

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. VII.—No. 80.

SEPTEMBER, 1893.

MONTHLY ; ONE PENNY.

What's the Good of Congresses?

WHY not leave the Marxists to stew in their own juice? Why should Anarchists bother to go to their so-called Labor Congresses, only to be kicked or manoeuvred out of them, or have their mouths shut by the wire-pullers if they succeed in remaining?

Because the great object of Communist Anarchists is to permeate the whole Labor movement with Communist-Anarchist ideas, and to set a really Free Communist society as their aim before the mass of the workers. Therefore, their place is in all assemblies and movements of the workers; in congresses as in strikes and demonstrations. Wherever the workers are there must the Anarchist propagandist be.

Now, the object of the Marxist leaders is to manoeuvre the Anarchists—and, in fact, the whole Revolutionary Socialist element, whether it be called Anarchist or not—not only out of this or that Congress, but out of the Labor movement. And it is therefore our business to confront and defeat these tactics wherever they are tried. It is our business to force the hand of the would-be leaders, and make them plainly confess whither they are really trying to lead the workers. If merely to constitutional reforms, flavored with Authoritarian Socialism, let them say so openly. Then those who wish merely for such reforms and such "socialism" can follow them, and the rest take their own way. We Anarchists wish to force no man's convictions. We merely claim the right of the advocates of Free Communism to be heard as much as the advocates of Democratic Socialism, the advocates of direct action, *via* a general strike on the part of the workers, as much as the advocates of parliamentary methods.

If the Marxists wish to hold a congress of Marxists, let them hold it, in Marx's name. Anarchists—and a good many others—will leave them severely alone. But if they profess to convene a Labor Congress or a Congress of all Socialists, then Communist Anarchists claim a right to attend it as much as Social Democrats or Fabians or Labor Party men. And, as a matter of fact, the arbitrary measures to which the attempt of the Anarchists to attend the Zürich Congress incited the Social Democratic leaders have made excellent propaganda for Anarchism, better perhaps for the movement at this moment than if all our comrades had succeeded in keeping their places and explaining their ideas at length. "What are these Communist-Anarchist ideas" every one is asking, "at which the Marxists and their allies are so desperately frightened?"

The New Inquisition at Zurich.

THE so-called Labor Congress at Zürich spent the first half of its sittings in demonstrating the absurd anomaly of the title it assumed. Till Wednesday, Aug. 10th, it was occupied in a conflict with heretics, *i.e.*, those Socialists, workers or not, whose attitude in the Labor Movement happens to seem heterodox in the eyes of the Marxist leaders.

Providence—we beg pardon, "historical evolution"—has, we are informed by Mr. Bax, in *Justice*, Aug. 19, given over the "natural leadership" of the Socialist movement to the German Social Democratic party, whom he very aptly likens to the orthodox Christian [Roman] Church. It follows, of course, that these heaven-sent leaders and their allies look upon all opposition as sheer blasphemy, and consider all means justifiable for its suppression.

The expedient carefully fashioned for use at Zürich was a resolution admitting all Delegates from Labor organisations; "also all Socialist societies and organisations which acknowledge the necessity of the organisation of the workers, and the necessity of political action." The object of this was to make room for trade unionists, however conservative, the Marxists being very anxious to bid for their support, and also to include all the middle-class Social Democrats and wire pullers, so useful in "manipulating" the movement, while, on the other hand, it afforded a pretext for excluding delegates from Anarchist Socialist bodies, and more especially the rebel German and Austrian Independent Socialists, besides making matters as unpleasant as possible for all unwelcome revolutionists from Belgium, France, and particularly Holland.

Accordingly, on Monday, August 7, when this resolution was referred to the congress, the presidential chair was given to Herr Singer, the portly Jewish capitalist and M.P., who is the financial backbone of the German Social Democratic Party, and, in his money-making days, said to have been known as one of the most heartless exploiters in Germany.

The debate began by Keufer, a French delegate, arguing that a Labor Congress was the place for a free and open discussion of all ideas on the labor question, and therefore that the last clause in the resolution, excluding a considerable section of the Socialist party, should be

struck out.

Bonnier, of the Paris *Ere Nouvelle*, opposed this. Then Landauer, editor of the Berlin *Sozialist*, who has lately openly declared himself an Anarchist, pointed out that his credentials and those of his ten fellow-delegates of the Independent Party were of exactly the same sort as those of the orthodox German Social Democrats—all of them being chosen at public meetings to avoid the oppressive German laws against labor organisations. The credentials of the Independent Party being from working men, and exactly similar to those of the orthodox party, ought to be received by a Labor Congress which received the others, without the imposition of a creed test. He objected to the word "political" being cut down to mean merely "parliamentary." Political action was action for or against government. Bonnier, being the French translator of the German section, it fell to him to render his opponent's speech into French, the language understood by most of the delegates, and a fine hash he made of Landauer's eloquence.

After Hobson, of the Sheffield Trades Council, had supported Bonnier, Comrade Mowbray, delegate from the Amalgamated London Tailors, rose up and in a speech of fiery energy repudiated the establishment of an inquisition in the labor movement, the limitation of political action to parliamentary action, and the arbitrary attempt to turn a workers' congress into a Social Democratic congress. He also strongly objected to the terms "police agents" or "blockheads" applied by Bonnier to the Anarchists.

This fetched Herr Bebel, once a German working man and energetic revolutionist, but now degraded into a mere party leader and politician. This Honorable Member of the Reichstag burst out in a fury, denouncing all the Anarchists as fools and idiots, and saying they had no business to be attending a Labor Conference in the character of Trade Unionists (it is interesting to observe how the recent departure in Anarchist tactics enrages and non-plusses the S.D. leaders). Their only motive must be obstruction pure and simple, unless, as was most probable, they were police agents. He moved an addition to the resolution defining the words "political action" as meaning *parliamentary action*.

The American Jewish delegate, Cahan, was as wildly agitated by the Anarchist Unionists as Bebel, and said that Anarchist trade unionists were like boiling ice-creams.

Cornelissen, a Dutch comrade, then supported Mowbray; and a Spaniard, Inglesias, the reactionary party. (Where have the Marxists fished up these bigotted Social Democratic Spaniards? The fact that the mass of Anarchist Socialism in Spain was totally unrepresented and two Social Democrats appeared as the sole representatives of the whole Spanish labor movement shows how far from truly representative of the labor movement throughout Europe the Zürich assembly was.)

The debate was finally ended by Hobson moving the closure, in a speech which, being translated with immense gusto by two Marxists, Scheu and Smith, into German and French, "practically tripled" the one speech allowed.

In spite of the appeal of Guérard to the right of free speech, and a "clamor of protests" from the meeting, the closure was carried, the 100 German Social Democrats voting solid at the lifting of a little finger from their leaders.

Next, a motion by Jean Volders, of Belgium, was agreed on to the effect that, if the original Brussel resolution was adopted, all the other motions should fall to the ground. The original resolution was then put to the meeting, and scenes of the wildest confusion ensued. Many delegates were under the impression that by voting for the original resolution they were voting for the retention of the Anarchists, the words "political action" being taken in their wider sense. The vote was taken by nationalities, with the result that majorities of sixteen nations (including Holland) voted for, one (Spain) against, while the French abstained with a warm protest against the Congress's lack of tolerance. Of the British section Byrne, Mowbray, McLeod, Roland and MacLaren, of the Amalgamated Tailors; Steadman, L.C.C., and Macdonald, of the London Trades Council; Gilles, Workers' Co-operative Society; Watts, Quelch and Cleaves, Social Democratic Federation; Major Edwards, Kentish Independent Labor Party; Winchesky, Jewish Trade Unions, and a few more voted in the minority against the words political action.

And now the Marxists sprung their little mine. Singer declared that it had been agreed on Volders' motion to drop all amendmends, "except Bebel's," and this he now put to the meeting—amid a chorus of protests, that of Volders himself the loudest of all. The Dutch sent up a declaration: "We have voted for the Belgian proposal for the sole reason that by its adoption Bebel's amendment would also fall through, as has been decided previously. But we are deceived; we shall not vote again!" France and Belgium both voted by large majorities against Bebel, and the Marxists saw their adherents reduced to majorities in twelve nations. The German Independents and Anarchists were standing in the lower part of

the hall, surrounded by the German and Swiss Social Democrats. Shouts were raised, "Out with the rascals." Werner called out: "I declare that this is no longer a Workers' Congress!" Then came cries of "outside! outside!" with retorts of "Vive l'Anarchie!" followed by long uproar and deafening noise; Greulich (of the Swiss organising committee) rushed to the president for instructions. "Outside?" he asked. "Yes, outside," responded Singer. Greulich ran back, called on the Swiss and German lackeys of Singer, Bebel & Co. to look alive, and a scene of most scandalous brutality ensued. A number of the servile crew threw themselves like wild beasts upon fourteen of our comrades, using chairs, sticks and umbrellas to belabor their heads. Landauer and Werner were made special targets for their brutality, and Frau Landauer's dress was torn. Our comrades defended themselves as best they could with their own natural weapons. "Of the British delegation the heroic Mowbray," says the *Star*, "held the Anarchist fort to the last."

When the Anarchists and Independents were evicted Greulich reported to the president: "I announce that the wretches have been cleared out." Roland, Mowbray and a few other Anarchists, however, who had credentials from trade societies were, of course, protected by the first section of the resolution; hence the rage of the wirepullers, who thus saw themselves "hoist with their own petard."

To do away with the bad impression produced by this scene of intolerance, the question of a general strike (hitherto altogether omitted from the agenda) was hastily, on the suggestion of the French, added, with that of the agricultural situation, to the subjects for discussion, and so ended the first day's debate in this anomalous assembly.

The heretics, however, even those forcibly expelled, were by no means crushed.

Tuesday morning brought a written protest from the eleven German Independents and a hot discussion as to whether the question should be reopened. The president for the day was M. Argyriadès, a Greek, delegated by French Socialists, who in his opening address objected to the portrait of Karl Marx in solitary grandeur above the platform; why were the founders of French and English Socialism not beside him? and protested, somewhat feebly, against intolerance of ideas. The truth is that the natural French allies of the Marxists were "strained off" by the French elections, and the 38 French delegates were more or less revolutionary Socialists, besides being mortally jealous of German domination in any shape. Accordingly they were against the Marxist clique and inclined to demand fair play for the heretics out of sheer opposition.

Domela Nieuwenhuis (Holland) protested against the unfairness of Singer as chairman the day before. The Congress limited freedom of speech, he said, by the expulsion of the Independents and Anarchists yesterday. Is it not too foolish to terrorise one another? We, Dutch delegates, protest against the management of the Congress. We accepted the Belgian proposal in order that Bebel's amendment should drop through. But first the Belgian proposal was adopted and then Bebel's amendment is also put to the vote. I should have thought Bebel himself would have objected to such a proceeding, but it was not so. We were all deceived by the Congress. Were its actions wise and honest? The Congress disgraced itself before all the world, inasmuch as, by such conduct, it has shown itself afraid of discussion with certain Socialist schools. True, it stands written on the walls of this hall in 16 languages in the words of Karl Marx, "Proletariat of all countries, unite!" but it does not stand so in the hearts of the delegates. Wrap the portrait of Marx with mourning crape after such a deed. Nieuwenhuis concluded by moving the rescinding of Bebel's amendment. He was followed by Volders (Belgium), who also protested, in a vigorous speech, against the action of the committee and supported Nieuwenhuis's motion.

Andreas Scheu, "in a despotic, tyrannical sort of speech," says our Congress correspondent, "harped on the old string: an Anarchist could not be a trade unionist." (But what when he is, Mr. Scheu? Surely the actual is possible.) And then our former contributor, the Fabian Communist, Sydney Olivier, supported Bonnier in moving the "next business,"—without having decided upon Volder's motion—in a speech that seems to have taken all the reporters' breaths away, for we can find an intelligible account of it nowhere; and we can only hope Mr. Olivier was not the traitor to his earlier convictions he is made out.

Still, however, the matter was not at an end, for the Germans put up Bebel to read a "protocol" on his amendment, and then the credential committees had to present their reports.

(These congresses are a fine exhibition of red tape which does not, however, prevent them from being simply bear-gardens. The preliminary meeting on Sunday is described in the *Star* as "an Ollendorffian orgie," a tedious, disorderly contention over a tangle of amendments, protests and points of order, till in despair the majority passed the standing orders *en bloc*, though two or three of them were strenuously objected to by many who voted for them as the shortest way out of the mess. In fact, this Congress of would-be politicians was "beaten by its formal work," and this in spite of the most elaborate Marxian machinery of resolutions, amendments, reports, circulars, orders of the day, "Bureau," officers of Congress, national sectional committees, credentials committee, committees to digest and report on special subjects and what not. As G. B. Shaw remarked, when his amendment was conveniently "lost," "The Gentlemen of the Congress Bureau, who profess to be able to construct a Social Democratic Republic, have not shown at this Congress enough capacity to manage a country postoffice.")

The whole discussion broke out again over the refusal of the German majority to recognise the credentials of the Independents, F. Gilles, of London, rising to demand fair play. On this the Fabians and certain Trade Unionists in the British section, who seem to have failed altogether to understand that this question of free discussion and fair play

was the most important matter before the Congress, forced the president to put the closure, by threatening that all the British delegates would otherwise leave the hall, which of course they would not have done; thus Cipriani, Adler and others were prevented from speaking, and finally a majority of nationalities was brought to vote against the German Independents—many individuals in each nation again being in the minority, amongst them the S.D.F. delegates. "There is too much wire-pulling here," very justly observed Quelch.

On Wednesday Cipriani sent in the following written protest, which was not allowed by Mr. Hodge (Glasgow Steel Smelters' Association), who was in the chair, to be read out to the Congress.

"Gentlemen,—In attending your Congress I hoped that justice and fraternity would have presided over all its deliberations. But my hopes have been sadly deceived. From the very first day you have displayed a deplorable intolerance, unworthy of men calling themselves Socialists. Intolerance pushed to the point of refusing me permission to speak in defence of the delegates brutally expelled from the Congress Hall, without any reason, and to protest against this expulsion, unworthy of the ideas you say you profess. These men were expelled solely because they were revolutionists. When a Congress calling itself Socialist carries intolerance so far as to persecute ideas, it ceases to be such and becomes as reactionary as the governments which imprison and murder us. Know, then, Messrs. Chucks-out, that this red flag around which you assemble was taken on a heap of 35,000 French proletarians, slain by the autocrats of Versailles, dead for the liberty of all, and not for that of a petty clique. The Socialism of our dead excludes no one; it means union and not disunion, love and not hatred, liberty and not oppression. You, you, in these three days, have trampled upon all this. Gentlemen, you have killed the International, and, for this crime, you will answer before humanity, before history. As for me, faithful to the principle of the true International, which is not yours, I retire from this Congress, which has nothing Socialist about it, to join the expelled victims of your intolerance and brutality, and take my place in the ranks of battle, and this time to hinder your work of liberticide and fratricide from spreading and in the end destroying that of our martyrs."

"AMILCARE CIPRIANI."

The following letter, from the *Daily Chronicle* for August 11th, will show how an English Labor Party Socialist looked upon the matter.

"Sir,—In the interest of fair play, allow me to report that the International Socialist Workers' Congress yesterday evening disgraced itself by a display of reckless intolerance, which resulted in the expulsion of a considerable portion of the German delegation, on the sole ground that these delegates represented independent Socialist societies, with leanings towards Anarchism (of the harmless kind), which does not happen to be agreeable to their Marxist compatriots or the majority of the Marxist organisers of the Congress, who decorated the Congress Hall with a huge portrait of their God. I regret to say that, with the exception of the English S.D.F. delegates and a few Independents, some fifty out of sixty-five English delegates voted for the exclusion of the German Independents."

"EUSTACE G. EDWARDS."

"Zürich, August 9."

We have received the following, on the same subject, from Frank Hall, Secretary of the Fabian Society at Rochdale.

"I agree entirely with the arguments put forward [in our circular to Trade Unions] relating to the right for the representatives of any trade organisation be they Anarchist, Social Democrat or anything to else, to be heard and listened to when the question of labor is to the front, and more so when the object of the Congress, be it national or international, is to bring about a common understanding and a feeling of solidarity among the workers of all countries. Then I think, and strongly think, that, so long as any man is representing any section of the workers, that representative must be heard, even if perhaps his opinions and convictions do not coincide with the majority of those present. Free speech, free thought and above all—Freedom."

We hope those Fabians who agree with Mr. Hall will call their delegates sharply over the coals for their attitude at the Congress.

The whole question is very precisely summed up by Mr. Champion in the *Newcastle Daily Chronicle* for Aug. 18th:—

"Why, if the Congress was meant to be a Marxist one, did not those responsible for the arrangements say so plainly, and save all this waste of time and temper? To answer this question exposes some of the trickery, to call it by no harsher word, which to my mind is a very regrettable and far too prominent feature of these gatherings. The idea is, first, to try to produce the effect on the public mind that the faith of Marx is held by the proletariat of the world, with a few exceptions unworthy of notice. That is not true—I for one [we are of course still quoting verbatim from Mr. Champion] am very sorry that it is not—but no amount of jugglery and wire-pulling will make it true. The second reason is that when the assembly is called a Workers' Congress many of the British Trade Unions will take part in it, whereas if it were called a Social Democratic Congress they would have nothing to do with it. Bluntly these organisations are got to attend under something very like false pretences. . . . The lack of straightforwardness in the Zürich invitations cost just half the time at our disposal and exposed us to the jeers of the enemies of labor."

On August 9th the expelled delegates held a meeting of protest, and called together a Conference on their own account, which we shall report in our next issue. The attendance and proceedings were most successful.

In spite, however, of all the efforts of the wire-pullers, a considerable unorthodox minority still remained when the Marxist Congress at length, on Wednesday afternoon, got to the business on the agenda. There were the Dutch, who, as Mr. Champion regretfully admits, "seemed to have gone Anarchist in a body," and a good sprinkling of sympathisers whether with Anarchism or merely with fair play, amongst the Belgians, French and English. The victory of the Marxists has been a Pyrrhic one, likely to cost them dear, both as to the light it has thrown on their tactics, and as to the effect of the declaration of policy with regard to the great questions of the Labor movement to which opposition has driven them. With this latter aspect of the matter we propose to deal next month.

Comrade Turner paid in August the last visit allowed to Nicoll before his release. Our Comrade was well and in good spirits, brave as ever.

* For a portrait of Cipriani and some account of his devoted life and sufferings in the cause of Socialism see *Freedom* for May, 1893.

Commercialism at its Worst.

IN *Justice*, of June 10, appears a most excellent article, with the above title, by Mr. James Leatham; in which commercialism, as typified in Manchester, is subjected to unsparing criticism. Mr. Leatham further seizes the occasion to complain alike of the narrowness of the purely bread and butter Socialist propaganda of today, and of its identification with various "isms" and "anities" with which it should have no legitimate connection. I have thought his title an excellent text for some further reflections on the all-pervading influence of commercialism, as evidenced in the course which many Socialists are today pursuing. I am the more anxious to bring the matter into discussion because the recent Social Democratic successes in Germany are giving the whole movement an additional impetus in a direction that I, for one, regret.

Let me commence with a definition, which many seem to ignore.

The Socialist is a *Rebel*; he is, metaphorically at any rate, up in arms against the monopoly by a few of all that makes life worth living. He is always and everywhere a rebel against monopoly; if he is not that, he is nothing. He directs his attack mainly against economic monopoly, because that is the root from which all other monopolies spring; but, if he is clear-sighted, he understands that the economic monopoly-system is the mould that gives all other institutions their shape, and that this applies specially to the political institutions of every country. Our economic system reduces life more and more to a question of money; the tendency therefore of all modern political movements—those of the Socialists themselves included—is to get away from the great principles upon which life itself is based, and to narrow discussions and tactics down to questions of temporary expediency. Here, to my thinking, we see "commercialism at its worst"; it makes us its slaves everywhere, and follows us even into our reform and revolutionary movements. Look through the platforms of the various Socialist parties, and you will be astonished at the appeals to the commercial instincts of the people contained in illusive palliative remedies, almost all of which are directly opposed to the fundamental principle of Socialism—Liberty. These palliatives are inserted because "we must have votes," and because "nobody thinks so much of money as does the poor man." In other words, we bend the knee, in practice, to that very spirit of commercialism against which, theoretically, we are in revolt.

Socialism has a pedigree of which it may well be proud. Its parents were essentially *revolutionary* writers and speakers, who cursed commercialism from the crown of its head to the sole of its foot, and appealed entirely to the higher instincts. They produced, poor though the circumstances were, a fever of revolt such as the highly disciplined forces of the German Social Democracy have not yet produced. It may be, of course, that, through the latter, Emperor William's throne will topple. It actually *was* that, after a few years of the old-style agitation, a number of thrones did topple. Since then some two generations have elapsed.

But it is not alone in their theoretical departure from principles that our Socialistic parties give evidence of the spirit of commercialism that is in them. Their practices pattern far too closely after the model set by the regulation bourgeois parties; in all you will find the same philosophy, and the same phenomena, repeated *ad nauseam*. Throughout you can trace the pressure of the modern economic mould, the tactics in vogue in the industrial world. Captains of industry—political leaders; unquestioning obedience to authority in the factory—unquestioning obedience to authority in the party: revolt leading to immediate dismissal from the factory—revolt leading to immediate dismissal from the party.

Such tactics, of course, come into immediate collision with all principles of freedom—with the practice of free speech, the exercise of healthy criticism, and so forth; practices that, in all other departments of life, we are gradually learning to estimate at their invaluable worth, because we see that upon them all progress depends. In this instance, however, it is not the tactics but the principles that have to go. Yet, surely, of all questions ever submitted to the human understanding this social question is incomparably the most difficult; of all parties that which is composed of the poor and uneducated stands most in need of self-instruction since it is most certain to make the most egregious mistakes! Here then, if anywhere, the exercise of free speech, constant individual vigilance, and tireless enquiry, is most imperative.

To all these arguments—which are, from a theoretical standpoint, absolutely unanswerable—it is objected that, in practice, discipline and certain immediately realisable demands, are a necessity; that along these lines alone is progress possible. This brings us to the simple calculation of whether or no we are advancing as quickly as we should advance, and that question I have already answered, so far as my own judgment is concerned, by my reference to thrones that actually did topple in the forties. Against this must, however, be set the apparently growing strength of the Social Democratic movement in Germany, as evidenced by their steadily increasing vote. Those who bring this forward as a crushing argument seem to take no note of certain exceptional circumstances which it is, surely, necessary to bear in mind.

The Germans, so advanced along certain lines, are today under the imperious domination of an immediate and most reactionary past. We have suffered from it in England, we have suffered from it in America. The Germans have been, in reality, vanquished by their victory over France, which has sent the military fever chasing through their veins, just as England and America have been suffused with jingoism as the result, more particularly, of the conquest of India and the Civil War. The military spirit is unquestionably reactionary, and even those who, in Germany, most bitterly oppose the standing army are necessarily

more or less influenced by it towards the autocratic, the bureaucratic and disciplinarian ideals that it evolves. Nowhere has the schoolmaster walked more industriously abroad than in Germany, but nowhere has he been more invariably rod in hand. Nowhere has there been a greater production of *savants*, learned men, and nowhere has there been such a tendency to invest the *savant* with the infallibility of his deposed Excellency the Pope—a danger to Socialism long ago pointed out by Bakounin in his "God and the State."

The brutal force by which Bismarck brought about the unification of Germany has left, as its legacy, a belief in the future of the nation as such, and a conviction of the efficacy of force as a social solvent—two most reactionary delusions.

The recent, and prodigious, commercial advances that Germany has made have given her people the commercial fever. We had it in England badly during our own period of factory expansion. It came a little earlier with us, and we are getting over it a little sooner—that is the only difference.

I believe, therefore, that the German Socialists have today in their highly-disciplined Social Democratic movement exactly that which suits the military stage in which the nation at present is, but I do not believe that it represents, even for the Germans, the final evolution of their movement. As for England and America—to make no mention of other countries—I believe that the progressive spirits whom Socialism naturally attracts have already passed that stage, and the proof is found in the fact that both American and English Socialists always revolt against the authoritarian tactics of the Germans—a truly healthy sign.

The policy of commercialism has proved itself already a weak-kneed policy, unable to stand the test of time. It succeeded Feudalism which had enjoyed a tranquil reign of centuries; it has itself never known an hour of tranquility and is already on the eve of dissolution. Its inherent weakness is that it has no fixed principles, but is governed solely by expediency; that it aims at immediate profits, and lets the future shift for itself. The weakness of the commercial politics into which all modern movements have been tempted is that they too will set their foot on such vital principles as freedom of speech or action if they can thereby gain a single vote; that, under-estimating the value of liberties for which our ancestors shed their blood like water, they will barter them away for the return of an additional member, and the scourgings of a mess of pottage; that they will compromise, and imagine they have triumphed when they have shelved an inconvenient truth; that, like the shoddy manufacturers at whose feet they have sat, they care nothing for quality as long as they can get quantity.

The simple truth is that Socialists are rebels alike by the necessities of their position, and by the line of their descent; that they spring directly from the lines of those who suffered under the Inquisition for free thought, and were nailed to the pillory by Charles the First for free speech; who revolted against Feudalism a hundred years ago in France, and had prices set upon their heads here, in America, by the slave-owners not fifty years ago. It was the spirit of revolt that launched the modern Socialist movement, and with the extinction of that spirit it will as surely founder. Yet here, in New York, the (German) Socialist Labor Party, through its Central Labor Federation, resolves that those who do not vote the straight party ticket shall be treated as "scabs": an idle enough threat today, but an intolerable tyranny if ever the party should become an actual power.

Ex pede Herculem: such is the manner in which commercial politics have taught the party of Liberty to use its growing strength!

W. C. OWEN.

California.

A Humble Reminder

TO THE PROPRIETED CLASSES.

(Slightly altered from Rudyard Kipling's Ode in praise of English Enterprise.)

We have fed you all for a thousand years,
And you hail us still unfed,
Though there's never a pound of all your pounds
But marks the workers' dead;
We have yielded our best to give you rest,
And you lie on a crimson wool,
For if blood be the price of England's wealth,
Good God, we ha' paid in full.

There's never a mine blown skyward now
But we're buried alive for you;
There's never a wreck drifts shoreward now
But it's we are the ghastly crew;
Go, reckon our dead by the forges red,
And the factories where we spin;
If blood be the price of England's wealth,
Good God, we ha' paid it in.

We have fed you all for a thousand years,
For that was our doom, you know,
From the days when you chained us in your fields
To the strike of a week ago;
You have eaten our lives and our babes and wives,
And we're told it's your legal share;
But if blood be the price of England's wealth,
Good God, we ha' bought it fair.

N.

Notice.—Owing to the pressure upon our space this month, we are obliged to hold over Part II. of the Manifesto. It will appear in the October number.

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—J. O., 1s.; N. W. T., 10s.; W., £6. PAMPHLET FUND—S. M., 5s. TOWARDS EXPENSE OF CONGRESS CIRCULAR—W. W., 3s.; J. T., 1s.; W. Mc., 5s. NICOLL FUND—J. O., 2s. 6d.; F. H., 1s.

NOTES.

THE WELSH MINERS.

The action of those Welsh miners who are under a sliding scale agreement with the coal owners has been rather puzzling to outsiders during the strike. At the Aberdare meeting, Aug. 26, however, their demands were clearly stated. They wish for 20 per cent. advance, which they believe the owners, in fairness, owe them. Also they desire to abolish the two years' sliding scale, apparently in favor of one for a shorter period, "so that if the masters make 10 per cent. the men may get 10 per cent. also." They are reproached, said one of the speakers, with paralysing the trade of the community, but, to get their rights, they would paralyse not only the trade of the community but of the whole world. It is a pity so resolute a spirit is not combined with larger ideas as to the rightful claims of the workers.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE EXPLOITERS.

Sir William Lewis complained to the *Times* correspondent that the coal owners were accused of greed, whereas these poor innocents have actually sunk a quarter of a million or so apiece in pits which will be exhausted in 60 years. Of course therefore each of them, "in addition to earning [sic] a dividend upon his capital," must manage to refund to himself the whole quarter of a million in the 60 years, and lately they have had to introduce a lot of life saving improvements, "entirely at their own cost," so that the dividend and the quarter of a million have become more difficult to "earn." Poor capitalists, their lot is indeed a hard one! What folly to compare it with that of the miners, who, for a bare twenty to thirty shillings a week, daily exhaust themselves with toil, whilst running a perpetual risk of a horrible death.

MANUFACTURING WAR.

Every Briton is of course properly disgusted by the abominable French exploitation of the Siamese, and the shameless invention of imaginary grievances as an excuse for final annexation. But most Britons don't recognise that England is engaged with equal greed and still more hypocrisy in preparing to annex a big slice of South Africa. As the Paris *Temps* bitterly complains, the English are so damnably clever in inventing pretexts. We generally set about stealing land from native people with a plausible pretence of philanthropy. Just now, while the clumsy French are floundering about with imaginary insults to the national honor, outrages on French subjects, etc., and giving England and other powers endless grounds of protest, the astute English are going to war in Mashona land to protect the poor oppressed Mashonas from that cruel tyrant Lobensula. "I weep for you," the walrus said; "I deeply sympathise"; but the fate alike of Lobensula with his conquering Matabele, and of their victims, the Mashonas, is certain eventually to be that of the luckless oysters whereof the Walrus and the Carpenter are said in "Through the Looking Glass" to have made so excellent a meal.

BRIEF UNITY.

The Joint Committee of English Socialists has disjointed itself. There are now only two joints left. The Fabians, having disagreed with their colleagues on the question of tactics, have withdrawn, and only the S.D.F. and little Hammersmith S.S. remain to represent joint English Socialism.

AN APPEAL.

Again many of our comrades engaged in spreading the principles of Anarchism in Germany have been sentenced to heavy penalties. Thus, among others, Comrades Wiese and Witzke were sentenced to nine, Rennthaler to six, Hermann and Grünberg to four months imprisonment, respectively. Most of them have wives and children, who are now robbed of their bread-winners. Every one who has some feeling of solidarity in his heart should therefore consider it his duty to help in rescuing from want the families of our brave comrades, who, whilst

engaged in the cruel struggle both against the denunciations and calumnies of their former comrades, the Social Democrats, and the capitalist system—have been forced to put on one side the interests of their own families. Immediate help is urgently needed! Subscriptions, marked "for the support of the families of the imprisoned Anarchists," should be addressed to Comrade G. Wegner, Coeslinerstrasse, 7, II., Berlin N., or to the office of the *Sozialist*, 91, Alte Jakobstrasse, Hof 3 Treppen, Berlin.

The Chicago Conference.

We gladly publish the invitation and particulars given below and wish they had reached us in time for our August issue, which would have given the English comrades more chance to respond. It is to be hoped that British groups none of whose members can cross the Atlantic will send letters of sympathy to our American comrades.

TO THE ANARCHISTS OF THE WORLD, GREETING.

Many of us have become convinced that the time has come to assemble together in convention for the purpose of collectively proclaiming to the world the great principle of human liberty; to devise means whereby we may be able to demonstrate the faith that is in us; to suggest places for strengthening our movement; to compare our views by discussion of sociological theories; to meet new faces and renew old friendship; to cement, if possible, the fraternal ties which should bind together in loving accord all those who are struggling to achieve an era of free men and women. . . . You are, therefore, invited to attend our International Conference of Anarchists in Chicago, to be convened on Saturday, September 16th, 1893, and to continue from day-to-day, until such business, as may be brought before it, is done. Let us see if Anarchists of all shades of opinion and belief cannot agree upon some common plan of work which will enable us to act together to resist the growing encroachments of monopoly and greed.

Comrades, let our watchword be Liberty, and through Anarchy the solidarity of the human race."

The Committee,

W. HOLMES, Secretary.

PRACTICAL DETAILS.

All persons proposing to take part in the Conference are requested to send in their names to the Secretary, 70, La Salle-street, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A., as soon as possible, that arrangements may be made for their accommodation. Those having special addresses to deliver are requested to send the titles of the respective subjects to the Secretary at once. No address to be over half an hour. It would be well for all organisations sending intended delegates to forward copy of instruction in advance, so that printed programmes may be prepared.

AGENDA SUGGESTED BY THE COMMITTEE.

1. The issuing of a Manifesto to which all Anarchists can subscribe.
2. A discussion of Sociological theories and studies calculated to increase our usefulness as propagandists.
3. Tactics.
4. Methods of removing the prevailing prejudice against Anarchy.
5. The Anarchist press; how to support it.
6. Attitude of Anarchists towards other Schools of Social reform.

Letters to be read at the Conference are invited from Comrades and friends unable to be present.

The "Productor" & the Chicago Conference.

A SERIES of articles has been appearing of late in our Spanish Comrade "El Productor," under the title "Puritanism or exaggeration." They have been written in answer to a criticism by some Valencia comrades of an article which appeared in the "Productor" concerning the Chicago Conference, called "Shoulders to the wheel." As the Chicago Conference is so near at hand it may be interesting to English comrades to hear what the opinion of Spanish Anarchists on the question of conferences is.

In the disputed article, the "Productor" proposes that all Anarchists who agreed with the desirability of the Chicago Conference, should send in a voluntary subscription, accompanied by the name of the delegate whom they thought best suited to represent the Spanish Anarchists at the Conference; when these votes had all come in, they were to be collected, counted up and verified, and the men whose names had most supporters was to be sent to Chicago, with the money obtained by the subscriptions, there to give voice to the opinions and wishes of the Spanish groups, and to bring back to them an account of the proceedings and the conclusions arrived at.

To these propositions six Valencia comrades answered by a declaration, in which they state that while fully realize the importance and undeniable advantage to be derived from the Chicago conference, they are completely opposed to the program put forward by the "Productor," which they denounce as opposed to the Anarchist principle, which denies the possibility of one man representing another, under any circumstances. Especially do they object to a subscription being required as an accompaniment to a vote, declaring that even the Bourgeois governments are seeing the absurdity of a money qualification. To these objections the "Productor" replies by saying that it does not consider that the question of the best way for the Spanish Anarchists to take part in a conference is in any sense a matter of principle, which it defines as a fundamental basis, but entirely a matter of convenience. It states that it does not consider the idea of representation to be opposed to Anarchy; that it is only so when applied as it is by our existing Bourgeois society, and it asks if any one would maintain that it would be contrary to Anarchist principles if, after the revolution, several groups wishing to confer together on points of common interest, and it being impossible for all the members of the said group to meet together to discuss, they should each choose delegates to set forth the opinions of their comrades, and afterwards announce the result of the conference so that the different groups might come to some common understanding, provided the delegates received no authority to enforce their decisions. As to the money qualification, the "Productor" says, that as they made the subscription entirely voluntary, that is to say that it might consist of 1 centime or 50 frs., it did not think that it would be an obstacle to any one's voting; but, of course, it says, if any one should be found in so destitute a condition as not to be able to afford even a centime, he would be allowed to give his vote without a subscription.

This seems a dangerous method to establish, savouring rather of the method in vogue in Bourgeois society of remedying present evils by charities in various forms. But, of course, it is true enough that people as a rule are very disinclined to produce money unless some pressure is supplied, and there would be very few cases in which it would be impossible to give a half-penny or a farthing; the

other objections as to verifying votes, etc., disappear if we once invade the first two points.

The Valencia Anarchists say that their idea of what an Anarchist conference should be is that any Anarchist who feels inclined to go should go; that he should go on no one's behalf and represent no one but himself; that the Anarchists thus assembled should discuss for their own benefit any subjects they feel inclined to, and by thus strengthening themselves individually, they would ultimately strengthen the cause, and they point to the Paris congress as a *beau idéal* of an Anarchist conference. The "Productor" answers this by asking if a single object was attained, or result arrived at by the Paris congress, and replies in the negative. It therefore concludes that if the expense of going to Chicago is to be stood, it must be compensated by substantial results, and that this can only be the case if a plan something like the one they suggested be adopted.

It is to be regretted that the articles on both sides have been written in a spirit of active antagonism, most unfortunate among Anarchists when a mere point of tactics is under discussion. Surely Anarchists should be the first to respect free individual initiative in such matters, and if one set of comrades wish to send a delegate to a conference, others should surely not require them to retract on pain of declaring them not to be Anarchists, and *vice versa*.

To overthrow our present society means that we have such a tremendous and varied work to do, that there is surely room for every description of method and propaganda, and no time should be wasted in trying to compel others to adopt one's own special line.

We are Anarchists because we recognize that all men are different, and that it is desirable that they should be so; let us put this principle into practice, and no more waste our time in trying to lord it over some one else.

O. ROSSETTI.

Reasons for Pardoning Fielden, Neebe and Schwab.

THE above is the title of a pamphlet by John P. Altgeld, Governor of Illinois, U.S.A., a copy of which has been sent us by the Illinois Bureau of Labor Statistics. In this pamphlet Mr. Altgeld states with admirable clearness the evidence which convinced him that the jury was packed and legally incompetent, that the defendants were not proven guilty by the evidence adduced, that, as far as Neebe was concerned, the State's Attorney had himself declared that there was no case against him, and that the judge was partial, therefore that the trial was an unfair one and the imprisoned men ought to be set at liberty.

Mr. Altgeld is so far from being in sympathy with our comrades that he says no punishment under American law could have been too severe had they been proved guilty, after a fair trial, of the offence charged against them, *i.e.*, of constructive murder, or the use of such language in speech and writing as might have been construed by the thrower of the bomb into advice to kill policemen and Pinkertons. The Governor's attitude is that of a legalist, outraged by an obvious and scandalous miscarriage of such justice as is professedly aimed at by the law. His Reasons are as follows:—

1.—*The jury was packed.* It was chosen from a band of specially selected men, picked out by a special bailiff, one Henry L. Ryce, appointed by the trial judge, at the suggestion of the States' Attorney, instead of from a number of names taken haphazard out of a box, as the law intends. H. L. Ryce himself admitted before witnesses that he selected such men as were certain to hang the prisoners. This is certified in an affidavit, Nov. 7, 1887, by O. S. Favor, a Chicago business man of repute, himself one of the jurors so summoned and rejected upon the prisoners' challenge for prejudice against them. The prejudice of the selected jurymen is proved by the Record, which contains an account of the examination of 981 of them. Nearly all of these, including the 12 chosen, admitted an inveterate prejudice against the defendants. Those who served were talked over by the Court into a statement that they would do their best to judge by the evidence alone. For instance, J. H. Walker, stating that his prejudice would handicap him, was told that he was therefore specially well qualified, as the "more a man feels that he is handicapped the more he will be guarded against it"! Several jurors were friends or relatives of the slain policemen. Others openly stated that it would require very strong "proof of innocence" to convince them that the prisoners were not guilty. Further, the jurymen were almost all drawn from the employing class or were men specially recommended to the bailiff by their employers. All these facts Mr. Altgeld substantiates by copious extracts from the Court Record.

2.—*American law, as laid down in the Supreme Court, both before and after the Chicago trial, holds a trial illegal and unfair when any of the jury are proved to have been legally incompetent,* as, for instance, when they are partial and avow a preconceived opinion as to the merits of the case about to be tried or the guilt or innocence of the defendant. Mr. Altgeld quotes at length from the review of the law on this subject by the Supreme Court in the Cronin case (*The People v. Coughlin*). In this review the cross-examination of a juror to induce him to admit himself competent is severely condemned. The Cronin case was reversed by the Supreme Court on the ground that two jurors had been thus talked over. But in the Chicago case not only did many of the jury admit prejudice, but one was a relative of a slain policeman, and admitted a bitter personal animosity, yet they were induced by the judge to serve;

3.—*The evidence brought forward in Court does not prove the prisoners' guilt.* The State has never discovered who threw the fatal bomb at the Haymarket meeting, May 4th 1886, and in absence of proof as to the thrower of the bomb it is totally impossible to prove that this action was, in any way, influenced by the defendants.

(To be concluded.)

THE CONQUEST OF BREAD.

By PETER KROPOTKINE.

CHAPTER IV.—EXPROPRIATION.

I.

It is told of Rothschild that, seeing his fortune threatened by the Revolution of 1849, he hit upon the following stratagem:—"I am quite willing to admit," said he, "that my fortune has been accumulated at the expense of others, but if it were divided among the millions of

Europe to-morrow the share of each would only amount to five shillings. Very well then, I undertake to render to each his five shillings if he asks me for it."

Having given due publicity to his promise, our millionaire proceeded as usual to stroll quietly through the streets of Frankfurt. Three or four passers-by asked for their five shillings, which he disbursed with a sardonic smile. His stratagem succeeded and the family of the millionaire is still in possession of its wealth.

It is in much the same fashion that the shrewd heads among the middle-classes reason when they say "Ah, Expropriation, I know what that means. You take all the top-coats and lay them in a heap, and every one is free to help himself and fight for the best."

But such jests are irrelevant as well as flippant. What we want is not a redistribution of top-coats. Besides, is it likely that in such a general scramble the shivering folk would come off any better? Nor do we want to divide up the wealth of the Rothschilds. What we do want is so to arrange things that every human being born into the world shall be ensured the opportunity in the first instance of learning some useful occupation, and of becoming skilled in it; next, that he shall be free to work at his trade without asking leave of master or owner, and without handing over to landlord or capitalist the lion's share of what he produces. As to the wealth held by the Rothschilds or the Vanderbilts, it will serve us to organise our system of communal production.

The day when the laborer may till the ground without paying away half of what he produces, the day when the machines necessary to prepare the soil for rich harvests are at the free disposal of the cultivators, the day when the worker in the factory produces for the community and not for the monopolist—that day will see the workers clothed and fed; and there will be no more Rothschilds or other exploiters.

No one will then have to sell his working power for a wage that only represents a fraction of what he produces.

"So far good," say our critics, "but you will have Rothschilds coming in from outside. How are you to prevent a person from amassing millions in China and then settling amongst you? How are you going to prevent such a one from surrounding himself with lackeys and wage-slaves—from exploiting them and enriching himself at their expense?"

"You cannot bring about a Revolution all over the world at the same time. Well, then, are you going to establish Custom Houses on your frontiers, to search all who enter your country, and confiscate the money they bring with them?—Anarchist policemen firing on travellers would be a fine spectacle!"

But at the root of this argument there is a great error. Those who propound it have never paused to inquire whence come the fortunes of the rich. A little thought would suffice to show them that these fortunes have their beginnings in the poverty of the poor. When there are no longer any destitute there will no longer be any rich to exploit them.

Let us glance for a moment at the middle ages, when great fortunes began to spring up.

A feudal baron seizes on a fertile valley. But as long as the fertile valley is empty of folk our baron is not rich. His land brings him in nothing, he might as well possess a property in the moon. Now what does our baron do to enrich himself? He looks out for peasants!

But if every peasant-farmer had a piece of land, free from rent and taxes, if he had in addition the tools and the stock necessary for farm labor, who would plough the lands of the baron? Each would look after his own. But there are whole tribes of destitute persons ruined by wars, or drought, or pestilence. They have neither horse nor plough. (Iron was costly in the middle ages, and a draught-horse still more so.)

All these destitute creatures are trying to better their condition. One day they see on the road at the confines of our baron's estate a notice-board indicating by certain signs adapted to their comprehension that the laborer who is willing to settle on this estate will receive the tools and materials to build his cottage and sow his fields, and a portion of land rent free for a certain number of years. The number of years is represented by so many crosses on the sign-board, and the peasant understands the meaning of these crosses.

So the poor wretches swarm over the baron's lands, making roads, draining marshes, building villages. In nine years he begins to tax them. Five years later he levies rent. Then he doubles it. The peasant accepts these new conditions because he cannot find better ones elsewhere; and little by little, by the aid of laws made by the oppressors, the poverty of the peasant becomes the source of the landlord's wealth. And it is not only the Lord of the Manor who preys upon him. A whole host of usurers swoop down upon the villages, increasing as the wretchedness of the peasants increases. That is how things went in the Middle Ages; and today is it not still the same thing? If there were free lands which the peasant could cultivate if he pleased, would he pay £50 to some "Shabble of a Duke" * for condescending to sell him a scrap? Would he burden himself with a lease which absorbed a third of the produce? Would he—on the *métayer* system—consent to give the half of his harvest to the landowner?

But he has nothing. So he will accept any conditions, if only he can keep body and soul together, while he tills the soil and enriches the landlord.

So in the Nineteenth Century, just as in the Middle Ages, the poverty of the peasant is a source of wealth to the landed proprietor.

* "Shabble of a Duke" is an expression coined by Carlyle; it is a somewhat free rendering of Kropotkine's "Monsieur le Vicomte," but I think it expresses his meaning.—TRANS.

Some aspects of Anarchist Philosophy.

TURN his attention wheresoe'er he may; to philosophy, moral, mental and physical, ever fruitful of idea; to science of concrete and abstract things, pregnant with promises of future triumph; to art in all its function of beauty, overflowing with emotion, the patient enquirer will find at least a conclusion to his research in Anarchy.

Wary of sophistry and prejudice, undaunted by terror of new thought and feeling, mindful only that he is seeking for the light, following the current of his own free life, the pilgrim of truth will arrive one day in the Land of the Blest, in the Home of the Free, in the Kingdom of Love, to which Anarchy leads.

Not beyond the clouds, nor across the sea, nor over mountains is our promised land to be found; but here, in the great cities and throughout the land. When men look towards, not away from, each other, then the din of work, so hopeless to us now, will sound like music unto weary hearts.

We need no magic rod nor wonderful lamp to rend the rocks, and light our footsteps: we need only the light of intellect and love; only the power to perceive, the will to think, and the courage to act; when already we breathe the odours of Eden, feed on the honey dew of Valhalla, and drink the milk of Paradise. Once more the gods are with us on the earth, the gods we create and love, the real ideals of poetic life. Erect and fearless, not afraid to live, the stars grown nearer, and the sun more bright; the day's work fuller, and the night less long, we face the future with unbounded hope.

Confident that the regeneration of the world has begun, commensurate with all he knows of truth, the Anarchist finds himself in thought like a "disembodied joy," ransacking the heavens to the very poles of time; eager for the light for the sake of life, giving that life for the service of man.

Poetry and science are the parents of Anarchist philosophy: to know and to love at the same time is its secret of intelligence, criterion of truth, and standard of morality.

Not only in sociology will it be found that the forces, so-called, which regulate the sequence of things, the evolution of phenomena, are Anarchical in origin and control; and, indeed, in applying the principles of this philosophy it cannot be too well borne in mind that there is an analogy in the struggle against government and the struggle against theological tyranny; in so far as both have equal bearing on the evolution of universal thought; moreover, they have many points of parallel history which are suggestive to discuss.

All reforms begin with initiative idea and action: history and experience further show that social initiative begins with the people, as we might expect; since being in the main stream of development they are the first to feel that forward force of Evolution, a law to be subsequently reviewed. Ideas arise in, and are more or less expressed by, the great mass of humanity. Here it is that philosophers secure their greatest conceptions; mould them in the fires of learning, and, if hearts are true as heads are wise, give back to the people their own thoughts elaborated into definite form. Thus it was in the great struggle against the church; so it is in the struggle against government.

The laws of the church were found oppressive by the people, and individuals of initiative lived in consequence "ungodly" lives. Strong in instinct, if untrained in reason, having the courage of their feelings, they were of course persecuted. This brought the philosophers upon the scene; moral and philanthropic men and women were influenced; the wave of thought passed on to literature, and thence to the world at large. Those first rebels were true heroes, and to their courage we owe whatever religious liberty we possess. Cowardice is the curse which makes oppression possible; and all society would seem to be in conspiracy to make cowards of the race.

In some of the early struggles against the church, had heroic action been infectious, as it now more and more becomes; had it spread among the people directly from its origin, there would have been no necessity for Voltaire; no use for secular literature on the subject, for the people would thus have learned the first principles of Anarchist social philosophy.

Rebellion against the theological institutions led to rebellion against their god, which ended in an entire revision of the whole system of cosmology. A subtle parallel is here to be found. Anarchy not only rebels against government, it denies the existence of real and inevitable dominating force in the so-called governments of the world. There are innumerable institutions in the name of public direction, as there are in the name of personal gods; but the one and the other are like masks behind which no living face is concealed. Each name stands only for horrible delusion, pitiable ignorance and culpable fraud. Governmental institutions have no power in themselves. Their potency and inevitable necessity exist only in the idea of them that is still fixed in the human mind. When the idea is destroyed these awe-inspiring laws and institutions will be seen for what they are—a meaningless mockery, corresponding to nothing in the reality of things. No! the laws which actually govern humanity were never born in the brain of a legislator.

Not until the destruction of the institutions which distort the tendency of human progress is an accomplished fact will the great universe be opened up to the unfettered contemplation and energy of man, but still for those who have already cast their chains; who have drawn the locks, bolts and bars, which abject slavery alone permits, there are joys of life known only to the Free.

Even as a traveller by sea or unknown lands must correct, to begin with, the index error of his instruments, so the removal of error in philosophy clears the way for trustworthy observation. Error removed,

we are at once in contact with truth; and this is why Anarchy, though negative in name, implies a truly positive philosophy.

Our name is an effective barrier to all fallacy of metaphysics; by it our enemies are confounded: no wonder they would like us to give it up. Our plan of battle and our battle cry will remain, however, till the world is conquered by Truth, we being firmly convinced that the forces which made the stars, our planet and ourselves can surely bring our lives into harmony with the strength and beauty of the universe.

FAUSET MACDONALD.

Observations on the Russian Commune (Mir).

III.—(Concluded.)

The cosacks of the Don, of the Ural, of Astrakan and others, the majority of the inhabitants of oriental Russia and those of Siberia are the descendants of fugitives from the Muscovite state. Isolated from the action of the government these fugitives organised according to their custom into autonomous communes, and at the end of three or four years their communes prospered. Today the commune, the life of the Mir, are in full force among the Cosacks, in spite of the stupid and atrocious militarism that the government imposes on them.

"Thirty years ago," says General Venukoff, "the governor of the province of Amour, General Pedashenko, whilst on a journey of inspection, visited the villages recently founded by voluntary colonists. He was struck by the prosperity they had attained in so short a time (two years), whilst the government colonies were in a pitiable condition. 'You live here very comfortably, my friends,' said he to the peasants; 'much more so than the inhabitants of the banks of the Amour. Why is it so?' 'Ha, little father, your excellency, it is because here we live far from the administration,' answered the peasants. O, what cruel irony!" concludes General Venukoff. . . . How true! we, for our part, add.

Lovers of equality in their customs, the Russian people also cherish with constant persistency the idea of popular emancipation accompanied by a general division of all the natural resources of the country amongst the various autonomous communes. This rebellious idea is so deeply rooted in the popular mind that all the efforts of the government to uproot it are fruitless. Writers of different opinions—Yakonshkin, Maksinoff, Ertel, Garin and many others have stated this fact. In 1878 the Minister of the Interior, Macoff, issued a circular to the local administration ordering them to declare at the meetings of the Mirs and in all the churches that those are enemies of the Tsar who spread the rumour of a general redivision of the land. The circular, it is said, encouraged amongst the peasants a hope that the moment for the redivision is not so far off, and that the time for a popular movement will not delay coming. Everywhere they refused to reap the harvest for the nobles and bourgeoisie. "It doesn't matter," they said, "all the land of the nobility and bourgeoisie will soon become common property." The ruling classes and the administration began to be uneasy. They prevailed on Alexander III. to convoke the mayors of all the districts at his coronation and to declare to them that no redivision of the land would take place. Indeed, the Tsar made this declaration in 1883. Well, now the people say that the land will become the property of the State, and that this latter will redistribute it among the communes according to their needs. "A sort of land nationalisation," exclaims Garin. (*Russian Thought*, 1892.)

The communal life which I have just described in this slight sketch was formerly common to all the European races. But the western nations, owing to the influence of medieval serfdom and the growth of modern capitalist industry, have completely lost it. Founding their opinion on this fact, many worthy people, and even governmental Socialists, notably the Social Democrats, declare themselves against the Russian communes and Mirs. These gentlemen assure us that the people must in the first place completely loose their communal life so that they may be able to preach in the rural districts their so-called "scientific socialism." They have come even to deny the Socialist character of the Russian revolutionary movement of 1873-81. In a review of Mr. Kirkup's book, "The History of Socialism" (see *Daily Chronicle*, 1893), the writer, a Social Democrat, assures us that in Russia Socialism does not exist because it is an exclusively agricultural country. This is quite a revelation to us. We had thought till now that Socialism demanded a solidary life for all humanity. But evidently we were mistaken, because now, in the name of *Scientific Socialism*, this right is denied to 90 per cent. of mankind. Only I wonder then what that grand formulae of Internationalism on the solidarity of nations and even of races means. The advocates of legal tactics and insignificant reforms call themselves *Scientific Socialists* and disciples of Karl Marx. Poor Marx, what an outrage on your broad humanitarian and revolutionary ideas! If the reforms that the Social Democrats recommend to the electors can be defined as *Scientific Socialism* then certainly the Russian revolutionary movement had nothing in common with it. They adopted the popular formula "Land and Liberty" as their war cry. They preached the abolition of private property, the free organisation of communes and autonomous *artels* and their spontaneous federation. These courageous Nihilists were so ignorant of legal and "scientific" socialism that they believed it to be their duty to renounce all their privileges, to sacrifice their property and even their lives to a Revolution far differently Socialistic to that of the law-abiding socialists of today.

And we hope that in the future, when the Socialist movement will reassume its former impetus in Russia, that the revolutionary party

will again found itself on the popular revindication as put forward in these terms:—

"The land to the Commune; the instruments of production to the Artels; complete education for the free individual in the free commune; the autonomous federation of communes and artels instead of the government, which will be abolished.

W. Tcherkessoff.

Mr. Auberon Herbert's "Voluntary State."

(Continued.)

(5.) "National Defence. The Voluntary System would be much developed. A large body of men drilled in the evenings and on Saturday afternoons, and receiving perhaps £5 a head per annum, would form an intermediate class between the regular forces and the volunteers. The regular army would be smaller in number; the men would be highly trained."

Comrades! all these hirelings, to defend other people's "property" and privileges! and to keep our race divided into two camps—those whose adventitious clutch on the general resources enables them to utilise the vital needs of their fellows in the cause of their own supremacy, and those who must sell themselves in order to be clothed and fed. Why does Mr. Herbert so often use the word "Liberty" as if it were something that we all had a right to? Echo answers, Why?

(6.) "Foreign Policy. There need be no break in the general Foreign Policy of the country. Its natural pacific tendency would be confirmed. . . . At present the chances of war are much increased because those who desire it are able to make others who are opposed to it support part of the burden."

Compulsory taxation makes war equipment easier; yes. But removal of compulsory taxation does not touch the causes of war. Foreign Policy! The new Economy and the new Ethic recognise no "foreigner" as such, and require no foreign policy as such. One blow dealt at the spirit of nationalism does more towards abolishing the waste and the burden of war than a thousand and one blows dealt merely at the mode of collecting money for it. The British Empire is already too confined an ideal for the fast developing instinct of human fellowship. Mr. Herbert would diminish the mechanical facilities of nations for flying at each other's throats. We would spend our crusading energy on no lesser aim than that of destroying their immoral pretences for doing so. The property craze and its incidental vices lurk in all Foreign Policy. And then, as to the chances of war being "at present much increased" because those who desire it can force the money burden of it on the rest: surely not much increased? The chances of war can at no time be greater than is the confidence which the minority who are interested in wars can place in their hired soldiers. This confidence is again measured by the ability of officers and priests to keep soldiers blind and ignorant as to all deeper and higher issues, to inflate them with hollow vanity, and pervert any power of manly devotion that is in them to the service of false and ignoble ends. (Sir Garnet Wolesley's Handbook containing *Advice to Officers* will show "how it's done.") None, however, at this hour know better than the powers that be how the sword they grasp already threatens to pierce their own hand; how increasingly indifferent soldiers everywhere are to "patriotic" considerations; and how increasingly aware of and disgusted at their own degraded position and inhuman vocation. Thus the confidence which is necessary to war-making wanes from week to week, and with it the chances of expensive conflict with the mere "foreigner." Fighting no less than tax-paying must in future be done voluntarily, and because the actual combatant has his natural heart in it. And so it will presently be seen that the propertyist must be his own defender. It will be seen first by property's hirelings—seen, despite the frantic and increasingly convulsive efforts now going on to lash into activity the perishing remnants of barbaric sentiment, or to smuggle the seeds of that noxious weed "patriotism" into the fresh soil of little school-children's defenceless consciences. Only a little later, and it will be brought home to the propertyist himself. The international proletariat will find means of bringing it home to him.

(To be continued.)

L. S. B.

Books, Pamphlets, etc.

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

IN ENGLISH.

- God is Love: Is it true?* By G. E. Conrad Naewiger. London: R. Forder, 28, Stonecutter-street, E.C. Price 2d.
- General Booth's Book refuted.* By H. M. Hyndman.
- Shelley's Principles: has time confirmed or refuted them?* By H. S. Salt. 1s. W. Reeves.
- Looking Inwards—a dream of the Fog of substitution dispersed by the Light of intuition.* Price 6d. William Reeves, Fleet-street.
- Dan Chatterton's "Atheistic, Communistic Scorchers." No. 33. April 1893. 1d. 27, Goldsmiths'-buildings, Drury-lane, W.C.—In this number Dan goes for the Prince of Wales.
- Forward. A marching song by "An English Yeoman."* Music and words 1d. Published by F. Hunt, 78, Drury-lane, W.C.
- The Melbourne Riots and how Harry Holdfast and his friends emancipated the workers.* A realistic novel by David A. Andrade. Melbourne.
- Our Social System and how it affects those who work for their living.* By D. Andrade. Melbourne. 1d.—A good Anarchist pamphlet.

Citizens' Money. By Alfred Westrup. Chicago. 10 cents.—An Individualist Anarchist pamphlet.

The Beacon. A paper devoted to the solution of the Social Problem. San Francisco, California. Vol. II., No. 3.

The moral effects of Socialism, by W. Diack; being a lecture delivered in Greyfriars Hall, on the evening of 12th February, 1893, under the auspices of the Aberdeen Socialist Society; 1d.—A very good pamphlet, showing the dreadfully demoralising influence of the present system of competition, and how Socialism would not only negative these evils but bring into force new moral and elevating influences.

The Days for Toil are Over, by M. Clifford.—A handbill with one of the Satires of "Cynicus" on the back called "Capital and Labor."

Work for All, Overwork for None, by M. Clifford.—A good handbill for distribution, with picture on back, "How labor is robbed by force and fraud." Both these leaflets, at 2s. per 1000, may be obtained of M. Clifford, Derby-rd. Woodford, Essex.

(To be continued.)

THE PROPAGANDA. REPORTS.

LONDON—

The London comrades, despite the hot weather, have carried on an active propaganda through August. Reports have been received of the work at Peckham, in the Parks and at other London stations, but owing to want of space we are obliged to hold them over until next month.—A meeting was held at Grafton Hall on August 25th. to hear the report of the London Anarchist delegates Mowbray and Roland upon the Zürich Congress.

Enfield.—Of late this old conservative town has been visited by several comrades. This came about through a comrade living close by who suggested that we could do some very good propaganda there, as the town was mostly inhabited by workmen.—Accordingly three comrades went there, one Saturday night about three months back. On arriving at the market place, which is very crowded on Saturday nights, we found the district Salvationists were going it in the usual style, hammer and tongs, but all the while exciting very little attention. We waited patiently until they had finished, till nearly ten o'clock, and then began our meeting. The speakers were comrades Young, Cantwell and Presberg. While the meeting was proceeding, the policeman on duty paid great attention to what was being said, until he discovered that we were Anarchists. Then he immediately ran to the police station and brought a detective back with him, who anxiously enquired the names of the speakers, but, alas, no one knew. The meeting continued until 11 o'clock—a late hour here as all the shops are closed at that time; the audience remaining all the while. After having distributed some 500 Anarchist leaflets and sold several *Freedoms* we retired, feeling sure our first visit to Enfield was a complete success.—Some three Saturdays later we again visited the town, and this time met with greater success than the former Saturday or than we had anticipated. The audience numbered between three and four hundred, and we were received with the greatest enthusiasm. Cantwell and Presberg were the speakers. After Presberg had finished speaking some slight opposition was offered by a few middle-class tradesmen, which was very easily answered; the answers being appreciated by the audience very much. The audience was mainly of workmen, and they seemed to know our middle-class friends who opposed us, as they displayed great hostility towards them. The meeting did not finish until 11.15 p.m. Groups of people were discussing when we left the spot. Some 28 *Weals* were sold, as well as some *Freedoms* and pamphlets. Several of the audience asked us to come down on the following Saturday.—On the following Saturday Comrades Quinn and Young were the speakers. It appears that the tradesmen on this occasion collected their forces, and for a little time things were lively. Eventually peace reigned, and the meeting finished up with remarks of appreciation by the audience and a fair sale of literature.—The last two Saturdays have gone off remarkably well, the speakers being Mowbray, Leggatt and Presberg, with the useful assistance of comrades Galbraith and Primmer. Some slight opposition on each occasion very easily disposed of. Good sale of *Weals* and *Freedoms* and pamphlets.—On Saturday last there was a good muster of comrades, and as the meeting finished somewhat earlier than at other times, we paraded through the town, singing the Marseillaise, La Carmagnole, No Master and other revolutionary songs, quite shocking the natives. After a good ramble round we returned to the market place, having utilised all lamp-posts and hoardings by sticking up Anarchist leaflets. As we marched round the people would say to each other "Here they are," "Here are the Anarchists," "Look here, Jim, here they are," and so on. So ended another successful night's propaganda.—As Enfield is one of the most conservative little towns in England the success which we have met with is certainly most remarkable, and we believe that if the propaganda continues to be carried on in a short time we shall find Enfield a hot-bed for Anarchy.—J. P.

To London Comrades.—As we shall soon have the winter upon us, which will prevent us from being very active outdoors, it is necessary that comrades should try and form groups in each of their districts with the object of arranging lectures and indoor meetings. It is also necessary that both *Freedom* and *Weal* should be sold at as many shops and indoor meetings as possible. That can be done by comrades, in whatever districts they may be living, leaving the papers in shops, and also by attending lectures of all kinds and displaying literature on every occasion possible. It is necessary that comrades in each district should try and make themselves dependent on themselves, not on any one in another district. If comrades will try and do this then things will be carried out more effectually.

In conclusion, I say with William Watson that

"Hate and mistrust are the children of blindness."

It is therefore necessary that we should try and rid the people of this blindness by spreading our ideas more actively, so that, instead of hate and mistrust, we should have love and honesty, which are the ideals upon which the future society will rest.—J. P.

PROVINCES—

Glasgow.—We are still pegging away with our out-door propaganda here, and although we cannot boast of many open-air speakers, yet our two Sunday meetings are always well attended. On August 6th, three of our Edinburgh comrades paid us a visit, and we had the pleasure of an address from Com. John Smith. The interesting and simple way he put the position of the worker and his master the idler, before the audience fairly fetched them. Com. Hendry opened the evening meeting by singing the French "Song of the workers" in English. It was effective in drawing a large audience which was treated to two hours' Anarchist talk. We are looking forward to a visit from Agnes Henry, but the date is not fixed yet.

Brighton.—The meetings here have been carried on very well on week days on the Front, and on Sundays on the Level. The speakers were, Ford, Reid and Laurence. August 13th, Comrade Ford opened a good meeting, and H. Samuels from London, delivered a very good lecture. August 20th, Com. Tochatti and Mrs. Tochatti, Atterbury and another comrade came from London. We had a

meeting on the Front and in the afternoon on the Level. All our meetings are well attended by a mixed audience, many of whom attend regularly and seem to be seriously interested in what they hear. We have always some opposition, generally from Christians, but they are always well answered. We always sell many *Freedom*s, *Weals* and different pamphlets not only at our meetings but also among trade-unions, secularists and even some, but very few, at Christian meetings.—T. SIMSON.

Aberdeen.—Our usual open-air meetings on Castle-street and on the Links continue to be successful. On Sunday, July 30th, Comrade Jack Robb of Glasgow was with us and along with comrade Duncan addressed two very good meetings. On Saturday, August 19th we held our first pic-nic at which about fifty people were present. Sunday, August 20th, Com. Agnes Henry lectured in the Odd-fellows Hall in the forenoon on "Free Organisation v. Parliamentary Municipal Government." There was only a fair audience present; some good opposition from an anti-revolutionary standpoint by the Rev. Alexander Webster, Unitarian minister, Kilmarnock, an earnest worker for the emancipation of the wage-slaves who, unfortunately, believes in Parliament as a means, was successfully combated by Agnes Henry. In the afternoon, on Castle-street she and Duncan spoke to a good crowd. In the evening in the Oddfellows Hall she lectured on "Women under Anarchist Communism," there was a large audience, mostly men. Her lecture was supported by the Rev. Alexander Webster and Com. Duncan. On Tuesday evening they spoke on Castle-street and on Wednesday afternoon at the Quayside Agnes Henry addressed a meeting of Shore Laborers, and was listened to with great attention and sympathy; and in the evening she, Duncan and Shepherd spoke on Castle-street. At all these meetings the crowd appeared to have a distinct desire to know more of our principles. Agnes Henry's work here has been productive of an immense amount of good for the Cause.—On Saturday August 12th, we held a meeting at Inverurie, but it only lasted about half an hour. However in that time we managed to leave our mark among the people, for quite a number of those present desired that we would revisit them and talk longer to them.

Manchester.—The July was an active time here, the fine weather allowing our out-door meetings to be well attended, and the prospect is promising.—We have been helped by the visits of Agnes Henry, London, R. Bingham, Sheffield and George Cores, Leicester, who have addressed good meetings, and in return our speakers have gone to Leicester and Sheffield. We expect Mowbray and Samuels in August.—H. Stockton lectured at the Gorton I.L.P. Hall on July 4th, to a large audience. The lecture was followed by a brisk discussion. At our weekly meetings C. Healy has read two interesting papers, "Remedies for the Ills of Society," and "Respectability: its cause and cure," and we have arranged for some opponents to lecture before us at these meetings. Literature has sold well and leaflets have been distributed in various places.—J. V. B.

Sheffield.—During the last month or two, though we have not sent any report, we have still continued to hold our usual meetings, which have been well attended. We have been assisted by Comrade A. Henry, when we held two splendid meetings at the Monolith and West Bar Pump. Our comrade was listened to with rapt attention until the close of her address; questions were asked, and dealt with satisfactorily. Since then we have had a visit from Com. Barton of Manchester, who gave three good addresses; in the morning at Monolith, afternoon at Newhall, night at the Pump, which were greatly appreciated; good discussion, collection responded to manfully. Interest in the movement seems to be on the increase here, and we hope it will continue.—J. B.

Dublin.—The lecture session of the Dublin Fabian Society was wound up by a lecture from H. Russell Smart, on "Home Rule and Socialism," in which some home trusts were administered to the politicians, and the evil influence of clericalism on Irish public was graphically set out, much to the annoyance of a few rabid "Faith and Fatherland" folk who attended. Some one in the front bench protested frantically against a comparison he had supposed the lecturer to have made between priestcraft and witchcraft, when a soothing voice from the back called out "Sure what's the good of making all that fuss, are they not one and the same thing?"

Sunderland.—The few Anarchist Communists residing in this district having organised themselves for propaganda purposes, and not possessing any speaking ability, Comrade Agnes Henry (London) kindly came to our assistance. She stayed with us three weeks. We held our first meeting at Gill-bridge-avenue, where, in spite of a heavy rain, a large and attentive audience listened to our comrade for above an hour. The same evening our comrade addressed a meeting at Monkwearmouth, which was well attended. Here we had a little good natured opposition from a "beery" member of the I.L.P. Comrade Henry addressed several large meetings at this place during her stay. She also addressed fair audiences at Centre-house and James William-street, at both of which places our comrade held the crowd together nearly two hours. Good meetings were also held in the surrounding districts, where Comrade Henry made a great impression upon the miners, especially at Ryhope and Seaham Collieries. At the latter place all the literature was sold out, and they asked that more should be sent. We have had a fair sale for literature during comrade Henry's course of lectures. Comrade Pearson lectured at Ryhope this morning (20th), subject, Anarchist Communism. A heavy shower of rain at the commencement having driven off most of the people, there was only a small, though appreciative audience. We distributed a few old "Freedom" and "Solidarities." We consider there is good groundwork here to propagate Anarchist principles, the greatest impediment being the want of speakers; we appeal for help in that direction. If there should be any single man who is able to speak, willing to work and wishful to further the cause, if he forward his name and trade, we will try to find employment here for him. During the short time we have been engaged in propagandism, we have received our fair share of misrepresentation from our State Socialist friends (?) At the commencement of our campaign, some of their most prominent men assured us we had their sympathy, and should have all the assistance they could give us. Their sympathy was shown in the despicable and underhand means used to influence people's minds against us, by appealing to their religious bigotry and intolerance, and by giving inaccurate and misleading information concerning us to newspaper reporters. The assistance they gave was to refuse Comrade Henry the use of their platform. She challenged them to debate, but none of them would take it up. We meet every Friday night, 7.15, at large room, Bridge-end-vaults.—J. J. BLACK, 38, Crescent-row, Ballast-hill, Ayres-quay, Sunderland.

Leicester.—More good news! We have three months of active propaganda to tell you about. This summer the work has been carried on more vigorously than ever before, and we are glad to say that the results have been most encouraging. Our meetings get larger every Sunday, and the numerous questions which have been put to our speakers show that a great number of people are taking a sympathetic interest in our teachings. Moreover, new converts have come forward and joined the group; in fact, we are getting stronger and stronger, and leaving the S.D.F. a long way behind. We have had much valuable help from outside speakers, whose visits always do an immense deal of good. Comrades Barker, Mowbray, Pellier, Andrew Hall, Stockton and Barton, have all been to Leicester, and done "yeoman service" for Anarchist Communism. They were all in "good form," and gave some splendid addresses to large audiences in Russell-square, Market-place, and Humberstone-gate. Our own local speakers have all worked wonderfully well, both in open-air

propaganda and in their respective trade-unions. They are consequently becoming very well-known, almost "popular," in fact, among the workers of this town. Those comrades who are unable to speak have done good work in distributing literature, which is selling well, especially "Freedom" pamphlets. We have held regular meetings in the Market-place at Loughboro' on Saturdays, and they have all been fairly good ones, although it is the first year we have attempted to "work" that town. On August 6th, a very lively debate took place between Comrade Glassman and Chambers, an old Social Democrat, on "Politics, and the worker." A great number of people assembled in the Market-place to hear the arguments, and were very much interested. The arguments and the laugh (of the audience) were decidedly against Chambers, who sang very small at the finish. We are making preparations for a lot of indoor work next winter. We mean to invade every club, society, association, and even church or chapel that we possibly can to put forward our ideas and advocate our cause. Next winter is expected to be the most severe one for the working classes in the memory of living men. Already there are hundreds of unemployed, and hundreds more on "short time." The capitalistic system of production approaches its end. It has been weighed in the balance, and found very much wanting. The monstrous contradiction of "over production" and "starving population," is an object lesson which is setting working men a thinking. May it soon stir them to action and revolt!—A. W.

Dundee.—At a meeting of the Saddlers' and Harness Makers' Union, July 17th, Comrade H. Campbell brought up the question of delegates to the Zürich Conference, and a strong protest was entered against any question whatever being put by the organiser of trade congresses to authorised trade union delegates, beyond demanding the presentation of their credentials at such congresses. At a meeting of the S.S.F., it was decided to send a delegate to Zürich, and the said delegate was instructed to vote against the admission of Anarchists to the conference. We are glad to say six members of the S.S.F. voted against any attempt to exclude Anarchist.

Anarchy in Lancashire and Derbyshire.—August 4th, Comrade Macdonald (Freedom Group) and Comrade Leggett (Commonweal Group) left London for Manchester. They were met by Barton, Brown, Stockton, and other comrades, who conducted them to Comrade Brown's house. We then had a ramble, through Manchester. At night they went to a discussion in the Forum, opened by Alexander, S.D.F. of London. Stockton, Healy, Macdonald and Leggett opposed, and found plenty of supporters, but a prominent Tory spoke very strongly against our "murderous designs," especially against the speech made by Leggett. Sunday, though wet nearly all day, we held three good meetings, one at Ardwick-green, Stevenson-square, and Market-street, Manchester respectively. At Ardwick-green there was some opposition from Gospel grinders, ably replied to by Leggett and other comrades. In Stevenson-square, in spite of its raining all the time, there was large audiences, 12s. collected, and 6s. worth of literature was sold. Market-street, large crowds addressed by Macdonald, Stockton and Leggett, whose humorous speech kept the crowd, though raining all the time; good sale of "Weals." On Monday we went to Monsal-dale, about 36 miles from Manchester, and met comrades from Sheffield, Derbyshire, Leicester, and Manchester: we roamed through splendid mountain and river scenery, and forming in a group close to a water-fall, we sang revolutionary songs amidst the splashing of the waters. The effect was enough to arouse the enthusiasm of all hearers. Thus without government, policemen, or social democratic would-be political despots, every thing passed off harmoniously. There being no authority, we went where we liked, and rambled in groups along the river banks till we came to some boards, which said on them that "Trespassers will be prosecuted." We held a discussion as to the meaning of the words, and finally decided that they were relics of the Antediluvian period, and thought it best to knock the boards down and throw them into the river, which was done at once. We then repaired to an old cottage where Comrade Bingham had arranged for tea, and upwards of 100 sat down and did full justice to the cake, etc. We then held a conference under the hill side, addressed by Cores, Bingham, Gorrie, Caplan, Stockton, Leggett, etc.; a fund was started with 28s. for Nicholl on his release, Archibald Gorrie as treasurer. It was also decided to try and make arrangements to get the released Chicago Anarchists over here, and to hold a big demonstration in the North. It was decided to hold the next excursion at the same place next year, Bingham to arrange it. We then proceeded to the station, and liberally posted it all over with little notices, such as "Anarchy no Master;" Revolution, not Reform;" Read "Commonweal" and "Freedom," etc., and then went home after giving our comrades a hearty cheer, and also cheers for Anarchy and the Social Revolution. The next day Macdonald and Stockton went to Wigan, and spoke to the colliers on strike, and Barton, Healy and Leggett went to Pendlebury, and also spoke to the miners, who are a fine determined lot of fellows and know their power, and intend to use it, and not to be led by "leaders" who will only betray them, and induce them to accept arbitration. After speaking for about two hours to a large crowd of women and men, answering an I.L.P. man, we sold some pamphlets and Weals, and returned to Manchester. On Wednesday night, a meeting of comrades at the Labor Church; good discussion, Comrades Macdonald, Barton, Stockton, taking part. On Thursday we returned to London, but hope to go to the north again soon.—EDWARD LEGGATT.

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 Peckham Park-road; 3.40 p.m., Hyde Park; 5 p.m., Clerkenwell Green; 7 p.m., Mile End Waste. Saturdays, 8 p.m., Hyde Park, and at corner of Commercial-road (near Old Kent-road Station.)

The Commonweal Group meets every Tuesday, 8.30 p.m., at Grafton Hall, 55, Grafton-street, Tottenham-court-road, W.

PROVINCES—

Brighton.—Open-air meetings: on the Front, weekday evenings at 7; on the Level, Sunday afternoons, at 3.

Sheffield.—Meetings are held Sundays, at the Monolith, 11.30 a.m.; at West Bar Pump, 8 p.m.

Norwich.—Communist Anarchist literature may be obtained of A. D. Moore, 24, Rose-yard, St. Augustine's, Norwich.

NICOLL FUND.

RECEIVED FROM AUG. 1st to AUG. 31st:—

Anarchist Jack, 4s.; Leicester Comrades, 8s.; Hugh Pope list, 3s.; Ogilvey, 2s. 6d.; C. E. Skeritt (4 months' subs.), 20s.; E. N. G., 4d.

M. Galbraith,
19, Conderton-road, S.E.

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