20th December, 1840, in his ninth year. His attachment was without selfishness, his playfulness without malice, his fidelity without deceit. Reader, if you would live beloved, and die regretted, profit by the example of Dash.'"

O, ye starving slaves of old England, honour the royal wedding, and rejoice in your degradation! Follow, O, ye slaves, the example of the royal dog Dash, and rattle your chains to a pauper's grave.

J. SKETCHLEY.

Organized Labor.

THE AMALGAMATED TAILORS' MANIFESTO.

THIS manifesto is a true indication of the tendency of the labor movement towards the development of trade centres capable of looking after their own affairs by means of organization. Instead of looking outwards to government to assist them in their fight against the greed of

capitalists, workers are more and more taking the matter into their own hands.

The Tailors' Union is forced into action by the organization of masters, who are determined to force a new log upon the workers, whereby prices will be reduced and the whole trade consequently injured. It is the old story; but the tailors are going to make a strong stand, and even if they are late in setting about making a widespread organization, they will lay the foundation of a movement which must in a short time be irresistible.

The grand idea of looking inward to the union is the first important truth the tailors, individually and collectively, can learn; and if this important step be only supplemented by the further grasp of true principles of economy, this union may set the lead for a new life throughout unions of workers in general.

It would surely not be an impossible task for the union to absorb all workers in the trade, for it is owing to the faulty nature of the constitution of unions that some good workers will not come into them, and many indifferent and unfortunate ones are expelled from their ranks, to swell the number of the unemployed and blacklegs. For instance, piece-work operates to the detriment of the trade in many evil ways: it engenders severe and cruel competition, which cultivates a spirit of hostility among the workers, and thus the idea of union is rendered foreign to great numbers. Not only that: it breaks the wages, stimulates sweating, and creates the unemployed, in this way:—

To begin with, a good worker earns a good wage; too good, the master thinks, and, in order to handicap him, lowers the whole wages: and thus, while this worker may get along fairly well, his fellow-workers are hardly pressed to make both ends meet, and have to sweat for a living. But the good worker cannot always remain in first-rate form; when he is ill, or getting old, he too has to sweat under the state of things he has brought about, in the first instance, by being a superior hand; and so he reaps the reward of competition; for had he not, by his superiority, broken the wages, he would always have had a fair pay.

However, this is a point of detail which, no doubt, the union will look to. Under a better constitution, wages will rise, while the unemployed and blacklegs will be absorbed; and the union, then a body of strength, will be in a position to examine more closely the whole economic question. There is no reason then why trade communes should not develop, and ultimately, by a system of combined communes, attain a practical solution of the labour question.

F. M.

THE CONQUEST OF BREAD.

By PETER KROPOTKINE.

CHAPTER III.—ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

I.

(Continued from previous number.)

Moreover, there is a tendency, though still a feeble one, to consider the needs of the individual, irrespective of his past or possible services to the community. We are beginning to think of society as a whole, each part of which is so intimately bound up with the others that a service rendered to one is a service rendered to all.

When you go into a public library—not indeed the National Library of Paris, but, say, into the British Museum or the Berlin Library—the librarian does not ask what services you have rendered to society before giving you the old book, or the fifty old books, which you require, and he comes to your assistance if you do not know how to manage the catalogue. By means of uniform credentials—and very often a contribution of work is preferred—the scientific society opens its museums, its gardens, its library, its laboratories, and its annual conversaciones to each of its members, whether he be a Darwin, or a simple amateur.

At St. Petersburg, if you are pursuing an invention, you go into a special laboratory or a workshop, where you are given a place, a carpenter's bench, a turning lathe, all the necessary tools and scientific instruments, provided only you know how to use them; and you are allowed to work there as long as you please. There are the tools, interest others in your idea, join with fellow workers skilled in various crafts, or work alone if you prefer it. Invent a flying machine, or invent nothing—that is your own affair. You are pursuing an idea—that is enough.

In the same way, those who man the lifeboat do not ask credentials from the crew of a sinking ship; they launch their boat, risk their lives in the raging waves, and sometimes perish, all to save men whom they do not even know. And what need to know them? "They are human beings, and they need our aid—that is enough, that establishes their right—To the rescue!"

Thus we find a tendency, eminently Communistic, springing up on all sides, and in various guises, in the very heart of theoretically Individualist Societies.

Suppose that one of our great cities, so egoistic in ordinary times, were visited to-morrow by some calamity—a siege, for instance—that same selfish city would decide that the first needs to satisfy were those of the children and the aged. Without asking what services they had rendered or were likely to render to society, it would first of all feed them. Then the combatants would be cared for, irrespective of the courage or the intelligence which each has displayed, and thousands of men and women would outvie each other in unselfish devotion to the wounded.

This tendency exists and is felt as soon as the most pressing needs of each are satisfied, and in proportion as the productive power of the race increases. It becomes an active force every time a great idea comes to oust the mean preoccupations of every-day life.

How can we doubt, then, that when the instruments of production are placed at the service of all, when business is conducted on communist principles, when labor, having recovered its place of honor in society, produces much more than is necessary to all—how can we doubt but that this force (already so powerful) will enlarge its sphere of action till it becomes the ruling principle of social life?

Following these indications, and considering further the practical side of expropriation, of which we shall speak in the following chapters, we are convinced that our first obligation, when the revolution shall have broken the power upholding the present system, will be to realise Communism without delay.

But ours is neither the Communism of Fourier and the Phalansteriens, nor of the German State-socialists. It is Anarchist Communism, Communism without government—the Communism of the Free. It is the synthesis of the two ideals pursued by humanity throughout the ages: Economic and Political Liberty.

II.

In taking "Anarchy" for our ideal of political organisation we are only giving expression to another marked tendency of human progress. Whenever European societies have developed up to a certain point they have shaken off the yoke of authority and substituted a system founded roughly more or less on the principles of individual liberty. And history shows us that these periods of partial or general revolution, when the governments were overthrown, were also periods of sudden progress both in the economic and the intellectual field. Now it is the enfranchisement of the communes, whose monuments, produced by the free labor of the Guilds, have never been surpassed, now it is the Peasant Rising which brought about the Reformation and imperilled the Papacy, and then again it is the society, free for a brief space, which was created at the other side of the Atlantic by the malcontents from the old World.

Further, if we observe the present development of civilised peoples we see, most unmistakably, a movement ever more and more marked to limit the sphere of action of the government, and to allow more and more liberty to the individual. This evolution is going on before our eyes, though cumbered by the ruins and rubbish of old institutions and old superstitions. Like all evolutions, it only waits a revolution to overthrow the old obstacles which block the way, that it may find free scope in a regenerated society.

After having striven long in vain to solve the insoluble problem: the problem of constructing a government "which will constrain the individual to obedience, without itself ceasing to be the servant of society," men at last attempt to free themselves from every form of government and to satisfy their need for organisation by a free contract between individuals and groups pursuing the same aim. The independence of each small territorial unit becomes a pressing need; mutual agreement replaces law, and everywhere regulates individual interests in view of a common object.

All that was once looked on as a function of the government is today called in question. Things are arranged more easily and more satisfactorily without the intervention of the State. In studying the progress made in this direction, we are led to conclude that the tendency of the human race is to reduce government interference to zero; in fact, to abolish the State, the personification of injustice, oppression and monopoly.

We can already catch glimpses of a world in which the bonds which bind the individual are no longer laws, but social habits—the result of the need felt by each one of us to seek the support, the co-operation, the sympathy of his neighbours.

Assuredly the idea of a society without a State will give rise to at least as many objections as the political economy of a society without private capital. We have all been brought up from our childhood to regard the State as a sort of Providence, all our education, the Roman history we learned at school, the Byzantine Code which we studied later under the name of Roman Law, and the various sciences taught at the Universities, accustom us to believe in government and in the virtues of the State Providential.

To maintain this superstition whole systems of philosophy have been elaborated and taught, all politics are based on this principle, and each politician, whatever his complexion, comes forward and says to the people, "give me the power, and I both can and will free you from the miseries which press so heavily upon you."

From the cradle to the grave all our actions are guided by this principle. Open any book on sociology or jurisprudence, and you will find there the government, its organisation, its acts, filling so large a place that we come to believe that there is nothing outside the government and the world of statesmen.

The same lesson is repeated in divers tones by the Press. Whole columns are devoted to Parliamentary debates and political intrigues, but the multitudinous daily life of the people only comes casually into view in some paragraph referring to some economic question or the working of some law, or in the reports of the police courts. And while reading the newspapers one is apt to forget that, beyond these few personages, whose importance has been so magnified that they seem to hide humanity in their obstructing shadows, made larger by our ignorance, beyond these there are countless human beings, almost the whole human race, in fact, who are growing up and dying, suffering, working and spending, thinking and creating.

(To be continued.)

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

Monthly, One Penny; post free, 1½d.: U.S.A., 3 Cents; France, 15 Centimes.

Annual Subscription, post free, 1s. 6d.; U.S.A., 36 Cents; France, 1fr. 80c.
Foreign subscriptions should be sent by International Money Order,
payable to C. M. Wilson.

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

All communications, exchanges, &c., for "FREEDOM" to be addressed to
THE EDITOR, 61, ST. AUGUSTINE'S-ROAD, CAMDEN-TOWN, LONDON, N.W.

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.

Back Numbers.—Vol. I., October 1886 to September 1887 (No. 2 sold out), price 2s. Vol. II., October 1887 to September 1888 (Nos. 16, 17, 18, 19 sold out), price 1s. 6d. Vol. III., October 1888 to December 1889, price 1s. 6d. Vol. IV., January to December 1890, price 1s. Vol. V., January to December 1891, price 1s. Carriage: single volumes, 2d., five volumes, 6d., throughout the United Kingdom.

Received: "FREEDOM" PUBLICATION FUND—H. G. (Cape), 10s.; W. F. (Dundee), 1s.; H. C., 8d. V. NICOLL FUND—Anon (Manchester), 1s.

NOTES.

AT LAST.

The Governor of Illinois has set Fielden, Neebe and Schwab at liberty, holding that their trial was unfair and the Court prejudiced. And what about the five, murdered by means of the same Court, whose wrong can never now be redressed? The capitalist press is furious with the Governor for his act of tardy justice.

THE NEW DRILL.

The prevailing spirit of the time is revealed even in the new army regulations for Infantry Drill, recently issued to the Press, though the blundering old War Office has seen fit to recall them at the last moment from general circulation, so that the confusion which has distracted the army for the last fifteen months may continue a little longer. The war of 1870-71 proved to all but English tacticians that it was no longer possible to bring soldiers to the attack in solid battalions. Fighting in line and fighting in column have since then become as extinct as their counterparts in politics, the well-drilled party and the "compact liberal majority," will soon become. For years past, all great armies, beginning with the German, have been organised so as to fight in sections or "groups," for that is the technical word, apparently borrowed from the Anarchists.

For years past the object of the best drill has been, not the mechanical and undeviating movement of masses which excites such admiration on Wimbledon Common, but the education of the individual soldier in self-confidence, activity and resource. In the battles of the future, the control of the generals and higher officers will cease as soon as the front of battle is formed; the control of the Captains will cease as soon as the firing begins: the firing will depend upon the serjeants and other non-commissioned officers; the result of the final assault will depend simply upon the individual private fighting with his little group of comrades, often perhaps isolated even from them.

It is impossible to over-estimate the effect of this new system of "individualist" drill upon the workers who form the great continental armies. The workers are always in the fighting line; they are always under fire. They must learn the new tactics, and fight in groups of comrades or man by man, no longer caring for mechanical compact majorities. We congratulate the War Office on their adoption, however belated, of the true Anarchist system. We gratefully recommend their new Red Book as a convincing Anarchist pamphlet. The next time that the Duke of Cambridge takes the field, the little red flag of Anarchy will be fluttering from the point of his famous umbrella, whether he knows it or not.

ANARCHIST LITERATURE IN THE ARMY.

A comrade writing from Brighton says:—"A group of soldiers I was talking to yesterday, on the occasion of a big 'indignation meeting' here, eagerly took *Freedoms* and *Weals*, and yet these lads read our literature at some risk. Quite lately a soldier, here in Brighton, got 'six months' because a *Weal* was found in his pocket. I am more and more convinced that property's hirelings in red and blue are beginning to recognise the nature of their calling and are increasingly sick of it." No wonder that there are in military circles from time to time cogitations as how best to make Tommy Atkins believe his "lot's a 'appy one." But a smart uniform and trots behind a brass band somehow are not sufficient compensations for being prohibited to think, and so Tommy kicks out occasionally.

INTERNATIONAL MINERS' CONFERENCE.

The Brussels Conference has unanimously declared in favor of the socialisation of mines; and has besides taken a step towards equality by demanding eight hours for surface workers as well as miners. Unfortunately it has also taken a step the opposite way by carrying a resolution against permitting female labor in or about mines, "the more easily because there were no female delegates present to oppose it." Mine work may or may not be suited to women, but that is a question for women to decide. Most male workers see the injustice to

themselves of being ruled by a class with opposing interests, but apparently some of them don't see yet that the injustice is precisely as great when any section of workers takes upon itself to decide what another shall or shall not work at.

NOT DANGEROUS

The *Times* correspondent at Berlin reassures any timid conservative who may have been alarmed by the Social Democratic successes at the poll, by observing that the Social Democrats have ceased to be a revolutionary party in methods, whatever their aims may be.

MAJORITY RULE AND THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE.

The German government quite hope to carry their Army bill in spite of the unpopularity of the measure with the majority of German citizens. Slender majorities in relatively small constituencies have won or saved seat after seat for the friends of the government, while in populous districts overwhelming majorities had pronounced against them. The proportion of voters at the first ballot against the Bills was at least 5 to 4 and yet it seems likely that the majority in the new Reichstag may be in favor of them.

Mr. Auberon Herbert's "Voluntary State."

PART I.

CONSERVATISM seems to me to be giving another dying gasp as I read two leaflets lately issued by Mr. Auberon Herbert. The habit of domination dies hard, and dies hardest, of course, at its tap-root, Mammon. Mr. Herbert, as we know, still retains an unshaken belief in the rightfulness of property-owning, and in the healthfulness of commercial competition; consequently, he acquiesces without a sigh in the tortuous wriggles human nature is compelled into executing in the name of the wage-system, and acquiesces, also, in just as much hired brute force as may be required to keep property where it is, commercial competition what it is, and the wage-earner in his "proper place," i.e., at the beck and call of the wage-dispenser. This is conservatism, pure and simple, candid and honest; but Mr. Herbert, besides believing in property and its train of . . . consequences, also believes in the development of individuality up to the limits necessarily imposed by property restrictions, and is possessed by the idea that property-owning on part of some, and property-seeking on part of all, is a means by which that blessed thing, Liberty, may be obtained. The thing he chiefly objects to is that particular function of Government which limits the absolute sway of the individual property-owner, compulsory taxation;—the taking of money out of private pockets for so-called public purposes.

One of the new leaflets gives a sketch of the "Voluntary State" which (as soon as, and no sooner, than mankind at large shall have peaceably evolved towards a recognition of the evils of compulsory taxation) is to somehow bless us all by ensuring the repose of money in the private pocket, until, and unless, voluntarily drawn forth by owner of the pocket for purposes which, whatever their public significance, shall be yet frankly and primarily that owner's individual purposes.

What place in this Voluntary State for us Anarchists, who regard property as a word-based illusion, and ownership a myth?

The other leaflet gives twenty-three "Reasons why we object to Compulsory Taxation in all its forms."

The spirit which animates the "Liberty [of] Property Defence League" breathes throughout both these manifestoes; and, if space be allowed me, I will take their clauses, one by one, and do my best to give an Anarchist's reasons for repudiating them.

The Voluntary State "limns the features" of what, without disrespect, I may call a Pocket Utopia. It is to be a State in which the pocket is to be in a heaven of its own. And each man is to carry his own share of heaven in his pocket, or nowhere. The pocket is to be regarded as part of the person of the individual. In Mr. Herbert's words, "It is impossible to separate freedom of action from freedom of possession. A man acts through and by means of the various substances of the world, and if he is not free to acquire and own these substances as an individual, neither is he free to act as an individual."—(I fancy I hear some comrade ejaculate, "What hopeless rot!") The Voluntary State is to be a state in which the volition of the property-owner shall virtually be the sole moving power: in which, too, the protection of all, as persons, is to be practically of secondary importance to protection of some, as owners, since under its provisions it is the persons of property-owners, and of those whom it may suit property-owners voluntarily to pay to have protected, who alone are to have the services of the hired brute force which this Voluntary State will support. I will quote. "The Voluntary State would be founded on the following principles:—

- (1.) "It (the State) would acknowledge as its highest law, supreme above itself, the sovereignty of the individual. In J. S. Mill's words, 'Over himself, over his own body and mind, the individual would be sovereign;' in Mr. Herbert Spencer's words, 'The widest possible liberty of each would be only limited by the like liberty of all.'"

How heartily will every Anarchist echo these sayings, adding only that the like liberty of all cannot exist so long as liberty remains an article of commerce, depending on "property"—that skeleton-key, forged by force and fitted by fraud, and kept in the hands of the "owner," to open the gate to freedom: the gate over which the custodians had written in the blood of the down-trodden of the crowd

outside—"No Thoroughfare." The like liberty of every baby born! Where, so long as property thus bars the way, shall parents find this preliminary boon for their little ones?

- (2.) "So far as it employed force, the State would simply do so to protect person and property from injuries inflicted against the will or consent of the injured person. It would use force to guarantee every living person against the murderer, the thief, and the swindler, and his property against injurious acts; but for no other purpose."

Against this clause we Anarchists urge two considerations:—(a) The thief and the swindler are two culprits incidental to the mammon-based system under which we live; they are bred of that institution "property" itself, which, if you anywhere scratch its surface, stands revealed as a consolidated theft and swindle, and, like a ripe cheese, is ready to produce its own maggots to prey upon it. So long as poor humanity is forced to tolerate this gigantic and pestilent evil, let it—thieve and swindle—be robbed and swindled; force will be of no avail against the production of the natural maggot; fraud will, as heretofore, always "go one better" than force; and the "voluntary" law (how funny that sounds!) be as frequently evaded by the cunning of the hungry, and the cunning of the would-be rich and richer, as in these days of compulsory taxation. (b) The "murderer"? Deduct all the murders committed for property's sake, or because of grievances having their root-cause in property (the institution rather than the thing), and how many remain? Would the number of men and women ready to destroy one another, for any cause at all, under a system of society where all should have more than the scope, the ease, the resources, and enjoyments now monopolised by a few—would the number of murderers under a Free State be worth the ugly risk to social peace implied in a standing apparatus of force to guarantee citizens against their attacks? Surely the question answers itself.

- (3.) "It (the Voluntary State) would establish Free Trade in everything. It would have no Tariffs, or Custom Duties. It would not interfere with or regulate any part of production or distribution. So far as force was concerned, would not inspect anything or anybody; would not guarantee the safety of any article used by the public, or the fitness of any person employed."

And so on.

Good. And yet we maintain that neither Free Trade, nor free anything else, can be possible under Capitalism. The profit-monger, the man with capital, must always push markets about, and coerce the action of the man who is destitute of capital or who repudiates profits. The man who will not starve while he waits will always force his own terms, under one form or another, on the man who cannot wait and live. And then, what mockery it is to talk of not interfering with or regulating any part of production or distribution, so long as the force-protected private property-owner remains, and that system of competing in mere pursuit of "property," which, once owned by the most ruthless or the most cunning, means so much opportunity snatched clean away from neighbours right and left.

- (4.) "No compulsory taxes or rates. [Only] voluntary contributions."

Good again. But how about rents? (!)

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

"TAKE WHAT YOU NEED"—A FALLACY.

To the Editor of FREEDOM.

Sir,—While granting that gratuitous roads, bridges, museums are communistic it may be questioned whether they are Anarchistic; but a more serious flaw is concealed in the paragraph in Prince Kropotkin's article in "Freedom," June (p. 35), which follows that in relation to gratuitous institutions. From season and zone tickets readers are informed it is but a short step to a uniform charge such as prevails in the Postal Service. Now, in the first place, Postal charges are not uniform. There is a classification, and the only uniformity of charge consists in ignoring distance. Discriminating charges are made for weight, privacy, priority (late fees and the regulations that packets at letter rate take precedence of those at the cheaper book rates), variation of contents (letters excluded from circular rate), infrequency of repetition of title (monthly newspapers excluded from newspaper rates) and others. Again, and more important is it to observe that the apparent concessions to season ticket holders, and long distance journeys of passengers or mail matter cost next to nothing. It is an invariable law of value that what costs little tends to sell for little, apart from its general utility. As Jevons would express it, its final utility then falls, and this eventually affects its exchange value. When a train service is established it costs scarcely anything more to run it full of passengers than empty, and when once a man has purchased his ticket and been booked into a train it is a matter almost of indifference to the company how far he may ride. Uniformity has so many economies that up to a certain point it pays to obtain it at some apparent sacrifice in other directions. It might be a personal requirement of a man to take his wife or servant with him on a railway journey, but the zone or season ticket would not allow it without a further charge, although in a cab drive no extra charge would be made; nor will the post office carry a two ounce letter for the same rate as one.* There is simply a reduction on taking a quantity.

I am &c.

J. GREEVZ FISHER.

[Our correspondent's letter may be best answered by reprinting a portion of the passage that called it forth. "In spite of the narrowly egoistic turn given to men's minds by the commercial system, the tendency towards Communism is constantly reappearing and influences our activities in a variety of ways. . . . In all these innovations, and a thousand others, the tendency is not to measure the individual consumption." Kropotkin does not state that our society is already entirely Communistic or that all its partially communised institutions are Anarchistic also. He simply notes the existing tendency towards Communism. Un-

* In cabs two persons are conveyed for same rate as one; here distance is the costly element, and number unimportant.

doubtedly this tendency is perpetually vitiated today by the tyranny of officialism, and by the profitmongering of monopolists, trying how much they can get for themselves out of their neighbors' needs. The capitalist, whether government department or private individual, only ceases to measure individual consumption in those cases where he has already learnt that the cost of measuring exceeds the returns to be gained by it. Probably our monopolists, blinded by their narrow view of self-interest, have not yet discovered anything like the extent to which the waste of human energy might even now be economised by giving up the measuring system. Probably as they discover it, the tendency towards Communism will be thus developed.

But this is not all. Nor is it the principal factor in the growth of Communism. To whatever extent the estimate of individual material return due for labor expended now enters into exchange value, that estimate, depending on the existing condition of the human mind is continually liable to change. As social feeling and social intelligence grow each man comes to attach more and more importance to his neighbors' needs in relation to his own expenditure of energy. To the Socialised man the extent to which he is able to satisfy by his work the needs of his fellows along with his own largely determines the extent of his own satisfaction in working. He will be disposed to regard his expenditure of energy as most profitable to himself when it supplies most human needs—whether the most numerous or the most pressing. The growth of social sympathy and intelligent realisation of social fellowship is capable of modifying the practical basis of exchange to an extent little dreamt of by many of the economists who now talk about the relative importance of cost and utility. It is to this mental growth that we Anarchist Communists look for the actual realisation of a Communistic society. We agree with our correspondent in holding that enforced Communism is not Anarchistic, but we hold that without Communism Anarchy is impracticable. A free society implies both—Communism in economics and Anarchism in politics.—Ed.]

KROPOTKINE'S VISIT TO AMERICA.

Comrade Kropotkin asks us to publish the following letter, a copy of which he is also sending to *Solidarity* and *Freiheit*.

Dear Comrades,—I learn through *Freiheit* that the American comrades are organizing for me a lecturing tour. There must be some mistake in the matter, as I have already twice written to friends in America, in answer to their enquiries, that, to my very great regret, I see no possibility of coming to the States for the present.

At any rate, if I only could come, I should have organized my journey in such way that the comrades should have nothing whatever to do with a "guarantee fund" and like money matters, and might give all their attention to propaganda of ideas alone.

Yours fraternally,

P. KROPOTKINE.

Observations on the Russian Commune (Mir).

(Continued from April number.)

Great was the disappointment and astonishment of the Russian bureaucracy when in the year 1869, eight years after the emancipation, it was found that only a very small and insignificant minority had passed from communal tenure to private property, whereas, even in the provinces outside of Great-Russia, whole masses abandoned private property for the communal system. Still more amazed were the bureaucracy and the educated classes when a report of the Moscow *zemstvo* showed that the communal system was superseding that of private property even in Moscow—the largest commercial and industrial centre of Russia. According to the investigations of Orlov, the statistician of the Moscow *zemstvo*, the market-gardeners of Moscow and the neighborhood manage their land on the communal system, with long terms of tenure.

The entire life of the Great-Russians is filled with the spirit of association, solidarity and common responsibility. If a man hires himself out as a mower, all the arrangements are made by the *Artel* of his commune; in the same way drivers are engaged in whole *Artels*, and live, board, even go to the bath together. All arrangements are made and all expenses controlled by the elected "Starosta" or Elder of the *Artel*, and, as soon as the work is finished, the money earned is divided by him, according to established custom. The form taken by the *Artel* varies according to the character of the work. From the *Artels* of the Stock Exchange (the members of which conclude business transactions for the common advantage) to those of boatmen, water carriers and other poor folk—all live and work on the principles of association and common responsibility. Even the prison life among the common convicts bears the signs of social organisation and self-government. Chains, the knout, penal servitude . . . and self-government! The combination is an absurdity! And yet it exists. The necessity of keeping some kind of order, however incomplete, among the hundreds of desperate people, who have nothing more to lose in life, has forced the legislators to grant to the convicts the privilege of choosing from among themselves a *Starosta* (elder). The *Starosta* looks after the property of the association, the entries and division of donations, food and clothing, and the internal arrangements of the convict slaves. And, strange as it may appear, this Elder, while he fills the office of elected representative of the convict society, is strict to the last degree in the discharge of his duties, and even regulates the interference of the prison authorities. Of course the prison superintendent and his assistants do pretty much what they like with the convicts under the *Starosta*, but it is nevertheless characteristic that the law recognises the rights of the *Starosta*, and the authorities know very well that no arbitrary violation of the rights of this appointed convict-chief ever passes over without mutiny and even bloodshed.

But the most perfect of the Great-Russian *Artels* is that of the carpenters. The whole of Great-Russia, including even the majority of the city population, lives in wooden dwellings, and the carpentering trade is therefore of great importance. Everywhere the carpenters from the same locality form themselves into associations, each number-

ing from six or eight up to twenty persons. The best and most experienced of the workers is elected manager, and finds work, enters into contracts, receives deposits from the employer, and during the work supervises matters generally. Besides the manager, one man is also elected to look after the domestic affairs of the *Artel*—viz., the food, lodging, washing etc. Very often some member of the *Artel* brings his wife with him; then the household is handed over to her, and the members of the *Artel* call her "Matka" (mammy). The *Matka* prepares the food and does the washing, and in leisure time darns and mends for the whole association. At the sharing of the earnings, when the work is finished, the *Matka* and the young half-time workers get each half the share of an able bodied worker; in some *Artels* the manager gets a share-and-a-half, and in most cases a double share. In these associations the members not only live together but eat from one common bowl. Usually the dinner consists of sour cabbage-soup, meat or fish, and porridge. The meat or fish is cut up into small pieces and thrown into the soup. Every member of the *Artel* waits for his turn, and is very careful not to dip in his spoon before his next neighbor on the right hand side, and no one takes a bit of meat or fish until the oldest person present has done so, tapping on the bowl with his spoon. Cases of illness are treated at the expense of the *Artel*, and the cost is deducted from the wages of the sick person only in those cases when the illness lasts longer than three days. When the job of work is ended, every member of the *Artel* is free to do what he pleases. As a general rule the whole *Artel* goes back in a body to its own village, where, in the absence of the bread-winners, the old men, the lads and particularly the women have been carrying on the home affairs and performing the public duties of the absent.

All public duties in a village commune are either elective or are performed by every one in turn. The *Starshina* of the *Volost* (parish or borough), the judges of the *Volost* and the *Starosta* are chosen at the meetings of the commune, and are bound not to be absent from their duties for long at a time. But the offices of "sotsky" and "dessiatsky" (a kind of domestic police) are filled by every one in turn. The *Sotsky* and *Dessiatsky* have to give notice at the meetings of the communes of all documents and instructions received from the authorities, to stand on guard on all occasions when a guard is needed, to escort prisoners, etc.... But the character of the Russian peasantry is so remarkably peaceable and quiet that guards and escorts are comparatively rarely required; and it has therefore become the custom for women and lads to replace absent men in the offices of *Sotsky* and *Dessiatsky*. Besides the duties of *Sotsky* and *Dessiatsky*, which every man fulfils in turn, each household is bound, in case of fire, to help in extinguishing it and to provide some one or other of the necessary implements. In front of every cottage can be seen a little sign-board with a rough representation of a hatchet, a bucket, a ladder or some other object. This means that in case of fire the members of the household are bound to provide this particular implement.

The hardest thing in the life of a village commune is the collection of taxes. These have risen to absolutely monstrous figures, the peasant paying on the average 50—and in some places 75—per cent. of the entire produce of his land. The collection of taxes—and indeed the whole local administration—is entrusted to persons chosen by the commune. Care is taken to choose men of unstained reputation, and, if possible, one in comparatively easy circumstances, in order that their opinion may carry weight at the meeting at which the division of the taxes is decided upon. The collectors, the church *Starosta*, the judge and (on the occasions when there is such a person) the *Khodok*,* or delegate, represent at these meetings the interests of the commune. These are the most honorable posts to which a commune can elect any member, and are always filled without payment. As for the offices of *Starosta*, *Starshina* of the *volost* and voter on the *zemstvo*, the election to them always takes place under pressure exercised by all-powerful Russian officialdom, and these elections are losing their communal character with every day and sinking into mere nominations by the police.

"Anarchism and a Moribund Society."

A most interesting and important book on the Anarchist movement, entitled "La Société Mourante et l'Anarchie,"† has just been brought out in French by Jean Grave, for some time past editor of *La Révolte*. Another work of Grave's, "Society on the Morrow of the Revolution," published under the *nom de plume* of Jean le Vagre, which has reached its 13th edition in France, is already known to our readers, having run through *Freedom*, from January 1890 to March 1891.

The 1st chapter of "Anarchism and a moribund Society" deals with the growth and development of the Anarchist idea, showing how it sprang up from the undefined aspirations of humanity—the "enragées" in the French Revolution being amongst its pioneers; how it began to be put into shape by Proudhon and others, and in spite of the scant means of propaganda has grown into a wide-spread movement; how this rapid growth, in spite of every obstacle, is, in itself, a strong proof of the truth of the idea. Grave then points out that the only real reason for governmental Authority is the defence of private property, and that when this is destroyed government will be no longer required,

and will of itself cease to exist.

The next chapter is devoted to showing that the terms Anarchism and Communism are not opposed to each other, as the Individualists try to make out. Societies or associations, says Grave, are recognised by Anarchists, as by Individualists, as having been created for the benefit of the individual, and not the individual for that of societies, their object being to obtain the greatest possible results with the least expenditure of labor; and therefore a state of *free* communism, in as much as it would accomplish this object and satisfy the physical and intellectual requirements of man, who is essentially a social animal and not an isolated individuality unaffected by the conditions of his fellow beings, would be a benefit to each and all, and not subject the individual to tyranny. Both Individualism and Altruism pushed to an extreme are equally harmful, but combined they resolve themselves into a third term, Solidarity, the ruling principle of the future society.

Speaking later on of the objection so often raised against Anarchists that they are too fond of discussing abstract questions, Grave very truly points out that, in as much as they aim at bringing about a total change of present conditions, it is absolutely necessary for them to go deeply into all sorts of questions, so that they may clearly show the workers that they will never improve their condition by a mere change of masters; the mere fact of being Anarchists implies that we do not wish people to follow our advice unless convinced of its desirability, which can only be shown by serious study and by reasoning out all sorts of questions to their logical conclusion. We must prepare ourselves intellectually for the Revolution by thought and education, just as the bourgeoisie prepared themselves for the abolition of royalty.

Grave next attacks the important question as to whether man is in himself bad or whether he is not rather the creature of circumstances, the expression of his environment, deteriorating or improving in direct ratio with his surroundings. Grave inclines to this latter opinion, but considers that the fact that men are as good as they are under existing conditions is a strong proof of an essential tendency towards goodness. But be they good or bad, the downfall of capitalism is alike inevitable, as in either case people still have the right to live as they wish and to revolt if exploited. We cannot help, however, thinking that it is not owing to a tendency towards goodness, as Grave puts it, but rather owing to a spirit of cowardice that men have allowed themselves to be tyrannised and exploited.

The following chapters deal with existing institutions, which Anarchists wish to destroy: private property, the family as at present understood, government, the magistracy, jingo patriotism, and militarism. After sketching the growth of private property, Graves contends that the bourgeoisie, unable any longer to maintain the theory of their divine right to all the means of life, have built up a completely false science to defend it; how, after terming everything Capital which is put out in the shape of labor, intelligence, machinery, etc., for the production of wealth, and requiring to be paid back in the shape of subsistence, security against risk, and wear and tear of machinery, etc., they have still been unable to account for the surplus money capital, and so have been reduced to the absurdity of saying that that capital is the reward of abstinence!

The chapter on government is a masterpiece of clear, logical reasoning. It shows how the bourgeoisie only conceded universal suffrage when they saw it could do them no harm, how the idea of representing a nation is a complete impossibility, and how majority rule resolves itself really into minority rule, or at best means mediocrity rule. Almost everyone will agree that they themselves could do without government, but they do not think others could, as human beings are as a rule so bad, which, as Grave says, comes to this: Taken as a whole men are too bad to be able to agree among themselves, but taken individually they are fit to govern others.

The chapter on proposed reforms also deserves careful study, showing as it does that all such measures put in force under the present capitalist system must always turn in the long run to the advantage of the capitalists and the greater misery of the workers. He also deals with the mistake of advising the use of governmental machinery to bring about Anarchism, truly saying that the only way to bring about Anarchism is to act as Anarchists. The Revolution, he concludes, is under present circumstances necessary and inevitable, and must be used by the Anarchists as a means to bring about an end—Anarchism.

These are in outline the contents of this most interesting book. It is written in a clear, emphatic style, involved sentences and ambiguous terms being carefully avoided. All French-speaking comrades should read it, and we hope a translation may soon be ready for English-speaking friends. The preface by Octave Mirbeau, a leading French journalist, is also very interesting.

O. ROSSETTI.

Anarchism.

(Concluded from previous number.)

That Anarchism has such a vague and at times an unhealthy form in the minds even of some people calling themselves Anarchists, but who are not entitled to do so, as they have no intelligent notion of the term, is not to be wondered at. That some people should be drawn to it who see in some of the phrases used by Anarchist orators and writers a justification of their own meanness and selfishness is not to be very much wondered at. They think of the good time coming as one when each shall be able to wallow in the filth of their own selfishness, and do "as they bloody well please," irrespective of the feelings and brotherly claim of others, because there shall be no laws. In a state of Anarchism they would pretty soon waken from their miserable Fools' Paradise,

* A *Khodok* is sent to the chief town of the province, or, in very grave cases, even to St. Petersburg, when a commune wishes to complain of some injustice, or to ask some favor.

† Published by Tresse and Stock: Galerie du Théâtre Français, Palais Royal, Paris. Price 3fr. 50c.

and find unwritten laws dodging their footsteps, for people will always hate the stink of the skunk. Those anti-social instincts which our anti-social society has developed and emphasised in us will die out in a free society, and the better ones grow and assert themselves, but the process won't be so speedy, I am afraid, as some people think. No man has ever seen a single religion die out, and no one will see the death of the anti-social instinct—the process is too slow for that. At any rate a free society will stop the growth of it.

It strikes me that we often argue from our anti-social instincts when we argue and come to the conclusion that it would be right to steal from our neighbor that which we are in want of ourselves. Mere stealing can never lead to better things—it never did, nor it never shall. In an Anarchist society the man who would steal from his neighbor, I hope his neck would be introduced to a piece of hempen cord. All such people, after they prove themselves incorrigible—the selfish, the mean, the ingrate, the wife bully and coward—will be left severely alone, and they will be shunned as the lepers were in olden times. As Kropotkin says, we will oppose them with our instincts; and who can doubt the end of such a struggle? It is only perverted (in the most of cases) instincts that can discuss the question of the desirability of stealing—an anti-social growth of our present diseased society.

There is one question often eagerly discussed by Anarchists and that is the subject of religion. Loud is the denunciation of religion, and with a good amount of justice too. Everything pertaining to what is called the religious sentiment is eagerly seized hold of and ruthlessly stabbed in a dozen places. This curse of the past makes us indiscriminate in our attacks, and people who believe in the further development of new powers in man which will have extraordinary effects on the human race are ridiculed as mental imbeciles by people who ought to know better, and a fetter is sought to be placed on free thought and free inquiry. Darwin was not so foolish as to lay down a line and say thus far only can Evolution go.

That there are powers within us waiting for the moment when conditions will be favorable to their growth, very few people doubt now; and it is our duty to stimulate scientific inquiry and be afraid of no bogey in so doing, whether it is styled God or Devil or what not. I believe the idea of the supernatural will die out, but it is too much to expect it to do so at once. As science leads the way and spreads her discoveries over the earth, the supernatural and supersensuous will grow dimmer. In a free society religion will be completely crippled of its power of intimidation, and there will be nothing to fear in it. If we are to wait for Anarchism until the idea of the supernatural is blotted out of man's mind, we shall wait for many a year indeed. The thing itself will die in a free society, and not until we have that free society. There is nothing to fear from it; with the loss of its State-machinery and the destruction of Respectability the thing will be powerless for evil, and it will die a natural death. In the free society if my neighbor wants to worship a table, or something in the air, I would be the last to interfere with him, knowing that reason and enlightenment alone could aid him; and if he did not interfere with me, we could still be good neighbors and go on our way rejoicing.

We shall all see our way clearer with each other, and instead of being a hindrance to each other's development, as we are to-day, we shall act and react on each other in a helpful way; and that too without knowing anything of the sophistries and philosophies of Altruism, Truism and Egoism, with their hair-splittings and wonderful feats on the mental horizontal bar—which only prove, after all, a very shallow cleverness without results either to ourselves or others. The facts of life will always remain, and mental acrobaticism never touch them.

With regard to morality, I for one at any rate care not to discuss it. I do not see much use in troubling myself about Moral Theory, because I think we usually know well enough what is Right and Wrong. Laziness and cowardice seem to me to be the chief anti-moral tendencies, and next to them selfishness, which, however, is included in them.

As to methods—the much vexed question of methods—I believe each must settle that for himself. And so long as the method is in harmony with the principle of Anarchism, and carried out without the hope of mere personal gain and selfish aggrandisement, that method, whatever it is, can do nothing but good.

J. M. BROWN.

Books, Pamphlets, etc.

We have received during the past months the following books and pamphlets on our cause and kindred subjects.

IN ENGLISH.

A Plea for Anarchist Communism, by H. H. Duncan; No. 1 of the Aberdeen Anarchist Communist Group; 1d. A good pamphlet exposing our main ideas plainly. It would be useful for propaganda, as it is written in a popular style very fit for calling attention to the subject. May now be obtained from Freedom office.

Evolution and Revolution, by Elisée Reclus, 4th English edition. William Reeves: 1d.

Revolutionary Government. Translated from *La Révolte* and reprinted from the *Commonweal*. By P. Kropotkin, 1d. This pamphlet demonstrates the absolute incompatibility of Revolution and Government, the disastrous effects of a "revolutionary dictatorship," and the error of thinking that a secret society can overturn a government and take its place.

Revolutionary Studies. Translated from *La Révolte* and reprinted from the *Commonweal*. By P. Kropotkin. 2d. Office of the *Commonweal*.—This excellent pamphlet points out that the chief reason of the failure of former revolutions to effectually improve society has been the lack of audacity of the revolutionists, who have never gone far enough and whose idea of the future has always

been an improved edition of the past. Kropotkin points out that in the Social Revolution the duty of the Revolutionists is to be daring enough, and to recognise that their work will lie, not in making grand speeches, but in reorganising production among the workers on a Communistic basis, and to give absolute freedom to individual initiative.

Labor Robbery: the Politician unmasked, by W. Barker, 1d.—This pamphlet is intended to show that all present evils spring from the governmental system, and that all attempts to tinker up this system are shams and deceptions. Barker considers education as absolutely necessary for a revolution, but upholds isolated individual action as the only weapon we now possess.

Socialist Songs. Compiled from many authors by J. Bruce Glasier. Price 3d. Labor Literature Society, 105, London-street, Glasgow.—An excellent collection of Socialist poems, to many of which the names of tunes to which they might be sung, have been appended. The list includes the names of Morris, Swinburne, Shelley, Francis Adams, E. Carpenter, D. J. Nicoll and many others, though as they are poems fit for setting to music of course many excellent pieces have had to be omitted.—(To be continued.)

THE PROPAGANDA. REPORTS.

LONDON—

During the past two months, of which there has been no full report, the propaganda has been going on well. The Commonweal Group, after having a very successful winter's work, with an increase of comrades and finances, decided to restart the 'Weal'. It was agreed to have as editor Comrade Samuels, who, in this capacity, is, and has been, working very hard for the cause. After a hard day in a workshop, he then sets about his editorial duties. These circumstances, combined with the great amount of out-door speaking he does, entitles him to the encouragement which all good comrades are sure to give. The 'Weal' has been going on very fairly. It is pushed well, but there is still a lack of energy on the part of some comrades; and it is this lack which prevents the 'Weal' from having a larger circulation than it has, although there are so many comrades who find it more convenient to support the movement financially than otherwise, which method of support is quite as necessary as any other. The out-door propaganda has been carried on with great activity by the comrades. Very successful meetings have been held at the following places:—Every evening in the week, Hyde Park; every Saturday evening, in Victoria Park and Enfield Market Place; Sunday morning, Hyde Park, Regent's Park, Finsbury Park, and Victoria Park; in the afternoon, Hyde Park, Victoria Park, and Clerkenwell Green; in the evening, Victoria Park and Hyde Park. Although each of these meetings are carried on very well, there is still plenty to be done and room for new speakers, because London is so vast that the above stations are as almost nothing in it. The sale of literature has been very fair all round. On one recent Sunday, as much as 11s.-worth of literature was sold at a meeting in Victoria Park; and probably at the other stations as much could be sold, if comrades only worked with a little more activity. Among the speakers have been—Leggatt, Quin, Samuels, Cantwell, Wess, Lawrence, Barker, Reid, Sullivan, Cook, Young, Presberg, J. Turner, Tochatti, Merlino, Henry, Gittens, and Banham.—Several new groups have been formed; one, a group composed of the Jewish workmen of the West-End, which is mostly composed of tailors; another, the Proletarian Club in the district of Clerkenwell; while a very active group has been formed in the East-End. Mowbray has been very busy among the tailors, and the results of his hard work may be seen sooner or later. The *English Illustrated Magazine*, published monthly, has had an article on "Hartmann, the Anarchist," and in order to create a large circulation has had stuck over most large hoardings great posters, depicting the blowing-up of the Houses of parliament by dynamite. Ever since these things have been posted about, we have been busy printing handbills and large posters, calling on the people to meet on the day of the approaching royal marriage, to protest against the pomp and show that is to be displayed while the workpeople are living on a starvation wage; and comrades have found these very posters relating to Hartmann, the Anarchist, very useful to stick our posters upon. Round one hoarding there was quite a rush of people anxious to read the posters that had been stuck up; at another hoarding there were as many as one hundred people looking and reading the leaflet or bill that had been stuck up by a comrade. Altogether, we have made good use of the posters issued by the *English Illustrated Magazine*, and we hope that the editor will continue his excellent work in our behalf. Our ideas are gaining ground every day; wherever one goes it is to find our principles discussed in some way or other. The very fact of a journal like the *English Illustrated* containing such a story, is a clear sign of the growth of Anarchism in Conservative England. The more daring we are, the more revolutionary, the harder we work—the more helpers will come forward; the greater influence we will obtain among the people; and the nearer we will be to that grand and glorious era. As Shelley says: "Thoughts have gone forth, whose powers can sleep no more."—J.

Clerkenwell.—In this neighborhood the Italian groups, who have been in the habit of holding meetings at Warner-street on Sunday afternoons, have had their meetings constantly broken up and dispersed by the police. But the right of free speech being doubly important to maintain, because of the desire of our Comrades to form a union among the Italians in that quarter, Merlino invited English Comrades to join in resisting the police. Accordingly Tochatti and others went to their assistance, and June 4th, a meeting was opened at Warner-street by Merlino, round whom gathered a crowd of interested Italians. A policeman soon appeared and told our Comrades if they wanted to hold a meeting to go on Clerkenwell Green. Tochatti stepped forward and said, that no obstruction was being caused and that it was intended to test the police interference. He then spoke for some ten minutes, telling the Italians what the English law was on the question and pointing out that whenever the right of free speech was used to convey important social truths, which attacked the interests of the capitalist class, this class, having control of the police, never failed to use them to suppress free speech. He then called on Merlino to explain Socialism to the Italians in their own tongue. Merlino, Malatesta and Pietrarago then spoke without being further interfered with. The meeting afterwards adjourned to Clerkenwell-green, where Tochatti spoke for nearly two hours. His points were well taken by the audience, who cheered heartily at the conclusion. Mrs. Tochatti then sang a Socialist song. Merlino followed with a very lucid exposition of Anarchist Communism, and Tochatti brought the meeting to a close at 10 o'clock. June 11th Merlino was addressing a good meeting at Warner-st. when again a policeman attempted to break it up. Tochatti again interposed and maintained their right to hold a meeting there, calling attention to the fact that there was no obstruction and asking why the Salvation Army was not interfered with, to which the policeman replied: "That is a religious body." Tochatti then said that the Socialists were more truly religious, and that he would not allow a policeman to interpret the law for him. "Oh, won't you," said this limb of law, "I am the law's prerogative and I mean to stay here and stop your meeting." Tochatti said, "I am going for all that to hold a meeting; you can summon me if you like." Oh, no! he would not do that. He would lock Tochatti up. Tochatti still said, "I am going to hold a meeting anyway. You can do what you like." The policeman then mouched off, and the Italians catching the sense of what had

just occurred cheered lustily. Merlino, Malatesta and Pietraroga having thus had their propaganda work emphasised for them so nicely were able to go on with telling effect. A good meeting was afterwards held at Clerkenwell-green, opened by W. English. Opposition ably replied to by Merlino and Tochatti. Agnes Henry and Atterbury also spoke.—June 18th a good meeting was held at Warner-street. English comrades attended, but there was no need for them to speak as there were no interference from "prerogatives of the law," although they, too, were in attendance on the ferocious Anarchists. Afterwards a good meeting was held at Clerkenwell-green, opened by Cantwell. Tochatti and Atterbury spoke amid interruptions from the Irish, who objected to the condemnation of party politics. Tochatti alluded to E. T. Craig's experiment at Rahaline as illustrating the lines upon which Anarchists should move. Craig, when asked to wait and see what Government would do before trying his experiment, replied, "Damn the Government!" It had proved to be the most successful experiment tried on the land without government or politics. An Irish nationalist offered some courteous opposition. Atterbury in reply pointed out how both Liberal and Conservative were voting against the Home Rule Bill. If the Irish could be brought to see what party politics were worth and could gain a grip of the economic conditions, it would bring them speedily to Anarchist Communism. Thus terminated a most interesting and successful meeting, which had lasted from 6 to 10 p.m.

In consequence of the assistance given to our Italian comrades by the English comrades forming the Carmagnole Group, as stated above, the Hyde Park meetings were temporarily suspended.—W. E.

Victoria Park.—Good meetings have been held here every Sunday in June. Leggett, Quin, Turner, Samuels, Cook, and Barker have all addressed large and interested audiences. So far, it seems to be as good a park as any in London for our purpose. According to statistics, more people visit Victoria Park than any other park in London. Not only are the audiences large and interested, they are also in no hurry to break up even when the lecture gives out. On June 11th Leggett spoke for one hour and a half, and then declared the meeting closed, but the people would not go away, and so he went on for another spell, until the L.C.C. blue-coats whistled him out of the park. Our comrades hope to find a good sale for *Freedom* in this quarter.—E. T. G.

Peckham.—A good month's work has been gone through here. Although it was prophesied by the local Social Democrats that we would not exist as an organisation more than a month, we are still alive and flourishing; have made several new members since we started, and a number of sympathisers, and with the help of a few local comrades are holding three meetings every week. Our Sunday morning audiences at Peckham Park Road have been addressed by the following comrades:—Atterbury, Samuels, Tochatti, Banham, and another Peckham comrade. We are also holding meetings every Thursday evening at the same spot, and on Saturdays at Commercial Road. These week-night meetings up to now have been conducted entirely by the following local comrades:—Banham, Buckridge, Levings, and another comrade; but we should be glad of help from any other comrades who could manage to come over. Comrade Turner had better make up for past misdeeds (he has disappointed us twice by not turning up), by coming over and speaking for us at some of these meetings. We have distributed a large amount of literature—in fact, we intend flooding Peckham, Camberwell, and Dulwich with our papers, so that all may have the chance of knowing what Anarchism really means. Hardly a night passes but what we have been hard at work for the cause of Anarchism; for when not holding meetings of our own, we endeavor to do our best to bring Anarchism to the front at the S.D.F. and Labor Church meetings at Walworth, Camberwell, and Peckham, by joining in the discussion, pushing the sale of literature, and other means. We are also arranging for a debate between our Comrade Samuels and a local vestryman, John Hampden Davis, at the North Camberwell Radical Club, and hope by this to do good propaganda work.—Revolutionary Social Democracy, in this neighbourhood, is fast developing into legal, respectable, and religious channels; not a word is now heard from their platforms of "the Class War," and the ideal is deserted in order to puff so-called palliatives, to the end that fools enough may be found to get the would-be leaders a seat—and a salary—in the House of Commons. But here, as elsewhere, they have to reckon with the Anarchists; and now that Anarchism has gained a firm footing in Peckham, we intend to peg away, exposing the whole of the political frauds, whether Liberal, Tory, or Social Democrats, until working men see that it is not by putting a cross to a man's name that their emancipation will be realised, but by a determined effort to break down the power of the governments which protect and legalise the robbery and slow murder of their class.—W. H.

PROVINCES—

Aberdeen.—Anarchy is steadily increasing its influence among the workers here, and is even, to some extent, growing popular. Anarchism frequently crops up in conversation, and it is no uncommon thing to see a band of young fellows parading the streets whistling loudly the "Marseillaise," or humming the "March of the Workers."—Our open-air Sunday evening meeting on Castle Street is, if anything, bigger and better than ever, despite the fact that the gospel grinders are on every hand, with their sultry doctrines of hell and damnation, assisted by a band of teetotalers. On Sunday, 18th June, we commenced meetings on the banks in the afternoon, and we were agreeably surprised to gather in a short time a very fair crowd indeed. A feature of our meetings worth noting, is that, for the last few weeks, questions have been asked at almost every meeting, and the questions have not been of a carping or sophistical nature, but requests for fuller explanations of doubtful points.—On Saturday, 17th, Stonehaven, a village about sixteen miles south of Aberdeen, was visited, and a fair meeting held. Although there were considerable interruptions from one or two drunkards, the meeting was, on the whole, attentive and sympathetic. Some rather stupid questions from a half-drunken young man smartly answered.—On the 8th inst., we took part in an indignation meeting organised by the Socialist Society, protesting against the Town Council's decision to grant £100 in order to start a subscription for a wedding present to the pauper offspring of a royal pauper race, and to spend £100 or £200 more on fireworks on the wedding day. We are to issue a leaflet on the subject of the royal marriage on the "day of rejoicing." Several comrades have been vowing that there will be some fun on that day, and there is every likelihood of it.—We have, after much tearing of trousers, cutting of hands and knees, got a sufficient number of comrades able to bestride bicycles, to conduct meetings in country places where trains do not run or are badly timed for meetings. Skine, Inveraria, Durris, and Ellon, will shortly be visited. Never has the group been more active and enthusiastic than it is at present.—E. S.

Manchester.—We are going along steadily here with our out-door propaganda on Sundays, and weekly meetings for discussion and business. We are arranging for speakers from different parts to visit us and enliven our work, Agnes Henry being with us at present.—On May 31st, Somerville, of the I. L. P., lectured on "The Possibility and Efficacy of an I. L. P.," in reply to one against Barton. This was followed by Comrade W. Stockton, on "The Fallacy of Political Methods," clearly showing the wisdom of revolutionary action.—Comrade Bruce Glasier has been lecturing in Manchester, and addressed our meeting at New Cross on June 18th.—On June 21st, Agnes Henry addressed our weekly meeting at the Labour Church Institute, on the "Social Revolution," dealing with the expropriation of the masters and the arrangement of food supply. This was followed by some discussion. Of course, all opportunities are taken at meetings for discussion at the clubs of the S. D. F., I. L. P., and so forth,

to further our opinions.—At New Cross, on Sunday night, June 11th, a row took place after the meeting, when the people collect in groups, discussing animatedly till unrespectable hours. A comrade, once himself a Catholic, had excited some of the crowd by his remarks on that religious body, and the police, who must have been new on this beat, and anxious to do their duty, made it an excuse to attack the people pell-mell, injuring several persons rather badly. Almost every one of the comrades had left the scene. We shall mind it that this game is prevented in future, as it would be seized as a good reason to stop our meetings, to preserve the law.—J. V. B.

Newcastle.—It is a long time since we sent you a report. We have not been able to be very active here, owing to lack of fresh speakers. Unfortunately, we are too far from any other groups to exchange speakers without a great deal of expense. We were very sorry that Agnes Henry could not come here while in the north. Any comrade would be welcome who would pay us a short visit. But although we have not held any regular meetings, we have been able to give a number of lectures on Anarchism at the halls of the Liberal Associations, the Secular Society, and the Independent Labor Party. Comrade Pearson has also had five debates on Anarchism, all great successes. We have also held meetings at Jarrow, Sunderland, Chesterle Street, Jelling, and Bolden Colliery. A group has been formed in Sunderland, and as our energetic comrade, Kapper, is there now, we expect it will soon be a big group. About 1,000 pamphlets, back numbers of *Freedom* and *Commonweal*, have been distributed on the Quayside to the workmen, who are always standing about that place. We have had a visit from the "Christian want of Evidence" lecturer, Celestine Edwards, who, after delivering a lecture against Secularism, which was an incoherent mass of misrepresentation and personal abuse, favoured us with a lecture against Anarchism. The hall was crowded (there are plenty of fanatics still left), so that it was a good advertisement for Anarchism. A comrade having given Edwards a pamphlet on the Chicago Martyrs, he said he was not surprised at those men resorting to force under such conditions. He then went on to show his absolute ignorance of Anarchism, there being half an hour's discussion with Pearson. In the whole lecture there was scarcely anything worth mentioning; but during the discussion that followed, Pearson said that he was opposed to all law, i.e., enforced regulations, whether made by God or man. "No you don't," said Edwards; "I defy you to get up here to-night and tell this audience that you disbelieve in the law made by God and man—'Thou shalt not steal.'"
"Yes," replied Pearson, "I do oppose the law, 'Thou shalt not steal,' but I am not opposed to the principle, 'Thou shouldst not steal.'"
Before he went away, Edwards gave us a lecture on "Liberty." His liberty consisted in the right of Christians to criticise and even "to honestly doubt the Bible;" in the right of the workers to join trade unions; and in the prevention of anybody's giving under-value for any article. When asked if he would allow Secularists the right to leave money to secular institutions, he said, "No; unless they could prove that they were right in doing so." A Social Democrat, named Robertson, and Pearson opposed him, Pearson defying him to point out the difference between his "liberty" and the tyranny of the Czar of Russia.—Next month, we hope to send a better report, and will send an account of the different parties here. We are besieged just now with politicians—Labor, Liberal, and Tory. This seems to be the centre of the political fight.—T. P.

Glasgow.—Last Sunday we abandoned our evening meeting in Jail Square, to break new ground in the north-end of the City. The site we fixed on is at the gate of the Alexandra Park, which hitherto has been held exclusively by the religious "tub-thumpers." Comrade Lebeau opened with the workers' "Marseillaise," which soon brought a large crowd around us. Comrades Levenston, Robb, and Muir afterwards addressed the meeting, which seemed greatly interested in our new "gospel." Some of the comrades thought the meeting-place too far from the City, and too many "mashers" about to do much effective work; but it helps a speaker greatly to emphasise an argument to point to smiling fields and woods giving a glimpse of the promised land.—As Comrade Anderson has been obliged to recoup his health in the country, I have been appointed secretary in his absence. All communications to be addressed to John Robb, 113, Burnside Street.

Edinburgh.—Owing to the want of an open-air speaker, we have to content ourselves with selling literature in the meadows on Sundays, and entering into discussion with small groups here and there, and in this way we never allow Anarchist Communism to be lost sight of. At the next union meeting of Saddlers and Harness-makers, of which I am a member, I am to read a paper on "Will Trade Unionism, as at present constituted, solve the labor problem?" questions and discussion to follow. I have been distributing old *Freedom*s and *Commonweals* at all our union meetings for some time back.—H. C.

Brighton.—Lack of open-air speakers has forced us for the last few months to spread our ideas by distributing literature and discussing with small groups at Secularist and other meetings, supplying restaurants and reading-rooms with *Freedom*s and *Weals*, and pasting them up whenever we have a chance. Willing is offering 10s. reward to anyone who catches us trespassing on his hoardings!—Comrade Halmer perseveringly pushes the cause at the Tailors' Club. On June 25th, G. W. Read and W. Barker held three capital meetings on the occasion of the Builders' Strike demonstration.—S. B.

NOTICES.

LONDON—

Open-air meetings: Sundays, 11.30 a.m., in Hyde and Regent's and Finsbury Parks, and at Mile End Waste, Kensal Green, and Triangle (Peckham Rye); 3.40 p.m., Hyde Park; 5 p.m., Clerkenwell Green; 7 p.m., Mile End Waste. Saturdays, 8 p.m., Hyde Park.

Commonweal Group meet every Tuesday night at the Proletarian Club, 47, Corporation Row, Clerkenwell, E.C., 8.30 sharp.

A debate will take place on Tuesday, July 18th, at Crafton Hall, 55, Grafton Street, Tottenham Court Road, at 8 p.m. sharp, between H. B. Samuels (Commonweal Group) and Herbert Burrows (Theosophical Society), on "Anarchism v. Social Democracy." Mr. M. Macdonald, M.P., will preside. Admission by ticket, 6d. and 3d., proceeds going to Commonweal fund.

Peckham.—Open-air meetings: Thursdays, 8 p.m., and Sundays, 11.30 a.m., at Peckham Park Road (opposite the Gas Works), Old Kent Road; Saturdays, 8 p.m., Commercial Road, Old Kent Road.

NICOLL FUND.

RECEIVED FROM JUNE 1st TO JUNE 30th:—

Anarchist Jack, 4/-; Abrahams' list, 1/3½; Anon., 1/-; Gutzkow, 1/-.

All communications should be addressed in future to M. Galbraith, 19, Conderton-road, S.E.

All comrades will sympathise with Comrade Stenzleit on the loss of his eldest son, Bruno, who died June 17th. Though only 16, he was very active in the sale of Anarchist literature, and his familiar figure will be missed at every London meeting.

Printed and published by C. M. Wilson, 61, St. Augustine's-road, Camden-town, London, N.W.