

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. IX.—No. 98.

OCTOBER, 1895.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

THE TRADE UNION CONGRESS.

The annual Trade Union Congress held this year at Cardiff is now a part of past history. On the whole, it passed off much calmer than many anticipated. Not that anything startling or novel in the shape of revolutionary proposals was expected, but that rather a dead set for reaction was thought to be probable. Indeed, this was really attempted by the majority of the late Parliamentary Committee and, so far as the enforcement of the new standing orders upon the Congress without its consent was concerned, was successful. Nor was the pretended attempt to exclude the political fakirs of the Trade Union movement at all distasteful to us as Anarchists. On the contrary, we were delighted that it should have been brought so prominently before the whole of the organised workers; but we do most strongly resent the dictatorial policy pursued. Every impartial worker must also object to the exclusion of the delegates from Trade Councils, since it is only through these that the smaller societies can hope to get their grievances heard. Dual representation had previously been prevented, and the application of the same qualification for their delegates as for those direct from societies would have effectively prevented any but real workers getting into the Congress by this road.

We cannot help thinking then that this proves that there were motives at work, not altogether pure, which prompted the Parliamentary Committee to take the steps it did. The defection of the Durham and Northumberland miners, the threatened withdrawal of the boiler-makers, together with the recent political defeat of so many of the old Labor men, bound up as they were with the fortunes of the Liberal party, impelled them to do something for the purpose of regaining the temporary lost confidence of the small middle class who had backed them politically in the past when they thought there was nothing to fear in the Labor movement, but who were the first to show their timidity as soon as the workpeople began to break from the traditions of days gone by.

The Liberal Labor address of the President was almost as poor as the one of the year before at Norwich, at least so far as a broad and clear survey of the present industrial position of the workers was concerned, and as for any conception of the future there was an utter void.

We can quite understand his being appointed a J.P., and being also a member of the Cardiff Town Council, and can fully believe him capable of enforcing the law—the legal right to rob Labor—as energetically as any of the plundering class, and, worst of all, conscientiously believing he is adding to the “dignity” of labor in so doing.

The excuse made for the altered form of voting is also of the most shallow kind. The big societies—those who can afford to send the most delegates—can now merely pay their affiliation fees for as many thousands as their societies contain, and yet send only one or two delegates who will have an altogether disproportionate power in deciding the fate of any resolution that is discussed at the Congress. And yet it is in the name of proportional representation that this dangerous alteration was made in the Standing Orders!

And now, passing from the purely technical to a general view, what can we make of the result of the discussions? As we said before, nothing startling was to be discussed. The only fresh idea was the resolution by the Amalgamated Society of Tailors for a general strike to enforce the eight-hour day if the Government declined to act in the matter.

Whether this got merged in the resolution about the legal eight-hour day or not, we have been unable to make out from the reports, but there seems to have been no separate discussion of this idea. The mere fact of this resolution being sent in, however, together with the ruling out on a point of order of the attempt to rescind the Collectivist resolution, especially after it became known that the delegates of the Miners' Federation were about equally divided on the matter, shows that the Congress, despite all the efforts of the reactionary members of the old Parliamentary Committee, has really gone forward though very slightly, and the efforts to throw it back have failed. It also shows that at least some of the organised workers are getting tired of waiting for the politicians to improve their condition and are thinking of doing something for themselves, an idea which every one of us must encourage as much as possible since, as has been pointed out so often, until they do little will be effected.

The discussion on the Federation scheme was disappointing, and one can not help feeling that here again the big societies, feeling their own power and thinking that any scheme of federation might hamper rather than help, voted against the proposed scheme not altogether on its merits but because of a general mistrust of it; and yet the suggested scheme like the whole of the Trade Union movement was very Anarch-

ical in character, it was to be voluntary, to be managed and worked from within the societies themselves, not to be bossed from without; but it was rejected through the vague fear that it might develop into a centralising power which would act as a drag upon the initiative of the various societies. And, after all, we cannot help feeling that there is some ground for this instinctive dread, and while in favor of anything which would help the solidarity of the workers, we feel it must be the outcome of a natural growth of the idea of unity rather than any particular scheme foisted upon the Unions even if it should secure the approval of some future Congress.

Most of the resolutions were very old chestnuts; many affecting only particular trades and callings and, had there been any government in power that really desired to palliate the present dangerous condition of industry, would have been passed into law long since, as they in no way affect the principle of the exploitation of labor now paramount in society or challenge in the least the right of the capitalist to both rule and rob the workpeople.

The result of the election to the Parliamentary Committee was a fair reflection of the Congress as ruled by the new standing orders, and and there is nothing to warrant us in expecting very much from it during the following twelve months. In fact the whole Trade Union movement in England just now would be well described as marking time. The miners, despite their organisation, dread the expiration of the two years truce effected by the Rosebery conciliation; especially since they see the mountains of coal at the pit's bank growing bigger and bigger, and can see the proprietors drawing closer and closer together for some concerted action in favor of a reduction of wages as soon as the first opportunity presents itself.

And the textile operatives—the best organised of any section of the workers—see the prospect of the home cotton trade declining through the competition of the East, where our shoddy civilisation is beginning to make itself felt and hopes of a better chance of exploiting the natives in the absence of any organisation rise buoyant in the capitalist breast; and yet they allow themselves to be hoodwinked by their officials and are half inclined to throw themselves on the side of the bi-metallic fad in the hope that if prices advance and profits rise they will be able to secure a part of the plunder.

As to the New Unionism it is already almost a spent force, as proved at this Congress, and although Will Thorne danced agilely to the tune played by Dr. Aveling, even to the extent of having a dig at us Anarchists over next year's International Congress, it becomes more and more apparent that constitutional politics and Trade Union action are a bad mixture at the best, and that, after all, us wicked Anarchists have correctly gauged the situation when we have pointed out that the open revolt of Labor is the only way of salvation. It may thus safely be said of the Congress that it was anxious for some trimming and, at its best, stood on the defensive; while, if there was the slightest move forward, such as the resolution of the tailors, its ventilation was burked.

The discussion on the anti-alien resolution also showed that the labor movement is gradually growing out of some of its old prejudices; for although it was again carried it was only by a slender majority and, singular to say, when the vote was challenged and a vote by card taken it was still smaller. This looks as if, in time, the boot and shoe operatives will be left stranded in this matter.

Taken altogether one may safely say the anticipated break up of the Trade Union Congress has not come off as some capitalist papers—the wish being father to the thought—had prophesied. The action of the Parliamentary Committee has helped the idea that has been growing for some years now that it is not worth the money spent on it, that it is really reactionary in spirit and taints everything it touches with its own complaint. In fact it becomes clearer every year that one of two things will have to be done: either abolish altogether the Parliamentary Committee as now constituted and replace it by a permanent committee who shall look after the *whole* of the interests of the Trade Union movement outside Parliament even more than inside, or else as a counterpoise have a propaganda committee whose duty it shall be to do this work now altogether neglected. Should this be done the organised labor movement would have a chance of waking from the slow, sleepy methods of the past, and a policy of “rest and be thankful” would be almost impossible in the future.

The Trade Union movement in England has advanced so rapidly in ideas during the last ten years that some change in both its methods and machinery is now inevitable. The political spurt given it by the New Union movement of five years ago has not accomplished what its advocates claimed for it and the ground is being cleared for an Anarchist element to step in and, picking up the revolutionary traditions of the older unions purged of their sectional and economical mistakes, show

the way for putting into practice the newer ideas they have assimilated. That the standing orders now in force will be again altered there is not the least doubt. The Trade Councils of the country are too numerous and too important to be permanently excluded. The London Trades Council has been charged with calling a conference of the Councils for the purpose of concerting measures to regain entrance to the Congress and, doubtless, they will have the support of many if not all the unions affiliated to them.

The cry of "proportional representation" is likely to go further than some of its pretended advocates anticipated. Questions to be discussed at the Congress will have to be discussed in the various societies beforehand; and even then if there is a difference of opinion the members will claim proportional representation. Thus the London Society of Composers delegates to have voted by proportional representation should have given seven votes against and six for the Collectivist resolution. But they seem to have relied on the majority vote of their members to cast all their votes for reaction. What will the minorities—large minorities in such societies as this—say to their being used against themselves? Proportional representation all round! will be the cry; this will lead to their full number of delegates being sent and with the help of the smaller societies the conservatives are likely to be hoist with their own petard, and out of intended evil good may come.

The Cardiff Congress has at least proved that the purely working-class organisations cannot go back. Economic evolution would push them on in spite of themselves, and when this is assisted by the growth of fresh ideas, when the very system that creates classes and with it all the antagonism in society is being openly challenged by those who suffer most from it, it is quite time that Anarchists everywhere should speak with no uncertain voice the truth that is in them. Delegates with Anarchist ideas were very few and very feeble and were altogether boycotted by the London press. But so were the advocates of Social Democracy only a few years back. Every Congress will give us better opportunities and comrades everywhere must see to it that no chance is missed to make clear to their fellow workers inside their unions that any hope of the emancipation of labor along the old lines is altogether hopeless; that it is not only organisation that is wanted, but a clear perception of the fact that the monopoly of landlord and capitalist must go and with it political power; that there must be courage on the part of the workers, not merely to strike for better conditions under Capitalism, but to be prepared to repudiate it and all its works and shoulder all the responsibilities that such a change would entail.

If these ideas are pushed as they should be the training obtained by the workers in their own trade organisations will stand them in good stead whenever they should decide to take action. To teach them to rely upon themselves instead of upon the government, to prove to them the absolute necessity of an economic revolution in industry;—this is the work we have to do.

The Cardiff Congress just closed has not accomplished much; it should be ours to see that future ones go ahead. Anarchist ideas are growing apace; let us see to it that they are pushed home in the right places—in every assembly of the workers.

J. TURNER.

The International Socialist Workers Congress.

AN ANARCHIST MANIFESTO.

At a conference of Anarchist-Communists of all nation alities it has been decided to issue the following manifesto:—

FELLOW WORKERS—As you are probably aware "The International Socialist Workers' and Trades-Union Congress" meets next year in London. A committee of twelve, consisting of six members elected by the last congress and six appointed by the Parliamentary committee of the Trades-Union congress, has been entrusted with the preliminary arrangements for the congress. This committee has issued invitations to all Trades-Unions and to all Socialist organizations that believe in and advocate political action to participate in the congress. No invitations have been issued to any organization of workers, other than Trades-Union, that is known to object to the principle of political action, and particular care has been taken to make it clear to them that it is intended to exclude them from the congress.

It is well known to you all that there are large numbers of workers in all countries, some of them organized in Trades-Unions, who ignore the principle of political action or object to it altogether. These workers, commonly known as Anarchist-Communists, faithful to the declaration of the International that "the economic emancipation of labor is the great goal to which all other political movements must be subordinated" believe that the introduction of any attempt to conquer political power, and to take possession of the means of government, far from being advantageous or useful to their cause, will only delay the day of emancipation. Experience has taught them the uselessness of voting, and they have found out to their cost that whenever one of their more active spirits, getting tired of the slow work of education, descends into the political arena and mixes up with the people who have made politics a profession, he becomes demoralised and gradually abandons the position of independence he has occupied before. At one time Socialists all the world over were agreed on that point. It is only recently, comparatively speaking, that some of them have taken up the new position of advocating parliamentary action, and, like most apostates, they pursue with undying hatred the men whose constancy to principle reminds them of their change.

The real, perhaps the only, usefulness of these International Con-

gresses lies in the opportunity they provide for the workers of different countries to meet and exchange their views. Forming a section, and by no means an unimportant section, of the working classes we cannot allow another congress to meet without protesting against any attempt to make party capital out of that which should be of benefit to the whole of the Labor world. The spirit of intolerance that we complain of first manifested itself at the Paris Congress of 1889, when the followers of Marx refused to listen to S. Merino or to allow him to move an amendment he had given notice of, and followed this up by his forcible ejection, a course of procedure which led to the secession of the greater number of the Italian and English delegates. It grew to gigantic proportions in the expulsion of all Socialists opposed to political action from the Zurich Congress, except the few who were in possession of Trades-Union credentials. It has now so entirely overpowered the reasoning faculties of the organizers of next year's congress that they refuse to recognize as eligible for admission any section of the working classes not agreeing with their views on political action.

We have no objection to a Social-Democratic congress as such, or to a congress to which only believers in political action are admitted, provided no attempt be made to claim that such a congress is representative of and speaks in the name of labor. But we object to remain silent and allow a body of political adventurers—members of Parliament, capitalists and manufacturers, journalists, professors, lawyers, shopkeepers, all politically on the make—to take credit to themselves as the only representatives of Labor and to gull the wage-slave of Capital with promises of a better time to come; promises which could never be realized if their tactics were successful, as that success would allow them to live by exploiting the worker. We claim that an International Socialist Workers' Congress should be open to workers of every shade of opinion, and we denounce as treason to the cause of Labor the attempt to exclude the Anarchists for no other reason than that their views differ from those entertained by the people who have made the bossing of these congresses a fine art.

We appeal to your sense of fair play. Only the opponents of political action, as defined by the Social Democrats, are excluded, everybody else is admitted. According to the wording of the invitation the most reactionary workman, even if the proven enemy of his class, together with the employer and exploiter of labor can sit and vote as a delegate at the congress; we alone, who have surely given sufficient proof of the sincerity of our convictions, the earnestness of our endeavors to alter the conditions of the down-trodden and wretched, are excluded because our presence would spoil the game of the party bosses and endanger their efforts to blind you in the future as they have done your brothers on the Continent in the past.

Fellow Workers, it rests with you to say whether these tactics shall be successful or not. Invitations have been sent to your Unions to take part in the congress and to appoint delegates thereto. We ask you to exercise your influence in your Union to have your delegates instructed to vote for the free admission of all. The final decision, the final responsibility, rests with the congress. The ingenious, if dishonest, attempt of the organizing committee to evade the difficulty by a carefully worded form of invitation will not be allowed to succeed. We intend to knock at the door of the congress and to assert our right to plead the cause of Labor as we understand it. Remember that this attempt to exclude us is only the thin end of the wedge. To-day it is our refusal to be drawn into political action which has brought us under the ban of these would-be politicians who try to boss us all; to-morrow some objection on your part to one or other of their notions may bring their displeasure upon you. If, to-day, you oppose this attempt to stifle our voice, if you take care that your delegates be instructed to vote for free speech and liberty for all, you will strike a blow, which, in the long run, will be beneficial not only to you but to the cause of Labor all the world over.

AN APPEAL FOR FUNDS.

The decision of the organisers of next year's International Socialist Workers Congress to exclude all who do not believe in political action provides us with an unequalled opportunity to make propaganda for our views and to expose the hollowness of the pretensions of Social Democrats to fight for the emancipation of Labor. It has been decided to spare no effort to take proper advantage of it, and the manifesto we publish above is the first outcome of our deliberations; but to circulate it properly and to carry on the multifarious work necessitated by the occasion, we require money: £30 at least. We appeal to you all to use your best endeavours to provide us with it. If individually you cannot do much, yet, by united and well-directed efforts much can be achieved. We ask you to hold meetings and devote the collections to this purpose; to ask your fellow-workmen for subscriptions; in a word, to do all that lies in your power to enable us to fight the cause of Labor. Above all, remember that time is pressing and do that which you intend to do as quickly as possible.

All remittances to be sent to O. Rossetti; other communications to F. S. Paul, at 127 Ossulston Street, London, W.C.

RECEIPTS.		EXPENDITURE.	
Aug. 30, B. K.	1 - 0 - 0	Account book, paper and envelopes	10
Collection Reg. Pk.	7 - 5 1/2	4 stereos	11 - 2
J. J. Black	6	6 reams of paper	1 - 4 - 5
Sept. 7, C Roche	1 - 0 - 0	Printing expens's	5 - 6
C. A. B. Verein	2 - 0 - 0	Postage of manifestoes	1 - 8 1/2
Regents Park	2 - 10 1/2	Stamps	8 - 0
" 21, H. Gaynor (2 subs)	1 - 0 - 0	Letters to London papers	10
" 22, A. Rossetti	2 - 6	Carriage of parcel	6
" 23, Glasgow sub.	5 - 11		
Oct. 1, Leicester	5 - 0		
		£2 - 12 - 11 1/2	
	£5 - 5 - 3	Balance in hand on date	£2 - 12 - 3 1/2
			£5 - 5 - 3

OLIVIA ROSSETTI.

THE INTERNATIONAL & ANARCHY.

II.—SOCIALIST DICTATORSHIP.

If I mistake not, among the organising committee of the next International Socialist Congress there are some victims of the *coup d'état* brought about by the Trade Union Parliamentary Committee at Cardiff.

I want to ask those victims if they approve of the Parliamentary Committee's action? Do they admit the strange and barren argument of John Burns in defence of the authoritarian action of the Committee? Do they think the Committee acted rightly in imposing its own will on the Trade Unions? I think those victims highly disapprove of the Committee's dictatorial act; and they are right in disapproving of it. All attempts to impose your own will on others will always be immoral.

And yet the Committee was benefiting Trade Unions: they endeavoured to eliminate politicians, men who did not belong to the trade, and by this means the Committee wished to reestablish the former purely workingclass character of the Trade Union Congress, with its discussions about the people's economic emancipation instead of idle talk about candidatures for the ambitious. The Committee certainly acted with good intentions. And yet all condemn their tactics; among others members of the committee of the International Socialist Congress to come.

Do these gentlemen know how far more revolting their conduct is towards Anarchists? In excluding our party from the workers' International Socialist movement they repeat the same brutal violation of the autonomy of different Socialist schools that the Parliamentary Committee enacted at the Cardiff Congress. Only, the difference is this:—At Cardiff the elements that led Trade Unionism astray from its traditional economic struggle were eliminated; while the organising committee tries to eliminate us from an International Socialist Congress because we have remained faithful to the claims of Socialism, to the glorious traditions of the International Association of workers.

As I mentioned in my preceding article, we Anarchists do not cease repeating to the people that "the economic emancipation of the workers is the main end to which all political movements must be subordinated" (General rules of the International Workers' Association). But the men who want to exclude us in the name of Socialism declare: "The struggle against class domination must be a political one, having the conquest of political power for its end." If any have the right to reserve to themselves the title of International Socialists it would evidently not be politicians of the Gambetta school with their "political struggle for the conquest of political power." It is not for them to exploit the name of the "International" and to make use of it against Anarchists, who were, during many years, the only defenders of the principles and traditions of the great Association.

But, above all, it is not for them to repeat an act of violation and usurpation that they disapprove of in the Trade Union Parliamentary Committee; and against whom? Against Anarchists, who have saved International Socialism from a stupid and immoral attempt to establish an usurping dictatorship of ambitious men who suffered from grandomania. And who were those pretenders? It is all the same to us. We do not wish to attack individuals, but false ideas and immoral pretensions. Socialists of all shades of opinion, would you believe it if you heard it said that certain groups of individuals, of no matter what nationality, aspired to an authoritative power to guide the working-class movement of the civilised world? No, decidedly not. Even admirers of discipline, of subordination and other military absurdities, even they do not dare to propose such a thing. And yet the Centralist Socialists of the International—the founders and fathers of Social Democracy endeavoured to secure a monstrous dictatorship, and tried to create a sort of Socialist Papacy. You can scarcely believe it, so monstrous does it appear nowadays. Judge for yourselves. Here are the facts:

According to the rules of the International, its general committee had purely administrative functions, and was to be used as a central office for the correspondence of the different national organisations. The council was in no way to interfere with the internal affairs of a national organisation. But little by little, at the end of four years, the council set itself up as a power that not only arrogated to itself the right of guiding workmen's organisations, but even gave orders during a revolution: while in London, it attempted to direct the movements of Socialists during the Paris Commune. A handful of strangers wanted to give orders to the heroic defenders of a town besieged by the Germans and the Versailles.

On April 3rd, 1871, the general council wrote: "Citizens, members of the Paris bureau are invited, considering the state of affairs, to send daily reports to the central committee."

Fancy asking reports from men who were writing so glorious a page in modern history with their blood. And why did they ask for reports?

"We await the result to give you our instructions" (April 9, 1871). If these men fought after the Emperor, King of Prussia, Bismarck, and others who, wishing to command, were present on the field of battle! But no, they preferred remaining in security and giving orders; and what orders? "Let the Republicans act, and don't commit yourselves to anything" (April 9). What does this mean? Paris had proclaimed the Commune on March the 18th, the people are fighting, and strangers in London send them cowardly orders that they are not to risk anything. It is more than strange. I have known honest bourgeois who have

come forward to help the fighters. I have met women of the nobility who exhausted themselves tending the wounded of the generous and heroic defenders of Paris; and here were assuming strangers sending Socialists cowardly recommendations to do nothing at all!

But the height of absurdity was reached when those same power-maniacs wanted to control the movement of each Socialist combatant. "Keep Gubert, Henriot with you in Paris; send Estein to Marseilles," (March 23). "Send Cluseret to Paris" (March 24). "Considering the difficulties impeding the departure of citizens Assi and Mortier to Lyons, citizen Landeck is delegated to Marseilles and Lyons with full powers" (March 20). Those eccentrics who imagined themselves universal dictators even entrusted "full powers" to unknown nobodys! It became obligatory to put a stop to these immoral pretensions, these ridiculous acts; and it was our Federalist Anarchist friends who protested energetically. The usurping dictators put forth all their energy and did not stick at calumny or threats, and their pamphlet, *The International Alliance*, is a unique example of calumny and meanness. But in spite of all, Anarchists have succeeded in destroying this odious dictatorship. At the first congress after the Commune in 1872, the dictators—those new popes—damned the Anarchists. The blow was mortal to themselves. All the national federations decided against them. The central international was dead; once for all, dictatorial aspirations in the Social movement were destroyed.

To-day another question presents itself, not less dangerous than a ridiculous dictatorship—that of principles. Must we leave the successors of the dictators to substitute politics pure and simple for Socialism? Must we leave German Democracy to persuade the working classes that "the struggle against class domination must be political," and that the Gladstone-Harcourt-Asquith programme is a Socialist one? "The agenda for the Social Democratic Congress is a feeble copy of the English government programme," says the *Daily Chronicle* of September 25, 1895. Is this Socialism? Socialists are everywhere beginning to feel anxious, and our sympathetic friend, Domela Nieuwenhuis, gave expression to this anxiety in his pamphlet, *Socialism in Danger*. The organised trades in France have separated themselves from the political Democrats, like the trade-unionists at Cardiff. It is our duty as Anarchists to go to the coming Congress,* in London, in sufficient numbers to gain acceptance for the following:—

1. The economic and social emancipation of the workers is the main end, to which all political movements must be subordinated.
2. Political action, legal or revolutionary, must never assume other than a local character; because the political struggle must shape itself according to the political condition of each country. What has already been accomplished by the English and the Swiss may be the aim of a political revolution for German or Russian Democrats.
3. The economic struggle only can become international in its character, therefore Socialists from all parts of the world are asked to help producers', conscripts' or consumers' strikes.
4. The decisions of international congresses shall not be obligatory for any federation or groups who do not agree with the decisions and recommendations of the congress.
5. That Socialist congresses shall only deliberate on Social subjects, that is to say, the conditions of work in different countries, methods of economic struggle; and progress in the strike, Co-operative and Trade Union movements.
6. Individual Socialists, groups, local or national federations are completely autonomous in their methods of struggle, as Revolutionists or Legalists, so long as they work towards a common aim: the workers' emancipation.
7. Congresses are called, not for the triumph of such-and-such a clique, but only for the establishment of a fraternal solidarity among the workers of the world, and that militant or peaceful Socialists, Co-operators or conspirators can frankly and cordially discuss the great problem of Socialism and human regeneration on the basis of economic equality, absolute autonomy of the individual in a group, and of groups in a united and Communist humanity.

In the name of these Socialist claims I invite all Socialists, and especially all true Internationalists, to present themselves in sufficient numbers to put an end to the monopoly of Socialism, unjustly assumed by political Democrats, as once before we Anarchists put a stop to a foolish and immoral dictatorship.

AN OLD INTERNATIONALIST.

* The revolt of public opinion against the Democrats who degrade the Socialist idea is everywhere apparent. On Sept. 24th, Mr. Stewart Headlam, speaking at Sion College, said: "True Socialism, he took it, aimed at bringing about the greatest economic change with the least possible interference with private life and liberty. Spurious Socialism postponed the initiation of those reforms which were necessary for bringing about the economic change, but itched to interfere with the individual in every possible way, and especially did it delight to meddle with the pleasures and morals of the individual. The defeat at the polls, even if it had been the annihilation of the supporters of that spurious kind of Socialism, should cause no kind of anxiety to those working for that great economic reform which would place the means of production in the hands of the people."—*Daily Chronicle*, 25 Sept., 1895.

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, 7, LAMBS CONDUIT STREET, LONDON, W. C.

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.

NOTES.

THE BLESSINGS OF CHEAP FOOD.

What an ungrateful race of mortals we are, to be sure!—especially we Anarchists. Always grumbling; never satisfied. And how often have we been reminded by our elders of the happy conditions we live under compared to the days when they were boys! Cheap post, cheap travel, cheap clothes, cheap food—all these blessings we inherit, and still we are not happy. What can be the reason of it all? The answer in full to this query would be rather a long one; but a study of the evidence taken before the Committee on Food Adulteration will offer some reasons why we don't think things are quite so satisfactory as they might be under an honest, that is to say, an Anarchist state of society.

We find, for instance, that butter is weighted with water in many cases to the extent of 25 per cent., and more. As to the question of margarine, despite our Acts of Parliament and their penalties, some retailers, we read, keep machinery on their premises to blend it with butter. Then, as to cheese, the following may be instructive:—

"From America, Hamburg, and Holland comes a mixture known in the trade as *filled cheese*. It is made of skimmed milk and lard is added to it or *oleo oil*. The result is not a cheese, not even an inferior cheese, the fat being held mechanically in the curd; and this fat after a time, and generally suddenly, separates and becomes offensive and rancid; and, kept in warm rooms as poor people have to keep it, the stuff soon changes. It is a trade that is mainly encouraged by the enormous profits that can be made out of it at times when food is dear."

Of 43 samples of coffee the average adulteration was exactly 50 per cent. Fine oatmeal is adulterated with barleymeal, bees wax with 50 or 60 per cent of paraffin wax, beetroot sugar colored with aniline dyes is sold as Demerara. We might continue the list *ad lib.*, until we should find that the same rottenness was permeating present-day religion and morality so-called. But we will end by asking a question of those persons who pretend the workers would have little to complain of were it not for the "agitators." Take a laboring man, a State-exploited dockyard laborer for instance, with his eighteen shillings per week and wife and two or three children, and tell us, after rent and clothing is paid for, how much really *genuine human food* he and his family get in the course of a week?

WITHOUT FEAR OF RESULT.

"All forms of opinion must have their chances in the labor movement as elsewhere; and truth and error must grapple without fear of result."

Thus wrote Mr. Rogers, President of the Vellum Binders Society, in the *Daily Chronicle* of September 18. We hold exactly the same opinion, and congratulate Mr. Rogers on taking up such a manly and fair-minded position. But there is a "form of opinion" in the labor movement which asks for a hearing and is quite prepared to stand any "grappling" which, if its opponents have the truth on their side, they ought to be able to inflict.

Yet Anarchism—for that is the form of opinion we are alluding to—is to be denied admission to the Socialist Congress of 1896 where any scamp, if he is a Social Democrat, can gain admission and have his say. Will Mr. Rogers look into this matter and take the side of Justice (not the journal) and Fairplay in practice as well as in theory "without fear of result?"

A MUNICIPAL ELDORADO.

Glasgow must be a wonderful city by all accounts, and it will be surprising if there is not a rush of woebegone Southerners to that place to share some of the advantages which the Glasgowers ought to be enjoying by this time. "A splendid municipal success" is surely something which would lead one to expect great things, and that is how the *Daily Chronicle* describes the working by the Glasgow County Council of the tramway system of that city.

Probably some folks may be satisfied with the results of this "splendid municipal success" which the *Daily Chronicle* glorifies with a column of description; but, to tell the truth, we are not so favorably impressed.

After carefully studying the statements made, the nett result seems to be that the working men of Glasgow have perhaps saved a few pence in fares, and the Glasgow County Council have made a profit of £24,204, part of which, as you might expect, will go to relieve the ratepayer.

As to the condition of the men who have *earned* this money for the Glasgow County Council—not one word. As to what improvement may have taken place in the life-conditions of the poor wage-slaves who ride to their wretched homes for a halfpenny less per day, the *Chronicle* does not condescend to say.

These details are not taken into consideration, for the very simple reason that the "splendid municipal success" has done nothing to improve the social condition of the workers in Glasgow. None of the fundamental evils of our present system have been in the slightest degree checked by this "success"; and barring the £24,204 profit—which the workers do not get—things are practically "where they were." If Municipalisation does not mean anything more than profit-making and exploitation, and monopoly by a Council instead of a Company, what in the name of the *Daily Chronicle* is the good of it to the working classes?

"AS A WARNING TO EVIL-DOERS."

One or two lessons may be learned, we think, from the case of Robert Coombes, aged thirteen, who killed his mother at Plaistow. First and foremost, it is as clear as anything need be that the gallows has no terrors for such natures as Robert Coombes. In fact, it seems to us it would not be difficult to prove that capital punishment combined with other morbid influences was directly responsible for this murder, seeing that the lad's craze for executions had thoroughly obliterated all respect for human life. At any rate we hope the good Christians and refined people of ethical culture who still argue in favor of the barbarous criminal code which still disgraces us will consider this case in its true light.

As to the question of the trashy literature which many boys read, it is very probable its effect upon young Coombes' mind has been greatly exaggerated. It has always seemed to us, however, that this sort of literature is entirely superfluous while we have a cheap press to supply the want. Take any halfpenny or penny paper, and what a rich store of blood-curdling horrors would these boys find if they only knew it. Here, for instance, is a choice morsel from the *Daily Chronicle* of Sept. 19: "Seven heads were yesterday chopped off with a sword." And the *Chronicle* is not at all disgusted, notwithstanding the fact that "it is almost certain they were not the real culprits." We need not give more examples; the fact is evident: there is no *really genuine* respect for human life inculcated by our modern press. There is only respect for the Law—which is quite another thing.

THE "RENT OF ABILITY," SHAWLY!

Another attempt has been made to explain the political situation; this time by Mr. Bernard Shaw. He is one who is generally humorous at the expense of all logic, and occasionally logical at the expense of his principles. He believes in Collectivism—by instalments; and his quarrel with the late Government is that the "instalments" they gave were too microscopical for the appreciation of the working classes. We think so too. Yet John Burns told us differently, and Mr. Shaw supported John Burns at the recent election; which is a trifling example of political cross-purposes.

However, to come back to Mr. Shaw's address to the Fabian Society which was entitled "The Political Situation." His political forecast, as far as we can gather, may be summarised as follows:—Liberalism, hopeless; Conservatism, (of course) ditto; Independent Labor Party, ditto; Social Democracy (as enunciated by the S. D. F.), ditto. The one oasis in this desert of despair, according to Mr. Shaw, is the fact as he conceives that there is a class of young men rising up, who are being attracted by the "Fabian view of social and individual development," whatever that may mean. For the immediate future our only hope lies, he thinks, in that *reductio ad absurdum* of the wage-system, Payment of Members. Taken altogether, one may surely say of Mr. Shaw's view of the political sphere, "All who enter here leave hope behind."

AN HONORABLE MAN.

Within the past few days the newspapers have been startled by the discovery in our midst of an "honorable man."

He did not belong to the "nobility," as some might suppose; neither was he discovered in the House of Commons, nor amongst any of the high officials of the land where honorable men *ought* to abound. He was only a "common" sailor whom the Lord Mayor had remanded on sureties: but his strong sense of honesty induced him to walk from Cardiff to London rather than break his word. He had some prospect of imprisonment, too, at the end of his journey. However, he did his seven days walk—the last two without a meal—and kept his word. All the precepts of the Church and all the laws of the State will never do half as much to inspire honesty and good faith among men as this single example of manliness and probity. See how public attention is arrested by this single act. Yet why are these acts so rare? Our degrading social system must answer for the warped state of things which to-day answers for morality. "For every Stoic was a Stoic; but in Christendom where is the Christian?" says Emerson.

A NEW ANARCHIST PAPER.

We have just received *The Rebel*, published by our Boston comrades

at 170 Hanover Street, Boston, U.S.A. For style and workmanship it is the best in the whole Socialist movement; and the names of its contributors guarantee its literary quality.

TEETOLASIM & ANARCHISM.

Of course, there are a large number of people who object to Anarchism, and from various standpoints; their objections varying according to their occupation—or want of occupation,—or the particular kind of salvation syrup they are in the habit of prescribing for other people.

Being a Teetotaler I will deal with the Teetotal objector first. He is often a well-meaning individual with a strong belief in the weakness of everybody else; consequently he thinks that if the drink-shops could be abolished by Act of Parliament, and the sale or purchase of alcoholic liquors made a penal offence, that the money now spent that way would be banked every week by the workman and the proverbial "rainy day" lose its terrors for evermore. Imagine the horror of this benevolent person when he comes across an Anarchist, who is striving to abolish governments, acts of parliament, and banks—those mysterious places where the worker may put in £100 and, at the end of a few months, find it grown to £102½ or more. Visions of unlimited drunken men and women, pass before his eyes, coming to borrow of his sober, thrifty self, forcibly or otherwise, the price of half-quarterns of gin and pots of beer; and expending their superabundant energy in carving up those who escaped being pounded to a jelly in the discussions thus given rise to.

But, really, there is nothing in Law or Government to prevent the realisation of this picture (which one can readily imagine to accompany a fit of the "blues") only that people generally respect themselves and each other and do not care to do such things,—not because of Law and Government; for, in the rows between Orangemen and Nationalists in Belfast, when Government, in the shape of the police, has interfered, both parties have turned on the police and the scrimmage has been intensified. Likewise, a man is not made sober by hauling him up before a magistrate, and robbing his wife and family of any little money they may have left, in order to pay a fine, and he has been furnished with no logical reason for being teetotal if he is sent to prison in default, and loses his employment; on the contrary, these misfortunes, added to the other discomforts of a workman's existence, are rather likely to "drive him to drink," as the saying goes.

His ideas of social well-being are very limited, and may be summed up thus:—If the workers are good slaves, their masters will be good to them, and promote the most servile and obedient to be slave-drivers in their interest; and the worker, sufficiently niggard of comfort and pleasure to himself, may possibly set up as slave-master "on his own." He is probably a Christian as well as teetotaler—quite unconscious of the direct opposition of Christianity to Total Abstinence; he is generally a Christian because it is "respectable" to be so.

The temperance lecturer, in his little mind, cannot picture to the workers a state of things for them worth realizing; for the sober workman requires some other pleasure to replace that he might have found in getting drunk, and as the means of enjoyment, as well as the means of production, are monopolised by our masters, we have to pay for our pleasures; consequently, be we sober or drunken, we are never far removed from the pains of starvation, since the competition for employment, and the use of labour saving machinery in the interest of the master class, keep wages to the level of bare subsistence. He never thinks of men being able to work without asking the permission of a capitalist, or of inquiring what right has the landlord to demand rent; and his ideal condition for a workman corresponds to that of a well-groomed donkey. The sight of hundreds and thousands of workpeople walking about houseless after helping to build, not only houses, but palaces; clad in rags who make clothes; wandering up and down in a famished condition outside the warehouses and stores which they have filled with the necessities of life, never suggests to him that this monstrous state of things requires an alteration which is outside the power of teetotalism to effect. He likewise fails to see that, were drink a basic cause of poverty, it would affect all classes of the community equally, whereas, although we hear occasionally of my lord Tom Noddy appearing in the bankruptcy court through gambling, betting, or keeping a too numerous harem, I do not recollect this occurring through drink, although he drinks champagne to the worker's "cold fourpenny."

We do not find the Teetotalers carrying on their crusade in Regent Street, Pall Mall, or St. James' Street; they are moved with touching regard for the welfare of the working man, and are animated by a laudable desire to show him how he can rescue himself from the mire of poverty by spending his wages properly; indeed, he may even save a little by not spending it. Although, if it is intrinsically good, then it is good for rich and poor alike, but, up till now, I have not found it to be a remedy for poverty; I have not grown rich or even "independent," and I never knew a Teetotaler who became wealthy by his own labor of hand or brain. I have often heard Teetotal lecturers say that the drink bill of this country is only £136,000,000 (in this is included the wines, spirits, and liqueurs consumed by the rich); well, according to the government statisticians, Giffen and Mulhall, the annual wealth production is of the value of £1,250,000,000, of which £450,000,000 go to the workers who produced it, while the idle class of landlords and capitalists grab the other £800,000,000.

It is, therefore, evident that the worker comes the poorer off in spite of his industry; and even though he abstained from alcoholic liquors from his childhood up, that would not bring under the control of the

working class the £800,000,000 which, according to Giffen and Mulhall is the plunder "annexed" by idleness and rascality.

It is my contention that, under our present system of production, though some might drink themselves to death, as many overgorge and override some hobby to the same effect, they would not starve if they were free to work and earn their livelihood when they were tired of drinking or had no more to spend; but, at present, if their drinking has displeased Mr. Shoddyrogue, Esq., he will refuse to employ them, to let them work, consequently they will starve as they might have done if Mr. Shoddyrogue or Mr. Shortweight had found "trade" bad.

I am a teetotaler because I believe it good for my health, but it is disgusting to find teetotalers preaching such economic bosh as I have alluded to, and mixing it with the degrading superstition of Christianity. T. C.

TRANSITORY v. ETERNAL.

Those so-called owners of the earth to-day will soon leave it to others. One thing only is real—the transmission of Life: as regards the subjects of human understanding, the ideas and beliefs that occupy our minds, they are the mere modes, more or less fugitive, of our intelligence, that is to say, the psychical aspect of Life. They pass, and soon vanish into the great abyss of eternity: let them go—those grand shadows of our dreams—those religions which seem to us so lasting! Cannot we see that the universe is not a mass of inert undigested atoms that to live and keep in motion must receive from without the breath of life and movement?—that if life, with all its properties, like every other force of Nature, is immoment in the world, it is idle to dream of a supernatural origin? And if Life be but a natural force, like gravitation, though more dependent and more complex, why should it alone escape from the universal fixity and the iron law of necessity? J. Sourn.

OVER THE WATER.

The bomb thrown at a group of engineers by Decoux has a great importance for the student of revolutions; though much consideration has not been given to the event in the English newspapers.

The story is this: The mining company of Aniche has always taken very seriously the relations of employer and workmen. From the very beginning of the Socialist movement the directors have not indulged in any slackness of hand; the fight against the flowing tide has been considered in earnest, and the way the miners were treated can be easily imagined. Of late years the general manager was a man named Vuillemin who, to use his own words, did not care whether he was hated or not, if only he was feared.

Some years ago there had been the ordinary story of an unsuccessful strike and, on the resumption of work, the refusal of employment to a hundred men, those who had been conspicuous for their resistance during the strike. Among them was a miner—Decoux by name.

On the fourth of August, the mining company gave a festival to honor the fiftieth anniversary of Vuillemin's engagement in the company (a "self-made man," having begun as under-engineer). There had been the usual collection amongst the workmen in order to present Vuillemin with a work of art (only twenty-five refused to subscribe, as against three thousand slaves). After divine service at church there was to be a banquet, crowned by a speech from Vuillemin; and it was already said that he would seize that opportunity to be magnanimous and announce a complete amnesty for the locked-out strikers.

But as the staff of engineers and officials were leaving the porch of the church, Decoux, who was in the crowd, stepped forward, fired five shots from a revolver at Vuillemin inflicting some slight wounds, and took a bomb from beneath his coat that exploded in his hands, killed him on the spot and wounded some of the onlookers, but not seriously. It is not known whether the bomb was intended to be thrown at the employers, or if the death of Decoux was a suicide following the attempted murder of Vuillemin.

Decoux has never been considered as an Anarchist; it is at any rate certain that he did not share their ideas on mankind, nor their schemes of regenerated society.

It is not necessary to speak about the discussions which that action of Decoux has provoked in the French papers. It is only worthy of notice that a large section of the press has been sympathetic with him.

But I would draw the reader's attention to the time which has elapsed between the incitement to the deed—the refusal to give any work to Decoux—and the throwing of the bomb. For months has he pondered over his situation towards Vuillemin, and when his decision was taken he was not deterred from it by the announcement of an amnesty.

That is generally the succession of events in the history of revolution. The possessing and ruling class thought sometimes of giving way, but when too late.

The process is wonderfully shown in an article published in one of the last supplements of "Les Temps Nouveaux." In the south of France, at Carmaux, there is a glass works owned by a certain Resseguier. Two workmen of the firm were, last month, elected as Socialists to some district council. The employer dismissed them. Moved by solidarity, the workmen struck work, and now Resseguier won't open the work again unless lower wages are accepted. With the exception of half a dozen papers all the press is dead against Resseguier, as his action is liable to tear away the delusion which the working man may still have about universal suffrage.

Resseguier is sowing revenge, murder, explosion. The crop may not be immediate, but inevitably it will come, somehow, sometime, somewhere.

As the article to which I allude explains clearly: to understand Decoux, it is only necessary to look at Resseguier.

The speeches of our comrades George Etiévant, Jean Grave and Caserio, delivered on their trials in 1893-94, in the press 36 pp. 8vo, price 1d.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE LOGIC OF ANARCHISTIC FINANCE.

In my first letter in the June "Freedom," entitled:—"Kill The Money Monopoly First," I indicated the four forms of robbery to which Labour is subjected, namely, Rent, Interest, Profit and Taxation, a position which, I suppose, every Anarchist will support. Then, by referring to a recent mathematical computation, I showed that Interest is by far the most deadly of the four robbers; that Interest depends simply and solely upon the denial of the right of individuals to use their credit as money; and that if, by a rapid dissemination of the principles of a sound scientific system of money, individuals were persuaded to inaugurate such system by pooling their credit and issuing money upon their credit (real credit: concrete security), Interest would certainly fall to the ground. The possibility of obtaining money free of Interest would send more and more people into business. These people, competing with the ordinary capitalists, would sell cheaper by reason of their non-interest bearing currency; prices generally would fall through this competition; wages would not fall, because of the increased demand for labor consequent upon the increased number of business enterprises which would certainly ensue from the possibility of obtaining money at cost, and finally, Interest being abolished, competition amongst proprietors to obtain Labor, in order to prevent their property from decaying through sterility, would be so great that the highest terms would be offered; and the highest terms are the crediting to the laborer of the value of his product in exchange, and the debiting of him to the amount of damage, or wear and tear, of the materials used. Now, in such a case, property could not increase without personal exertion; the individual proprietor would no longer be able to impose a tax upon Labor for the mere use of his capital, because the laborers, whose services would be always in demand, would obtain wages that would enable them to purchase capital and go into business for themselves, either co-operatively or individually. So long as the proprietor only claimed in return for the use of his capital sufficient to make good the wear and tear thereof, no one could complain; but so soon as he should claim more, it would be found more economical for laborers to purchase their own capital and leave the greedy and dishonest proprietor to his fate. If these laborers in co-operation required skilled organisers or "captains of industry," they would be always on hand, and competition would secure the best man at the lowest price. All occupations being thrown open by the abolition of the monopoly that to-day permits only a limited number of proprietors to enter into industry, Labor would at last be really and truly free from economic slavery. The most pleasant and simple occupations would receive the lowest remuneration. Why? Because there would be more applicants. The least pleasant occupations would receive the highest remuneration. Why? Because there would be fewer applicants.

Communists seem to have shifted their ground recently. At one time they maintained that to give to Labor its entire product would be impossible because it cannot be measured. Now some of them say that the laborer can have his product if he so chooses. How can he have it if it is impossible to measure it? In the above I have more fully elaborated the claims of Mutual Banking; for, although "some of us Anarchist Communist wage-workers have looked into it with unprejudiced minds," others haven't. W. A. Macdonald, and the author of "Anarchy and Property" in last month's *Freedom*, made me laugh at their references to it. Macdonald seems to be afraid of Mutual Banking; for he struts around it like a far-from-game-cock, crowing all the time: "Oh, it's absurd! Property doesn't really exist, you know; therefore money is of no consequence. It only means a return to barbarism." But he doesn't discuss; probably for the reason that freedom in finance has been defended by Herbert Spencer, who, you must know, is an awful ass in the eyes of W. A. Macdonald.

The other gentleman, who wrote the article above referred to, "can hardly see how it can be seriously treated," and at once proceeds to treat it very seriously. The paragraphs upon Mutual Banking by this writer are as funny as church music. I cannot deal with them now, however; for I have an apology to John Turner for neglecting his criticism until this late point. I have done so, however, in order to give my constructive position first place. The charge of "equivocation" which, he says, rebounds upon me, re-rebounds upon him when I remark that the equivocation aforementioned consisted in his deviation from my first letter in his first reply, wherein he makes excursion into the dark realms of speculative Communism and almost totally ignores the Mutual Banking question, which was mainly the subject of my letter. But at last Turner has brought forward an argument bearing upon my position towards Interest. He says: "The implication that interest upholds rent and profit is not economically correct. Both rent and interest are paid out of profit." Very good! But will John Turner inform me how profit would maintain itself if the monopoly of land, and therefore rent and the monopoly of money, and therefore interest, were abolished? In other words, how could it be possible "for both rent and interest to disappear and yet the exploitation of the workpeople to be as great as ever? Tell me how, John Turner.

When I said that "Free Money will place capital within the reach of every laborer by reducing its price to the labor cost and causing such competition among capitalists to obtain labor, etc.," I knew what I was talking about. I did not suppose it possible to annihilate the capitalists all at once. The abolition of the money monopoly by the establishment of Mutual Banks will not absolutely abolish Interest in one day; but it will first reduce the rate of interest on money by depriving the present bankers of many of their customers, and the ordinary banks will go, as the possibility of obtaining money at cost becomes more widely known, and finally they will disappear before the survival of the fittest in financial institutions. I have traced out this logical sequence above, to which I refer John Turner.

As for my charge against him of sneering at Mutual Banking, which he attempts to fix upon me for the original reference to it as a "palliative," I may say that the sneer is not implied in my reference of "palliative," but in his own as a "paltry palliative."

WILLIAM J. ROBINS.

Friend Robins only seems to have made it clearer that Mutual Banking is only for the possessors of property—those who have "concrete security." He need not worry himself about them: they are able to take very good care of themselves to-day. Otherwise his fresh dilation seems a tissue of beautiful assumptions.

Competition, he assumes, would bring down prices of commodities, but not wages(?), because there would be an increased demand for the commodity Labor; and yet, later on, speaking of "captains of industry," says, "they would be always on hand and competition would secure the best at the lowest price." If

for special captains why not for general laborers? The lowest price is cost of subsistence.—Not much economic freedom here!

He assumes that money being based upon all kinds of property would abolish interest; but does not show how. If some of those going into business wanted to borrow more than the bank was prepared to lend upon their "concrete security," I guess they would offer the usual inducement, in the shape of interest, for those with money to lend it them and take the risk.

Fancy the proprietors crediting to the laborers the value of their product less wear and tear, just to prevent their property decaying through sterility: was there ever such a favourable condition of property pictured for the Communist theory to make headway both with proprietor and proletaire?

I never knew Communists to say it was impossible to give to Labor its entire product, on the contrary, I always understood this was just what they were contending for; but I have that it is impossible to secure the individual worker the exact amount he has produced by his own effort; while it has always been urged that the individual worker should be free to appropriate to his own use what was due to him as approximately the result of his own labor if he desired it.

Friend Robins tries very hard, but with little success, to fix the charge of equivocation upon me. I did not make any "excursion into the dark realms of speculative Communism" (wherever and whatever that may be), in my first reply to him. I did try to clear the ground for a discussion upon the respective merits of Mutualism and Communism to see if it was possible to "co-operatively carry on the campaign for the abolition of all governments," thinking that was the purport of his letter. It now seems I was mistaken: he only wished to push the "palliative" of Mutual Banking.

Oh, beautiful assumptions!—"If the monopoly of land," "if the monopoly of money" were abolished. Ah, if? what then? If land was open to all and money based on all forms of property those without "concrete security" would still have to sell themselves to those who had, or pick up a precarious living as best they could,—if the monopoly of all other forms of property remained. The farmer who had previously paid rent to a landlord and, perhaps, interest to the bank for a loan upon his machinery and improvements would now cease to pay rent, and issue his own money or pool with others through the Mutual Bank. But I do not think he would credit the laborers with the full result of their labor; if he did he would be very communistic with the product and would be giving up the benefit the holding of private property confers. There would then be no reason for not holding the whole of his property in common with all who used it. What would be likely to happen would be that he would pay wages sufficient to induce the laborers to stay with him and not try to get a scanty living working by themselves without machinery upon a poor piece of disused land.

But this would be much the same as now, and the farmer would pocket what he formerly paid away in rent and interest as increased profit. What is true of farming is intensified in the more complex industries, whether of production or distribution; and the economic impossibility of competing with them except with even larger masses of capital becomes clearer every day.

An ounce of fact is worth a pound of theory. There is little to prevent a start in Mutual Banking except that their money will not legal tender in settlement of debt with outsiders who refuse to accept it. But the modern Mutualists are different to the old currency cranks: they do not want to legalise their currency; they are Anarchists and, therefore, cannot grumble. We wish them every success, but refuse to join them in a venture with such poor prospects.

Interest has been steadily falling off for the last half century, and is likely to fall to zero unless some outlet for capital is found by subjugating some savage or semi-civilized countries such as Africa or China. Agricultural rents have been falling for the last twenty-five years, but the exploitation of the laborers was never so great. Every modern economic tendency makes for Communism—even the arguments of Robins. But, at the same time, I am no sectarian; I think the views of all should be carefully considered, and the bigot, whoever he is, is abhorrent to me. The following extract from an article by the late Professor Huxley, in the *Fortnightly* of November 1892, could be pondered over with profit by some of the professed disciples of Proudhon; it expresses my feelings regarding the narrowness of sects, and seems to me the very essence of Anarchy:—

"Such acquaintance with the history of thought as I possess has taught me to regard schools, parties and sects as arrangements, the usual effect of which is to perpetuate all that is worst and feeblest in the masters', leaders' or founder's work; or else, as in some cases, to upset it altogether; as a sort of hydrants for extinguishing the fire of genius and stifling the flame of high aspirations the kindling of which has been the chief, perhaps the only merit of the protagonist of the movement. I always have been, am, and propose to remain a mere scholard. All that I have ever proposed to myself is to say: This and this have I learned; thus and thus have I learned it: go thou and learn better. But do not thrust on my shoulders the responsibility for your own laziness if you elect to take on my authority, conclusions, the value of which you ought to have tested for yourself."

J. TURNER.

ANARCHY.

SIR,—Most certainly I resent being classed as a philosophic thinker with "two such noble natures as Reclus and Kropotkin." Mr. Duncan Dallas might as reasonably class me with Florence Nightingale and Bunyan. What in the world has nobility of character to say to clear thinking? Mutualists and Communists are certainly agreed in wishing to put a stop to the present robbery of labor by means of rent, interest, profits, and taxes, and in seeing that all these methods of exploitation are rooted in government by physical force. Our methods of action are, however, entirely different. They contemplate a violent revolution of the workers and the subsequent establishment of a Communistic state of society—all wealth to be held in common, and each person to work according to his ability, and to take from the common stock according to his needs. Such a state of things would confer a premium on laziness and incapacity, so that some governing body would be necessary to estimate the ability and needs of each person. Hence Communism is merely a form of State Socialism.

We Mutualists, on the other hand, propose to abolish interest by establishing Mutual Banks, issuing paper money based on commodities of all kinds, to abolish rent and taxes by passive resistance to the payment of them, and to abolish profits by passive resistance to all patents and copyrights and unjust protective laws of every kind. Under such conditions of freedom it would be impossible for any man to obtain more than the just wages of his labor, and the present exploitation of the workers by the idlers would be at an end. There is nothing Utopian in any of these proposals, nor incompatible with human nature as now developed.

Anarchism does not mean no government. It means no government by physical force. It does not mean each for himself independently of others. It means voluntary co-operation. Anarchism is Socialism without physical compulsion. It means that we should proceed in the direction of less government by physical force until we learn how to dispense with all. It does not advocate license for the criminal. It demands liberty for the industrious. Mr. Dallas says that "the order and decorum of a dinner-party rest upon a severe code." Would he knock down a man then, at dinner, who ate peas with his knife? Or even if a man got drunk at his table, would he hand him over to the police? Of course, no man in society is free from the fear of the disapprobation of his fellows. It is that very thing which renders society possible. But I contend that clubs

and dungeons and scaffolds are unnecessary and harmful for the expression of this disapprobation. Social ostracism and the "boycott" would answer every purpose under conditions of freedom.

Once we did not see how we could get on if a commoner were allowed to dress like a nobleman; or if people were not hanged for a score of offences, stealing a loaf of bread among the number; or if people were allowed to read the Bible and exercise their private judgment on it. Thirty years ago few persons in the Southern States of America could see how they could be saved from ruin without their slaves. Yet all these absurd and hurtful laws have gone, and everyone is much better off without them. At present most people do not see how we can get on without a Prime Minister, and a Cabinet, and six or seven hundred legislators, all "on the make." By-and-bye, when we have learned to do without them, some Mr. Duncan Dallas of the future will say, "I do not see how a law-strangled, Government-ridden, officer-bullied, State-Socialistic, and slavishly dependent society could have existed with as much harmony, peace, and sobriety as they did."—Yours, &c., G. O. WARREN, Major (retired). Myton, York, Aug. 21.

The following letter was sent in reply to the above one from Major Warren, which appeared in the "Hear all sides" column of the *Echo*; but with his usual fairness, the editor, who habitually ignores the Anarchist Communist side, refused to insert it.

In his reply to Mr. Duncan Dallas, Major Warren, by the way, points out the difference between his system of Mutualism and Communism, and tries to indicate the weak points, as he deems them, of the latter.

He says of the Communist state of society: "all wealth to be held in common, and each person to work according to his ability, and to take from the common stock according to his needs. Such a state of things would confer a premium on laziness and incapacity, so that some governing body would be necessary to estimate the ability and needs of each person. Hence Communism is merely a form of State Socialism."

"Such a state of things would confer a premium on laziness and incapacity"! Physical compulsion by means of government is not necessary to prevent crimes. Under conditions of freedom there are other and better means. Surely the Major's thinking might be clearer. Then, about idleness under Communism, here is his answer to his own objection: "No man in society is free from the fear of the disapprobation of his fellows. It is that very thing which renders society possible. But I contend that clubs and dungeons and scaffolds are unnecessary and harmful for the expression of this disapprobation. Social ostracism and the 'boycott' would answer every purpose under conditions of freedom."

Well, if "social ostracism and the 'boycott'" are strong enough to prevent or diminish crimes, why should they not be strong enough to extirpate or diminish laziness—a lesser evil than crime! As to the premium on incapacity, I cannot see in satisfying all material needs of men a great "premium"; because incapacity will necessarily, I don't say justly, suffer in many directions by the very fact of this natural weakness.

If Major Warren cannot see, on the one side, that an Anarchist Communist society can protect itself very well against laziness, and is far from conferring a premium on incapacity;—on the other hand, he is blind to the dark side of the principle of Competition which is included in his system of Mutualism. He looks at competition only as a means of strengthening what is good in the natural quality of emulation; but he forgets that competition serves also to strengthen the bad passions of mankind, to sow envy, rivalry, and discord between men. With what result? "Divide et impera," was the motto of the Roman emperors; in other words, where there is division (i.e. discord) there will be an opportunity for "imperare," that means a place for a government. Hence Mutualism is merely a form of Socialism, implying economically Communist conditions without acknowledging it, but willing to work to-day for a compromise between Capitalism and Anarchism and so missing both the logic and force of the latter. If the recognition of moral obligation is strong enough to maintain honesty under Mutualism, cannot the Major admit the same as sufficient mutual safeguard against idleness under Communism, especially seeing that the economic incentive to fraud or favor will have been removed with Competition?

Since Mutualism can only have existence in the personal perception and willingness to act upon this principle, will Major Warren kindly say why the economic form of Communism implies the necessity of the intervention of some "governing body"? Has the Major applied as much "clear thinking" to Communism as he has to other matters, or is there a little prejudice still lurking about? Surely Mutualism is not going to place itself in the peculiar and paradoxical position of claiming a monopoly in morality.

TO THE EDITOR OF "FREEDOM."

FREE-COMMUNIST AND CO-OPERATIVE FARM NEAR NEWCASTLE.

Receiving a letter from one of the founders of this colony I became curious to have a look at it, and resolved to go there.

All that I saw there seemed to me very interesting; the men appeared to me skilful, practical, industrious, and to possess the essential quality of being able to agree with each other. In short, the general conditions promise a success in my opinion. But one thing is lacking:—Too eager to realise their ideal, too sanguine to wait any longer, these men made perhaps the mistake of starting without the necessary capital. As far as we possibly can, we should do our best to prevent this being a cause of failure, and I appeal to those who have the means to assist them as far as lies in their power.

BERNHARD KAMPFMEYER.

(HON. TREASURER, W. KEY, Tavistock House, Sunderland.)

The Psychology of the Anarchist-Socialist.

The Psychology of the Anarchist-Socialist, by A. Hamon, is the first serious and honest attempt to examine and describe the character of the Anarchist Communist, and consequently, indirectly, of the Anarchistic faith. The value of this book is, in my opinion, enhanced by the fact that it is not a controversy of the superficial and more or less denunciatory criticisms of Anarchists by such as the Italian criminologist, Lombroso, or Socialists of the legalist type. It is, on the contrary, a scientific study, written in a scientific (i.e. impartial) spirit, of the beliefs, desires and aims of Anarchists as expressed by themselves and as evidenced by their literature.

Furthermore, the author does not pretend to say whether Anarchism is based on Truth, or whether the Anarchistic is a desirable or undesirable type of character. All that he leaves to the reader to decide for

himself. What M. Hamon does is to examine the "confessions" of a large number of Anarchists of various and differing social grades—from the cultured scientist to the poorest laborer. Analysing the tendencies betrayed in these confessions, he compares them with the literature of their party, showing undeniably that the views preached are in harmony with the opinions and sentiments of the followers professing them. Finally, having classified their psychological traits, such as the Spirit of Revolt, Love of Liberty, etc., etc., he concludes with the delineation of the Anarchist type as drawn from the preceding examination.

It is to be noted that, with but very few exceptions, the "confessions" do not emanate from the authors of the literature quoted, with which they are compared; while, at the same time, the form of the questions asked in order to obtain these confessions, "Why are you an Anarchist?" and "How became you one?" is so strictly personal as necessarily to give a strongly biographical character to the answers. This evidently excludes the possibility of there having been any attempt, conscious or unconscious, to make the one (the "confessions") appear to coincide with the other (the literature).

When we come to the delineation of the Anarchist type, it will be strikingly evident—at least to every Anarchist Communist—that, as M. Hamon himself says, it is merely the *typical* and not any individual Anarchist he is describing. Therein he, the individual, may see the ideal Anarchist, and measure thereby his own shortcomings.

It may be objected with regard to the "confessions" that no one knows himself. Certainly; but in this case it is not required that any one should attempt to delineate himself further than to give a specific answer to a limited and specific question. This by no means implies a complete comprehension of one's character as a whole. Surely no one can deny that it is within the capacity of any sane-minded individual to say, for instance, why he is a musician and not a doctor, a painter, a lawyer, or what not; also, why he is a Radical and not a Tory. And granted that his conception of Radicalism or Toryism is just, will his answer be found to be in accordance with what is recognisable as distinctive of Radicalism or Toryism. And a study of such answers together with the doctrines would surely bring into clearer light the characteristics of the individuals as well as of their opinions.

This I take to be the object of M. Hamon's book, to make known to the public the true character of those greatly misunderstood and hitherto incomprehensible people, the Anarchists; thereby also indirectly drawing attention to their doctrines. Unfortunately, as yet, the proportion of the general public who really have any honest desire to understand Anarchists and Anarchism, and who are not too impressed by the superficial and denunciatory prejudice of their acknowledged opponents, is lamentably small. Also it is exceedingly difficult for even the ablest Anarchists, boycotted as they are by an interested and servile press, to reach the ear of many honest but ignorant people engrossed in the multitudinous pursuits of the day. This "Psychology of the Anarchist Socialist," if heartily pushed by all who are interested in it, ought to render good service in this respect. A. H.

CLASS WAR.

Who makes the laws which I am expected to obey? The heads of the churches say: "The laws which we give to you are dictated by God." Away with them! your God is a lie.

Princes, who force their subjects to submit to their tyranny, also appeal to the divine will. Let them beware! their divine right is a lie.

And you, lawmakers of the constitutional monarchy and of the representative republic, who has given to you the right to make laws? "The people elected us to do so," you reply. But often you do just the opposite of that the people desire, and the people have no power over you. Is that justice? No reasonable man will say so.

Lastly, we encounter the lawmakers of the Democratic republic; they tell us: "The people, who have elected us, have the power to remove us and to reject our laws." Very well! Let us take an instance. A law is proposed. Many are in favor of it, many against it. A vote is taken; 1,000 declare for the law, 999 reject it. And the minority is expected to submit to the will of the majority. Is that justice? No, it is quite as much an outrage as the command of a tyrant.

No individual or number of individuals has the right to dictate laws. Where it is done, right does not govern, but might.

All law-making is a violation of justice.

What is the object of law-making? "Men cannot live peacefully without laws," declare the opponents of Anarchy.

We Anarchists admit that laws are a necessity as long as private property exists.—Only force can protect that.

All differences of opinion, therefore, come to this:

Either private property, and with it tyranny and slavery and the misery of the worker, or Communism, and with it the freedom of the individual and the welfare of all. Let every man choose.

When will the social revolution break out? On the day when the downtrodden, the maltreated, the starving, have come to see:—

That is in vain to appeal for help to God;

That there is no recompense in heaven for the misery here below;

That the ruling classes have no right to rule;

That it is contrary to the interest of the ruling classes to see the wretched condition of the worker improved;

That all attempts to improve the lot of the worker by individual efforts or by reforms within the limits of the present social order must fail;

PRINTED & PUBLISHED BY J. TURNER at 7, LAMBS CONDUIT STREET, W. C.