

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. X.—No. 103.

MARCH, 1896.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

THE COMMUNE OF PARIS.

This year will be celebrated the 25th anniversary of the Commune of Paris, and, although a quarter of a century has passed since this glorious event happened, yet revolutionists in all parts of the world will meet on the 18th of March to do honor to the memory of those courageous and devoted souls who suffered and died and left us this splendid example of human solidarity to admire, to study and to profit by.

Out of the ruin of that less than human thing, Napoleon the little, emerged the French Republic. History, repeating itself once more to-day, presents to us the spectacle of the Republic, from which so much was hoped, smitten with the same corruption, differently manifested, as that which formed the only possible medium for the unspeakable Napoleon. The evil tree of government has again borne its evil fruit, and the world is waiting for a new departure.

Under these circumstances it is as well we should remember that the Paris which gave us the Commune is still active with revolutionary thoughts and aspirations.

The history of the Commune is too well known to need repetition in these columns; and despite the cloud of lies and slanders with which the Press and bourgeois "historians" have tried to blacken its memory, the real significance of the events then enacted is becoming clearer to us every year.

Let it be remembered that, in the brief struggle which led to the proclamation of the Commune, little blood was shed.

Let it be remembered, also, that during the days of the Commune life was more respected and property safer than had ever before been known.

And, above all, let it be remembered that the days of horror and blood were those in which Thiers, that monster of the middle-classes, attacked, defeated and crushed the Commune—the hope of the workers of the world.

It has been said by some that the Commune came before its time, and that its methods were far too revolutionary. Such people do not recognise the inevitable in social evolution: they imagine society can be cut, dried and labelled to the order of the ruling classes. They do not understand the hopes and desires which are silently fermenting in the breasts of the "common herd," and which at some unexpected moment struggle to give themselves shape in actual life.

Such a moment had arrived when the Commune of Paris was declared. And nobly did the working men and women respond to the call. Did they need men to defend the beloved city from the parasites who had oppressed her and then plotted her ruin? They came forth in their thousands and fought and died like heroes. Did they need women to tend the sick, to aid the wounded and to give the help which only women can? The women were there, brave souls, ready to do and dare all for the great cause which they instinctively felt was the one great hope of life and liberty for themselves and their children; and history, perhaps, has never recorded a more touching instance of woman's courage and devotion than was given in those days of the Commune. In a word, no sacrifice was too great for the people to make, and the history of the Commune teaches us that the workers, when their enthusiasm is stirred by a great ideal, have accomplished and will always accomplish things which produce the most far-reaching effects for human progress and make the brightest and most inspiring chapters in the world's history. Many have mourned that such sacrifice and devotion should have produced, as it seemed, only a Bourgeois Republic; but it would only be confusing cause and effect to attribute this result to the failure of the Commune. It is to be attributed far more to the fact that this sacrifice and devotion was largely misdirected by timid leaders, who did not realize so well, perhaps, as the people themselves the great issues that were at stake. In other words, so far from being too revolutionary, the Commune was not revolutionary enough. And herein lies the lesson which we all need to learn. In times of revolution the more we can break away from the customs, the prejudices, the superstitions of our old slavery and bondage, the greater our chance of success. Compromise at such times is the golden opportunity for reaction; and to allow, as did the leaders of the Commune, the follies of a red-tape system of administration to take the place, even partially, of initiative and free organisation is to court failure.

In so far as the Commune was established and lived, much to the world's amazement, for three months, it was a success—a living proof, even to cynical politicians, that when the people are deeply stirred they are to be trusted. More real organisation and less red tape, more real Communism and less respect for so-called "private property"—property which really belonged to the people and should have been returned to them—might have defeated the brutal, cunning, unscrupulous forces of reaction which eventually crushed it.

But the defeat of the Commune can never be attributed to lack of courage and devotion on the part of the people; and, whatever cause there may be for regret in the mistakes that were made in those trying days, the Commune is redeemed from failure when we remember the self-sacrificing conduct of those who were fighting for the future.

Let us, then, whilst recalling these things and whilst expressing our gratitude and admiration for the comrades who fought and died in this great event, remember we still have our share to do to-day in striving for the Commune. But let us make no mistakes: let it be the FREE COMMUNE!

TWO NEGATIVES=ONE POSITIVE.

Probably it will be objected, that Humanity is but in its youth: we know it well. It is time, nevertheless, that it made a sublime effort, even at the cost of a few falls, to walk without leading strings. It is time that we had a larger comprehension of the great truth lying hid in the proposition which, till now, has been but a rule of grammar, that two negatives give rise to one affirmative. Science, for instance, is a compromise between ignorance and error; liberty, between license and slavery; pleasure, between pain and apathy; life, between nothingness and death. It is in the wisdom and nature of man to seek to eliminate and abrogate, by his love of pleasure, pain and apathy; by his love of liberty, license and slavery; by his love of science, ignorance and error. But it is also in the wisdom and nature of man to search for science even at the risk of error, which is preferable to ignorance; liberty, at the risk of license, which is preferable to slavery; pleasure, at the risk of pain, which is preferable to apathy; life, at the price of death, which is preferable to nothingness. For death is a condition of life, and is a progress over nothingness; pain is a condition of pleasure, and is a progress over apathy; license is a condition of liberty, and is a progress from slavery; error is a condition of knowledge, and is a progress from ignorance. The reason is that there is still some truth in error, and none in ignorance; that there is still liberty even in license, and none in slavery; that there is still a modicum of pleasure in pain, and none at all in apathy; that there is life in death, but none in nothingness.

Humanity is still young; but already it is possible to discern in the future, in the way we point out wondrous discoveries to the profit of generations in the future, by means of a scientific synthesis which, in its application, will profoundly modify our social life and the condition of the people, carrying the notions and conditions of existence to a degree of development from which, at the present time, we are assuredly far distant. We shall see, to a large extent, that the revolutionary era inaugurated by the French has changed, for man, the law of favor and constraint into the law of liberty and justice.—BOUTTEVILLE.

The Free-Communist & Co-operative Colony.

We have received the balance-sheet and report of the above Colony, which has been in existence but five months, and, notwithstanding immense difficulties, must be counted a success. The total income for the five months has been £214-14-8½, which was made up by subscriptions from sympathisers and sales of milk, eggs, poultry, etc. The expenditure, which amounts to £213-3-1, has, of course, been largely absorbed by purchases of tools and live-stock, and the initial expenses of taking over the stock and fixtures of the Clousden Hill Farm, Newcastle, where the Colony is now established.

A glasshouse has been built, and our comrades intend to apply the principle of intensive culture, from which it is hoped in a few months good results will be obtained. Meanwhile, the struggle will not be easy, though we are glad to see our friends facing it in a cheerful and hopeful spirit. Kropotkin has recently visited, them and was delighted with the immense amount of good work that their energy and determination had accomplished. Altogether, it seems to be one of the most hopeful undertakings of its kind that has ever been started in these islands.

It seems to us it would be an excellent thing for the London comrades to express their sympathy and solidarity with our friends in the North in their efforts to attain to a practical realization of Anarchist Communist principles, by sending them periodically a little financial help. We shall be glad to receive and forward any amounts sent to us, and we trust comrades will do their best to give some help. Except for the sums collected by Mrs. Dryhurst and Mr. Nevison (£8) and a little help from the Hammersmith Socialist Society, London's aid in this excellent work has not been too generously shown.

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

Monthly, One Penny; post free, 1½d.; U.S.A., 3 Cents; France, 15 Centimes.

Annual Subscription, post free, 1s. 6d.; U.S.A., 36 Cents; France, 1fr. 80c.
Foreign subscriptions should be sent by International Money Order,
payable to C. M. Wilson.

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

All communications, exchanges, &c., for "FREEDOM" to be addressed to
THE EDITOR, 7, LAMBS CONDUIT STREET, LONDON, W. C.

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.

NOTES.

THE CLARION AND THE CONGRESS.

We fully appreciate the *Clarion's* honesty and fairmindedness in publishing the fact that "Bebel's rule excluding from the forthcoming International Congress delegates who disbelieve in Parliamentary action is causing grave discontent amongst our Continental friends." Such, indeed, is the case; and not only amongst our "Continental friends," but also amongst "friends" here at home. We hope the comrades of the *Clarion* will return again to this subject, which is really of far more importance than the wire-pullers care to admit. Meanwhile, we may take this opportunity of pointing out that it is quite useless to call a congress of workers from which anyone who has the sense to see through the farce of "political action" is to be contemptuously excluded. If these organisers with "Bebel's rule" (should we not rather say "Babel's rule"; for that seems likely to be the outcome of his little trick?) could throw off their petty ambitions and look squarely at passing events, they would welcome as sincere and far-seeing people those who cry with such good reason, "Damn your politics!"

Can you blame us for feeling no interest in the election of a Gibson or a Macdonald? Seriously, does it matter to the men in the mines, in the docks, in the factories, on the seas or behind the plough—does it really matter to them whether Gibson polls 274 or Macdonald 866? Not a pin's head. There they are at the mercy of economic conditions, and a hundred men in your talking-house at Westminster will not free them. You think you have "educated" them when you have taught them to drop a piece of paper in a box; but we Anarchist Communists point out, and will continue pointing out, that there are other and better ways than this. In a word, we have a message for the workers, and, being workers ourselves, we claim that an *International Socialist Workers' and Trade Union Congress* is a place where we have a right to be heard. Why should we be feared? We belong to no political clique; we have no ambitions of our own to serve; we shall be outnumbered. Why should we be feared? We ask the *Clarion* and the *Labor Leader*, who have both dealt fairly with us, to continue their help that justice may be done and that all views on the labor question may have a fair hearing.

STRIKES.

The Labor Department has issued its annual report on strikes and lock-outs for the year 1894, which is probably the completest in details that Mr. John Burnett has yet produced. There were in all "1,061 strikes, involving 324,245 persons—little more than half the number who were concerned in strikes during the previous year."

The number of successful strikes is given as 22 per cent; 36 per cent unsuccessful; and partially successful 34 per cent. This is as much as mere figures can tell us. But, of course, there is a sense in which a strike is always a success, in so far as it is a protest against accepting *any* conditions that a master may try to impose on the workers. In other words, strikes keep the spirit of revolt alive in the people—even when they "fail." More than that, they tend to encourage a feeling of solidarity amongst the workers, although cynics of the labor movement deny this. But, we ask, where would have been your growth of solidarity without strikes? Even the strike of the Belfast engineers, just ended, brought out the fact of a growing solidarity between unionists and non-unionists, and this is an encouraging sign; for a man may have good reasons for remaining a non-unionist which the unionist should respect, and when we see them loyally supporting a strike under great hardship, as they did at Belfast, we feel sure there are plenty of good fellows among them. Indeed, there could not be a greater injustice than to confound, as some do, the non-unionist with the blackleg. A blackleg is a traitor to his class: he is one who sneaks in by the backstairs to steal a place which his fellow-worker has not yet relinquished; he tries to turn the guns against those who are fighting his own cause, and no condemnation is too severe for his cowardly conduct. But the non-unionist may be, and often is, a man of sturdy independence of character, and if the unionists could induce him to join by ridding their unions of some of the undoubted abuses which exist among them he would be a real acquisition to their ranks. Meanwhile, it is unfortunately evident that the conception of the importance of the Universal Strike makes but slow progress just now, so far as outward signs indicate.

PRACTICAL POLITICS A FAILURE.

"Only those whose lives are spent amongst the close-packed masses of our slums," says Dr. Bowmaker, the Medical Officer of Health for Sunderland, "know to what extent home life has become an impossibility to the toiling masses of the community." This is the official verdict after two generations of "legislative effort" to deal with the housing of the poor. And still Democrats and Fabians are looking to the political machine for help in their efforts to ameliorate the condition of the workers. They might as well, like the Peculiar People, rely on the efficacy of prayer; for surely no blind faith in pope or priest ever equalled their faith in the works of St. Stephens. Yet the Acts of these Apostles are such ludicrous failures that they have become the laughing-stock of sensible people, and even the politician smiles complacently over the jokes he perpetrates on the people. There is no exaggeration in all this, nor is it the "unpractical Anarchist" who publishes these damning facts. Even the progressive *Chronicle* devotes a leader to the subject, and very sensibly points out that we cannot expect men to "lead clean lives in a filthy atmosphere; and children reared in herds cannot grow up strong and healthy." After which it is compelled to add that what has vitiated the Acts is "the taint of property running through them." Rather more than a "taint," we imagine;—the "sacred rights of property" are at the bottom of the whole question, and always will be if we "reform" till we are black in the face. It is surely much more sensible (and practical) to recognise this fact, as we Anarchists do, and devote our energies to better ways and means of ending a system which is based on property with all its "taints." The Democrats should reconsider that question of "stepping-stones" which tend to multiply themselves on political lines till they rival "Jacob's ladder," and offer you about as much chance of reaching the top.

MORE SHOCKING EXAMPLES.

But perhaps our Democratic friends will tell us that we persist in ignoring the fact that some Acts of Parliament do succeed in accomplishing their object. Well, it is not our wish to be unfair, and we cheerfully admit that there are cases in which Acts of Parliament have the desired effect, either in throwing a sop to the discontented worker and lulling him to sleep for a time or, better still, of making the capitalist more comfortable and secure in the enjoyment of his stolen wealth. In this latter particular Acts of Parliament never fail, and when we note this point we arrive at the be-all and end-all of politics. That is why political action is the most dangerous snare held out to the worker by the ruling classes—and by those who would like to rule. However, we have only to read our daily paper to find enough proof, we should think, to convince even a Democrat of the futility of so-called working-class legislation.

For example, are the Adulteration Acts a success? No! "The Local Government Board reminds us that the Adulteration Acts remain almost a dead letter in many parts of the country, and are in no place efficiently enforced" (*Daily Chronicle*, Feb. 25). Or, again, the Railway Servants Act of 1893 (quite a "new broom"); a success? Not at all. On Feb. 14, a deputation representing the railway signalmen of the United Kingdom waited upon Mr. Ritchie at the Board of Trade to ask him to compel a more rigorous application of the Act, and to put a stop to boy-labor in signal-boxes. Of course, poor Mr. Ritchie couldn't help them. He wanted evidence. Mr. Lazenby told him that a man who gives evidence might as well send in his resignation. To which the facetious Ritchie replied, that if they want to get the "full benefit" (?) of the Act "they must be prepared to take some responsibility." Yes, starvation perhaps! We hope they left *wiser* if sadder men. Shall we instance the Factory Acts? or the Allotment Acts? or—but space will not permit of more examples. We must leave these things to speak for themselves; and when the Democrats have become disgusted with politics, we advise them to study Anarchist Communism in the light of their past experience.

THE FALL OF CRISPI.

Crispi the renegade has fallen, and his grip on the throat of Italy has been loosened. "Will Italy now have a chance to breathe?" is a question we are all asking ourselves. Since the days of Mazzini and Garibaldi her blue skies have still continued to look down on a starving peasantry; and thousands of her children, scourged by taxation and exploited almost from their cradle, have left their sunny land to seek relief (or death) in foreign climes. Such has been the fate of a "United Italy" left to the mercy of the capitalists and the politicians. And now at last Crispi, who, in his treatment of the Anarchists and Socialists, has proved himself a monster worthy of the Inquisition, is in the dust. Will she endure another dictator and live through another act of the tragi-comedy of a "more liberal government"? An amnesty for political prisoners will almost certainly be given; but will there be no attempt to overthrow the economic conditions under which the people groan?

At such times as these we may well exclaim with Ebenezer Elliott:

When wilt thou save the people,

O Truth and Justice, when?

Not thrones or priests, but nations;

Not kings or lords, but men.

A Meeting to Commemorate the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Proclamation of

THE COMMUNE OF PARIS

will be held in the hall of the

WORKMEN'S CLUB & INSTITUTE UNION,

Clerkenwell Road (near Holborn Town Hall), on

THURSDAY, MARCH 19th, at 8 O'CLOCK. ADMISSION FREE.

Speakers: Pearson, Kropotkin, Rucker, Tochatti, Malatesta, Caplan and others.

THE MATERIALIST EXPOSITION OF HISTORY.

We already know the value of those "great discoveries" attributed by Engels to Marx and, indirectly, to himself; we know, also, the part played by the State, exploiter and oppressor, so dear to Mr. Engels' disciples. It now remains for us to study the third discovery, that of "the Materialist Exposition of History." Let us hearken to Engels' definition of it:*

"The materialist conception of history is based on the idea that the production and exchange of things (products and values) form the foundation of every social organisation. In every human society the distribution of wealth and formation of classes or of ranks in society are the result of the method of production and exchange practised by the society."

The idea is true enough in itself, apart from a certain exaggeration of statement. The method of production shows us the state of the culture and civilisation of a society or historical period. But that was well known before 1845, and even before the 20th of November 1820, when Engels was born; only it was then spoken of as the influence of economic factors on history. But the sum of economic factors, which we call "Economism," is not the same thing as Materialism. The mode of production is only *one* factor, or rather one element among many others which serve as the evolutionary generalisations known under the name of materialistic doctrines. A *part* cannot contain the *whole*, and Economism cannot make up the whole doctrine of Materialism. We know many writers who have admitted the influence of conditions and economic relations in the development of humanity, who were not only idealists and metaphysicians, but deists in every sense and fervent Christians. Guizot, for instance, who traced the history of class antagonism in England during the 17th century, was as bigoted as a Trappist monk. Or there's Niebuhr, the founder of the German historical school, of which Mommsen is one of the most brilliant representatives; at the very beginning of this century he declared that the legends of Titus Livius about the origin of Rome must be set aside, and we must study history according to the economic and social conditions of the Roman people. From this we may date the investigations into the agrarian laws of Licinius Stolo and the Gracchi, and the minute research of Mommsen. But Niebuhr, Mommsen and all the German school were very far from materialism.

We shall find the same thing if we go back to the first historian who hinted at the influence of cosmic and economic conditions on the progress and development of humanity, and consult Vico [1668-1774] or his French translator, Michelet, who for his part dwelt at length on economic conditions in his researches into the origin of French law. Adam Smith, another man of genius and the founder of Political Economy, stated the following fundamental formula as early as 1776:

- (a) Labor is the only source of social wealth.
- (b) The increase of wealth depends on the economic and social conditions of labor, and the proportion between the number of producers and non-producers.

But this modest philosopher laid no claim to Materialism. A. Blanqui, again, a good citizen and professor, though less original and profound than Adam Smith, thus formulated in 1825 the part played by economic elements in history:—"I was not long in perceiving that between these two sciences of History and Political Economy there existed so many points of contact that it was impossible to study one without the other, or fully to apprehend either separately. One furnishes the facts; the other explains the causes. Step by step I followed the great events of history, and in each I found two parties alone—those who wished to live on their labor, and those who wished to live on the labor of others—patricians and plebeians—slaves and free—Guelfs and Ghibellines, the Red Rose and the White, Cavaliers and Roundheads, the philanthropist and the pauper: all are varieties of the same species."

Political Economy explains the causes of historic movements, says Blanqui; and his contemporaries, Mignet, Augustin Thierry, etc., say the same. In England, J. S. Mill, in his analysis of the 1st volume of Michelet's History of France, classifies the historical schools, and lays it down with his usual clearness that history, like all modern science, is occupied with the causes and social or cosmic laws which govern the development of humanity (Dissertations and Discussions). H. T. Buckle in his admirable attempt to trace the influence of cosmic laws, social conditions, and even food on history, says, "Of all the results which are produced among a people by their climate, food and soil, the accumulation of wealth is the earliest and in many respects the most important" (History of Civilisation, vol. i., page 40; compare pages 49, 50, 53, etc.). Professor Rogers, who was a contemporary of Marx and Engels but who entirely ignores them, besides his great work on "Six Centuries of Work and Wages," has a book on "The Economic Interpretation of History," in which he analyses the whole history of England from the economic point of view. Have these men of learning of different nationalities the least claim to Materialism? Certainly not. They were men of learning engaged in the search for truth. They followed the methods of scientific research in their study of history, and could give no other name to the result of their labors but the economic exposition of history.

* All Social Democratic compilers, of every nation, agree in attributing to Engels the exposition of materialism in history, and recognise that Marx only reduced it to a formula. We shall see below that the author of this rather startling exposition is in direct contradiction to Marx. The latter, a revolutionist by conviction, has never denied the part played by force and struggle in history, and never affirmed that the inductive sciences are known under the name of metaphysics.

How, then, did it come about that Engels, who wrote specially for workmen, for people crushed by superhuman labor, people who had neither the time nor the means to verify his assertions—how did it come about that Engels used the word materialism for what the men of science called economism? Why, instead of saying to the workers: "My friends, science as a whole, as expressed in the researches of all the men of learning in Europe, goes to prove that the happiness and development of the human race is created by your labor, that the welfare of humanity depends on your happiness and conditions favorable to your productive activity (Adam Smith); that, in consequence, the working classes are bound to destroy as soon as possible the organisation of the State and the exploiting or oppressive classes," why, I ask, instead of giving a purely scientific analysis, did he hide the truth from the honest worthy people who took him at his word? And what result is gained by this method, which appears more than strange? Politicians, unscrupulous men, who, owing to their complete ignorance are incapable of the least intellectual labor, learn by heart two pamphlets by Engels and a popular version of Marx, and then pose as men of science; and if, perchance, the workers in all good faith send them to Parliament, they declare, like Guesde, that Socialism has never been represented in Parliament before! Just as though Louis Blanc and Proudhon and others had never existed.

(To be Concluded.)

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

The history of Anarchism in 1895 shows a quiet resumption of propaganda, where interrupted by the persecutions of 1894, in most parts and on new ground, rather than striking events of an overwhelming character like those happening from 1892 to 1894 in France, Italy, Spain and the United States. There is no drawback in all this; for if anything prevented the sacrifices made by so many comrades during the preceding period of active struggle from having a full effect on the minds of the masses whom they tried to arouse to free themselves, it was the misunderstanding of our ideas among those masses, who almost entirely form their opinions from the poisoned sources of capitalist, religious and so-called Socialist (electioneering and political) reaction. Yet acts of revolt of a purely economic character were done by almost unknown men from among those masses. We notice three cases: that of the Bohemian miner, A. Hofmann, who, after being discharged for taking part in the May Day demonstration, shot one of the officials of the mine—it was a mine belonging to the Austrian State, a sample of State-Socialist "nationalisation" of mines, and of everything else, we suppose;—he was hanged at Prague, and died shouting, "Long live Anarchy!" The second case was that of Clement Decoux at Aniche, France, who was killed by a bomb which he threw among the officials of a French mine from which he had been discharged. The third was a workingman of Mulhouse, Alsace, who killed the manufacturer who had discharged him and then committed suicide. These three cases show that workingmen begin to see, here and there, that there is a more direct way of dealing with the problem of their everlasting misery than depositing slips of paper in boxes, called ballot-boxes, thereby condemning one of their fellow-men to the degradation and corruption which is inevitably the lot of an elected representative, and condemning themselves to new exploitation by frauds they themselves help to create.

In France there are signs that large numbers of Socialists are tired of political tomfoolery and begin to awake again to the economic character of the movement. At any rate, articles by Fernand Pelloutier in *Les Temps Nouveaux* and *L'Action Sociale* give a (perhaps too rosy) description of the libertarian currents in the Possibilist movement. Here the idea of a general strike, scorned at by the Marxist-Guesdists (the politicians and upholders of the present Bourgeois cabinet), has taken root; the idea of military propaganda and a soldiers' strike in case of war (chiefly proclaimed in the Netherlands, since 1891) is being taken up; municipal and governmental Socialism is shown the cold shoulder by the refusal of the most important trades-unions to make use of the *Paris bourse du travail*—closed in 1892 and now again graciously placed at the disposal of those who will submit to governmental supervision. Again the politicians were rebuffed when it was resolved to devote the profits of the *Verrerie aux Ouvriers*—the glass-works to be erected at Albi to give work to the Carmaux bottle-makers locked out by Reséguier—to a work of "economic and social" character, and not "for manufacturing deputies."

The idea emitted by an Anarchist, V. Barrucand, in the *Revue Blanche* last spring—that each municipality should guarantee FREE BREAD to all inhabitants—was presented to the Chamber of Deputies by M. Clovis Hugues, a Socialist poet; of course, it has no chance to be even considered at a time when all that is expected of the Chamber is that it will reject the monstrous bill, already adopted by the Senate, which punishes with sentences up to five years imprisonment every effort of government (naval and military) and railway (private or State-owned) workers to combine to better their position by strikes—a lovely idea of State benevolence which we should like to see printed as an appendix to all State Socialist programs and candidates' promises.

Hitherto we reproduced chiefly the facts brought forward by Pelloutier; personally, we are sceptical as to all this; the Anarchist ideas have for so many years been before the workers (in words and deeds) that they are easy of access at any rate to all who take an active part in these Possibilist and other movements, and if they have not yet accepted them it is very possible they never will, but will continue their oscillation between authority and freedom, politics and revolution.

Here we recommend to all the articles by Kropotkin (*Un temps d'arrêt*) in Nos. 4 to 19 of *Les Temps Nouveaux*, where all the fallacies of economic and other palliatives are fully discussed; we extract but two passages from them:—"All the lessons of the last few years may be summed up thus: The more the struggle between exploiters and exploited falls under the control of the State (by committees of arbitrators, municipal or governmental intervention, municipal dwellings for workpeople, free bread, etc.), the less chance the workers have of winning the contest."....."Their only hope of winning is by the transformation of a strike into a revolt, the taking possession of all by the workers. And this chance grows less the more the State or the municipality interferes between wage-workers and capitalists.".....

