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A JOURNAL OF

ANARCHIST COMMUNISM

WILLIAM REEVES, 185, FLEET STREET, E.C.
The so-called "Progressives" of the London County Council, and the Duty of Socialists.

By T. BATAS.

The London County Council has far outdone the old Metropolitan Board of Works in the proportion of superfluous officials to useful workers, and it has actually raised the previously enormous salaries paid by the old Board. The party on the Council which falsely calls itself "Progressive," supposes that the fat and most costly forms of the bricolage, dressing at the letter of a law, as against the spirit; and this to secure private advantage.

The Municipal Corporations Act very properly provides against public corruption, but its members, but it contains a clause which allows advertisements to be inserted in a newspaper even though a councillor may have a share in such newspaper. So-called Progressives on the Council have taken advantage of this exception to have a journal published only by themselves, and they put into such Council advertisements as they vote for. This scandal was duly protested against by Mr. Boultmore and other members; but the party of straightforwardness and honour was outvoted by the traitors Progressives.

It has been claimed that the Progressive party on the London County Council in some way represents Socialism, or Socialist action, it becomes necessary for Socialists of every grade to repudiate such which in its spirit and activity is unconscious and a calculated to disgrace Socialism in the eyes of honest persons.

In order to make clear how the action of the London County Council is essentially in opposition to the aspirations and aims of the real Progressives, it is desirable to briefly refer to the socialist conditions of the formation of the Socialistic party.

The basis of the Progressive or Socialist movement is to abolish the present system of giving the least pay to those who work hardest; while hereditary landlords who, like the Duke of Westminster, do no work, receive the largest incomes.

One third of the produce of industry in Great Britain is taken by landlords, bondholders, and shareholders, who do no work for that which they take; and of the remaining two thirds, one portion goes to the working classes in the form of wages, £100 per annum or the remaining third goes to a much smaller class of persons, who are largely engaged in work of superhuman effort, and who have incomes of more than £300 per annum. This class subsidises on its own what has been called the "extra-wage" of self-respect, but it is not only will show the "extra-wage" is mainly taken by useless bogons on the landholding, bondholding and shareholding classes. Their "extra-wage," indeed their whole wage, is for the most part paid to them for assisting to support the idle classes, the remuneration of which is in the usual practice never paid. This parasite class apes the manners and extravagant habits of the class it serves and so insists on a high salary. On the other hand, persons of notable ability or genius do not make a large salary the condition of exercising their calling, nor indeed they are generally willing to make a pecuniary sacrifice in order that they may do such work as they are specially qualified to do; and the early history of most great men contains a chapter prefixed to some sacrifice. In the competitive system it is improbable that persons of exceptional genius would be quite ready to exercise that genius at less than the usual rate of remuneration. Suppose, for example, that the painter Millais had the option between receiving the fees paid on the one hand, and painting on the other hand; can it be supposed that he would fail to choose the latter, even if the pay were somewhat less.

The main objects of all real Progressives are threefold:
1. To prevent the idle classes (landlords, bondholders, shareholders) from appropriating their usual third of the produce of industry. Secondly to bring into the ranks of the useful workers, not only all idlers, but also those who have hitherto been engaged in the pernicious operation of siphoning off value from the workers in the pockets of the idle class. Such increase in the number of the workers should be so organised as to shorter working hours for all and ensure leisure for high education and culture. Thirdly, the Socialist party aims at securing for all workers, as nearly as practicable the same rate of remuneration.

Those who, like the so-called Progressive section of the London County Council, have preferred to obtain efficient directors of industry by giving enormous salaries, have completely failed; the first result has been that capable persons, seeking the use of their talent, bring into play. In fact, in the case of the most notorious cases of bribe-taking and other corruption which have occurred in the course of office, the fact has been admitted, sometimes even by Progressives of the London County Council have actually asserted that it is necessary to pay high salaries in order to keep the ineficient directors away from other forms of robbery. If the officials are such that they can only be dismissed by getting them "sacked" in another and more secure way, we had better have a change at once.

Until the time arrives when all workers, whether handicrafts men, professional men, councillors, members of Parliament, or any other public office, receive salaries at the same rate of remuneration, there will be no far-fetched social reform, no hope of securing the best and most specially qualified persons in each department; till then, there must be a full measure of justice, and that strife for positions of special advantage in which the worst must triumph.

In all industry must now organised on the basis of commission officials taking enormous salaries) adopted by the false Progressives of the London County Council, the workers in Great Britain would be far worse off than under the most grinding forms of capitalism, and would rise to a smaller scale of industry, industry; political wire-pullers, chairmen and deadhead officials having far more than landholders, shareholders and bondholders now take.

Until members of Parliament and all public officials are paid for their services the people have no free choice in sending representa- tive, and scarce any option but to send them to the very worst to that class which lives idly upon interest, usufruct, or profit; as the workers cannot now spare time to serve in Parliament. Members of Parliament may vote on many means by which they will until further fill their pockets to the detriment of the work.

For example—jubbing with companies and other business concerns, or getting office. In short, although Parliamentary members are not at present paid in England, and by this reason the straight- forward workers are kept out, there are high speculative inducements which attract the corrupt and unscrupulous. Members of Parliament who devote their whole time to the work should be paid normal wages (at present from 3s. to 4s. per week), and a grave danger to society must result if they are paid more than the £200, in the United States of America, where the high pay to legislators has attracted the worst and made the political system a sink of corruption.

Above all, workers should beware of those false and false seeking agencies who contend that they can and should be specially high rates of pay; all social reform and purify of public bodies hinges on the normal rate of pay for all public representatives and officials. By this course not only will the place-hunters be kept out, but there will be a cut-off tendency towards raising above them all public officials who have studied theory and evolution, this mistake would not have been made.

Real action would have been taken towards nationalising those industries which have become organized in the gradual evolution of society—such as gas supply, water supply and railway transport. This has been done by the very obvious plan of distributing the companies for every infraction of duty, and at the same time striving to obtain legislative consent to the very obvious principle that each as assembled from, fraud, or failure in duty, should be judged by a fine and capital value of public ownership on the share list. This would be confiscation it may be said, but, even according to Tory principles, misuse property may be legally confiscated; as, for example, burglars taken the stock of a bank. And if absolute confiscation on public ownership, and unamendable property should be taken up nationally.

Now for the practical conclusion, as bearing on the coming Constitution:

Oppose at every opportunity and denounce as traitors to the Socialistic cause all who will not pledge themselves to support

1. Normal Wages and no more, for all who hold public offices, and devote their whole time to the work.

2. The immediate nationalisation—as far as circumstances allow—of industries, which, like gas, water, railways and tramways are already organised and ready for national ownership.

3. Prosecution of monopolist companies for every offense, and advocating of a pro rata writing in of public ownership on the share books for every offence or failure in duty. This would be the creation of new shares to be owned by the people at large.

A New Magazine.

The International Magazine is the title of a new quarterly periodical published by the International Communist, published at Paris. The object of this periodical is stated in the words of Goethe: "National literature has no more meaning to-day the time for universal literature is coming, and every one must now work to hasten the time." In the April number English literature is well-represented by Swinburne. There are large contributions by Walt Whitman, and others. Our comrade Bernard Layare has an article upon the New University of Brussels, where are our com- mune. We wish this new review a long and active life, for it has a useful mission to help in the destruction of frontiers between all countries.

The Commune Celebration.

The North London Progressive Society will hold a meeting to commemorate the anniversary of the Commune of Paris at the Millen Hall, Hollow Crecent, Kentish Town, on Monday, March 17th. P. Kro-
tkin, Louise Michel, J. Turner, E. Leggatt, A. Smith, J. Tochatt, and others will speak. All London Anarchists should attend and make this meeting a success.
THE COMMUNE OF PARIS.

By LOUISE MICHEL.

PART II.

THE REPUBLIC OF THE FOURTH OF SEPTEMBER, KNOWN AS

"THE GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE."

CHAPTER I.

On Sept. 2nd, rumors of victory circulated in Paris. They emanated from suspicious sources, and had recurred at each defeat. The graver the defeat, the more persistent were such rumors. Paris was in rebellion the whole day. During the following night, and on the 3rd and 4th of Sept. the truth was increasingly suspected. At the demand of Palikao, who admitted that disturbing despatches had been received, a night sitting was held of the Corps-Legislatif. Groups waited about Palikao. In the Placards, along the thoroughfares, felt a premonition of the final break-up. A young man who affirmed the defeat in face of the post of good news, was mortally wounded by the sergents de ville.

The next day (Sunday) those who during their night vigil had not already witnessed its affixing on the walls of Paris, read the following announcement:

PROCLAMATION OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS TO THE FRENCH PEOPLE.

"Frenchmen, a great misfortune has befallen the country. After three days of heroic struggle on the part of Marshal MacMahon's army against 500,000 of the enemy, 40,000 men have been taken prisoners. General Wimpffen, who, in consequence of Marshal MacMahon being seriously wounded, had taken command of the army, has also signed a capitulation. This cruel reverse, however, does not shake our courage. Paris is at present in a state of defence. The military forces of the country will be organized in a few days, and there will be a new army beneath the walls of Paris. Another army is the one in the hands of the Loire. Your patriotism, your union, your energy will save France. The Emperor has been made prisoner in the struggle. The Government, in concert with the public authorities, will take all measures to avert the gravity of the situation."

(Council of Ministers.)

The Republic was proclaimed, and the Government of National Defense was conducted at the Hotel de Ville. It was composed as follows: 1. Emmanuel Arago; 2. Cremieux (Minister of Foreign Affairs); 4. Julius Ferva; 4. Gambetta (Minister of the Interior); 6. Garnier Pathe; 6. Glais Bizot; 7. Eugene Pelletan; 8. Ernest Peard (Minister of Finance); 9. Jules Simon (Minister of Public Instruction); 10. Henri Rochefort; 11. Trocho (Governor of Paris, and Minister of War).

The word "Republic" electrified Paris; and full of new courage as we felt, defence seemed possible.

The fifteen forts, armed like war-ships, were garrisoned by hardy volunteers. On the ramparts there were a thousand guns, good, bad, and indifferent, that the Parisians swore that Paris could never be surrendered. Even though our confidence was not great in many members of the Defence, we were far from supposing them so pusillanimous and feeble that they proved in the event. It would have seemed that, according to the myth of the wheel which it was left by the Empire, they must of necessity reverse the wheels. But since they were afraid of revolution, they were of course unable to resist it.

Julius Ferva, in his "History of the Government of National Defense", relates the only time they had not been compelled to accept revolutionists as its members. "Violent appeals were made to Mons. Gambetta, who energetically repudiated the name of Felix Plast, on the very same grounds, however, which made it impossible to reject that of Mons. Simon. It is known that Mons. Plast has said in reference to Rochefort, "He is safer inside than outside."

At the sitting of the Corps-Legislatif, the names of the members of the Government were officially announced.

Meanwhile, what mattered the lack of spirit on the part of the directors? The people had spirit enough. The name of "Republican" world, we thought, now guaranteed victory, as in 1792 it had avowed to produce a thicker harvest under the hands of the labourers, who, stimulated by believing themselves free, had thrown more energy into the loom and the soil.

The necessity of boldness was so thoroughly felt that even in so moderate a journal as Le Social, P. Joiniaux wrote (under the heading "To us, the audacious") in the following terms: "In difficult circumstances it is prompt intelligence, and unwonted hardihood that are needed. To us belong the daring, the audacity, the undisciplined sergents de ville are our men. Idea and Action must alike be free. Do not interfere with us, nor repugnate us; but relieve us, once for all, of old yokes and leading strings. Such is the advice given to us by the other day by our friend Jourdan; and the advice is sound."

Not only were these currents of audacity dried up in an interminable succession of delays and treacheries that supervened, but there were repetitions and falsified mutinies; the despots were only overpowered; but never destroyed; on this hand, every sort of privation endured by the combatants (whose courage nevertheless remained unshaken); on the other hand, scandalous fortunes made by the providers. Moreover, the arrival of the officers themselves, the War Office, a neopolis whose all possibility of progress was banished. The single battle which had been armed completely and with weapons of better quality, was that which was appointed to guard the Ministers themselves, and was composed entirely of their own employees. General Guad had replied to those who spoke to him of breach-loading cannons—"Don't speak to me of that stupid business; Dorian was so long in obtaining the wherewithal to get the guns made, that they were only ready too late; and after all, the arming of the sergents de ville was only extended by the necessity for it." Strasbourg, which had been invested by the Prussians on August 13th, capitulated on Sept. 28th. On that very day volunteers went about Paris, their numbers augmenting at every step, asking for the guns. Strasbourg to be relieved, or least to be joined with her at the head of the ramparts. These demonstrations, were dispersed, and their deputies, Andre Leo and I, were only granted an audience in order to be taken into custody. The detention, however, was only for a duration, a member of the Government having ordered to be set at liberty. We were not told which member did us this service, but we were very sure as to which of them had not done it. "What can it matter to you whether Strasbourg perish or not? You are safe there!"—This was said to us at the Hotel de Ville, by a colonel of Trochu's army.

In the midst of the general depression the courage of the women, whether bourgeois or proletarian, did not flag for an instant; it seemed as if the spirit of the Gauls, long ago subdued within them, were again on the "Society for Aiding the Victims of War," the women of the people on the "Committees of Vigilance."—these and those were alike busy on the ambulances, while none of them would hear a word of surrender.

During this time the wicked dwarf whom the bourgeoisie knew as Mons. Thiers, and whom we called "Fontiquet," was making the round of the courts of Europe.

On Oct. 31st, Paris on awakening read the following paper, which accompanied the news of the surrender of Mota by Bazaine:

"Mons. Thiers has to-day arrived in Paris, and repaired at once to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in order to report to the Government the result. The Convention, in the strong impression produced throughout Europe by the resistance of Paris, four great neutral Powers—England, Russia, Austria, and Italy—have rallied to a common idea. They propose an armistice to the belligerents, having for its object the convocation of a National Assembly. It is, of course understood that such an armistice should have as its conditions a re-adjustment proportionate to its duration and the election of the assembly by the whole country."

Signed, The Minister of Foreign Affairs, par interim, for the Minister of the Interior, Jules Parre.

Then just as on Sept. 4th there had been heard the cry "Vive la Republique!" so now on Oct. 31st there were shouts of "Vive la Commune!" Paris did not wish to surrender. Moreover, she desired to save herself; she had had enough of "deliverers." Groups gathered, repeating persistently, The Commune had the people gone on Sept. 4th to the Corps-Legislatif, so now on Oct. 31st they trooped to the Hotel de Ville.

Floquet, who spoke of dippings the municipality of Paris once more into universal suffrage, could not make himself heard. Neither MacMahon, nor Jules Simon said in reference to "la Commune," drowned all else, and the crowd displayed a sheet on which one read: "No Armistice! Vive la Republique! Resist to the Death!"

It rained. The weather was in keeping with the strange scene. Crepuscular incidents occurred. The building of the building with a strong disposition to force it open. One or two, however, thought them of knocking, or of simply beating upon the door. It was supposed inside that some members of the Government had arrived. The door was opened, and the crowd invaded the Hotel de Ville.

To be continued.
NOTICE.

The day of the Commune celebration is Sunday, March 17th, at Milton Hall, not Tuesday, as stated on page 116. A meeting will be held on Monday, March 18th, 9 a.m., at the Lecture Hall, Hack Road, Tidal Basin, when P. Kropotkin and others will speak.

LIBERTY.
LONDON MARCH, 1895.

Between Ourselves

This paragraph is strictly in order. You want to know why LIBERTY for this month has been delayed in publication. The reason is that the editor and several of his co-workers have been seriously ill; this, we venture to think, will be sufficient explanation; this also accounts for several important notes being crowded out.

KROPOTKIN ON COLONIZATION.

A number of our comrades resident in the North of England have decided to establish a communal colony, and are negotiating for plots of land, and unless unforeseen difficulties present themselves at the eleventh hour, the colony will be established either on Tyneside or Wearside. Our comrade Kropotkin has been invited to become treasurer of the fund, which has rendered him the following answer:

Viola Cottage, Bromley, Kent, Feb. 16, 1895.

Dear Comrade,—Thank you very much for your kind letter and extremely clear statements of the facts. Thank you still more for your trust in me. But I must say to you that, as I am a communistic person, as I was never able to abide accounts of my own earnings and spendings. Moreover, I rarely have time.

As to your scheme, I must own that I have little confidence in schemes of communal communities started under the present conditions, and always regret to see men and women going to suffer all sorts of privations in order, in most cases, to find only disappointment at the end; retarding for many years the work of propaganda of ideas among the great masses, and of aid to the masses in their organization, for making an experiment which has many chances for being a failure.

But I must say to you that your scheme undoubtedly has several points which give it much more chance of success than some previous experiments were in possession of. For years I have preached that once there are men decided to make such an experiment it must be made.

(1.) Not in distant countries, where they would find, in addition to their own difficulties, all the hardships which a pioneer of culture has to cope with in an unpeopled country (and I only too well know by my own and my friends' experience how great those difficulties are), but the neighborhood of large cities. In such case every member of the community can enjoy the many benefits of civilization, and the struggle for life is easier, on account of the facilities for taking advantage of the work done by our forefathers, and, for profiting by the experience of our neighbours, and every member who is disillusioned with communal life can at any given moment return to the material conditions of the present society. One, in such case, enjoy the intellectual, scientific, and artistic life of the civilization without necessarily abandoning the community.

(2.) That a new community, instead of imitating the example of our forefathers, and starting with extensive agriculture, with all its hardships, accidents, drawbacks, and amount of hard work required, very often superior to the forces of the colonists, ought to open new ways of production as it opens new ways of consumption. It must, as we said, start with intensive agriculture—that is, market gardening, as much as possible, and it is classic glass. Besides the advantages of security in the crops, obtained by their variety and the very means of culture, this sort of culture has the advantage of allowing the community to utilize even the weakest forces, and every one knows how very Walters are by the homestead conditions under which most of the industries are now organized.

(3.) That the first condition of success, as proved by the American and the Russian communes, is to divest communism from its monastic garb and employ garments, and to receive it as the life of independent families, united together by the desire of obtaining material and moral wellbeing by combining their efforts. The theory, according to which families have entirely been destroyed in order to obtain some economy in fuel in the kitchen, or in the space of the dining rooms, is utterly false; and it is most certain that the Young Icarans are absolutely correct in introducing as much as possible of family and friendly grouping life, even in the ways they are taking their meals.

(4.) It seems to me proved to evidence, that, men being neither the angels nor the slaves they are supposed to be by the authoritarian Utopians, Anarchist principles are the only ones under which a community has any chances to succeed. In the hands of a few communities of which I have had the opportunity to read, I always saw that the introduction of any sort of elected authority has always been, without one single exception, the point which the community strangled upon; while, on the other hand, we see a partial and sometimes very substantial success, which accepted no authority besides the unanimous decision of the folk-moot, and preferred, as a rule, a couple of hundred of millions of Salavonian peasants do, and as the German Communists in America did so long as a unanimous, decision of the folk-moot could be arrived at. Communities, who are bound to live in a narrow circle of a few individuals, in which circle the petty struggle for dominion are the more acutely felt, and who, incidentally to abandon the principle of management, and majority rule, they must bend before the reality of practice which is at work for many hundreds of years in hundreds of thousands of village communities—the folk-moot—and they must remember that in these communistic communities majority rules of elected government have always been synonymous with concomitant with Disintegration—never with consolidation.

To these four points I have come, from what I know of communal communities, such as those formed by Russians and West Europeans who had no theoretical communities, but ventured no theoretical views, but simply put down on paper or verbally told me what they had lived through. Misery, disillusion, life, and the consequent growth of the spirit of intrigue for power, have always been the two chief causes of unsuccess.

Now, as far as I see from your letter, the community which you try to bring into existence takes the above four points as fundamental, and in so doing it has, I believe, as many more chances of success. In point of fact, these four points I have made in the paragraph you are, of course, beforehand. It is to do all possible for reducing home-work to the lowest minimum, and to find out for this purpose, and to invest if necessary, all possible arrangements. In new communities this is the very matter in which the woman and the girl remained in the new society as they were in the old—those of the community. Arrangements to reduce as much as possible the incredible amount of work which our women multiply especially in the rearing of the children. Work, as, in my opinion, as essential to the success of a community as the proper arrangement of the fields, the greenhouses, and the communal work, or, more in my opinion, the most perfect embodiment, it seldom pays attention to the squandering of the forces of the house slave, the woman. Some steps in advance have been made in Guise's familistere. Others could wisely be found out. But, with all that, a community started within the present society has to begin with many almost fatal difficulties.

The absence of communist spirit is, perhaps, the least of them. While the fundamental features of human character can only be modified by a very slow evolution, the relative amount of individualism, mutual aid and sports common the most changeable features of man. Both being equally products of an anterior development, their relative amounts are seen in character and even societies with a rapidity which would strike the sociologist if he only reflected on the subject the slightest fact.

The chief difficulty is in the smallness itself of the community. In a large community, the perversities of every character are smoothed, they are less important and less remarked. In a small group, on the contrary, the character and the individuality, the contact is too close, and, what is worse, the individual features of character acquire an undue importance, as they bear upon the whole life of the community. The familiar example of the 20 passengers who sail in one boat, or the 90 passengers of a steamboat, who soon begin to hate each other for small defects of individual character, is well worthy of note.
In order to succeed, the communist experiment, being an experiment in human accommodability, ought to be made on a grand scale. A whole city or, at least 20,000 inhabitants, ought to organize itself for self-managed consumption of necessities, life, houses, and essential furnishing, food and clothing, with a large development of free access for the satisfaction of the highest artistic, scientific and literary needs and hobbies—before it be possible to say anything about the experimentally tested capacities, or capacities, of our contemporaries for an entire new way of life. (By the expression the experiment is not an assemblage as it might seem at the first sight.)

The next great difficulty is this. We are not savages who can begin a tribe with a hut and a few arrows. Even if no hunting laws did exist, we shall need something—some addition to our home for protection and for some better stimulants for higher life than a drop of whisky supplied by the trader in exchange for fur. But in most cases, a communist community is compelled to start with even less than that, as it is burdened by the necessity of having to be organized to settle upon.

And so the community colonies which have hitherto been attempted, to say nothing of the work of the huts, is this I could not insist too much upon your wise decision of starting intensive culture under the guidance of experienced gardeners—that is, the most remunerative of all branches of agriculture.

And finally, there is the difficulty with which all such colonies had to contend. The moment they begin to succeed, prosperous, their numbers are inflated by new comers—mostly the unsuccessful in the present life, these who were wrenched between a long series of out of work life and privations, of which few of the rich ones have the slightest idea. What they ought to have before setting to work would be rest on good food, and then set to hard work. This difficulty is as the communists say, the theft of the rich that was necessary for all the communist colonies which have hitherto been attempted, to say nothing of the work of the huts. And knowing this fact, is this I could not insist too much upon your wise decision of starting intensive culture under the guidance of experienced gardeners—that is, the most remunerative of all branches of agriculture.

And then comes in the difficulty of men being not accustomed to hard agricultural work, navvies' work and building trades work—that is, exactly those sorts of work which are most in request in the young colony.

And finally, there is the difficulty with which all such colonies had to contend. The moment they begin to succeed, prosperous, their numbers are inflated by new comers—mostly the unsuccessful in the present life, these who were wrenched between a long series of out of work life and privations, of which few of the rich ones have the slightest idea. What they ought to have before setting to work would be rest on good food, and then set to hard work. This difficulty is as the communists say, the theft of the rich that was necessary for all the communist colonies which have hitherto been attempted, to say nothing of the work of the huts. And knowing this fact, is this I could not insist too much upon your wise decision of starting intensive culture under the guidance of experienced gardeners—that is, the most remunerative of all branches of agriculture.

It is this why is one of the central principles of communism and proclaim themselves individualists—small bourgeoisie, who have succeeded and will keep for themselves the wealth of their province, in which the communist principle having once been abandoned, the community is doomed to fail under the duality which has crept in; or, they accept the new comers with an unfriendly feeling ("they know nothing of the hardships we have had to go through," the old stock say), and gradually they lose interest in the commune as a whole whose numbers soon exceed the capital to be worked with. For a communist colony, the whole success thus becomes a cause of ultimate failure.

This is why some of the Labor leaders in America and their sympathizers from the Chicago middle classes who intended during the last Chicago strike to retire to some remote state of the Union, and there start with a socialist territory which they would have defended against aggression from without, had more chances of success than a colony.

Here is, dear comrade, what I had to say in answer to your letter. By no means should I like to discourage you and your comrades. I simply think that "forewarned means forearmed." The better one sees the difficulty, the better he can cope with it. Once you feel inclined to attempt the experiment, although knowing all its difficulties, there must be no hesitation in making it. Earnest men will always find out in it something to learn themselves and to teach their comrades.

Once your intentions go this way, certainly go on! You have some more chances of success than many of your forerunners, and I am sure you will find sympathies in your way. Mine will certainly follow you, and if you think that the publication of this letter can bring you any help, be it to an open letter to comrades intending to start a Communist colony. Yours fraternally.

P. KROPOTKIN.

This expresses the Anarchist-Communist's point of view with regard to colonization as well. But there is no occasion to answer Comrade Phipson's article—L.R.

WHY I AM A BELIEVER IN COLONIZATION.

BY E. A. PHIPSON.

Because, however magnificent the idea of arousing the whole world to overthrow the power of the landlord and landlord, the forces sustaining vested interests are so enormous that generations must elapse before they succumb to direct attack, whether by political, revolutionary or oratory methods; whereas I want to see those who are actually suffering enabled to escape from their poverty and misery.

Because the desire among the mass of mankind, and even many of the poorest, to become themselves "independent" (i.e., to live on the labor of others) is so widespread, the gambling instinct so strong, and the willingness to earn an honest living by steady work so rare, that even those who would chiefly benefit by the abolition of capitalism would for the most part oppose it.

Because reform cannot be simultaneous over the whole earth, and if one country may adopt a new social system—before another so may one part of a country, or a colony settled expressly for the purpose.

Because the great majority of people, though impregnable to theorizing and argument, are convinced at once by solid facts, and a single colony where men were actually enjoying the full fruits of their industry could not fail, when such had become appreciably larger than wages outside, to convert the most obtuse.

Because there are so many schools of reformers, whose efforts simply neutralize and defeat each other when endeavouring to convert a whole country; while colonies, into which the adherents of each could converge, would enable them without hindrance to carry out their views. Thus any colony could be divided into districts, all having their own distinct systems, and then the relative prosperity of each would be the best criterion of the soundness of its principles.

Because, while the adherents of one school when isolated can do but little, they may have complete power, when congregated into a colony, to give effect to their ideas, being unhindered by the apathetic or hostile.

Because, the pleasure of living together with those holding similar views would render such a colony most agreeable to members and attractive to outsiders.

Because, such colonies require nothing but the small initial expenses of buying or emigrating to the land chosen, and making the first start, for when industry was once organized, wealth would grow so rapidly that further aid from outside would be needless.

Because, even if the advantages of co-operation in manufactures are attainable without removal to a colony, combination in the equally important matter of domestic work is impossible among those living in isolated dwellings, scattered in different parts of a city or country, while the heavy expenses of distribution over such extended areas, and above all, the high ground rents which would have to be paid to town-owners, and which would be gradually raised as the prosperity of the community increased, would absorb much of the pecuniary income resulting from members' efforts.

Because in this manner, without any direct attack on vested interests or consequent interference by law or public opinion, the power of capital would indirectly but most effectually be undermined by withdrawing labor from the market and progressively increasing the standard of comfort. And as the colonies would be open to all who agreed with their principles, outside workers would be able to demand a constantly higher rate of wages under threat of joining the colonies.

Because there is thus no question of forming little Arcadia, or of deserting the general Labor cause. Every such colony would exert the most immediate and powerful effect on the condition of workers everywhere, and would form at once a refuge and a citadel in which workers could make sure of obtaining their full earnings and could defy the power of their former oppressors.

Therefore any propaganda work that may be necessary could be far more effectively carried on from such a colony where all were in the enjoyment of plenty and had ample leisure than in odd moments snatched under great difficulties from time needed to earn a living under capitalism.

Because the average man does not care one jot for reforms that will only benefit future generations, but will throw his whole strength into a scheme which he clearly sees will benefit himself.
PARLIAMENTARY POLITICS IN THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT.

BY ERRICO MALATESTA.

II.—Socialism and Parliamentaryism (continued from No. 14).

From the very beginning, socialism, in its critical judgment, had estimated universal suffrage and the whole parliamentary framework as not its true value. Had they been otherwise, nationalism would have been no reason for the existence of socialism as a separate part, as it would have been mistaken, as far as regards practical purposes, that constitute the life of parties, for the absurd Liberal Utopia that expects harmony, peace and general well-being from "the competition between rich and poor", and from putting into practice the principle of "one man one vote."

Socialism in the broadest and most authentic meaning of the word signifies society constituted on the principle of well-being of liberty and individual development and progressive for all the members—for all human beings. Starting from the fundamental truth that the moral and intellectual faculties can only be evolved when material wants have been previously satisfied, it is clear that there can be no harmony and solidarity. Socialism recognized that slavery in all its forms, political, moral, and material, results from the economic dependence of the workers on those who possess the land, the raw material, and the instruments of production. And since the exploitation of the masses had produced not only several fallacious and utopian systems, Socialism found at last a firm basis in the principle, scientifically demonstrated, of the justice, utility and necessity of socializing wealth and power.

The aim being thus determined, it was necessary to seek the ways and means of maintaining it. During this period, the Socialists, as soon as they emerged from the period of abstract speculation and began to convince the masses and to try their strength in the political struggle, found themselves placed by an iron circle that could only be broken by violence. Socialism had proved it impossible to be free without being economically independent. On the other hand, the manner of independent existence of a man is a slave? Man, deprived of all protection of the proletariat are such, that some of their resources are absurd and ridiculous, and the others are powerless and illusory as long as they remain within legal bounds.

There are only two ways out of the difficulty: either the government changes its course of thought, because this weapon has to use any value presupposes consciousness and independence in the numerical majority of the people, and it is precisely the problem to render these qualities possible and to conquer them. And moreover the consciousness of the workers is not confused with the helplessness, or, when terrified by their threatening demands, they see therein a means of leading them astray and lulling them to sleep. In this bitter case, from every point of view, it were folly to be satisfied with it. As the Socialists defeated the vote, the workers, too, knows the vote, will it and to juggle with it, and if by chance it proved itself hostile to its interests, they know how to suppress it. Then the only thing left to the people is the Revolution, that the vote ought to have rendent

Questions for Anarchists.

The following answers are from E. Pouget (Père Paixard).

1. Our idea has nothing in common with that of the Christian paradise: it does not imply passive acceptance of evils, and still less the abdication of human beings. To say that the man who has made an effort to ameliorate the present state of things, leads to obedience, and to the admission, as truth, of a host of absurdities, of which the greatest consists in believing that "the greater the misery, the greater the dignity," in the words of the Jesuits. If the idea is true, there would be nothing left for us but to fold our arms, rejoin the "Duchats" and endure with them more and more that the Revolution should come more rapidly. In reality the spirit of revolt declines in proportion as misery is intensified, and grows with misery diminished. The better social conditions become, the more violent will be the spirit of revolt and the more we will approach the realization of the anarchist ideal.

2. It follows from what I have just said that the revolt is not to be provoked by action in favor of the masses, but only by the masses themselves. At the same time, the masses themselves must be strong and determined, and free to think, to act, and to resist the efforts of the state to make them into bankruptcy by their extreme demands, so that the employers may begin to consider this their condition a troublesome burden. And never lose sight of, never forget that all present claims are but accessories, the final aim being communal expropriation. In politics, anarchist activity must tend to cut down the power of the state, to reduce it to its true and when they are reduced to zero; to expropriate itself from its illusory. Under which system has this resistance the greater chance of bearing fruit? If you go in for governmental action, (even in the opposite) yourself in an anarchistic community has been already acquired in the existence of the state, you have given it a part of your strength. The best way is to fight the state without taking part in its functions; by creating a world around you it weaken it. Besides you must enter in the community that depends on you iniative. Where State influence is nil, or where it is felt, endeavour to destroy it. Act, in these circumstances so as to prepare in the present society by the development of individual initiative, the aggravation of elements that in a future society, the State being destroyed, will replace it in the few real economic functions it had monopolized. If it be able to believe in the necessity of existence.

No Necessity to work.

PULLEN: "I worked hard trying to get a Government clerkship, but I'm going to take a rest now."

Pouget: "You've given up trying, have you?"

PULLEN: "Oh, no; I secured the place."

Assuming the working age be from twenty to sixty years, and counting only male workers, 500 persons in this country (United States) live on the labor of every 100 workers. But if we advocate a system by which all could work four hours a day, and all have a chance to enjoy the proceeds of their toil, and all have plenty and be happy, contented, and prosperous, we are called "Anarchists, revolutionists, and lunatics."

One afternoon, near the end of my first summer, when I went to the village to get a shoe from the cobler's, I happened and put into jail, because, as I have elsewhere related, I did not pay a tax to, or recognize the authority of, the state which buys and sells men, women, and children, like cattle at the door of its senate-house. — Thoreau.
SOCIAL WILD-FIRE

Set the social wild-fire flaming!
Set the social wilds alight!
Dull-rules finely shining
Who would force men to do right.

Comrades! ye who trust your fellows,
Men and women, brave and true,
Up, while yet there is room!
Prove it vain by what ye do.

Tired toilers! ye who feel us,
Hungry idlers, crowded out,
Form your ranks in free will order,
Put things to the right about.

Thief,—and food-adulterator;
Drunkard,—poison-seller too;
Prostitute,—and purse-purse-maker,
Fatted priest, and greedy Jew;

Victims, hand in hand with spoilers,
Join your venture and your fate;
Needs are like, while powers are diverse,
But not to be defied.

Lay aside your pen and paper;
Mammon-flattering Sophistry;
Wait to press your last conclusion
Till ye'v known men, Mammon-free.

Social wild-fire spreading, spreading,
Settings wilds and souls alight.
Supereding laws and custom's power;
Truncheon, gallows, dynamite.

Lay the bomb—tense social impulse
Charged with sharp-edged words of truth,
At the doors of institutions.

Churches, Schools of youth.

Set all hearts on fire! Oh, free them!
Risk all you have for what is just.
Trust a happier human nature.
To be faithful to its trust.

So shall magnates find their safety,
So shall scholars find their peace,
When their freedom signed to them.
For the People's last Release.

Revolution! Choose your champions,
(Life's Whole Freedom for the prize)
Men and women, true and trusty,
Social wild-fire in their eyes.

SOCIALISM IN DANGER.

By F. DOMELA NIEUWENHUIS.

Indeed they can go far. Not long ago Caprivi in a jocular spirit called Bebel "Regierungskommissar", and although Bebel replied "We have not spoken as government commissioners, but governments have adopted Social Democratic measures; everybody was the point, and the incident is a convincing proof of how closely the political antagonistic parties have drawn together, and that the spirit of federation may work wonders.

There is nothing in the fact that the bold saying "Not a man nor a farthing to the government" is quite out of date, and Bebel indeed promised his support to the government when, to meet the new situation created by the invention of smokeless powder, it asked for a gun to provide dark uniforms to the army. If they yield to militarism the so-called Social Democratic party possesses a dense knot of day after day they vote credits for dark uniforms, to-morrow for improved artillery, and the day after for an additional army corps, etc., always with the same justification.

Yet, compromise of principle marched in step with success at the polls, so that at length the exploiting classes found that an anti-socialist law was not needed. We would be simple indeed to imagine that they repealed the law from a sense of its injustice! It was the incomprehensibility of Social Democracy that brought about the abolition; and do not subsequent events go far to prove that they had taught up the party to a nicety? Has not its degeneracy since then made gross with leaps and bounds?

Stock likewise recognises that "in reality the revolutionary movement is the most direct." "Our party," says he, "ought to be revolutionary, and to place the social revolution as the highest revolution. The doctrine of the Social Democratic party is based on the necessity of the revolution of political power, and that it reveals such a character in all its political manifestations and measures. Let our propaganda and our claims be for ever revolutionary. Let us meditate continually on our sublime purpose, and let us become those devotees who go on the straight road. Let us for ever be and remain, in life as in death, Revolutionary Social Democrats and no other. So will the future be ours.

Now, there are two points of view taken by Parliamentary Socialists. Some there are who desire to obtain political power in order to possessed of themselves of economic powers; and that is the profession object of the Social Democratic party, as witness the formal declarations of Mr. Keir Hardie, and others. But there are those who will only engage in political and parliamentary actions as ancillary to their real agitation. For them all elections are merely instruments of propaganda. But here is the danger of the country with evil; a door should be shut on all the rest. But we close on nominating candidates for purposes of protest, but as the momentous and serious candidates. At first our members are not the Social Democrat as an irreconcilable attitude, but when their numbers increase they introduce bills and to imitate legislation. In order to make their measure successful, and that they are forced to enter into compromises, as Finger has well remarked. It is the first step which costs, and once on the slope they are obliged to descend. In no practical programme
authorised at Erfurt almost the same as that of the French Radicals? Is there a single subject in the work of the later International Congress which is not defined Socialism? The real and central idea of Socialism is relegated for its fulfillment to a distant future, and in the meantime labor is spent on paltry palliatives, which could just as readily be obtained through the Radicals.

To put the case under uncluttered, undressed conditions, the reasoning of Parliamentary Socialists is as follows: We must first obtain among the voters a majority, which will then send Socialist representatives to Parliament, and whenever we have a majority in the House, even of one, the trick is done. We have only then to make such laws as we wish for the common good.

Even losing sight of a common form of obstruction in most countries, a second or a third heel of the parliamentary chair, known as the House of Lords, a Senate, or an Upper Chamber, of which the members are invariably the unbending and arbitrary representatives of capital, we would be very silly to think that the executive government would get into a sweat in carrying out the wishes of a Socialist majority in the Lower Chamber. This is the way Liebknecht ridiculed such an idea: "Let us suppose that government does not interfere, perhaps in quiet assurance of its innate strength, perhaps as a matter of policy, and at last the dream of some imaginative Socialist politicians comes true, and there is a Socialist Democratic majority in Parliament—what would happen? Here is the Rubicon: it must be crossed! Now has come the moment for reforming society and the state! The majority makes up its mind to do something that will make the day and the hour memorable in history—the new era is about to start! O, nothing of the kind... A company of soldiers bids the Social Democratic majority goodbye or be handcuffed, and if these gentlemen do not leave quickly a few policemen will show them the way to the State prison, where they will have ample time to reflect on their quixotic conduct. Revolutions are not made by permission of the government; the Socialist idea cannot be realised within the sphere of the existing State, which must be abolished before the future can enter into visible life. Down with the worship of universal suffrage. Let us take an active part in elections, but only as a means of agitation, and let us not forget to proclaim that the returning officer will never issue into the world the new Democratic State. Under the cover of the law, only one party will be able to dominate the state and society after the abolition of police and military government."—(Ueber die Anarchie, pp. 11 and 12.)

This is temperate but striking testimony that will command a powerful allegiance.

To be continued.
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