

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. 5.—No. 52.

MARCH, 1891.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

A PUBLIC MEETING

TO COMMEMORATE THE

COMMUNES OF 1871,

WILL BE HELD BY THE

London Anarchist Groups,

AT

SOUTH PLACE INSTITUTE,

(Close to Broad Street and Moorgate Street Stations)

On WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 1891,

At 8 p.m.

SPEAKERS.

BLACKWELL, BURNIE, DAVIS,
KROPOTKINE, MALATESTA,
LOUISE MICHEL, MORTON,
PEARSON, TRUNK, TURNER,
YANOVSKY.

ADMISSION FREE.

THE EIGHTEENTH OF MARCH.

This date, ever to be remembered by the workers, is a date not of defeat but of victory. The Eighteenth of March, twenty years ago, was a triumph for the people's cause, a triumph in reality for Anarchy, because Government and Organisation had nothing whatever to do with the success of that day. It was not as very many, perhaps the large majority, of those who call themselves Socialists and Anarchists believe, a blow against the oppressors and exploiters prepared elaborately beforehand and struck at a given moment decreed by a committee or governing body on the side of the workers. It was a purely spontaneous unlooked-for attempt made by the people to free themselves and it succeeded just because it was an unprepared, unorganised effort. Of course there was preparation in so far as the people were and had been for a very long time discussing the situation, that they were on the verge of revolt and were full of hopeful dreams of a better state of society. But none of the actors in the events of the 18th of March had the slightest idea on the night of the 17th of what the morrow was to bring forth.

English revolutionists have heard much at the commemoration meetings of the past few years about the events which followed after the 18th of March in Paris, but very little about that memorable day itself. We are therefore going to briefly relate the chief incidents.

First of all it must be remembered that Paris had just passed through the Siege. The Prussians were still at the gates. A middle-class republic had been proclaimed only a few months before and a thoroughly reactionary Chamber of Deputies was sitting away in the South West of France at Bordeaux. This assembly was doing everything it possibly could to stir up and annoy the Socialists and Radicals of Paris. It insulted the veteran Garibaldi; it sneered at the Paris representatives;

it proposed the most outrageous measures against the people. In Paris its partisans imprisoned some of the leading champions of Liberty and were known to be seeking a plausible excuse for taking away their arms from the National Guard, which consisted of the people of Paris who had been specially armed to fight against the invading German army. A Central Committee was organised, which in some sense represented the views of the Parisian workers, and revolutionary papers were widely circulated. Some of these were repressed by the reactionaries, but the ferment was daily increasing. The enemies of the people, led by M. Thiers, perceiving this, were more than ever anxious to disarm them, and at last were ill-advised enough to attempt it. And it was precisely this attempt on the part of the exploiting class which proved the last straw and brought about the Commune.

Early in the morning M. Thiers attempted to strike his blow at the freedom of the Parisians. On the previous day he had held a Council meeting and given out the order to take away from the people of Paris the two hundred and fifty pieces of artillery which they had under their control. At 3 a.m. his soldiers began to act, at six they were in possession of the guns. But it was not until eight o'clock that they had obtained horses to take their prizes away. In the meantime Paris was awaking. The people were standing about reading the proclamation of M. Thiers and looking at the mitrailleuses placed in position by his soldiers. Presently a few National Guards gathered together and going along the Boulevard Ornano fraternised with a company of soldiers. Then they all proceeded to the heights of Montmartre. Just as they arrived another contingent of National Guards accompanied by a crowd of women and children came up on the opposite side and General Lecomte who was in charge at this place was surrounded. Three times he ordered his men to fire, but on the crowd coming up soldiers and people joined hands and he and his officers were arrested. Similar scenes were taking place elsewhere, and at 11 o'clock in the morning the Parisians were victorious, the soldiers and the people had fraternised everywhere. M. Thiers got out of the back door of the Hotel de Ville and fled to Versailles.

Crowds perambulated the streets discussing what had been done, what ought to be done next. Few realised what a victory had been won. Many began pulling up the paving stones and erecting barricades. A huge and threatening crowd surrounded the place where Lecomte was confined, clamouring for him to be given up to them. In the afternoon he was taken to the Rue des Rossiers where the Central Committee was supposed to be sitting. However the members of the Committee were as much surprised as anyone by the events of the last few hours. They were not sitting and had not even gathered together. The crowd got still more angry and was every moment growing larger. Half an hour after the arrival of Lecomte, another enemy of the people, Clément Thomas, was brought up. He had been arrested and brought to the Rue des Rossiers by some National Guards. But on arriving here the National Guards were overpowered. Almost at the same moment the window of the room in which Lecomte was confined was broken and he was dragged out into the garden attached to the house. There they both were shot by the soldiers whom they had so recently commanded and tyrannised over. Elsewhere the people were taking possession of the several barracks and the National Printing Office. In the evening an attack was made on the Hotel de Ville, and Jules Ferry, now so notorious as the "Man of Tonquin," followed the example set by Thiers and ran away. Other members of this gang of governmentals and exploiters accompanied by a few soldiers and some middle class men, also left, for the gates were wide open and there was nothing to hinder their going. By its spontaneous action, following the impulse of the moment, Paris had got rid of its exploiters. The first city of Europe was free, and its people were ready to begin a new life in which there would be room for all opinion to expand, for all the brightest hopes of humanity to be realised.

That such a fair beginning should have had such a disastrous ending is due very largely to the fact that after the day of the revolt the Parisians once again confided their destinies to a Government. Perhaps one of the best of Governments, let us grant even that most of its members were actuated by the purest motives. Yet its history is one long record of blunders. It was a millstone around the neck of the people and in the end it cost them dearly. We believe the people of Paris have learned the lesson and that never again in a time of crisis will they waste time and energy whilst waiting directions from Committees, Councils and Governments. Act, act, act, is the revolutionist's motto, and Paris will know how to adopt it when occasion again arises.

FREEDOM AND PROPERTY.

II.

We were discussing last month whether there exist any claims to individual personal possession of things which would be recognised by free men in a free society; that is to say, claims without the recognition of which most men's nature would be unsatisfied. For as free association and co-operation exist for the purpose of enabling each associate to develop all his faculties and satisfy all his desires as fully as possible, it follows that every strong human craving must be recognised by the whole association as implying a claim to the fullest satisfaction which is rationally attainable. If the association intentionally or unintentionally shut their eyes to some deep rooted craving of human nature and try to ignore it, complete freedom instantly becomes impossible—for the unrecognised faculties cry for exercise, the boycotted desires strive for expression and satisfaction, and must be kept down by some violent suppression, moral or physical, the man who cannot be persuaded to restrain them must be coerced by the others who wish them restrained, and so good-bye to freedom. Therefore, for us Anarchists, to whom freedom seems the most essential human good, the first aim and necessity of association, it is exceedingly important to find out clearly, and to fully respect and recognise the real deep seated cravings of human nature with regard to the possession of things, and to separate them from those depraved and morbid instincts and ideas which have grown, like some hideous tumour, from the effects of ignorance and violence, and social wrong. A communism which did not recognise and give scope for the satisfaction of such cravings, could not be Anarchist communism.

Need, as we said last month, seems to us a most real claim to the possession of the thing needed. If a man needs a thing very much, he feels himself that this is one reason why he ought to have it, and even in the present unhealthy state of society, the claim of need is recognised as a sufficient ground for supplying a human being (after a fashion) with the first necessities of life and for placing certain things (like lights, roads, etc.), in common for the benefit of any and every body.

But the question for us now to consider is whether this term "need" can be conveniently taken to cover every real human claim to the individual possession of things, without putting a strained meaning upon it. For instance, suppose Tom is digging, we might say he has a claim to the spade because he needs it for his work. Now suppose Will comes along and wishes to dig too; he also needs a spade, needs it as much as Tom; but if, on the strength of that need, Will snatches the spade from Tom, Tom will immediately ask him indignantly, "What do you mean by taking my spade like that?" And if there are any fair-minded bystanders, they will at once take Tom's part and say "For shame! Leave Tom's spade alone and go and get another if you want one." Why? Are their minds fogged with mere legal prejudices about "rights of property" or are they expressing what any free men might feel and think in their own minds to be right, in a society where no arbitrary legal rights are recognised? The latter; for if the spade were not Tom's property in any legal sense, if it were merely one spade of several kept in a common tool-shed on the garden patches for the benefit of the cultivators, the opinion of Tom and of the bystanders would be the same. If Tom is using the spade, he has more claim to it than Will, though both of them equally need spades.

Use, then, the active utilisation of a thing, would seem to give the user a claim to its possession which is not quite the same as the claim given by his need of it. He may need it a great deal or not need it at all in any serious sense; but if he is actually making use of it, that is a reason why he is entitled to its possession, other things being equal. All men need shelter. It is a burning scandal to our society that some amongst us should have no roof over our heads except the inclement sky. We feel that the shelterless have a claim to shelter merely on account of their need for it; but do not evictions outrage our moral sense even more than the sight of homeless people who have not been driven from their houses? And is not this because we recognise, not only the need of the evicted people for shelter, but the wrong that has been done in snatching from them the shelter they were using?

This sense of the claim of use is deep-rooted amongst us, there are traces of its recognition even in English law, dating mostly from the days when law was merely "folk right," the general sense of what was fair and expedient between men of the same community, written down by some military leader who wanted to prolong and enlarge his authority in time of peace by making himself popular. For example, the legal right of the squatter, the man who has managed to find a bit of unoccupied ground and settles himself there. If he occupies, *i. e.*, uses the ground for living upon for a given number of years, without recognising any one else's claim to it by paying rent, it continues legally his as long as he uses it. Relic of the ancient days when all land, which was not violently stolen from others, was acquired in this way. And again we find the same idea at work when a radical politician on the make, raises the question of waste lands, *i. e.*, land not being used, and disputes the legal owner's right of absolute possession on the ground of the soil being kept useless.

But enough of the diluted moral sense crystalised in law and its subtleties. Practically, as we are to-day, it would go against every one's sense of right conduct to his neighbour to tear the coat off his back, snatch the bread out of his hand, to turn him out of the rooms he is occupying, to drive him off a piece of ground he is tilling, or take away a machine or tool he is working with. To venture upon such conduct as this with impunity a person must be a monopolist, protected by some police system, and sanctioned by some formal and artificial code

of morals relating to property. In a society of free and equal men it would be so generally resented by everybody as to be scarcely possible. Resented by every body, because every body feels a sense of security to be needful to his happiness and his work. The long experience of countless ages has shown us that the life of each is miserable unless he feels safe. It is bad enough to feel uncertain if you will be able to get what you require for your most pressing needs; it is still worse to be continually afraid that what you are using will be violently snatched or deceitfully smuggled away from you. A sense that this is likely keeps a human being in a continual state of watchful suspicion, which is a slavery of the mind fatal to earnest, thorough-going work, to co-operation, to enjoyment. Who could put his whole soul into doing anything, if he felt that at any minute the tools he was using might be taken off by some one else and he left to go and find some more? He would always be fidgetting to keep safe the things he wanted. Who could feel a sense of rest in his home or take a pride in it, if he could never feel sure of having his own room to himself, never feel sure that he would not find some strangers established there when he came home from work? A man living in such a state of insecurity would assuredly not be free. His mind would be enslaved by continual apprehension and uncertainty. His distrust of his fellows would prevent him from co-operating frankly and fully with them and in this way again his possibilities would be curtailed. He would not be a free man as we Communist Anarchists understand freedom, the real complete freedom which is the dream, conscious or semi-conscious, of every human soul. A plentiful supply of possible houses, clothes, furniture, tools and whatnot, enough to supply all actual needs, would not be sufficient to give a real, thorough-going sense of security in a community unless the claims of the individual to regard as his particular possession those particular things he was using were recognised. If my special living room, where I have got round me all the things specially useful for my work and pursuits, the things which specially please and satisfy me, is taken from me by someone else, I shall not feel it is all the same to me, because there are plenty of other rooms, with all really needful furniture, at my disposal. I was using that particular room, and I therefore feel that my claim to it ought to be respected. If my claim is not respected nor acknowledged as a real claim, no amount of available dwellings will make me feel secure and free. I am secure of shelter and the actually needful articles for human life, but not in the undisputed use of any special shelter and articles, and I am an individual, a particular person, with my own special desires and faculties to satisfy and exercise in my own special way; not a mere abstract of average humanity, to be clothed in a uniform and housed in a barrack. So thinks and feels each individual "I" about the possession of many things besides rooms, and thence, we think, arises the general sense that individual, personal use gives a claim to individual, personal possession.

There is, of course, also the general consideration that it is for the public benefit that every available article should be used, made the most of; and if a person is using something, it is better that another person should find something else to use, and thus the two things brought into the general sum of utilities in active employment, and the two persons satisfied, if this is physically possible. But the economic advantage of recognising the claim of use is less potent probably in most minds than the sense of its necessity to social security.

In our next article we propose to consider a third claim to the personal possession of things, which we believe must be recognised by free men in a free society, the claim of the producer to what he produces.

ANARCHISM ABROAD.

FRANCE.

In the district around Lyons splendid progress is being made in the spread of Anarchist views. At Tarare, a town within a few miles of Lyons, a fine meeting was held by a group calling itself "The Disinherited." More than 500 persons were present. Comrade Orcelin demonstrated the stupidity of the passive form of strike. "When you demand your right to existence, and the right of your wife and children, you should not do so hat in hand and bending low, but in revolt you should claim your rights, because nature owes them to you and you should take them in the name of Justice and Freedom." Instancing Vienne he showed that the employers had made a few concessions as a result of the last May Day demonstrations. He was followed by Mollet, who delivered a most eloquent speech which was, however, interrupted by a disturbance made by a policeman at the door, who arrested two young men on some flimsy pretence. The people became very excited and a good many went to the police-station to demand the release of the prisoners. The meeting enthusiastically declared in favour of Abstention from the Polls as its political program and Expropriation as its economic program. Orcelin was arrested at the railway station when about to depart for Vienne, and was locked up for 48 hours in a room with broken windows and without food. He was afterwards released on bail.

At Lyons a great meeting was addressed by Mollet and Nabon, and a number of fresh comrades were made.

ITALY.

On the 4th of January Louis Giraud was buried at Turin. This comrade gave to the Anarchist cause all his devotion, his energy, his great intelligence and his health. During the past two years he had

been three times in prison. The imprisonment, exile and privations killed him when only 29 years old. He did a great deal of writing for the revolutionary press. His last pamphlet, "Elections and Misery," a reply to one of Crispi's speeches, was very much spoken of amongst persons of all shades of political opinion. At his funeral seven or eight hundred comrades followed the coffin, and these were themselves surrounded by a large body of police. At the cemetery a comrade spoke a few words at which several policemen were so brutal as to laugh. Immediately our comrades began to cry on all sides "Death to the Police." The chief of police tried to interfere and dissolve the meeting, but seeing the temper of the people he mumbled out an apology for his men's infamous behaviour and the affair passed off quietly.

SOUTH AMERICA.

At Montevideo, Uruguay, one of the leading Anarchists in the Republic, Comrade Bernard, was buried in December, two hundred comrades following his coffin. The funeral procession was preceded by a red and black flag. The police would not allow any speeches to be made.

BUENOS AIRES.—No. 13 of *El Perseguido*, our interesting fellow worker in the cause of Communist Anarchism, begins the second year of its existence and contains a most interesting article on the progress of our cause in Argentina. It appears that the orthodox socialists were very much displeased at our comrades taking part in their meeting held on the First of May last and sent for the police to have them expelled. This bitter opposition from their authoritarian "comrades" moved the Anarchists of the Argentine to more decided action, with the result that *El Perseguido* was started on the 18th of May. The subscription to the paper is voluntary, that is to say it is distributed free of charge and everyone gives what he can to support it. The result has been that in less than eight months it has issued twelve interesting numbers. Most of its articles are in Spanish but as the population is a mixed one there are frequently articles in Italian and French. After the middle class revolution of last July, three of the most energetic workers for our cause, Victoriano, Piette, and Mattei, who had been cast into prison during the previous year for issuing a manifesto, were liberated and the same manifesto was issued again by the group "Tierra y Libertad." Soon afterwards quite a number of groups sprang up in Buenos Aires and in the provincial towns. The groups "Tierra y Libertad," "El Perseguido," and "Los Errantes" have been the most active workers but they have been well supported by others in attending the meetings of the "partido obrero" or workmen's party to take part in the discussions which have been organised. The result of these discussions has been most satisfactory to our comrades. Not only have they made the audiences enthusiastic but they have drawn over to our side many of the leading organisers and speakers of the authoritarian socialists who are to-day the most active workers for the cause of communist anarchy. About the end of October "Los Errantes" issued another manifesto and "Tierra y Libertad" organised a public meeting which was however dissolved by the police. Other meetings have been held in various parts of the city and several manifestoes have been issued in Italian. On the 16th of November another Anarchist paper called *La Miseria*, was started and is now flourishing. If any of our readers would like to receive *El Perseguido*, we are sure the group will be pleased to send them the paper on receipt of a small donation to their funds, which may be sent through us. The formation of two new groups is also announced. "Los Desautorizados" has sprung into existence at La Plata, and "Los Hambrientos" at Barracas al Norte. The correspondent at the latter place speaks of having met a comrade from Junin who has been circulating *El Perseguido*, and hopes to start a group there very shortly. Altogether the cause in South America is making rapid strides.

eries, ought he to continue to be such a being? Evidently not, and Nature furnishes sufficient difficulties itself against which the whole of humanity may direct their forces for the purpose of overcoming them. In this work men can find all the essentials of a struggle of a far more advantageous kind than if they set to work to destroy one another.

So when the middle-class come to speak to us of progress, of the rights of society, etc., we can only laugh at them, whilst replying to them by the rights of the individual, who can scarcely care very much about progress if he is to continue to be the victim. But we shall see later on that a society in which men would be assured of the satisfaction of all their wants far from hindering progress would assist it, for it is in the nature of man to create new wants in proportion to the facility with which he is able to satisfy them. We shall see that the present society far from keeping its enjoyments for the most intelligent, hands them over to a degenerate and effete class.

While the middle-class had to struggle against the nobility, while it had to fight to conquer its place in the sunlight of freedom, it no doubt developed certain qualities which enabled it to obtain what it wanted, to acquire power, the supreme end of its eager desire. But once it had reached its goal there happened to it that which happens in the animal kingdom to all the parasites, notably to the crustacean who lives on the backs of certain molluscs and whose larva is more developed than the perfect animal; once installed on the back of its host it loses all its means of locomotion and develops instead certain tentacles, which only serve as a means of attachment to that which it exploits and from which it draws its nourishment; thus after being an animal acting and struggling, it loses all its faculties and transforms itself into a mere digestive bag. Such is the condition of the middle class: that which constitutes the force of the existing society is neither the physical faculties nor the intellectual faculties but merely money. Anyone may be scrofulous, rickety, idiotic, deformed, both physically and morally, if he has money, he may do what he likes, and may be sure of finding a woman who will enable him to be the founder of a similar stock; whilst a worker who may be born with a brain of unlimited capacity, finds it of no use to him if his parents have not sufficient money to give him the instruction necessary for its development. If he is born with all the physical advantages that could be wished for, premature work, privations and misery will break him down before he gets old, and if perchance he comes across some wretched woman who will consent to share his lot it will only be to give birth to some puny, sickly creatures; for very often in order to complete the sum needful at the time of confinement the woman is forced to work until the last day, almost always in unhealthy and unfavorable conditions.

Indeed the middle class has now attained to such a degree of degeneration that if it were to triumph in a struggle with the workers it would be very nearly in the condition of that ant (formica rubescens) which, through putting all the burden and care of the work on the slaves of the anthill, is become "instinctively so aristocratic" that it can no longer eat alone, and dies of hunger when it has no longer any servants to feed it.

From what we have said, it will be seen that the liberty of the "struggle for existence" for which the middle class clamour, is only an illusory liberty, and that this fight for life that they would wish to see perpetuated amongst us is only an imitation of those combats to which the Roman aristocracy treated itself in its bloody orgies, where horsemen completely armed entered the arena to contend with poor naked slaves armed with tin swords. Moreover as we have said their society, far from reserving its enjoyments for the most intelligent and the strongest, assures them on the contrary to a degenerate and feeble class or to those who are bound to become degenerate and weak, since the ideal state of these elected ones, when they have once reached their goal, is to destroy their powers by inactivity!

So when the middle class tell us that life is an eternal combat, in which the weak are destined to disappear to make way for the strong, we reply: we accept your conclusions. "The victory is for the strongest and best organised" you say. Very well, so let it be. And we, the workers, claim the victory. Your strength consists in the respect with which you have succeeded in surrounding your privileges, your strength is in the institutions that you have raised up as a rampart between you and the mass; your only strength, in fact, is in the ignorance in which, up till now, you have kept us to serve your real interests, and in your ability to induce some of our class to defend your privileges under the deceptive names of Country, Individual Property, Morality, Religion, etc. Very well. But the day when we are able to clearly see in what your ability consists, when we begin to understand that our interest is entirely opposed to yours, we shall see that your institutions, far from protecting us, serve only to keep us enchained in misery. Down with stupid prejudices, down with idiotic respect. We are the strongest: for an almost innumerable succession of centuries we have struggled against hunger and misery, under the most exhausting toil and yet we are still alive and kicking, whilst barely a century of power has sufficed to degenerate you. We claim the victory because we are the most apt, since all your social organisation falls upon us, we being the only producers. We claim the victory because we are the best adapted and the best organised, for at any time you might disappear without preventing us from producing (we should only consume the more); whilst on the day on which we refuse to produce, you cannot possibly supply your own wants. We claim the victory, in short, because we are the most numerous, and this according to your own showing is always sufficient to legitimize every audacity. On the day of battle we shall be in the right in applying to you your own sentence by making you disappear from the society in which you are only parasites.

You have said it yourselves, "Victory is for the strongest".

SOCIETY ON THE MORROW OF THE REVOLUTION.

Translated from the French of JEAN LE VAGRE.

XI.—DARWINISM AND THE REVOLUTION—continued.

Indeed, when the first organised beings, after an uninterrupted succession of transformations and adaptations, appeared on the earth, it is very evident that amongst all these organisms without reason, without intelligence, impelled by the single want to live and to reproduce, there was necessarily an incessant war without mercy for the vanquished. So in the first human associations (which nevertheless were due to the combination of interests and efforts) the weakest were sacrificed to the strongest, for man who had scarcely ceased to be a brute had acquired in consequence of the continuous struggle against nature and the other animals with which he had to fight for food and the right to live—so considerable a hereditary burden of instincts of struggle and domination that, even at the time when they began to understand the benefits of association, the most intelligent employed it as a means whereby they might dominate the weak and establish themselves as parasites on this new organism, Society.

But to-day, when man is a conscious being, to-day, when man compares and reasons, and possesses a language, spoken and written, by means of which he can transmit to his descendants his knowledge and his discov-

FREEDOM.

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

MONTHLY, *id.*, 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.

Back Numbers.—Volume I., October 1886 to September 1887 (No. 2 sold out) price 2s. Volume II., October 1887 to September 1888 (Nos. 16, 17, 18, 19, sold out) price 2s. Volume III., October 1888 to December 1889, price 1s. 6d. Volume IV., January to December 1890, price 1s. Carriage: single volumes, 2d., four volumes, 4½d., throughout the United Kingdom.

Address "FREEDOM," New Fellowship Press, 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.

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.

Donations.—G. H., publication fund and pamphlets, 12s. Autonomie Club pamphlets, £1.

NOTES.

THE COMMUNE OF PARIS.

Why was that short-lived insurrection in Paris, in the spring of 1871, so important that Socialists all over Europe have gone on celebrating it for twenty years, as an event of international importance? Those who want an answer to this question should send to us or to their book-seller for Peter Kropotkin's essay on "The Commune of Paris," which we are just publishing as "Freedom Pamphlet No. 2." Price one penny; post free, 1½d.; or per quire of 25, 1s. 4d. Ready by March 12th. Order early.

IN ENGLISH PRISONS.

Russian prisons are bad as bad can be, but if any one believes that middle-class Constitutionalism is such an improvement on Autocracy that we in England are in a position to throw stones at our neighbours, let him glance at last year's report of the Howard Association. He will see there how much "Constitutional Government and a free press" can leave undone. "In reference to the numerous recent scandals in connection with British prisons, the Committee do not for a moment wish to ignore the fact that these and other defects are rather owing to the system than to officials personally." "The highest prison authorities . . . are overwhelmed with duties beyond mortal competence to discharge fully; and the permanent officers are apt to get into a groove of mischievous tendency. This system, with its excessive secrecy and autocracy, works badly." This from an association wherein figure such powerful personages as the Duke of Westminster and the Earl of Derby, and a score of lords and M.P.'s; and yet in "free" England the scandals continue, the system is unchanged.

AN ENGLISH PRISON HORROR.

"In one of the largest and best reputed of English jails, that of Strangeways, at Manchester, in November, 1889, there was a man named Gatliffe, undergoing several weeks' imprisonment for being drunk and disorderly. The last night of his life he was in a room containing five other prisoners and one officer; in the morning he was a corpse . . . six ribs broken, three of them in two places, also the breast bone." The doctors at the inquest agreed that these injuries must have been inflicted within 48 hours of death; the prisoners told how they saw Gatliffe strapped down to the "iron cot" and how they "heard the sound of blows the whole night," cries from Gatliffe, "you are murdering me," shouts in another voice, "I'll break your damned head," "I'll break your ribs." Then cries for water and the reply, "Not a drop"; then a long silence.

The Coroner's jury returned a verdict of "manslaughter" against the officer; but at the Liverpool Assizes he was acquitted and warmly praised by Mr. Justice Grantham and the Governor of the prison.

THE STRUGGLE FOR JUSTICE.

The Howard Association took the matter up, got a letter written to the *Times*, and a question asked in Parliament. Mr. Matthews (of course) saw no use in further inquiry. Question asked later, by Labouchere: "Who did kill the prisoner?" The Home Secretary had made changes in the prison staff and trusted these disagreeables would not recur. Question asked again by Pickersgill and debate, but no result. "The extraordinary fact now remains, that during 1889, in one of the principal English prisons, a poor misdemeanant has been literally *smashed to pieces*, whilst all the prison officials, Commissioners, Inspectors, Visiting Justices, Judge, and Home Secretary, have been utterly unable to bring home the act to any one person."—Report of the Howard Association, 1890. Such is the outcome of our present method of dealing with crime.

A ROSE BY ANOTHER NAME.

The paragraph given Anarchists for digestion by *Justice*, January 31, has been digested by some of us without any difficulty. That Guizot, the Conservative minister of the last French kings, should have his

philosophy somewhat tainted is natural, but the quotation made by *Justice* from his "History of European Civilisation," is not so good a sample of the taint as might have been found. To seek after what is fittest to be done on each occasion, Society to rule itself by what is true, and furthermore to set forth what is true so that it may penetrate the minds of men, thus to procure their *voluntary and free* adoption of it—this is what Guizot calls the "Essence of Government," but we prefer to call it a good step towards Anarchy. Having taken such a step we cannot conceive, like Guizot, the necessity of Government, or the possibility of Government existing where there is "no scope given to coercion or where it is absolutely interdicted."

TWO OF A TRADE NEVER AGREE.

This is an old saw that still has some edge, and a fine example of it may be seen by those of our readers who study *Free Life*. Our contemporary professes to lead us by the right road to the land of liberty, and wastes a good deal of valuable time in an attempt to blend Anarchism with fine old crusted Conservatism, but they won't mix. The Anarchism, such as it is (*Free Life* prefers to call it Individualism) sinks to the bottom under the addition of what is worst in our present system. Why cry for the elimination of all forms of government save one, when the form to be retained is the very one in which it always professes to exist, i.e., defence of person and property. Whenever a Tory M.P., opens his mouth on a public platform he is sure to tell his auditors that he disbelieves in government save just enough of it to protect life and property, which only means keeping the Haves and the Have-nots where they are. And yet *Freedom* and *Free Life* nominally advocate the same thing.

A BRIEF FOR SOCIAL DEMOCRACY.

We are not ambitious to plead for the State Socialist, but he grips the right pig by the ear when he says that the worst offender against persons is the rich man, the holder of property in excess of his needs, the monopoliser, as far as he can, of the good things of this life—fresh air, wholesome food, and education. If this gentleman can be induced by Mr. Auberon Herbert to relinquish voluntarily his monopolies, so much the better, but we cannot help thinking of the old proverb, "Live horse and you'll get grass!"

A SUBJECT AVOIDED HITHERTO.

Free Life had better begin to investigate carefully where the rights of property begin and where they leave off. Now-a-days the defender of the right to accumulate wealth in excess of one's needs stands on a level with the man who would hoard grain in time of famine for the sake of coining gold out of the agonies of starving wretches.

THE RED INDIANS AND THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT.

"No race has been so systematically wronged as have the genuine American people—the original owners of the soil. From the time they ran down to meet the wonderful white men with gifts and smiling welcome on the Atlantic shores, to the last outrage committed against them on the frontier, their kindness has been met by robbery, their trust with treachery, their rightful demands with murder and extermination. They have been beaten back from their lands, cheated out of their rights, starved by rascally agents, made drunk with bad whiskey, inoculated with civilised vices and diseases, harrassed and provoked into some demonstration of resentment, that they might be more plausibly murdered. Men have gained riches and glory through dealing with the "Indian question"—some by being catchalls through which forced taxes were poured and small rations dwindled out, some by prophesying hostile intentions and nobly squelching unseen insurrections. Such men as William Cody (Buffalo Bill) of whom a Westerner once said, "there was sure to be 'Indian troubles' whenever he appeared on the scene," and the aspiring captain who longs for glory and little smoke, the capitalists who want their land, the agents who profit by furnishing the supplies of war, very easily believe a little fanatical dancing means an insurrection. Government is pursuing against this poor, weak, starving people the same course it has pursued toward all its poor and weak, whom a few greedy and powerful ones wished to profit by. Robbed, abused, provoked, then killed, and slandered as an apology for such conduct. The only thing that can be said in favour of the war on the Indians, is that they are sometimes very cruel to their captives, and that they will not receive our civilisation. The Indians bear a great deal of wrong before they retaliate. They have a feeling of honour about keeping their word. They consider treachery, breaking faith, the worst thing men can do, and deserving of any extreme of punishment. They have been deceived so often that their revengeful feelings are roused. They would have been kind in the first place, but white men have set them a fatal example. It is not safe to use a wild, free, natural race of men as they have been used.

As to civilisation, it is to their credit that they refuse to receive it, with all its attendant evils, vices, wrongs, disease, and poverty. They are too brave and free to take upon themselves the bonds that civilisation's poor must bear. An intelligent, free civilisation that recognised individual rights would reach them, for they have with them the possibilities of a great, strong, enlightened and noble people.

Whatever governments point their guns at, popular men denounce, and the rich abuse, you may safely set down as being in the right, and much superior to its respectable enemies."—LIZZIE M. HOLMES, in *Chicago Freedom*.

ANARCHIST PAPERS IN CHICAGO.

With March our brave little namesake and comrade the Chicago *Freedom*, attains its fifth month of existence. It is published by the Albert Parsons Assembly of the International Working People's Association, and boldly proclaims the principles for which the Chicago martyrs lived and died. Lucy Parsons is one of its regular contributors. Subscription 2s. 1d. a year; address Martin Lacher, Avondale Station, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A. Besides *Freedom* our Chicago comrades have a German organ, for something like a third of the population of the city speak that language. The *Vorbote*, a large weekly, which used to be merely a Socialist paper, is now edited by an Anarchist and boldly advocates Anarchy and Revolution. Needless to say how heartily we wish success to our comrades in a city which has a special interest for the Anarchists of the whole world.

THE INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL.

We have received a notice from Comrade Coulon that the International Socialist School, of which Louise Michel is head mistress, has been opened at the Autonomie Club, 6 Windmill Street, Tottenham Court Road, and he makes appeal to all Socialists in the neighbourhood to send their children.

ANARCHY AND COMMUNISM.

COMRADE EDITOR,—While thanking Comrade W. Bailie for his attempt to explain away my "confused and puzzling views," it will no doubt disappoint him when I confess that I am still in the mental fog in which I found myself when I wrote my enquiry; his letter has by no means cleared the view.

He says that my confusion of ideas arises out of a confusion of terms, the meaning of which I have not settled in my mind. He then goes on to define what *he* means by competition: "the economic struggle of man against man for existence," laying great stress on the word economic, as if it possessed some special signification explanatory of his meaning. It has, however, no such meaning—since it only signifies the usages by which or upon which society is carried on in any given case. To-day, for example, the economy of society is described as *capitalistic*, while a society carried on according to Comrade Bailie's notion of things would possess an economy described as *communistic*, and in like manner, when society is carried on according to my notions, I believe its economy would be described as *anarchistic*; thus in each case the word "economic" possesses the same value, and therefore it can have no special effect in settling our differences.

Comrade Bailie says I "cannot be free until competition with others becomes impossible"; and yet the desire to excel, which he defines as *emulation*, he lauds to the skies and wishes for more of it. I think the want of a fair settlement of the meaning of terms lies with him. Will he please explain the difference between competition and emulation?

The straw man which our comrade sets up and so assiduously knocks down again is indeed rather amusing.

After defining the struggle of man against man for existence (as seen to-day under privilege and monopoly) as *competition*, he asks how can privilege and monopoly be separated from competition! Of course, if his definition was correct, monopoly and competition would be identical, and their separation impossible. In my view they are *not* identical, and they *can* be separated. All the good can be obtained from competition when it is free, without the dreadful results of privilege and monopoly which accompany it to-day.

Our comrade has given no good reason why we should not regard the bread we eat, the coat we wear, or the house we live in, as property; he says that "they are part of our needs, our necessities of existence. But surely this is no valid reason for their not being property; the same may be said of all other things which Comrade Bailie considers property.

The desire to accord the right of possession to individuals, of the means of life, our comrade says is the creed of Communism, which, to say the least, seems to me rather contradictory.

He also defines "property" as that which a man cannot use himself and prevents others from using. Here is just the difference between us; I call it *monopoly*.

Property is also made to mean the exploitation of labour, and communism its negation. Both these propositions seem to me to be incorrect; and if our comrade will but think over the issues he will surely see them from another standpoint.

It is very necessary, it seems to me, to be as accurate in our terminology as possible, and we should not use terms which may have double meanings, nor use them to have one meaning in one place and some other when used elsewhere. I believe a great deal of propagandist work has been wasted owing to this want of exact terminology.

Instead of property meaning robbery as our comrade puts it, suppose we say: *Monopoly means robbery*. Does he not think this formula more correct?

With regard to Communism being the negation of robbery, it can exist either with or without monopoly; unfortunately it exists with it to-day as our syndicates, trusts, and rings prove.

To the question: "Will Communism limit freedom?" Comrade Bailie answers: "To me freedom is only possible through Communism," (and here note the reason he gives for his contention) "because it is economic freedom." Now if what I have said concerning the word "economic" is correct, it can be left out. As I have already said,

Communism can and does exist without freedom—it is not identical with freedom.

As I have said in my enquiry, I am not necessarily opposed to Communism, which implies association and co-operation; but at the same time the fact must not be ignored that while Communism may secure more convenience to individuals than any other method, the sinking of the unit in association is a greater limitation of personal freedom for the unit than when outside association.

The next point raised by our comrade opens up another aspect of the question concerning the methods of attainment, how to teach the workers and what they should do, etc., upon which I could say much if it affected the issues between us at present.

I will content myself, however, in pointing out what appears to me to be a glaring contradiction in our comrade's advocacy.

"After the Revolution," he assures us, "we will not dictate to a man what he should do, how he should associate with his fellows or how supply his wants." Why not?

If compulsory association is good before the "Revolution," why is it not good after? What I have said in my enquiry was meant to apply to men after as well as before the Revolution. In making this admission, however, Comrade Bailie seems to me to give up all he has been contending for. In effect he says: After the revolution, if a man wishes to compete with his fellows instead of co-operating and communising, he should be free to do so; which at once establishes my contention, viz., that competition unaccompanied by privilege and monopoly does not limit freedom, while enforced Communism will do so.

"The difference between two capitalists fighting for profits, and two workmen struggling for work," I can only explain as two *monopolists* competing for supremacy, and two *victims of monopoly* competing for work. The grand cause of the struggles of both the monopolists and their victims, when traced carefully, lead us to government and legislation.

In conclusion, I think myself, Comrade Bailie and many others are more in agreement in intention than our words would imply. I take it that we all agree that *some things* in present society should be abolished; what these things are is the reason for our discussion. I think the following formula will more clearly show the differences between us than many a desultory argument.

In answer to Comrade C. P. I cannot see how competition can exist when property-owning is abolished.

There must be something to compete with and something to compete for. If by "common property" is meant an equal opportunity to each to obtain possession of any object to satisfy needs, I agree that such condition is desirable and equal freedom impossible until we succeed in getting it.

ANARCHIST FORMULA.

1. (to be abolished) the Cause = Government = Law and Authority.
2. (to be retained) the Medium = Property-owning.
3. (to be abolished) the Effect = Monopoly.

COMMUNIST AND SOCIALIST FORMULA.

1. (to be abolished) the Cause = Property-owning.
2. (to be changed)
in form but } the Medium = Government = Law and Authority.
not abolished)
3. (to be abolished) the Effect = Monopoly.

What I would abolish I put in juxtaposition with what I think Comrade Bailie would abolish in order to bring about freedom. I say Government = Law and Authority, which is the cause of monopoly, must be abolished; while Property, the medium through which it acts, must be retained. Bailie says the medium, Property, must be abolished in order to abolish monopoly. This is the difference.

H. DAVIS.

THE CAPOLAGO CONGRESS.

By a Comrade who was present.

A CONGRESS of Italian Anarchists was held on January 4th, 5th, and 6th at Capolago (Italian Switzerland). Nearly one hundred comrades attended, who represented several hundreds of local groups and federations belonging to all parts of Italy, from Piedmont and Venice to Sicily.

This is the first general Italian congress since 1876. For the understanding of its importance and meaning, a few words of history are necessary.

Italian Socialism was originally anarchistic and revolutionary. From 1871 to 1880, despite the implacable war waged upon it by all middle-class parties, from the republican to the clerical, despite the persecutions of the government that outlawed the Socialists and treated them with the greatest severity, the Italian Socialist party never ceased to progress. Entirely organised under the banners of the INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WORKERS, it revolted from the very first against the authoritarian tendencies of the General Council, refused to send delegates to the Hague Congress, and made an alliance or compact of solidarity, which was confirmed at Saint-Imier between the Anarchist federations. It made several attempts at insurrection, published numberless papers, which were all suppressed by the government, and endured a great many prosecutions. At first the trials were generally followed by acquittals, but later, when the middle-class jury began to understand the importance and danger of the movement, there were heavy sentences instead. Besides this, the government, without waiting for middle-class opinion to be en-

lightened concerning the danger of Socialism, took good care to counteract the acquittals of the juries by administrative deportations to the Italian islands in the Mediterranean. But persecution only redoubled the zeal of the Socialists and increased the sympathy they met with among the proletariat.

A theoretical elaboration of programme accompanied the spread of acquired principles; and in the Florence Congress of 1876 the ITALIAN FEDERATION of the INTERNATIONAL, whilst respecting the principle that social reorganisation should be carried out by the free action of the masses, was the first to criticise Collectivism from the Anarchist point of view, and declared itself Communist-Anarchist.

There was a perfect agreement between all the members of the party; it accorded the complete autonomy of groups and of individuals with the necessary common action and solidarity which should exist amongst those who struggle for the same cause. Everything encouraged the hope that the Italian Socialist party, free from the shackles by which the survivors of the old authoritarian Socialists hindered the development of Anarchism in other countries, would remain united round the Anarchist banner until the day of the Revolution. But now the Italian Parliament, frightened at the rising of the revolutionary flood, bethought itself of opening a safety-valve by extending the right to vote. The new electoral law included among the electors those who can read and write, thus giving to the Socialistic and popular element a semblance of influence, helping to generate illusions of reform, and exciting the ambition and vanity of those among the people, who had or hoped to have some influence.

In fact, several Socialists let themselves be corrupted by the hope of becoming deputies; and a crowd of the obscure middle-class and politicians, who would not otherwise have succeeded, all at once felt themselves touched by the miseries of the people, declared themselves Socialists, and offered themselves as candidates. In this way was the party of State-Socialism created in Italy, which, in order to be thought well of, began by always declaring itself on the side of Anarchy and Revolution, and became in the end an ordinary reform party allied to middle-class radicals.

The first project of the new party was to disorganise and kill the Italian Federation of the International; and in spite of all the resistance offered by the anti-parliamentarian Anarchists, it succeeded completely in doing so, either because the so-called universal suffrage was quite novel in Italy and excited many unfounded hopes, or because among the old comrades who betrayed the cause there were several that possessed great influence.

Since then the Anarchist party, which alone remained faithful to true Socialism, has been almost totally disorganised. For many long years the Anarchists, scattered in various countries, rarely corresponding with each other, divided by a thousand little personal questions, caused by the lack of a common activity, have been powerless to take collective action.

The best they have been able to do, outside individual propaganda, never given up by the sincere man, has been to stem the legislative and parliamentary current, which was threatening to destroy all true Socialistic movements.

However, some time since reaction set in. The deception which attended every hope placed in parliamentary action and in the result of the suffrage, and the mean and spiritless conduct, when confronted by the middle-class party, of the few Socialists, who had succeeded in being nominated deputies through the support of the Radicals, went far towards opening the eyes of the many comrades, who had allowed themselves to be drawn into the constitutional movement, believing sincerely that they were acting in the interests of the Revolution. The ideas had been making way all the same, and the Anarchists began to come to the front again.

On the other hand, the people, pushed to extremities by a misery which is only equalled perhaps by that in Ireland and Russia, and awakened by the ideas of revolt which were spreading, became restive, broke into insurrection here and there, and fought against the gendarmes and soldiery. The government stifled the movement by massacres and imprisonment, and the Anarchists were filled with shame and rage at not being able to do anything, not for want of strength, but for want of skill.

By the time the 1st of May 1890 came, the need of organisation had been felt everywhere. The Italian Anarchists, like those of nearly every other country, took very little part, and that only during the last few weeks, in the arrangements for the proposed demonstrations for this day. But, nevertheless, the people in every place, where they had caught wind of the affair, demonstrated more or less energetically. In some places they resisted the soldiery, and in several towns it is certain that if the Anarchists had acted *en masse*, and the people had felt that they were an organised and prepared force, they would have been able to seize the factories, the houses, the warehouses, to put the middle-class to flight, and to cope with the government with more or less success.

As a consequence of all this, the need of being able to depend one on the other, to know one's strength, to organise so that it would be possible to be in reality a party of action became quite irresistible.

The question of organisation began to be discussed in the papers and in private correspondence; there were meetings between comrades of neighbouring localities, expeditions made into places where the Anarchistic element being quite new was altogether unknown. Several district congresses were called together, and finally it was agreed to hold an Italian Congress, which, to mislead the police, was publicly convoked for Jan. 11th at Lugano, whilst by a secret circular it was fixed for the 4th at Capolago.

Meanwhile, the general elections of the previous October had come on, and the Anarchists, thanks to the prevalence of ideas of organisation, made the Abstentionist Campaign with a spirit and unanimity, which had

long fallen into disuse. The results of the campaign were splendid, and gave a practical proof of the advantages of organisation.

The day of the congress arrived. The Anarchists, who had initiated the congress, with the object of provoking an opposing discussion, which might enlighten the comrades seduced by the leaders of the State-Socialist party, had invited to the congress Socialists of every school, making it clear to them that, after discussion, if they continued comrades, who believed that Socialism could be worked together with authority and parliamentarianism, the Anarchists, being further advanced, would organise among themselves.

Some of the groups had even summoned the "socialist" deputies to come and explain their conduct at Capolago. But the said deputies, as well as all the leaders of the State-Socialist party, having tried vainly every means to render the congress abortive, did not come; so that the Congress, when it met, was found to be almost exclusively composed of Anarchists, and, conformably to the instructions received by the delegates, the party of ITALIAN ANARCHIST REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISM was declared constituted, of which a summary of the programme and organisation follows.

The aim of the party is: the abolition of individual property and the State, by means of the Revolution, which should begin by the overthrow of Government, and the taking possession of and holding in common, by the revolted people, the land and all existing wealth, and which with the preventing of any reconstitution of authority and property, should lead to the complete disappearance of all profit and all domination of man by man, and to the organisation of production, consumption and all social life, in the interest of everybody, by the free action of those interested, acting of themselves without delegating their power to anyone.

Tactics of the party: the propaganda of socialist principles and the spirit of revolt; total separation from every party that does not contemplate the complete, direct and immediate abolition of individual property; actively hostile abstention from all parliamentary tactics, reformatory or otherwise, which might inspire confidence in the action of the State, and in the gradual and pacific transformation of middle-class institutions; participation in every working-men's and popular movement with the object of making propaganda and urging to action; the revolutionary initiative.

Federal mediums of the party: corresponding committees for each district, which, without any kind of authority, or power to injure in any way the autonomy of the groups and prevent individual initiative and direct correspondence between groups and individuals of all countries, are charged with the keeping up of relations between all adherents of the party, by communicating to all the deliberations and propositions of each group and individual, and being at the service of all for the communication of addresses, inquiries, etc. These committees are nominated by periodic district congresses; their expenses being covered by a monthly subscription, the amount of which will be fixed by each group, according to its means and needs which shall be known to it.

The Congress appointed a national commission provisionally, charged with the publication of an account of the Congress, with communicating it to all Italian Anarchists, with receiving adherents to the party and urging speedy convocations of the district congresses which shall have appointed corresponding committees. Once the district federations are organised the Provisional Committee will cease to exist.

The Congress afterwards voted the orders of the day, relative to elections, to connections with Republicans and *Irredentistes*, and to the strike on the approaching 1st of May, all of which were instilled with the principles accepted by the party. Resolutions were passed relative to the press of the party, and agreements of a practical nature were ratified that are not meant for publication.

Finally a hope was expressed that by the federation with the organisations formed, or to be formed amongst the anarchists of other countries, the Anarchist Party might soon take the title of *International Anarchist Party*, of which the Italian party would be only a branch.

The address of the Provisional Committee appointed by the Congress is: Ludovico Nabruzzi, Ravenna, Italy.

The success of the Congress was complete, not only on account of the resolutions passed at it, but especially by reason of the enthusiasm and revolutionary spirit which animated the comrades there. Some old comrades, who attended the Congress and lived over again in it the palmiest days of the International had to confess that this Congress was the most encouraging event that they had seen in their lives as socialists.

Only a month later the effect of the Congress was felt by a redoubled activity throughout Italy. Everywhere the district Congresses are organised (those of Romagna and of Toscana have been held)—everywhere efforts are being made to reproduce the work of the Congress in deeds by the spread of the propaganda and by revolutionary action.

DER ANARCHIST: A FORTNIGHTLY JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM. Post free to Great Britain for One shilling per quarter. Address: C. Timmermann, P.O. Box, 758 St. Louis, Missouri, U.S.A.

FREIHEIT.

INTERNATIONAL ORGAN OF THE GERMAN-SPEAKING ANARCHISTS.
EDITED BY JOHN MOST.

Address all communications to John Muller, Box 3135, New York.

Subscription, 2s. per quarter; under cover, 4s.

A T A L K

ABOUT

ANARCHIST COMMUNISM

BETWEEN TWO WORKERS.

BY ENRICO MALATESTA.

—o—

(Continued from previous number.)

William. But if, as you say, the world really has always been thus, there is nothing to be done and the employers cannot help it.

Jack. Well, I am ready to admit everything in favour of the gentry. Let us suppose that the holders of property are all sons of people who have worked and made savings and that the workers are all sons of idle spendthrifts. This is obviously ridiculous, you understand; but even if things actually were so, would there be any justice at all in the present social organisation? If you work and I am a lazy dog, it is right enough I should be punished for my laziness; but this is no reason that my sons, who may be honest working men, should be worked to death and famished to keep your sons in idleness and plenty.

William. All that is very fine, and I don't say to the contrary, but then the gentlefolks have got the property, and, when all's said and done, we must be grateful to them, because if it weren't for them people could not get a living.

Jack. If they have the wealth it is because they have taken it by force and have increased it by pocketing the fruit of other people's labour. But they may chance to lose it the same way as it was gained. Until now men have been fighting with one another; they have been trying to snatch the bread out of one another's mouths, and each has esteemed himself happy if he could subjugate his fellow and use him for a beast of burden. But it is time this state of things was put an end to. We gain nothing by fighting with one another; the only harvest we have reaped is poverty, slavery, crime, prostitution, and now and again, those blood-lettings called wars and revolutions. If instead we could come to a mutual agreement, love and aid each other, we should see no more of these evils; there would no longer be some people with a great deal and others with nothing at all, and we should all be trying to make every one as well off as possible. Of course I know that the rich, who are accustomed to rule and to live without working, will not hear of a change of system. We shall act accordingly. If they come to understand that there ought no longer to be hate and inequality between men, and that all ought to work, so much the better; if, on the contrary, they claim a right to continue to enjoy the fruits of their own and their fathers' violence and robbery, so much the worse for them: they have taken what they possess by force, and by force we shall take it from them. If the poor know how to come to an understanding, they are stronger than the rich.

William. But when there are no more gentlefolks how shall we manage to live? Who will give us work?

Jack. What a question! Why you see what happens every day; that it is you who dig, plough, sow, reap, you who thresh the corn, who feed the beasts, who make the butter and cheese, and yet you ask me how we shall live without the gentlefolks? Ask me rather how the gentry would manage to live without us, poor fools of working men in town and country, who slave to clothe and feed them. A moment ago you wanted us to be grateful to the employers because they enable us to live. Don't you understand that it is they who are living on your work and that every bit of bread they eat is taken from your children, every fine present they make their wives means the poverty, hunger, cold, even perhaps the prostitution of yours? What do these gentlefolks produce? Nothing. Therefore what they consume is taken from the workers. Suppose all agricultural labourers disappeared to-morrow; there would be no one to till the ground and every one would be starved. If the shoemakers disappeared, there would be no more shoes; if the masons vanished, there would be no one to build houses, and so forth. If each class of workers failed, one after another, with each a branch of production would disappear and men have to do without some useful or necessary things. But what harm would it do us to be rid of the gentry! It would be like the disappearance of the locusts.

William. Yes, it really is we who produce everything; but how could I, for instance, grow corn if I had neither land nor beasts nor seed? I am sure there is nothing for us but to be dependent upon the employers.

Jack. Come now, William, do we understand one another or not? I have told you already that we must take from the masters what is needful to enable us to work and live, land, tools, seed and all. I know very well that as long as the land and instruments of labour belong to the masters, the workers must always be in subjection and will reap naught but slavery and poverty. This is just why the very first thing to do is to take away property from the middle-class; without that the world will never mend.

William. You are right, you did say so. But all this is so new that I get quite lost. Now explain a bit how you would do. What would be done with this property taken from the rich? It would be divided, I suppose?

Jack. No, no, nothing of the sort. If you hear any one say that we want to divide up property and take the place of those who have

it now, you may rely upon it that he does not know what he is talking about or is a scoundrel.

William. Well then, I don't understand in the least.

Jack. And yet it is plain enough; we simply wish to put everything in common. We start with the principle that every one ought to work and every one ought to be as well off as possible. A man can't live in this world without work; if he does not work himself he must live upon the labour of others, which is unjust and hurtful. But of course you must understand that when I say that all must work, I mean all those who can do; cripples, invalids, and old people ought to be supported by society, because human feeling forbids us to let any one suffer; and besides we all grow old, and we are all liable to become crippled or sickly at any time, and so may those who are dear to us. Now if you think it over carefully, you will see that all wealth, that is to say all things which are useful to man, can be divided into two sorts. One, which includes land, machinery and all instruments of labour, iron, wood, stone, the means of transport, etc., etc., is absolutely necessary to enable us to work, and ought to be put in common for every one to work with. As to the method of working, we shall see about that later. I believe it would be best to work in common, because in that way one produces more with less fatigue, and, in many trades, if each person had to work separately, we should have to give up using machines which greatly simplify and diminish the labour of man. Besides, when human beings have no need to snatch the bread out of one another's mouths, they will not be like cats and dogs, but will take pleasure in being together and doing things together. Certainly those who choose to work alone will be left to do so, the essential thing is that no one should live without working, thus compelling others to work for him; but of course that would not be likely to happen where each had a right to the material for work and would certainly not choose to make himself the servant of another. The other sort of wealth includes the things which directly serve the needs of man, like food, clothes, houses. I think these ought to be put in common and distributed in such a way that people can get on until the new harvest and until industry has supplied some new produce. As for the things that will be produced after the Revolution, when there will be no lazy employers living on the toil of famishing proletarians, the workers of each country will share them as they choose. If they are willing to work in common and to put everything in common, this will be best; in that case they will try to regulate production in such a way as to satisfy the needs of all, and consumption in such a way as to secure the greatest well-being to every one. If they do not proceed in this way, they must calculate what each produces, so that each may take an amount of things equivalent to what he has produced. This calculation is rather difficult, I think myself it is almost impossible; so the result will probably be that when they see the difficulties of proportionate distribution, they will be more inclined to accept the idea of putting everything in common. But any way, things of the first necessity, like bread, dwellings, water and suchlike, must be secured to every one, regardless of the amount of work he may do. Whatever organisation is adopted, inheritance should exist no longer, for it is not just that one should be born to wealth and another to hunger and toil. Even if we admit that each is absolute master of what he produces and may make savings on his own account, those savings ought to return to the community at his death. Children ought to be brought up and educated at the cost of all and in such a fashion as to procure them the greatest development and best attainable teaching. Without that, there can be neither justice nor equality, the principle of the right of each to the instruments of labour will be violated, for it does not suffice to give men land and machinery if they are not also put in a condition to make the best possible use of them. I do not say anything specially about women, because we think women should be the equals of men and when we speak of "men" we mean human beings without distinction of sex.

William. There is just one thing: to take the fortune of rich men who have robbed and starved the poor is all very well; but if a man by hard work and saving has put by something to buy a little field, or open a little shop, what right have you to take from him what is really the fruit of his labour?

Jack. That is not an uncommon case in these days when capitalists and governments make a clean sweep of so much of the produce; but any way, I have told you that each person has a right to raw material and the instruments of labour and, for that reason, if a man has a bit of ground which he cultivates with his own hands, he might just as well keep it and he would be given besides all the best tools and manures and everything else he required to make it produce as much as possible. Certainly it would be the best plan to put everything in common; but there will be no need to force people to do so because a like interest will urge all to adopt a communist system. Things will go better with common property and work than with isolated work, especially as there is much machinery, and very likely there may be more, which it is most convenient to use in common.

William. Machinery! The machines are what we ought to burn! It is the machines that break our arms and take away our bread. Here, in the country, as sure as a machine comes, we can reckon on our wages going down and some of us losing our work and having to go somewhere else. It must be worse in the towns. If there were no machines the gentlefolks would want our labour more and so we should live a bit better.

(To be continued.)

Socialism in Dublin.

It is some time since we have had items of Irish interest in our columns. The atmosphere of the sister island has been so thick with political fog that it was difficult to see what was really taking place on *terra firma*. Now that the dust raised by the downfall of the Parnell idol has begun to clear away, and the noise of electioneering oratory has diminished, we see through the cloud the dim form of Irish Socialism lifting itself up towards the Sunshine of True Liberty. Thanks to a correspondent in Dublin we are able to place before our readers a brief sketch of the growth of Socialism in that city. In 1884, Socialism was first preached in Dublin by a Scotch Social-Democrat, Alexander Stewart, before the members of the Saturday Club. He attempted to form a branch of the S. D. F., but the Reform element was too strong, so that he had to content himself with an association calling itself the "Democratic," which, like many things Irish, blazed up bravely into a few very big meetings and then "burnt out like chips." However, towards the close of 1885, an English Anarchist, bearing the portentous name of Michael Gabriel, succeeded in forming a branch of the Socialist League. It was at first very vigorous, but police, clergy, and Oddfellows, vied with each other in persecuting it. Hall after Hall was closed against its meetings, such was the pressure brought to bear upon the various landlords, and at last "the blasted set of foreigners and atheists," to quote a gentle priest of Howth, whose flock ventured to attend one of the meetings held within his parish, were silenced. But the seed was sown to spring up later on. It showed itself in the Young Ireland Society, which used to meet in York Street. Here, the Fenian element, however, that still hankered after the pikes and green flags of '98, so fiercely resented the introduction and discussion of Socialistic subjects, that the society was broken up. In '86, the night Gladstone introduced his Home Rule Bill in the English Talking House, William Morris lectured on Socialism to an audience of Irish Home Rulers in the Rotunda, and their thoughts being all centred on the Great Home Rule Bubble, they gave the lecturer anything but an agreeable impression of Irishmen. That year the Dublin Branch of the S. L. was dissolved over the "Dave-Reuss" affair. Since then there has been developing, from the seeds sown during those three years, a Socialism of a sturdier growth. It resists the snares of home and foreign politics although it has a tendency to bend before the wind of the "New Trade Unionism." But with the days will come strength and our best wishes go towards our Irish Comrades who have both Church and State so fiercely allied against them in their struggle for social freedom.

OUR EXCHANGE LIST.

England.—Autonomie—Commonweal—Christian Socialist—Church Reformer—Free Russia—Herald of Anarchy—Justice—Land and Labour—Londoner Freie Presse—Personal Rights Journal—Seed-Time—Workers' Friend.
America, N.—Anarchist—Altruist—Coast Seamen's Journal—Fair Play—Freedom—Freiheit—Freie Arbeiter Stimme—Journal of the Knights of Labour—Journal of United Labour—Liberty—Liceo Cubano—Lucifer—Parole—Reasoner—Reveil des Masses—Revista de Florida—South-West—Twentieth Century—Volné Listy—Vorbote.
France.—La Révolte—Père Peinard.
Spain.—Alarma—Jornalero—Productor—Revolucion Social—Socialismo—Tramontana—Victima del Trabajo—Voz del Trabajo.
Italy.—Avanti—Campana—Combattiano—Nuovo Combattiano.
Belgium.—La Question Sociale.
Holland.—Anarchist.
Norway.—Fedraheimen.
Austria.—Arbeiter Zeitung, Schlesischen Nachrichten.
Portugal.—Revoluygo Social.
Cuba.—El Productor.
Buenos Ayres.—El Perseguido.
Australia.—Australian Radical—Worker.

We take this opportunity of thanking the editors of the papers mentioned in the list above for continuing to send the exchanges, notwithstanding our long delay in acknowledging them. Germany is conspicuous by its absence from our list. We should be glad to exchange with some editors in that country, as the more perfect the internationalism of advanced thought grows to be, the more widespread and courageous will be the action of revolutionists.

THE PROPAGANDA.

REPORTS.

LONDON—

At a meeting of the *London Anarchist Groups*, February 10th, at the Club "Autonomie," it was decided that a United Anarchist Conference should be held on Easter Sunday, March 28th, at the Club "Autonomie," 6, Windmill Street, W. Proceedings to commence at 10 a.m.

Anarchist League (Individualist).—February 4th, Albert Tarn lectured on "The Case for Anarchy" at the United Democratic Club, 57, Chancery Lane. There was strenuous opposition from representatives of the various political creeds present, especially from the Socialists, who want to have their turn at "bossing the show." February 17th, A. Tarn opened a debate at Wandsworth Liberal and Radical Club on "Individualism v. Socialism." He pointed out that Socialism would create privileges, and that Individualism would destroy them. This League has held successful meetings in Hyde Park every Sunday afternoon of late. The chief speakers being Robert Harding and Albert Tarn. Large audiences have been held together for hours listening to the exposition of political fallacies and frauds. Good sales of literature.

PROVINCES

Brighton.—February 1st, Albert Tarn lectured at the "Bath Arms" Assembly Rooms on "The Case for Anarchy." Lecture well received and reported in local paper.

Leicester.—Lectures have been given every Sunday evening in the Spiritualist Hall, Silver Street. The discussion generally drifts to "Anarchy v. Democracy," and then there is always a very lively and prolonged debate, in which, our correspondent says, the Anarchists invariably get the best of it. Out-door meetings have begun, and in addition to these modes of propaganda the Leicester

comrades make occasional visits to Young Men's Debating Societies and also distribute large quantities of leaflets, papers, etc. A "Christian Socialist Society" has been started, of which we are told one member is an Anarchist.

Manchester.—The International Working Men's Club opened a new club, February 14th, where they hope to do valuable work for the cause. It is in a capital position, 25, Bury New Road, the centre of one of the busiest places, and a great thoroughfare of the working people. The shop on the ground floor is devoted to the sale of literature, and already a great deal has been sold there. On the night the club was opened to the public, hundreds were turned away from the doors, unable to find room. Our comrade Louis Diemshitz was in the chair. After some excellent speeches, a collection of 10s. was made for the *Worker's Friend*. Many new members joined.

Great Yarmouth.—February 1st, Comrade Barnes read a paper on "Why I am a Socialist," and afterwards read to his audience "A Talk on Anarchist-Communism," out of February *Freedom*. February 8th, a course of Fabian lectures began in the Gladstone Hall, but our correspondent omitted to tell us the effect if any produced by those already delivered. Although the Yarmouth comrades did not send us reports for last month, they have been "pegging away with all their might at the rotten society around them," and they feel that the cause is making good headway down there.

Aberdeen.—Propaganda work goes on as actively as hitherto. Two out-door meetings are held every week, with an average attendance of 200. A public meeting is held every Sunday evening in the Oddfellows' Hall, average attendance being 300. The discussion at these meetings is always very interesting; all shades of opinion are represented, but none are received with more attention or respect than that of Anarchist tendencies. Comrade H. H. Duncan has lectured on Booth's "Darkest England," and on the following Sunday conducted a public debate with a Mr. Horne, who defended Booth's scheme.

Dundee.—February 1st, Comrade William Cameron attended a debate on the "Nationalisation of Railways" as a cure for railway strikes, and made the advocates of this cure feel small by reading a portion of our "Letter from Cape Colony," which shows that the Natal railways are State Property, but for all that the staff was being reduced, and likewise the pay of those that remained. He also pointed out the long hours and short pay of the London postmen, and of the workers in naval dockyards and other Governmental departments. A hitch having since occurred about the hiring of the Labour Institute hall, the discussion meetings announced to take place there have not yet begun. William Cameron, however, has been speaking to some purpose through the columns of the local paper (a mode of propaganda we recommend to our readers). One of Cameron's letters criticises John Burn's attitude when asked to become Parliamentary candidate for Dundee.

TRANSATLANTIC—

We hear from a comrade in New York that Anarchism is spreading surely, though slowly in nearly all the great cities of the United States. Social Democracy finds but little support. Its only English organ, the *Working Man's Advocate*, has to be backed by large private subscriptions. An account of the Hebrew movement is promised. *Freedom* and the "Wage System" are in much demand in the States.

Bristol.—The Socialists here have been doing good work during January. Several lectures have been given and new members have been enrolled. Edward J. Watson (Fabian) delivered a lecture to the Bristol Research Society on "The Commune of Paris, 1871." The lecturer expressed his belief that the time would come when the Paris Commune would be regarded as "one of the most glorious attempts ever made to emancipate the proletariat from the chains of capitalism and to erase the domination of class." He also pointed out that in the formation of the Communal Council, March 26th, twenty-one of its 101 members were members of the International Working Men's Association, and declared Socialists.

NOTICES.

East London Communist-Anarchistic Groups.—The Saturday evening meetings I.W.M.C., 40, Berners Street, are generally addressed by Anarchists. The *Knights of Liberty* hold propaganda meetings every Friday evening at the "Sugar Loaf," Hanbury Street, E. As further numbers of the *Anarchist Labour Leaf* cannot be printed, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, the only copies extant, have been put in pamphlet form and can be had from H. Davis, 97, Boston Street, Hackney Road, N.E., at the rate of 8d. per quire of 24, or single copies, one halfpenny each, by post, 1d. March 7th, a Concert in aid of the "Freedom Pamphlet Fund" will be given in the hall of the I.W.M.C., Berners Street, by kind permission of the Club.

Leicester.—Spiritualist Hall, Silver Street, every Sunday evening at 6.30. Public lectures on social subjects; discussion invited.

Aberdeen.—Comrade H. H. Duncan will lecture (date not sent), on "A Plea for Anarchism," at the Oddfellows Hall.

Dublin.—Socialist Union, 87, Marlborough Street, every Thursday at 8 p.m. For March 5th, J. O'Gorman on "The Basis of Industrial Slavery." 12th, R. W. Elmes on "Malthus and the Law of Population." 26th, A. J. Kavanagh on "Looking Forward."

CELEBRATIONS OF THE COMMUNE IN THE PROVINCES.

Bristol.—Castle Coffee Palace, Friday, March 20th, 8 p.m. Edward T. Watson (Fabian) will lecture on the "Commune of Paris." All are invited.

Great Yarmouth.—A series of commemoration meetings has been arranged, viz., Bradley, March 8th, 11.0 a.m. Burgh, same date, 3 p.m. Yarmouth, March 15th, 11 a.m. in the Gladstone Hall, at 3 p.m. at the Hall Quay, and at 7 p.m. in the Gladstone Hall. 17th, in the Club Room, 56 Row, Market Place. Speakers: Brightwell, Headley and Saunder, also several comrades from London and Norwich.

Norwich.—March 15th.

Manchester.—March 21st at the I.W.M.C. 25, Bury New Road.

Aberdeen.—Date not fixed.

Dublin.—March 19th, 8 p.m. Dublin Socialist Union, 87, Marlbro' Street. All Socialists invited.

UNITED ANARCHIST CONFERENCE.—EASTER SUNDAY, March 28, at the AUTONOMIE CLUB, 6 WINDMILL STREET, TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON. To begin at 10 a.m. Comrades from the country specially invited.

THE HERALD OF ANARCHY.

A MONTHLY EXPONENT OF CONSISTENT INDIVIDUALISM. Shows how Rent and Interest can be abolished by free competition, and defends the right of the labourer to the fruit of his own toil.

Published by the New Fellowship Press, 26 Newington Green Road.

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