

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. X.—No. 107.

AUGUST-SEPTEMBER 1896.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONGRESS.

The Socialist and Trades Union Congress of 1896 has come and gone, and those of us who strive honestly for the emancipation of mankind may do well to consider how we stand now that the stress and storm are over.

Two facts stand out clearly as a result of this Congress: first, that the Marxian Parliamentary Social Democrats are, whatever else they may be, first and foremost politicians, with all the tricks and tyrannies of that degrading profession; and secondly, that the anti-parliamentary and Anarchist spirit in the Social movement, not only abroad, but even in our movement here, is in a growing and healthy condition, and finds more sympathy amongst honest folk than even its friends could have imagined. For those who look a little deeper into things there is also another fact to be noted, which will be still more potent for the future, namely, that once for all it is made plain to the world the parting of the ways in the two streams of the Socialist movement.

There are other features of the Congress which we need not stop to dwell upon, such as the shameful treatment of the anti-parliamentarian and Anarchist section, which though not unexpected was none the less a disgrace to the Democrats, and gave the Congress a taste of Social Democracy in embryo. It is a warning to the workers that if they will fight for Social Democracy, and gain it, they will then have to fight again, and fight hard, for their liberties.

Far more encouraging and hopeful is it to leave this side of the question, and turn to the expressions of sympathy and goodwill which have been uttered in no faltering voice by comrades whose claim for justice for us, and for freedom of thought and expression, we appreciate all the more knowing that they do not share our opinions.

Keir Hardie, Tom Mann, Robert Blatchford, Morrison Davidson, J. C. Kenworthy, all these by word and pen have uttered their protests against the injustice which the dominating section of the Congress displayed against us. The *Labour Leader* of August 8th, after mentioning that the Anarchists displayed some very natural resentment over their unjust treatment, continues: "No sooner, however, did the 'Anarchist' section find that they were not to be left to fight their own battle single-handed, but that a portion at least of the British delegates were determined to see them have fair play, than they became one of the most orderly divisions of the Congress."

The *Clarion* also has made a brave stand for liberty, and we cannot do better than quote some of Blatchford's own words on the Congress: "I am not," he says (*Clarion*, August 1st), "an Anarchist in the usual acceptance of the term. But I feel pained and ashamed when I saw how these strangers—many of them valuable and honest Socialists—were treated in a meeting which professed to be democratic. Very honest and earnest, and very intelligent, were the faces of the evicted Dutch and French delegates; very forcible and moderate were their speeches, and very scant courtesy did they receive at the hands of some of the superior persons who sat—for reasons which I should like to have made plain—upon the platform.... Believe me, there are rocks ahead. The men and the motives from which this trouble has arisen constitute a serious danger to the cause of Socialism in England. The movement in this country contains within it elements of strife and disruption. It behoves all who have the interests of Socialism at heart to prepare themselves for an hour of severe trial."

In the *Clarion* of August 8th, some nine or ten columns are devoted to the discussion of the Congress by "Nunquam," W. G. Pearson, Domela Nieuwenhuis, Albert Métier, Tom Mann and Morrison Davidson. Tom Mann, whose powerful oratory was never better employed than in his impassioned appeal for justice at the Congress, says: "The unfair rulings and menacing behaviour of a number of British and German Parliamentarians especially were of so gross a kind that it can only be characterised as disgraceful. This 'law and order' party were the only ones that really precipitated the Congress into disorder." All of which is nothing more than the truth.

Morrison Davidson's remarks are also very much to the point. He says: "Anyhow, nothing can be plainer to my mind than this. No system of Socialism which should relentlessly rule out of its councils, on the ground of notorious Anarchistic heresy, Leo Tolstoy, John Ruskin, and Him of Nazareth (while probably admitting Judas Iscariot without challenge) can possibly be based on anything but fundamental error." Very true; and as a matter of fact Judas Iscariot was there, and spoke with more than one voice.

We have little space left to notice the remarkable issue of *The New Age* for August 6th, in which there is an excellent review of the Congress. From the conclusion, however, we will quote the following,

which contains a prophecy that seems to us quite justified by passing events: "Socialism and Anarchism, quite apart from their tendency to violent revolution, are powers, and the future lies their way. They have the idea, and the idea does indeed begin to find voice and limbs through them. And that idea will conquer, not by the carrying of any political programme, but by steady flow as of a rising tide into the mind and conscience of humanity."

Here, then, we begin to see some fruits of the Congress. Many have learned that political trickery and majority rule are a delusion and a snare for the workers when it places in the hands of unscrupulous persons, as it surely does, the power of working for personal ends. Many have begun to think that after all the Anarchists may have something to say worth listening to, and after the object lesson of the Congress, the idea is beginning to dawn that perhaps we may be right. Many have awakened to the truth of the situation—perhaps even those "hoodwinked angels of the blind and dead" who worship the ballot-box before truth, before justice, before humanity. Already the air seems clearer, and there is a lifting of the clouds of pessimism and reaction which but recently weighed heavily upon us. Already comrades have returned to their native lands invigorated by the crisis through which they have passed, seeing more clearly, feeling more keenly, the work which remains to be done. That task is a heavy one, but it is a labour of love, and it has been made lighter by that touch of nature which makes the whole world kin—the spirit of solidarity and good comradeship. Let us hope that when next we meet we may feel assured we have progressed toward our common aim—that which alone can restore to freedom the mentally, morally and physically starved slaves of the present system—the Social Revolution.

CHARITY: TRUE AND FALSE.

BY J. C. KENWORTHY.

But, in truth, the matter stands as we imagine Charity to have described it. Simply the rich have the privilege to take their labor-power from the poor and use it in their own service, giving the worker back enough to keep him alive, sometimes not even that. Lord Salisbury keeps up his house in style; tradesmen in the neighbourhood praise him for "living well," and say, "it is good for trade." But that extravagant living simply means that Lord Salisbury has the power to compel men somewhere else to find the food, clothing and shelter needed by those whose lives go in his service. And men do all this, work in this long chain, because they need to use the "property," the land and the capital which Lord Salisbury controls.

True Charity puts it very plainly to Lord Salisbury, and to all who in the remotest degree resemble him in taking what they do not work for, by saying:

"See, you evidently have got somebody else's share, and you do no stroke of useful work. Why do you not be honest and give it up?"

And then Lord Salisbury, and those like him, offer a lot of "evidence" that they are useful to society. But they have no evidence to show against this plain consideration, namely: If their whole tribe disappeared, with their swarm of parasites' parasites, there would not be a pennyworth less of food, clothing and shelter produced, and there would be fewer people to consume what is produced.

These "propertied" people keep their land lying idle because it will bring them no profit. They will not let the idle, starving workpeople use the land and capital without a profit to them, the owners. So that not only do these people do no work and consume in mountains the wealth others make, but they actually prevent other people from working! Then they say, themselves prompting the voice of Political Economy, "You workers' poverty is due to Nature's niggardliness and your own fault."

Let any person who ever so little thus lives on the labor of others examine his mind and his position fully and frankly, and he will find that he keeps his position and does this wrong, at bottom, from three reasons, namely:

- (1) Selfishness: "I like to have this wealth without work."
- (2) Fear: "If I insist upon taking only what I do productive work for, work that really helps to make food, clothing and shelter, I shall be cast adrift, never sure of a job and unable to provide for the future. I am afraid of poverty, to which such a principle leads."
- (3) Pride: "If I sink down to a worker's way of living, people will think I have lost my property, position and power, and think me a fool."

Something of the truth must, at some time or other, strike every "privileged" person. But nearly every one treats such ideas as ridiculous, and, if retaining any conscience at all, goes on with the regulation work of a false "charity."

And another phase of the matter must be looked at. The way in which the privileged rich live, not only is robbery of labor's produce, but it is the exaction of over-labor from the laborers. Because the squire's home has thirty rooms and ten servants Hodge must work twelve hours instead of four. Because the employer's income is £10,000 the clerk must work nine hours instead of three.

Let us not cloak the matter. The poor are poor because the rich are rich. The workers are overworked because the rich are idle and of bottomless appetites and desires. It is as though, beside an industrious village, a camp of robbers were set up—men who had carefully studied and mastered the ways of robbing the villagers to the limits of possibility and endurance. So long has the robbery gone on, that robbed and robbers esteem it consecrated by God and by reason; and if a robber should send in a chicken to a sick widow whose hen roost he has cleared out, or ride among the barns he has emptied in all the splendour of his robber's attire, everybody says, "What charity! what friendliness!"

And just this state of things Paul labored to expose and end when he said, "*Let him that stole steal no more; but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth.*" And "*If any man work not, neither shall he eat.*" Which are the plain maxims of a true charity, a true love for one's kin.

The reasonable man, then, perceiving that society exists for the mutual advantage of its members, conceded further that society must be arranged, its business must be carried on, for the equal advantage of each member. For if we say that society should seek the benefit of some more than of others, then the door is opened for all kinds of disorder and unfairness, such as are rampant to-day. Nor should we say that a good man is to be better treated than a bad man; for who is to say which is the good man and which the bad? Thus Jesus taught that good is to be done equally to all, to the just and the unjust alike, on whom the rain falls and the sun shines equally, making no selection of goodness or badness.

And the reasonable man, knowing all this and knowing that the first need of humanity is to be fed, clothed and sheltered, sees quite clearly that he, as a member of society, has two plain and simple duties at once and wholly binding upon his life. These are:

(1) To do at least his share of productive work in making and providing food, clothing and shelter.

(2) Not to consume more than he needs while others are in want.

As to the first duty, let there be no mistake. Productive work is obviously indisputable—hand and brain labor upon the growing and making, and carrying to where needed, of food, clothing and shelter. It does not cover financing, or governing, or scheming, or preaching, or writing. It is all very well to say that ideas help the production of wealth; but we already have enough ideas to make bread, and we want enough bread before new ideas. Give us your work, your work that proves itself in loaves, first; then we may take your ideas afterwards. Your ideas are speculative; your bread and coats and houses are real.

And again, as to the second duty, let there be no mistake. What a man needs is enough plain food to keep his body and mind at their best, enough covering to warm him, a room large enough to shelter and hold him. The greatest of men have done their work with no more than this. To use more simply means that you are taking for yourself that which might be given to others whose very first needs are unsatisfied; who are hungry and cold and roofless.

Now any man of good heart and honest thought must feel that all this is truth. And the only man who can face the truth knowing that he at all obeys it is the working man;—and not every so-called working man, but only those who are directly employed upon obviously productive work, and who live with working-class simplicity. A man who grows corn, weaves honest cloth or bakes bread, and a woman who cleans home and minds children, may think deeply and find themselves not to blame; but one who makes whiskey, builds gaols, tailors for the West-end, adulterates, makes ball-dresses or waits on the rich, cannot think truly of the position and be satisfied.

Indeed we are all of us either slaves or dishonest; many of us are both—we are dishonest slaves. Why do we not escape from our positions as cogs in the wheel of wrong-doing, of literal murder of our fellows, and find a way of living in accordance with the simple principles of honesty and goodness which we have discovered? The causes are twofold.

First, our artificial needs fetter us. We have learned to eat, to dress, to house ourselves in a certain style which has come to seem necessary to us. Whether this style demands an income of twenty shillings or twenty pounds a week to maintain it, the assumed need of getting that twenty shillings or twenty pounds makes us slaves to "the system"; we must go on working where we can get the money. And perhaps we have others dependent upon us, with similar assumed needs; and the fear of what any change would entail to "wife and family" rivets our chains. This is not the position of rich people only, but of many who are called poor as well.

Second, we think we have not the right opportunities and abilities. We are, therefore, afraid;—and we have much reason to be. Seeing the practised men who work the soil living in a state as bad as, perhaps worse than, ancient slaves and serfs, we ask, "How can we hope to live by labor on the land?" And, seeing skilled workers unemployed, we ask, "What chance have we in any productive labor, when we cannot do a skilled man's work in any trade?"

Here, in the two difficulties of our need and our fear, we have rested; content to study for ourselves and to teach others the theories of Socialism, Communism and Anarchism. A good work, so far; but one needing to be reduced from theory to some kind of practice. What kind? Let us, each one of us for himself or herself, ask, "How can I begin, not only to think rightly and to talk rightly, but to do rightly?"

If we will look over, our minds most of us will find, I fancy, that we have hardly thought about the new principles by which the New Society, when it comes, must be held together. Those principles, quite clearly, are summed up in this one we are discussing, in Charity—rightly understood as love, goodwill, perfect regard and concern for each other and each other's welfare. It must be so; cannot possibly be otherwise. Only because we instinctively concede this truth does the reasoning of Socialism, the generosity of Communism, the liberty of Anarchism acquire weight, power, validity with us. We take charity, love, goodwill for our premises, and logically deduce Socialism, Communism, Anarchism therefrom. And those two fundamental duties we have now recognised, of doing our share of useful (not pretended) work, and of not consuming more than we need, thus laying no burden on others—these only become duties through love.

So that, at bottom, it is Love and the work, the sacrifices of Love that we Socialists, Communists, Anarchists, have to preach and to practice. And I say that we have not all truly seen and felt this; or else the needs and the fears which prevent us (as we have seen) from fulfilling those duties of labor and abstinence would fall away from us. A father or mother who wholly loves a child, a man who so loves a woman, or a woman who so loves a man—will one of these allow either need or fear to prevent the doing of good to the loved one? Rather, indeed, such a lover will joy and glory in enduring needs and fronting dangers for the sake of the loved one. This is true, every day, in the lives of quite ordinary people. We take it for granted. Society is daily sacrificing in this way, member for member; it only needs to complete the circle by widening the bounds of personal and family love to all-embracing love of humanity.

(To be Concluded.)

THE STRIKE IN ST. PETERSBURG.

More than 30,000 workmen, from different factories in St. Petersburg, went on strike in the beginning of June. The calm and determined conduct of the strikers, the unanimity among men, women and young people engaged in the struggle against capital, called forth a manifestation of sympathy and solidarity all over Russia and abroad. Letters expressing solidarity came from all quarters. Subscriptions for the strikers were opened everywhere. Socialists of different nationalities and organized workers hastened to give fresh proof of the international solidarity of interest among workmen.*

To tell the truth there is no country in Europe where the worker has as much need of help as the Russian worker, especially the Russian striker. We all know what privations and misery strikers and their families endure during a strike in Europe. We also know what moral courage, what fraternal solidarity workmen show during a strike. But how much harder is the position of strikers in Russia, where the police are all-powerful, where the least attempt at collective action is suppressed by the police, where you risk being beaten, imprisoned and exiled for a simple collective petition. All these things happened during the last strike. In spite of an official declaration that the strikers maintained perfect order, and that their claims were just, many of them were arrested, and exiled to their native villages, often very far away from St. Petersburg, where they will suffer terrible privations. To give an idea of the conditions of existence obtaining in their native villages, it will suffice to mention that according to official calculations,† each inhabitant of a village in Central and Northern Russia, has on an average the sum of one pound sterling (no roubles) for his annual consumption.

Hunger drove the worker from his village; the police send him back by force to his desolate hearth because he dared to strike against the capitalist, who compelled him to work 14 hours for a salary of 1s.6d. and never more than 2s. weekly. And these same conditions obtain all over Russia.

During the cigarette-makers' strike in Petersburg, poor women were beaten by the police, and in spite of the evidence given by official inspectors that the employers acted like thieves and bandits, many of these poor women were sentenced. During another strike in the province of Vladimir, the Governor of the province ordered soldiers and cossacks to attack the strikers. Peaceful workmen were flogged, imprisoned, and exiled to their native villages. During another strike, that took place in the province of Yaroslavl, the military authorities fired on the strikers who were dispersing, and all the wounded and dead victims of this butchery were struck from behind. The commander-in-chief, General Kostanda, published in the name of the young Tsar, Nicholas II, an address of congratulation and thanks for this act of savagery.

* English workmen, especially trade unionists, were the first to stretch forth a vigorous and fraternal hand. Only the French Social Democratic deputies, on the contrary, refused to open subscriptions on behalf of the Russian strikers. These gentlemen did not dare to compromise their position as members of a parliament friendly to the Russian Government. Nevertheless, those friends of our tyrants had sufficient impudence to present themselves at the International Congress in London, without mandates from workers, and in the capacity of a new parliamentary aristocracy.

† Vice-Governor Engelhardt and others.

I have only mentioned last years' strikes. My readers will see the economic and political conditions under which a strike is declared in Russia. Strictly speaking, every strike under such conditions is an act of rebellion, like a skirmish during a civil war. Much courage is needed to take part in a revolt. Therefore everyone in Russia follows every movement among workers and peasants with feverish attention. In spite of governmental prohibition of the mention of strikes in the press, in spite of the most atrocious persecution of Socialists and Revolutionists, these last are always on the strikers' side. Without the least exaggeration we may say that during the last thirty years the entire efforts of the present generation in Russia (engaged in the Revolutionary movement), have been concentrated in agitating among the peasants and in the more or less revolutionary organisation of town workers. Since 1863, when first attempts to organise groups of workers were made, until our own time, all men of advanced opinions, all fractions of the Revolutionary-Socialist party have devoted their best efforts to the sublime work of developing a spirit of revolt among peasants and workers. It seems that the efforts of Russian Socialists have had the desired effect. The working masses begin to move in spite of governmental atrocities. The great strike in St. Petersburg opens up a new era in the Russian Revolutionary movement. Henceforth the struggle against exploitation and oppression will be fought, not by educated young Socialists with the help of a few isolated workers, but by the working masses themselves helped by those heroic young people. And we, a few old survivors and witnesses of the beginning of that struggle we salute with an inexpressible joy the appearance of that compact and determined mass of Russian workers on the Socialist battlefield.

W. TCHERKESOV.

ANARCHISM: ITS PHILOSOPHY AND IDEAL.

BY PETER KROPOTKIN.

But it is especially in psychology that this revolution leads to consequences of great importance.

Quite recently the psychologist spoke of man as an entire being, one and indivisible. Remaining faithful to religious tradition, he used to class men as good and bad, intelligent and stupid, egotists and altruists. Even with materialists of the eighteenth century, the idea of a soul, of an indivisible entity, was still upheld.

But what would we think to-day of a psychologist who would still speak like this! The modern psychologist sees in man a multitude of separate faculties, autonomous tendencies, equal among themselves, performing their functions independently, balancing, opposing one another continually. Taken as a whole, man is nothing but a resultant, always changeable, of all his divers faculties, of all his autonomous tendencies, of brain cells and nerve centres. All are related so closely to one another that they each react on all the others, but they lead their own life without being subordinated to a central organ—the soul.

Without entering into further details you thus see that a profound modification is being produced at this moment in the whole of natural sciences. Not that this analysis is extended to details formerly neglected. No! the facts are not new, but the way of looking at them is in course of evolution; and if we had to characterise this tendency in a few words, we might say that if formerly science strove to study the results and the great sums (integrals, as mathematicians say), to-day it strives to study the infinitely small ones—the individuals of which those sums are composed and in which it now recognizes independence and individuality at the same time as this intimate aggregation.

As to the harmony that the human mind discovers in Nature, and which harmony is, on the whole, but the verification of a certain stability of phenomena, the modern man of science no doubt recognizes it more than ever. But he no longer tries to explain it by the action of laws conceived according to a certain plan preestablished by an intelligent will.

What used to be called "natural law" is nothing but a certain relation among phenomena which we dimly see, and each "law" takes a temporary character of causality; that is to say: If such a phenomenon is produced under such conditions, such another phenomenon will follow. No law placed outside the phenomena: each phenomenon governs that which follows it—not law.

Nothing preconceived in what we call harmony in Nature. The chance of collisions and encounters has sufficed to establish it. Such a phenomenon will last for centuries because the adaptation, the equilibrium it represents has taken centuries to be established; while such another will last but an instant if that form of momentary equilibrium was born in an instant. If the planets of our solar system do not collide with one another and do not destroy one another every day, if they last millions of years, it is because they represent an equilibrium that has taken millions of centuries to establish as a resultant of millions of blind forces. If continents are not continually destroyed by volcanic shocks, it is because they have taken thousands and thousands of centuries to build up, molecule by molecule, and to take their present shape. But lightning will only last an instant; because it represents a momentary rupture of the equilibrium, a sudden redistribution of force.

Harmony thus appears as a temporary adjustment, established among all forces acting upon a given spot—a provisory adaptation; and that adjustment will only last under one condition: that of being continually modified; of representing every moment the resultant of all conflicting actions. Let but one of those forces be hampered in its action for

some time and harmony disappears. Force will accumulate its effect; it *must* come to light, it must exercise its action, and if other forces hinder its manifestation it will not be annihilated by that, but will end by upsetting the present adjustment, by destroying harmony, in order to find a new form of equilibrium and to work to form a new adaptation. Such is the eruption of a volcano, whose imprisoned force ends by breaking the petrified lavas which hindered them to pour forth the gases, the molten lavas, and the incandescent ashes. Such, also, are the revolutions of mankind.

An analogous transformation is being produced at the same time in the sciences that treat of man. Thus we see that history, after having been the history of kingdoms, tends to become the history of nations and then the study of individuals. The historian wants to know how the members, of which such a nation was composed, lived at such a time, what their beliefs were, their means of existence, what ideal of society was visible to them, and what means they possessed to march towards this ideal. And by the action of all those forces, formerly neglected, he interprets the great historical phenomena.

So the man of science who studies jurisprudence is no longer content with such or such a code. Like the ethnologist he wants to know the genesis of the institutions that succeed one another; he follows their evolution through ages, and in this study he applies himself far less to written law than to local customs—to the "customary law" in which the constructive genius of the unknown masses has found expression in all times. A wholly new science is being elaborated in this direction and promises to upset established conceptions we learned at school, succeeding in interpreting history in the same manner as natural sciences interpret the phenomena of Nature.

And, finally, political economy which was at the beginning a study of the wealth of nations, becomes to-day a study of the wealth of individuals. It cares less to know if such a nation has or has not a large foreign trade; it wants to be assured that bread is not wanting in the peasant's or worker's cottage. It knocks at all doors—at that of the palace as well as that of the hovel—and asks the rich as well as the poor: Up to what point are your needs satisfied both for necessities and luxuries?

And as it discovers that the most pressing needs of nine-tenths of each nation are not satisfied, it asks itself the question that a physiologist would ask himself about a plant or an animal:—"Which are the means to satisfy the needs of all with the least loss of power? How can a society guarantee to each, and consequently to all, the greatest sum of satisfaction?" It is in this direction that economic science is being transformed; and after having been so long a simple statement of phenomena interpreted in the interest of a rich minority, it tends to become (or rather it elaborates the elements to become) a science in the true sense of the word—a physiology of human societies.

While a new philosophy—a new view of knowledge taken as a whole—is thus being worked out, we may observe that a different conception of society, very different from that which now prevails, is in process of formation. Under the name of Anarchy, a new interpretation of the past and present life of society arises, giving at the same time a forecast as regards its future, both conceived in the same spirit as the above-mentioned interpretation in natural sciences. Anarchy, therefore, appears as a constituent part of the new philosophy, and that is why Anarchists come in contact, on so many points, with the greatest thinkers and poets of the present day.

In fact, it is certain that in proportion as the human mind frees itself from ideas inculcated by minorities of priests, military chiefs and judges, all striving to establish their domination, and of scientists paid to perpetuate it, a conception of society arises, in which conception there is no longer room for those dominating minorities. A society entering into possession of the social capital accumulated by the labor of preceding generations, organizing itself so as to make use of this capital in the interests of all, and constituting itself without reconstituting the power of the ruling minorities. It comprises in its midst an infinite variety of capacities, temperaments and individual energies: it excludes none. It even calls for struggles and contentions; because we know that periods of contests, so long as they were freely fought out, without the weight of constituted authority being thrown on the one side of the balance, were periods when human genius took its mightiest flight and achieved the greatest aims. Acknowledging, as a fact, the equal rights of all its members to the treasures accumulated in the past, it no longer recognizes a division between exploited and exploiters, governed and governors, dominated and dominators, and it seeks to establish a certain harmonious compatibility in its midst—not by subjecting all its members to an authority that is fictitiously supposed to represent society, not by trying to establish uniformity, but by urging all men to develop free initiative, free action, free association.

It seeks the most complete development of individuality combined with the highest development of voluntary association in all its aspects, in all possible degrees, for all imaginable aims; ever changing, ever modified associations which carry in themselves the elements of their durability and constantly assume new forms, which answer best to the multiple aspirations of all.

A society to which preestablished forms, crystallized by law, are repugnant; which looks for harmony in an ever-changing and fugitive equilibrium between a multitude of varied forces and influences of every kind, following their own course,—these forces promoting themselves the energies which are favorable to their march towards progress, towards the liberty of developing in broad daylight and counterbalancing one another.

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.
Other communications to the secretary, J. PERRY, at above address.

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.

The Editors are not necessarily in agreement with signed articles

NOTES.

AN ERROR OF JUDGMENT.

When one recognises the faithfulness and reverence the leaders of German Social Democracy have always exhibited for their earlier teachers, it certainly was astounding to hear them, at the recent Congress, calmly proposing that the next Congress be held in 1899, and in Germany. Surely there must be some error here, for the great Frederick Engels has prophesied the triumph of German Social Democracy in 1898; so that there will be no more need of meeting to discuss ways and means in 1899. We cannot believe the faith in gods has ceased to be the important factor in Bismarckian Socialism (as now recognised by the Social Democratic movements of Europe). For there can be no truth, no work, no act by man, whether consciously or unconsciously, containing any good—in a word, no life—without such catholic reverence, and acceptance without criticism, of opinions preached by the dead and uncrowned kings, of the only true and everlasting human life.

J. P.

TURNER IN THE STATES.

At last, after an uphill struggle, the good work being done by our comrade Turner is beginning to tell. A heavy task indeed he found awaiting him on his arrival in the States, where everything had to be arranged by Kelly and himself before effective meetings could be held. However, by dint of their untiring efforts, the work was carried through, and now the results are beginning to show themselves. Wherever he has gone Turner has made friends, even amongst the enemies of Anarchism; and his sincerity and abilities have been acknowledged by the public and the press. One can only hope that the good work thus far accomplished by our comrade will be continued when he leaves. We in England, while sending our hearty affectionate greetings to him, can assure him the work here has not been neglected. We may even go further and say, that on his return he will find a revival in the Anarchist movement here that will give him as much satisfaction as we trust he is now experiencing from the results of his own good work in the so-called "Land of Democracy."

LIEBKNECHT AND LIBERTY.

"If I was at the head of a government on a State Administration," says Liebknecht in *Justice*, August 15th, "the Anarchists might speak, teach, write, and do, as far as they did not interfere with the liberties and rights of others, whatever they liked."

Ah! good man, we fear you do profess too much; for leaving out of account the importance of the "if" in this connection, what do we find you saying a few lines further on. "We cannot allow enemies to enter our army.... Let no one say: 'The Anarchists are not enemies.' Who says so does not know them.... In all countries the Anarchists are petted by the Bourgeoisie;" and so on *ad nauseam*. And yet Liebknecht at the head of a government is going to allow these creatures, if they interfere with no one's liberty, to do as they like. But the very existence of the Anarchists would be an interference with the "liberty"—we should say the *license*—desired by a person like Liebknecht. He would therefore argue it was his duty to make war upon us, and the offence of "lèse Liebknecht" would be his opportunity to fill the gaols. We ought to be very thankful there is an "if" in the case. So much for his idea of liberty: now for his idea of truth. "In all countries the Anarchists are petted by the Bourgeoisie," says he. Come, come, this is too thick even for an S.D.F. man to swallow; for while the onlookers have seen Liebknecht & Co., well fed and well clothed, carried by the votes of the little bourgeois into the smugness of political life, the Anarchist has been conducted by these same bourgeois to the scaffold and the prison. We need say no more; he is too big a humbug to need unmasking.

MODERN ALEXANDERS.

It is hardly necessary to refer seriously to the trial of Jameson and his gang. To punish them for crimes which their judges and the

majority of the governing class regard as virtues would have been ridiculous. So, after permitting them a nice holiday amongst the Norwegian Fiords, they will be kept quiet for a few months as first-class misdemeanants—unless indeed the government and the press work up an appeal from Kruger, in which case they will probably be amongst us again ere many days. Our present social system has been built up largely by such men as Jameson, Rhodes, and the rest: why therefore punish them? They are, indeed, worthy children of the capitalist system, and "society" feels instinctively how much her own welfare depends on the crimes of these fellows. Don't breathe the word "justice:" "society" gets on so much better without it. One thing however, is remarkable. None of these heroes of the Stock Exchange seem to get shot. Jameson and the big pots with him went through the raid scathless, whilst a crowd of the poor fools in their pay were mowed down. Again, we read of Rhodes "riding conspicuously on a big horse" against the Matabele; and still he lives. We fancy our modern Alexanders would appear poor creatures without the assistance of lying telegrams and a lying press.

THE WATER FAMINE.

A new form of murder must now be added to the long list of "death penalties" which the monopolist and the exploiter inflicts upon his unhappy victims—the workers. Capital punishment, indeed! why it's an every day occurrence in the streets and alleys inhabited by the working classes. True, the gallows is never erected, and the executioner, as a personality, is never seen. That is how it is the thoughtless and stupefied victims are often ignorant of the suffering and death which they see around them. But the instrument of their destruction is an ever-present force—the economic system under which they groan and their executioners are the high and mighty ladies and gentlemen who live and have their being in the mansions of the cursed—the mansions of the ruling classes. Some of them draw dividends from the East London Water Company, and at the present moment their crimes are rather prominently before the public. The *Daily Chronicle* accuses them, indirectly, of being murderers; and so do we. But this does not seem to affect them much, as they are still starving the people who are unfortunately in their clutches. Of course, they always have a lie for an excuse; in fact, if they would only turn on their water as freely as they turn on their lies, the poor East-enders would have an abundant supply.

The best we can hope for from the lesson now being learnt from these facts is that many will be able to see how radical is the change needed to save us from the crimes and blunders of the present system. County Councils, Parish Councils bring no relief. What then is to be done? Why, strike! Strike against monopoly, and determine to supply your own needs.

REBEL, AND ALWAYS REBEL.

The Cretan rebellion has certainly shown to all observant persons how much better is to revolt than to submit. Whilst the unfortunate Armenians, with their passive and hopeless submissiveness, have been well-nigh exterminated, the plucky and spirited resistance of the Cretans to the disgusting tyranny of the "unspeakable Turk" has earned for them the respect of all peoples, and has gained for them a victory over their enemy which will bring them great relief if it is not vitiated by the "diplomacy" of the big bullies—the "Great Powers."

Of course, the Cretans have not done this without some sacrifice; but, then, look at the indescribable sufferings of the Armenians, and it will be seen that, after all, the rebels have come off much the better of the two. Sometimes, it is true, as in the case of the poor Matabele, the insurrection is not so successful; but even with those unhappy victims, of the Chartered Company one may truly say, it is better to have fought and died than never to have fought and been enthralled. For we can assure our readers that death is far preferable to the rule of the white man in Africa, as we hope to have the opportunity of showing in our next number.

FASHION AT THE SOCIALIST CONGRESS.

After all, there is something in the "philosophy of clothes," and Carlyle managed to draw some very pertinent conclusions from the way in which a man dressed. Had he been present, we fancy he might have indulged in some rather cutting criticism of the sartorial aspect of the Socialist Congress. First and foremost he would have noted the aggressively bourgeois appearance of the Marxist section of the German delegates—sleek, well tailored, decked with all the appurtenances of the comfortable middle-class. He might have muttered, "This is no place for the likes of thee." He would not have failed to observe the languid and diletante air of the Fabian section, emitting an exotic aroma and looking like hot-house plants in constant danger of being withered by the blast of the storm to which their unaccustomed nerves were occasionally exposed.

We hardly like to imagine what he would have said of that poor misguided "young person"—"nameless here for evermore"—who had evidently mistaken the Congress for a fashionable promenade. This "quick-change artiste" with her startling costumes should leave the labor movement and apply at the music halls. We will spare her the pain, poor girl, of any imaginary Carlylean epithets.

Then the "sage of Chelsea" would certainly have had something to say of the Anarchists—not altogether complimentary, we are afraid, notwithstanding our dislike of "formulas." What he might have said, however, we will leave to the "weak invention of the enemy."

REPORT OF ANARCHIST CONFERENCE.

ST. MARTIN'S TOWN HALL, JULY 29, to 31, 1896.

If this conference did not give a fuller picture of the present aspect of the Anarchist movement, the reasons are three-fold. First, not all Anarchist delegates left the Congress, and were ready to throw themselves fully into this new work, thinking to be of better use on the immediate battle-field with the enemy; hence, not the days, but, with one exception, only the latter end of the evenings could be given to these meetings. Second, there were three different opinions as to the purpose of the Conference, viz: that it should be a public exposition of our principles from the propagandist standpoint before all (the English view); that it should be a discussion on some controversial points among ourselves (the German view); that it should follow the official Congress, point by point, and record our position towards the various subjects under their deliberation (the Dutch view). Thirdly, time was always short and the necessary translations shortened it still more, hence some were anxious to pass on to other subjects, whilst others preferred that one subject should be discussed thoroughly.

As all preparations were made within six hours before the opening of the meeting,—during which time nearly all of us were present at the Congress—a preliminary discussion of the method of procedure was not held; hence all the differences of opinion showed themselves at various parts of the proceedings. Still, notwithstanding these shortcomings, all went on in the best of spirits.

AGENDA:

1. Reports from various nations.
2. Anarchist-Socialism *versus* State-Socialism.
3. Parliamentary action and its fallacies.
4. General Industrial Strike.
5. War and Military Strike.
6. Trade Unionism, Co-operation *versus* Labour Legislation.
7. Gradual Reform and Revolution.
8. Propaganda among Agricultural Labourers.
9. Crime and the Criminal Class.
10. Anarchism and Violence.

REPORTS FROM VARIOUS NATIONS.

FRANCE.

Only the French report could be given by Fernand Pelloutier, (Secretary of the Federated Labor Exchanges of France and Algeria). These 48 Labour Exchanges are practically synonymous with the British Trades Councils; they represent about 250,000 federated workers.

The French Trades Unionist movement is tired of politics; the failure also of isolated strikes made them consider the General Strike as the true economic means to set things moving and promote the downfall of the present system. A few hundred men cannot bring this about; the masses of the people are necessary for its execution; hence we must, with all patience and forbearance, gradually work among those Trade Unionists who, whilst not yet Anarchists, still dissociate themselves completely from the politicians. At the Congresses of Nantes (1894) and Limoges (1895) the Marxist politicians made frantic efforts to dissuade them from the General Strike idea, and to make them adopt electioneering tactics, but they utterly failed—hence their great enmity to the French Trade Unionists.

Delesalle then gave an account of the Anarchist propagandist movement in France (papers, lectures, groups, etc.), also of the severe persecutions they have had to undergo during the last four years. The government of M. Bourgeois supported by the votes of the Marxist delegates at the present Congress (Jaurès, Millerand, etc.) was just the government which expelled P. Kropotkin from France.

A discussion followed, in which one speaker insisted on Individualist tactics against Trade Unionist effort, to which Tortelier replied.

It being nearly 11 p.m. the meeting had to close, and owing to the shortness of time it was resolved that no more reports should be given. Otherwise we should have had verbal reports from England, the Netherlands, Germany, Switzerland, Denmark, Italy, Spain, and the United States—and written reports and other communications had also been sent from Berne, Geneva, Lausanne (Switzerland), Milan (Italy), from Roumania (two statements) and an account of the Swedish workers movement (from a town in the South of Sweden).

At the end of the meeting Comrade Tcherkesoff reminded us that it was in this building (though not the actual structure, erected only in 1890) that, nearly 32 years ago, on September 29, 1864, the old International Workingmen's Association was founded.

Next evening's meeting was opened by Comrade J. Perry with an introductory speech on the next point of the Agenda: Anarchist Socialism *versus* State Socialism, contrasting the two sets of ideas—economic and political freedom as represented by Free Co-operation and Anarchism *versus* State Ownership, and in Authoritarian Democracy as represented by State Socialists.

Then C. T. Quinn tried to lead the discussion towards an examination of the particular principles of the "Associated Anarchists."

Landauer (Germany), and Nieuwenhuis (Netherlands), considered this way of proceeding impracticable, and whilst the former advocated

the discussion of some controversial points of greater interest, like Free Co-operation, the latter was in favour of discussing the Agenda of the official Congress, an opinion which in the end prevailed; also upon the third suggestion made to discuss Nos. 3 to 6 of the Agenda under the head of "Economic *versus* Parliamentary Means." So the question of propaganda among the agricultural population was first discussed.

AGRICULTURAL PROPAGANDA.

Allowance must be made here by the English reader for the different position of the Land Question in different countries. Whilst in England landlords, farmers and labourers predominate, in France small peasant proprietors form the main part of the agricultural population.

F. D. Nieuwenhuis pointed out that the official Congress had not touched the land question at all, contenting itself with nominating once more a commission to examine it, etc., the same as happened at the Social Democratic Congress at Breslau. They are afraid to tackle the problem, as they want both peasants and laborers as voters, and dare not offend one part of them (the peasants) by taking the side of the other (the laborers). But we, who have no such political difficulties to consider, could tell the plain truth: that the small proprietary system of the peasants was doomed, and that the laborers must organise themselves on the same lines as the other workers for economic action. He moved the following resolution:—

"This Conference of Revolutionary Communists and Communist Anarchists, considering that the evils which capitalist ownership and exploitation of the land produces alike for the cultivator of the soil and for the whole of society at an ever-increasing rate, can be definitely abolished only in a society in which land, like the other means of production, has become common property which society causes to be cultivated in the common interest in the most rational way;"

"Considering further, that the land question can only thus far concern the revolutionary workers movement, as the expropriation of the bulk of the agricultural population renders the socialisation of the land and the means of production possible and necessary, and as far as the agitation among the agricultural population which is to a large extent still reactionary disposed;

This Conference declares:

Revolutionary Communists must declare themselves energetically opposed to measures like those proposed in the agrarian platforms of Social-Democratic parties of various countries (France and Belgium) and proposed by the Agrarian Committee at the German Party Conference held at Breslau, as far as these measures intend to protect small peasant proprietors cultivating their own land, and to alleviate their position and that of farmers by tax-reforms, etc.—or to promote the final realisation of State Socialism, which is entirely the contrary of our own aspirations.

"They must endeavour to convince the peasant proprietors and farmers of the insufficiency of such measures and of their irresistible final ruin in their competition with cultivation carried on on a large scale by landlords.

"This Conference further declares it to be one of the tasks of Revolutionary Communists to organise the labourers in labourers unions, to undertake under the present system the struggle against their employers, and to prepare besides to take over in the future the cultivation of the soil into their own hands."

After Nieuwenhuis, Leon Parsons (a French Delegate) spoke in a similar way, declaring the agricultural population only thus far worth our attention, as they had lost the land and become proletarians like the rest of the workers, and in consequence became a revolutionary force.

Hunter Watts (S.D.F.) advocated the use of political methods, parish councils, etc., by the Agricultural populations. This speech was extensively replied to the next day by J. Tochatti, who showed the impossibility of this and pointed out the rising tendency, also in England, to abstain from the ballot-box altogether. He showed what we could achieve by consequent Anarchist propaganda, as well as by spreading the General Strike idea.

Emile Pouget (of the *Père Peinard* and *La Sociale*) replied to Nieuwenhuis and L. Parsons. Their speeches showed that even some of us Anarchists were still filled with the fallacious Marxist ideas. We must not wait for an impossible development sketched out by Marx; but take matters as they really are. The peasant as he is can be very well made to see the truth of our ideas, for he is exploited, oppressed and hampered on all sides by the State, which in the form of the gendarme, the rent and tax collector, and the guarantee of the mortgage and usurers interest, is continually taking away from the peasant the best part of what he produces; his sons are, on the continent, taken from him for military service, etc. He insisted on the importance of pointing out to the peasant that the State is his greatest enemy—for all revolutions in which the peasants did not take part, failed, as in France in 1848 and 1871, whilst the great French Revolution in which, from the beginning, the peasants took an active part, alone succeeded.

E. Malatesta emphasised Pouget's remarks. Marxism is really a cancer in the body of the labour movement. The Marxists of France and Italy, and we may add of Russia, as well, have only one rule of conduct towards the agricultural population: to contrive to bring them on a level with the English labourers—for these Marx has laid down the further course of development, and that is all they require. So in Italy they resist a law which would guarantee to the small peasant security from seizure for debt of some of his

most necessary implements; because this would prevent him from becoming a proletarian pure and simple as soon as possible. No wonder that these small peasants are against a revolution which would take the land from them, as this attitude of Social Democrats must lead them to infer. In reality the land is one of the tools of the small peasant, and the tool should be the workers. The product of his labour should also belong to him—who can dispossess him of them? Would the Socialist State expel him by gendarmes and soldiers, or should we wait for a hundred years until the alleged concentration of capital eliminates the last peasant? Nor is even this certain; for anything, such as the invention of a new electric motor decentralising machine power, might turn the whole course of events another way. The small peasant will give up his way of cultivating the land when he really sees the greater advantage of collective cultivation by the example given. In the meantime, besides helping to give this example, we must in the way described by Pouget, point out to him the political exploitation under which he suffers, notwithstanding that he owns the instruments of production in the shape of land, etc., and the way he is deprived of the product of his labour by the State. We must organise the agricultural population in all manners possible (in labour associations) against the payment of rent, interest, and taxes, and against military service.

Landauer (Berlin) equally approved of the criticism of the Marxist standpoint on the land question. The dogma of the accumulation of capital is very doubtful indeed. One part of the middle-class may disappear, but new sections arise afresh. He also pointed out that the intensive cultivation of the soil, by which the problem of the superiority of small holdings over large farming is again raised, to the certain triumph of our idea. For whilst cultivation on a gigantic scale is akin to State Socialism, this intensive cultivation corresponds infinitely more to free, automatic groups—to Anarchist Communism. Landauer's resolution was as follows:—

"The Anarchists no longer believe in the fatalist and jesuitical doctrine of Marx, which declares the spread of Capitalism on a large scale and the elimination of all smaller producers to be necessary conditions of the realisation of Socialism.

"As to the land question, they are of the following opinion:

"1.—We reject State aid—not because in view of bringing about the Revolution small peasants ought not to be helped, nor because it were impossible to help them; but only because every act of State interference leads to the perpetuation of the State and of exploitation.

"2.—We want to spread the principles of Free Socialism among labourers and peasants as well.

"3.—We desire that peasants hinder their proletarianisation by associating themselves with their labourers in agricultural co-operative associations, thus preventing the growth of landlordism, and creating organisations which might be the nuclei of socialistic Society;

"4.—Considering that the desire just expressed can in many cases not be realised, we advise in the meantime labourers, as well as farmers and peasants, to unite for an energetic economic struggle against their exploiters."

A similar resolution was proposed by Cini (Italian).

F. D. Nieuwenhuis declared at a latter part of the meeting that he also agreed with Pouget's and Malatesta's remarks. He emphasised again the necessary insincerity of the Social-Democratic parties in all these questions, as their speculation for votes prevented them from telling the plain truth to the people.

The discussion had to come to an end as some insisted that other parts of the Agenda should have a chance of discussion also. It was useful in pointing out the various and many ways open for successful propaganda if once we are thoroughly emancipated from the swaddling clothes of Marx's cast-iron rules for the development of society.

Here and there intensive agriculture was alluded to as a subject worthy of a much fuller discussion; as materials for such we will mention P. Kropotkin's "Agriculture" in *The Conquest of Bread*, now being translated in Tochetti's *Liberty*, and his article on "Intensive Agriculture," in *The Forum*, June, 1890, also the three pamphlets by Sir Arthur Cotton, recently published by *The Clarion*, and a number of letters on this subject in *The Clarion* also. We might also point to some experiments in co-operative intensive agriculture, notably that in which our comrades at Clousden Hill Farm, near Newcastle-on-Tyne are engaged.

The subject of Industrial Propaganda was discussed next, and Trade Union action and the General Strike were the chief topics.

D. Nicoll (Sheffield) introduced the subject, and pointed out, among others, the miners as the best starting point for a General Strike propaganda; whilst another comrade, speaking of France, described the interest which, before all, the railway workers of that country took in this propaganda.

E. Leggatt spoke of the necessity to join Trade Unions, and to work in their midst for our ideas. He alluded to the success of John Turner's American propaganda, so much supported by his close connection with Trade Unionism. The persecutions and obstacles put in the way of other methods would also induce many to use these means.

C. Froehlich spoke against the authoritarian constitution of Trade Unions, and deprecated the alleged tendency to use Trade Unions as the only field of propaganda, whilst he quite agreed that Trade Union action should be one of our means of action. Two German speakers and E. Leggatt replied, and C. Froehlich once more formulated his objections, which seem to us to be worthy of attention as far as each individual is concerned (it being strongly essential that those taking

part in Union work should not lose themselves in so-called "practical" details, but always bring Anarchism to the front), but which seems to fight against a tendency that really does not exist in the movement considered as a whole.

A. Sanftleben (Zurich) called attention to a movement propagated in Switzerland, to make Trade Unions extend their sphere of action by undertaking distributive co-operation, which established a closer bond between the members, made funds available for strengthening the union and for propaganda, and would later on allow also productive co-operation on a large scale. (There is a pamphlet: *The Strengthening of the Trade Union Movement by Co-operative Associations*, written in German by Dr. Hans Mueller, of Basel, Switzerland, 1896, in which this idea is further developed). He also spoke of the strong and numerous associations existing among Swiss peasants for saving labour and expense by common ownership of machines, etc., and a common sale of their products. All this was entirely outside of the State, and whilst the Swiss Social-Democratic workers were wasting their efforts to elect some of their leaders into legislative bodies—where as a rule they became utterly corrupted (the reports addressed to our Conference gave numerous instances and facts about this)—these peasants quietly worked on these lines of free co-operation and sapped the roots of capitalism, in his opinion.

Later in the evening Louise Michel spoke on the General Strike; partial strikes fail, and partial revolts fail and lead to hecatombs of victims—of the best of the workers. But a general strike would be a gigantic revolt which could no longer be put down by massacres. Hence we must work with all our energy for a general strike of all the miserable and downtrodden on earth.

Time again failed for further discussion; it was clear, however, that all saw the great importance of getting into close contact with that section of the working-class who are already aware of the advantages of organisation, to help to shape their societies out of ordinary cast-iron routine bodies for small benefit and provident purposes into free organisations in which individual initiative would have full scope; only then they could fully use the many progressive possibilities now slumbering in them, give examples of free co-operation, etc., until one day they might all rise in a common effort, the—General Strike—which lead the way to still greater events. Without deprecating any other way of propaganda, this was certainly one way that could not be too strongly insisted upon.

At the last meeting on Friday evening, July 31st, a Russian comrade proposed the following resolution:

"Considering that all Anarchist Socialists agree that the emancipation of laboring masses by organised struggle against Capital by means of a general strike is absolutely impossible without systematic struggle against the monopolised State:

This Conference decides to work out a clear and practicable plan of permanent campaign against the State:

And further, considering that the source of political power lies, not in parliamentary majorities, but in the natural political rights of each and all adult individuals composing the population of countries; and that while giving up those natural rights to the governments in the shape of votes for their deputies, the electors are voluntarily depriving themselves of the right of direct control over the corrupted machinery of State;

And further, that the government cannot make use of the thus acquired political power without money, which they receive from the same individuals composing the population:

This Conference recommends:—

- (1) All adult citizens to demand from the Government at once and by all means of agitation and pressure at their disposal, obligatory referendum for the approval of the communal mass meetings of all vital economic resources of the very existence of the Government, viz., yearly budgets, extraordinary war credits, and all measures of taxation.
- (2) To refuse to pay those taxes which they are not morally obliged to pay without their own previous and direct approval.
- (3) To persuade the electors to limit the mandates of their deputies in Parliament (if they choose to send them at all), depriving them of the right of final vote on those economic enactments.
- (4) To organise all who are already fighting against Capital for a general Political Strike against the State, monopolised by the capitalist class, until the people receive the right of direct and full control over the economic functions of the State."

This comrade thus proposed a Political Strike against the State by refusing to pay taxes, to give military service, etc.

The discussion on this proposal was somewhat hampered by the lateness of the hour, which induced other comrades to bring forward other subjects which they wanted to draw attention to before the inevitable end of the meeting at 11 p.m.

It was said, however, that the particular methods described in the resolution were rather Parliamentary ones, and hence had in our eyes small guarantee of success. In general, however, the idea of setting the Political Strike by the side of the Industrial Strike as the Anarchist counterpart of parliamentarism and labour legislation and State control of production, met with approval. But the Political Strike would not mean only mingling with the referendum and similar demo-

cratic fallacies, but it would mean, as it always meant with Anarchists complete abstention from participation in State work, which would be ever so much supported by a refusal to pay taxes, etc.

In this discussion D. J. Nicoll (Sheffield) and F. Domela Nieuwenhuis also took part. The latter said, the official Congress wanted to narrow the meaning of political action as designating only parliamentarism. We understand it to be something different. Is not the assassination of the Czar Alexander II. a political action? Yes! Is not the abolition of the State a political action? Yes! They have departed from the true object of the International, the economic struggle; it is our work to take this object up again.

J. C. Kenworthy said, it was not sufficient to be critical and destructive; we must also be positive and re-constructive. We have to achieve the conquest of industry. We must organise our own industry. The only means to destroy the State were to withdraw from it, to consider all as traitors who in any way sold their labour power to maintain the State. He dwelt on the necessity of the abolition of force. This is only possible among men who are moralised—we are feeble and dispersed, because we have no moral cohesion between us. We do not know each other, have no confidence in each other, are incompetent and untrustworthy. The first conquest man had to achieve was the conquest of himself. Anarchism was bound to become a moral movement. Everywhere people began to see that it was to themselves they must trust. Let one word go forth from there: Anarchism is old religion brought to life again.

He thus resumed his opinions in writing:

"That the programme of Free Socialism, or Anarchism, is the conquest of the organisation of industry. This must be done through Free Socialist Co-operation as the means of carrying on democratic industry, and through the destruction of the State by the withdrawal from it of the masses of the people. Government by force must then be ended. Our movement is one of character, and can only be carried on by the self-development and increase of moral quality in each man and woman, as this only can enable the co-operation of free people."

There was also handed over, though not read to the meeting, an anti-force resolution by another member of the Croydon Brotherhood Group; also the following by Dr. Gumpowicz:

"Politics are the struggle for domination. We Anarchists do not struggle for domination, do not want to replace existing domination by a new form of it, but we want no rule. Hence our action can only be non-political or anti-political, never political, and least of all, of an aggressive military character. We can make State-power crumble away by refusing our services to the State and by exhorting our fellow men to act in the like manner; but we cannot oppose aggressive power by aggressive power on our own part, for this leads to a new rule of force and not to freedom.

These three resolutions would have come in under the last item of the Agenda; as they were handed in shortly before the end of the meeting, and two of them were never read to the meeting at all, a discussion and an eventual reply was impossible; hence the opinion of the meeting on these points was not tested.

In conclusion, after A. C. Burn (a Social-Democratic delegate at the Congress) and L. Gros, of Marseille, (an Anarchist Trade Unionist) had made farewell speeches, P. Gori read a letter which the Anarchists transported by the Italian Government to one of the Mediterranean islands had sent to him to lay before the Congress. The intolerance and bias of the Congress made him prefer to place this letter before our Conference, where it met with heartfelt sympathy. (At the official Congress the Italian delegate, Ferri, had even stated that these Anti-Anarchist laws in Italy were chiefly aimed against Social-Democrats because their organisation was then dissolved by the government of Crispi. In reality now, under Rudini, the Social-Democrats hold Congresses, have been amnestied, etc.; whilst, as before, many hundreds of Anarchists are transported on the islands, kept in prison, and exiled).

An appeal from Armenian Comrades was also distributed, showing that all along the Armenian revolutionists had fought for themselves, whilst unfortunately a part of their countrymen still believed in the promises of diplomacy, of the great Powers, which had foiled them once more. Left alone by all sides, they appeal to the Socialists of all schools to help them—not by tears of sympathy alone (of those they have received enough and to spare), but by arms and volunteers. The appeal was to be addressed to the official Congress if it admitted all Socialists. Since the Anarchists were excluded it was particularly addressed to the Anarchist Conference, and to all men of good faith in the Socialist movement in general.

Thus, the Anarchist Conference concluded. There was an abundance of speakers from many parts of the world, of subjects for discussion, of goodwill and enthusiasm—only an utter want of time; hence the shortcomings described, and also the want of a fuller report than the one we alone are able to give.

DOES TRIAL BY JURY STILL EXIST?

Edmund Burke said that the sole object of the British Constitution was to provide twelve honest jurymen for each convicted person. If this is the case, the British Constitution seems in danger since though the jurymen may remain, their decisions are far from recognised.

The case which is fresh in our mind, is that of Elizabeth Lack, a

single woman, charged at the Nottingham Assizes, June 24, 1896, before Justice (save the mark!) Grantham, with the murder of her child. The evidence showed she had taken it out, and dropped in the river. The jury brought in a verdict of not guilty, on the ground that they were not satisfied as to the child being alive at the time. On this verdict, the sapient judge remarked "that that amounted to a verdict of concealment of birth. It was a privilege of juries, to come, as it were, between the law and persons who were guilty. Of course, it was not for him to complain of their exercising their privilege. If the jury had found a verdict of guilty of murder, no one in court would have felt that it was not a proper verdict. He wished he could send the prisoner to penal servitude, and he would give her practically the largest sentence the law permitted—eighteen months' hard labour."

Where concealment came in, considering that several people saw the child one does not know, but in any case it was a downright and shameless over-riding of the legal rights of juries. *No member of Parliament has taken up the case of this poor woman or this outraged principle.*

Is it not time that people saw the farce of laws, when brutes like Grantham can deliberately override their fundamental principles, to satiate their lust for cruelty and death.

REVIEWS.

LA GRANDE FAMILLE: by JEAN GRAVE.

(Publisher: P. V. Stock, Galerie du Theatre Français, Paris.)

This is a new book by our comrade, the editor of *Les Temps Nouveaux*, of Paris.

The author calls his work a military novel, but really it is a collection of episodes in the life of a lofty-minded young soldier, whose patience is so tried by the continual provocation of the officers, that he kills one of them, and afterwards makes away with himself.

As we do not believe in mutual admiration, we will say frankly that we do not think much of the literary merits of the work. But one feels that all that is said in it is strictly true; and perhaps the lack of art will make it more effective for those who are studying what a terrible engine is the army for corrupting and brutalising the men.

The author of *Société Mourante*, and *Société Future*, has certainly given a new valuable contribution to the propaganda of the libertarian idea; and we are glad to be able to recommend his book to all who read French.

E. M.

THE LABOUR ANNUAL.

(Price 1s. Reeves, 185, Fleet Street, and *Clarion* Office, 72, Fleet Street, London, E.C.)

It is somewhat late in the day to review this work, which was published in January last. However it only reached us recently, and our space having been limited, explains the lateness of notice. It is filled from beginning to end with extremely interesting matter bearing upon the Socialist and advanced movements of the world. It contains a numerous collection of photographs and short biographical sketches of prominent Socialists and Anarchists; amongst which are R. Blatchford, L. Tolstoy, W. Morris, M. Davidson and Edward Bellamy.

Amongst other information there is a directory of all British trade unions, their secretaries and addresses. Also a list of names and addresses of Socialist and Anarchist lecturers in Great Britain. A great deal of space is devoted to a list of Socialist and advanced papers. There are also numerous selections from the writings of eminent thinkers, all of which seem to us to exhibit an Anarchist tendency. An article on the International Socialist Congress, by a Mr. R. W. Anderson, who is good enough to inform us that at Zurich the Anarchists and Anti-Parliamentarians "were bundled out of Turahalle in a body." There is also a well compiled list of recent books and articles bearing upon social questions.

One of the most interesting articles in the Annual is by Comrade Albert Matin, called "The Socialists of France," in which he points out the importance of the revolutionary development of the organised labour movement of France, especially the "Parti Ouvrier Socialiste Révolutionnaire," whose objects are greatly influenced by the teachings of Kropotkin. They are called Allemanists after Jean Allemane, who, with Paul Brouse, is its active spirit. The belief in General Strike distinguishes them from other parties; their participation in Parliamentary action is of minor importance, their work lying outside among the people. They are imbued with the true revolutionary spirit, they work hand in hand with the Anarchist-Communists and are really a great force to be reckoned with in France, being particularly disliked by the Marxists and Guesdists. This is especially evident by their important influence at the recent Congress.

We hope to give the next *Annual* a more favourable review, but in the meantime we would recommend all comrades to add this valuable and cheap work to their libraries; it is of the greatest utility, giving much information, which would otherwise extremely difficult to obtain.

Those Comrades who have received lists and not yet returned them should do so immediately.—J. PERRY.

No. 1. THE WAGE SYSTEM. By PETER KROPOTKINE. 1d.
 No. 2. THE COMMUNE OF PARIS. By PETER KROPOTKINE. 1d.
 No. 3. A TALK ABOUT ANARCHIST-COMMUNISM BETWEEN TWO WORKERS. By E. MALATESTA. 1d.
 No. 4. ANARCHIST-COMMUNISM : ITS BASIS AND PRINCIPLES. By PETER KROPOTKINE. 1d.
 No. 5. ANARCHY. By E. MALATESTA. 1d.
 No. 6. ANARCHIST MORALITY. By PETER KROPOTKINE. 1d.
 No. 7. EXPROPRIATION. By PETER KROPOTKINE. 1d.
 No. 8. ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. By C. M. WILSON. ½d.
 No. 9. ANARCHY ON TRIAL—George Etiévant, Jean Grave and Caserio Santo. 32 pages; 1d.
 Our next pamphlets will be :—
 No. 10. ANARCHISM : ITS PHILOSOPHY AND IDEAL.
 No. 11. REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT.

LAW AND AUTHORITY. By PETER KROPOTKINE. 2d.
 EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. By ELYSEE RECLUS. 1d.
 AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. By PETER KROPOTKINE. 1d.
 THE CHICAGO MARTYRS. Their speeches in Court and the record of their trial, with the reasons given by Governor Altgeld for pardoning Fielden, Schwab, and Neebe. Price sixpence.
 GOD AND THE STATE. By MICHAEL BAKOUNINE. Price fourpence.
 A DIALOGUE AND HUMOROUS POETRY BY L. S. B.; 16 pages 8vo. 1d.
 THE IDEAL AND YOUTH. By ELYSEE RECLUS. 1d.
 REVOLUTIONARY STUDIES. By PETER KROPOTKINE. 1d.
 REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT. By PETER KROPOTKINE. 1d.
 AN ANARCHIST ON ANARCHY. By ELYSEE RECLUS. 1d.
 SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN GERMANY. By GUSTAV LANDAUER. ½d.

Finally, it seems to us highly probable that the next Marxist Congress will afford some interesting items for the "fashionable intelligence."

COMPULSORY VACCINATION.

At last it seems there is to be a cessation of the brutal and inquisitorial system of compulsory vaccination. That it has been a disgusting and degrading infringement of the liberty of the individual, every decent-minded person will admit. In this case, as in so many others, it is the poor workers who have suffered most. How many women of the working class have stood trembling by while their little ones have been ruthlessly poisoned by the callously indifferent "public vaccinator." Some, however, have made a spirited fight against this iniquity, and to those will be due the praise that may surely be given to all who battle against the coercion of the State. Compulsion is always the most brutal of methods, and generally gives rise to a spirit of resistance in persons who might by reason and argument be brought to see the advantage to themselves of a certain line of conduct. Compulsory vaccinators have only themselves to thank that the efficiency of vaccination has become so widely discredited. They should have confined the practice to themselves and shown *practically* the advantages of their theory; then, if those advantages were manifest, they would not have needed to appeal to the State for compulsion—any more than there is need to compel people to walk in the public parks for the fresh air.

REPORT OF THE HOLBORN TOWN HALL MEETING.

About two months ago, on the initiative of two or three comrades, a meeting of London Anarchists was convened, which decided to arrange for a mass meeting to welcome delegates and friends on the occasion of the International Congress, to be held in the Holborn Town Hall, on July 28. The preparatory work was done by a small committee, receiving instructions from weekly gatherings of the London comrades. The meeting was well advertised by handbills, large red posters, and advertisements in Labor papers; about thirty speakers agreed to address the meeting, and many were the letters of sympathy received from comrades at home and abroad.

The meeting was thoroughly successful, Holborn Town Hall being filled up to the last bit of standing-room by an enthusiastic crowd, and an overflow meeting had to be held in the adjoining hall of the Club and Institute Union; whilst many opponents and the general public were present, and probably half the speeches were delivered in foreign languages and translated, perfect order prevailed,—neither a chairman nor an intolerant audience interfering with the speakers, however their opinions might differ from their own; and for those who had assisted at the rowdy meetings of the Congress this meeting was calculated to clear them up again and to confirm more than ever their belief in *freedom* as the paramount basis of everything that is just, right and reasonable.

COMRADE J. PERRY opened the meeting by saying that he was not there to act as an authoritarian chairman, but that simply for the sake of convenience it was advisable to have somebody on the platform to read communications, call upon speakers, etc.; the control of the meeting was vested in the audience itself. He read a number of communications (of which we give extracts elsewhere), and briefly explained the position of Anarchists towards the International Congress. It was said that Anarchists had no right to be present at the Congress because they did not believe in constituted government and authority. But there is just this difference between constituted authority and congresses—that the former's decisions are carried out by force, having become laws obligatory on everybody; whilst the decisions of congresses bind only those who themselves agree with them and choose to co-operate. This is the bond of organisation we believe in, whilst we affirm that the belief of men in authority makes them become slaves, as they are at present. When this belief will have died out, men will voluntarily unite for purposes of production and exchange of all they want. True Socialism is incompatible with political subjection. We do not believe in representation in the ordinary political sense, viz., the abdication of our right to be free in favor of men whom we allow to make laws for us and to become our masters; but we do quite admit it may be convenient that a man communicates to others certain proposals upon which those who sent him agreed, and that, in return, he informs those of the opinions of the others with whom he met. In this sense we send "delegates" to the Congress, and maintain that we have a perfect right to do so. If Anarchists are excluded from the Congress it loses the character of a *Socialist* Congress,—excluding those who before all held up the principle of the old International Workers' Association (to which the Congress pretends to succeed), viz., "*That the economic emancipation of the working classes is therefore the great end, to which every political movement ought to be subordinate.*" It would then extol political power at the cost of economic freedom, and become a mere Parliamentary Reform Congress. If this is intended, let them call it a Reform Congress, and we will give it a wide berth. As long as it pretends to be a *Socialist* Congress we shall be there. After welcoming the delegates, he urged upon all to do their best to bring about a change in society. When everyone has done that as best he can, we have done all that man can do.

J. KEIR HARDIE was the next speaker. He felt favored when he was asked to speak from this platform and to bid welcome to the Anarchist delegates. They came as Anarchists, not ashamed of their ideas but glorying in them; and hence respectable society holds aloof and refuses to acknowledge them. Speaking for a very large portion—not for all—of the I.L.P., he gave a hearty and fraternal welcome to our Anarchist comrades here in England, saying: "I do this the more readily as I am not here as an Anarchist. I am one of those who believe it to be the duty of Socialists, not only to spread economic ideas, but to capture and manipulate in the interest of Socialism the whole machinery of the State; but whilst I believe in this, I have sense enough to recognise that I may be wrong and that the Anarchists may be right, and I am above all a seeker after truth. I am no bigot of State Socialism, no bigot for the use of the political machinery. The sole and unique principle to which I give my full adhesion is the struggle against the present order of society and the determination to help to bring about its fall. This is not a time for those to strive among themselves who agree as to these main ends. I remember the advance of some episodes in the religious wars in Scotland, when those who fought the battle of religious liberty a couple of centuries ago on one occasion, not ten miles from the place where I was born, bitterly quarrelled among themselves as to whether 14 or 16 angels

could pass through the eye of a needle, or on some suchlike problem, when the enemy overtook them and defeated them altogether. It is time to close the ranks against the common enemy, and to present a united front. If Social Democracy is the truth, in the end it will be supreme; if free Anarchy is the truth, it will be supreme. Let us first dispose of the common enemy. One word on the Congress, though I would rather not have said anything about it. You are in it, you will not be expelled (he is referring to the trade union delegates who were Anarchists), and, if I may advise you, remain in the Congress and express your opinions to the last. Give no opportunity to your opponents to say that they had to expel you for this or that miserable detail. I believe that the cast-iron rule which has been too long predominant in the Socialist movement is broken at this Congress, and that future international congresses will show towards all sections of the movement a spirit which is more worthy of our principles, more in harmony with Freedom, Equality and Fraternity—in the name of which we have met. *Liberty* does not mean that the majority ruthlessly crushes the minority. *Equality* does not mean that if you are not of the same opinion with me I refuse to have anything to do with you; and the bitterness, hatred, uncharitableness, which some of the delegates use against the Anarchists, is not *Fraternity*. For all these reasons I rejoice to be on this platform, and as one English delegate, at least, I offer hearty, courteous and fraternal welcome to the Anarchist delegates from all countries."

ELISEE KECLUS: We greet all delegates, though as Anarchists and Communists we cannot agree with their belief in government and laws. The prime factor in human history was never *law*—which prevented progress, and hindered men from being and acting as men—but the *idea*; and when an idea grows and grows revolution must come: it is impossible to stop it, it comes, it comes. We Anarchists have no laws, no regulations, no congresses, no binding resolutions among ourselves, and yet all over the world we arrive at the same conclusions and always co-operate. There is everywhere a wonderful unity in thoughts, sentiments, and the desire and determination to be *free*.

CHRISTIAN CORNELISSEN (of Amsterdam) spoke in Dutch as an anti-parliamentary Communist. Liebknecht had told his party to get rid of phrases; he wanted to know what else the German Party in their long parliamentary career had ever done but talk, use phrases?

TOM MANN: He considered it his duty and took pleasure in meeting advanced men and women active in the same movement as he. Not long ago he had explained his position towards Communist Anarchism in that very same hall, and it was well understood that he did not pose there as an Anarchist; he did not seek the kind recognition of Anarchists nor of anybody else; but he recognized Communist and Collectivist Anarchists and anti-parliamentary Socialists as members of a common school for the overthrow of a tyranny which he had learned to despise himself, and everyone was doing his share in that work. He further said: "I was never identified with the Individualist Anarchist movement; but my sympathies are strongly disposed towards the Communist Anarchist movement. I am not working altogether upon their lines, but upon lines which permit me to take part in political action, municipal and trade unionist efforts, as well as every other way of action. I do not advise Anarchists which way they ought to go, I am faithful to the cause for which I work; but I will speak my opinion on those who work as Socialists and are doing good in their way, but who show a degree of intolerance pitiful to look at. I was infinitely sorry to see the intolerant attitude of the Congressists yesterday and to-day against those who differ with them as to methods. And as I am constituted—whether I am right or not I do not care—whenever I see a majority acting in this tyrannical way against a minority, only because it is a minority, then I side with the minority. The argument, which was used to-day for the hundredth time, that the Anarchists wanted to take part in the Congress only to upset it, is so utterly baseless and in every way so shameful that I gladly separate myself from all persons who use it deliberately. Some friends of mine in the I.L.P. and other friends are very sorry to see me at this meeting; but various men have at various times been so damned sorry for me that I have tried to live without their advice and to form my own way from the facts before me; and the conclusions I drew from them and what little courage I possess make me to go where I believe it to be right to go."

He then addressed the more indifferent part of the audience, who wondered what it all meant, on the main principles of Communist Anarchism and of Collectivism, which he himself upholds. Whether we work from the Collectivist standpoint (by political action) or from the anti-parliamentarian standpoint (by voluntary agencies, trade union effort, etc.), or from the Communist Anarchist standpoint, in each case we work for the destruction of monopoly and no more room for parasites. That men may lead happy lives, that women and children shall no longer starve—think and remember that it is these wicked Communist Anarchists and anti-parliamentarian Socialists who use all the energy they are capable of to bring this about. As to methods,—be not Pecksniffian, but be clearminded, nevertheless.

After his speech, Tom Mann gave us a hand in introducing the subject of a collection, which was then made, and £11 8s. 6½d. were collected. After the choir had sung,

LOUISE MICHEL addressed the meeting. We quote from her speech the comparison of the politicians to squirrels imprisoned in a wheel, where all their efforts to move it forward never manage to advance it even one inch. The gulf between old and new society is widening, and the politicians are with the old rotten and doomed society. They will be crushed by the coming storm of freedom, and it is we who are and shall always be on the side of freedom, fighting for the happiness of the masses and not for a few individuals. We shall never achieve anything by parliamentary action: we shall achieve everything by *freedom*. Men are men after all, and will not always be content to be slaves. Until death we shall fight for liberty, with no other limits than human conscience, and even this can only exercise itself by the exercise of freedom. Long live freedom!

J. C. KENWORTHY: Twelve years ago an Anarchist mass meeting like this would have appeared a phantasy. To-day we have met with our ideal well developed to greet the anti-parliamentary Socialists and Anarchists of so many countries.

J. C. KENWORTHY.

He welcomed the signs of the rising tide of the world's commonsense. The idea of free industrial brotherhood is common to all Socialists. Let us never forget this; but let us remember also that the name *Socialism* does not belong to any section of the movement, but that in the beginning of this century it was first used to designate—not a political—but a *Communist and industrial* movement. From his experience in moving about the country he was able to say that people turn away from politics to-day. The English nation, with its sound commonsense, is ready to give up politics as a weapon and to turn to industrial co-operation on free Anarchist Communist principles. The co-operative movement is leavened with people who do not take part in the ordinary methods of propaganda, but who are active at this moment to build up the industrial groups in our very midst. He also thinks that our movement begins to become a *moral* one. Free industrial brotherhood must not be based upon laws, but upon moral principles. These principles I define shortly as *goodwill unto man and truth in our mutual relations*. The conquest of industry is the conquest before us, and it can only be realised by men who are true comrades in deed, who know each other, have confidence in each other and stand side by side in their war are of peace.

TORTELIER (of the Paris cabinet makers' trade-union): The Paris trade-unionists think that it is time for the workers to emancipate themselves from politics and to conquer economic freedom. No more capital against labor, nor government against freedom. Unfortunately some still imagine that they want leaders to set them free, whilst, as we in France see before all, the deputies elected, by over-confident workers in reality become their new masters. All this is monarchy—for what does it matter if the supreme power is invested in one or in 600 or 700 rulers who have the means in their hands to enforce their will. Down with tyranny! Long live the brotherhood of all peoples!

PETER KROPOTKIN: Whilst the desire to make one's own will predominate over that of others may have created dissensions, nevertheless we are all delighted to see that such an enormous mass of workers, by sending delegates to the Congress, expressed their determination to fight against Capital and to take property out of the hands of the monopolists and exploiters of labor. He hopes that only workers' associations will be admitted at future congresses: we want delegates not as Social Democrats nor as Anarchists, but as men who have won the confidence of a workers' association, whatever be their personal opinion. Furthermore, not only the trade-unions ought to be represented, but also all workers who do something to free themselves from the capitalist yoke, notably the co-operative associations. He also deprecates the voting by nationalities in an assembly purporting to be a really international one.

BERNARD LAZARE (one of the young French authors who are declared Anarchists): History, let us hope, will at once designate this Congress as the one at which the revolutionary proletariat put a stop to authoritarian, parliamentary Social Democracy, which, as everybody is now aware, has no right to claim to be the representative of the revolutionary movement of the world.

TOUZEAU PARRIS: Anarchists love freedom, not merely for themselves, nor for those who are of the same opinion with them, but for all. Anarchy means the freedom to think for ourselves, and not for everybody to think alike. True progress is based upon many minds and many ideas, not upon a uniform dead level of thought. Free thought is the true dynamite of English Anarchists. The more one thinks the more he will be with us, the more he will act with us. Help us to win true human freedom.

F. DOMELA NIKUWENHUIS: He was never so happy at not living in a Social Democratic State as yesterday and to-day. In that case this hall and platform would also be under the control of the government, and we should be prevented from expressing our opinions, which we may do even now under the bourgeois system. Let Jules Guesde (the French Marxist leader) call Kropotkin a fool and Reclus a worthless fellow—as he did in an interview with a correspondent of a reactionary Paris paper (*Matin*): the names of those men and the work they have done will be remembered at a time when those of Guesde and his friends will have sunk into oblivion. Social Democrats of to-day work by all means to conquer power, to exploit the people, and to suck their blood in turn after the bourgeois system has come to an end. But we want a free society, and not a society in which such persons would exercise probably greater power than the capitalists ever did.

W. K. HALL: He was here as an Anarchist who combats all lawmakers, of whatever description. Government is based on distrust and destruction of the masses of the people. He had confidence in his fellow-men, but not in those who want to be our masters. Goodwill unto man and morality are incompatible with a society based on masters and slaves. Power demoralises both masters and slaves. Give power to a worker and he becomes your enemy, like an aristocrat. All Social Democratic ideas are monarchical ideas. [And here he put forward Tortelier's argument, given above, which shows the spontaneous unity of ideas of the Paris and Edinburgh workers, who do not understand each other's language.] Power has the same effect on the heart as strong drink on the brain. Politics are the poison of the workers' movement, synonymous with corruption, domination of man over man, and diverting attention from the economic situation. Electioneering is mainly based on bribery. Candidates pander to the passions of the voters and tell them lies in which they do not believe themselves [interruptions]. "I have been a candidate myself," replied the speaker. Have not governments in the past always obstructed progress and been the bitterest enemies of the trade union movement? The day has come for Anarchists to rise and tell the people: "*Human life is too short to be humbugged by voting.*"

ERRICO MALATESTA: All illusions that anybody might have left as to the Social Democrats' sense of freedom and fairplay will be destroyed by their action yesterday and to-day at the Congress. They say of us that we are "no Socialists," "enemies of organization and of the political struggle."—Comrades, those are three lies! We are "no Socialists," indeed! But is Deville a Socialist (one of the French Marxists at the Congress who recently defended the rights of private property)? or they, as a whole, who advocate a new kind of wage system, perpetuating competition, rivalry and hatred among men? Or are we Socialists, who as Communists demand a society of brotherhood and true solidarity? We are against "organisation of the workers"! Who fights trade unions—we or they? At the Italian Socialist Congress, held at Florence in July last, none but electoral societies were admitted, trade unions being excluded. They do not like trade unions, because they want the government; and a government can only exist when the people are disorganised, isolated, powerless and unable to make up their minds as to their real aims. In the same way as past governments, those who aspire to be the government of the future try to disorganise and split up the workers' movement in order to dominate and boss it. We "want no political struggle," they say. If this means that we reject submission and electioneering, this is true; but in reality it means, *struggle against the government*. Property will never be touched unless those who attack it proceed over the bodies of its defenders—the gendarmes. For these reasons we are against all governments, even those of Social Democrats. The gendarmes of Bebel, Liebknecht and Jaurès always remain gendarmes. Whoever controls them will always be able to keep down and massacre the proletariat. So we will give this power to nobody,—neither to Social Democrats nor to ourselves; for none in such a position could become anything but *canailles* (scamps). Brousse, Guesde and so many of them were, twenty years ago, Anarchists themselves. But they craved after power and are now corrupt—aspirants of the government, aspirants of the police. Emancipate yourselves by organising your own forces, and you shall be free. But if you expect your liberation from any government—be it of charitable bourgeois, be it of Social Democrats—you will for ever be lost.

PIETRO GORI began to speak in Italian and continued in French, which he speaks less fluently, as he was never permitted to stay in France, having been expelled from that hospitable country before he ever intended to go there—during his stay in Switzerland, in fact. He brings greetings from Italian, French and Spanish workers in the United States, whence he returned after a ten months' tour.

* NOTE.—We may here call attention to W. K. Hall's recently published pamphlet, "*The Ballot-box a farce.*" Edinburgh, 1896, 16 pp., 1d.

propagandist tour. He shows up the contradiction between words and action which characterises Social Democrats, who crush down all opposition in a manner even bourgeois parliaments do not resort to. He remained at the Congress in order not to give up a fighting position. At future Congresses we shall come forward stronger than ever to stand up for the ideas of freedom against those sectarians who want to direct the whole workers' movement into their narrow limits, and to exploit human stupidity and ignorance. We see how they behave even now, without being in power;—in what way would they act if they had full power in their hands?

G. LANDAUER: He is proud and glad to address this meeting after having once more been excluded from an official Congress. In Germany there are no such "free" institutions as in England, and, according to Social Democrats, we should concentrate all our efforts upon getting them for ourselves. Yet, whilst in England and France you got tired of political Democracy, we are tired of it in Germany too, having seen it at work within the Social Democratic organisation to which most of us German Anarchists belonged until a few years back. Their greed for domination and intolerance made us forswear the strife for political power and enter the struggle for the abolition of all authority. For this we live; and, however insulted and persecuted, we shall continue this work of propaganda for Anarchy.

LOUIS GROS (a Marseilles trade unionist) is disgusted by seeing the politicians at work during these two days—men who produce nothing, make their living out of rhetorical display, and pretend to represent, rule, and order about the workers in spite of their own will. They treat them like dogs and want to muzzle them. But we do not want anything of this kind. "Everybody is best served by himself," is what we say; and if you act each of you in this way, you will succeed.

Sixteen speakers thus followed each other in rapid succession, besides translations of foreign speeches, and a number of songs were sung by the choir. As far as the speakers available and the enthusiasm of the audience to stay were concerned, the meeting could have lasted for hours longer; but 11 p.m. being near, J. Perry concluded by replying first to a question, which was as follows: "Since Anarchists are against palliatives and consider all, short of physical revolution, as palliatives, how can they consistently take part in a Congress dealing with the discussion of palliatives?" The reply was, that it was not the aim of international congresses at all to be limited to a discussion of palliatives; on the contrary, the very first congress of the old International declared for *economic emancipation*, to which end all political action was subordinated; and, as long as the Congress is not described as a Social Democratic or Palliative Congress, we have a right to be there. But he did not even grant the premises of the question. It is false that we consider physical revolution as the only means. Why, then, was this meeting called? Why do we speak, write, spread literature, etc.? Are all these palliatives? Call them as you like, we call them *propaganda*; and by spreading the idea the institutions are sapped, decay, and fall. Hence we are logical in attending at the Congress. In conclusion, he said: "Whether congresses or not the people are starving. Congresses can only help to bring hope to the more apathetic by showing them how the idea is spreading all over the world. Some means of spreading our ideas are—to tell the soldiers to lay down their arms instead of flying at each other's throats at the bidding of their masters, and to tell to the producers of all wealth to refuse to supply commodities to the armies when at war, etc. Only the workers themselves can bring about the change they desire; no government, no parliament will help them. Though we may look few and they many, yet big things are not necessarily great things, and the most practical way is, after all, to hold fast to principle. And everyone who thinks that we are right in principle, it becomes his duty to help us in preaching Anarchism."

Long live the Social Revolution!

After singing the Marseillaise the meeting dissolved.

In the Club and Institute Union hall comrade W. Wess, F. Kitz, S. Mainwaring, A. Hamon, S. Pavlovitch (of Berlin), and others who had addressed the larger meeting, spoke.

GREETINGS and messages from all parts.

Greetings were received from different provincial and all Scottish groups. The following are extracts from certain messages:—

"The comrades send fraternal greetings to fellow-workers assembled in meeting, and hope that a greater spirit of toleration may prevail amongst parliamentary Socialists in the future."

"If the meeting held produces this effect, a step towards the success of the revolutionary movement of the world will have been achieved."—Leeds Anarchist-Communist Group.

By wire:

"To our comrades from all lands, greetings:

"We are with you in the fight for freedom 'when man to man, the world or shall brothers be an a' that.'"—Glasgow Anarchist Communist Group.

By wire:

"Comrades join heartily in greetings to international rebels against authority and monopoly. Hurrah for Anarchy!"—Manchester Anarchist Communist Group.

By wire:

"Aberdeen Anarchists send fraternal greetings to comrades of all nations. May this meeting and following Congress help to strengthen the spirit of solidarity among the workers and hasten the Social Revolution."

"We sincerely hope this great gathering of comrades will be a means and productive of good."—Dundee Anarchist Communist Group.

The following note is a reply from William Morris, who was too unwell to answer personally; his secretary therefore says:—

"Mr. William Morris asks me to thank your committee for the kind invitation to take part in the meeting of the 28th. Mr. Morris is very sorry that he is still too unwell to attend any public meeting; and, indeed, apart from that, he will not be in London on the 28th as his doctor is sending him out of town immediately. He wishes you all possible success, and is very sorry that he cannot be with you."

Robert Blatchford, who was unable to speak, expressed a hope that the demonstration would be a success. He finally handed in the following protest on the night of meeting:

"Mr. Chairman.—Will you allow me, on behalf of myself and the other *Clarion* men, to say that we consider the treatment of the Anarchists at the Congress ungenerous and unfair. We think they were not given a fair hearing, and that the Congress in expelling them has sent away many of the best Socialists in Europe. If I could have spoken French, I would have expressed my sympathy with the French and Dutch friends verbally. As I could not speak to them at the Congress, will you please read to them this protest against the narrowness and intolerance so unfortunately manifested at the Congress.—On behalf of the *Clarion*,
ROBERT BLATCHFORD."

"What we think proper and worthy of our principles, is to continue our propaganda everywhere by word and example. We are further still convinced that the example we have initiated will, in the near future, produce better fruits and create more converts than all this Congress can do. Wishing you success in your anti-parliamentary campaign.—FREE COMMUNIST AND CO-OPERATIVE COLONY, Clousden Hill Farm, Newcastle-on-Tyne."

Comrade Walter Crane sent a statement to be read at the meeting. The following is an extract therefrom:

"As I am not able to be present at your meeting of welcome to our brethren, the foreign delegates to the International Socialist and Trade Union Congress, I write a few lines; since I certainly desire to join in a hearty welcome to all those coming to London to attend this great Council of Labor; and I heartily wish and hope that it may tend to unite Socialists of all shades of opinion, sinking minor differences, and declaring and working for the great and main principles to which we look to raise the whole plane of human life and labor upon the earth."

From abroad the following communications were received:

Berlin.—A letter from Mrs. Agnes Reinhold, our comrade who has just left prison after serving six years' penal servitude for having taken part in the distribution of some Anarchist leaflets in 1890.

"A few days ago I was liberated from the penitentiary in which I underwent a six years' sentence passed on me by a Pruss-German court of justice for having stated my views too plainly. I feel compelled to send a greeting to the representatives of the proletariat of all countries assembled in London. I should be happy to be in your midst, comrades, to discuss the best way to lead mankind towards freedom. Above all, I wish, by my greeting, to prove the fact that there are in Germany, as in all other countries, brave men and women convinced of the truth of Anarchism, who, in spite of all tyranny, stand fearlessly by the flag of Liberty and remain faithful to Anarchy. Anarchy flourishes in Germany, as I observed to my great joy on returning to life, notwithstanding all falsehoods and treachery; and its adherents, hand in hand with our brothers and sisters of all countries, will march to victory. With Anarchist greetings,
AGNES REINHOLD."

Milan.—A letter from the Anarchists of Milan, expressing their principles, also exposing the ever-growing reactionary tendencies of the Italian Social Democratic parties.

Switzerland.—The Anarchists of Berne express "their sympathies and their solidarity in your struggle against the Marxist chiefs, the Socialist politicians, and the sectarian leaders who want to arrogate to themselves the right to speak and to make laws in the name of the Socialist and International proletariat. In this country we have better opportunity than elsewhere to see these men at work who live on the working-classes, and never miss the opportunity to join their persecutions and calumnies of us to those of the government." The letter then growing into a report, exposes their actual work, their corruption, their petty intrigues, mutual jealousy, etc., which differs greatly from the glowing accounts we have heard sometimes of Swiss Democracy, the Referendum, etc. But it is confirmed by two other reports; one from a combined group of Geneva, Lausanne, and the other from the Anarchists of Geneva. The latter says with regard to the Congress:

"The Anarchists of Geneva cannot differ from the opinion of their comrades of all countries in the appreciation of the proceedings resorted to by the Marxists, to exclude the adversaries of Parliamentarism from the so-called 'Congress of Socialist Workers of all Countries.' It is indeed not a matter to discuss the usefulness or the sterility of Congresses in general, and of the London Congress in particular, nor to ponder over the very problematic results for the cause of Freedom which may issue therefrom. But it matters to protest against the ostracising measures used for the suppression of free discussion, to hinder our friends from sapping the principles of inviolable authority and reverend legality which are so beloved by the political Socialists of all varieties. Upon this point all the Anarchists must be unanimous to combat the influence of Collectivists and other Socialist wirepullers and to use every occasion to open the eyes of the people and to show up the pitiable rôle which they play in all those farces called 'revindications,' 'reforms,' etc., etc., by political and parliamentary means. For these reasons we are happy to send to your meeting a few words of sympathy and encouragement. We join with our comrades of all countries to expose the unqualifiable attitude of those so-called representatives of the labor world, and we appeal to the people, who, let us hope, will make short work with the arrogant pretension of the Marxists to represent them, whilst they only represent the interests of ambitious leaders, greedy place-hunters, animated by the hope of supplanting the bourgeoisie at the rich governmental banquet."

Italian workers group of Zurich, Switzerland, writes, in delegating Sanftleben, that: Firstly, since nothing else but the vital interests of the proletariat can be discussed at such a Congress, no party may pretend to be the sole and privileged representative of those interests; and Secondly, that by Jesuitical tricks and authoritarian tutorship, the Social Democracy wants to impose its own methods to the whole movement, excluding thus the best parts of the forces of revolution.

Another letter, written in German, expressing a similar protest, reached us from Lausanne.

Spain.—On April 10, the Organising Committee of Spain for the International Congress, residing at Barcelona, published a translation of the London Zurich Committee's preliminary rules, and made enquiries of all the Spanish trades-unions whether they agreed or not with the narrow spirit of these rules, excluding anti-parliamentarians, etc.

The following 30 trades-unions demanded the admission of all delegates, without distinction of sociological views, to the Congress: Agricultural Laborers of Marchena, Carpenters of Santiago, Agricultural Labourers of

Paradas, Union of Workers of all Trades of Badajoz, Agricultural Labourers of the Espejo, Stonecutters of El Ferrol, Bricklayers of Manresa, Mechanical Weavers of Tarrasa, Union of Workers of all Trades of Granollers, The Workers Solidarity Union of Vile, Union of Workers of all Trades of Calange, Mechanical Weavers of San Givès de Volasar, Carpenters of La Coruña, Workers of all Trades of La Coruña, Shoe-makers of Malaga, Paper-makers of Benolas, Mechanical Weavers of Saladell, Shoemakers of Barcelona, Silk Dyers of Barcelona, Carpenters' Union of Barcelona, Bakers and Confectioners of Barcelona, Lace and Ribbon Makers of Barcelona, Carpenters of San Martin Provencals, Union of all Trades of Alcoy, Brick-makers of Sans, Wood-turners of Barcelona, Cotton-dyers of Barcelona, Railway Workers of Spain, Printers of Barcelona, Tanners of San Martin Provencals.

Whilst the nomination of a delegate for the 30 Trade-Unions and the elaboration of his instructions were under consideration, the explosion of June 7 occurred, which became the pretext for a persecution of workers' societies everywhere in Spain and chiefly in Catalonia, the province where Barcelona is situated. Half of the Commission which prepared the Congress is in prison; the Associations had to suspend business for the moment, and the delegate cannot be sent. Hence Comrade Malatesta was asked to take over the representation of these 30 Trade-Unions. He is instructed to ask for the admission of all delegates without discrimination of school.

The document containing these and other facts concludes: "Hurrah for the Solidarity of the Workers! Hurrah for Social Emancipation."

Cuba.—The General Society of Cuban Workers published a protest against our exclusion, saying, among other things, "As men before all, and as working men, partisans of the most complete equality, we solemnly protest against any proposed workers' congress which is not a gathering of the workers themselves; and we protest against an international meeting of working men in which each and all of the working men's organizations would not have a chance to be duly represented. There is but one justice which cannot be altered. To permit its falsification means to take part in committing an iniquity—the vulneration of right. In this way thinks and acts the General Workers' Society of Cuba."

Roumania.—Bukharest Anarchists send a protest and plead for tolerance, as follows: "Intolerance—we consider it horrible for Socialist schools and parties. The more so, as it is not manifested by a sect, a single country or a whole continent, but by a universal movement! We are with those who maintain tolerance, hence the admission to Congress of all Socialist schools, of all individuals who, without representing anybody, have something to say; because the number of votes adds nothing to the right or wrong of a person's opinions. One single man has had the courage to say in his time: *e pur si muore* ('and yet she is moving')—Galileo in speaking of the earth; and he was condemned by all the rest of men. It is a pity if Socialists proceed in a like manner against those who may, perhaps, be in the situation of that unhappy scientist. They forget that the last word of science always belongs to the future."

Moldavia.—The Moldavian Socialists of the mountains send a long statement of principles, ending with a similar protest.

Sweden.—A letter full of facts on the Swedish labor movement, equally expressing sympathy and solidarity, was sent from Malinö in Southern Sweden.

Armenia.—An appeal addressed to the Congress, or, if all Socialists were not admitted to it, to the Anarchist Conferences which would take its place, was sent by Armenian comrades; they saw all along, what many of their countrymen unfortunately saw too late, that Armenia has nothing to hope from diplomatic intervention, and they appeal to all Socialists for active help in the most immediate way—arms and volunteers if possible.

It would be easy to fill our columns with protests published in French and other papers; the French trade unions, in fact, were all but unanimous in their protests. The same applies to Holland and Spain.

Two propositions to the official Congress were sent to us in duplicates, to be mentioned if the official Congress took no notice of them. One is a resolution passed by the German Working Men's Society, of Brussels, in favor of the admission of *all*.—This is the *only* plea for tolerance coming from a German society which is *not* Anarchist. Another is an appeal in favor of a special agitation amongst the *young*; and was sent from Hamburg.

The Anarchists present at the Congress held mandates from England, Scotland, France, Spain, Italy, Germany, Austria (Bohemia and Galicia), Switzerland, Denmark, United States,—besides the Free Communists of the Netherlands.

APATHY: A Dialogue with a Moral.

Pessimist: Oh yes, I know; I've heard all that before. People like you always think such a lot of good things are going to happen when a little stir is made, and now you're going mad over the Congress, and you think the Revolution is a century nearer because you've kicked up a dust at Queens Hall. You seem to forget that all those fellows will go home and, at the end of a week, they'll forget all their big talk and mope along in the ordinary grooves.

Enthusiast: But are you in sympathy with any of the objects of the Congress? Do you really wish to see a change?

Pessimist: Why, of course I do; and I'd be willing to help if I thought there was any chance of making a change during the next thousand years.

Enthusiast: Well, we won't go into the question of *when* the change is coming—that's as much beyond your reckoning as it is beyond mine. But we are both agreed there's got to be a change; so the question arises: who is the wiser person of the two—you for standing aloof and sneering at the apathy of the masses, or I for giving what help I can to forward the movement and being of good cheer whatever happens, feeling my ideas to be right?

Pessimist: Say, rather, is it better to live in dreams of the future, or to adapt yourself to the circumstances of every day life?

