

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. XI.—No. 115.

APRIL, 1897.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

THE EUROPEAN CONCERT.

What will happen in European countries in this year of the Diamond Jubilee? Look at the picture presented to us by the governments of the "Great Powers," as they are called. "Great Powers," indeed; Great Criminals in reality, doing the disgusting work of the unmitigated scoundrels of the money market—the bondholders and financiers.

We are confronted with innumerable ironclads carrying the most costly and terrible instruments of destruction, and hundreds of thousands of men concentrating on the frontiers preparing for the possibilities of mutual destruction; and all this display of force ostensibly because the Cretans, sick of Turkish rule, are in open revolt and are anxious to secure themselves rather more liberty and possibly less taxation than the broken promises of a gang of worthless despots have brought them. Behind all this, however, lie the real motives which are urging the Great Powers to support Turkish rule—the millions lent by the Hirsch's, the Rothschilds and the rest, who are complaisant enough to finance the band of brigands who rule Turkey, in consideration of a handsome percentage to be wrung from the unfortunate races—Turks, Cretans and others—who have the misfortune to live(?) under Turkish rule. To secure the spoil of these worthy capitalists—without whom, as the political economists tell us, our cities could not be built and industry would be paralysed—the Cretans must remain in subjection to the Turk; and the armed forces of the Great Powers rally to the rescue of the vultures who are sucking the life-blood of the people. And certainly these monopolists and exploiters have some reason to be anxious, everything considered; for the progress of events during the last ten years has shaken them somewhat in their belief that the future is all for them. They have seen the tide of Democracy rising, and if there has been no direct and successful attack on their strongholds, there has at least been a wave of Socialistic thought and aspiration which has been too definitely grasped, too consciously conceived by the workers to be pleasant to those whose interests are only served by the people's ignorance and apathy.

There have not been wanting those, of so-called liberal minds, who have raised their voices against the Socialist propaganda; and the more determined and uncompromising that propaganda has been—as, for instance, in the case of the Anarchist Communist—the more it has excited their anger and dislike. As was to be expected, many of these have joined the forces of reaction; a reaction which has been making itself felt for some two years or more, and which is not only political, but also economical and religious—if there is such a thing as religion among the ruling classes. And now in that vile accumulation of governmental force, which hovers over Crete like a cloud of death and destruction, we see the natural culmination of this European reaction. The governments of the free(?) countries are hand-and-glove with the despots, and behind this abomination stands international capitalism, lynx-eyed and insatiable, cynically surveying the prospect of a human sacrifice that is simply unthinkable, and all in order that their coffers may remain full. And the refined and cultivated gentlemen of the British government are rather enjoying than otherwise the accounts of the mangling of Cretan women and children by the shells from the British ships.

Government is indeed a protector of life and property; it is indeed an institution that keeps humanity from falling a prey to its own passions; and those who look up to it as the head and fountain of our national life and conscience must be thrilled with the part it has played in the European Concert.

We notice that the *Chronicle*, amongst other things, has made an appeal to the English people to let its voice be heard in favor of Greece and liberty. We will not stop to enquire what the *Chronicle* means by liberty. But if an appeal to the people is to be made at all, we should suggest it should be made to the people of all nations and it might take the following form:

Men and Women of the world who toil and suffer to produce the wealth which others enjoy, you will see at the present moment how the rulers of the nations in Europe are gathering their forces, not to help progress, not to aid humanity, not to preserve peace—for which in reality they care nothing,—not to ensure that the natural evolution of human liberty shall have free scope, but that the class which robs and oppresses you shall maintain their privileges for which you will have to pay and for which, perchance, some of your relatives or friends will be shedding their blood. Such is the irony of the situation. Do not suppose that it is merely a question of Cretan liberty: it is a question of the liberty of all of you, in every land. And until that question is in a fair way of being answered it is useless to talk of peace. It is for you to find that answer. Hard as it may seem that in the midst of

your struggles for bread—so hard to win and often under conditions of the direst misery and degradation,—it is nevertheless true that some moments must be found for the consideration of the problem which at every step forces itself upon you. Do not be persuaded that others can do your thinking for you; until you do it for yourselves there is little hope for the future. That you are awakening to this fact, is true; and if you can learn the lesson of the perfidy and cruelty of government and the crushing power of the capitalist, which display their evil influence so plainly to-day, you will have made some advance in the direction of your own emancipation.

The ANARCHISTS OF BARCELONA.

This month we have before us an overwhelming mass of documents which might fill the entire space of our paper. Letters and appeals from the tortured who were sentenced to death, letters from other prisoners, an article by Tarrida del Marmol, long statements by the Spanish independent press, manifestoes, etc.; details, more horrible than ever, become known and the facts are openly and without meeting a denial discussed in the Spanish press.

First, we publish an appeal from poor tortured Sebastian Sunyer, first published by the Berlin *Sozialist* and reprinted as a leaflet in 100,000 copies. Surely the English labor press will find space for the appalling words of the unhappy man.

"TO ALL GOOD AND RIGHT-MINDED PEOPLE

"From you I hope for a little sympathy and justice.

"They want to murder us.

"After having torn the flesh from our bodies and the nails from our fingers, after compressing our heads and mutilating our testicles, they want us to disappear so that we never might bear witness of these infamous proceedings.

"Good and right-feeling people, do not let your attention be diverted from this ill-famed Anarchist trial. You, who, with honest hearts, took up our defence, shall be told how matters stand. Our torturers want to conceal and frustrate the good work which you did by making our martyrdom known to all the world.

"Listen with your pure souls: In the minutes of the court-martial, held in the accursed dungeon, our tortures, though distinctly told to our judges, are not mentioned by one syllable.

"Listen, you with your honest hearts. In their zeal and love for justice our torturers have published a series of lies. By means of these lies the inquisitors want to confuse public opinion and suppress the truth.

"Read this, honest men: They want us to sign a document by which we declare that we have not been tortured, and they have resolved to obtain these signatures from us by all means.

"Good people of the world, we are innocent; yes, we are innocent!

"Did ever such a monstrous injustice take place? All good and right-feeling men, in the name of all that you love in this world, save us from the power of our executioners! Aid us in our helplessness! Think of our misery!

Fortress of Montjuich, March 11, 1897.

SEBASTIAN SUNYER.

"All good people are requested to copy this document and spread it all over the world, that it may penetrate at last also to the Spanish papers."

This is not a letter from a victim of the old forgotten days of the Inquisition, but from a living man, lying practically buried in the fortress, it is true, written three weeks ago and published at the risk of further tortures and death; the writer's name we have frequently mentioned as an author of pamphlets (*La Utopia*, 1892; *El Terco y el filosofo*), and before his arrest he prepared a Spanish edition of Kropotkin's *Conquest of Bread*. For three months he has been lying under sentence of death; and a new crime is being committed: we may almost say that they are now mentally tortured to make them deny the physical tortures of last year.

In Eugene Sue's *Wandering Jew* we are shown, in the first part, how the designs of greedy priests, supported by brute force alone, are frustrated; in the second part, the same designs are achieved by slow moral poisoning done by the priests. Of these two stages of clerical (and, for that matter, of State) tactics we are reminded by what now happens: "Towards the end of January or early in February," we read in a letter to the *Vorwärts* (the paper of Liebknecht who maintained last year that Anarchists were "petted by the bourgeois"), "four Jesuit fathers came to Montjuich Castle to convert the prisoners. With Ascheri and Mas they apparently succeeded; as a reward they now receive better food and treatment, and are allowed several hours walking in the drill-ground. But Molas sent them about their business in such a way that they did not call again. Sunyer did the same: when the Jesuit father came to see him, Sunyer, without uttering a word, showed him the wound where his testicles had been torn away, and then turned his back upon him. The Jesuit stood for a few moments as if nailed to the spot, and then left the cell in silence never to return."

A letter from another prisoner, printed in *Les Temps Nouveaux* (Paris), says, "Unfortunately for our enemies, these fiendishly refined tortures gave rise to a scene at the court-martial never to be forgotten; for, in spite of the precautions taken—all doors closed, the accused securely handcuffed, forty-eight gendarmes, armed to the teeth, each ready with a gag to stifle the truth in the mouths of our comrades,—in spite of all this our friends bravely did their duty; there was continuous exchange of defiance between counsel and judges; truth and falsehood had a desperate struggle, in spite of the precautions and the apparent superiority of reaction, the battle was half lost for reaction and it turned back nearly as quick as it had advanced. No

more was said about the famous silver inkstand presented to the judge, Marzo, which represented a superior officer crushing under his feet a dragon holding in its mouth two Orsini bombs.

"This is what is being done. A committee of inquiry was formed to investigate the allegations of the tortured. This committee consists of six members and is presided over by the chief general of Barcelona."

"These six individuals went into the dungeons where Ascheri, Molas, Nogues, Luis Mas, Sunyer and Callis are kept, and laid before each of them a declaration, fully written out, in these words:

"I, the undersigned, formally declare that I have not been tortured or ill-treated by any of my warders; on the contrary, I have only to praise their conduct. For these reasons I declare the statements in the press to be lies."

"In exchange for their signature they were promised:

"1. Grace of their life.

"2. Good wine, good bread, and good food until their acquittal, which would soon be ordered from Madrid."

"None accepted save Ascheri, who was feeble enough to sign. In face of the categorical refusal of the other prisoners, the members of the committee changed their tactics, and begged and supplicated with no better result. Then they begged their victims to pardon their torturers, saying that it was a misunderstanding. All replied by a categorical refusal; Ascheri said nothing.".....

This shows how this enquiry—which Sir Frank Lockwood so justly fears, in his letter, "will not be a searching one,"—worse than a farce, is becoming a new instrument of torture!

In another letter (to the *Vorwärts*) it is also recorded how Portas (lieutenant of the gendarmes and immediate chief of the torturers) went about from cell to cell craving for pardon and shamming remorse; he met only with contempt. Meanwhile he found another victim. Captain Juan Morales, counsel for Nogues, had challenged him to a duel; the government prohibited the duel and relegated him to the reserve; upon this he shot himself. He had risen from the ranks, and the Republican press honors his memory.

The reprint of further letters would but confirm the facts mentioned in this and in previous numbers, and help only to initiate us into the refined details of cruelties. There is a letter from J. Molas telling of nine days and nights of torture, converting them from the innocent unconcerned persons they were before into men accusing themselves and others of every conceivable crime. A letter from F. Callis states that a military surgeon examined him and saw his many wounds from tortures, before the trial.

Juan B. Oller (sentenced to nineteen years, one month, eleven days) tells how, barbarously manacled, he had to move about for thirty-nine hours, his only food dry codfish, and after this he was mercilessly flogged until blood came from his mouth and nose. Roused again in the middle of the night, he was beaten with sticks; when he could no longer walk he was placed erect against the wall until he fell down exhausted when he was kicked profusely and then left with some food but no water; after being subjected to another course of this horrible treatment intensified by excruciating thirst, he had delusions and, in desperation, ate chalk from the walls and drank his own urine and the paraffin from the lamp.—All this for not telling what he did not know himself: where one of the Anarchists was hiding. After that they told him they found that he was of no importance, and warned him to be silent about his treatment. "You bought Anarchist papers," Portas said to him, "why not Catholic papers, why do you not like these?"

The clearest view of the inner side of the trial, which is, above all, a blow aimed by the Spanish priests at free thought in every form, is given in an article, "To the Inquisitors of Spain," by Tarrida del Marmol in the *Revue Blanche* (Paris) of Feb. 1. The old saying that in the name of no cause have so many crimes and murders been committed as in that of religion—purporting to bring a message of love for mankind,—is proved up to the hilt. The same author gives endless details of the torture of insurgents in the Philippine Islands, and he is preparing a book on Spanish rule, containing more details and documents.

Among the hundreds of persons arrested since last summer there are seventeen Republicans, one of whom is a former Deputy and one a former minister of the government, Nic. Estevanez.

There is also a German locksmith among them (M. Hueffel of Cologne) who, since 1891, has been arrested every time that a strike or an explosion happens to take place. From his long letters to the *Sozialist*, we gather many details of the previous tortures of the days of Pallas and Franch, of the horrible insanitary dungeons, etc., etc. Again, in a letter to the *Vorwärts*, the instruments of torture are described; especially the implement for compressing the skull, tearing the lips, etc.

We could quote from the *Despertar* long extracts from *El Pais* and *La Justicia* of Madrid, also the stirring manifesto *La Espana Salvaje* (Savage Spain) to the Spanish people, published by the group "Jovenes Anarquistas" of New York; protest meetings were also held in Switzerland, Norway and elsewhere; but we will conclude, pointing out that by the publication of the circumstances under which retractions are sought to be extorted by the Spanish government, the utter infamy of that government becomes manifest. Spain, the most Christian country (if it is not England that claims this byword), and Turkey, the alleged most un-Christian country—in what respect do they differ? Government and priesthood are the same all the world over. Was the king of Benin worse? We never heard, in any case, that he made his victims sign denials of their tortures!

Let this latter fact above all be known, and spread Sunyer's appeal in spite of the silence of press and politicians on this crime against humanity!

On Feb. 17, a deputation consisting of Edward Carpenter, Walter Crane, Rev. Stewart Headlam, Herbert Burrows, H. Salt and J. Perry called at the Spanish Embassy to lay before the Ambassador a protest against the tortures inflicted on the Anarchists of Barcelona. Being told that they could not see him, they returned the next morning (save E. Carpenter, who had to leave London) joined by R. B. Cunningham Grahame and Mrs. Mallett. A butler told them they could see the Ambassador's private secretary in the afternoon. This was not found to be convenient for the deputation, so the following letter was sent:

To His Excellency, Count Casa Valencia, Ambassador to the Court of St. James.
Grosvenor Gardens.

YOUR EXCELLENCY,

I beg to enclose for your perusal and consideration an extract from the *Daily Chronicle* of Tuesday January 26, 1897, in which an account is given of the tortures to which alleged Anarchist prisoners, against whom nothing has been proved, have been subjected in Barcelona in order to compel them to ac-

knowledge themselves guilty and also to accuse their friends. The deputation who called at the Embassy to-day was composed of British citizens, who have satisfied themselves that the accounts of the tortures are true. The facts were recently laid before a large public meeting in London, at which an indignant protest was made against such practices being resorted to by authorities under a civilised government. The deputation represented various schools of thought and its members wished to lay the facts before your Excellency in the hope that for the honor of Spain you will be able by transmitting our protest to your government to secure the cessation and prevention of practices which are totally opposed to all human feeling and principles.

As we were not fortunate enough to see your Excellency, may I beg that you will kindly appoint a time at which we can wait upon you personally.

(Signed) On behalf of the deputation

Respectfully yours,—J. PERRY.

The Ambassador neither sent a reply or acknowledgement to this or any of the three following letters.

To His Excellency, the Spanish Ambassador to the Court of St. James.

February 22, 1897.

I beg to draw your Excellency's attention to a letter I forwarded you on Thursday last, 18th inst., on behalf of English citizens.

I have neither had an acknowledgment of or reply to the same. Trusting it will receive your immediate attention, anticipating an early reply,

Very respectfully yours,—J. PERRY.

February 26, 1897.

Your Excellency,—I beg to draw your attention to my letter of the 18th inst. to which I have as yet had no acknowledgment. I desire to state that it is my intention to publish the correspondence, and am therefore awaiting your reply.

Respectfully yours,—J. PERRY.

March 13th, 1897.

Your Excellency,—I beg to draw your attention to my communications since the 18th of February of this year, bearing on the alleged torture of political prisoners in Spain.

I should be pleased if you would kindly let me have an acknowledgement—if not reply to the same. Trusting to hear from you soon,

Respectfully yours,—J. PERRY.

A copy of *Freedom* (Feb.) was sent to the Marquis of Salisbury with the following letter:

February 19, 1897,

SIR,—Enclosed please find an account of the alleged tortures on Spanish Anarchists, which I trust you will carefully peruse and give your serious consideration.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH PERRY.

The reply was:

Foreign Office, February 24, 1897.

SIR,—I am directed by the Marquess of Salisbury to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 19th inst. forwarding a copy of the journal *Freedom*, containing statements as to tortures said to have been inflicted by the Spanish authorities on the Anarchists concerned in the bomb outrage at Barcelona.

I am, Sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

T. H. SANDERSON.

Joseph Perry, Esq.

In reply to a similar communication, Sir Frank Lockwood wrote:

26 Lennox Gardens, Pont Street, S.W.

21 February, 1897.

SIR, I thank you for sending me the paper containing an account of the infamous treatment to which the Anarchists in Spain are alleged to have been subjected. I see that an inquiry has been promised, but I fear it will not be a searching one.

Yours truly

FRANK LOCKWOOD.

Royal Courts of Justice, Room 551,

February 24, 1897.

DEAR SIR, In reply to your letter, Sir Frank Lockwood directs me to say that unless some of those who were treated as it is alleged so barbarously were British subjects he does not see how any question could be put in the House of Commons.

Yours obediently,

R. E. BARRATT.

[To which we might append the question: whether the Armenians and Cretans, whose case has been almost daily before the House of Commons during the last year, are British subjects either?]

Sir Charles Dilke wrote:

76 Sloane Street, S.W., Feb. 16, 1897.

DEAR SIR,—I have too many questions to take up new ones, and have not a sufficient knowledge of Spanish affairs to be inclined to go into what would be to me a new question as regards that country. There is plenty of scope for all the labor that I can give in connection with countries as to which I am better informed.

With respect,

I am truly yours,—CHARLES W. DILKE.

Joseph Perry Esq.

Since that Sir Charles Dilke has more closely examined the matter and has now promised his support.

A question was asked in the House of Commons on Feb. 22, by Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

"Mr. P. O'Brien asked the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs whether he had received any confirmation of the report that torture was applied to several prisoners in the fortress of Montjuich, Barcelona, during December 1896; whether any of the sufferers were British subjects; and, if so, whether he proposed to make any representations to the Spanish government on the matter."

"Mr. Curzon:—'Beyond a newspaper report which was sent to me by the hon. member, we have heard nothing of the matter alluded to. If any evidence reaches us indicating that British subjects have been injured, of course we should inquire.'"—*Standard*, Feb. 23, 1897. Suppressed by the *Times*, *Daily Chronicle*, etc.

Since then a Committee has been formed (consisting of members of the I.L.P., S.D.F., Fabian Society, Friends of Russian Freedom, Humanitarian League and London Anarchists) which is preparing a further large meeting. The new facts disclosed in the letters from the fortress in this month's *Freedom* ought to rouse an universal protest against this greatest outrage upon political prisoners of our time.

P. S. We now learn (by telegraph) that the Supreme

Court-Martial has decreed the execution of NINE instead of EIGHT prisoners. This is all the result of a three month's agitation all over the world.

ECHOES OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST WORKERS' CONGRESS at London, 1896.*

Among the numerous reports and articles dealing with the Socialist Congress of 1896, Hamon's unquestionably takes its place in the first rank. As regards the number of collected documents, resolutions and amendments in all languages; the references and quotations produced by him from various newspapers and from speeches, all of them given in the original expressions made use of by the respective authors and orators; the fairmindedness and impartiality† exercised by the author in relation to all the fractions of the international Socialist movement who were present at the Congress. This work is almost the best one among all the writings on the subject. To this we must add that, by way of introduction, the author gives a brief review (filling 72 pages) of the present position of the Socialist movement among all the civilised nations, by which he greatly helps the reader to understand and to appreciate the debates and conflicts of the various parties and fractions of the Congress.

However, the book is not devoid of errors regarding both the theoretical part and the review of the contemporary movement. In the first case we were struck by his definition of the origin of the term "Socialism," and, in the second, by the outline of the Russian Socialist movement.

"Many definitions have been suggested," says Hamon, "since 1832, a period when Pierre Leroux *invented the word*" (p. 3). Of all the attempts made by the author to define Socialism, he summarises it thus: "A social system or an ensemble of social systems wherein the means of production are socialised" (p. 5). He further adds, "The specific feature of Socialism is therefore the socialisation of the means of production" (p. 6). This definition is rather vague and does not show us the most essential side of the system, the production and distribution of the "socialised means." Some, for instance those of Engels' school, may claim that this distribution ought to be performed by their Democratic Bureaucracy; others will demand it for the Democratic Church; still others for Parliament, and so on. To all of them it is possible to transform the means of production into common property; but as long as the right of managing the social wealth is not acknowledged to all autonomous communities, autonomous groups and productive societies, so long there might exist Social Democratic Bureaucracy, the Social Church, etc.; but Socialism in the true sense of the word will not exist. In accordance with the conception as to the rôle of society and of the individual in the management of the communal property, the following definition of the term will be exact, without any equivocations as regards the State, Bureaucracy or Church, that "Socialism is a social system, wherein the means of production are socialised and administered by the community itself on the basis of equality between the sexes." This definition is in perfect agreement with the conception of Socialism by the earliest writers. Had Hamon directed his attention, instead of to the vague, deist-metaphysician Pierre Leroux, to the English Socialists of the beginning of this century he would have considered Leroux's pretentious claim to the invention of the word Socialism ridiculous. From J. S. Mill's autobiography we learn that already in the twenties the Owenite, W. Thompson, discussed with his friends at meetings the subject "Socialism"; and from the text of their publications (*An Inquiry etc.*, by W. Thompson, 1824; *Labor defended against the claims of Capital*, Hodgkin, 1835) we see that the terms "Capitalism," "Surplus-value," "Socialism," and so forth were created and made use of by the Owenites (*vide* the debates of the Society of all Classes and all Nations).

The English Socialists put as the fundamental principle that all possession, production, distribution and education should be communal, by the community for the community, and hence Socialism and not the State and not Democracy. Socialism cannot be either Democratic or aristocratic or clerical. Social Democracy is a pleonasm born of the corruption of Socialism by means of the teaching of the idea of the State by German Democrats. Socialism, by establishing the equality of the sexes, the autonomy of the individual, by securing to all members of the community all their wants—material, ethical and social;—by this it puts an end to all high-sounding and empty phrases of political Radicals and Democrats. Political Democracy has accepted but very few of the Socialist claims, and makes an effort to carry such a transitory order of things from the capitalist State, based upon militarism, privilege and exploitation, into the Socialist state of solidarity and autonomy, in which transitory state are also admitted both wars and exploitation. The German Social Democrats have quite openly declared to William II. and the bourgeoisie that they are faithful patriots ready to fight under the banner of the first; as to the latter, they also adhere to their theory of a variable wage-system in the future state. For Democracy this is perfectly natural; but Socialism is, above all, the negation of militarism and the wage-system. Therefore the truly

Socialist International Congress of Lausanne, in 1867, resolved that in case of war breaking out there should be a general strike of soldiers and workers of the nations at war; and the Democratic Congress of Zurich, in 1893, rejected this very same resolution brought in by the Socialists of Holland.

Owing to the above-mentioned inaccuracy of definition of Socialism it was possible for the Democrats—trusting in their great number—to try and push forward their Democracy, decorated with Socialism, as the only scientific and true Socialism. Moreover, once the Socialist literature of our day will have established the clear definition of Socialism of the early writers, especially the English, i.e. if we supply the second part of the formula, then neither Democracy nor the State nor the Church will find a place in it: the first being a relic of primitive evolution; the second an anti-social organisation of bureaucracy and red-tapeism; and the Church being supplanted by absolute freedom of enlightened thought and conscience of the economically and socially equal members of the Socialist community.

It is a pity that in a book so carefully compiled as that of our friend Hamon is, we should meet with weak passages like his sketch of the Russian movement. I believe that he gathered his information from the publications of the school of Engels; to wit, from the maniacs of a monopoly in Socialism and science—the Social Democrats. If, before the Congress, Hamon had no opportunity of knowing their mania for attributing to themselves all scientific truths and the possession of the one and true Socialism, nor their strange pretension to impose their dictatorship on the English, the French and other nations, he has himself seen their not over loyal way of acting during the Congress. He ought to have been on his guard against their tales and ought never to have told his readers that "the leadership of the (Russian Socialist) movement belongs to Social Democracy," nor that "once there existed a revolutionary terrorist movement . . . in this movement there were Liberals, Radical Republicans!"

I can assure our friend Hamon that, since the conspiracy of Moscow (1864-66) up to this date, no Republicans or simple Radicals took part in the Russian revolutionary movement. All groups and parties who were persecuted as Nihilists openly affirmed their Socialist convictions. The Russian Socialists were real revolutionists; they fought despotism, the Tzar's oppression as brave and courageous men and women who know how to make a sacrifice of their fortune, their liberty and their life. All our Terrorists were Socialists; they belonged to different fractions of Socialism, it is true, but Socialists were they all, be they sprung from the people, workingmen like Khalturin, Alexyeev, Malinovsky, Obnorsky and others, or from the highest ranks of the aristocracy like Sophia Perovskaya, Lisogub, Batiushkova and hundreds of other victims and martyrs.

The Liberals, in common with all the enlightened portion of Russia, sympathised with the revolutionists, admired their courage, sometimes even supported them, but were never met with in the ranks of those who fought. There existed a fraction in Russian society who called themselves Social Democrats and revolutionary; but they not only had no sympathy with the heroic struggle of the Russian Socialists, they pronounced themselves against the revolution. It was Plekhanoff, to whom Hamon attributes the leadership of Russian Social Democracy, who gave the following advice to the Revolutionary Socialists:

"With regard to all that we have said, we think that the only non-fantastic aim of Russian Socialists can now only be the conquest of free political institutions on one side and the preparation of elements for a future Socialist Workers' Party on the other. They must raise the demand for a *Democratic constitution* which, together with the 'rights of men,' would give 'civic rights' to the workers and would give them by means of universal suffrage the possibility of an active participation in the political life of the country. Whilst not frightening anybody . . . by the *red spectre* [the Social Revolution] such a program would bring forward the sympathies, for our revolutionary party, of all who were not systematic opponents of Democracy; together with Socialists it might be signed by many representatives of our *Liberalism*" (*Le Socialisme*, par G. Plekhanoff, Geneva 1883, p. 71).

This extract from a pamphlet of the man who, before the International Congress of Brussels in 1891, boasted of "*fighting for years*" all factions of Russian Socialism, clearly shows that at any rate before 1883, that is during the heroic struggle of the Terrorists, the revolutionary party consisted of Socialists. But the Russian revolutionists did not follow the advice of Mr. Plekhanoff, they did not give up the "red spectre" of the Social Revolution, they braved the atrocious persecutions and in their secret printing offices they published pamphlets and manifestoes for workingmen without distinction of school or party: Social Democratic publications have been printed by Communist Terrorists.

As to the results of the London Congress, we see how Social Democracy in its evolution to Moderatism always puts forward the assertion that they alone hold the monopoly of science. At the London Congress this monopolist tendency received a first blow, and we may expect this good result for the international movement: that the German party saw that the working-classes do not want to fall under their domination, neither Englishmen nor French, Spaniards, Belgians, Dutch; and their resolution to hold the next Congress in Germany is the best proof of this; they know neither Russians nor French can come to that country. But they had to try to save themselves, and this resolution presented itself to them as an honorable retreat.

W. TCHERKESOV.

* A. Hamon. *Le Socialisme et le Congrès de Londres*. Paris, P. V. Stock.

† The author greatly accentuates his desire to be an impartial historian, and quotes the words of Montaigne, "Ceci est un livre de bonne foi."

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.
Business communications to T. CANTWELL, at above address.

The Editors are not necessarily in agreement with signed articles.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

T. HOLLAND.—Thanks for your card. You will see the acknowledgement in this issue.
W. CAMERON.—You are quite wrong in your suspicions of the person you name. The matter is not worth further discussion.
H. TAYLOR.—Your communication to hand, but we are already holding over matter that is crowded out.
W. WHITE.—Yes, we do exchange with the "Labor Leader." We think you are right about the address you mention.

NOTES.

THE "CONTAGIOUS DISEASES" ACTS.

We notice there seems to be a periodical attempt to revive the "Contagious Diseases" Acts, and at the present moment some people are agitating the question once again. It is very little we care to say on the matter; but, whether they be revived or not, one thing is certain: that while we have a standing army, and while we have a sexual "morality which necessarily includes prostitution," we shall have the evil of contagious disease always with us. It is like many other evils from which we suffer that cannot be cured except by a radical change in our social system.

We are sorry to see that Major Warren in the *Echo* defends the Acts. Does he know to what extent vile intoxicants are sold and consumed in the canteens in India and elsewhere, and the frightful evil this is to the men? Would he, then, favor an Act to prohibit soldiers from drinking, and does he think it would be effective?

OH! THE JUBILEE!

Why should we celebrate the longest reign? Nobody knows, but it seems we are going to do it; and, the idea having been started, the commercial instincts of the English people have risen to the occasion. In the twinkling of an eye a kind of Jubilee Grand View Speculative Company has been started and has been doing a brisk trade in windows and balconies. The papers report the rise of prices just as they do in the money market. The landlord, too, never to be denied, has been on the alert and has been playing his little game of eviction on the poor costers and the like who had the chance of netting a few pounds by letting their windows to some of the Inanities who will pay to garp at royalty, even from the window of a Borough lodging-house. The latest quotation for seats is ten guineas per head. We cannot say whether there is much loyalty in it all; but certainly there is a lot of money in it, and that, after all, is what the English nation glories in.

THE AGE OF LIES.

Undoubtedly this age will be known to future generations as the age of lies. And why not? We speak of that period in which man used weapons and implements of stone, as the stone age; and at the present time, when the ambition of so many is to accumulate wealth by wholesale plundering, a lie is the weapon so frequently and dexterously used that the title we suggest would be most applicable. We need not refer to the lies told over the Indian Famine, or those uttered day after day in the House of Commons over the bombardment of the Cretans. It is sufficient to note the lies told by that respectable clique who concocted the Jameson raid. The examination of some of the witnesses shows us how telegrams can be falsified, what a pure-minded thing is the press, and how the modern bandits of commercialism can play the part of respectable members of society and appear in evening dress. It seems to us it would be a capital idea to erect a huge column—say in front of the Stock Exchange—in some way appropriately symbolical of a lie, and it might be called *The Colossus of Rhodes*.

JOHN NEVE.

In recalling some incidents connected with Johann Neve's work in London it may not be out of place to give a personal description of the man whom the German Government have done to death in their prison hell. Of medium height, fair and robust, with a genial frank countenance, quiet and unobtrusive, neither an orator nor writer, yet possessed of a certain power of inspiring in others confidence and enthusiasm which made him the life and soul of the German movement in London. Tender-hearted and generous, the sight of misery and oppression stirred within him both pity and hatred: pity for the victims and hatred of the oppressors. Earning high wages as a highly-skilled workman, he lived abstemiously that he might devote the bulk of his earnings to the furtherance of Socialism. Working at his trade by day, he gave up

his nights to the movement; depriving himself of rest until his health broke down under the strain.

Our enemies are in the habit of depicting the Anarchist as a monster whose hand is against everyone's. Neve was a kindhearted workman who dedicated his life to the service of the workers; and who, moreover, up to a certain period, believed that their emancipation could be achieved by legislative methods; a man who hailed even the political and social program as put forward in the *Vorwärts* of the day, including as it did obligatory voting, as a new gospel! His conversion to Anarchism was effected by the German Government when it seized upon the pretext afforded by the attempts of Hödel and Nöbling against the Emperor to pass the Anti-Socialist Law.

Arbitrary arrests, seizures and imprisonments had been the normal state of things prior to its enactment; but now the last vestige of apparent justice was removed. Thousands were expatriated, hundreds of families broken up, hundreds imprisoned; seizures and confiscations were the order of the day. Of those torn from their families and means of life, a number went insane and others were irretrievably ruined; a great number sought refuge in England, and our club in Rose Street presented at times the appearance of a departure or arrival platform at a station, with luggage and cases of prohibited literature, and the bewildered emigrants going to and fro. The strain on the funds of the party was enormous, and many hardships had to be borne in those days. But these events seemed to change Neve's whole nature, they infuriated him; but his fury burnt slowly and fiercely within him.

Whilst all hope or belief in constitutional methods was destroyed in him, others—even the victims of this cruel object lesson—still clung to the shreds and tatters of their exploded creed. The leaders of the Party issued at this crisis their famous or, as many thought, *infamous* Manifesto, the keynote of which consisted in the advice, "*Bleibet ruhig*" (remain quiet). Dissensions added to the bitterness of the situation; quarrels arose, and eventually the Party here split into two camps. Neve, Most and others, devoting themselves to the advancement of Anarchism.

This cleavage was only, after all, one of the symptoms of that revolt in the ranks against the growing dictatorship of the leaders, the rigidity of internal discipline in the Party, and a growing disbelief in the utility of political action. The Congress of Ghent had shortly before shown the Anarchist element to be increasing; the followers of Bakounine had made themselves felt and the division between Authoritarian Socialism and Anarchism began to be pronounced; with the later developments of this struggle the readers of *Freedom* are doubtless familiar.

But to return to Neve. He set himself the almost Quixotic task of striking at the common enemy with weapons of destruction. Two English comrades were in the secret of his resolve, and one tried strongly to dissuade him from his dangerous mission; but the once gentle Neve had become an implacable foe of all government, and with unshaken determination he started to carry out his project. The plot which led to his ultimate capture through the spy, Reuss, as narrated in a preceding article, would never have succeeded but for the culpable negligence or assinine stupidity of certain German comrades in London, who in face of ample warnings were too lethargic to bestir themselves in a manner and direction that would have saved our comrade.

It may interest certain persons, who now prate about what they did in the "early days of the Socialist movement" and "the heartbreaking struggles" they underwent, to know that our deceased comrade, Neve, was the chief one to assist in the formation of the English section in connection with the German and other sections composing the Rose Street Club.

To describe the manner in which Neve was brought into contact with a number of English comrades and the causes which led to the formation of the English section in London, it will be necessary to cast a glance at the position of affairs at that time. The reaction which ensued after the suppression of the Commune affected the "business politicians" who formed the bulk of the British section of the International, and they hastened to disclaim any sympathy with "violence," etc., etc. The moral cowardice of the "practical politicians" previously alluded to had caused the celebration of the Commune in later years to fall almost exclusively upon the foreign comrades in London. A remnant of the International which still clung to the old faith, with a sprinkling of old Chartists and followers of Robert Owen and Bronterre O'Brien, met under various political titles in obscure public-houses and coffee-houses, in the West End of London; one of these English groups approached the German Communist Society with a view to a joint celebration, with the result that a magnificent international meeting took place in the Cleveland Hall. Prior to this the British reptile press had exultantly pointed to the isolation of the foreign revolutionary element in London as a proof that their especial pet, the hard-headed British artisan, would never—no, never!—be led away by the violent visionaries from the Continent who sought refuge in happy England; and, moreover, Socialism would never take root on English soil; so said the scribes, who, as Ruskin has it, "pawn the dirty linen of their souls in order that they may dine."

Mainly at the instigation of Neve steps were taken to form an English section, with the result that when the Liberal government was so ill-advised as to seize the *Freiheit*, at the instigation of Russia, the English comrades issued a Manifesto which was sold by thousands in the heart of the City, and also issued an English edition of the *Freiheit*. They formed a strong Defence Committee, upon which were a number of delegates from Radical Clubs—then not quite given over, as since, to beer and billiards. The Defence Committee engaged the late A. M. Sullivan M.P. to defend Most; they organised meetings and issued

appeals, and public attention was thereby drawn to the question of Anarchism. From that time a revival set in which has gone on steadily increasing ever since.

Neve had a narrow escape of arrest after the first seizure of the *Freiheit*. Two Scotland Yard detectives called at his lodgings with a warrant for his arrest; the landlady, a homely woman, readily guessed the object of her visitors, "Step inside and I will send him down to you," she said. Neve was at that moment walking up the street to the house; slipping out of the house she met and warned him, and Neve was soon beyond reach.

The *Freiheit* was a thorn in the side of the German government, and many were the devices which Neve and his friends resorted to in order to introduce it into Germany. One was a fresh title every issue, which compelled the government to ascertain its title before they could prohibit it. Once it appeared as *Lehmann*, a name assumed by William of pious memory when fleeing from the revolutionists of '48. A run of bad luck set in; the government were able for several weeks to prohibit the paper in advance; the special issue was carefully sent out and the closest watch failed for a time to discover the betrayer. One fine evening, however, on the occasion of a concert in the vicinity of Hampstead a man was quietly walking upon the Heath when a shot was heard and our friend was taken to hospital to enjoy a long vacation. The *Freiheit* was not so easily prohibited after this incident; and one spy had to retire from business.

In concluding these desultory references to matters in which our comrade Neve took part I may note the change of tone towards the movement now. Then, when we sallied out to hold our meetings, we were all adjective Germans or blarsted foreigners, and many a Cockney adherent, who had never been beyond happy Hampstead in his life, has been told to go back to his own country and not come preaching this rubbish to Englishmen. We attacked the Thrift, Emigration and Overpopulation panacea-mongers until they feared to meet us and hid their diminished heads; from being derided and abused we got to be listened to, and thus a handful of hardworking men, devoid of "culchaw" and the presence of "dramatic critics," set a ball rolling in England which gains in momentum every day.

F. KIRZ.

THE LABOR QUESTION VERSUS ANARCHISM.

By DR. L. SMIRNOW.

(Being an address delivered before a mass meeting called by the International Workingmen's Educational Club of Waterbury, Conn., U.S.A., revised and enlarged.)

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

There are many people claiming the attention of the workingmen—Republicans, Democrats, Prohibitionists, Populists, Socialists, etc., each claiming to labor in the interests of the people (the workingmen especially), and for the love of the country. Not one, however, of these many thousands fail to ask to be elected for the office which they seek. Everyone claims that if he be elected the people will be better off, they will get better wages, they will be happy, etc. I seek no offices. I do not ask to be appointed, nor elected, nor nominated. I set forth no benefactions of any kind; all I ask is to be heard and understood. Surely one who seeks not his own interest ought to be listened to rather than one who takes every advantage possible for his own good. Yet, as a matter of fact, just the reverse is done. They who spend weeks and months in listening to and reading political nonsense and trash, such as the Tariff question, the Silver question, McKinley's Bill, and Sherman's Bill, etc., etc., would not spend an hour or two in listening to a friend. I know from experience that as soon as anyone goes to tell the working people their true position in society they misdirect their attention, they do not listen, they do not understand. Why this is so it is hard to say. The explanation can be found, however, in the fact that their friends lack that cunningness and tact of the politician. That tact which Brutus so eminently displayed, and which kept the people content over the assassination of Julius Cæsar. That tact which Antony possessed, and which afterwards set the very same people at rebellion over the death of the emperor. That tact which exists in this very day, and which still serves to keep the people in subduance. Their friends, I say, lack this tact, and therefore the truth they utter is not listened to, their teachings are not readily accepted, and their warnings are not heeded. It is, however, possible to find here and there an intelligent workman who would listen to what is said to him and would be able to discriminate between truth and falsehood. And it is in the hope that this audience is of the latter kind that I thus deliver this address.

GROUNDWORK FOR ARGUMENT.

It may be questioned by many, is there such a thing as a labor question? And if so, what are the reasons for its existence? Indeed, multitudes of people do not yet know that society is, through economical influence, divided and subdivided that one class imposes upon and exploits another, and even those, or many of them, that feel and are themselves affected by the social evils do not question into them, and do not know the causes underlying them. It thus becomes a matter of primary importance to first acquaint them with these social evils, to demonstrate the inequities and inequalities, the inhumanity, vice, and corruption that prevails in society, after which they will better understand the labor question.

If there is any one physiological process that has a detrimental effect upon progress it is that of *adaptation to surroundings*—a faculty that is prevalent throughout the animal kingdom, and plays no small part in the affairs of mankind. The following experiment will illustrate:—A bird is introduced into a box with a glass window in it containing fresh air. The interior is gradually charged with carbonic-acid gas (very poisonous) until it reaches a high percentage, yet the bird lives there and appears to be quite comfortable, and will even live several weeks in the obnoxious atmosphere; but if a fresh bird be introduced it will die at once. Anyone who enters a room where the atmosphere is heavy or unwholesome, particularly a smoking-room, will at once take notice thereof, some will even have to withdraw, while those that are in the room are comfortable and undisturbed. And should the new comer remain a short time in that room he, too, will become accustomed to it and will not mind it. Exactly in the same way, but in a broader sense, have the people adapted themselves to the existing system—the Capitalistic or Wage System—to the religious and political institutions, to the quackery, fraud, transgression and hypocrisy of the business, political, and spiritual worlds. This simple faculty of the brain, or better said, of living matter,—since even micro-organisms and microscopic cells are found to live under unfavorable conditions,—explains many things. It explains why social conditions and institutions, now existing, so odious and detestable, so detrimental to the health and happiness of each and all, so unjust and barbarous, should find support and recognition in the majority of men. It explains the sad indifference of a great many people and their apparent ignorance of their surroundings. And it explains also the unreasonable slowness of social evolution and the great difficulty attending reforms and revolutions. But there is a counter force, of much greater importance, innate in living matter, which is the everlasting tendency to acquire new and better conditions,—the *strife towards a state of perfection*. This too is not only a faculty of the brain but of all living matter, superseding, in degree varying with the quality and kind of matter, the faculty of adaptation to surroundings. It is found in every manifestation of nature, it produces the beautiful butterfly out of the ugly caterpillar, it develops the child out of the two microscopic cells, it develops the man out of the child. It is this force or tendency that changes the simple into the complex, that causes matter to expand and ramify, and causes finite objects to become infinite. And this, too, is the domineering force in social affairs; it changes systems and governments, it dethrones kings and decapitates monarchs, it banishes tyrants and traitors, it renovates, it ameliorates, it reforms, it revolutionises. And in every phenomenon or manifestation, of whatever kind it be, these two hostile forces are continually at work, the difference in power or intensity determining the success or failure of one or the other. Hence when we speak of the labor question, or Anarchism, or Socialism, etc., we tacitly imply this latter force—the tendency towards perfection, as contrasted with the present system, representing the contending force,—adaptation to surroundings.

(To be continued.)

"JUSTICE" & RUSSIAN REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISM.

We read in *Justice* of March 20, an article, inquiring "Was the Russian revolutionary movement of 1872-82 a Socialist movement or not? teeming with errors and misrepresentations. This time it is a Russian who distinguishes himself by his complete ignorance and *mala fides*. For who could write *bona fide* that the Socialism of the Russian Revolutionary Party of that time included

".....the glorification of the small domestic industry of the peasant (the so-called *kustar* industry) which practically is nothing but a kind of sweating-system industry, the preaching of voluntary associations amongst the agricultural workers and town artisans, and the clamor for rural banks, cheap credit, and State subsidies to the manifold co-operative organisations of the peasants, all this and many other things give to the *Narodnichestvo* an air, hardly to be mistaken, of that type of Socialism(?) which, promulgated by Schultze-Delitzsch....."

Where did Mr. Rothstein find similar revindications? From which publications of the Russian *Revolutionary Socialist* Party has he extracted similar stupidities? From Bakounine's *Norodnoe Dyelo* (The People's Cause)? or from Lavroff's *Vperiod* (Forward)? or Tkatcheff's *Nabat* (The Tocsin)? or from the *Rabotnik* (The Worker) of the Russian Anarchists of that time (1875-6)? or the *Obshchina* (The Commune) of Clementz, Stepniak, etc.? or the *Zemlia i Volia* (Land and Liberty), the first organ published in St. Petersburg at the risk of the gallows? or the *Narodnaia Volia* (The People's Will) which succeeded it?

No, Mr. Rothstein can not quote one book, *not one*, which does not give a complete denial to this literary ignominy.

Or is it by propagating translations of Lassalle (since 1872), of Marx' *Capital*, of big volumes on the International and the Commune of Paris that the Russian Socialists advocated the theories of Schultze-Delitzsch?—Lassalle and Schultze combined! If Mr. Rothstein does not know the papers mentioned nor the Russian movement and Russian life, he must have learned from his German friends that the partisans of the International, of the Commune, of Marx and Lassalle have nothing in common with Schultze. As a Social Democrat he ought to ask himself why, in 1882, Marx recognised the Russian Revolutionary Socialist Party as the "vanguard of the revolutionary movement in Europe;"*

* In the introduction to the second Russian edition of *The Communist Manifesto*.

—does he know why? Because under the influence of the noble and courageous thinker, N. Tchernyshevsky (whom Marx greatly admired), the Russian young generation studied the works of Robert Owen, St. Simon, Fourier, Louis Blanc, later on of Lassalle and Marx, and when they began revolutionary action hundreds, if not thousands, of noble, devoted women, of men heroic in their struggle for the *social emancipation* of the Russian people, gave up their titles and social privileges, sacrificed their fortunes and their lives to the cause of a *social revolution*. Women like Sophia Perovskaya, Bardina, Batiushkova, Leshern, Subbotina, Breshkovsky, Kovalevsky, Korba, Figner, Armfeld, Helfmann, Volkenstein, etc.; and men like Lisogub, Osinsky, Jeliaboff, Sukhanoff, Stromberg, Myshkin, Veimar, Lopatin (an intimate friend of Marx), Sukhomlin, and Presniakoff, Khalturin, Alexyeff, Obnorsky, Malinovsky, Kriloff (the last named all workers), etc.—all of whom were either hung or died in dungeons or have been from fifteen to twenty years immured in the fortresses or the Siberian mines—all declared themselves before the sanguinary tribunal of the Tzar Socialists and Revolutionists.

Where then did Mr. Rothstein find his formula? If he will not point out his sources, we shall have the right to say that he took it from the press of Russian spies, of Katkoff, Grindmut and their band. These worthy servants of Alexander III. and the third section of police always were at pains to pass for Socialists and Revolutionists, honest men and writers, who, in the legal press, advocated the reforms and economic measures mentioned by Mr. Rothstein. Only Katkoff and his like never succeeded in convincing even Alexander III. that the peaceful people of popular banks and associations were Socialists and Revolutionists, and Russian society pilloried the Katkoffists as public calumniators.

It is a sorry business to slander and distort the ideas of men living and able to defend themselves; but to act in this way against the glorious memory of heroic martyrs is even worse.

W. TCHERKESOV.

THE SLAVERY OF NON-RESISTANCE.

In our last issue, comrade St. John set forth his reasons for inculcating non-resistance to the tyranny and oppression forced upon us by our rulers. In explaining why we are still unconvinced by St. John's arguments, it may clear matters a little to state that we do not at all deny there are occasions when passive resistance is both the wisest and the most heroic attitude to adopt. Further, we have all along said we are not immediately concerned as to whether Jesus always acted as a "thorough-going Anarchist" or not; our quarrel is with the assertion (contained in Kenworthy's letter) that Jesus was the Anarchist *par excellence* because "he gave even his enemies entire freedom to do as they pleased with him." Now that is just what a consistent Anarchist does *not* do. On the contrary, whenever the opportunity occurs he rebels against the injustice with which his enemies try to crush him. And, maybe, he uses physical force. Does St. John think that is to be deplored? Well, what would be still more deplorable, would be to see mankind quietly submitting to all outrages because their "enemies had perfect liberty to do as they pleased with them."—Why not invite extermination at once?

"Have there been any more successful rebels (as far as they went) than the Quakers?" asks St. John. "As far as they went," no doubt they did very well; but, after they got what they wanted, *have there been any more successful exploiters* than the Quakers? Not many. Get the truth from those who have worked for them and you will see with what hypocrisy man can preach peace and practise cruelty. Then St. John instances the Doukhoborsies. Well, what has their policy gained them from the Russian government? Will St. John please tell us? On the other hand, is it not a fact that the nations who have had their revolutions with a definite aim—France and England for example—enjoy the largest share of liberty?

St. John speaks of good will and ill will. But if you mean to have a will of your own you must certainly struggle, and struggle hard, against those who would destroy it.

And this brings us to a point raised by Florence Holah, *viz.* "that the attitude of non-resistance gives a man's enemies 'entire freedom to do as they please with him'—that is, with his body; but it gives them no power to control his will." Now we are afraid that this idea arises from an old superstition of Christianity which regarded the body as distinct and inferior to the mind or "soul." It is hardly necessary for us to point out the fallacy of this. It is time we had done with this theory that "stone walls do not a prison make," etc. As Anarchists we are for the entire freedom of the individual; not simply for free thought and free speech, good as they may be; but for free action and free development of every organ of body and mind. And do you think your will is active while your body is enslaved? Let us have as much respect for the body as for the mind; it is not to be hacked and hewed, tortured and imprisoned with impunity by our oppressors while they leave us the sickly satisfaction of *thinking* of Justice and Freedom—just to torture us a little more. While we could resist such treatment we would resist by all means in our power. Yet it seems to us this principle of non-resistance almost invites the cruelty of the oppressor; indeed, it is hard to draw the line between it and what we call submission and obedience. Perhaps St. John could make this clear.

St. John says, "We are not without admiration for all the heroes of history who have resisted oppression *in whatever way*" (the italics are ours). Then he tries to make out that it is not their strength and muscle that we admire, but their "intelligence." The want of clearness in St. John's position is evident; we cannot dissociate thought and action in this arbitrary way.

What we really admire, and what we have benefitted by, is the action which was the *outcome* of their intelligence; and that action (of the Greeks) was force used to resist aggression.

We are sorry St. John does not give us an idea of where he thinks we should be if non-resistance had been the attitude of all peoples in the past.

As to Jesus and Anarchism, that had better be left as a matter of opinion. If St. John thinks the authority of the "Heavenly Father" and the ten commandments compatible with Anarchism—well, that's his affair. Again with regard to the angels, we are quite willing to admit we are not in it with St. John on that point. 'Our dear editor' hasn't the remotest con-

ception as to whether they are "winged" or "shining" or in "white robes;" or whether, after all, they may not be "an oriental expression for forces of nature.....burning up all that is evil or unsocial in nature's furnace of natural consequences." This interpretation approaches the sublime and reminds us of Gladstone in his theological controversies. But, frankly, we should prefer to leave the angelic interpretation out of the discussion and turn our attention to men and things.

LESSONS OF THE HAMBURG DOCKERS' STRIKE.

The mistakes of the German Social Democracy are bad enough, in our opinion, and it seems a pity that they should be exaggerated by the misrepresentations of their over-zealous followers in England. This is done in an alleged translation of extracts from the *Neue Zeit* of February 20 (p. 641-4) given us in the *Social Democrat* (London), March 1897, p. 92. This article, "After the Hamburg Strike," is indeed quite sensible as far as it goes. It points out that the German bourgeoisie "made it a great point to demonstrate that they did not *intend* to grant to the German proletariat a tolerable existence within their bondage, that they saw their historic vocation in crushing every attempt of the workers to create a tolerable existence for themselves on the basis and with the means of capitalist society. Again, that the German government, by its hostile attitude, emphasised the remark of Marx's "Communist Manifesto" that: "the executive of the modern State is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie. . . . Every worker is now aware of what he has to expect from this government, nothing else but deadly enmity. It serves only for the purpose, and in the Hamburg Dock Strike, showed that it intends to do nothing else but to place its organised power in the service of the employers when it is important to frustrate the efforts of the workers to better their position as a class on the basis of bourgeois society." All this would lead to strong conclusions against reform-mongering and State-Socialism.

Even the loss of the strike is no defeat for the rising cause of the workers. One might even say in a kind of paradoxical manner "the less purpose the sacrifices made for this gigantic strike may have had, the more effective they have been. If the Hamburg dockers had resumed work when every prospect of victory was lost, the strike would soon have been forgotten like many others; if it did attract the widest interest of the whole nation, this was done because it was fought until the last crumb of bread, because it gave in not before any power of men, but only before cold and hunger."

Still, it was a defeat, and this might have been evaded if the strike had been undertaken at a more convenient time, with a stronger organisation and richer means.

Upon this follows:

Social Democrat.
Without mentioning that something is left out and giving the sentence the directly opposite meaning.

"Thus the Hamburg Strike confirms anew the experience gained in other (English) strikes, that the trades organisations are impotent against modern capitalism. Capital is now completely fortified against surprises."

Neue Zeit.
"These three reasons are internally connected with each other, for a strong organisation disposes of large means which it takes care not to jeopardise at an inopportune time. From the whole course of the strike there is no doubt that if these conditions had existed the workers could have won. In this respect the Hamburg Strike *refutes* anew the opinion, refuted already by English experiences, that trades-union organisation is impotent against modern capitalism. Capital is invincible against surprises by unorganised masses rushing forward with elementary power".....

It is further pointed out that the "brilliant and spiritual" pamphlet of Parvus, declaring labour legislation and trades union organisation to be the most immediate tasks of the German workers has now been justified by facts: "whilst the parliamentary representatives of the working-classes continually utter smart rebukes of our opponents, one strike after the other is being lost, and before all the Hamburg strike meant a loss of power of the class-conscious proletariat, extending far beyond Hamburg, which the most splendid successes in parliament cannot balance."

Social Democrat.
Without marking that something is left out at the end of the paragraph.

"It is possible that the elections a year hence will create conditions which will shift the centre of gravity of the class struggle again to the region of politics. . . . A Parliamentary debate can sometimes be of more importance than a dozen strikes. The capitalist press," etc.

Neue Zeit.
"It is possible that the new elections a year hence will create conditions which will shift the centre of proletarian class struggle again to the region of parliamentary politics: to-day it lies not there, and as long as the present parliament lasts it will not be there. A parliamentary debate can sometimes be of more importance than a dozen strikes; at present things are in such a position that the Hamburg strike alone was of more importance than all debates which since a year and a day have been held in Parliament. It is of course a perfidious lie or an incurable absurdity if the capitalist press says," etc.

(Italics ours.)

These omissions—not marked in several instances—show a deliberate effort to press the article into the service of parliamentarism, whilst it really proves that the writer is just now rather pessimistic about parliamentarism. Must this fact be hidden from the English Social Democrats by such foul means?

A Message of the Spring.

The sun glints in through the window-pane,
Tinting the room with gold,
And Nature awakes to life again
After the winter's cold.

Out in the world there's a driven mass
Sunk in a sluggish sleep.
The gloom of their winter, like dank morass,
Lies heavy, drear and deep.

But a Day will dawn and a Sun will rise,
There will be a gospel new,
And the Summer of Life, in joyous wise,
Shall ripen the good and true.

T. R.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

General elections took place in Italy and in Austria, and we are told of great Socialist victories. In Austria of the seventy-two members elected by manhood suffrage fourteen are Social Democrats; besides these seventy-two that Democratic parliament contains three hundred and sixty other members elected by various kinds of property suffrage, some exclusively by large landlords, some by chambers of commerce, etc. This, then, is the result of nearly four year's agitation: a few Socialists and a few Galician Radicals balanced ten times over by Clericalism in its various disguises—Conservatism, Anti-Semitism, Christian Socialism, Slavonian Nationalism, etc. Thus, superficially viewed, it is easy to jubilate over the large Socialist vote; looking deeper, we see it more than outweighed by the unheard-of increase of the reactionary vote. The same happens in nearly every country, England included; in Belgium and Germany Clericalism is the predominant parliamentary power; in Austria it has been and will be so more than ever. It is worthless talk, in my opinion, to boast of grinding down the so-called Progressive parties between the millstones of Socialism and Clericalism: if these two were really antagonist opposites and Socialism were winning, the logical outcome would be an increase of the Socialist vote and of the mildly progressive vote by the less decided electors; but this nowhere happens. A general progressive tendency is met with nowhere, and I for one conclude that the Socialist electioneering propaganda is one of the main factors to bring about the strengthening of reaction everywhere. For, as a rule, it contains no particle of free spirit that would tell the masses to act for themselves, to help themselves or nobody will help them; no, it mainly consists in demands that the State should do this or that for them, and that the candidate if returned will strive to get it for them, etc.; it is the old *panis et circenses* (bread and play) policy of the Romans revived with a vengeance: there is no bread and very little play in it—only promises and looking forward to new beneficent laws. That the electors who hear this should, to an ever-increasing extent, prefer to vote straightaway for the reactionists, is quite logical: they see that the latter has got hold of the State-power and might really get a few crumbs for them, whilst the Socialist is at present in disgrace with the powers that be. If elections are brought down to the level of rival expectations of State gifts and tips, what else could be the result—and what election rises above this level?

From Austria we hear nothing of Anarchist action during this period; in Italy the large new paper, *L'Agitazione* (published since March 14 at Ancona, Via Cialdini, 10) took up a vigorous abstentionist propaganda; the large manifesto which is published and which is now being signed by groups all over Italy is also a reply to the strange fascination which parliamentarism lately had for a well known comrade; we intend to publish a translation of this manifesto as a hint to comrades not to lose the opportunity of making our ideas known at bye-elections by a similar propaganda with placards, leaflets, etc., if not by meetings.

Another manifesto, against Clericalism, published by the *Libertaire* of Paris, has been translated by the Brest comrades into Breton and 25,000 copies will be distributed over the priest-ridden country districts of Brittany. When shall we hear of a similar thing being done in the sister language, the Welsh, which is quite ignored by our propaganda. Wales is as dark a country as Brittany, however Liberal it may vote and however the State Church may be disliked. Religion permeates the public and literary life there more than anywhere, as we see e.g. by the Bethesda choir singing sacred music in aid of the quarrymen's strike fund, a mild and religious way of acting which we find no longer paralleled in modern countries. This Penrhyn strike would be just the occasion to explain our ideas to the Welsh in their own language; the difficulty, I am aware, is not the publication but the distribution of such a Manifesto.

Militarism crushes every honest man it gets hold of. Comrade Bastien, a soldier of Amiens, being home on leave, spent an evening at a social gathering of Anarchists; for this he got a fortnight's imprisonment. He then took his life in his hands and chanted Anarchist songs all the time and made Anarchist inscriptions on the walls of the cell. When an officer came he tried to strangle him, but was unsuccessful. Death now awaited him, but he committed suicide. Nor are things better a few miles over the frontier, where the other set of murderers are drilled. Comrade Klink, a soldier of Wurtemberg, for having shouted "Long live Anarchy!" in a restaurant, was sentenced to two year's imprisonment in a fortress; it is added that the sentence was not yet confirmed, being considered too small. Klink had been a Social Democrat, throwing this over for Anarchism. The local Social Democratic paper wrote that "his action, bordering on madness, cannot be excused. For the same reasons for which he had to be removed from our party he must now be effaced for many years from the years of the living," which shows that, as regards discipline, Social Democrats over there and the army seem to feel in accord.

La Société Nouvelle, of Brussels, the well known review published since 1884 is stopped; in later years its foremost contributors were Anarchists; it also published copious translations from William Morris and Edward Carpenter. It will be replaced this month by *L'Humanité Nouvelle* of Paris, (Charles Albert, rue Hallé, 34) which will be supported by the same contributors, among whom we name Elisée and Elie Reclus, P. Kropotkin, Jean Grave, C. Malato, B. Lazare, F. D. Nieuwenhuis, C. Cornelissen, F.

Pelloutier, A. Retté, E. Carpenter, etc., besides libertarian authors like G. Eekhoud, Camille Lemonnier, L. Descaves, E. Verhaeren, etc.

At Bucharest *Miscarea Sociala* (weekly) has been published since Feb. 18. The early English Socialist and to some considerable extent Anarchist, William Thompson, is the subject of an elaborate essay by Professor Hector Denis, of Brussels, in the *Annales de l'Institut des Sciences Sociales*.

THE PROPAGANDA.

[Will comrades in the London and provincial Groups make a point of furnishing us with reports of their meetings and progress by not later than the 20th of each month.—Ed.]

REPORTS.

PROVINCES.

Inverness.—It is now over two years since an attempt was made to form a Socialist Society here. At the beginning there was much ignorance regarding Socialism, and the formation of our Society created a little stir. Probably the lieges were afraid of their own—imagination. However our propaganda has not been altogether fruitless; many misconceptions and prejudices have been removed, although we are not yet deemed quite respectable. One of the greatest barriers to our progress is the religious sentiment (it is all sentiment), which is very strong. One of our members has got a long article on "Socialism" inserted in one of the local papers, and we are hoping a discussion will follow. No doubt many are apt to think that the Highlands are much behind on matters Socialistic. That is a mistake. Some time ago a debate took place at Fortrose, twelve miles from here, on Socialism. On a vote being taken, Socialism triumphed by more than two to one. At Nairn a discussion on the same showed that opposition is not so strong as formerly. Last month (March) there was another discussion, at Beaulieu, the subject being, "Is Socialism Desirable?" The largest Hall in Beaulieu was packed, and the meeting seems to have created a favorable impression. Much more progress could be made if less attempts at fighting bye-elections and more attempts at fighting ignorance were made. So far as we are concerned it is an utter impossibility to convert people to Socialism from Halifax or East Bradford. That is our experience at any rate; we wish it was the other way as it would be much easier. It would be much nearer the mark if they would establish vans such as the *Clarion* has set going, instead of contesting bye-elections. Let us have Socialists before Socialist M.P.'s. If the people can't be educated outside of Parliament, then it is a hopeless case; for it is an absolute impossibility to convert them from the inside. We have many readers of *Freedom* here and they appreciate it very much. At present there is a dispute among the carpenters for an increase of wages and less hours of labor. Up to the present no settlement has been made. J. P.

Liverpool.—The people of Liverpool during the past winter seem, like many animals, to have gone into the torpid state; and the group here, following the example—chiefly through want of a club-room—also became torpid. The weather of February, however, seems to have had an invigorating effect upon us; for we have come into action again fresher, if anything, for the rest. We intend doing great things in the coming summer; that is, weather and funds permitting. J. C. Kenworthy and D. Nicoll have been down here lecturing for the I.L.P. Kenworthy, in his fine style, pointed out to the I.L.P.ers the fallacies of government and the dangers attending any handling of it. Nicoll gave his lecture on "Prison Life." The respectables here, like those in other towns, are going in for that conscience-easing hypocrisy—weeping over the sufferings of the poor victims of the Indian famine. They do not drop a tear on behalf of the starving in Liverpool—at least, not at Princes' Park. Liverpool is noted for many things; but the greatest should be the apathy of the workers. They will stand and listen to you, but will neither agree nor disagree with you; they merely stand and listen in order to kill time. They sometimes seem to me to be well up in ears, like an animal unmentionable. But "while there is life there is hope," and where there are brains—even though accompanied by ears—there is a possibility of thought, of reason; therefore we will keep the ball rolling, and if the movement here is not stronger this time next year it will not be our fault. We send fraternal greetings to all comrades. W. A.

LONDON.

THE COMMUNE COMMEMORATION.

A large and enthusiastic meeting, organised by the London Anarchist Communist Groups, was held in the hall of the Club and Institute Union, to commemorate the 26th anniversary of the proclamation of the Commune of Paris. Frank Kitz was in the chair. A letter was read from

P. KROPOTKIN, explaining his inability through illness to attend. Clouds, he said, were everywhere on the horizon, and Europe again seemed to be entering into a disturbed period of life of which nobody could foresee the ultimate results. Whatever these might be, they were sure to awaken minds and open eyes to the abominations of the present system and to impress the idea that it is high time the workers of all lands should take their own destinies into their own hands.

D. J. NICOLL, in speaking of affairs in the East, declared that just as the governing classes had shot down, twenty six years ago, the Parisian Communards, they were ready to-day to shoot down striking miners or insurgent Cretans whenever the interests of capital required it.

LOTHROP WITHERINGTON also referred to Eastern matters and expressed the hope that those peoples on the verge of civilization, their virility yet unspent, might refuse in the long run to submit to the yoke of capitalism. Their tendencies, moreover, would be rather towards the federation of small societies than the development of great states, towards Federalism rather than Imperialism. These things would, no doubt, influence some of the great states in Europe in their turn, and out of the turmoil and breaking-up freer societies might evolve.

JOHN TURNER, in defending the Commune from the charge of vandalism and destructiveness, pointed out the real meaning of such acts as the pulling down of the Vendôme Column—a monument erected in remembrance of the achievements of French invaders, a standing dishonor to the French and an insult to the foreigner. They had burned houses, no doubt; so had the respectable British government whenever British interests (i.e. those of the financiers) had to be protected. Surely, if anybody was entitled to go burning houses, it was those who had built them. The Communards had made a great mistake in wasting time in legalising their position. They might have had just a chance of success if they had followed up their first victory instead of waiting for a week on an election. After all, that Sunday's voting did not save the life of a single man in the massacres that followed their defeat.

TOUZEAU PARRIS said that some very striking reasons had been given for the failure of the Commune. One was, that the country people did not understand what the Parisians were about. That might not be the trouble in England, nor in France to-day; but even here in London they must not forget that it was only the few who were in advance—the mass of the people were not with them. Now, they must have men who knew what they wanted and what they were going to do to get it. It was no good talking about striking down their opponents, going back to those methods which belonged to the class they had to oppose. That class could strike as well as they, and doubly hard. He was not against force; but force used in desperation was utterly useless; used to pay back old scores, worse than useless. Men might be good and brave, yet foolish. Of course, there were

one or two things in connection with the Commune in which there was no failure. Its enemies had not succeeded in suppressing the thoughts it had started. It had set men thinking all the world over. These men must work still at permeation; because, till the mass of the people knew what they were going in for, revolt would only bring trouble and perhaps disgrace.

C. T. QUINN said they had met not to commemorate either the bloodshed or the excitement of the Commune, but the intelligence and courage of those who took part in it. The Communards were the first body of workingmen to fight against governmentalism, and the first who were not merely nationalist. It was not possible for any government to bamboozle all the people all the time. Government was like that spectre of the Brocken, which was held in such fear till the scientist came along and pointed out that it was but a gigantic shadow. Government was but the shadow of their own fears thrown upon the mist of ignorance.

J. TOCHATTI, in speaking of courage, did not think that the workingman was getting more courageous. From the average Londoner they could expect but little. Environment was often such as to debilitate character rather than to strengthen it. We must not depend on the majority of men; we should never get them to rise. What the Anarchists wanted was an intelligent minority which would carry its courage into everyday life. The men who raved on a platform about shouldering a gun have generally proved wanting when the time came. Quiet determination and capacity for hard work was what was wanted.

HERBERT STOCKTON, while agreeing in the main with Touzeau Parris, deprecated the Social Democratic idea that they must not do anything till they were all in line and got the word to move. When men had got the spirit of revolt within them they could not wait for the millions of lazy devils behind, but would act as their nature dictated.

MRS. THORNTON SMITH (S.D.F.) appealed to all who held the brotherhood of man ideal, held by the men and women who died in Paris so long ago, to carry on the flag which had dropped from their hands—not to let it drop nor even droop. It was easier to die than to suffer; far harder to go on living the hum-drum everyday life and still keep working for their ideal than it was to stand behind a barricade. The blood of the Communards had fertilised the seed; but they of to-day must still work for the harvest.

Comrade Caplan spoke in Yiddish, and a French comrade also addressed the meeting.

THE WOMAN'S MOVEMENT IN RUSSIA.

Peter Kropotkin being unable through illness to deliver his lecture at Christ-church Hall, Spitalfields, on March 15, Madame Kropotkin spoke instead (for the first time on an English platform) on the above subject.

She explained at starting that the movement was one in which the working woman of agricultural Russia took no part, for the simple reason that she was already economically independent of her husband. She was the gardener, the spinner, the weaver, the tailor and so on for the family. She it was, often, who earned the few pence which a Russian peasant family could spend in the year. Consequently, she occupied a position quite equal to her husband's and had no struggle apart from him. She took part, for instance, in the debates on all the local arrangements, such as the redistribution of the communal land. Among the Dissenters who form such a large proportion of the population she is very often the reader and frequently the minister; and it was she who generally led the rising of the serfs in former times.

The women belonging to the wealthier classes had had, on the contrary, more to encounter in Russia than elsewhere. In addition to the usual difficulties in regard to means and to social prejudices, they had had to face the antagonism of the government. In the Russian Liberal movement of the sixties some of the ablest men raised their voices for the rights of women, and advised the women to aim at education as a means both of getting them and of keeping them when got. There was absolutely nothing then for the higher education of women. Now they had 343 high schools for girls, with an educational standard so high that their degrees are commonly accepted as equal to those of the men's universities. They had not been satisfied with that; however, but strove still for university education, especially in medicine. Some professors of the Military Medical School allowed them to study a little physiology, and gradually the course extended. Finally the Minister for War gave greater facilities, thinking of the possible value of the women on the battlefield. Even then, however, they were not allowed to go to the same classes as the male students; so they started a medical school for themselves. The professors were astonished at the results and declared they never had such a splendid set of students. Yet, though their program was as full as the men's, with additional attention to the diseases of women and children, they were not allowed to take the name of "doctor," and had to content themselves with the title of "educated midwife." Not till after the noble part they played in attending to the wounded during the Russo-Turkish campaign were their rights in this matter conceded—they had had to pass through the fire and smoke of the battlefield to get them. Now there are over a thousand women doctors in Russia, two-thirds of thirds of them being employed by the county and district councils in preference to the men, not because they accept a lower remuneration, but because they have proved their love and natural fitness for the vocation.

In other branches the same difficulties had to be met. The government became alarmed about the thousands of women seeking higher education, and interfered; but they crowded to foreign universities and, of course, returned more revolutionary than ever. The schools which had been closed had to be reopened.

When this struggle was beginning, advanced ideas of another kind were spreading also. In the sixties, Russian people seemed to be awakening. They were criticising boldly all they saw around them. Fortune and luxury, many of them declared, they did not want at the expense of the lives and happiness of others. Women who had been taught to strive for social position saw that sort of thing was not worth striving for. Just as they had overcome the opposition of the government, they overcame the yet harder opposition of their friends. They were not content to strive for their own liberty only; they joined the ranks of the Socialists and began to strive for the liberty of all. They dressed like peasants and worked with them in the fields and in the factories; everywhere they went side by side with the men; and no young Russian student ever thinks of discussing the equality of woman—she showed it. The government was terrified and the party became powerful only after the women joined it. Thousands of them had been kept long years in prison; in every far-off corner of Siberia women were found. Even now there were such women in cells underground, under the reign of the young Czar when we were told there were no more political prisoners. Nevertheless, though the men in the Russian movement had sometimes weakened and some had even fallen to betrayal, the women had remained steadfast and faithful all throughout.

The numerous questions and long discussion showed the interest of the audience.

REVIEW.

THE OLD IDEAL AND THE NEW.*

This volume is a bold and interesting contribution to the sex question. It must be generally admitted that no sphere of social life has been more exploited

* Published by the author, Emile Rudabusch, Maryville, Wisconsin, U.S.A.; price two shillings.

this reason, if for no other, all honest attempts to put our crooked morals straight, or rather we should say to enlighten men and women as to their highest interests in this matter, deserve our sincere consideration. Mr. Rudabusch strikes a bold note in putting forward his view of love-relationship; but this is an age when prejudices and superstitions are falling fast under the merciless but beneficial criticism of new ideas.

All the chapters in this volume are interesting, and can be easily understood by the general reader; that, however, which is of the most importance contains the author's view of how the present chaotic condition of the relationship of the sexes might be replaced by a system which will secure to woman her freedom and and degraded by priest and politician than that of the sex relations; and for self-respect—a most vital point—and to both sexes, indeed, healthy and normal attachments, which are our only safeguard against the degrading evils of to-day. Each one should study the volume for himself; but we may say briefly that the author's idea is practically to regard love as we do friendship. The attachment of friends, a growth slow or rapid; but no one ever thinks of saying: "You shall be my only friend for life," or, "We shall be friends for so many years;" such an artificial arrangement would be laughed at. Indeed, the more our social nature is developed, the broader our capacity for friendship and the greater our appreciation of the varied individualities and their characteristics which make up the charm of social intercourse. On such lines love might develop all those manifestations which at present are mostly the dream of the past, and which are only too rarely found in marriages of the present day with their hypocritical vows and empty ceremonies. Mr. Rudabusch discusses all this in the clearest manner, and meets possible objections with perfect frankness.

All who are interested in the subject—and who should not be?—will be amply compensated for the time spent in a perusal of *The Old Ideal and the New*.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Donations to FREEDOM Publication Fund.—G. R. 1s.; H.G. 10s.; Prince 1s.; Subscriptions.—T. Holland 1/6.

Sales of Pamphlets.—Office, 4d.; W. B. 2s.; Percy 1/4; G. S. 10s.; G. L. 8d.; E. L. 2/8; Glasgow 18s.; G. R. N. 1s.; Huddersfield 1/3.

Sales of FREEDOM.—Gundersen 3s.; Matthias 6d.; Heiligenstein 4d.; T. R. 8d.; H. Taylor 1s.; T. Cantwell 3/4; Glasgow 4s.; St. John 3s.; Nelson 15s.; Nicoll 1/6; Manchester 5s.; Huddersfield 9d.; Norwich 2s.; Edwards 3/4; Ohlson 1s.; L. Turner 2s.; Smith 1/4; G. L. 8d.

SOCIETE MOURANT ET L'ANARCHIE (Dying Society and Anarchy). G. Nelson wants 80 comrades to join in a 5s. subscription to cover the cost of material for printing English translation of Jean Grave's famous book. Subscribers to take value in finished copies. We will produce it if the £20 is raised. Address T. Cantwell at this office. E. Young 5s., Nelson 5s.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS.

"THE COMMONWEAL"

We have in stock the following
BOUND VOLUMES OF "THE COMMONWEAL"
Published during the Editorship of
WILLIAM MORRIS.

Vol. I.	1885	...	...	...	2	Copies.
" II.	1886	...	...	...	1	"
" III.	1837	...	...	...	1	"
" IV.	1388	...	...	...	2	"

- 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. 1d.
- No. 9. ANARCHY ON TRIAL—George Etievant, Jean Grave and Caserio Santo. 32 pages; 1d.
- No. 10. ANARCHISM: ITS PHILOSOPHY AND IDEAL. 1d.

Our next pamphlet will be:—

- No. 11. REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT. 1d.

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. 1d.
MONOPOLY; or, HOW LABOR IS ROBBED. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
THE TABLES TURNED; or, NUPKINS AWAKENED. A Socialist interlude. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1s. each.

(Only a few of these original copies left.)

CHANTS FOR SOCIALISTS. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
USEFUL WORK VERSUS USELESS TOIL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.

All the Freedom Pamphlets notified above can be obtained at the CLARION
OFFICE, 72 Fleet Street, E.C., and of W. REEVES, 185 Fleet Street, E.C.

Printed and published by J. TURNER at 7 Lambs Conduit Street, London, W.C.