

# Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. 6.—No. 62.

JANUARY, 1892.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY

## “PEACE ON EARTH AND GOOD WILL AMONGST MEN.”

Now that the winter is upon us, in all its severity, we again begin to hear of deaths among the workers, caused wholly through the lack of food. In the summer-time the poor can hustle about a bit and manage to get along somehow, but when the winter comes with its long nights, its cold and rainy days and its restricted demand for labor, the pinch is felt everywhere. The festive season, which to the rich, and even to the moderately well-off worker, is something to be looked forward to with hope, as a time of merriment and happy gatherings, is to the poor laborer something to be dreaded. There is no festivity about it for him. On the contrary, his scanty means get to be still more scanty, in view of the extra expense he is put to in order to live. His wants increase and his always inadequate means remain stationary. He feels the necessity of a fire in his home, but the price of coals has gone up because the coal owner sees his opportunity to take advantage of the necessities of his fellows. Polly wants a new pair of boots, Johnny wants a warm overcoat, and the poor worker himself feels the necessity of that useful garment, but as it costs him already every penny he gets to live, he cannot buy it. Sometimes a more fortunate fellow worker has a coat to spare, otherwise the worker has to go without, thus laying himself out as an easy prey for the various chest diseases which winter fosters. “A Merry Christmas” you hear on every side, but there are hundreds of thousands of people in London alone, who are wondering where the merriment comes in.

At such a season of the year as this, hallowed by custom as a season of enjoyment and good feeling, when people begin to think of turning over a new leaf and making a fresh start with the New Year, we are almost inclined to forget for the moment that we are Revolutionists, that there is no hope of a reconciliation between the possessing and the dispossessed classes. We think of that typical capitalist represented by Dickens in his famous “Christmas Carol.” Full of greed, wrapt up in his own selfishness, the image of Scrooge comes up before us, and in pitying him we pity the whole of this self-centred race of which he is the type. They know nothing of happiness, of fellowship, of love, of the lives which men might lead if indeed there were peace on earth, goodwill amongst men; if selfishness were replaced by solidarity; if true fraternity took the place of the present system of class rule and servitude. Poor Scrooge, we pity him almost as much as his victim, for if he has made his victim's life unhappy, if he has wrecked the happiness of those who are in his power, he has certainly destroyed his own happiness. How delightful it would be if the ghosts who came to see Scrooge on that memorable Christmas Eve would kindly pay a visit to the whole Scrooge tribe, and lead them all to repent of their misused lives and their evil deeds. With what pleasure we should welcome the conversion of the rich monopolists to the principles of Freedom and Brotherhood, and how pleased we should be to hear them say “Yes, we admit that we have behaved badly, but in the future we will try to atone for our past misconduct. We will no longer be the miserable, tyrannical, selfish wretches we have been, but will give the rest of our lives to helping you to bring about the so much needed Revolution, and the establishment on a firm and substantial footing of a state of things

“When man to man the world o'er  
Shall brithers be for a' that.”

But alas! Scrooge was quite a good sort of fellow compared to the ordinary capitalist of the present day. His heart was not entirely dead, and it was possible to recall him to a sense of justice and truth. The newspaper cuttings which lie before us as we write, remind us that the typical capitalist of to-day has no longer even a rudimentary trace of that organ of sympathy. Take the case of Edward Haynes, the poor cooper, who walked up from Tunbridge Wells the other day in order to get work, and expired in Stepney workhouse from “starvation,” as the verdict has it. The principal witness at the inquest was the assistant at a “free shelter” in Limehouse, where the deceased had stayed the previous night. At this establishment “there were chairs for any who liked to sit up, and if they went to sleep they lie on the floor;” “no food whatever is given, except one meal on Sundays;” “on an average about two hundred men spend the night in the Shelter.” And even for such accommodation as this the poor, unemployed, starving workman is thankful. Then we have the case of Joseph Atkins, who committed suicide at the age of thirty-five, “consequent on the dire distress of his wife and five children, for whom,

owing to his inability to procure work, he was unable to provide food.” “Atkins was a very sober man and had a nice home until he lost his work.” The jury returned a verdict of “Temporary Insanity.” It is a pity this worthy jury did not explain a little more clearly what they meant by these words. If they mean that it is insanity for a man to kill himself, instead of attacking his enemies, no doubt the verdict may be considered a just one. William Rogers, an army pensioner, fifty-six years of age, was recently employed in a dispensary from seven in the morning till ten at night, every day in the week, including Sunday. Sometimes he worked all night for a change. For these services he received the munificent sum of 2s. 6d. per week. He tried to live on this and his pension of sixpence per day, but failed. The jury returned a verdict “that deceased died from exhaustion, from starvation.” Thomas Gold tried to live on 5s. a week, which was allowed him by his son, but out of this 2s. 6d. went to the landlord. He dropped down dead in an East London street and the cause of death was certified by the doctor as “bronchial pneumonia and privation.” Sophia Clifford was a widow, aged forty-five years. She had no means except 3s. from the parish and a little washing. Out of this she had to keep herself and three children. The landlord took 2s. a week. The poor woman drowned herself in the Thames.

This is how the poor die in consequence of man's inhumanity to man. These deaths are in fact nothing less than murders, for which everyone who does not strive to put an end to the state of society which causes them, is morally if not directly responsible. How the poor live is, however, more horrible still: a living death to which, perhaps, the real death is to be preferred. In the face of such instances as we have quoted, which are merely a few examples which happen and come under notice, seen by pulling back the smallest corner of that curtain of everyday life, which hides from many of us the fearful tragedies going on in our midst, it is impossible to speak calmly of the possessing classes. The cases of death by starvation, of poverty and misery, which come under our notice, are infinitesimal compared with the reality. Let us think, only for a moment, under what conditions a vast multitude of our fellow-creatures, thinking, sensitive beings like ourselves, with the same desire for happiness, comfort and well-being as we have, will spend their Christmas Eve, their Christmas Day. Not to speak of those who are kept toiling, away from their homes, their wives, their children and their friends; let us consider those who would even be thankful for the chance to toil. How many thousands of thousands of them there are. The writer of these lines has on more than one occasion visited the lodging-houses of the Borough, in order to spread the Gospel of Revolution therein, and he knows of his own knowledge that within a stone's throw of St. George's Church, some thousands of people will spend their Christmas within the precincts of a fourpenny or a twopenny “dosshouse,” without the least degree of comfort or merriment, sleeping, maybe, on the benches and tables in the common kitchen or indulging, maybe, in the luxury of a ‘rasher’ and a ‘doorstep,’ and all over the poorer quarters of London similar groups of common lodging-houses are to be found, inhabited by the same type of social castaway. Then there are the men of the refuges such as we have referred to above, the inmates of the workhouses, the hundreds of thousands of dwellers in garrets and alleys without a penny to bless themselves with. See what a huge population—we might almost say army, if it were not that they show no disposition to fight—the city of misery contains. How can there be peace on earth when such a state of things exists? How can there be goodwill amongst men? It is the struggle for existence in which the weakest is crushed, in which the competitors care not the least for their fellows but only for themselves. Every successful man has to fight to maintain his place, there are crowds of aspirants for his position, for his business, or for his employment. The man who enjoys is the enemy of the man who is in need, and is regarded as such. Fellowship is a hollow fraud. Instead of being pleased at each other's successes, all workers and monopolists alike, consider another man's success as an injury to themselves. There is no solidarity, no hope, no happiness. It is just a mad rush, a scramble, for the dead sea fruit.

Here and there, however, amongst all this war of interests and display of selfish passion, we see a few men and women standing out from amidst the fight and beckoning to others to come and join them. This struggle, this hatred, they say, is suicidal; let us put our efforts together and destroy the awful society which exists to-day, setting up in its place a true social structure, in which there will be room for all, and every newcomer will be welcome as the flowers in May. Scientific

investigators have proved by their researches that the productiveness of the earth is practicably inexhaustible. All the necessities of men and women may be easily supplied, nay, there might be luxury for the most insignificant dweller on the planet. Nature is bountiful, we have only to ask from her and to have, the poverty of to-day is no concern of hers. It is a purely artificial thing, created by those monsters in human form who deny the millions of willing hands access to the productive soil. What we have to do is to overthrow those who bar our way to Nature's storehouse, to put an end to their tyranny, to get rid for ever of her highwaymen of commerce and industry, and place the vast wealth of Mother Earth at the disposal of her children. It is because we wish to do this, because we deny the authority of those who obstruct our path that we are called Anarchists. But it is only by the triumph of those principles of liberty which we champion, that peace on Earth and goodwill amongst men can ever be realised.

## MUST WE PASS THROUGH STATE SOCIALISM ?

WHEN the revolution breaks out, it will not be thanks to the Social Democrats, who are rapidly ceasing to be revolutionists at all, but thanks to the impatience of the masses and the spread of Anarchist ideas.

Now, whilst the people are in a state of revolt, they must eat. The articles of consumption they find in the warehouses and shops will not last long, and neither gold from the bank nor jewels and ornaments from the houses of the rich will satisfy hunger. Therefore it will be needful to organise production immediately, and everywhere to take possession of the houses, means of production, land, machinery, etc. A piece of work in which a Socialist State would be powerless, one which must be done in a revolutionary, an Anarchist fashion.

Doubtless the State, or a Central Committee, could take possession of certain capitalist enterprises and make them into national workshops. But what use would that be? They could pronounce a sentence of forfeiture against certain Captains of Industry who had already left the country; but that is about all they would dare or be able to do. The State or Central Socialist Committee will never expropriate property and capital to put them in common. How could they set about it? They would have to get a law voted, a very complicated law, a whole series of laws, to provide for all cases and give rules for all circumstances. There are many sorts of property, and it is extremely difficult to distinguish, on paper, between ownership of articles of personal use, which must not be interfered with, and property employed for the exploitation of the worker, which must be abolished. Certainly it would never do to take their cottage and vegetable garden away from a peasant family, or to tear the clothes off folks' backs. Thus the law must establish a maximum, or some other regulations difficult to apply, particularly in a time of revolution, or else it must confide the business entirely to the discretion of officials specially charged to carry it into effect. Just fancy this army of property-distributors swarming over the country, searching and inquiring in the houses, valuing property and capital down to a given limit, and afterwards deciding what is to be left to each family and what must be put in common!

Apart from the crying injustices which would be committed and set everyone against the Revolution, it would be a work of years, ages, as we have seen during this century in the case of the abolition of feudal and communal domains in Italy and Germany.

Finally, all this would come to nothing, or nothing but a counter-revolution.

No, a government or a law cannot carry out expropriation. Expropriation must be the work of the people, in tumultuous, summary fashion, at the same time all over the country, managed with the good sense and discretion that the "real" people always bring into their actions.

In every direction they will take possession of land, workshops, machinery, mines, everything needed to set about organising production at once.

Again, no waiting for orders. During a revolution men must act. Those who have initiative will set the example; the factory hands will only have to go on working on their own account, instead of working for a master; new associations of workers will turn up and set to work with the materials they have collected or received from other associations. Production also will be organised "Anarchically," for it would be madness to wait for the permission and regulation of a central authority. A government may organise tyranny, oppression, the exploitation of the masses by a class; but as for organising the real interests of the people, it is not able to do anything of the sort.

We shall be met with the objection that the organisation of labor is a very complicated matter, that it is not enough merely to have the instruments of production, one must set oneself a task, fix a definite number of hours for the working day, and, especially, divide and subdivide labour. All this supposes knowledge not possessed by every one, and it may cause discord.

Let us reply, first of all, that just because the organisation of labor is a complicated affair, and differs much from one industry to another and one locality to another, it cannot be done by a general law and under the orders of a central government. All that a government could do would be to name commissioners in each locality, who in their turn must consult the workers themselves and refer the matter to them. For this service, which would be useless, and dangerous on account of

the injustices to which the intervention of the commissioners might give rise, the workers would have to pay heavy taxes.

As for the pretended incapacity of the workers to organise their work, we absolutely deny it. Moreover, there is no want of workers, even among those toiling to-day in factories, who know what has to be done; the others, if they really feel themselves incapable, can refer to these without thereby conferring any authority upon them.

We must further remark that the point of departure of the future organisation of labor will be the existing organisation. The factories are there, the machines are fixed in them; it is known how much coal an engine consumes, how many hours of labor such and such a quantity of produce takes, etc. Here is a basis to go upon. Doubtless in time much of this will be changed: some products will be limited, some stopped altogether, others increased and developed, more will be thought of the necessary, less of the superfluous; production must be decentralised; no more enormous factories built to provide articles of commerce, no more excessive subdivision of labor, killing the worker's intelligence and undermining his health. There must be alternation of work, and intellectual must be combined with manual labor, that the worker may exercise all his faculties.

But all these changes will come afterwards, little by little. At the beginning, what is most pressing must come first, and people will cling only too closely to the habits and systems of to-day. Those who dread too many novelties need not be afraid.

The only thing remaining for the associations of workers to do will be to come to a common understanding, federate with one another, for the purpose of putting the respective products in common, exchanging with other federations, and in general for all common interests: dwellings, means of communication, education, public health, and social security.

Here the authoritarian Socialists will put in their oar. They will demand the constitution of a Central Committee to organise all the public services, or at least to sit in judgment and regulate differences. If they have their own way, they will create a police, impose taxes, make partisans, and intrigue to keep their places. Claiming intellectual and official work for themselves and their functionaries, they will condemn the public to manual labor, and, considering themselves as superiors, they will also demand larger emoluments, were it only for the sake of their *prestige*; or rather they will levy supplies for themselves and thus finish by pushing us back into the present system again.

It is against this danger that Anarchists must energetically act. They ought to leave the masses themselves to look after their own interests. All that could be done by a Central Government, can be better done by the workers of different localities. Take dwellings for example. The best organisation for managing them and all needful changes connected therewith is a union of the inhabitants of the ward or district. Hygiene belongs to the dwelling department. The maintenance of streets and means of communication is the object of one or several industries: all those employed in existing tramways, omnibus, and other such companies will form one or several associations. Each association will bring its quota of labor to the Federation; each will let the others benefit by its work, and will itself benefit by the labor of the others. To come to an understanding, they could hold meetings, either general or of delegates bearing a fixed mandate. They will adopt one or other criterion for the division of produce; there will be no difficulty from the first about the things that have been produced in sufficient quantities. Less plentiful things will be assigned to the most pressing needs. Certain dainties, for instance, will be reserved for the sick. In fine, the workers will make what arrangements seem good to them, provided there be no central government commissioned to fix the price of the hour of labor, the exchange value of goods, etc.

Doubtless there will be some inequalities, injustices even, and some strife. But such strife will be the life of the new society, the pledge of progress; whilst the uniform and despotic system of a central government would inevitably end in stagnation and reaction.

There will be not only inequalities, but entirely different systems. Very probably, for instance, the peasants of some countries will want to divide the land and till it separately. But when they go to exchange their produce with those engaged in town industries, they will have to do business with Communist organisations, and be led for the sake of obtaining a regular exchange, to put their produce in common. Afterwards, the necessity of increasing production by the use of machinery, will bring them to put the land itself in common.

Another change will take place. The industrial towns will wish to spread themselves, taking in a little of the surrounding country, were it only that the workers might do agricultural and industrial work, turn and turn about, and at the same time secure a minimum of subsistence.

On the other hand, the country folk, as they acquire new needs, will be led to vary their occupations and to supply themselves with certain tools, were it only to learn how to use them, and will claim their share in intellectual work and town civilisation.

Hence will result the formation of associations at once industrial and agricultural, the organic unity of the future society.

Such changes ought not to appear unlikely to us; we knew in how short a time industrial England has arisen, and how fast German towns are growing to-day.

If there is one thing certain concerning the on-coming Revolution, it is that (in France at least) it will not be centralised, but communal. Marseilles and Lyons will not await the orders of Paris, nor submit to her dictation. Anarchists will thus have every chance

to give full weight to their principles; and if they cannot hope to see them adopted everywhere, they can, at least, put them in practice in many places. These will be centres round which neighbouring associations will group themselves, until society is entirely reconstructed upon the Anarchist plan. Either this or a political and economic autocracy of the most obnoxious sort.

It is for us to strive that the spirit of solidarity, the conviction of its advantages and its necessity may penetrate the masses and modify the various organisations formed at the moment of the Revolution, in the direction of Communism and of Anarchy.

## ANARCHIST MORALITY.

By P. KROPOTKINE.

(Continued from previous number.)

IV.

Mosaic, Buddhist, Christian and Mussulman theologians have had recourse to divine inspiration to distinguish between good and evil. They have seen that man, be he savage or civilised, ignorant or learned, perverse or kindly and honest, always knows if he is acting well or ill, especially always knows if he is acting ill; and as they have found no explanation of this general fact, they have put it down to divine inspiration. Metaphysical philosophers, on their side, have told us of conscience, of a mystic "imperative," and, after all, have changed nothing but the phrases.

But neither have known how to estimate the very simple and very striking fact that animals living in societies are also able to distinguish between good and evil, just as man does. Moreover, their conceptions of good and evil are of the same nature as those of man. Amongst the best developed representatives of each separate class: fish, insects, birds, mammals, they are even identical.

The thinkers of the XVIII. century noticed this, but it has been forgotten again, and it is for us now to bring forward the full significance of the fact.

Forel, that inimitable observer of ants, has shown by a mass of observations and facts that, when an ant who has her crop well filled with honey meets other ants with empty stomachs, the latter immediately ask her for food. And amongst these little insects it is the duty of the satisfied ant to disgorge the honey, that her hungry friends may also be satisfied. Ask the ants, if it would be right to refuse food to other ants of the same ant-hill, when one has had one's share. They will answer, by actions impossible to mistake, that it would be extremely wrong. So selfish an ant would be more harshly treated than enemies of another species. If such a thing happened during a battle between two different species, the ants would stop fighting to fall upon their selfish comrade. This fact has been proved by experiments which exclude all doubt.

Or again, ask the sparrows living in your garden, if it is right not to give notice to all the little society, when some crumbs are thrown out, so that all may come and share in the meal. Ask them, if that hedge sparrow has done right in stealing from his neighbour's nest those straws he had picked up, straws which the thief was too lazy to go and collect for himself. The sparrows will answer that he is very wrong, by flying at the robber and pecking him.

Or ask the marmots, if it is right for one to refuse access to his underground storehouse to other marmots of the same colony. They will answer that it is very wrong, by quarrelling in all sorts of ways with the miser.

Finally, ask primitive man, a Tchoukche for instance, if it is right to take food in the tent of a member of the tribe during his absence. He will answer that, if the man could get his food for himself, it was very wrong. On the other hand, if he was weary or in want, he ought to take food where he finds it; but, in such a case, he will do well to leave his cap or his knife, or even a bit of knotted string, so that the absent hunter may know on his return that a friend has been there, not a robber. Such a precaution will save him the anxiety caused by the possible presence of a marauder near his tent.

Thousands of similar facts might be quoted; whole books might be written, to show how identical are the conceptions of good and evil amongst men and the other animals.

The ant, the bird, the marmot, the Tchoukche savage have read neither Kant nor the Fathers of the Church, nor even Moses. And yet all have the same idea of good and evil. And if you reflect for a moment on what lies at the bottom of this idea, you will see directly that what is considered as good amongst ants, marmots, and Christian or Atheist moralists is that which is useful for the preservation of the race; and that which is considered evil is that which is hurtful for race preservation. Not for the individual, as Bentham and Mill put it, but fair and good for the whole race.

The idea of good and evil has thus nothing to do with religion or a mystic conscience; it is a natural need of animal races. And when founders of religions, philosophers, and moralists tell us of divine or metaphysical entities, they are only recasting what each ant, each sparrow practises in its little society.

Is this useful to society? Then it is good. Is this hurtful? Then it is bad.

This idea may be extremely restricted amongst the inferior animals, it may be enlarged amongst the more advanced animals; but its essence always remains the same.

Amongst ants it does not extend beyond the ant-hill. All sociable customs, all rules of good behaviour are applicable only to the individuals in that one ant-hill, not to any others. One ant-hill will not consider another as belonging to the same family, unless under some exceptional circumstances, such as a common distress falling upon both. In the same way the sparrows in the Luxembourg Gardens in Paris, though they will mutually aid one another in a striking manner, will fight to the death with another sparrow from the Monge Square who may dare to venture into the Luxembourg. And the Tchoutche will look upon a Tchoutche of another tribe as a person to whom the usages of his own tribe do not apply. It is even allowable to sell to him, and to sell is always to rob the buyer more or less; buyer or seller, one or other is always "sold." A Tchoutche would think it a crime to sell to the members of his tribe: to them he gives without any reckoning. And civilised man, when at last he understands the relations between himself and the simplest Papuan, close relations, though imperceptible at the first glance, will extend his principles of solidarity to the whole human race, and even to the animals. The idea enlarges, but its foundation remains the same.

On the other hand, the conception of good or evil varies according to the degree of intelligence or of knowledge acquired. There is nothing unchangeable about it.

Primitive man may have thought it very right, *i.e.*, useful to the race, to eat his aged parents, when they became a charge upon the community—a very heavy charge in the main. He may have also thought it right, *i.e.*, useful to the community as before, to kill his new born children, and only keep two or three in each family, so that the mother could suckle them until they were three years old and lavish more of her tenderness upon them.

In our days ideas have changed, but the means of subsistence are no longer what they were in the Stone Age. Civilised man is not in the position of the savage family who have to choose between two evils: either to eat the aged parents or else all get insufficient nourishment and soon find themselves unable to feed both the aged parents and the young children. We must transport ourselves into those ages, which we can scarcely call up in our mind, before we can understand that, in the circumstances then existing, half-savage man may have reasoned rightly enough. In fact, do we not see the peoples of Oceania a prey to the ravages of scurvy, since the missionaries have brought them to give up eating their aged kinsfolk and their enemies?\*

Ways of thinking may change. The estimate of what is useful or hurtful to the race changes, but the foundation remains the same. And if we wished to sum up the whole philosophy of the animal kingdom in a single phrase, we should see that ants, birds, marmots, and men are agreed on one point.

Christians† have said: "Do not to others what thou wouldest not they should do thee." And they have added: "Else, thou wilt be sent to hell."

The morality which emerges from the observation of the whole animal kingdom far surpasses this, and may be summed up in the words: "Do to others what you would have them do to you in the same circumstances."

And it adds: "Take note that this is merely a piece of advice; but this advice is the fruit of the long experience of animals in society. And amongst the great mass of social animals, man included, it has become habitual to act on this principle. Indeed, without this, no society could exist, no race could have vanquished the natural obstacles against which it must struggle."

Is it really this very simple principle which emerges from the observation of social animals and human societies? Is it applicable? And how does this principle pass into a habit and continually develop? This is what we are now going to see.

(To be continued.)

\* Miklukho-Maclay has stated this, and his observations are known to be trustworthy.

† Putting in negative form the positive command of their Master: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."—MATT. VII. 12.

**LA REVOLTE**: ORGANE COMMUNISTE-ANARCHISTE. Paraissent tous les Samedis. Administration: 140, rue Mouffetard, Paris.

**L'HOMME LIBRE**: ORGAN DE COMBAT POUR L'EMANCIPATION DES TRAVAILLEURS. Tous les Samedis. Administration: 27, rue Montagne-de-Sion, Bruxelles, Belgique.

**DER ANARCHIST**: A FORTNIGHTLY JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM. Post free to Great Britain for One shilling per quarter. Address: Karl Masur, 315, E. 44 Street, New York, U.S.A.

**FREIHEIT**: INTERNATIONAL ORGAN OF THE GERMAN SPEAKING ANARCHISTS, edited by JOHN MOST. Subscription, 2s. per quarter; under cover, 4s. Address: John Müller, Box 3135, New York.

**THE HERALD OF ANARCHY**: A MONTHLY EXPONENT OF CONSISTENT INDIVIDUALISM. Annual subscription 1s., post free. Address: A. Tarn, 27, St. Johns Hill Grove, New Wandsworth, London, S.W.

## FREEDOM.

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.  
MONTHLY, 1d., POST FREE 1½d.

Annual Subscription, post free to all countries, 1s. 6d. Foreign subscriptions should be sent by International Money Order.

Wholesale Price, 1s. 4d. per quire of 27, carriage free.

Address "FREEDOM," 26, Newington Green Road, London, N.

Freedom Pamphlets.—No. I., "The Wage System," by Peter Kropotkin, 1d., post free, 1½d. No. II., "The Commune of Paris," by Peter Kropotkin, 1d., post free, 1½d.; per quire of 25, 1s. 4d. No. III., "A Talk about Anarchist Communism between Two Workmen," by Enrico Malatesta, 1d., post free, 1½d.; per quire of 25, 1s. 4d. No. IV., "Anarchist Communism: Its Basis and Principles," by Peter Kropotkin, 2d., post free, 2½d.; per quire of 25, 2s. 8d.

Notice to Subscribers.—If there is a blue mark against this notice your subscription is due and must be sent before next month if you wish to go on receiving the paper.

Received: Publication Fund—Kat. 1s.

## NOTES.

## THE NAUGHTY BOY OF EUROPE.

William the German must be a source of considerable uneasiness to his fellow monarchs. There is no limit to his tongue, and his mischievous propensities seem to match. Last month he lectured his recruits and rashly explained to them the oath they had just taken. "My children," he said, "you are young and may not understand the oath of fealty you have sworn to me. I will tell you what it means. It means that you have given yourselves—bodies and souls—to me, that, henceforth, my foes are your foes, and that, if called upon, you must fight them, whether abroad or at home. It may be that I shall have to call upon you to fight against the Socialists, and that you will have to shoot down your own relatives, fathers and brothers, I hope not; but if I do call upon you to do this, you must do it. This is what your oath means.

## CHILDREN AND FOOLS SPEAK TRUTH—OUT OF SEASON.

The truthfulness of William the German has been condemned by the English daily papers that reported his speech as impolitic. It was putting a soldier's position in too clear a light. In other countries troops have been ordered to fire on their defenceless compatriots, but their commanding officer has not beforehand, with brutal frankness, explained that they are to go out and kill their fathers and brothers. No doubt, unless truthful William's example is imitated in other quarters, Europe will again witness the horrid spectacle of brothers by brothers slain. Nay, wives, sweethearts, and mothers too have received their death-blows from the hands that should only have been raised to succour them; but what of that, the soldiers only kept their oath!

## TOMMY ATKIN'S OATH.

The British Soldier swears, so help him God, that he "will defend Her Majesty, Her Heirs, and Successors, in Person, Crown and Dignity, against all enemies," and that he will observe and obey all orders of "Her Majesty, Her &c. &c., and of the Generals and Officers set over me." Poor devil! And so for a miserable pittance per day he is bound, if ordered by Her Majesty, Her &c., his Generals or Officers, to shoot, maim, kill, and otherwise destroy his socialistic brothers, for whom Her Majesty's Person, Crown, and Dignity are but so many bubbles that will burst and pass away when the scum and froth has been removed from our social system, and the wine of liberty is ready for quaffing.

## CURIOUS, BUT TRUE.

The officers of Her Majesty's army take no oath. Why should they? They belong to the class that is interested in upholding the old order of things, and in this, not in the taking of oaths, lies the source of the British army's loyalty. Strange too, the Volunteer takes no oath to obey his General and the Officers set over him, and yet among Volunteers there is less insubordination than among the regular troops. So much for the voluntary system founded on self-interest.

## ANARCHISM IN SPAIN.

Our Spanish comrades have made first rate use of the last Chicago Anniversary. Meetings have been held in all places, great and small, even in the smallest, before and after November 11. The *El Productor* Group, with the aid of Comrade Malatesta, who is now on a lecturing tour in Spain, have made a most successful propagandist expedition throughout the country, holding mass meetings everywhere. Spanish Anarchists are numerous and strong, but they mean to become more numerous and stronger. They realise that the noblest principles in the world will never become a living, moving force until they are backed by large numbers of working men. This is why our Spanish comrades have made themselves members of trade societies, and the fruits of their steady, persistent work is visible in the series of enthusiastic mass meetings they have lately held. It seems as if Spanish Anarchism would shortly be ripe for action.

## THE CHICAGO OUTRAGE.

The Chicago magistrates have fined our comrades heavily for being present at the two meetings at Grief's Hall, on Nov. 12th. These meetings (ordinary trades' union meetings) were "illegal," they say! Our comrades have appealed. Evidently the police find they have gone a little too far, for they have offered to pay for the damage they did. The unions, whose belongings were destroyed, have refused the proffered compensation, and are prosecuting the police.

## THE DECADENCE OF FRANCE.

For some years past we have been told that the population of France was stationary. According to the latest returns, it is on the decline. In 1890 there were 40,000 more deaths than births. This would seem to show that France is in a parlous state. Nothing but the breath of Revolution can restore the country which gave birth to the great uprising of one hundred years ago. If this state of society continues much longer, France is doomed. The patriotism of its inhabitants will avail nothing against the damning fact above-mentioned. The invasion of the foreigner may take place in one form or another, and the territory now controlled by the French race must pass into other hands.

## SOCIAL DEMOCRATS IN CHICAGO.

The handful of Social Democrats in Chicago have been graciously pleased to address a manifesto to their brethren in the States, England, Germany, and elsewhere disclaiming all connection with the Anarchist Socialists. There is a deep gulf, they state, between them and Parsons, Spies, and the other martyrs. We can well believe it. If it were not so deep, possibly the Social Democratic cause would not be losing ground in America, and its organ, *The People*, be able to keep up its size as an eight-page journal, instead of shrinking to a four-page as it has lately done.

## THE ROUMANIAN WORKERS.

The Roumanian Government for the last thirty years has been of the modern bourgeois type, representative institutions, equality before the law, and all the rest. But the condition of the workers there is much the same as in Russia. Serfdom and feudal overlordship existed down to 1864, and the mass of the population are still peasants working in the fields. As in Russia, industry on a large scale is only beginning to exist, most industrial work is done in small workshops. None the less the industrial workers are vilanously exploited. Many factories work from 5 a.m. to 9 p.m. For a day of 16 to 17 hours, young boys and girls get 3d. or 5d., and older hands 10d. Boys employed as clerks and book-keepers in shops work for 17 hours, 7 days a week, for nothing during the 5 or 6 years of their apprenticeship (they could learn the work in a month), and when their time is out, for about £2 a month. Numbers of them suffer from hernia, in consequence of the heavy weights they are required to lift. Apprentices in other trades work for 16 to 18 hours daily on no better terms.

## ANARCHISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN ROUMANIA.

A group of medical students in Bucharest are now bringing out an Anarchist paper, called "Revolt," and intend shortly to publish pamphlets. "We are only a handful," writes our correspondent there, "but already several working men are being attracted to the movement." This is good news, for Socialism in Roumania has been since 1884 mainly represented by certain Marxists of the "high and dry" order, eternally discussing economic theories and wasting their strength in agitating for useless palliatives. The old story; "Scientific" Socialism, playing, with the best intentions, into the hands of the ruling classes and aiding them to quench genuine revolutionary movements amongst the people. When the peasants' insurrection broke out in 1888, for instance, "the Socialists," as they state in their report to the Brussels congress, "far from taking part in or encouraging this movement, did all they could to hinder it in places where it had not yet declared itself." Reasons: the peasants (or the Marxists?) were not ready and Russia might have interfered.

## THE ROUMANIAN PEASANTS.

As for the country folk, their condition is well nigh as desperate as that of the Tzar-governed Russians. The Constitutional Roumanian Government made just the same mistakes as the bureaucratic Russian despotism, when it liberated the serfs in 1864. As in Russia, the land had been held by the lord and his serfs in common, the lord having almost absolute right over his serf's person, but being obliged to allow him access to the soil to gain his subsistence. When the government divided the land between the ancient co-proprietors, it, of course, regarded mainly the interests of the lords and gave the peasants a miserably insufficient share of the worst land, no grazing ground, and no farming capital. Necessarily they fell a prey to their ancient oppressors in a new way. The feudal lords were now landlords with land to let. A middle class of farmers and usurers arose and the half-starved peasants became the hirelings of the one and the debtors of the other. Often the landlord and the farmer unite the profession of usurer with their other means of enrichment. Often they take two-thirds of a peasant's harvest, for the rent of the extra land he has been obliged to take to make a living at all, and for the seed, implements, etc., he has been forced to borrow. Besides he is subject to endless exactions; feudal dues not yet abolished and modern charges for pasturage, drinking water, etc. Once the wretched victim gets into the clutches of these greedy devourers of the poor, he will never undo the knots of their red tape, never throw off the weight of legal obligations they pile upon him.

In spite of a law declaring the land of a peasant inalienable, and another law passed ten years ago to supplement it, the rising middle class have got the land of the Roumanian peasants more and more into their hands. In that country, as everywhere else in Europe, the numbers of propertiless, landless men grow and increase. a ready prey for the prowling capitalist.

## THE GERMAN SOCIALISTS.

We say "Socialists" advisedly, for the "Young" Socialist party in Germany have as yet a right to the name; and "The Socialist" is the name of their new paper, published at Berlin (*Der Sozialist*, Alte Jakobstrasse 91, Hof 3 Treppen). This capitally managed paper gives some painful glimpses into the character of the "Old" Social Democratic party. For instance in the Supplement to the "Sozialist" No. 4, we read, first, that the Socialist deputies have continually been courting the lower middle class, though once upon a time Bebel used to say that the lower middle class were doomed to disappear and return to the ranks of the proletariat. But since, in 1884, he was not re-elected at Dresden, he has changed his tone. Secondly, that "the victory recently gained by the proletariat at the Berlin elections," at which exclaims "Vorwärts," "the palaces tremble," consists in the return of a Dr. Zadeck, Singer, and Stadthagen. Thirdly, that Singer, on the 19th Nov., speaking at the Town Council at Berlin, boasted that the "Social Democrats themselves have shed their blood on the battle fields of 1870-71 and are ready to do the like again." Fourthly, that Liebknecht first of all declared against the printers' strike and *all strikes*, though now he has had the impertinence to send a letter to the London Trades Council saying that he "approves" of it, and "commending" it to the support of the English workers (which letter, by the by, when read out at the enthusiastic meeting in the Memorial Hall, in favor of the German printers' strike, fell so flat, that it seemed as if either nobody or everybody knew him). Fifthly, that this same Liebknecht in the Saxon Chamber declared he regarded his oath of allegiance to King, Constitution etc. as pledging his honor, and intended to respect it. Sixthly, that the "Vorwärts," the official organ of Social Democracy, defends the interests of brewers and Limited Liability Companies who share a dividend of from 30 to 80 per cent, and whose directors receive a salary of from 10 to 20 thousand Marks a year, &c. &c.

In the same paper—"Sozialist"—we are pleased to see reports of numerous meetings of the "Independent Socialists," and of the formation of new groups in Berlin and in the provinces. They are contending with the Social Democrats mainly on three points: 1. Legislative reforms, and the illusions folks make for themselves on the subject; 2. parliamentarism and the corruption it engenders; 3. discipline, red-tapism and boycotting in the party.

It is easy to see from the above the importance of this movement.

## WOMEN IN ITALIAN RICE FIELDS.

A LITTLE while ago, we published the description given by an eye-witness of the horrible exploitation of sulphur miners in Sicily.\* The work of the women employed in the rice fields of Italy is scarcely more tolerable. We translate the following account from an article by Angiole Cabrine in the Milan *Critica Sociale* for Aug.—Nov., 1891.

In the first weeks of spring begins the recruiting of the *moundine*, as the women who work in the rice fields are called in the Lombard dialect. [It is remarkable that the "weaker" sex forms five-sixths of the human merchandise which goes to rot in the rice fields.]

The recruiting takes place in the following manner:

A farmer, a part of whose land is devoted to the culture of rice, engages a slave-driver, or recruiter, or dealer in human flesh.

The slave-driver—called chief or corporal—agrees with his patron as to the quantity of land to be devoted to rice culture, and as to the daily wage to be paid to the workers. He also has the charge of providing for the troop.

The contract settled, the slave-driver or overseer, begins to scour the country, enticing into his service the army of those who are to be the victims of malaria and death.

Young people whom hunger has driven from their homes; young girls anxious to obtain trinkets, with a view to getting married; those who having collected some finery have sold it again, together with their mattresses in the great misery of winter, to buy medicines for old and sick parents, or keep some poor widow whom the employers no longer require, because they prefer to engage WHOLE FAMILIES; all these flock in troops at the call of the overseer, demanding a few halfpence more than the preceding year. And what may be this wage?

From 1£ to 30s. for about forty days work, including board and lodging. What board and lodging, you shall hear directly.

This child, thin, small, hardly fourteen years old, is not worth more than £1. This other, stronger built and not so young; had the Tertian ague last year; she will get from 25s. to 27s. For the privileged, the fortunate, with iron muscles, is reserved the maximum, 30s.

The engagement is made. The day arrives to quit their villages for the valley of Lodi, or the Lomelline. The troop bravely mounts the cart, drawn by a jaded beast, which at every ten paces drives the flies and musquitoes off its belly with its hind feet.

On the cart, hardly protected from the dog-day's sun by the elm-branches twined above them like a roof, the "maundine" slowly approach the rice fields. Inspired with the hope of a distant wedding-day, how many find thereon their grave!

Bruised, burnt, and covered with dust, they reach the farm. With the water from the ditches they wash and quench their thirst. Then all, men and women, children and adults, stretch themselves upon a shake-down of straw.

How often does the village doctor, called to a young girl of fifteen years, after her return from the rice fields, find her pregnant!

At four o'clock in the morning, the rough voice of the overseer awakens the band, and, still half asleep, they proceed on their way to the fields. Arrived there, they trudge into the swamp, which covers their feet to above the ankle. The novices pull a wry face, but the overseer yells: "Forward! to earn your bread!" The sun begins to clear away the morning mist hanging like a foul and dirty sheet above the stagnant, fetid waters of the rice swamp.

The sheet vanishes; the sun darts his scorching rays upon the unhappy creatures, who, with skirts tucked up to their knees and heads bowed down to their waists, breathe the miasma exhaled by the stinking soil, covered with gnats, frogs, and, happily, leeches.

Happily!

Yes, happily; for the leech represents gain to the "maundina." She lets it attach itself to her skin and suck a little blood. Then she quickly snatches it off and puts it into a little bottle. On the Sunday she disposes of her collection at the village pharmacy, thereby adding a few pence to her pay.

As far as I know, the farmers have not yet pretended to a claim on the profits got by the leeches; soon probably they may enforce it.

And what are the hours of work?

From 4 to 8 in the morning; from 8.30 to 11 o'clock; from 12 to 4 p.m.; and from 4.30 to 8 in the evening.

The food consists of a small piece of yellow meal bread twice a day (this piece ought to weigh 1½ lbs., but in reality it never exceeds 1 lb.) and also broth twice a day. In some places broth is only given once a day.

To conclude; what with the straw—by no means always clean, the water—seldom pure, the overseer's bell—which sounds always before time to begin work and after time to cease, what with prostitution, imbecility and fever, is it surprising that these women are very quickly transformed into walking skeletons!

## INDIVIDUALIST SOCIALISM (sic!) IN BELGIUM.

(From a foreign correspondent.)

*La Question Sociale* is the title of a fortnightly popular sociological review, which, having a year ago suspended publication, has now reappeared. Address: 14, rue Vésale, Brussels. We are sorry to be obliged to remark that the editors of this little review appear to know of no Anarchism but that of Proudhon and Colins (Colins an Anarchist!), Tucker and the Liberty and Property Defence League. They do not appear even to suspect the existence of the Anarchist Communism which counts as many thousands of adherents as Individualist Anarchy counts units. Furthermore, the Anarchists of "La Question Sociale" "believe that, in a somewhat distant future, in a century or two, there may be a free collectivist system, like that of Colins," but "after Individualism itself has first of all had sufficient time to transform regenerated humanity economically, politically, and morally, by a slow but sure evolution."

We pass for Utopians; but even we have not much opinion about what is going to happen to regenerated humanity in the XXII. century. Regenerated by individualism too!

We have not "the patience to limit ourselves to passively awaiting the slow approach of the triple economic, political and moral evolution needed before free collectivism becomes possible; and meanwhile content ourselves with the very problematic abolition of the monopoly of land, of the industrial and commercial currency, enforced taxation and the progressive abolition of the State, Government, Parliamentary system"....

These monopolies are no mere accidents, as was once believed, they are one with the existing system; and if by an absurd supposition we imagine them abolished, other things remaining the same, they would immediately be born again from the bosom of individualism. We are tired of hearing these insignificant words individualism, individual liberty etc. dinned into our ears. The individual does not exist apart from society, and it is only amidst a social organisation, based on the principle of solidarity, *i.e.*, Anarchist Communism, that the independence, the freedom of each member of society, *i.e.*, true individualism, can grow up. But instead of this, these good folks want to persuade us that, after a gestation of two more centuries, collectivism will come forth from the womb of individualism!

It is true that the free collectivism in question is of a queer sort. A big central administration to collect all the rent of the land (How are they going to distinguish the rent from the returns to labor? And why not confiscate "interest," the rent of capital?), and distribute it (at their pleasure?) to groups of commissioners who will use it, one group for the instruction of the young; the second for the maintenance of the sick and aged; the third for keeping up and beautifying the authorised agricultural or industrial establishments (there are then to be leases granted by the administration to individuals); the fourth for the advance of marriage portions, or loans of capital (loans to be repaid: another large business for the administration); the fifth for the locomotion of persons and things; the sixth for the protection of men and property; the seventh for social as against individual competition, to reduce the profits of traders (then individual trading, social trading, competition, and all the evils arising therefrom, are still to exist).

And all this system, which is in some points inferior to the Socialist State, is to be based on agricultural rent, itself based upon the existing commercial system!

This view of Socialism seems to us somewhat limited for folks who pretend to know what is to happen in two centuries.

\* See *Freedom* for October, 1890.

# ANARCHY.

By ENRICO MALATESTA.

(Continued from previous number.)

The principle of each for himself, that is, of war of all against all, has come in the course of time to complicate, lead astray, and paralyse the war of all combined against nature for the common advantage of the human race, which could only be completely successful by acting on the principle of all for each and each for all.

Great have been the evils which humanity has suffered by this intermingling of domination and exploitation with human association. But in spite of the atrocious oppression to which the masses submit, of the misery, vices, crime, and degradation which oppression and slavery produce, among the slaves and their masters, and in spite of the hatreds, the exterminating wars, and the antagonisms of artificially created interests, nevertheless, the social instinct has survived and even developed. Co-operation, having been always the necessary condition for successful combat against external nature, has therefore been the permanent cause of men's coming together, and consequently of the development of their sympathetic sentiments. Even the oppression of the masses has itself caused the oppressed to fraternise among themselves. Indeed it has been solely owing to this feeling of solidarity, more or less conscious and more or less widespread among the oppressed, that they have been able to endure the oppression, and that man has resisted the causes of death in his midst.

In the present the immense development of production, the growth of human needs which cannot be satisfied except by the united efforts of a large number of men in all countries, the extended means of communication, habits of travel, science, literature, commerce, even war itself—all these have drawn and are still drawing humanity into a compact body, every section of which, closely knit together, can find its satisfaction and liberty only in the development and health of all the other sections composing the whole.

The inhabitant of Naples is as much interested in the amelioration of the hygienic condition of the peoples on the banks of the Ganges, from whence the cholera is brought to him, as in the improvement of the sewerage of his own town. The well-being, liberty, or fortune of the mountaineer, lost amongst the precipices of the Appenines, does not depend alone on the state of well-being or of misery, in which the inhabitants of his own village live, or even on the general condition of the Italian people, but also on the condition of the workers in America, or Australia, on the discovery of a Swedish scientist, on the moral and material conditions of the Chinese, on war or peace in Africa; in short, it depends on all the great and small circumstances which affect the human being in any spot whatever of the world.

In the present condition of society, the vast solidarity, which unites all men, is in a great degree unconscious, since it arises spontaneously from the friction of particular interests, while men occupy themselves little or not at all with general interests. And this is the most evident proof that solidarity is the natural law of human life, which imposes itself, so to speak, in spite of all obstacles, and even those artificially created by society as at present constituted.

On the other hand, the oppressed masses, never wholly resigned to oppression and misery, who to-day more than ever show themselves ardent for justice, liberty, and well-being, are beginning to understand that they cannot emancipate themselves except by uniting, through solidarity with all the oppressed and exploited over the whole world. And they understand also that the indispensable condition of their emancipation is the possession of the means of production, of the soil and of the instruments of labor, and further the abolition of private property. Science and the observation of social phenomena show that this abolition would be of immense advantage in the end, even to the privileged classes, if only they could bring themselves to renounce the spirit of domination and concur with all their fellow-men in laboring for the common good.

Now should the oppressed masses some day refuse to work for their oppressors, should they take possession of the soil and the instruments of labor, and apply them for their own use and advantage, and that of all who work, should they no longer submit to the domination, either of brute force or economic privilege; but if the spirit of human fellowship and the sentiment of human solidarity, strengthened by common interests, should grow among the people and put an end to strife between nations; then what ground would there be for the existence of a government?

Private property abolished, government—which is its defender—must disappear. Should it survive, it would continually tend to reconstruct, under one form or another, a privileged and oppressive class.

And the abolition of government does not, nor cannot, signify the doing away with human association.

Far otherwise, for that co-operation which to-day is enforced, and directed to the advantage of the few, would be free and voluntary, directed to the advantage of all. Therefore it would become more intense and efficacious.

The social instinct and the sentiment of solidarity would develop to the highest degree; and every individual would do all in his power for the good of others, as much for the satisfaction of his own well understood interests as for the gratification of his sympathetic sentiments.

By the free association of all, a social organisation would arise through the spontaneous grouping of men according to their needs and sympathies, from the low to the high, from the simple to the complex, starting from the more immediate to arrive at the more distant and general interests. This organisation would have for its aim the greatest good and fullest liberty to all; it would embrace all humanity in one common brotherhood, and would be modified and improved as circumstances were modified and changed, according to the teachings of experience.

This society of FREE MEN, this society of FRIENDS would be ANARCHY.

## II.

We have hitherto considered government as it is, and as it necessarily must be in a society founded upon privilege, upon the exploitation and oppression of man by man, upon antagonism of interests and social strife, in a word, upon private property.

We have seen how this state of strife, far from being a necessary condition of human life, is contrary to the interests of the individual and of the species. We have observed how co-operation, solidarity (of interest) is the law of human progress, and we have concluded that, with the abolition of private property and the cessation of all domination of man over man, there would be no reason for government to exist—therefore it ought to be abolished.

But, it may be objected, if the principle on which social organisation is now founded were to be changed, and solidarity substituted for strife, common property for private property, the government also would change its nature. Instead of being the protector and representative of the interests of one class, it would become, if there were no longer any classes, representative of all society. Its mission would be to secure and regulate social co-operation in the interests of all, and to fulfil public services of general utility. It would defend society against possible attempts to re-establish privilege, and prevent or repress all attacks, by whomsoever set on foot, against the life, well-being, or liberty of each.

There are in society certain matters too important, requiring too much constant, regular attention, for them to be left to the voluntary management of individuals, without danger of everything getting into disorder.

If there were no government, who would organise the supply and distribution of provisions? Who regulate matters pertaining to public hygiene, the postal, telegraph, and railway services, etc.? Who would direct public instruction? Who undertake those great works of exploration, improvements on a large scale, scientific enterprises, etc., which transform the face of the earth and augment a hundredfold the power of man?

Who would care for the preservation and increase of capital, that it might be transmitted to posterity enriched and improved?

Who would prevent the destruction of the forests, or the irrational exploitation, and therefore impoverishment of the soil?

Who would there be to prevent and repress crimes, that is, anti-social acts?

What of those who, disregarding the law of solidarity, would not work? Or of those who might spread infectious disease in a country by refusing to submit to the regulations of hygiene by science? Or what again could be done with those who, whether insane or no, might set fire to the harvest, injure children, or abuse and take advantage of the weak?

To destroy private property and abolish existing government without reconstituting a government that would organise collective life and secure social solidarity, would not be to abolish privilege and bring peace and prosperity upon earth. It would be to destroy every social bond, to leave humanity to fall back into barbarism, to begin again the reign of "each for himself," which would re-establish the triumph firstly of brute force, and secondly of economic privilege.

Such are the objections brought forward by authoritarians, even by those who are Socialists, that is, who wish to abolish private property and class government founded upon the system of private property.

We reply:

In the first place, it is not true that with a change of social conditions the nature of the government and its functions would also change. Organs and functions are inseparable terms. Take from an organ its function, and either the organ will die, or the function will reinstate itself. Place an army in a country where there is no reason or fear of foreign war, and this army will provoke war, or, if it do not succeed in doing that, it will disband. A police force, where there are no crimes to discover, and delinquents to arrest, will provoke or invent crimes, or will cease to exist.

For centuries there existed in France an institution, now included in the administration of the forests, for the extermination of the wolves and other noxious beasts. No one will be surprised to learn that, just on account of this institution, wolves still exist in France, and that, in rigorous seasons, they do great damage. The public take little heed of the wolves, because there are the appointed officials, whose duty it is to think about them. And the officials do hunt them, but in an INTELLIGENT manner, sparing their caves, and allowing time for reproduction, that they may not run the risk of entirely destroying such an INTERESTING species. The French peasants have indeed little confidence in these official wolf-hunters, and regard them rather as the wolf-preservers. And, of course, what would these officials do if there were no longer any wolves to exterminate?

(To be continued.)

## RESPECTABILITY AND ITS MARTYRS.

Not long ago, one of the most conspicuous placards in the streets of London was a "Popular Educator" picture, issued by Messrs. Cassell: a graphic representation of the awful contrast between respectability and *sans-culottism*, between sobriety and sottishness, between legality and crime. There they stood, for the moral comfort and edification of the well-to-do classes—the line of Respectables above, developing through each phase of their well-ordered career, from smirking infancy to smug youth, from smug youth to busy manhood, from busy manhood to pious and hypocritical old age; the line of *sans-culottes* below, with corresponding gradations of vice, penury, and squalor. It was a suggestive picture, suggestive perhaps of something more than its artist had meant by it; for it spoke not only of the divergent results of education and ignorance, but also of the inevitable connection and interdependence of self-aggrandisement and self-degradation; of a steady course of money-making on the one hand, and an equally steady course of man-unmaking on the other. But in one point it seemed to me that the picture hardly conveyed the particular moral which was presumably intended; for if there were indeed (which God forbid!) no other alternative but a choice between the upper line and the lower, between snob and sot, between respectable and criminal, one could not feel quite sure that a wise man would deliberately choose for himself, or for his children, the respectability thus depicted. There may be an even sadder death-in-life than a career of crime and brutality; "worse than a bloody hand," so a great poet has written, "is a hard heart."

*Respectability* is a perverted term; the opprobrium which is now beginning to attach to it was not its original portion. Etymology tells us that *respectable*, so far from being synonymous with dismal boredom, primarily means that which is worth looking back at, that which deserves something more than a passing notice—a meaning which, in strict justice, is scarcely applicable to the so-called Respectables of the present day. But let us be generous, and admit that, in another sense, these unhappy victims of propriety and custom are deserving (if only as affording a monumental warning and example) of the careful attention of their contemporaries; let us not deny to the self-torturing Respectables of civilised Europe and the nineteenth century at least that psychological interest which we feel in the mediæval hermit or the oriental fakir. Men and women who are content, nay proud, to bear their burden of respectability, at the cost of so much suffering both to others and themselves, are as well worthy of study as the fanatics who pass their whole lives in iron cages, or mortify the flesh by clenching their fists till the nails grow through the hand. Let us pause awhile, then, and look back at them, and give them the privilege of their name.

In every town and in every village stands the Temple of Respectability, not built indeed with hands, but none the less the most solid and enduring of all civilised institutions. Frequent are the sacrifices at its altars; sacrifices of liberty, nature and truth; countless the tortures to which its votaries subject themselves in their life-long struggle to be numbered among the faithful and the elect. In family or society, in business office or church pew, you may know them by the *insignia* of their membership, by that cheerless livery which it is their doom to bear from the cradle to the grave, from their infant baptism of starch to their extreme unction of pharisaism. The black coat and the tall hat (the *nessus-robe* and crown of thorns in modern martyrdom), the cuffs and collars, the laces and braces, the tight gloves and tight boots—these are the outward badges and tokens of the hearts that by a simultaneous process are cramped and atrophied within. Surely these were the sufferers who inhabited that "City of Night," of which the poet has sung:

"Yet as in some necropolis you find  
Perchance one mourner to a thousand dead,  
So there; worn faces that look deaf and blind  
Like tragic masks of stone. With weary tread,  
Each wrapt in his own doom, they wander, wander,  
Or sit foredone and desolately ponder  
Through sleepless hours with heavy drooping head."

Of old, in the "Pilgrim's Progress," it was the Delectable Mountains that gave refreshment to the eyes and heart of the wayfarer. Commercial progress, it seems, has changed the Delectable to the Respectable; and the result is what might have been anticipated from the change.

The endurance shown by the Respectables, in their compliance with the ritual of their creed, may be aptly compared with the behaviour of the so-called "savages" of the Pacific, who patiently submit themselves to the analogous process of tattooing—though it may be questioned whether it is not less savage on the whole, to be tattooed in body than in mind. "The operation," writes a traveller who has witnessed it, "is extremely painful, yet pride induces them to bear this torture, and they even suffer themselves to be tied down while it is performed, in order that their agony may not interrupt the operator. The men commence tattooing as soon as they are able to bear the pain, generally at the age of eighteen or nineteen, and they are rarely completely tattooed until they arrive at the age of thirty-five. I was informed that every line had its meaning and gave to the bearer certain privileges at their feasts." Here is a description which is applicable enough, in another sense, to those martyrs of "civilised society," whose function it is not to be happy but to be proper, not to be honest but respectable.

But it is not only *self-torture* that is an attribute of our Respectables; inhumanity to others is implied, not directly or consciously perhaps, but none the less surely, in their creed. For Respectability

is the foe of all naturalness and instinct; it is the determination to keep up appearances at all costs, without the slightest care for the actualities of compassion, humaneness, and justice; so that Shelley was well within the mark when he described "the respectable man" as "the smooth, smiling, polished villain, whom all the city honours; whose very trade is lies and murder; who buys his daily bread with the blood and tears of men." Heartlessness towards others, joylessness in himself—those are the two dominant qualities of the nineteenth-century Respectable.

H. S. Salt.

## COMMUNISM.

I REGRET to see that the principles of Anarchic Communism are so little clearly understood. First, what is Communism? It is not any system of organised co-operation and distribution, but the expression of a principle—the principle of Liberty, expressed in repudiating the intervention of any alleged superior right to decide any matter of possession. In a condition of Communism everything is *un-owned*. To sum up, Communism is Economic Anarchy. Ownership is the restriction placed by law or by usage on all but the owner, in respect of the thing owned; and restriction of persons is their being owned in the other sense in which a master is said to own slaves, by whoever can take advantage of that restriction.

To lay down a usage exacting the giving up of equal products (except by individual foregoing) as the condition of obtaining other products, is contrary to Communism, being a mere dilution of the property-system. Communism is that each labor according to his choice and liking; that each supply aid in the shape of labor, or in the shape of goods for which he nevertheless has some need, according to the measure prompted to his free-will by his several instincts, and in the shape of what he has, but is not needing, according to the demand; and that each also ask and obtain in accordance with his needs—no question of price or remuneration being possible, and exchange having no other function than to facilitate the satisfaction of two needs instead of one or none, by altering *locative* distribution—as for instance, when, your table being too large and mine too small, we change tables; or when (taking another form of exchange) Mary is fixing the wet clothes on the lines with hairpins, while Jane has neither clothespegs nor hairpins, but wants to fix up her hair, and Ellen, by supplying clothespegs to Mary, enables her to hand the hairpins to Jane and still carry out her own purpose. The object of distribution is not to secure to each or any a return for permitting someone else to have some or other thing, but to enable each to have exactly what he needs, and thus create the most favorable meeting for each to do and be as he likes. On the other hand any sanctified basis of mutual rationing is likely to grow into law, and opens the door to fraud.

It is not "that an Anarchist *may* be a Communist," he *MUST* be a Communist in order to be an Anarchist at all, Anarchy being the perfection of Individualism, properly so called, which cannot exist unless there is absolutely free individual initiative in matters of possession, without privilege or preference to the claim of the producer\* or anyone else. The so-called Individualism that erects such a preference denies Anarchy, and so does the so-called Communism that perpetuates property under one form or another by "value exchange."

J. A. ANDREWS.

Communist Anarchist Group No. 2,  
Smithfield, New South Wales,  
Australia, October 21st, 1891.

\* Surely comrade Andrews admits that Anarchic Communism necessarily allows the producer, not an absolute monopoly of the produce, but a claim to a voice in its distribution? When a man makes anything, alone or with others, either the producers must decide what is to be done with their work, or someone else must; and if someone else is to decide, he will be their employer, their master. Men can only be said to be free to work as they choose, when they are not constrained by others in the disposal of what they make. For instance, if Ellen makes clothes pegs, she must be at liberty to decide (if she is to be a free worker) whether she will make them for Mary, or, having a limited number on hand, whether she will give them first to Mary, or to some other neighbour who may be needing pegs also, or divide them between the two.

The simplest plan would be to make supplies of needful things and put them in a local store for the provision of all comers, but in that case surely it must be the producers who decide whether they will send their produce to the store or dispose of it at home, how much of it they shall send and so forth. If not they, who? Of course, they know that they have not produced as isolated, self-sufficient individuals; they are aware that they owe their power to produce in large measure to the Community, and also that they owe the supply of their varied needs to the labor of their fellow-workers, and therefore they will naturally desire, in common fairness, to make their produce as generally useful as possible. But the way they do so must be surely left for them to decide.

In an Anarchist Communist community, where every able-bodied person was a worker, the producers would easily come to a common understanding as to the best way of distributing what each and all produced. But to deny that they have a claim to do this on the ground of having put their energy into the produce, is to set people needlessly against Communism; for every thinking man knows, or at least feels,

that he has some very real part in what he produces, and that the person who ignores this and comes and takes it away from him against his will, on whatever pretext, is robbing him. He will listen to the Communist who explains to him how partial that claim is, how much he is indebted to his fellow-men in every thing he produces, how even as a producer his claim is social, implying deep and wide-spread obligations to his fellows, which he is bound to bear in mind if he is an honest man. But if a Communist tells a worker that as a producer he has no claim at all to what he has been working at, the worker can only tell that Communist that if he were a worker himself, his own experience would contradict the assertion; for while he is working he is intentionally and consciously putting his own energy of mind and body into the thing he makes, and that causes a real physical connection between it and him, of which an intelligent worker is conscious; and if other people ignore it, he will feel that they are unjust.—ED.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

H. C. Donovan would call the attention of Anarchists to the materialist psychology initiated by Dr. Gall and his disciples. Instead of following the older philosophic method of attempting to study mind merely by reflecting upon consciousness, they studied the physiology of the brain, and this method has led to a far more satisfactory analysis and classification of human faculties. If we bear clearly in mind the elementary faculties, impulses, desires, which are essential parts of the brain function of every normal individual, we should puzzle less over such questions as the medium of exchange in a better state of society. The capacity to form individual friendships is a natural faculty of the human animal; so is that which leads him to associate with groups of his fellows; so is the delight in giving, generosity. "In a free state of society will not the natural capacity for true friendship have ten, nay a thousand times the influence on our actions that it has at present?"

It appears that this is an important question which has been overlooked, and it would be as well to take it into consideration. And the more we think of it the less we will bother our heads about the medium of exchange, and the go-between quid pro quo.

Markets and mediums of exchange are for enemies when circumstances compel them to barter. Commodities will not always be looked upon as prisoners of war, as they are at present, to be exchanged for a quid pro quo or allowed to die in prison.

Even in our present state of society true friendship is worked on the principle of anarchy. It is regulated by no parliament-made law. Thousands of tons of produce are given amongst friends there being no fixed medium of exchange, resting only on the pleasure of giving and friendship."

W. M. Beith, of Glasgow, sends us some verses on "The Fallen Flag" of which we regret that the pressure on our space forbids us to publish more than the first:—

"Take the blood-red banner, take it;  
Raise it gently from the dust;  
Grasp its broken shaft, and shake it  
O'er the rallying ranks of lust.  
Here the traitor's dagger tore it,  
Here the foeman's steel has passed;  
By the pains of those who bore it  
Guard it nobly to the last.  
Take the blood-red banner, take it,  
Raise it gently from the dust."

We have also received the following verses from L. S. Bevington, authoress of "Key Notes" &c.

### "BOUGHT WITH A PRICE."

"Ay, a price!—What price? ye saved ones of these latter ages,  
Ye few who have right to be free, and have true things to tell!—  
The price of the past generations of blind men and sages  
Who lived for you, died for you, suffered, and went down to hell.  
And never came back!—Savage sinners, the conquered, despised;  
Crude spokesmen of chaos they sprang from, all lusty with dew-time;  
Then, singly, messiahs blood-sweating for order and beauty:—  
In their day all failures; all martyrs for you of the new time.  
Ay, bought with a price! my sisters and brothers, this moment  
We live, and know how, and know why, and have nothing to fear;  
We are debtors, sweet comrades! Oh, think of the Calvaries suffered!  
Hands round: true to trust:—'Millenium' through us must appear."

## BOOK NOTICES.

We have received lately many Anarchist publications in the Spanish and Portuguese languages. Besides the excellent number de *El Productor*, containing articles and mottoes from comrades of all countries, and very good illustrations in reference to the 11th November anniversary, we receive regularly "El Despertor" from New York (No. 37, Columbia Heights, Brooklyn) whilst a new Anarchist Communist organ "La Eribuna Libre" is announced in Sevilla (address: J. Antonio Durán, a lista de correo, Sevilla).

The Oporto Anarchist group "La Revolution Sociale," has published two new pamphlets of its "Bibliotheca," a translation of Pentecost's lecture on the "Crime of Chicago," and a criticism on current questions: "Emigration, Labor Exchange, &c."

"The Individual and the State: a brief analysis of Political Government," by Albert Tarn, is a penny pamphlet which may be obtained of the author, 20, Bucklersbury, E.C. It is a protest against the misleading assumption that by calling the Executive Government the State, you really speak of a body which in any true sense represents the individual men and women living in a country, or acts in their interests. "The idea which possesses the mind of every politician is that every one living in a certain area ought to be forced, this idea having been in the first instance established in men's minds by force of arms." Hitherto political struggles "have been merely concerned with the question, who shall force? and to what extent and for what purposes shall he do so? The new and really revolutionary idea is that men shall not be forced at all." Comrade Tarn proposes a league of honest, working citizens to back each other up in refusing to pay taxes or in any way submit to Government. Any one who

cares to join it is invited to communicate with him at the above address.

"Socialist Bombs, No. 1." is a leaflet issued by the Bristol Socialists' Society, written by our correspondent, E. J. Watson, clearly setting forth the elementary doctrines of Socialism and advocating common ownership. Useful for distribution.

W. Reeves has sent us a batch of pamphlets by politicians, clergymen, and "cranks" upon the social question. "Looking Further Forward: a Sequel to Looking Backwards," 1s.; "Liberal Measures and Tory Doings: a Political Retrospect and Guide for the Future," by J. Dyer, 6d.; "Poverty, Wealth, and Taxation," by Rev. J. Macdonald; "The True Basis of Reform of the Material Condition of the Poor," by Rev. T. Hill, 2d.; "Plan to Revive the patriarch Joseph's War on Capital," by E. Garbett, 3d.; "Huxley's Mendacity, and the Bible and Darwin's Veracity on the effects of Noah's Flood," by the same author (dated in the 46th year of the fulfilment of Daniel).

"Dumb Nature's Sermon" preaches that fitness, adaptedness to conditions, whatever these happen to be, is the only chance of survival that Nature offers to her creatures. If we would select certain fitnesses and reject others in life, "fences, legislative or other, set up between a not yet comfortable human creature and forbidden pastures more beautiful than the way he ought to walk in, will not facilitate adherence to or progress along that devious way. Fit up a set of conditions favourable to and remunerative to a ready conscience or a sympathetic temper, and then and there, lo! the development and beauty of one and the other. L. S. Bevington (Mrs. Guggenberger), Villa Platter, Miran, Tyrol. Price 1d. post free.

"Some Common Misconceptions about Socialism," price 1d. or 5s. per hundred, and "On the Importance of Right Methods in Teaching Socialism," price 1d., are two pamphlets by R. J. Derfel, of Manchester, written from the evolutionary State Socialist point of view. They contain some good answers to common objections to Socialism, and are noteworthy for their humane and earnest tone, and also for the curious difference between the two in their treatment of Anarchist Communism. In the second, a paper read before the Manchester Fabian Society, he objects to Anarchists being regarded as Socialists at all or permitted to speak from a Socialist platform; "Anarchism and Socialism are the negation of one another." In the first, his view is far more liberal and he frankly recognises Anarchist Communists as the advanced section of the Socialist party and Communism as the goal of Society.

We have received the following from the Editor of the *Herald of Anarchy*:—

### ANARCHIST PUBLICATIONS.

*The Anarchists*, by John Mackay. A Picture of Civilisation at the close of the nineteenth century. Just out. Describes revolutionary movements in London, Battle of Trafalgar Square, Tragedy of Chicago, &c. Price 2s.; 2s. 3d. post free.

*What's to be Done!* By N. G. Tchernichewski. A Nihilistic romance. Price 1s. 3d.; post free, 1s. 6d.

*Money*. By Emile Zola,—his latest and most brilliant production. Price 2s.; post free, 2s. 3d.

*My Uncle Benjamin*. By Claude Tillier—an amusing story, full of humour and philosophy. Price 2s.; post free, 2s. 3d.

The above and numerous other works of interest to Anarchists may be had from A. Tarn, 27, St. John's Hill Grove, London, S.W.; also from R. N. McDougall, 211, Pentonville Road.

## THE PROPAGANDA.

### REPORTS

*Aberdeen*.—Owing to the severe weather the outdoor meetings have been considerably interfered with; nevertheless some first-class meetings have been held in Castle Street. Our Sunday evening meetings in the Large Oddfellows' Hall did not come up to our expectations in spite of the fact that we had a splendid programme for the month. Comrade McFarlane lectured on "Are we on the verge of a Social Revolution?" Comrade Addie on "The French Revolution," and Comrade Duncan on "Burns as a Labour Poet." All our meetings are of an attentive as well as of an enthusiastic character, and give us more and more hope for the future of Anarchy in Aberdeen. Comrade Collie, by his unflinching energy, keeps up the sale of literature.

*Dundee*.—Sunday, Nov. 29th, Comrade Cameron opened an adjourned debate on "Labour Representation and Payment of Members," in Tally Street Hall. In the course of his speech he pointed out that State payment of members existed in Norway—Salary, 14s. per day for a six weeks' session. Salary in Sweden, £66 for four weeks' session, with a fine of 2s. a-day for being absent. In France, senators and deputies get 35 francs a-day; in Belgium, £17 per month; Denmark, 15s. per day; Portugal, peers and commoners get £76 a-year; Switzerland, 10s. per day. He asked the State Socialists present to show what advantages these countries enjoyed over Britain where payment of members does not exist. He also asked some of the so-called Freethinkers who were present if the idea that salvation could be brought about by putting an inky cross on a ballot paper, was not as absurd as believing that salvation could be brought about by putting faith in a man who died upon a cross made of wood? but got no answer. On Sunday, December 13th, Comrade Hugh Clark made a very creditable first appearance. He opened an adjourned debate on "The Thin End of the Wedge." The State Socialists present wanted to make out that voluntary co-operation and government were one and the same thing; but our comrade pointed out that Government required batons, bayonets, soldiers, &c., which were not necessary under voluntary co-operation. We have also formed a discussion class, which meets on Sunday at two o'clock. It has been pretty successful so far as it has gone.

*London*.—A course of lectures has been arranged by the Young Anarchist Group, at the Autonomie Club, Windmill Street, Tottenham Court Road, on Wednesday evening, at eight o'clock. Jan. 6th, D. J. Nicoll, "Anarchists and Anarchy;" Jan. 13th, G. Bernard Shaw, "Difficulties of Anarchism;" Jan. 20th, Touzeau Parris; Jan. 27th, R. W. Burnie, "Common Agreement of all Socialist Schools."

The Individualist Anarchists have arranged the following lectures to be held at the Central Reform Club, Fitzroy Square, on Thursday evenings, at 8.30.—Jan. 14th, A. Tarn, "Need of a New Departure;" Jan. 21st, W. Cooper, "Free Trade in Banking;" Jan. 28th, L. G. Rylands, "Suggested Reforms in our Methods of Dealing with Crime."

Printed and published for the proprietors by C. M. Wilson, at the New Fellowship Press, 26 Newington Green Road, N.