

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. VII.—No. 81.

OCTOBER, 1893.

MONTHLY ; ONE PENNY.

THE COAL WAR.

NO ENGLISH strike has been more significant than the coal war now raging. As we write, the action of the Northern French and Belgian miners is as yet doubtful, but the fact that they should threaten a strike in conjunction with the miners of Great Britain is one of the most noteworthy events the Labor war has yet seen. It brings the possibility of the direct, voluntary, international action of the workers against capitalist tyranny from the region of theory down to the very threshold of "practical politics."

What is to be the end? Are we one step nearer Freedom, or will the present industrial upheaval prove, as some declare of all such occasions, merely a disappointing retrogression? The answer lies with the miners; lies hidden with—and we fear to a large extent from—those who are mainly unconscious guardians of the secret. Yet there is hope. It would seem impossible to suppose that among such a body as the locked-out miners there are none who recognise the potentialities of the situation, and though they may yet be few, we may be sure they will not be idle or over modest, but will let their light shine on their less perceptive brethren.

The outline facts of the case are tolerably well known. Two hundred thousand coal-miners have deliberately ceased to earn *anything* rather than consent, at the dictation of the coal-owners, to lower their present standard of comfort, by earning *less* than they now do for the same amount of work. There has been some quibbling over the exact terms of the proposed reduction, but it seems tolerably certain that the amount first mentioned was 25 per cent. off present wages, and that its calculation upon the increase since 1888 was an afterthought. These little evasions on the part of Employers' Federations, by the way, are becoming quite a usual feature of such disputes; but let that pass. The fact remains that, whether against a reduction of 25 or 17½ per cent., the men are still fighting, after two months' idleness and consequent privation.

Nor have the locked-out miners everywhere starved resignedly, after the old dumb, helpless fashion of the strikers of the past. They have been guilty, here and there, of assailing the sacred rights of property, by helping themselves to such food as could be got from standing crops, and imperiously demanding aid from well-to-do travellers on the roads. Moreover, they have held tumultuous assemblies, and marched in bands from village to village, trying to enlist public sympathy amongst their fellow workers. And finally, several collieries have been wrecked. At the risk of untold misery to themselves from hopeless loss of employment, they have had the resolution to strike the capitalist foe in his only tender place, the pocket, and by destroying workings and plant mulcted him to the tune of some hundreds of thousands of pounds. An heroic policy which, whatever wretchedness it may entail on the workers who have hitherto earned their wretched subsistence by toiling at the destroyed pits, is certainly the only way to make capitalists hesitate about provoking strikes for the purpose of ruining trades unions.

Of course, such active resistance on the part of the miners to the capitalists' attempt to starve them into abject submission has been replied to by the mine monopolists by calling in the aid of their agent, the Government. Large bodies of police and troops have been drafted into the disturbed districts. "If you don't choose to starve like rats in a hole, we will shoot you for a change," say the masters; and at Featherstone, near Pontefract, two miners have been shot: murdered by their sweated soldier-brothers, at the instance of the Plutocracy and the Liberal Government!

Some kind hearts are asking whether the amount of property destroyed is sufficient to warrant this slaughter, either in revenge or for the protection of other property; others, a little more advanced, are asking whether *any* property is worth such consideration; a question which only the Anarchist Communist has the right to put forward seriously, and on which no authoritative pronouncement is at the moment likely to be acceptable on either side. But meanwhile reserve stocks of coal, got in at the ordinary prices, have "advanced in value" 50 per cent., and the miners have not received an extra halfpenny in wages; so why should the masters doubt that economics and morals are on their side?

Now, what do these gigantic strikes and lock-outs mean? As we pointed out in the case of Hull this year, they mean that the management of the world's business is in the wrong hands. These capitalists, legal owners (*i.e.*, withholders from others) of all that can make life enjoyable or indeed rational, who can sway any government, however powerful, whether Tory or Liberal, to do their bidding, have by governmental aid protected their own supposed interests to such purpose that the worker has now no interest save in their destruction. Of

course the worker at large does not yet know it. But he is learning it: thanks to Socialist and especially Anarchist Socialist teaching, and will learn yet more from his ever-increasing burden of toil and poverty. As he learns his lesson, slowly, painfully, one letter at a time, each acquisition of knowledge gives him a fresh right *and* power to question the authority of his masters over his *life*. For it is nothing less than that. Not so much an hour, not so many hours a day, but—Who shall control industry and dispose of its products, those who work or those who shirk?

We do not hope too much from strikes. They are, as a rule, too local or too personal; too narrow in their issues to be of much lasting service, even when they succeed; and when they fail they are apt to produce despair. But there are not wanting signs that the strike, barbarous as many trade unionists declare it to be, is yet a perfectible weapon. There is an element of hopefulness in the fact that strikers are not so ready as formerly to accept defeat composedly. The struggle is too intense, the stake too serious, for the old much-vaunted "perfect good-humour on both sides"; and it is no longer a question of which side will first tire of the game, but of which must give in to avert class-destruction.

The introduction of violence into these disputes (begun, it is almost needless to say, by the capitalists and their tools, the governments) can only be productive of good. It will teach strikers and locked-outs that it is not as men, but as *hands*, that they are appraised by their masters, and in this way relieve them of some of the blind respect for property and position that now hampers their progress; while those who only look on will see to what lengths capitalism and power will go in defence of class-privileges, and may even come to recognise in property and authority the twin foes of humanity, the curses that must be swept away if the destruction of the race is to be averted.

This is probably seditious. Well, something pungent is needed to clear men's vision when those who profess to sympathise with the miners are advising them to carry on this struggle without any disturbance to the comfort of the community. For this is what is involved in the advice, so freely tendered them, to abstain from disorder, to condemn violence, and to *open to work all the pits they can*, so that nobody may go short of coal. We have neither right nor desire to dictate to the miners, but we do wish that they may see and spurn the folly of weakening themselves by attempting to please those who are thus directing them to certain failure. What if commerce be demoralised? It always is and always will be so long as it continues to be based upon immorality. The experience of Leeds, Paris, Southampton, East London and countless other places proves that success attends a strike in direct proportion to the disturbance of the daily life and occupations of the community; and the sooner workers in different industries recognise that their interests depend upon each other, and not at all upon masters, the better for all.

Meanwhile, what is to be the end? Is this the Revolution—the gathering of forces for a final struggle? Hardly that, but it marks an important stage in our war of emancipation. Liberal Governments may send out their forces with bullets capable of piercing 35 inches of elm, warranted to kill at a mile, but the Revolution will thereby be accelerated, not delayed. Every act of governmental violence, every attempt to refasten the fetters that starvation has loosened, will give tenfold effect to the efforts of propagandists, and recoil upon those who would stifle the new, sweet, abundant life now upspringing. "The Kingdom of Heaven cometh not with observation," yet it is at hand—waiting only to be won.

Therefore, Remember Featherstone!

ANARCHIST REPLY

TO THE
MANIFESTO OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF SOCIALIST
BODIES (LONDON).*

PART II.

At this point the reader may ask, what is all this quarrel about? Why are there Communist Anarchists at all? What is their object? Why can they not unite with the Social Democrats to fight the common enemy, the capitalist? Our answer is as follows:—

1.—We agree with Social Democrats upon the necessity of doing away with the capitalist system. Many Social Democrats, however, have now thrown this object into the back-ground, and are chiefly busy in advocating constitutional reforms and other palliatives, old and new. But:

* For Part I. see *Freedom* for July. The Joint Committee as above has now practically ceased to exist. The manifesto to which ours is a reply was its first and last effort!

2.—We disagree with them altogether as to the necessity of government and the advantages of parliamentary action. Social Democrats contend that democratic government is not only absolutely necessary, but highly beneficial. We Anarchists contend that all governments are harmful and oppressive, and that no radical change for the better can possibly be achieved until all government and coercive, aggressive force is done away with.

3.—We agree on the necessity of the Social Revolution. This, however, holds good only of the rank and file of the Social Democrats, not, of course, of the leaders, nor of the Fabians. But

4.—We disagree in the view we respectively take of the future society. The latter point may seem of no importance. The question as to what the future society shall be may be deemed premature. Yet it is not so; for whether the revolution be beneficial or harmful depends on whether the men who are foremost in the revolutionary struggle have a right or a wrong idea of the changes to bring about.

Now, Social Democrats contend that the first step in a period of revolutionary agitation must be to elect a new government, which will have to carry on the expropriation of the capitalists and the reorganisation of industry. We, on the contrary, contend that the people must effect the expropriation themselves, and not wait for the laws and regulations of any government whatever; nay, elect no government, as any government could only be a stumbling block to the revolution and the formation of new and better social relations.

Social Democrats propose that the instruments of production should be declared national property and handed over to the management of the national Government; that the latter should issue regulations or perhaps send round its own officials to organise trades, fix hours of labor, wages, terms of exchange etc.; in fact, that Government, central and local, should become the universal employer of labor, the workers remaining wage-slaves as before, but wage-slaves with higher wages, shorter hours, more sanitary workshops, and so on.

We Anarchists say that no government of mortal men is fit for such a task; that should a government, however democratic, be allowed to undertake it, it would wield so immense a power over the lives and liberties of the people as to make them practically slaves. Indeed the workers have more chance to hold their own against their disassociated capitalist employers to-day than they would against a gigantic federation of employing corporations, such as a central democratic government, with its subordinate local authorities. France and America to-day show a fair example of the professional politician under a democracy. The elected, paid representative poses and promises, humbugs or buys the voters, plays unscrupulously to the gallery to retain his pay and place; "the gallery" being either the majority, as expressed in its prejudices and narrowest interests, or of the noisiest section of it for the time being, which happens to enjoy a temporary predominance. The official administrator, high or low, does likewise, struggling, in addition, to keep in office, or to curry favor with his superiors, or to gain preferment, as the case may be, by everlasting intrigue, favoritism, bribery and subterfuge. The political atmosphere in these two great republics is so foul that the best men keep out of it altogether. Put the enormous additional powers of economic administration into the hands of these paid politicians, and officially make them in their corporate capacity the universal employers of labor and distributors of the produce, and no elective checks ever invented will save from slavery the people depending on them for employment and daily bread. Under Social Democracy, the most predominant common interest of the majority would be their narrowly selfish interest as consumers; as producers or distributors the people would be split up into sections, and against the special interests of each trade or business would press the common interest of all the rest of the population to get all they could out of each section of the workers for as little as possible. Let workmen judge how much freedom in their work and in disposing of its results they are likely to enjoy with the representatives of the majority as their employers. As was recently pointed out by a Social Democrat,* there will be at least as strong a need for fighting unions to protect trade interests under Social Democracy as under capitalism. Is it worth while to struggle through the dangerous and painful crisis of a social revolution to inaugurate another era of even mitigated wage-slavery, diversified by labor wars and party intrigues?

We Communist Anarchists believe not. Therefore we suggest, as the first step of the Social Revolution, that the people should by their own direct action take possession of the instruments of production, every worker and society of workers of such things as they need in their own branch of labor. When we say "take possession," we do not mean that any worker or group of workers should claim these things as their absolute property, as a capitalist or a landlord now claims plant and soil as his own, so that he can, without lifting a finger himself, exact toll from all who use them. We mean that the workers should refuse to recognise the right of any human being to hold any such absolute property at all; but that those who are using farms or factories, mines or workshops shall insist upon having the free use of them and of all they produce there. Make themselves, in a word, their own employers, with a view to organising their own labor as they like, and arranging for the free exchange of its fruits with the producers of other things; thus abolishing the wage system and the employing class altogether.

(To be concluded.)

The Workman's Question: why he is poor. 7th edition. 2d.

Crimes of Governments. 2nd edition. 2d.

Review of European Society. Post free, 1s. 6d.

J. Sketehley (wholesale and retail), 52, Salthouse-lane, Hull.

* "Relationship between Co-operation and Trades Unionism," by Mrs. Sidney Webb.

Belfast Trades Union Congress.

THE most notable feature of the Congress, from our point of view, was the passing of an amendment, introduced by James Macdonald, of the London Tailors, in favor of the nationalisation of the land and the means of production and distribution.

By so doing, the Trades Union Congress has practically pledged itself to Socialism, and if congresses are at all representative of the opinions of skilled workmen and women of the nations, then Socialists may feel that this section of workers have taken one decided theoretical step onward.

For four years Macdonald has striven to have this resolution carried, and his success in obtaining a substantial vote of 137 to 97 is significant of the rapid advance of Socialistic ideas. Nor is that all; John Burns, M.P., thought fit to second the amendment in a strong speech, and so we may at last consider him to be moving with the tide of labor once more, although we must still deplore his unhappy attitude towards strikes and revolts.

Fortunately, the great cause of the people does not depend upon individuals, however fondly some of our contemporary egoists dream to shepherd it; and this is keenly felt by those who have the discerning eye and listening ear to catch the side lights and sounds of a Congress like that of Belfast.

The official routine is much the same year by year. Parliamentary Committees are formed; resolutions in favor of parliamentary measures are carried by sweeping majorities. The trades unions have marched from ultra conservatism to the near neighbourhood of Social Democracy in a period of ten years along the path cleared by political radicalism. But the official action still lags far behind that congress within the congress, to be found where delegates converse together and speak freely without restraint, as they sit over their coffee and beer.

We are more interested in what we hear thus direct from the delegates when they are themselves, than when in fruitless attempts to be eloquent they indulge in heroics, and pose to their constituents; speak at the people rather than to them.

We must regret that the voice of Anarchism was not heard more frequently, but, with the exception of Comrade Mowbray, we were entirely unrepresented; and this being his first English congress, Mowbray wisely preferred to study the tendency of the Congress rather than endanger his position as a trade unionist by hasty conclusions. Moreover, he was not aware that amendments must be notified six weeks beforehand, and so he was handicapped in speaking on several important questions.

Anarchists might consider this policy of entering boldly into Unions and exercising their influence right and left; go to Congresses where possible and carry the propaganda into the heart of the labor movement. Mowbray's example, we feel sure, might be followed with great advantage.

The Unions are based upon Anarchical lines, why should we let them be fooled by pot-hunters and journalists? They are naturally with us; perhaps we unnaturally neglect them. If we had a few more representatives next year, the education obtained would be useful to us in preparing for the International meeting in 1896, when it is to be hoped Anarchists will make a decided and lasting stand against Marxist oppression.

It is a pity that Unionists should accept too much luxurious hospitality from their natural enemies, capitalists, municipalities and non-unionists.

Why not be bold, uncompromising, dignified as workers should, who are the only people in the world entitled to dignity? But when you find non-union tramway companies proffering free tickets, and millionaires giving picnics, is there not room for alarm in the ranks of those who deny themselves in order to subscribe funds to send a delegate to Congress? Tolerance may be only another form of Hypocrisy; and your enemies will only laugh when they see what a toy the Trades Union Congress may be made.

If you are for a Social Revolution, act as Revolutionists, not as weaklings. Have the courage of manhood and refuse all capitalist patronage as gratuitous insult.

There are infinite possibilities for Trades Union Congresses on either side: they may become organs of the coming Revolution or may grow into playthings for the Revolution to cut its teeth upon.

If the integrity of delegates is sapped by compromise; if honor and dignity are lost by cringing flunkysim; if the Congress is to be the one man affair, the "man with the Red Tape" would have it, you workers had better keep your pence in your pockets and look upon the Congress with horror and dread; it can only bring you woe.

What was the Belfast Congress, then? Ten days outing for Trades delegates; one resolution in favor of Socialism; another in favor of equal rights of men and women; all the rest, parliamentary in character, worse than useless to the worker.

If delegates would only remember they represent their respective trades, not the political or religious opinions of individuals, much would be done of practical value to the cause of labor.

Anarchists must remember they are far from blameless if they stand aside, nursing their ideals of nobility, rather than placing themselves in a position where their example may be followed and their influence felt.

One word to Trade Unions. Stand upon your intrinsic worth; be not led into servility to government; look to strikes and revolts; hold your Congresses, but look to tactics of your own rather than to the old middle-class politics; work in sections, like the British Association and Medical and Science Congresses; read papers and discuss them. Your Congress as at present constituted is as clumsy as it could be.

FAUSET MACDONALD.

Reasons for Pardoning Fielden, Neebe and Schwab.

AN ANALYSIS OF GOVERNOR ALTGELD'S PAMPHLET.

(Concluded.)

Third Reason. The evidence brought forward does not establish any connection between the unknown thrower of the bomb and the eight Anarchists prosecuted.

In the first place, the "seditious and violent language" used by the prisoners was only gathered and selected from articles appearing at intervals during years in two small papers, having a comparatively small circulation, and from speeches at a few meetings held at intervals, some very scantily attended; and these words were written or spoken during times of general popular excitement, when a section of the population believed they had suffered grievous wrong, and consequently large numbers were expressing themselves strongly.

In the second place, the conduct of the police, Pinkertons and legal authorities had been such as to enrage the workers past endurance and lead them to believe that they could expect no redress by applying to the law.

For instance, when the Harmonica Association of Joiners held a peaceable meeting in Turner Hall to meet the delegates of the employers, fifteen or twenty policemen suddenly burst into the hall, a club in one hand and a revolver in the other, shouting, "Get out of here, you damned sons of bitches," and began beating the people and firing their revolvers. One young man was shot dead, and when the terrified people rushed from the hall, they found the stairs lined with police, "who applied their clubs to them as they passed, seemingly with all the violence practicable under the circumstances." "These general facts," says Judge McAlister, before whom this case was brought, "were established by an overwhelming mass of testimony," and he proceeds to lay down the law that the police were in this case criminal rioters breaking in upon a lawful assembly.

But the police paid no attention to Judge McAlister's decision. In 1885, some Pinkertons were hooted by the people as they marched to McCormack's Reaper factory, where there was a strike against a reduction of wages. Thereupon the Pinkertons fired upon the crowd, fatally wounding several innocent passers by. Four Pinkertons were indicted for murder by the grand jury, "but the prosecuting officers apparently took no interest in the case," and allowed it to be continued a number of times, until the witnesses were worn out, and in the end the murderers went free.

The same year there was a tramcar strike, and the police under Captain Bonfield were told off to protect the blacklegs running the cars, whereupon they took occasion to arrest and seriously injure with their clubs a number of men who had nothing at all to do with the strike, and even some of the Tram Companies servants who were repairing the permanent way. Their conduct was so outrageous that even the notorious Captain Schaak of the Chicago police speaks of it as "brutal and uncalled for," and 1000 leading citizens living in Madison-street, where the bludgeoning took place, signed a petition to the Mayor and City Council, praying for Bonfield's dismissal; "but on account of his political influence he was retained."

"Various attempts were made to bring to justice the men who wore the uniform of the law while violating it, but all to no avail; the laboring people found the prisons always open to receive them, but the courts of justice practically closed to them; the prosecuting officers vied with each other in hunting them down, but were deaf to their appeals." In 1886, there were more labor disturbances, particularly at McCormick's factory, and "under the leadership of Captain Bonfield the brutalities of the previous year were even exceeded."

During the Eight-hour agitation, "a number of laboring men, standing, not on the street, but on a vacant lot, were quietly discussing the situation, when suddenly a large body of police, under orders from Bonfield, charged on them, and began to club them. Some of the men, angered at the unprovoked assault, at first resisted, but were soon dispersed. Some of the police fired on the men while they were running, and wounded a large number who were already 100 feet or more away. At least four of the number so shot down died, and for this wanton and unprovoked murder there was not so much as an investigation."

It was when Bonfield and his forces were preparing for another murderous attack upon a peaceful meeting that the famous Haymarket bomb was thrown, and all the above facts go to suggest, says Governor Altgeld, that this bomb was thrown as an act of personal revenge, for which "*Captain Bonfield is the man who is really responsible.*"

Turning next to the evidence brought forward at the trial, Altgeld says that much of it was "a pure fabrication." "Some of the prominent police officials, in their zeal, not only terrorised ignorant men by throwing them into prison and threatening them with torture if they refused to swear to anything desired, but offered money and employment to those who would consent to do this. Further, they deliberately planned to have fictitious conspiracies found, in order that they might get the glory of discovering them."

In illustration of these charges against the police, Altgeld quotes the *Chicago Daily News*, which published an interview with Captain Ebersold, chief of the Chicago police in 1886, in which he plainly stated that when he had wished to quiet things down after the Haymarket meeting, Schaak had proposed to send out men to organise Anarchist societies! Also the affidavits of two men who refused to be witnesses. Both of these were imprisoned and cruelly bullied. One describes how his house was searched at night, his little children dragged out of bed, he himself "kicked, clubbed, beaten and scratched," and his wife insulted—all to induce him to testify facts of which he had no knowledge.

Fourth Reason. Against Neebe no case even as to the utterance of "seditious language" was made out; whilst against Fielden the accusations of the police as to his words and use of a revolver at the Haymarket meeting were not believed by even the Public Prosecutor Grinnell and Judge Gary himself.

Fifth Reason. The charges made against Judge Gary seem, says Governor Altgeld, "to be sustained by the record of the trial and the paper before me." These charges include conducting the trial with a "malicious ferocity" worthy of Judge Jeffreys, forcing the eight men to be tried together instead of separately, allowing the prosecution a latitude denied to the defendants in the cross examination of witnesses, ruling invariably in favour of the prosecution, and so forth. Even this year Gary has shown his bitter prejudice by publishing in the *Century Magazine* for April an article "full of venom" against the men he hanged or imprisoned.

Yet, in face of such reasons as these, the capitalist classes of America, as represented by their press, have the shamelessness to openly cry out upon the absolute pardon granted, on the 26th June last, to the survivors of the judicial murder of Nov. 11, 1887.

Our Glasgow comrades are bringing out a new (the fourth) edition of "The Speeches of the Chicago Martyrs," enlarged by the addition of Altgeld's pamphlet *in extenso*. Price 6d. This book will be as valuable a piece of propagandist literature as we have in the movement; every Anarchist should push it. Address orders to this or *Commonweal* office, or to J. S. Anderson, 92, Canning-street, Glasgow.

The Zurich Anarchist Conference.

THE Conference held by the Anarchist and Independent Socialists expelled from the Marxist Congress was attended by Congress delegates of almost all nationalities, and by its harmony and earnestness contrasted favorably with the other assembly. The meetings were held in the Plattenhaus, in the evening, August 10—13. The first question discussed was whether Anarchist and Revolutionray Socialists could work together, and after an animated debate, in which Werner, and Landauer (Berlin), Gumplovitz and Kähne (Zürich), Watts and Cleaves (S.D.F.), Mowbray and Roland (London Anarchists), Gilles (W.C.P.S. London), Nieuwenhuis and Cornelisson (Holland), Madame Collard (Paris) and others took part, it was unanimously agreed that all who agree that the workers must strive to abolish the capitalist system by all means, legal and illegal, peaceful and violent, can work together to that end. Nieuwenhuis, in his speech, commented on the folly of the official Social Democratic party, in withdrawing its hand from the left, while almost always ready to hold it out to the right.

The second subject on the agenda was May Day. The proletariat all over Europe, said Kähne (Zürich), have taken up the proposal of the Paris Marxist Congress of 1889 in an actively revolutionary sense its authors little anticipated, and now for the last two years the official Social Democratic party in Germany have been doing all they can to check the revolutionary action of the masses. The First of May rightly understood, said Molinari (Italy), should be the beginning of a general strike.

The Conference next passed on to consider the labor movement, especially with reference to the general strike. The strike of the future, said Landauer (Berlin), will be successful only when the workers come out resolved not to starve. Strikes, attempts at labor organisation, partial agitations, all that we call the labor movement to-day is revolutionary education, and it is our business to rub its lessons in; trade unions are the germs of a Socialist society, and a general strike would begin a social revolution. Gumplovitz (Zürich), though agreeing with the above, would lay more stress on co-operative societies, such as now exist in Belgium. They render capitalist employers superfluous, while strikes, even partial ones, are eliminating the smaller fry of capitalism. When self-employing co-operative societies, trade societies and such like voluntary workmen's organisations have brought the greater part of economic power into the hands of the workers, then will be the time for the general strike.—Most of the meeting agreed with Landauer's point of view.

On the War question Nieuwenhuis brought forward his proposal for a general strike of all privates and workers connected with the army and transport service on a declaration of war, which was rejected by the jingo and political element at the other Congress. The Anarchist Conference agreed to it heartily.

Landauer next proposed a resolution against the use of parliamentary action as a means even of propaganda, on account of its corrupting influence.—Most of the meeting agreed with him, but seven revolutionary Socialists preferred a resolution by Gilles, which, while advocating the destruction of parliament as a more bourgeois instrument of oppression, "antagonistic by its whole nature to the Socialist idea of freedom," left, while it does exist, its use as a means of exposing present evils to be decided by circumstances.

Finally, the following was unanimously adopted: "To rouse the revolutionary spirit in the labor organisations and actions of the proletariat; to develop as much as possible the independence of the individual; to point out to the workers the uselessness of parliamentary politics—this is what we understand by revolutionary propaganda." Thus closed the Zürich Independent Congress. It received telegrams and messages of sympathy from the French delegation of the other Congress, from the Anarchists and revolutionary Socialists of Vienna, Frankfurt, Höchst, a group of Communard exiles at Geneva, etc.

A crowded meeting of protest against the outrageous expulsion from the orthodox congress was held on the 8th August in Zürich; like meetings took place in Berlin, Vienna, Prague, Paris, etc.

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—A. M., 3s. 6d.; W., £3. For THE FAMILIES OF IMPRISONED ANARCHISTS IN GERMANY—A. M., 2s. 6d.

NOTES.

AFTER SEVEN YEARS.

Seven years this month since *Freedom* was started; three years since the occasional supplement became regular, permanently enlarging the paper. Now, as we enter upon our eighth year of existence, we are again confronted with the necessity for further enlargement. As fresh groups spring up in London and all over the country, and existing groups become more and more energetic in their propaganda, the chronicle of their doings and sayings becomes more and more important and interesting. Every month want of space forces us to omit useful theoretical articles or criticisms of current events; every month we are reluctantly obliged to shorten, leave out or hold over important reports. The difficulty, of course, is want of funds. It is only by the utmost efforts that we are able to keep the paper going at its present size. During the past year the regular circulation of the paper has gone up about 700. The present issue varies from 2250 to 3000, according to circumstances, *i.e.*, whether there are special demonstrations, etc., going on. Here is a rough summary of the outgoings and incomings for June last, when we printed 2250:—

RECEIPTS.		EXPENSES.	
	£ s. d.		£ s. d.
Papers sold:		Composing	4 10 4
2055; value, £5 5s. 4d.		Printing and paper ...	2 9 0
Cash received	3 8 6	Postage and carriage ...	1 1 7
Outstanding accounts ...	1 16 10	Office rent (4 weeks) ...	18 0
Donations	1 0 1	Sundries and Office expenses	6 11
Deficit made up by Freedom Group	3 0 5		
	£9 5 10		£9 5 10

This may be taken as a fair average for the smaller issue. This issue, however, runs us very close, as it leaves under 200 extra copies for exchanges, free list, reserve and special calls, and some months we are sold out altogether. The last three months we have printed 2500 copies. Besides the regular deficit we have to advance money against the outstanding accounts, as we make it a rule, even at the cost of being late in the month, to pay all the expenses of one issue before we publish the next. We only manage this by the help of comrades who work for the benefit of the paper and give it their earnings, and by drawing on the pamphlet fund, which latter, of course, hampers us in publishing pamphlets. You see, comrades, that it is uphill work, and why we beg you to pay cash month by month for papers received. More than half our subscribers do this, or we could not get on at all; but we need more help badly. We appeal to all comrades who think *Freedom* useful to aid it by—

- 1st, Endeavouring to increase the circulation;
- 2nd, Paying promptly;
- 3rd, If they can, helping to meet the inevitable monthly deficit.

FRANCIS ADAMS—AGED 31.

It is with much regret we note the death of this young poet, who used his great gifts to voice the wrongs and sufferings of the dumb masses all over the world. No more slashing indictments of what is called civilisation have been penned this century than those to be found among his "Songs of the Army of the Night," a little shilling volume, which should be one of the books of every Anarchist. England's foreign and Irish policy, her pharasaical colonisation that debases what it touches, her art rooted in rottenness, her virtuous women reared among hideous prostitution, all are pilloried here. The pity is that our poets now can find no themes but such as these to touch our hearts. Under kinder conditions, what fair and pleasant things Adams might have sung for us!

A PRACTICAL MAN.

Henry Nunn, a blacksmith of Coggeshall, having vainly called the attention of local authorities, Board of Guardians etc. to the dangerous condition of some deserted dwellings that threatened to fall on the heads of passers by, and to the steepness of a certain part of a road in

the neighbourhood where horses continually stumbled and fell, proposed to remedy these evils with his own hands. After due warning that he would do so, Nunn began levelling the road, and had succeeded in making his mark on it before law and authority stepped in to hinder him. Needless to say that the guardians of the people, who paid no attention to demands for the good of the community, were very spry in prosecuting the man, who wished to benefit his fellow-men thus practically, and Nunn was accordingly "bound over" to refrain from teaching Boards of Guardians their work, and threatened with extreme penalty if he tried it on again. Nunn's lesson should make a deep impression on all Socialists. If we want a thing done well we should do it ourselves, is an old adage and a very true one.

FROM AN IRISH POINT OF VIEW.

Priests, Protestant and Catholic, have succeeded in making the unthinking muddle-heads in Ireland imagine they smell brimstone whenever Socialism is mentioned, yet the notion that if the workers hope to better their condition they must stick close together has, it seems, at last entered even the dullest trade unionist in that country. Pete Curran's proposal, at the Belfast Congress, for the federation of trades, that recent bugbear of trades unionism, was received with astonishing unanimity, as were other equally socialistic motions, in spite of the howls of the staunch Orange Protestants, who bellowed like Bulls of Bashan when they thought a Socialist was speaking.

AFTER THE CONGRESS.

Although the Church and State party merely howled and did not eject the Socialists from the Congress with bodily violence, yet Zürich manners were fully displayed by them on the Sunday following when some Socialists held a meeting at the Custom House. The meeting was broken up and a determined attack made on the speakers, who were jammed against a wall, and but for police interference would have fared very badly. The pious Orange bullies then held a counter meeting, at which they denounced all trades-union Socialists now in Belfast; they are to be damned with the Nationalists. It is surprising what a number of unpleasant idiots there are still in the world.

THE HOME RULE BILL.

The lordly pillars of pride and prejudice have acted as was expected of them, and in full accordance with tradition. Although the wisecracks who pretended to represent the people had whittled Gladstone's little Irish bill almost to nothingness, the little that was left was speedily rejected by the "Upper House." To the Irish peasants, sick with hope deferred, starved both in body and mind, this has fallen as a cruel blow, for they have not yet realised how impossible it is to regenerate a country by Act of Parliament, or how powerless political leaders are, however honest they may be, to carry out schemes of reform, even on paper. We should almost despair of a country where such venomous creatures as Belfast Orangemen are bred, hybrids that neither Scotland nor Ireland will own, did we not know that the new ideas are growing surely though slowly among the real Irish and that such questions as national education, the claims of the unemployed and the right of freethought are quietly ousting the old narrow theme of mere nationalism.

A USEFUL LESSON.

"The Zürich Congress," writes a correspondent, "is an object lesson which, we feel sure, will have good results for Anarchism, since it makes it clear to the most superficial observer that authority in its latest (and as we believe its last) guise of majority rule is the same mischievous and corrupting agent that it has ever been in all its earlier forms. Despotism is overthrown and replaced by a republic, and many hope for great things. But the 'great things' never come, and the people in their disappointment wonder to see the old despotisms rise again, strong as ever. The cry is then raised that the republic must be replaced by a Social Democracy, in which authority is to play its old part. We are to take a step forward, but we are to carry with us the fetters which have bound us in the past. What those fetters are likely to be the Zürich Congress helps to teach us. We ask all to consider this truly vital question. Are not these Bebels and Singers and the rest as bad as the Bismarcks and Constans? Fancy these worthies holding executive power in "a government of the people, by the people, for the people," as the mockery runs. Here is another reason, if one were needed, why the workers, and indeed all honest people, should study the Anarchist position."

CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. OLIVIER EXPLAINS AND PROTESTS.

To the Editor of FREEDOM.

Dear Comrade,—I notice in *Freedom* for Sept. that you deplore some supposed inconsistency of principle in a motion made by me (not by Bonnier) in the Zürich International Congress. I have always held it to be a principle of the first importance for the conduct of business in public conferences that a resolution once voted on should not be again proposed for submission to the vote. Had I, or any one else with any notion of order, been in the chair, Nieuwenhuis and Volders would have been ruled out of order at once, and an hour of empty wrangling saved. Consistently with that principle I did what I could, by moving that the Congress should pass to the order of the day: which it forthwith decided, almost unanimously, to do. No other principle was involved. I protested equally strongly, but without effect, against the equally disorderly admission of a "protocol," whereby the German party presumed (out of pure benevolence) to declare the meaning of a Resolution adopted by the Congress at a previous sitting. You have suffered in this small matter, as you have in respect to your quite

partial and misleading account of the expulsion of the "Independents," from the imperfections of the press reports of the Congress.—Yours &c.

SYDNEY OLIVIER.

[Mr. Olivier's explanation is an excellent example of the stultifying influence of red tapism on a man of liberal views. Because in a general way it is undoubtedly advisable that the business of a conference should be discussed and dismissed point by point, the official mind erects this useful business habit into "a principle of first importance," and applies this precept of the narrower expediency to strengthen the hands of a tyrannical faction, who are warring by trickery and misrepresentation against what really is a vital principle of all rational human association, in congresses and elsewhere, *i.e.*, freedom of opinion and speech. Surely when justice and fair-play are at stake mere questions of business routine sink into a secondary place. It is just because some English delegates failed to appreciate this that they were made the catspaw of the wirepulling clique. As Mr. Olivier, with characteristic candour, admits, when his "principle of the first importance" suited the Marxist game it carried the Congress (*i.e.*, the subservient or hoodwinked majority) with it; and when it pulled the other way it was "without effect."

As to his criticism of our article, we can only say that our information was taken from a careful analysis and comparison of the reports of the 7 or 8 English and German papers which gave the fullest account of the proceedings, corrected and supplemented by the written and verbal reports of our own delegate; if Mr. Olivier can convince us that our facts are inaccurate we shall be happy to correct them.—Ed.]

ANOTHER FABIAN EXPLANATION.

G. Bernard Shaw writes, in a private letter to the Editor, from which, with his permission, we quote the following:—"The difficulty the Anarchists are in at such conferences is that they encounter not only the hostile vote of the Social Democrats, but also the vote of those who, like the English Trade Unionists, see that they must accept the decision of each national section on its own credentials. Thus, if a German-credential is reported against by the Germans, the English cannot pretend to know any better, especially as they would fight fiercely if the Germans interfered in the question of the British credentials. There were plenty of Anarchists in the Dutch and French sections; but nobody proposed to exclude them when their credentials were passed by their own people."

[But, Mr. Shaw, the final decision as to disputed credentials was, as a matter of fact, referred to the whole Congress. If the British delegates objected to this mode of procedure in itself, they should have said so, and refrained from taking part in the matter on either side.—Ed.]

THE CONQUEST OF BREAD.

By PETER KROPOTKINE.

CHAPTER IV.—EXPROPRIATION.

II.

THE landlord owes his riches to the poverty of the peasants, and the wealth of the capitalist comes from the same source.

Take the case of a citizen of the middle class, who somehow or other finds himself in possession of £20,000. He could, of course, spend his money at the rate of £2,000 a year, a mere bagatelle in these days of fantastic, senseless luxury. But then he would have nothing left at the end of ten years. So, being a "practical person," he prefers to keep his fortune intact, and win for himself a snug little annual income as well.

That is very easy in our society, for the good reason that the towns and villages swarm with workers who have not the wherewithal to live for a month, or even a fortnight. So our worthy citizen starts a factory: the banks hasten to lend him another £20,000, especially if he has a reputation for "business ability"; and with this round sum he can command the labor of five hundred hands.

If all the men and women in the country-side had their daily bread sure and their daily needs already satisfied, who would work for our capitalist, or be willing to manufacture for him, at a wage of half-a-crown a day, commodities selling in the market for a crown or even more?

Unhappily—we know it all too well—the poor quarters of our towns and the neighbouring villages are full of needy wretches, whose children clamour for bread. So, before the factory is well finished, the workers hasten to offer themselves. Where a hundred are required a thousand besiege the doors, and from the time his mill is started the owner, if he is not more than commonly stupid, will clear £40 a year out of each mill-hand he employs.

He is thus able to lay by a snug little fortune, and if he chooses a lucrative trade, and if he has "business talents," he will increase his income by doubling the number of the men he exploits.

So he becomes a personage of importance. He can afford to give dinners to other personages, to the local magnates, the civic, legal, and political dignitaries. With his money he can "marry money," by-and-by he may pick and choose places for his children, and later on perhaps get something good from the government—a contract for the army or for the police. His gold breeds gold; till at last a war, or even a rumour of war, or a speculation on the Stock Exchange, gives him his great opportunity.

Nine-tenths of the huge fortunes made in the United States are (as Henry George has shown in his "Social Problems") the result of knavery on a large scale, assisted by the State. In Europe nine-tenths of the fortunes made in our Monarchies and Republics have the same origin. There are not two ways of becoming a millionaire.

This is the secret of wealth; find the starving and destitute, pay them half-a-crown, and make them produce ten shillings worth in the day, amass a fortune by these means, and then increase it by some lucky hit, made with the help of the State.

Need we go on to speak of small fortunes attributed by the econo-

mists to forethought and frugality, when we know that mere saving in itself brings in nothing, so long as the pence saved are not used to exploit the famishing?

Take a shoemaker, for instance. Grant that his work is well paid, that he has plenty of custom, and that by dint of strict frugality he contrives to lay by from eighteen pence to two shillings a day, perhaps £2 a month.

Grant that our shoemaker is never ill, that he does not half starve himself, in spite of his passion for economy; that he does not marry or that he has no children; that he does not die of consumption; suppose anything and everything you please!

Well, at the age of fifty he will not have scraped together £800; and he will not have enough to live on during his old age, when he is past work. Assuredly this is not how great fortunes are made. But suppose our shoemaker, as soon as he has laid by a few pence, thriftily conveys them to the savings-bank, and that the savings-bank lends them to the capitalist who is just about to "employ labor"—*i.e.*, to exploit the poor. Then our shoemaker takes an apprentice, the child of some poor wretch who will think himself lucky if in five years time his son has learned the trade and is able to earn his living.

Meanwhile our shoemaker does not lose by him, and if trade is brisk he soon takes a second, and then a third apprentice. By-and-by he will take two or three journeymen—poor wretches, thankful to receive half-a-crown a day for work that is worth five shillings, and if our shoemaker is "in luck," that is to say, if he is keen enough and mean enough, his journeymen and apprentices will bring him in nearly £1 a day, over and above the product of his own toil. He can then enlarge his business. He will gradually become rich, and no longer have any need to stint himself in the necessities of life. He will leave a snug little fortune to his son.

That is what people call "being economical and having frugal, temperate habits." At bottom it is nothing more nor less than grinding the face of the poor.

Commerce seems an exception to this rule. "Such a man," we are told, "buys tea in China, brings it to France and realises a profit of thirty per cent. on his original outlay. He has exploited nobody."

Nevertheless, the case is analogous. If our merchant had carried his bales on his back well and good! In early medieval times that was exactly how foreign trade was conducted, and so no one reached such giddy heights of fortune as in our days. Very few and very hardly earned were the gold coins which the medieval merchant gained from a long and dangerous voyage. It was less the love of money than the thirst of travel and adventure that inspired his undertakings.

Now-a-days the method is simpler. A merchant who has some capital need not stir from his desk to become wealthy. He telegraphs to an agent telling him to buy a hundred tons of tea, he freights a ship and in a few weeks, in three months, if it is a sailing ship, the vessel brings him his cargo. He does not even take the risks of the voyage, for his tea and his vessel are insured, and if he has expended four thousand pounds he will receive more than five thousand; that is to say, if he has not attempted to speculate in some novel commodities, in which case he runs a chance of either doubling his fortune or losing it altogether.

Now, how could he find men willing to cross the sea, to travel to China and back, to endure hardship and slavish toil and to risk their lives for a miserable pittance? How could he find dock-laborers willing to load and unload his ships for "starvation wages?" How? Because they are needy and starving. Go to the sea-ports, visit the cook-shops and taverns on the quays, and look at these men who have come to hire themselves crowding round the dock-gates, which they besiege from early dawn, hoping to be allowed to work on the vessels. Look at these sailors, happy to be hired for a long voyage, after weeks and months of waiting. All their lives long they have gone down to the sea in ships, and they will sail in others still, until the day when they perish in the waves.

Enter their cabins, look at their wives and children in rags, living one knows not how till the father's return, and you will have the answer to the question. Multiply examples, choose them where you will, consider the origin of all fortunes, large or small, whether arising out of commerce, finance, manufactures, or the land. Everywhere you will find that the wealth of the wealthy springs from the poverty of the poor. An Anarchist society need not fear the advent of an unknown Rothschild who would seek to settle in its midst. If every member of the community knows that after a few hours of productive toil he will have a right to all the pleasures that civilisation procures, and to those deeper sources of enjoyment which art and science offer to all who seek them, he will not sell his strength for a starvation wage. No one will volunteer to work for the enrichment of your Rothschild. His golden guineas will be only so many pieces of metal—useful for various purposes, but incapable of breeding more.

In answering the above objection we have at the same time indicated the scope of Expropriation. It must extend to all that permits any one, no matter whom—financier, mill-owner, or landlord—to appropriate the product of others' toil. Our formula is simple and comprehensive.

We do not want to rob any one of his coat, but we wish to give to the workers all those things the lack of which makes them fall an easy prey to the exploiter, and we will do our utmost that none shall lack aught, that not a single man shall be forced to sell the strength of his right arm to obtain a bare subsistence for himself and his babes. That is what we mean when we talk of Expropriation; that will be our duty during the Revolution, for whose coming we look, not two hundred years hence, but soon, very soon.

Mr. Auberon Herbert's "Voluntary State."

(Continued.)

- (7.) "Local Government. . . . The important point is that no local authority appointed to manage common property should have any right over private property. If any owner of private property injures . . . the property of another person, as for example by allowing his sewage to affect the soil of such person, he must be restrained by the action of the ordinary courts. Such acts . . . must not be made an excuse for confounding the rights of private owners in managing their own property and the rights of public authorities in managing common property. . . . Over public property—which must only be acquired in the same equitable manner as private property, by gift or by sale—the managers appointed by the public must have full authority; over private property they must have no authority."

Here we seem to have one rule proposed for No. 1—that is, for His Almighty Majesty, the private owner—and a precisely opposite rule for Nos. 12, 100 or 1000, who own property in common. *Government by their own servants*, for people who jointly "own" property. Their property is to be under the authority of the "managers appointed by the public." For the private proprietor, on the other hand, *no government at all*, least of all the authority of his servants—the bailiffs, agents, what not—appointed by him to manage his property. Of course I shall be told that it is necessary to be practical, and not quibble at apparent discrepancies: for how could private property be properly managed except by the individual, part of whose working individuality his goods are supposed to be? although when the property part of a man's working individuality is very big it becomes somehow needful to have other individuals, disconnected with the goods, to do the managing as *their* wills do not direct. Yet, contrariwise, how could public property be managed by the actual individuals owning it jointly? They are too many, and there is a will and a right of ownership to every man-jack of them; they must have proxies, fewer in number, to represent them; that is, to act independently of any one of them or of any minority of them. So we see that private owning means despotism unalloyed, while common owning means mob-rule so far as it is not officialism, and officialism so far as it is not mob rule.

But, to me, the significant point in the paragraph about Local Government is that parenthesis which I have above italicised. Quite by the way, Mr. Herbert divulges his idea of what constitutes an equitable title to property and its privileges; and the ethical dusk in which the property-ridden mind habitually moves becomes once more evident. The root question which underlies the whole position is begged—nay, stolen off-hand in that parenthesis; and on we go as if nothing had happened. "Private property is" then, in existing society, acquired "in an equitable manner"? Ye crowns and periwigs! And this equitable manner is "by gift and sale." (Note that in these last words it is once more the will of His Almighty Majesty the "owner" which is alone considered. It is not my own act of purchase or acceptance which gives me a right to my pound of tea, or my pig in a poke. It is His Almighty Majesty's "gift" or "sale" by which I do the acquiring. This is a trifle, but it is a tell-tale straw on the propertyist current of thought all the same.)

As to sale, I bethink me instantly of the little boy who, on hearing that property in the soil is acquired by purchase, asked his father whether the first owner bought it from God? We know that those who undertake the tricky task of defending the existing "rights of property" cannot afford to think of first owners, or to ask or answer questions about any previous owners at all; they have to fall back upon the term "gift," so construed as to include *bequest*, and somehow even *inheritance*. At no step of the factitious reasoning is there moral space for standing upright in. Mr. Herbert gives no sign that he considers productive or constructive industry any title to ownership. Still less is urgent need a title. The property owner's *will* is the single road along which starving humanity (though it be the humanity of a genius or a saint) may travel towards the necessary loaf. Mr. Herbert, in sketching his State, ignores the sole agency to which the institution "property" owes its existence—individual grab *plus* public concession. This was, is and will be property's only demonstrable title, whatever number of theoretical justifications special pleaders may invent. *Individual grab* and the concession of those who, either through indifference or fear, found it their policy then and there to "let be." With the withdrawal of this concession the *quasi* title of present owners to custody of property falls to pieces. No "right" to it has ever been acquired, nor in the nature of things could be. It is from hour to hour a purely provisional and conventional concession, which changing human conditions are rendering obviously preposterous, and already it is being more and more widely and distinctly disallowed. A like public concession, however, regarding a new set of owners would have no more ethical significance than the ancient one. As Anarchists let us bear in mind that *private property as an institution* should be swept out of existence, and that *common property* is, in the last resort, a contradiction in terms.

Re sale. Sale cannot mean any acquisition of property at all. It is only a change in the form of property already held. What is acquired by purchase is something to balance the yielding up of some other thing of the same nominal value. If you have made the equitable exchange you are supposed to make, you have acquired no increased custody of the community's ways and means, no access of "property" (which always implies such custody) by the transaction. The only man who

acquires property by purchase is the profit-monger, the mercenary, the man who extorts more than he yields. Will Mr. Herbert call him equitable too? Of course this is what the property owner habitually and despotically does, as regards the property-less; the result being the steady increase in the number of distressed citizens, side by side with the increase in the total wealth of the community. Strange that equity should yield such queer statistics.

As regards gift, the distribution of goods or of opportunities effected by gift may in single instances be either apparently equitable or obviously the reverse; the chances being each time hundreds to one against equity. For all depends on the degree of disinterested impartiality, as well as on the degree of human insight into actual needs possessed by the giver. But to call gift *as* gift "equitable," with no regard to the giver's title to what he gives or the recipient's need of what he receives is to dogmatically impose the whole principle of ownership; and is from a social and moral point of view once more preposterous. I even venture to repudiate any compromises under the name of "relative justice." For you cannot have a relatively just application of a radically unjust principle.

Lastly: *Administration of Justice.* In this paragraph Mr. Herbert foretells

"an immense simplification of the civil and criminal code . . . in criminal cases by the sweeping away of the many offences with which it has been the modern fashion to fill the statute book. The State would recognise its moral incompetence to deal with vice or folly, or to protect human beings against themselves; and all the odious punishments connected with Education Acts, or Factory Acts, with Acts intended to repress betting, gambling, drinking, and other unlovely habits would disappear Some much less brutal and less stupid form of punishment for slight offences than imprisonment would be employed."

With this Anarchists have no fault to find, as far as it goes. Only of course we would go very much further, and, disbelieving wholly in the statute book as serving any good purpose at all, or in the utility of "punishment" as such, we would try the effect of complete freedom from public regulation for everybody, leaving individuals to settle their own disputes privately; and forbidding no individuals or groups of friends to protect themselves or one another, in cases of aggression, as each should think best. For no two persons and no two cases of offence are ever sufficiently alike for a like mode of action to be fair in each instance.

(To be concluded.)

L. S. B.

No Rent.

FREDERIC GOULDING, of Stratford, has been having some exciting experiences. Goulding, who loves to call himself "the Stratford Anarchist," has a rooted objection to the payment of rent; and did actually avoid paying any for over eighteen months. But on April 24th, two policemen and an agent of the landlord of 9 Angel-place came along prepared to evict this refractory tenant. Goulding, assisted by his wife and family, offered as stubborn a resistance as was possible in so frail a tenement, but eventually an entrance was forced from the back and the family expelled from the front. Their belongings speedily followed, and our comrade found himself in the street; shelterless, and with night near at hand. Now appears one of the saddest features of the whole melancholy business. A large crowd had of course assembled, to whom Goulding endeavoured to make known the reasons for his actions, and something of Anarchist principles. To this end he gave away a number of *Commonweals*, *Freedoms* and leaflets; but the mob took advantage of this good nature to help themselves, and even went so far as to smash what they could not remove. Consequently, he lost many articles of furniture, a number of books, and many of the tools by which he earns his bread. The list of books stolen is worth giving, as indicating what manner of man he is. They were:—histories of Ireland, of the French Revolution, of the Commune of Paris, of America, of the Roman Empire, and of the Anti-vaccination movement; the Letters of John Bright, Life of C. Bradlaugh, The Rights of Man, the works of Shakespeare, Scott, Burns and Byron, besides various magazines and a manuscript Autobiography. On attempting to find a fresh lodging, Goulding found himself severely hampered by the action of the crowd, which persistently followed him from street to street, until at one time it seemed likely that his lodging for that night at least would be upon the cold ground. Happily, this was averted, but a few days later, being unable to get work, and having no money left, Goulding took a board from a building as firewood for his wife's use; and having characteristically left his name and address behind, he was promptly sent to Pentonville for seven days. It is needless to say that his wife and children suffered greatly; but their troubles were bravely borne, and Goulding's determination to pay no rent is not in the least shaken. "A born rebel," said one comrade, after a personal interview.

Some of the stolen tools, we believe, were afterwards recovered; but any wealthy Anarchist might do worse than endeavour to save, in a practical way, some of the hurts sustained by this revolutionary family. During Goulding's imprisonment 14 comrades (not wealthy) managed to make up 16s. in small amounts to help his wife.

Since the above account reached us Goulding has again been evicted, this time without resistance. Considering, however, that only two of his children, aged respectively 6 years and 2 months, were at home at the time, their peaceable exit can hardly involve any discredit to Goul-

ding. This makes six evictions in less than two years, at a total money cost in deposits on account of rent of nine shillings. H. C.

ORGANISED LABOR COLUMN.

[We shall be glad to insert under this heading communications and reports from all comrades engaged in the Anarchist propaganda among Trade Unions.]

ANARCHISM IN TRADE AND LABOR UNIONS.

To the Editor of FREEDOM.

Dear Comrade,—Our protest against the threatened State Socialist tyranny at Zürich has been justified by events. Evidently, even freedom of thought and speech would be denied us under a Social Democratic State, or in any movement in which the Social Democrats became a dominant power. It is not too early to prepare for the International Congress of 1896. Middle-class cliques must not be allowed to "noble" the organised labor movement. While we had a fairly good list of signatures to the circular, published in the August issue of *Freedom*, I noticed that a dozen skilled branches of industry were unrepresented, although I know many comrades who belong to them and are at once earnest Anarchists and old and energetic members of their respective societies. It is remarkable what a hold Anarchism has secured on the members of the "old unionism" as well as the "unskilled" workers.

I should like to add a few remarks about propaganda work in organised bodies of workers. We are all, I take it, anxious to maintain the successful public propaganda of Anarchism by means of lectures, discussions, demonstrations, literature &c., but at the same time we may not, as workers, separate ourselves from our fellows who combine, however imperfectly, for the protection or advancement of their common interests. Not only does the non-unionist and the "blackleg" sacrifice more of their manhood than their organised brethren in their personal relations with employers, but should Anarchists become non-unionists and "blacklegs" under the foolish impression that to be such is "free labor," it will have the effect of retarding the practical acceptance of Anarchism by the working class as a whole. At the least such conduct on the part of Anarchists would set the best section of the workers against them; and, indeed, I claim that the unionists who take the trouble to think, speak and organise for the improvement of economical conditions are the best material for our own movement.

I should like to ask all who object to Anarchist workers taking interest and active part in trade and labor organisations, why we should leave the management of our societies to reactionary minorities, who, in many cases, are constantly at variance with the bulk of their members? More than that, why should these bodies become mere political caucuses when the workers exhibit so many Anarchistic tendencies? Is it not possible that the narrow aims, exclusive methods and the authoritarian character of the organised labor movement can be abolished? To give a negative answer to the latter question would imply to me that the workers are incapable of comprehending the principles of Anarchy, which is absurd. To work actively in the labor movement will not set us in antagonism with six millions of the working classes of Great Britain as a rule, as in the cases of the dockers, railwaymen, Lancashire cotton operatives, miners, tailors, shoemakers, &c., &c., the unions received the active sympathy and support of unorganised workpeople. It is a small minority which upholds blacklegism. I do not regret temporary hostility to them (except in so far that the system which produces them is not abolished) because, to my mind, not even "the whip of the stomach" is sufficient excuse for their attack upon those, who, generally speaking, are revolting against slavery and injustice. We are told that as lovers of freedom we should uphold freedom of contract when men refuse to work on certain terms. But where is the "freedom" of contract between an exploiter of labor and a traitorous wage-slave? Is freedom of contract between worker and capitalist possible under the present system of society?

To return to the main question, Anarchists need not leave the ordinary propaganda, and are not justified in concealing their identity, or supporting anything opposed to their principles though their trade societies. Whatever fate other folks who talk of "leading the blind masses" may have met with, it has no significance to those who do not wish to become "leaders," or desire personal aggrandisement or power, but wish to build up a free unity of workers, opposed to wage-slavery, monopoly and government. Perhaps it will be said that to do this we have to destroy much evil which exists. Granted; but in changing the character of these organisations we are converting the people who belong to them. At least we dip our nets with good chances of hauling in some very good fish. Has it not been proved that in those countries where this policy has not been carried out Anarchists find themselves cut off from the main body of their fellow-workers? Can we not, inside our trade organisations, oppose all attempts to strengthen the belief and tendency of the workers in a parliamentary direction, and drive home the necessity for the complete overthrow of the commercialist system of society? I submit too that we can do good by advocating the expropriation of the propertied classes by the union of labor. What a splendid stroke the miners could have struck had this idea been widely propagated amongst them!

Trade Unionists are recognising the failure of their old policy. Even when victorious in an open struggle with the capitalists it is seen that the latter discover some method of minimising the concessions they are forced to make, and to take back with one hand what they gave with the other. The failure of sectional strikes on present lines (i.e. starvation and moderation) has been shown conclusively by events at South London, Durham, Lancashire, Hull and elsewhere, and is being used by the newer set of political tricksters to turn the workers' movement into the loathsome political channel, as futile for good as the methods of the "old unionism," perhaps more so; they only try to make out that parliamentary humbug is better than organised self-help. It is for us to pioneer the way to a general strike against idleness and legal robbery. Now that Anarchism has spread amongst workers in so many parts of the country, some effort should be made towards directing the enormous strength of the trade and labor organisations against the very existence of capitalism and government.

Yours for Anarchist Communism

Leicester.

GEORGE CORES.

A MANIFESTO TO THE LOCKED-OUT MINERS

has been issued by the Freedom Group and another by the Manchester Communist Anarchist Group. The aim of both is to point out that strikes should be as general as possible, that their avowed aim should be the expropriation of the capitalists in favor of the voluntary associations of workers, and that the active attack of the monopolists on their wage-slaves should be met by active resistance, not merely by the passive starvation policy, which has so often ended in defeat.

ANARCHIST FUND FOR LOCKED-OUT MINERS.

It is proposed to raise an Anarchist strike fund to aid the locked-out miners. Contributions should be sent to Alfred Marsh, Hon. Treasurer, 3, Alpha Villas, Archway-road, Highgate, N., who will supply collecting lists and acknowledge sums received in *Freedom*.—Already received: A. M. (two weeks), 5s.; W., 5s.; J. P., 1s.; W. W. (two weeks), 1s.; collection at "Workers' Friend" Benefit Concert, Athenaeum Hall, 6s. 9d.; collection per A. M., 4s. Two previous collections from comrades in the East End and one from *Freedom* office acknowledged in the *Star* for Sept. 18.

THE PROPAGANDA.

REPORTS.

LONDON—

Ossulton-street.—This station is a very old one, but was neglected for some time. Some good meetings have been held here lately, marked with success in every possible way; generally there is quite a crowd waiting for the meetings to begin, and while the speaking is going on very great attention is paid. The speakers have been, J. Turner, Cantwell, Presberg, Clarke, MacQueen, Gundersen Junr and Macdonald.

Chelsea Embankment.—The Social Democrats in this district have challenged everybody in and about Chelsea to debate Social Democracy by issuing a leaflet and advertising in the local journal. Comrades Samuels and Presberg went down to the dreary embankment to hold a meeting on Monday, August 6; for Samuels having been a former resident of Chelsea had determined to accept the challenge. We had a very fair and attentive crowd during the whole of the meeting, which lasted one hour and a half. Samuels pointed out that the Anarchists were really the only Socialists, and that those styling themselves Social Democrats were not Socialists, but mere politicians. When the meeting closed we let the people understand that we intended to come down every Monday night. Meanwhile Samuels wrote to the Social Democrats and to the local papers accepting the challenge.

Tottenham.—Saturday, August 12th, meetings began here. A very large audience listened for some time to comrades Presberg and Quinn. Some slight opposition offered by a man who boasted of working 20 hours a day and having a "quid" in his pocket on Saturday night; to which Presberg replied. Quinn then spoke and afterwards indulged in a private discussion with our friend, who still boasted of working 20 hours a day. But in the end the fellow invited Quinn home to have supper and declared himself an Anarchist.—Sunday, August 13th, meeting in the morning; good audience, very attentive, and fair sale of literature.—Saturday, August 19th, good meeting in the evening; very large audience, very interested and attentive. Speakers, McQueen, Banham, Quinn, Young and Presberg. Some opposition offered by a Social Democrat and a stranger. Presberg replied, and, judging by the audience, replied very well. Our Social Democratic friend asked the following ridiculous question: "If you do not believe in force, how was it then that the Chicago Anarchists were hanged for throwing bombs?" Now, this just shows how much the Social Democrats follow events. They accept things as their gods present them, and anything different must certainly be incorrect. Presberg pointed out to them the late release of those Chicago comrades who were alive, explained the details of the case and showed how these noble men were hanged and the other 3 imprisoned simply for being Anarchists. The question put by the stranger was, "If you do not believe in government, how can you believe in organisation, as government meant organised action," to which Presberg replied that the organisation of government was an assemblage of men to impose certain laws and regulations upon other men, having power to punish if not obeyed, which meant force and tyranny, while the organisation of our belief was simply the meeting together of people to discuss ideas so as to come to practical conclusions. In short, free agreement of people, without government tyranny. Quinn next answered some of the questions, and the discussion continued until midnight.—Sunday, August 20th, in the morning good meeting. We are quite notorious now in this district, and on this occasion when we began the whole of the audiences composing the meeting of the Christian and temperance advocates left them and came to listen to us. Good sale of literature, and requests from the audience to continue our meetings. Speakers, Young and Presberg. We have made two declared converts, one of them a newsagent, who has taken the *Weal, Freedom* and pamphlets for sale.—The Saturday night meetings at Enfield have been discontinued, as the distance is too great for most comrades.

Edmonton.—Good meetings have been held here every Sunday evening during the last month. July 30th, good meeting; speakers being Cantwell and Clarke; very good sale of literature.—August 6th, very good meeting, opened by Galbraith, followed by Cantwell, Presberg and Clarke; some opposition by Social Democrats who came to oppose. It is a pity they could not make a better show, their strongest arguments were, Who is going to do the dirty work? and What if a lot of men break shop windows and commit criminal acts?—and questions of like nature. The Social Democrats were asked what they were going to do with these people. They would punish them, but not send them to prison—they were not going to have any of these things; yet they are going to have government. Riddle—how is government going to exist if there be no police or military to enforce the law? Eventually, we discovered the law of Social Democracy is to be different to the law of to-day. But how? Cantwell and Clarke took part in replying.

Hoxton Church.—This station, one of the oldest for Socialist meetings in London, "has been infested with Anarchists lately"; so said one of the audience in a meeting at which Turner spoke. Turner has been carrying on an active propaganda here. He has become quite popular; while the poor S.D.F., who have been continually meeting there for years cannot get an audience now, and the poor I.L.P. the same. People are more interested in Anarchism, and owing to this fact the Social Democrats have been continually offering opposition; but, alas! Turner is one too many for them. At last they said they had found a man to lick Turner. So on Tuesday, August 22nd, at Hoxton Church, a debate took place between Turner and one Arnold. Poor Arnold, I was really sorry for him. Such a licking I have never yet seen or heard a man receive! The poor democrats were tearing the hair from their heads, and tried to make a collection, but that too was hopeless. The audience was quite Anarchistic, and Turner was repeatedly asked not to fail to be at the Church next Sunday.—J. P.

Peckham.—Good meetings, followed by interesting discussions, have been held during the past month at Peckham Park-road on Thursdays and Sundays. Our Saturday evening meetings at Commercial-road we have had to abandon, owing to the four-ale opposition we have there had to contend with. We have also shifted our Sunday morning meetings from Peckham Park-road to the Triangle, Peckham Rye, where we get larger audiences. Sunday, August 5th, Comrade Atterbury addressed a good meeting. August 9th, Forrester, of the S.D.F., opened and Banham followed with a good address; slight opposition from a friend, who said he agreed with our principles but not our methods. August 12th, Comrade Mitchell assisted. Aug. 16th, large meeting at Peckham Park-rd. from 8.30 to 10.30, Banham introducing and Quinn lecturing; courteous opposition from a Christian, to which Comrade Quinn effectively replied. When the meeting closed a noisy discussion arose, and at that moment 3 or 4 police and a sergeant arrived on the scene and rudely dispersed the crowd, ordering everybody to move on, and desiring to know where the disorderly Anarchists were. The crowd, of course, dispersed. The police followed Quinn and Banham, threatening to take them in charge if they did not move a little quicker. When they followed no longer, Quinn went back and requested to be arrested as a disorderly character; but this they declined to do. He then took the numbers, L 6 and P 408, and went round to the police station and requested the inspector there to keep his men in order.—Sunday, Aug. 19th, we re-started on the Triangle, when Comrade Cantwell, assisted by Banham, addressed the meeting; opposition from a Social Democrat, who wanted to know, if the capitalists used Parliament to further their own ends, why the workers could not utilise it in their own interests.—Thursday, Aug. 24th, large and sympathetic crowd, Banham opening,

followed by Presberg, who made a telling speech; slight opposition, to which Comrade Presberg gave a crushing reply; Comrade Quinn then followed.—Local comrades are requested to turn up at the meetings regularly, so as to give the speakers encouragement.—W. H. & C. T. Q.

London Fields.—Saturday, 26th August, in the evening, a meeting was held here by Banham and Quinn. This is a new spot, and we think it may be worth while to speak here in opposition to the Social Democrats.

Victoria Park.—Sunday, July 30th, meeting from nearly 3 till 9 o'clock, when the Park shuts up; 6 continuous hours. The platform was mounted thirteen times. The speakers were Quinn, Banham, 3 opponents, one of them H. Davis (Individualist Anarchist) and Leggatt, who spoke for nearly two hours. Probably 3000 people came and went during the various addresses. Our first opponent claimed that Anarchists were necessarily murderers of the deepest dye, and instanced Ravachol and Berckman. Banham pointed out the causes that led them to act as they did, and claimed that their actions were justified by the attendant circumstances. The crowd during this explanation was very noisy and threatening, and apparently in favor of our opponent, who again mounted the platform, but remained upon it so long that the meeting turned against his unfairness and howled him down. Quinn answered this opponent too coolly for the more rowdy section of the meeting and it immediately retired. Davis then opposed, but contented himself with merely endeavouring to tear up the position of Anarchist Communism. He did not believe in military rule of any kind. He believed in mutual agreement to settle all matters, but did not believe it was possible it should ever come about, and that free competition, which should be the basis of society, meant after all that every person was to receive exactly as he produced. Quinn answered by saying that if Davis did not believe in police-manism or militarism and did believe in mutual agreement he was practically an Anarchist Communist, for if free competition merely meant getting an equivalent for what you produced there was really no competition in it at all; but it was impossible to get an exact return for what you produce, and no one could prove that any person had a right to claim even whatever he had himself produced. Nature had given man wants and meant that he should satisfy those wants in a true way when, how and where he could. Comrade Leggatt, as usual, held a very large crowd together for hours. Altogether, a most successful meeting, and we believe that more meetings of this description would do a great deal of good.—Sunday, August 20th, meeting held by Leggatt and Mowbray in the morning. The attendance was large and the literature sold well. The meetings were held for quite an hour and a half, but there was no opposition forthcoming. On both occasions the audiences were greatly sympathetic. In the evening Leggatt spoke, till he was compelled to desist. There is not the slightest doubt that this park would repay working up better than any other park in London; but for this to be done thoroughly it requires more speakers, and we should be glad if any comrade would volunteer to give us help in this quarter.

Clerkenwell Green.—Sunday, 13th August, in the evening a meeting was held here by Comrades Presberg, Turner, McQueen, Quinn and Banham, lasting from about 7 till past 11 o'clock. Good work was done. One person came forward and said that after having listened to Turner and the other speakers, though he had been a Social Democrat when the meeting started, he was now an Anarchist. As usual, the police were in full force to keep us in order, but I am sorry to say that once during the meeting they forgot their dignity (if they have any) and tried to howl down one of the speakers, who was using the words "defence," "police" and "dynamite" rather freely. Altogether, a very good meeting.—The meetings on subsequent Sundays were kept up by Comrades Merlino, Turner, Gunderson, McQueen and others, which were well attended and successful, without exception.—C. T. Q.

Hyde Park.—Good meetings have been held in Hyde Park. Comrade Marshall (Manchester) addressed a large meeting July 30th, and was followed by Comrade Barker, who had some opposition from a Liberal canvasser, to which Barker ably replied. More opposition from an individual who said that co-operation and improved legislation were the only means of obtaining our ends. Barker, in his reply, said there were no good laws, and pointed out the foolishness of wasting time over co-operation, which would come naturally. Tochatti went on and said that the curse of present co-operative societies was that they were nothing more than limited liability companies, paying a dividend to share holders. G. J. Holyoake had admitted, in a discussion with Tochatti, that productive co-operation was of the greatest importance, and he (the speaker) contended that with the abolition of monopoly and government this would come and be Anarchism. Holyoake, like our Comrade Barker, is utterly opposed to State interference. Good sale of literature.—As there was a demonstration of the Paddington Vestry employees being held at the Reformers' Tree, we took the opportunity of holding a meeting there. Cantwell opened by saying that we were pleased to see them demanding a higher wage, and that the solution of the labor question would only come about by the workers' rebelling against starvation wages and lack of leisure. Atterbury followed, calling attention to the fact that whenever they trusted to political leaders these men ended by becoming mere wire-pullers for the political parties; when John Burns stood for Battersea he said that three things were indispensable for a labor candidate: 1st, he should be a temperance man; 2nd, a trade unionist; 3rd, a Social Democrat. And now we find John Burns using his influence to secure a seat for a middle-class man who is none of these. The speaker then gave several instances where men had been fooled by trusting their leaders, and pointed out that their masters, whether controlling municipalities, workshops, or mines, had them in their grip, and the outcome of it all was a mere subsistence wage. Tochatti then addressed them and said that we as Anarchists were only too pleased to see the vestry employees demanding a higher standard of comfort; they had object lessons in London, showing that their demands were only too moderate. Other localities were paying higher wages than what they received, and the wealth of the country was such that under the present wasteful system they had a right to their share in the shape of wages of £5 a week; a little reflection would convince them that their work was as important to the community as that of a doctor's. He asked them as men to recognise the value of their lives to themselves and to the community—seeing this, they could not fail to become Anarchists and demand a state of society in which it will be possible to realise a pleasure in living. Another meeting was held; Blundell opened by reading "Jones's Boy," which was listened to attentively by a large crowd. He was followed by Reid with a good speech that excited opposition, replied to by him. These three meetings here kept steadily going from 3.30 to 9 o'clock. Good sale of pamphlets and papers.—August 6th, three meetings were opened about 3.30 and continued until late in the evening, during which time many pamphlets and papers were disposed of. It is impossible to report all the speeches, as there were so many speakers. One meeting was opened by Gunderson, followed by Presberg, Banham, Samuels, Tochatti, Atterbury. Barker and Harrigan spoke, and had some opposition, at the second meeting. At the third, Blundell and Reid spoke to a good crowd. The meetings in the park are exciting considerable interest, and our views are gaining ground, small groups are to be seen after the meeting discussing until a late hour.—Aug. 13th, a good meeting was held; speakers, Mitchell, Gittens, Gunderson, Lawrence, Banham, Tochatti, Barker. The latter speaking only a short time, having severely taxed himself by holding meetings during the week. Tochatti spoke at some length; attentively listened to by several soldiers and sailors. Seeing this he took the opportunity to adapt his arguments to meet their case effect, at the conclusion of which the Jack Tars, 5 in number, would insist upon escorting our comrade out of the park to drink with them to the coming Revolution. Fair sale of literature and papers.—W. E.

Finsbury Park.—This is a stronghold of the Christian Evidence Society, one of whose lecturers recently so far desecrated the Sabbath as to purchase a Freedom pamphlet. It is to be hoped that the society he represents will not deal too harshly with him on account of this sinful act, as the occasion was sufficiently urgent to be classified as a "work of necessity." According to his own statement he has arranged to demolish our movement in a series of four debates with a comrade; "so," he ingenuously added, "I must now begin to look into these things." After this who can doubt the ignorance and duplicity of the wicked Anarchists? When it is added that the gentleman in question is one of the Finsbury Park favorites it may be possible to understand why progress is so slow in this quarter.

East Grinstead.—A new field of operations has been opened here. East Grinstead had not heard of Anarchism in any definite way till lately, though of course there is here, as everywhere, plenty of vague discontent with the existing system of society, and a few of our townsmen are at heart revolutionists. But these few have for the most part kept their thoughts to themselves, and meanwhile the place is a happy hunting-ground for ecclesiastics, male and female; the ladies of our local convent reigning at "mothers' meetings," and dispensing "holy" waters along with more substantial aids to subsistence to the outwardly submissive working-class women. But lately comrades G. Lawrence and Tom Reed paid us a few weeks' visit, and held some meetings at which Anarchism was expounded, the audience proving on each occasion keenly interested and largely sympathetic. Literature and hand-bills have been distributed; much conversation (at the pubs, &c.) now turns on the social question; the spirit of Anarchy is fairly alight, and we hope that, from time to time, comrades from London will pay us a visit and fan the flame.—Collier Bourn.

* * * Comrades are requested to send their reports and notices in every month on or before the 21st. Over a dozen London and provincial reports unavoidably held over for want of space.

NOTICES.

LONDON—

During August there has been such a demand for more meetings that we have opened the following new stations: Chelsea Embankment near the bridge, Mondays at 8.30 p.m. Ossulston-street, Euston-road, Thursdays at 8.30 p.m., West Green-road Corner, Tottenham, Saturdays at 8.30 p.m.—Corner of Angel-lane, Edmonton, Sunday mornings 11.30 a.m. and Sunday nights at 7.30 p.m. We intend to open more stations shortly.

The Chicago Commemoration will take place at South Place Institute on Friday, Nov. 10th, at 8.30 p.m.

Open-air meetings: Sundays, 11.30 a.m., in Hyde and Regent's and Finsbury and Victoria Parks, and Hoxton Church; 3.30 p.m., Hyde Park; 5 p.m., Clerkenwell Green; 6.30 p.m., Victoria Park; 7.30 p.m., Edmonton (Angel-lane). Thursdays, 8.30 p.m., Ossulston-street, Euston-road. Saturdays, 8 p.m., Hyde Park.

Peckham.—Sundays, 11.30, Triangle, Peckham Rye; Wednesdays, 8 p.m. Vicarage-road, Church-street, Camberwell; Thursday, 8 p.m., Peckham Park-rd

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

Special Notice.—Comrades, it is just 17 months since our brave and sincere Comrade Nicoll was sentenced to 18 months imprisonment for writing in the "Commonweal" an article which was calculated by the then authorities to be an incitement to murder, but, after all, was not any more an incitement to murder than many an article which appears in the ordinary press, especially at election time. Nicoll has borne up bravely and has shown his love and sincerity for the cause, and all comrades should show their appreciation of this by rallying round him. Let us show Nicoll when he comes out that, since his incarceration, things have been moving quicker than ever; more comrades in our ranks, more support on all hands. Welcomed when and wherever we speak, the Anarchist spirit is growing all round, and it must grow, now the seed has once been sown.

Nicoll will be sorely in need of a helping hand on his release, so it has been decided by the comrades that the best means of raising a little fund for him will be to arrange a very good concert and ball, also a public reception. The concert will take place on October 24th (Tuesday), at Grafton Hall, 55, Grafton-street Tottenham Court Road, W.; to commence at 8 o'clock sharp.—Tickets will be 6d., 1s. and 2s. each; all money taken to be presented to Nicoll as a means of making a start in some way. Comrades must not fail to turn up strong on this occasion.—On Wednesday morning, Nov. 1st, Comrade Nicoll will be received at the prison gates, and afterwards at Liverpool-street Station, to be followed by a luncheon.—On Friday, November 3rd, a public reception will be given to Nicoll at Grafton Hall, at 8 o'clock sharp, at which he will be present and speak. Admission free. All comrades should devote as much time as possible towards making both concert and reception a complete success.—J. Presberg.

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 SEPT. 1st to SEPT. 30th:—

Frank Hall, 1s.; per J. Bullas, 4s.

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

THE COMMONWEAL: A REVOLUTIONARY JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM. Fortnightly, 1d.; post free, 1½d. Address 24, Sidmouth-mews, Grays-inn-road, London, W.C.

SOLIDARITY: A FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW OF THE RELATIONS BETWEEN DIFFERENT SECTIONS OF THE WORKING COMMUNITY OF THE UNITED STATES AND AN EXPONENT OF ANARCHIST SOCIALISM. 3 cents (1½d.; post free, 2d.). P. O. Box 2611, New York; or from Freedom Office.

LA REVOLTE: ORGANE COMMUNISTE ANARCHISTE. Paraissant tous les Samedis. 10c. (1d.; post fr e, 1½d) 140 Rue Mouffetard, Paris.

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