Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. VII.—No. 76. MAY, 1893. MONTHLY ; ONE PENNY.

LABOR DAY.

THE London workers intend to show their solidarity with the workers of the civilised world by taking May Day as a holiday and coming in their thousands to Hyde Park to discuss the common interests of labor. It is idle to talk of Labor Day as a preordained date for insurrectionary movements. Successful insurrections spring up when the time is ripe, they are not made to order, due notice being given beforehand to governments and vested interests. Labor Day is a time for the wage workers of all countries to cease their grinding toil a moment and take hands; to feel their common interests, and note the progress towards freedom that each country has made since last year.

The Anarchist arrangements for taking part in the Hyde Park demonstration are as follows:—Open-air meeting at noon, at Buck's-row, Whitechapel-road; after which a procession will be formed, and will march to the Park by Commercial-street, Old-street, Clerkenwell-green, King's Cross-road, Euston-road, Fitzroy-square (where the Grafton Hall contingent will fall in), Tottenham Court-road, and Oxford-street. The procession will be formed of the Anarchist groups and clubs (English and Foreign), the East London Jewish Trade Unions, and the West-End Amalgamated Tailors.

MANIFESTO ISSUED BY THE ANARCHIST SOCIALIST GROUPS.

Workmen of London,—We call on you to assemble and demonstrate your right to live like men.

We call on you to demonstrate in favour of your comrades who in London, in Hull, and elsewhere are fighting the tyranny of capitalism.

We call on you to demonstrate in favour of the workmen of Belgium, France, and other countries who are in revolt against their masters and rulers.

We call on you to demonstrate in favour of those who now are suffering in prison—like the Walsall Anarchists, Nicoll, Davis, Berkman (in America) and others—for the crime of advocating the emancipation of the wage slaves.

We call on you to demonstrate in favour of those who languish in prison, while the real criminals, the slum owners, the Shylocks and wholesale exploiters are at large and in high places.

We call on you to denounce all parasites and drones, and the governments which protect and abet them! On this May Day the workmen of the world have promised each other to show their masters that they are united in spite of diversities of race, nationality, or condition, in the determination to be free, to live without masters, to organise their own trades, and to enjoy the fruits of their own labour, without sharing them with capitalists and politicians.

Come in thousands! Come in tens of thousands! Come and parade your misery and your determination to end it! We Anarchist Socialists may disagree with you sometimes, for instance, when you fight each other for a job, instead of attacking your common enemy the capitalists; or when you split on account of your national descent, while you are all, to whatever nation you belong, equally oppressed and robbed, and your only salvation is in your unity.

We do not think, as some of you think, that you can remedy the evils you suffer by changing your representatives in parliament and other governing bodies. We are sure that it is necessary to change altogether the economic and political institutions of to-day, to suppress capitalism by expropriating the capitalists from their ill-gotten wealth and giving the land to the laborer, the machine to the artisan, and freedom to all.

We do not expect, as some of you expect, to make our lot better by constitutional means, i.e., by the generosity of our masters and rulers. We are convinced that men must gain freedom by their own action, opposing to the force of those who oppress, the force of those who rebel.

But such disagreements do not prevent us from standing by you in all your struggles against our common enemies.

We appeal, then, to you again to disregard any advice to the contrary and join in our great demonstration and our war cries:—

Down with capitalism and government! Hurrah for the social revolution!

> "Working man, awake! arise!
> And thy might once recognise.
> For every wheel on earth stands still,
> If that but be thy strong arm's will."

WAR WITH THE CAPITALISTS.

YES, War! The interests, not of capital and labor, but of capitalists and labourers, are so opposite, that the opposing parties must wake up to the obvious fact, sooner or later.

Labor needs capital, I.E., that portion of the stored-up wealth of the community required as a means of production. But the workers don't need the capitalists at all, and the sooner they make that fact clear to themselves, the quicker will they find life become worth living.

The real question now at issue at Hull, according to Mr. G. A. Laws, of the Shipping Federation (letter to the "Times," April 24th), is whether the employers or the workmen shall control the dock work there. The real object of the Shipping Federation is to keep the AUTHORITY, the POWER, in the hands of the capital-owning class in the shipping trade. If the unions have not yet the sense to understand the root of the matter, the masters have. They are beginning to realise now, whether the men realise it or not, that mere disputes about wages, and even about "free labour," are only passing phases of the labor movement. The great root question is: Who is to control the means of production? Who is to control and organise the work? The men who do it? Or the class who have hitherto controlled both means of production and organisation of labor?

Fear outruns hope. Whether the unions are awake to the meaning of their own present position or not, the employers see that what they have now to defend is their position as masters. They have founded the Shipping Federation, and will form other such societies, as American capitalists already have done, just as governments mobilise their armies: to be ready for the attack they fear.

Their fear is so great that they are continually letting the cat out of the bag. They are continually—in the more Conservative section of the capitalist press, for instance—giving the workers the cue. How long will it be before the unions take it?

How long will it be till the unions boldly say, "Yes, we do intend to take the control out of your hands? What right have you to control our labor? What right have you to hold exclusive possession of docks and machinery, or whatever the special means of production in question may be? You did not make them. Why should you not share and share alike with us in the work and the fruits of it? We will take the sole responsibility of organisation off your shoulders, and you will, of course, see that, in that case, you ought to lend a hand to the manual labour, and take your fair share of the results, just like the rest of us. If you don't see it—well, we are afraid you must find a scope for your energies elsewhere."

This is the point to which the logic of events is driving the labor dispute. This is the point to which the fears of the capitalists are showing the way. The sooner the Trades Unions grasp this idea, and boldly include it in their program, the sooner will the term "free labour" become something better than a mockery. For the man who works perforce under another man's orders, and gets a pittance instead of the result of his labour, is a kind of slave. The really free worker is the man who has the means at his disposal to arrange his own work at his own pleasure, and who disposes of the results according to his own judgment.*

About the most practical piece of propaganda an Anarchist Socialist can undertake in England at this moment, is to spread this one definite idea amongst the workers, and make it seem real and practical to them. Once grasped and acted on, it would mean the overthrow of both the monopoly of private property and of governments. The most effectual war we can make upon would-be popular governments is to take the wind out of their sails, by leading the workers to feel that they don't need them, and can best fight their battle for themselves.

Trades Unionism and Blacklegs.

Two great questions have been brought to the front by the two biggest strikes of last month. In Belgium, universal suffrage as a method of solving the social question. In England, Trades Unionism versus "free labor." We propose here to say a few words about the latter.

Ought every working man or woman to join a Trade Union? We believe in no hard and fast universal rules of conduct. Let each judge

* Of course, we do not mean to imply that each man must work alone if he would be free. Slavery is no necessary part of industrial co-operation. Men can work together by mutual agreement in perfect freedom, each taking his full part in settling what work is to be done, and how, and each sharing equally in the produce. When men acknowledge in each other an equal right to use the means of production, they naturally try to come to the most convenient arrangement for each in arranging their work together. And when a group have agreed to work in co-operation, they naturally consult each other as to what is to be done with what they make.

for himself what it is right for him personally to do. There is no doubt that trades unions have been and still are very valuable in helping some at least of the workers to hold their own against the ceaseless aggressions of the capitalist class. They have done much to gain and keep a living wage for skilled labor, and, what is as important, to keep up the spirit of the workers, and make them feel themselves men and not mere helpless slaves.

Further, Trades Unions are founded on the sound principle of voluntary association. They are, at least in theory, societies which a man is free to enter or leave as he chooses.

Other side of the question: trades unionists don't always respect their own voluntary principle, and some times try to bully men into joining them. Also they have developed within themselves in many cases the vices which are a danger to every association, and which specially beset all fighting bodies—i.e., arbitrary authority, place hunting, red tapism, wire pulling, conservatism and exclusiveness. From the Communist-Anarchist point of view existing unions have three great defects: they allow a sort of petty government within themselves; they are not sufficiently possessed by a sense of the absolute necessity of finding some way of winning and including in their organisation the great mass of workers; their aims are pitifully narrow.

It is very little wonder if a man of larger aims and a keen love of personal liberty sometimes finds the atmosphere of his trade union too cramping for him.

Should such a man work alone or cast about to bring together others in his own trade, like minded with himself, to form a new association with larger aims and more liberal methods? We say again, it is a question for his own judgment. But we think that the man who feels impelled to form such wider associations, or join such, is doing very good work.

Nothing would bring along the old unions faster than the co-operation of new unions with larger views in the practical labor conflict of to-day. Now unionists say to thorough-going Anarchist Socialists: "You want an ideal freedom, a revolution in the clouds. You spend your energy in shouting ALL OR NOTHING, and you leave us to do the practical work—and starvation too—that wins and keeps for the workers the money to live decently and the freedom to combine." If there were bodies of Anarchist Socialists who took their part side by side with the older unions in the skirmish of to-day, with the avowed purpose of making it into a big battle for larger ends to-morrow, their influence on the whole labor movement would be enormous. They might hope to do what existing unions, with their tendency to develop an aristocratic exclusivness, will never accomplish—i.e., bring a large number of the aimless disunited masses outside into conscious association, in voluntary groups. The newer unions, like the dockers, talk about trying to do this; it is part of the theory of trades unionism, but a part that seems too often to remain a dead letter. In their deadened and hopeless condition the masses see nothing attractive in the sacrifices of unionism. Only if it could come to them with the moral awakening of a great new hope might it rouse them to understand and act.

Why should they be roused to understand and act by means of voluntary associations especially? some may ask. Because men who have experience of what it is consciously and deliberately to combine with others and work with them for a common end are a great deal fitter for a free community than men who have no practice of the sort. Voluntary association is a practical lesson in free social relations. Those who have learnt it best are the least likely to fall helplessly under the authority of the first plausible leader who turns up and promises them Paradise if they will trust and obey him.

Those people who have practical experience that it is possible to come to mutual agreement with others and work to some purpose with them are the least likely to have a superstitious belief in the necessity of government They are the men who are ready to take the responsibility of life upon themselves.

So much as to the desirability of joining and forming trades unions. We repeat that, in our opinion, it is an open question for each individual whether his own character and circumstances make it best for him to be a unionist or not. For each Anarchist it is an open question whether he can serve the cause best by working in his union or elsewhere. And of course it goes without saying that the man who does not join a trades union ought to be left by his fellow workers who are unionists as free to work as the unfreedom of the present state of society will allow.

But what about blacklegs? Are they really vindicating the freedom of every man to work and to make contracts? No; for this reason. The job a blackleg takes is not a job that is going abegging. It is an opportunity of employment to which another man has a greater claim.

When a workman leaves his employment for good and all his place is vacant, and it is open to any other man who chooses to take it. But a striker has not left his place vacant in that way. He wishes and intends to go on with the job directly he can come to terms with the employer. He is not the dog in the manger keeping hay from the oxen. He is the ox occupying his own place at the rack, and trying to get rather less musty hay. A blackleg is like a man who should take advantage of some legal iniquity to take possession of another poor man's bit of garden, on the plea that he is not actually working in it at that moment, when he has been cultivating it for his living in the past and is intending to cultivate it in the future. Deliberately shoving in and snatching another man's chances away from him while he is at a disadvantage is not the act of a man who knows what freedom is. It is the act of either a hard-hearted unsocial self-seeker, who has lost his sense of fair play and human sympathy, or of a desperate slave, so cruelly driven by circumstances that he does what he can, not what he chooses.

In the case of blackleg versus striker the wrong is aggravated by the fact that the striker is temporarily ceasing work in the interests of greater freedom not only for himself but for all the workers in his trade. Greater freedom—because freedom consists in largeness of opportunity. And whether he strikes for better wages or for the right to combine and organise, or for less interference in his work—the striker is demanding more freedom for his mates as well as himself.

Free contract in the present society is a farce. In the agreement between the capitalist and propertyless worker, whether he be a unionist or the poor slave called in bitter mockery a "free laborer," there is little freedom. For a free agreement implies that the parties to it are on an equality and have equally other courses open to them. Whilst the capitalist monopolises the means of living and working and the workman must come to terms with him, or else starve or go to the workhouse, the agreement between them cannot be free. But unionists, by means of their combination, are able to put themselves something nearer an equality with the capitalist, and, by dint of struggling and starving, to get a tiny bit fairer terms. Talking of free contract at all—the contract between trades unionists and capitalists has more freedom about it than that between capitalists and isolated laborers. Unequal though they be, unionists and capitalists are more on an equality than capitalists and the isolated wage-worker.

Unionists therefore can only look at blacklegs as the burghers of a city in the middle ages, who were struggling to hold their own against the tyrannical nobles, looked upon mercenary soldiers who sold themselves to fight the nobles' battles.

The "free laborers" of to-day, like the "free lances" of old, are very often men greatly to be pitied. Men driven from the land and the means of production, and so miserable as to be careless for what dirty work their services may be used, so long as a living can be made by it. But their "freedom" is another name for slavery; and when they deliberately help the capitalist class to perpetuate that slavery for all workers, they are fighting against true human freedom in general and the freedom of the working-class in particular.

William Morris on Communism.

MARCH 10th at Grafton Hall, Grafton Street, W, in aid of the *Freedom* Publication Fund, William Morris delivered a lecture on Communism, of which we give the notes as follow:—

My friends, I perceive you have no chairman here, a good custom, when you can manage to do without him. I have no objection to begin straight off. Well then, as to the possible means by which Communism can be obtained. I have considerable doubt as to various things which have been done, and I really want to consider it with various groups. I am in point of fact in a rather puzzled condition. The real difficulty is as towhat actual steps should be taken, for all sensible men must think Communism a right thing in itself. There are many measures towards this end which is advancing upon us, mostly honest and put forward with much ability. But I have doubts what would be gained by them. The quesion is whether the steps advocated would bring us further on the road. There is indeed a mass of things which the general public call socialism, but of this a great deal, it seems to me, is not of the essence of socialism, but merely machinery, which socialism must use in its militant condition—and perhaps afterwards. There is good in the scheme of business-like administration we have now in London as compared with the old Whig *laissez faire* methods, worked by corruption. The London County Council is a much more useful body than the Metropolitan Board of Works, and is instinct with a different spirit, a spirit which is promise of a better day. There is now an attempt to give a certain dignity to the life of London, as a whole, which did not exist before. No one can quarrel with the attempts to remove some of the sordidness of town life by the provision of parks, public libraries and so on. The advantages, however, are rather unequally distributed. Free libraries are gains for the middle rather than for the working classes. Our socialist machinery can be pushed further. Why, in Ancient Rome, under chattel slavery, more was provided for the public than we have to-day in London! Industry is now being carried on by the municipalities; the houses of working people are to be improved by being taken out of the hands of private speculators, and more time is to be given to education. These are indications that the public conscience is awakening.

On the other hand, great as is the gain, the amount of real progress depends very much on the spirit in which these things are done. For equality of condition is the thing to be aimed at, and a new standing-ground must be gained by the effort of sweeping away all privilege. The proprietory classes are suffering to some extent, and will struggle to minimise the movement. Power may be gained in this way by the useful class to overcome the resistence, stupidity and selfishness of the ruling classes. The non-working classes along with their parasites, it should be remembered, are, even numerically, very strong, and they hold the nine points of the law, *i.e.*, possession. As soon as they begin to fear for their livelihood they will begin to resist to the utmost of their power.

The gains of municipal collectivism are to be considered in regard to their effect on the minds of the workers in arousing a pure longing for Socialism itself; a condition of somewhat less misery would be a costly gain were it to dull the hearts of the workers and make them indifferent to the hope of gaining a real society of equals. This consideration is not merely speculative, for a partial betterment of the people might become an obstacle; half a loaf might be better than no bread. Perhaps the useless might become to some extent a useful class—a fact which would enable them to keep their power over the commonwealth—and equality, in this way, become further off than ever. But I think myself that such a state of things could be possible only on the condition that the working-classes became satisfied with merely the machinery of socialism—supposing that there went with this extension of machinery some increased prosperity to the working-classes owing to the better organisation of labor. The change must be slow in coming, and we must all therefore cultivate a longing for it. It can only perhaps arrive through a period of great suffering and misery, through the absolute breakdown of our present civilisation. The minimum of suffering is desirable. The Socialistic idea must be well planted. If the people reject Socialism as an ideal we may cease to trouble ourselves about the future. We shall in that case perhaps have to make terms with Tories and benevolent Whigs, and ask them to govern us as wisely as possible and to exploit us only in moderation.

Not by obvious violence, however, can we make an advance.

I must beg the workers to get rid of their intellectual slavery to the ideas of their masters. I hope that some spark of enthusiasm may vivify the masses. This might be done if a great crisis were close at hand. The question is—is capitalism coming off its hinges? Some, perhaps, myself included, did believe

in the inevitableness of a speedy change in society, but alas! we must remember how hard other tyrannies have died, tyrannies which added palpable violence to their other dark deeds. The impulse due to direct and open incitements and attack is not likely to come, what then are we to do without the sting of hope and enthusiasm. We must use all means to draw the worker into Socialism. I am driven to the conclusion that the progressive measures of to-day are necessary to give form to the aims we desire to attain.

We have to inspire the trade-union leaders with the notion that the system in which the masters live upon the labor of the workers is not a necessary one.

We have also to raise the standard of life of the workers. At present they are desperately lacking in the power of orgunisation. Education in this respect must be supported by efforts to inspire a longing for the complete change. Social Democratic measures may be either mere shifts or they may be means for leading us towards a new country of equality. The Socialistic spirit should vivify the use of such machinery. The enemies of the public, if we work under the impulse of the true social instinct, may after all be defeated in their efforts to use public machinery for the purpose of exploiting the worker.

I shall now try to explain what to my mind is Communism, but briefly, for the subject is very large. Perhaps Socialism and Communism are names as good as one another, but I call Communism the completion of Socialism. The Socialist is clearly willing to aim at a true society. Communism comes in when Socialism is triumphant. The resources of nature, land and other things, which can be used only for the reproduction of wealth, must be owned by the whole people for a common benefit. Nowadays the owners of the means of production do practically own the workers, inasmuch as they dictate to them what life they shall live. The land, the plant, the stock of a country should be communised, and in this way the accumulation of riches would be checked; for no man can become very rich unless by force or cajolery. The utmost that a most acquisitive man could gain would be the higher salary he might exact from his fellow-citizens. But the producers of specialities will not presently be able to exact any such enormous remuneration. Under Socialism, again, there would not be the waste there is now. The labor that is thrown away in the making of fashionable luxuries would be diverted to what is useful. The market price now gives us no standard of value. In a society of inequality the standard of usefulness is necessarily utterly confused. In such a society the price is fixed by the necessities of the poor and the cravings of the rich, for these last must spend their accumulations some way or other. In a society of equality the demand for an article would be based on its utility. Look up and down the London shops to-day and see what wastefulness there is in producing the fripperies exhibited; while, on the other hand, what sordid makeshifts are produced for the supply of the poor as a set off to the waste in making the luxuries of the rich. What waste there is in the mere process of business, the buying and selling of Commerce; in the endeavour of each to get the monopoly of the market. A society only tending towards equality would make us all wealthy. Genuine well-made articles would then be available for others than those who can buy them now. Beautiful objects would be produced, beautiful houses built for for the public use. For a wealthy society, such as a Communist one would be, would demand the erection of fine buildings.

When all are living comfortably the keeness of competition will abate. Many men get rich nowadays, not because they wish to do so, but because they are anxious to escape the chance of becoming poor. When no one is allowed to defile the natural beauty of the earth, the sky, or the rivers, there will be no advantage for one man to be nominally richer than his neighbour. If we made the means of industry common property we should soon reach conditions of complete equality.

By Communism, of course, I do not mean what so many silly people suppose, the communal use of clothes and toothbrushes. Most sure I am that every state of society but that of Communism is grievous to all that belong to it. Most anti-socialists and some Socialists confuse Communism with what is the machinery of the secialistic state. Take a ship, with its captain and sailors, there you have an instance of a social body acting under a leader, in which each will do his work for the benefit of each and all, instead of trying to make a profit on his own account.

You sometimes hear people commiserating the unemployed, and the general public, when it thinks about them, would like to see them absorbed. But each employer really knows it would be against his interests if this were the case; for the employer and capitalist to-day are necessarily, through their economic position, the enemies of society. Time will teach reasonable men to submit, when necessary, without demur. The unreasonable man must find consolation by damning the nature of things.

Some questions were then put. Comrade Wess asked: Was a leader to enforce his orders by authority? To which Morris replied, Nature will compel men to obey, otherwise they might starve. Some State then would be established, purued Wess, and would not that be a hindrance to the development of the individual? But Morris declared we must emancipate ourselves from the tyranny of words: administrative entities will be necessary which peole will feel themselves generally compelled to obey and Philip sober will, if need be, have to be protected from Philip drunk. Man's will, when ordered to be carried out, will require the full consent of the society to which he belongs. As to the complaints against Board School and South Kensington Art School teaching, it is in all probability poor enough, but is that any reaeon for doing without teaching at all? Such teaching as the State gives to-day is as good as you are likely to get in a commercial society such as ours; for the object of our teaching is, unfortunately, to make a man a fit slave for the purposes of commercialism.

Morris was then asked, What line do you advise us to take? and replied: Upon my word, I don't know. I came here to see if I could learn myself what to do. People must go their own road. It is no use asking me to become a vestryman. There are some people I know who can be vestrymen, and who can be nothing else. The intention of a movement is, after all, the most important thing: the actual development of a thing is always very different from our conception of it. Ten years ago, to talk big about Socialism was the necessary thing. Now as to what peole ought to do to-day, I am not altogether unsanguine. As to what some working-men leaders propose to do, if their parliamentarianism turns out well, well and good; I should be pleased, although it goes against my own theories to urge Socialists to become M.P.'s.

Comrade Leggatt then asked why a few believers did not go out from the present society and combine to prove a communistic state possible. Morris said, he thought communistic societies are impossible to-day, because of the money power. Small communistic societies are apt to become monastries. Besides, to withdraw from the struggle—is not that to give up the struggle?

Another comrade having asked, should not each man do what was good in his own eyes, Morris said that he thought the Anarchists have done very much that was wrong with their "this or nothing." The working-people of this country are prepared only for constitutional action. At one time there were no working-men in the socialist movement. Now it has become a working-class movement. As a movement spreads, however, people become less certain about its meaning. As working-men become better circumstanced they will feel themselves to be in an inferior position through no fault of their own, they will resent being slaves. We have to withdraw ourselves out of the present condition of social war into a condition of social peace. "I am not a practical socialist," he went on, "I am not fully satisfied with all this talk about statistics and progress. I have simply an honest desire to bring about a happier state of things.

H. Samuels then rose indignantly to express his disappointment at Morris's coming to lecture without having anything really definite to say, and maintained that the force that kept the workers slaves could only be removed by force. Morris, in reply, seid: Anarchism was a negation of society and, it seemed to him, but the present condition of things with the present authority removed—practical war. In answer to Merlino he said, he objected to the revolutionary movement as being necessarily a movement by force, as this could not always be done—that is, a movement which proposed to alter the whole basis of society. Anarchists were pedantic in their demands, and are apt to set private misery over against public misery. W. Wess asked, should not the workers be taught to depend upon themselves rather than to work through parliament, to which Morris replied: he thought there should be some form of organisation, although he had no desire to lay down the law as to what its particular form should be.

Morris was next asked, if the expression of private misery did not sometimes call attention to the misery of the class to which the individual belonged, which might otherwise have gone unheeded for centuries. This he admitted to be the case, but added "we don't want any martyrs now, but common-sense practical people." To a question by A. Henry, Morris replied: "What is Anarchism? Many folks in the Socialist League were merely disturbandist. Your Anarchist proper is a man like Tucker, who wants the dissolution of all society. Socialism, on the other hand, says that all our acts should be directed towards the welfare of society. He did not agree with the negation of government, though the question of how to minimise the interference of society was a difficult question, but to the end of time there must be some friction between the individual and society. Anarchism, it seemed to him, made Communism impossible. As to the hatred of force expressed by Anarchists, we cannot get rid of force in society. To denounce majority rule is a mistake; the advantage of a majority is that it simply declares where lies the greater force.

Bristol Labor War.

SINCE our last notes matters have undergone great changes in "ye anciente citye."

The girls who for six months fought against the white slavery practised upon them by Sanders and Co. are all now placed in other situations, more decent and better in every respect. That strike then at least cannot be ranked among the failures of labor struggles. Under such-like circumstances better were it in every case to move young girls into other situations, even if it takes six months to do, rather than leave them to the tender mercies of sweaters, who rob them of their labor force and, in many cases, their virtue as well.

Would that such satisfactory remarks could be made with regard to the dockers. Things, however, are with them in the same deplorable condition. Blacklegs still rule the roost, while dealrunners willing and anxious to work are thrown upon the streets to, for all the traders care, starve. But not content with this, the merchants have instituted a system of the most unprincipled persecution ever perpetrated in a local labor dispute. With a persistency that baffles description, they have hounded on the police and "free laborers" (happy phrase this) to trump up charges against the unionists, so as to bring discredit upon the movement, and lay some of the more active workers by the heels. And in this they have been only too successful; some twenty or thirty convictions having crowned their efforts.

A short time past, the masters' bantam actually had the audacity, when prosecuting some unfortunate dockers, to announce that in future all prosecutions would be backed by the Timber Merchants' Association; this unscrupulous solicitor no doubt thinking that, as the chairman of the association was a magistrate, his brother beaks would be pleased to oblige him in every possible way and deal extra harshly with all cases brought under their jurisdiction by his society.

The ways of justice are indeed inscrutable.

To-day, rushing from a stifling court where friends have just been sentenced, one is almost forced to cry aloud for a pen steeped in venom.

The trial of the Bristol rioters is over. Society has had its pound of flesh and property is secure.

For taking part in a procession on the 23rd December last, Jarman, Baker and Lacroix are each condemned to three months' imprisonment. Although the events of that evening are now a quarter and more old, yet every worker has them engraved indelibly upon his memory. As Lacroix said in court, to please the whim and fancy of a monied king, a big fish, cavalry were imported into the city to cut down citizens exercising their right of assembling together for the purpose of ventilating their grievances. And no truer words were uttered in court than these.

The big fish, however, by now stinketh.

Little did the workers think three months ago that Wathen, the arch-enemy of labor, would so soon be laid low. To please his vanity, soldiers slashed the people, and at his nod policemen truncheoned them. Last month the red-coated butchers were to have been regaled by this knight, and princely fare was prepared for them. But such gluttony and wine-bibbing was not to be. On the afternoon of that day, in the Council Chamber, surrounded by sycophants and trimmers, he fell dead—thus for ever effectually ending his evil doing and treachery. In few cases has such hatred been publicly expressed against a man as against him. So were the victims of Black Friday avenged. Not by a dagger or a pistol shot, but by Time, the avenger that never misses his prey though years be necessary to overtake it.

For a period at least smug faced respectability can lie in peace; again may well-dressed robbers sweat their slaves; Society is satisfied, for its enemies are now in safe keeping; once more the rich will say: "Let us carouse and be merry, for the danger is past!"

But is it?

And if Society is satisfied, are the workers?

We trow not.

Groanings and rumblings are heard on all hands. These sentences are merely the forerunners of others. In other towns similar scenes will be enacted, and repeated, until with a crash the whole structure of modern civilisation shivers and crashes with mighty sound.

ÇA IRA.

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 to all parts.

All communications, exchanges, &c., for "FREEDOM" *to be addressed to* THE EDITOR, 61, ST. AUGUSTINE'S-ROAD, CAMDEN-TOWN, LONDON, N.W.

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

Back Numbers.—Vol. I., October 1886 to September 1887 (No. 2 sold out), price 2s. Vol. II., October 1887 to September 1888 (Nos. 16, 17, 18, 19 sold out), price 1s. 6d. Vol. III., October 1888 to December 1889, price 1s. 6d. Vol. IV., January to December 1890, price 1s. Vol. V., January to December 1891, price 1s. Carriage: single volumes, 2d., five volumes, 6d., throughout the United Kingdom.

Freedom Pamphlets.— No. 2, "The Commune of Paris," by Peter Kropotkine, 1d.; post free, 1½d.; per quire of 25, 1s. 4d. No. 3, "A Talk about Anarchist Communism between Two Workmen," by Enrico Malatesta, 1d. post free, 1½d.; per quire of 25, 1s. 4d. No. 4, "Anarchist Communism: Its Basis and Principles," by Peter Kropotkine, 2d.; post free, 2½d.; per quire of 25, 2s. 8d. No. 5, "Anarchy," by Enrico Malatesta, 1d.; post free, 1½d.; per quire of 25, 1s. 4d. No. 6, "Anarchist Morality," by Peter Kropotkine, 1d.; post free, 1½d.; per quire of 25, 1s. 4d

NOTES.

HULL MEN REFUSE TO LIE DOWN AND STARVE.

According to the latest news as we go to press the Hull Strikers have the pluck and resolution to defy the Shipping Federation's cruel attempt to starve them into subjection. The endeavour to come to terms having failed, they are firing the dockyards and obstructing the trains bringing blacklegs. They are as much within their rights as besieged citizens in making a sortie.

Our comrades in Norwich and Yarmouth have been taking part in meetings of sympathy, and issued a circular warning all unemployed workers to keep away from Hull.

THE OBJECT LESSON OF ULSTER.

Of course the Ulster minority have a perfect right to refuse, by force of arms if need be, to be ruled by the majority of Irishmen. But what of their claim to force that majority to submit to a rule they dislike? Truly, Britons are learning by practical experience that majority rule is not the universal panacea for social difficulties. If these people could only grasp the fact that there need be no government at all, the whole ridiculous contention as to who shall rule which would be at an end.

THE BELFAST GROUP.

There has lately been a new Anarchist group formed, which seems to have been initiated by one calling himself Lord Salisbury, and another of the name of Balfour. We do not intend to give the names of the others, as we have no wish to aid Scotland Yard in their dirty work of hunting down social reformers. But these two have spoken out so boldly against majority rule that nothing we can say will endanger their position. All the same, comrades, let us beware of these new recruits. Their antecedents are, to put it mildly, a trifle suspicious. They have been born and bred in the noxious atmosphere of politics, have indulged in exploitation and rack-renting to an unlimited extent, and have themselves, whilst in power, persecuted Anarchists- It is, therefore, clear that they are at present making use of Anarchist ideas only asa subterfuge to gain some political advantages for themselves.

DOWN WITH MAJORITIES!

We cannot, however, refrain from quoting a spicy phrase or two from an oration, at Belfast, by one of these dubious comrades:—

"I do not come here to preach any doctrines of passive obedience or non-resistance. (Hear, hear.) You have had to fight for your liberties before. (A voice—"And will again.") I admit that the tyranny of majorities may be as bad as the tyranny of kings, and that the stupidity of majorities may be even greater than the stupidity of kings; and I will not say, and I do not think any rational or sober man will say, that what is justifiable against a tyrannical king may not, under certain circumstances, be justifiable against a tyrannical majority." (Loud and continued cheering.)

As Mr. J. P. O'Connor remarks in the "Weekly Sun," this is a frank incitement to violence, for which Mr. Balfour is liable to six months' hard labour under his own Coercion Act. Belfast is rioting, but we have not yet heard of his arrest. So much time was not lost in the case of poor Nichol, though no violence resulted from his article.

FREEDOM VERSUS SOBRIETY.

A correspondent writes:—"If a man whose mental consciousness was in complete harmony with natural law, i.e., an Anarchist, coming from some happy land perhaps where human degradation is unknown, were led by chance or curiosity to a meeting such as that in Trafalgar Square on the 'Veto Bill,' what wonder would be his! As a glimmering of the state of affairs began to dawn upon him, 'Poor Fools,' he might say, 'and this is the form of your particular insanity! The blind leading the blind from one quagmire to another; who in their struggle to BE SOBER resign their right to BE FREE!'

"It is quite true that abuse of alcohol leads to insanity; it is equally true, however, that insanity predisposes to drunkenness; but most of all must it be recognised that villainy, deep rooted, conscious scoundrelism is responsible for both. For the 'glory' of the British Empire is built upon the ill-gotten gains of 'liquor'; the bulwarks of England are now her public-houses! Were it not for the desperate tragedy behind we could laugh at the comedy of present Government, but for the Anarchist life is too real and earnest, and he MEANS BUSINESS in his reforms. All such questions as local option will answer themselves under a state of Anarchist Communism, for we should then be too happy ever to require artificial stimulant, too desirous to be awake ever to drug our sensibility with alcohol or any other hypnotic." But even if this were not the case, it would be wiser to prefer, with the late Bishop of Peterborough, England free to England sober, if sobriety can only result from stringent laws.

COMRADES?

We cannot be surprised at the warmth with which the comrade, whose letter we publish this month, speaks of the bitter and unfair tone of hostility towards Anarchist Socialism lately assumed by certain of the Social Democratic Party in England. In Germany, this same spirit of factious dogmatism has risen to so shameless a height amongst the high priests of Social Democracy that no German who loves human freedom now cares to call himself a Socialist, without some such word as Independent to qualify the term. As may be gathered from the article of our German contributor, the name Socialist has been almost abandoned by the really advanced party in Germany; just as in England we have been obliged to drop the fine old name of Radical, because it has become the summary of opinions no longer in the forefront of progress. We trust our comrades of the Social Democratic persuasion will set their faces against this undesirable importation from Kaiser-land. It is a danger signal, and portends the attempt to import also German "party discipline," i.e., red tape, wire pulling, and despotism, á la Liebknecht and Bebel, unless English Social Democrats keep their eyes open.

QUEER SOCIALISM.

In accordance with this same Germanising policy, no Anarchist Socialists have been invited to join a "Joint Socialist Committee" lately formed "to facilitate a common understanding between Socialist bodies." "Because no Anarchist CAN be a Socialist," said one member of the committee! If such a remark has any meaning at all, it must imply that the principle of governmental authority is an essential part of Socialism. An assumption which many Social Democrats would certainly repudiate. We are sorry not to find the Hammersmith Socialist Society protesting vigorously against this attitude of prejudiced narrowness.

For the real relation between Socialist Anarchism and Socialist Democracy at this moment, we refer our readers to Comrade Merlino's excellent letter in "Justice" for April 22nd.

A SHAMEFUL TREATY.

The whole present system of criminal hunting, and all extradition treaties as a part of it, are pernicious in our eyes; but there is something peculiarly obnoxious in the handing over of "political criminals" by one government to another; because it necessarily means handing a man over to his avowed enemies for trial.

The case is yet stronger against surrendering "politicals" to states like Russia, where the trial of political offenders is conducted secretly before military tribunals, and the most cruel punishments are awarded at the pleasure of a despot. Yet in face of these facts, the Republican United States of America, which gained their independence only in the last century by force of arms, and settled their social and political internal difficulties by a civil war only a generation ago, have concluded a political extradition treaty with Russia. They have agreed to hand over to the Russian police anyone accused of "conspiring," directly or indirectly, against the life of the Tsar or any of his family—i.e., all political agitators. For as all government in Russia centres in the Tsar, ANY attempt at insurrection, or even political agitation, is, directly or indirectly, an attack upon his person. It behoves all Englishmen who care for freedom to be on the watch, lest our government disgrace us in like manner.

A BRUTAL SENTENCE.

Comrades Bauer and Nold have been condemned to NINE YEARS imprisonment for "inciting to riot" by distributing an Anarchist leaflet at Homestead AFTER the riot—i.e., battle with the Pinkertons—had taken place! They were convicted also of "conspiring with Berkman" to kill Frick, in spite of the fact that no evidence of this imaginary conspiracy could be scraped together.

THE PROTECTION OF LAW.

The Chicago Anarchists were hanged for "conspiracy," and now Bauer and Nold are imprisoned for "conspiracy," not according to but in spite of the written law of the American States. The services of lawyers, says "Solidarity," commenting on this fact, are of no real use to accused Anarchists. A legal defence only serves to befog the real issues. "The time has come for us to realise that we cannot carry on a professed revolutionary propaganda and at the same time expect the protection of the law." If the revolutionists keep within the letter of the law, then the judge and jury find some quibble to set it aside, and revenge themselves upon the enemies of the existing social order all the same.

Cipriani and the May-Day Riots.

LAST month our Italian comrade, Amilcare Cipriani, was for a few days in London. A man of action rather than theory, Cipriani is the Blanqui of the Italian revolutionary movement; he has already spent twenty-two years in prison. In 1861, 1862, 1866, and 1869 he took part in the Mazzini and Garibaldi insurrections in Italy. On September 4th, 1870, when the French republic was proclaimed, he joined the first battalion of the National Guards, together with Flourens. On the 31st Oct. of the same year and the 21st Jan. 1871, he was one of the chief participators in the unsuccessful attempts made in Paris to capture the Hôtel de Ville and to drive out the Provisional Government. On the 18th of March and after Cipriani fought gallantly for the Paris Commune. On the 4th of April, he was brought before the court-martial at Versailles, and sentenced to death, which, however, he escaped almost by a miracle. A severe wound in his leg prevented him from keeping pace with his four comrades in marching to the pillar to be shot, on April 6th, and just as he reached the spot a telegram from Thiers arrived communing his sentence to transportation for life to New Caledonia. The suffering and torture he was subjected to in New Caledonina were most repelling. On his return to Paris, after the amnesty, he was expelled from France, on the 1st Jan. 1881, whence he returned to Italy. He first went to Rimini in order to see his dying father, but had scarcely left the steamer when he was again arrested, on the general charge of revolutionary conspiracy, and taken to Milan. There he was kept secretly in prison until an amnesty became granting his release. But instead of freeing him, the authorities brought a fresh charge against him and sentenced him to 25 years' hard labor. He was elected in 1888, in consequence of the great popular agitation in his favor: the Italian people having insisted upon electing him nine times during his imprisonment as deputy (five times in Ravenna and four times in Forli), though, of course, as an Anarchist he scorned to take his seat in Parliament on his liberation.

AMILCARE CIPRIANI.

Now he has just finished his latest two years' imprisonment, for the part he took in the May Day riots in Rome, in 1891. For an account of his trial, with that of sixty-one other Anarchists, see "Freedom" for November and December 1891 and April 1892.

At a meeting held in Grafton Hall to greet Cipriani, on April 10th, he gave an interesting account of the Roman trial and the events leading up to it. He began by referring to the Anarchist Congress held in Capolago (Switzerland) in December 1890. At the conclusion of this congress it was agreed that Cipriani should make a propaganda tour in Italy. This tour he undertook in the last two months previous to the 1st May 1891. The government had prohibited any public meetings in connection with his journey, but he succeeded in addressing large crowds of people in spite of the police, and privately saw a large number of friends. All told him of the great misery prevailing among the working classes and their readiness for a revolution. There were great expectations for the 1st of May; but Cipriani himself believed that it could be only a demonstation-day, not a preordained date for an insurrection. For the government had prepared, the military was mobilised, and many comrades beforehand imprisoned. On May 1st 1891, more than 25,000 soldiers were in and around the Santa Croce square, at Rome, where the demonstration was held, and it would have been sheer folly to provoke a fight in such conditions. Cipriani spoke to that effect. After him comrade Palla, who had just come from Paris and was unknown except to a very few, addressed the crowd. His remarks, little understood, were taken as a pretext for interference by the police. A police agent fired the first pistol shot. Then the trumpet call was heard, and at this signal the troops attacked the people.

The scene which ensued baffles description. Men, women and children ran for their lives in every direction, to meet everywhere troops that charged them over and over again. In despair they tried every street, without finding an escape. Hand to hand fights occurred between the police and individuals. A police agent was struck dead by some unknown hand, just as he was firing at Cipriani. Ultimately Cipriani was thrown to the ground by a squadron of cavalry, the horses passing over him, and taken to a friend's seriously wounded.

During the following days more than 500 arrests were made. The prisoners retained for trial were brought up in two batches. Cipriani belonged to the second batch of sixty-two. The trial lasted several months. Almost all the prisoners professed to be Anarchists. The evidence for the prosecution was forged at the headquarters of the police: an inspector, who is even now in the employment of the government, admitted the fact. He also confessed that the weapons produced in Court as found in the Santa Croce square had been put there by the police. Notwithstanding this and other disclosures, Cipriani and his friends were sentenced as members of a "criminal association." The trial was brought to an end without the presence of the prisoners and their counsel, who declined to appear in Court owing to the unfair treatment of their clients.

After his two years seclusion Cipriani has returned to the world to find the number of Anarchists in Italy greatly increased by the government persecution. He believes a revolution a comparatively easy thing in Italy, if only the people are united. Unfortunately the leaders of the working classes look at the people merely as a voting herd, and have little desire for anything else but their own exaltation. "We have to fight them," writes an Italian correspondent, "not for personal hatred, but because they are a real hindrance to the revolution."

C. C. Davis.

COMRADE DAVIS has been tried, insulted in Court and sentenced to fifteen months' hard labor, for protesting publicly against the sentence of starvation pronounced on him by society. We have received the following letter from him since:—

"Dear Comrade,—This is to inform you that I am not sentenced to fifteen months' imprisonment for what I have done, but for what I said in Court, although I shall not be able to write down here the whole of what I said. 'I understand that I am to be tried before the members of this Supreme Court of Birmingham on two charges, one of breaking a window and the other of stealing a quantity of jewellery, at the value of £100. I cannot see how that charge of theft can be brought against me. If I understand the law against theft, it is this: That if any person takes what does not belong to him, and makes off with it, that would be theft. But in my case, I did not make the slightest attempt to make off with any of the jewellery whatever that I had taken from the window. My intention was to destroy as much of the jewellery as I could. And I thought, by throwing the jewellery into the road, that it would be trampled on by passing vehicles, and be destroyed or left in a valueless condition. I understand that the whole of the jewellery was recovered uninjured. If any of the jewellery had been found to be injured in any way, still the charge against me could not have been one of theft, but only one of damages. Therefore I ask you to withdraw that charge; if you will not withdraw it, and insist upon convicting me upon that charge, then I say it is a miscarriage of justice. When I hear the jury's decision upon those charges, then I will proceed to speak in my defence. The reason why I committed the crime for which I am now about to be tried was because I began to feel the pangs of hunger, and I resolved not to starve quietly any longer. Cardinal Man has said that law has no necessity for a starving man.' The judge asked me whether I had anything more to say. I said, 'Yes, when I have heard the decision of the jury.' He said, 'Now is your time, you will not be allowed to say anything afterwards.' Then I proceeded. 'You and your class, who own the mines, factories, railways, land, and all means of transit, wont allow me and my fellow-workers to work unless we allow you and your class to take two thirds of the produce of our labor. You and your class deprive me and others of the right to work, the right to live, or to have free access to the means of life. If the whole army of unemployed workmen who had assembled outside the Council House during the month of January, to demand work, had gone and done in a body what I have done alone, it would have made more effect upon society than all the agitation in the world. You and your class are to blame for that horrible crime which was perpetrated, some few weeks ago, by an unemployed workman who resolved to take the life of his family, and not to endure misery and starvation any longer.'

"I cannot tell you any more at present. Cheer up, Nicoll, your time will soon slip round! Do not trouble yourselves about me at present, I am in good health and spirits.—With my best greetings to all comrades.

"Yours fraternally,

"Birmingham Prison, April 19th. "C. C. DAVIS."

According to a Birmingham daily paper, Davis's defence was concluded as follows:—

"It would have been a great deal better if he had gone and taken the lives of several magistrates—of persons of your class (pointing to the Assistant Recorder), for by doing that society would begin to feel the action of the starving people. But this crime stands hidden, as it were, behind the scene, away from the eyes of society, and has no effect upon the system whatever. If words will not alter your feelings, then deeds must. You and your class cause all the prostitution and depravity which we see around us today. While within the walls of the bastile at Winson Green awaiting my trial, I had lent me 'Chambers's Educator' for the people, and from it I learn that we cannot expect to educate the people while we have such ignorant, apathetic persons to do with as you and your class. You and your class block the way or education to the working classes, and, as Carlyle says, 'Wherever ignorance, cupidity, and brute meanness exist, attack it by all means.'" The prisoner went on, "Away with the evil institutions, which are the cause of all the misery, starvation, degradation, privation, prostitution, and depravity, and let us establish a system of society where we shall be able to enjoy and inherit all that which makes life worth living for. With these few remarks I will conclude. We are told that England expects that every man this day will do his duty. Now I want you jurymen, if you are men, to do your duty here to-day, and that duty is to walk out of this building and not to enter it on any occasion whatever. But, if on the other hand, you are determined to sit here and give your verdict in this case and others, and support this hypocritical, barbarian, and aggressive institution, then I say you are not fit to be called men; you are hypocritical, Jesuitical monsters, who are not fit to live another hour of your life. Long live Ravachol, long live the Walsall Anarchists!"

The Socialist Movement in Germany.*

(Concluded from previous number.)

It would be an error to believe that the Social Democratic party of Germany ever was a revolutionary party. Its present degradation and corruption is the inevitable consequence of the basis on which it was built. Its main object is the struggle for political power—one of the fundamental errors of Marx, who, whilst clearly pointing out that political power is only a consequence of economic power, yet urged the workers first to conquer the consequence, i.e., political power, and then destroy the root of the evil, i.e., the economic monopoly of the capitalist, which is clearly an impossibility This merely means a waste of the forces of the proletariat on a corrupting and demoralising shamfight with ballot-boxes, for shabby reforms. Marx tried to make this the official doctrine of the International Working-men's Association, but failed ignominiously, thanks to the valiant resistence of nearly all the non-German-speaking Socialists on the continent, who rallied round Bakounine and other Anarchists. In that struggle within the I.W.M.A. Messrs Bebel and Liebknecht fought the Anarchists of that period as bitterly as they fight them now, and with the same venomous weapons of calumny and slander. Their own party was at the time still connected with the bourgeois radical party of Southern Germany, whilst the only other Socialist body, the Lassallean organisation, was to a certain degree under the influence of the Conservative monarchists of Prussia. These two parties, having later on freed themselves from their bourgeois and reactionary alliances, fought each other, but finally amalgamated (in 1875), and a period of material prosperity but corruption of principles followed (1876—1878). All revolutionary events in other countries were sneered at, ridiculed and misrepresented, in order that the German workers might not learn anything from them or ever dare to strike a blow in their own country. We remember Mr. Engel's insults to the Spanish insurrection of 1873, published in the official organ, whilst Cartaghena was besieged and was making an heroic resistance; the attitude towards the attempted rebellions in Italy in August 1874 and April 1877, towards the beginnings of Nihilist action (the Petersburg Demonstration of December 1876), and towards the persecutions of Internationalists in Switzerland (March 1877) etc. All this was crowned by the wild abuse thrown at Hoedel and Nobiling, in 1878, who had dared to strike a blow in Germany herself. The following period of the anti-Socialist law (1878—1890) did not stay the process of decomposition, which became at last so evident that the government knew no better way to accelerate it than by abrogating that coercive law. Then the reactionary, decadent tendencies had free scope to develop!

We are not writing here a history of the German movement, and hence cannot dwell on the many instances of sacrifice and solidarity shown by many members of the party. We maintain that they are thrown away, nay, are misleading, in lending lustre to a cause which is bound to fail. The great number of votes (one-and-a-half million) which the party scores is due to the absence of any other radical party in that country, the Progressists and Democrats there being less advanced than an average Whig or Tory. Also the trade unions are of late origin and almost entirely led by Socialists. All this explains the great number of votes. But whenever something "dangerous"—e.g., like the general and military strike as a reply to a declaration of war—is advocated, as it has been by the Socialists in Holland, the "greatest socialist party on the face of the earth" rapidly dwindles down to only some tens of thousands of "really convinced" men, of whom anything of a revolutionary character can be expected; so Mr. Bebel himself said. The big numbers then are nothing more than a stage army.

What is the probable future of this party?—More votes, more papers, more funds in the Bank of England; less principle, fewer convinced socialists (those who are in earnest are joining the Independent Socialists)—in short: respectability, growing diplomacy, policy, transactions with the governing classes, etc. They go the same way as Mr. Burns' and Mr. Mann's socialism of some years ago went. And yet all these people, who consider themselves so eminently practical and clever, are blind or shut their eyes to the rising tide of the popular and levelling revolution, which will sweep them away together with the system that they bolster up. They call us dreamers, and yet they themselves are visionaries to such a degree as to believe that the people will ever accept them and their tools as a new class of masters and oppressors.

* * * * *

It will be asked whether a certain number of this party are not resisting the anti-revolutionary current. They are, but since they either leave the party when convinced of its inefficiency, or are expelled from it by authority when they try to open the eyes of others, the best elements are being continually eliminated, and the selfseekers and politicians left. For the meshes of the network of coercive regulations are so narrow and the powers of the leaders so great and arbitrary that any work within the party for its reform is impossible.

Anarchist ideas began to be propagated in Germany, in 1876—1878, by Reinsdorf, Werner, and others who had learned them in the ranks of the Jurassian Federation of the International, in the French-speaking parts of Switzerland. The second period of revolutionary and Anarchist agitation is marked by the propaganda of the "Freiheit," of Most, and of the Austrian and German propagandists by deed, 1879—1885. To both these movements the Social Democrats were furiously hostile. For instance, they denounced and hunted down Reinsdorf for years, nay, they made fun of his execution, as could be shown by extracts from their official organ of that time (1885). By the elections of 1884 the number of Social Democrats in Parliament was doubled, and the result of this triumph was, of course, not that they became more revolutionary, but that they became anxious to make a smart piece of jobbery with the government over certain parts of the estimates. A movement of indignation against their policy broke forth. The first wave of opposition (Frankfurt, 1885). The second wave followed in 1887 (Berlin; a movement for abstention at the municipal elections; "Volkstribüne"). The third wave followed in 1890 (Berlin, Dresden, Magdeburg), the fourth in 1891 (Berlin). The evolution of the opposition was quickened by the expulsion of several of their leaders at the Annual Congress at Erfurt, in September 1891. These annual congresses are mostly composed of officials of the party, who sit in council with their masters, the central authorities—a touching example of the harmony between capital and labor! Those who were expelled, and others who left at their own will, call themselves "Independent Socialists," and have since formed a number of societies, held many meetings, and are publishing a lively weekly paper, the "Sozialist" of Berlin. Their numbers are increasing, and there is no doubt that whilst they are a small party, fighting for elbowroom, there is great enthusiasm among many of them. They are often best in exposing the corruption of the old party which they have seen themselves from within and at its everyday work. In their publications they accumulate from the history and practice of the old party valuable materials for a future historical sketch of the methods by which the people are deceived.

But it is more important to examine what their principles are. All we can say is: Whilst often mercilessly exposing and stricturing the old party, they are IN NO WAY ANARCHISTS. They are discontented with the present state of the Social Democratic party, but most of them believe in the impossible fiction of a "Revolutionary Social Democracy." Some attribute the fault of the present stagnation to the men, some to the methods employed, but very few seem to see that the authoritarian, political and reformist principles which form the basis of Social Democracy CANNOT be revolutionary. Their opinions about the remedy are of course different. Some oppose parliamentarism altogether. Others want men sent to Parliament to protest and to withdraw. Others again demand the resignation of the present Members and new elections on a purely Socialist program. Those who reject parliamentarism advocate mass meetings, collective action of the people, demonstrations. Others speak to the Unemployed, and others propagate the General Strike. Some, again, defying the official orders to let religion alone, preach atheism and holding aloof from the protestant church. A few become the advocates of this or that neglected socialist system, like that of Duchring, etc. All this wavering gives us a new proof of the soundness of Anarchism: however much we may differ among ourselves as to details or methods, we know that there is no link between rank reaction, be it called Toryism or State-socialism, and Anarchism; "Revolutionary Social Democracy" being a mongrel impossibility.

The future of this party may be this. If no war or revolution happens, they may succeed in gradually breaking up the old party and in absorbing the Socialist elements left in it. But then the history of the old party is fated to repeat itself, for wo do not see in their principles any safeguard against this.

At present they are a brisk young party which may be for some—and we hope will be for many—a preparatory school for Anarchism. We must not forget that the Catholic church can hardly take more pains to prevent heretic books getting into the hands of their credulous flock than the official Social Democrats use to bias their followers against even looking into Anarchist literature. This spell is broken by the Independent Socialists. For the first time, if we except some Proudhonist and Tuckerian literature, as well as some secretly printed leaflets—and in Austria, not in Germany, some papers—Anarchist articles, extracts from the writings of Kropotkine, for example, are published in Germany (in the "Sozialist" and the "Lichtstrahlen" of Berlin). The Anarchist ideas on centralisation and authority find a vague echo in many of the Independents' speeches, etc. In fact, the German workers have been intellectually starved for many years; they heard nothing, absolutely nothing, but the hymns of adulation sung to Marx and Mr. Engels, and were told to despise all other thinkers as fools or bourgeois hirelings. Now they are learning to know a little of the progress of Socialist thought round the fossilised Marxian dogmas, and as they are very much in earnest about it, the days of the Marxian monopoly are numbered.

* * * * *

A number of Anarchist groups exist already. It is difficult to estimate their strength, but anybody comparing the state of things in Germany of three or six years ago with that of to-day will find that Anarchism begins to tell on public opinion in that last stronghold of authoritarianism too. Since last year distinctly Anarchist public meetings are held—which never happened before. A paper was to be started in Berlin, but it was suppressed before the first number was even issued (November 1891). Arrests are often made, and sentences to a number of years' penal servitude are not infrequent (Trial of Kamien, etc.). Yet we read continuously of the turning up of Anarchist speakers and literature in places where some years ago all was dead silence. It is quite certain that the ice is at last broken, and that the outworks of the Marxian citadel are being invaded.

A few words as to Individualist Anarchism. Germany possesses a Proudhonist author, Mülberger, and a Tuckerian author and poet, J. H. Mackay, whose book "The Anarchists" is now being published in a cheap edition by the publisher of an Independent Socialist review at Berlin. The so-called "young literature," many writers of which in

* *By a German correspondent.*

France now profess Anarchist ideas, is not so advanced in Germany; it left Social Democracy behind some time ago, it is true, but embraced an aristocratic individualism (Nietzsche) etc. However, this is a symptom too of the intellectual waste around the State-socialist party.

* * * * *

In another article we shall consider the Austrian Socialist movement. There too at last Anarchism is making good headway.

* *

Enemies of Progress.

(No. 5.)

THE CAPITALIST.

"MUCH as I deplore the present state of the labor market, the fact stares me in the face that I must reduce your wages until times mend. We *must* work harmoniously, for labor cannot get on without the capitalist." The old, old story of the profit-monger who, more subtle than his dupe, the worker, deceives him into the belief that the worker cannot get on unless there is a capitalist close at hand. And the number of workers who swallow this assertion is legion; anyone who doubts this statement can soon have it verified by attending some Trades Council meeting. The delegates are willing enough to rate and deprecate the action of capitalists, but they cannot grasp the idea that society could continue to prosper without the capitalist. The workers do not yet understand that the capitalist is one of the greatest enemies of progress; a vampire, so to speak, who drains the best blood from the veins of the laborer, and, when his rapacity is satisfied, throws away the withered and shrivelled body.

That the capitalist is an enemy of progress is patent on the face of it when we consider that he accumulates what rightfully belongs to others. He himself is not the maker of capital, for it is the result of unpaid labor. A certain amount of work is done by the wage earner for which he receives a certain sum of money. But that which his labor has produced is worth more than he receives in the shape of wages, and this unpaid portion the capitalist appropriates. Some of it becomes capital, i.e., is used as a means of production; but a large part the capitalist simply takes for himself. To put it in still plainer language, the worker produces, for which he is paid a sum of money far below the value of work rendered; the capitalist—non-worker—takes a share (large or small) of the work produced, and yet has not put his hand to help in the smallest degree in its production.* By this it will be seen that the capitalist is a useless item in society and a drag on the wheels of progress. Nay, more, he is a legal thief, for he steals from ignorant workers that portion just spoken of and, in justification of that act, he calls it profit. In course of time the spirit of profit gets such a strong hold upon the capitalist that a feeling of humanity towards the producers is often wanting. The greed for gold is so rampant amongst capitalists that they are at war with each other as to who can get most out of the worker. With the aid of machinery, they become rich men, often millionares. They have their fine mansions; their horses, footmen and servants are in evidence when out visiting, and their carriages are the pink of latest inventions and costliness. Their wives and daughters can be seen in the best boxes at the opera, flashing with jewellery, some dressed in the finest clothes and some nearly naked. And this class of people look upon the toilers as "mob, scum and dregs."

Yet it is the poor producer who has made these capitalists rich, and he does not know it! He has filled the coffers of the capitalist to the brim, while he himself is dressed in shoddy or even worse. The toiler "made it all"; and the capitalist, who never soiled his fingers with work leaves a fortune to his dependents when he comes to die, while the worker, when *his* turn comes to leave this vale of tears, must sorrowfully think that his wife and children have the workhouse only to look to.

Can we not plainly understand that the capitalist is merely hoodwinking the people when he says "capital and labor must work harmoniously together." Yes, they must, if he wishes to have an easy and workless life. As long as he can gull the people his life of affluence will be assured.

But can we exist without the capitalist? Decidedly, Yes. For if the toilers at present produce everything useful, they will also be able to do the same when the capitalist is improved off the face of the earth. The worker could himself enjoy the whole of that which he produces, and not have to keep idle drones as he is doing to-day.

The result of this clearance must be good both for the individual and for society. When the capitalist is no more, then poverty will be a thing of the past; but as long as capitalism flourishes, so long will poverty be in our midst. Progress must be hindered when we have a small class of people possessing all wealth, all instruments of production and all land practically, and doing with them as they like. Then it only remains for the toiler to take possession of these things and use them for the best possible benefit for the whole of the community, then and then only will the Golden Age be at hand, when

"Poverty shall be no more,
And happiness reign supreme;
And the Era of Peace be ushered in,
For man has awaked from his dream.
Yes! man has awaked from his dream."

The capitalist, like the parson, must go. There is no room in the industrial hive for drones; for each drone's consumption of food, etc., some one else must go short of some commodity or other. "They work not, neither do they spin," yet the earthly father—the worker—is fool enough to keep them and work for them. Society could get on very well without the capitalist, but as long as he remains chaos must continue. The capitalist is the enemy of progress, for he wishes the present state of things to continue. He has only his own selfishness and self-aggrandisement at heart. He cares not for the toiler, he only cares for that which he can press out of him. While the toilers are ignorant, his position will be secure; but when knowledge is partaken of, things will change. The worker will get his just rights, and the idle class of capitalists will either have to work or starve. They have been too long a burden upon labor, and they have kept labor down. Their turn will come to work for themselves. If they wont, then they may starve, for they are useless to themselves and useless to the worker.

G. E. CONRAD NAEWIGER.

* This is perfectly true of shareholders and all that large number of modern capitalists who take no active part in the industrial concerns carried on in their names. In the case of the earlier capitalists, who "made" these businesses, and of those modern capitalists who still put active and continual brain work into their concerns, the wrong is that a brain-worker, who may in himself be useful, takes advantage of his position as owner of capital to grab for himself the lion's share and to force his fellow-workers to take only a pittance; instead of sharing and sharing alike with them.—ED.

James M. Brown.

A BELOVED COMRADE AND GENIAL PROPAGANDIST.

IT would be a regrettable omission if a few words did not appear in *Freedom* commemorative of one of the most lovable spirits of our movement—James M. Brown, who died at Dore, near Sheffield, on the 7th of last month. Being one of his oldest comrades, it perhaps falls to me to perform that little duty.

Brown, together with his then inseparable chum, Dan McCulloch, became a member of the Glasgow Branch of the Socialist League immediately after its formation, early in the year 1885. I had previously known him in connection with the Secular Society as an enthusiastic student of Goethe and Carlyle, and was attracted towards him alike by what I had observed and what I had heard of his kindliness and self-abnegation.

He soon became one of the most earnest and helpful members of the League. Although not a public speaker, yet, by his good humour, good sense, and his remarkable gift of "chumminess" he exercised a most healthy and nurturing influence upon the propaganda. He attended all the meetings, indoor and outdoor, and sold literature. None of our propaganda excursions were successful without him—his snatches of song and amusing stories and comments enlivening our long tramps. He was always making converts, and ever and anon introduced to us new comrades of the most wonderfully diverse external and internal characteristics. He was a tailor by trade, and the confinement of his occupation, coupled with an organic weakness of the heart, brought him latterly into a state of serious ill-health and great physical suffering. Then it was that a comrade, better circumstanced socially, lifted him right out of the workshop, and gave him a chance of recovering his health by complete rest in the country—an act of rare comradeship that ought surely to be put upon record for the honour of the movement. In the course of a year or so his sojourn in the beautiful village of Comrie, in Perthshire, made Brown almost a new man, and he was able to resume work.

This he did in the town of Beith, Ayrshire, where he remained for about a year, making frequent visits to his old comrades in Glasgow. Some three years ago he removed to Dore, near Sheffield, at the solicitation of his friends R. F. Muirhead and Edward Carpenter. Brown at once became a favourite with the Sheffield Socialists and Anarchists, and did not a little to impart good humour and enthusiasm into their work. He, as he himself put it, "tried to keep them right by laughing at them when they went wrong." His enthusiasm during Dr. Creaghe's agitation, and his zealous efforts in defence of our Walsall comrades, are well known to the local comrades.

The above brief account of his career in the Socialist movement fails—as would any mere record however full—to give anyone who did not know him personally a notion either of his actual helpfulness to the propaganda or the remarkable and pleasant dominion which his friendship had over his comrades.

It is one of the huge blunders of our modern Journalistic system of publicity that only men who make big speeches or do great deeds are regarded as of importance in the making of every-day history. Looking back upon the early days of the propaganda in Glasgow, I am sure I can say that not one of the orators had a greater influence upon the members and the course of the movement than had Brown. At Comrie and Beith, and wherever else he took up his abode, he succeeded in quite a marvellous way in interesting men of all kinds in the movement—workmen and masters, students and artists, farmers and stable-boys; and invariably the local physician and policeman. Only a few days ago, being in Comrie, I was amused to hear one of his protegees—an elderly merchant who has grown grey in the prosaic business of dealing out groceries—talk as familiarly of Carpenter, Kropotkine, and Morris, and the Walsall police plot as though he had been in the thick of the propaganda during the last dozen years!

None who knew Brown will forget his beaming face, his infecting cheerfulness of disposition, his comical reproofs, his droll hypotheses, his quaint blasphemy, and, withal, his most serious and deeply sympathetic interest in problems affecting the wellbeing of the race. Nor will they forget his songs—we all knew Brown's songs!—"John Grumlie," "Quivedo," "Annie Laurie," "When the Stars," "The Marseillaise" etc. He made us all become poets and musicians!

There is surely no living being—man, woman, or child—yea, or animal, for he was a great friend of animals—that thinks otherwise than with affection of the "good, kind soul that is gone."

He was a type of the highly socialised and intellectually sensitive natures that are growing up and quietly presenting themselves in the midst of the alien conditions of our time.

Intense physical suffering, and the actual modifications which ill-health induces in mental temperament, may latterly have told somewhat on the original sweetness and altruism of his disposition; but in his earlier years, when in good health, he was certainly fitted to live, and be glad and make others glad, in a society of complete Anarchish Communism.

Our friend Edward Carpenter—who, with other Sheffield comrades, nursed him during his last illness—has taken charge of his papers, and intends, I understand, to publish a small selection of his poetical pieces.

It is a pity that his letters cannot be published. The simplicity of his style, his graphic descriptions of men and things, and the humour and fancifulness that flowed, limpid and bright, through every page, made them ever welcome and delightful messengers. His letters descriptive of the men and incidents of local

propaganda would, if collected, form an invaluable treasure of reminiscences of the Socialist agitation.

Among the last things he did before being laid up in bed, was to write an article intended for *Freedom*, which he almost completed. Perhaps it may yet appear.

"*By the door thou standest, wondering tenderly of him that is gone; presently the doorway shall be empty of thy form, and another shalt stand there wondering of thee.*"

Glasgow. J. BRUCE GLASIER.

Traitors to the Cause!

(From a Correspondent well acquainted with the Belgian labor movement.)

A FEW days ago Belgium was on the verge of a social revolution. Hundreds of thousands of workmen had struck work; conflicts had taken place in several localities between the strikers and the troops; in one or two cases the soldiers had joined the workmen, and the situation was so alarming that already the government was discussing the military intervention of Germany and England.

It is true this movement aimed apparently at nothing better than universal suffrage. But it matters little what the OCCASION is on which a revolution is started. All revolutions have had the humblest origins. There are different phases in a revolutionary movement: the flood rises by degrees. And it would be a mistake to expect that the Social Revolution must of necessity begin by a revolt with the definite object of establishing Socialism. Besides, what the Belgian workers understand by universal suffrage is difficult to define. Like the English workers in 1832, they have been given to believe that an extension of the suffrage means a better state of things altogether: more freedom, better food, a more human existence, and the end of all human injustices and the exploitation to which they are at present subject.

In time of peace it is our duty to point out to them that they are mistaken; but in time of action we Anarchist Socialists must never forget that, after all the misunderstanding as to the real meaning of words, the aspirations of the proletariat are at bottom the same as ours.

The situation in Belgium may be summed up in two sentences: the Social Democrats have played a farce—the very same farce they played in May 1890. And the Anarchists have kept aloof (with a few exceptions) from the movement, or have failed in the part they were called upon to take.

In 1890 the miners went on strike and called upon the leaders of the Social Democratic party to keep an old promise and proclaim a general strike. The labor party leaders promised them that, if the revision of the Constitution was not decided upon by the Chamber on a certain day, and universal suffrage agreed upon, the general strike should be proclaimed.

The day came, the Chamber had done nothing. The Social Democratic leaders were forced to issue a manifesto calling for a general strike. But at the end of a few days the said leaders took advantage of the fact that a committee of the Chamber had nominated one of its members to report on the question of the revision of the Constitution, and at once issued a counter-manifesto inviting the men to resume work. The result was that the report was not presented for months, the whole subject remained in obeyance, and after three years the only way to urge matters on a little seemed to be another general strike.

This time again the people have been diddled by their leaders, who have played into the hands of the middle classes by accepting as a victory the plural vote, which the Chamber has enacted. For those who honestly believe in universal suffrage as a panacea, this plural vote is a sham, and worse than a sham—an outrage on the working man. By giving to professional men and property owners three votes against the workman's one, it emphasises the worker's condition of inferiority, and the domination of the classes over the masses of the people. Practically the system will result in the triumph of the Catholic party at the next elections.

Yet the Social Democratic leaders have shouted "Victory" over this miserable fiasco, and have induced the workmen to resume work without taking advantage of the situation to obtain a single social reform.

And what have the Anarchists done? Where were they? They had lost their influence with the people by, for some time past, HOLDING ALOOF FROM THE LABOR MOVEMENT. They played their part beforehand in so far as the denunciation of universal suffrage goes; but when the moment came to act, not to discuss; when there was the opportunity to fight; when tens of thousands of people were assembled together, and only thirty gendarmes confronted them; when the people saw some of their ranks fall under the balls of the soldiers, no one was there to turn the uprising into a revolution!

CORRESPONDENCE.

HOW ANARCHIST COMMUNISM IS MISREPRESENTED.

Dear Comrades,—We must not think that the only people who misrepresent our principles are the capitalist press. Of late, another lot of individuals have come to light, to whose interest it is to misrepresent Anarchist Communism whenever they have the opportunity. I mean the paid lecturers, labour-leaders, and so-called Socialists. For example, the Peckham Branch S. D. F. put up H. Quelch to lecture on Anarchist Communism. At the outset, he stated he did not know what it was. Then he went on to condemn it by saying that the best expression of our theories is to be found in the Liberty and Property Defence League! And that we do not want organisation, but *absolute* freedom. This seems to be wilful misrepresentation. In last month's *Freedom*, under "Scotch Notes," we hear that Mrs. Aveling has been lecturing in Edinburgh for the Fabians. She told her hearers that Anarchists worked hand in hand with the police—went about blowing up buildings and taking innocent lives. In Glasgow, Andreas Scheu lectured for the labour army on "A Reply to our Opponents," and included Anarchists with them. He, too, misrepresented Anarchism in the usual manner.

Justice, the "organ of the social democracy," for April 1st, had two paragraphs on Anarchism, in which it misrepresented us in the usual way. It said we claimed to be ultra-revolutionists, but in reality were reactionists of the extreme type; it further stated that there is no iniquity perpetrated by the capitalists which could not be justified by the arguments of the Anarchists. Seeing this, I think we Anarchist Communists ought to attend the meetings, and keep a sharp look out for the paid lecturers and labour-leading sneaks who misrepresent our principles.—Yours in the cause,

W. BANHAM,
Peckham Anarchist Communist Group.

THE PROPAGANDA.

REPORTS.

LONDON—

Meetings carried on in parks and indoors with much energy and success. New stations have been opened. Full report held over for want of space.

Peckham.—On Good Friday we had a large meeting at Peckham Rye, addressed by comrades Atterbury and Tochatti, when we distributed among the holiday-folks several hundreds of old "Commonweals," "Freedom," etc. Sundays April 2 and 9, we had no meetings, comrades Morton and Atterbury disappointing us by not turning up. April 16 and 23, large meetings on the triangle, addressed by comrades Atterbury, Leggatt, and Banham. We have decided to drop these evening meetings for the present, and have one on Sunday mornings in future, in the lower part of Peckham—the working class quarter. *See* notices.

We have had inflicted on us, lately, in this district, one of those unfathomable politicians known as a "Social Democratic Labour Candidate," put forward to contest a seat on the Camberwell Board of Guardians. Now, these same Social Democrats are forever dinning in the ears of Anarchists that the only reason they run candidates is to propagate Socialism. Yet, here, not the least mention was ever made of Socialism at their meetings, the candidate being actually advised by one of the leading local S. D. F. men to "keep Socialism in the background," or his chances of success would be very remote. The Social Democrats, having, seemingly, taken this advice, we Anarchist Socialists decided to bring Socialism to the *front*; which we accordingly did, by distributing at their meetings thousands of old "Commonweals," and leaflets explaining the only true Socialism—Anarchist Socialism.

PROVINCES—

Aberdeen.—We have recommenced our Sunday evening open-air meetings in Castle-street. Crowds already attend. Large sales of papers and pamphlets. Duncan and Shepherd have held a meeting in the thinly populated agricultural district of Dursie.—On the 18th, Duncan spoke at a meeting of dock laborers, for the purpose of reorganising their Trade Union, and was enthusiastically received. All the boys are working hard and earnestly.

Manchester.—Out-door meetings every Sunday at Stevenson-square, 3.30; New Cross, 7.30. Members' meetings every Tuesday, at 8, in the Labour Church Institute, St. John's Parade, Deansgate. New members being added to our list—some quondam Social Democrats.—Comrade H. Stockton lectured, Feb. 17th, at the Salford S. D. F. Club, on "Why I am an Anarchist;" good discussion, in a most friendly spirit. Other lectures have been delivered, some at Rochdale and Wigan, by Barton, Stockton, and Kelly, and opportunities used of making propaganda in public meetings advocating Protection, &c. April 8th, Stockton and a temperance reformer debated on "Marriage." We joined the Salford S. D. F. in the celebration of the Commune. March 14th—Kropotkine here. Social evening at the Labour Church Institute

Leicester.—Vigorous open-air propaganda. We have just started work in several large villages.—On Sunday, April 16th, our comrade John Turner paid us a visit, and did a splendid day's work for the cause. Morning, large meeting, Russell-square. Evening, good meeting. Lecture in Gallow-tree-gate Chapel, on "Socialism, and how to obtain it." A lively correspondence in local papers has resulted.

NOTICES.

LONDON—

Whitechapel.—A meeting of friends of the movement was held at 20, Hutchison-street, Aldgate, E., on April 14th, in which it was resolved (1) to form an Anarchist Communist Group, taking as its basis the determination of its members to use all means in their power to overthrow the present evil state of society; (2) that the group be called the "Fraternity Group;" and (3) that half a quire of *Freedom* should be taken every month, and that we affiliate with the other groups in existence. It is our intention, as soon as it is practicable, to form a club, and with that object in view the secretary has been requested to write to the secretaries of the various groups in London, asking them to agree to our affiliation.—The group will meet at the following address, *pro tem.* Communications to be addressed to organising secretary Frank Baker, 20, Hutchison-street, Middlesex-street, London, E.

Peckham.—On Sunday, May 14th, and every Sunday after, at 11.30, a meeting will be held at the corner of Commercial-road (opposite the Gas Works), Old Kent-road. Help wanted with speakers.

SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR SUPPORT OF LITTLE VICTOR NICOLL.

RECEIVED FROM MARCH 23rd TO APRIL 23rd:—

Anon, 2s. 6d.; Pope list, 3s.; R. Avis, 1s.; E. N. G., 2d.; Collection by Rose, 4s. 6d.; Aberdeen comrades' collection after Sunday meeting, 9s.

Comrades who remember D. J. Nicoll's self-sacrificing efforts in the movement; are requested to do what they can to prevent his little boy from wanting anything during his father's imprisonment. Comrade Nicoll has still about nine months to endure.

All communications should be addressed to M. Galbraith, Club Autonomie, 6, Windmill-street, Tottenham-court-road, W.

Donations to FREEDOM *Publication Fund.*—Locklaw, 9d.; Glasman, Is. 6d., Anon, 6d.; H. Glasse (Cape Colony), 10s.

C. C. DAVIS'S FOOD FUND.

(LAST LIST.)

Macdonald, 5s.; Warren, 2s. 6d.; Brownlee, 2s. 6d.

Printed and published by C. M. Wilson, 61, St. Augustine's-road, Camden-town, London, N.W.