

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. X.—No. 107.

JULY, 1896.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

On **TUESDAY, JULY 28th, at 7 p.m.**

A MASS MEETING will be held in **HOLBORN TOWN HALL**

to welcome

the delegates to the **International Socialist Workers Congress, 1896.**

Among the speakers will be:

T. MANN, E. MALATESTA, P. KROPOTKIN, F. KITZ, J. C. KENWORTHY, CIPRIANI, LOUISE MICHEL, ELISEE RECLUS, and others.

THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONGRESS.

Before our next number goes to print, the International Labor Congress will have met at London. Hundreds of workers, from all countries of the world, will probably meet at this Congress and assert the solidarity of the workers, to whatever nation, race or creed they may belong, in the face of the middle-classes of all countries, which foment a European war.

Whatever else the Congress may be it will be a formidable demonstration on behalf of the workers, to affirm once more that their enemies are not those who speak other languages, nor those who toil in other countries, but those who live on the labor of the toiling masses; those who have appropriated for themselves the land, the dwelling-houses, the docks, the railways, the factories, the mines; those who continue to keep the masses in poverty and, consequently, in ignorance, while their children learn in the universities how to rule the masses so as to maintain their own privileges.

In that sense the Congress will certainly be an imposing manifestation.

It may also, and let us hope it will, contribute to propagate Socialism among the workers of all countries, especially the workers of this country. The trade unionists who will come to London during the Congress may see that—whatever colorless aspects Socialism takes in the mouths of middle-class Socialists—the great mass of the manual workers of the world is animated with the desire of throwing off the yoke of Capital, and not merely of patching up in some modest way the miserable conditions of the wage-slaves. They will see, we hope, that for American and Continental workers the question is not whether school-meals will be distributed to hungry children and gas supplied by vestries, not even whether the wage-slave will be kept eight or nine hours in the factory. For them the question is to take possession of the land, the factories, the dwelling-houses in the city,—of all, in fact, that is necessary for life, work and well-being. The Socialist worker only searches his way as to what is to be done in order to take possession of that common inheritance of mankind. He asks himself, *how to manage it in the interest of all?* And if he hears no answer to these questions at the Congress; if all attempts to go deeper into those vital questions are drowned in petty repetitions of *what the workers already know*,—then the Congress will have entirely failed in its fundamental purpose.

In fact, the fundamental purpose of an International Labor Congress is that awakening of ideas, that deeper insight into the present conditions and present relations between Capital, Labor and State, which can be given to the masses of laborers by a great Congress better than by any amount of personal and local propaganda.

This made the force and the world-importance of the earlier Congresses of the International Working Men's Association. Each of them marked a new advance in *ideas*. At the first Congress co-operation and limitation of the hours of labor were spoken of as serious changes. But gradually, at each new Congress, the idea that partial reforms in the mutual relations between Labor and Capital are either simply impossible or utterly inadequate grew deeper and deeper in their minds. Each Congress marked a step forward. At Brussels, in 1868, the land question and the necessity of land-expropriation came to the front, and the reports on this question, as well as the discussion which followed, spread a flood of light and enlightenment on that fundamental question.

The next year, at Basel, the question as to the necessity of abolishing private ownership, not only in land, but also in all that is needed for production, was brought under discussion. Again several deeply thought over reports were read, and an animated discussion followed, which again spread a flood of light among the workers upon this crucial matter in Socialism.

Each Congress thus attacked a new problem; each went deeper into Socialism; and what was discussed at the Congress became matter for discussion in labor circles for the next year.

That such discussion is badly wanted at the present time is only too evident—be it only from the attitude of the British trades unions towards “the Socialist resolution” and the “Alien question” at their last Congress. Because we, a small minority, are Socialists, there is no use saying that all workers are imbued with the same ideas. They certainly are Socialists by desire, but every one who knows the English, French, German, Italian, Spanish and American workers—to say nothing of Eastern Europe—knows how much remains to be done in order to clear among them the forests of old prejudices.

Unhappily the last International Congresses have totally forgotten that task. They have taken quite a different direction.

Labor Congresses began to be looked at as a sort of parliaments which carry on legislative business. The great questions of Socialism pure and simple were simply cast aside; and, under the impression that “business” must be done at such congresses, questions of detail were brought forward in the most incoherent way; while the very discussion of those questions became simply nominal.

No reports dealing with the questions were read; owing to the great number of delegates each one was only allowed to speak ten minutes, and matters which it would have been necessary to treat at length from a general point of view were dispatched in small committees which brought forward mere resolutions to be voted upon—resolutions evidently worded so as to say the least in the vaguest manner possible, and thus to gather the greatest number of votes. The result was, that in “business matters” no thorough discussion took place and could not take place; while the function of the Congress—that of sowing broadcast larger and deeper views among the toilers of the two worlds—was simply wiped out. Moreover, owing to the formidable differences in the political conditions of different countries, the resolutions of the Congress lost all value and all interest.

The idea that an International Labor Congress must be considered as a Parliament of Labor rather than as a means for making a large Socialist propaganda is utterly false in itself. What can German or French workers induce English workers to do which they already are not doing? And what may English workers induce Russian or Italian workers to do which they already are not desirous to do (strikes, unions and so on) but can not do on account of the accursed tyranny under which they are suffering, the want of close intercourse, and the like?

Labor Congresses are not legislative bodies. Even if they limit themselves to simply *recommend* this or that action to laborers of different countries, they will simply express pious wishes. Their educative function, on the contrary, could be rendered immense. By an appropriate choice of questions to be brought under discussion, and by a thorough discussion of the same—both in written reports and during the Congress itself,—they could contribute immensely towards spreading more and more thoroughly Socialistic and more and more advanced views among the workers of Europe and America. They could clear the view among the most active spirits of the labor movement themselves.

To imagine that Socialism has said its last word is simply absurd. If the huge mass of the workers are so far yet from realising the *possibility* of taking possession of the common inheritance of mankind, and of managing it in the interests of all—it is not because they have never thought of it nor desired it. It is because they do not well see, and the Socialists have not yet told them distinctly, *how they can take possession of that inheritance and how they can manage it*.

The every day struggle against Capital and against State's tyranny has certainly to be carried on, and it necessarily must take a variety of aspects. But what is all this struggle for if it does not aim at a higher

state of organization, in which man has no sweater and no master? And what energy can be put in this struggle if a higher conception of labor solidarity ceases to inspire the struggling workers,—if the final aim does not grow clearer and clearer before the eyes in proportion as the struggle goes on from year to year? It is high time that the Labor Congresses should manfully face these great problems imposed by history upon our generation, and if Anarchists speak at all at the coming Congress they certainly will raise these great problems.

It will, however, depend upon the workers themselves to decide whether they wish to have those problems discussed, or whether they prefer to have a semblance of discussion of how to patch up the present wage-slavery, and blindly let themselves be led by the events, instead of consciously taking the lead themselves.

AN UNCIVILIZED VIEW OF CIVILIZATION.

That the reader may form some conception of a primitive Eskimo's habits of thought on moral questions, I quote the following letter from a converted Greenlander to Paul Egede.* I reproduce it because it in many respects bears out the views above expressed, and Egede's book, *Accounts of Greenland*, in which this translation is printed, is now not easily obtainable. The writer was a heathen, who had been baptised by Paul Egede's father, Hans Egede. The letter, which was of course written in Eskimo, gives evidence not only of a peculiar moral point of view, but also of a keen understanding, and of feelings which, as Paul Egede says, one would scarcely expect "in so stupid a people as we have hitherto taken them to be." It is, as will be seen, an answer to an epistle of Egede's, and runs as follows:—

Amiable Pania,†

You know how precious and agreeable your letter is to me; but how appalled I was when I read of the destruction of such multitudes of people in the great earthquake,‡ inconceivable to us, which you say devoured in one moment more people than there are in all our country. I cannot tell you how this moved me, or how frightened we were, so that many fled from the place where they lived to another, which was quite as unsafe, though it was on a rock; for we see even here that rocks have been split open from the top to the very depths, though when it happened none of us know. Granite rocks, such as our land consists of, and sand hills like your land, are equally easy for God to overthrow, in whose power the whole world stands, and we poor little animals are easily buried in the ruins. You give me to understand that with you there have been neither snow nor severe cold this winter, and conclude that it must have been all the severer with us; but we too have had an unusually mild winter. I hear that your learned men are of opinion that this mild weather has been caused by the warm vapors emanating from the earth at the time of the earthquake, which have warmed the air and melted the snow material. But if I had not heard that this was the opinion of the learned, I should have thought that the warmth of the earth would avail little to heat the height and breadth of the air as little as a man's breath avails to warm a large house in which he simply breathes for a moment and then goes out again. The south winds, which are always warm and have blown all the year through with us, are the cause of the moderate cold we have had; but why the south wind blew I cannot tell, nor the learned either, perhaps. Were these wretched people killed by the heat, or did the earth swallow them up, or were they shaken to death? Skipper B. thought that their own houses must have fallen upon them and killed them. Your people do not seem to care very much about it; for they are not only cheerful and merry, but they relate that the two nations§ who come here whale-fishing, not your countrymen, but of the same faith as you, are fighting with and shooting each other both by land and sea, hunting each other as we hunt seals and reindeer, and stealing and taking away ships and goods from each other, from people they have never seen or known, simply because their lord and master will have it so. I asked the skipper, through an interpreter, what could be the cause of such inhumanity? He answered that it was all about a piece of land right opposite ours,§ so far away that it could only be reached after three months' sailing. Then I thought that there must be great scarcity of land where those people dwell; but he said, no, that it was only because of the great lords' greediness for more riches and more people to rule over. I was so astounded by this greediness, and so terrified lest it should fall upon us too, that I was almost out of my mind; but I presently took heart again, you will scarcely guess why. I thought of our snow-clad country and its poor inhabitants, and said to myself: "Thank God! we are poor, and possess nothing which these greedy Kablunaks (so they call all foreigners) can desire. What we have upon the earth they do not care to possess: what we require for food and clothing swim in the great sea; of that they may take as much as they can, there will always be enough for us. If only we have as much food as we can eat and skins enough to keep us from the cold we are quite contented; and you know very well that we let to-morrow take care of itself. Therefore we will not fight with any one, even if we were strong enough; although we can as justly say that the sea belongs to us as the believers in the east can say of the unbelievers in the west that they and their possessions belong to them. We can say it is our sea which surrounds our land, and that the whales,

cachalots, grampuses, porpoises, unicorns (that is, narwhals), white whales, seals, halibuts, salmon, cod and sea scorpions which swim in it belong to us too; but we willingly allow others to take of this great store as much as they please. We are happy in that we have not so great a natural covetousness as they.

I have often wondered at the Christians, and have not known what to think about them—they leave their own beautiful land and suffer much hardship in this country, which is to them so rough and disagreeable, simply for the sake of making us good people;—but have you ever seen so much evil in our nation, have you ever heard such strange and utterly senseless talk among us? Their teachers instruct us how we are to escape the devil, whom we never knew; and yet the roystering sailors pray with the greatest earnestness that the devil may take them, or may split them. I daresay you remember how I, in my youth, learned such phrases from them to please them, without knowing what they meant, until you forbade me to use them. Since I have come to understand them myself, I have heard more than I wanted of them. This year in particular I have heard so much of the Christians that if I had not in the course of long familiarity with them known many good and worthy men among them, and if Hans Pengiok and Anarsak, who have been to your country, had not told me that there were many pious and virtuous people there, I could have wished that we had never set eyes upon them, lest they should corrupt our people. I dare say you have often heard how my countrymen think of you and yours: that you have learned good behaviour among us; and when they see a pious person among us, they will often say: "He is like a human being," or, "a Greenlander." You no doubt remember that funny fellow Okako's idea of sending angekoks—that is, medicine men—to your country to teach the people to be good, as your king has sent preachers hither to teach us that there is a God, which we did not know before. But I know that your people do not lack instruction, and therefore that proposal is of no use. It is strange enough, my dear Pania—your people know that there is a God, the creator and upholder of all things, that after this life they will either be happy or miserable, according as they shall have conducted themselves here, and yet they live as if they were under orders to be wicked, and it was to their honor and advantage to sin. My countrymen, on the other hand, know nothing, either of a God or a devil, believe neither in punishment nor reward after this life, and yet they live decently, treat each other kindly, and share with each other peaceably when they have food to share. There are, of course, bad people among us too, which proves that we must be of one stock; and perhaps we must thank our barren land for the fact that most of are above reproach. (You do not think, I hope, that I am talking hypocritically about my countrymen, for you know by experience that what I say is true.) When I have heard accounts of your pleasant country, I have often envied its inhabitants; for they have great abundance of the delicious fruits of the earth, and of animals, birds, and fishes of innumerable sorts, fine large comfortable houses, fine clothes, a long summer, no snow or cold, no midgets, but everything pleasant and desirable; and this happiness, I thought, belonged to you alone because you were believers, and, as it were, God's own children, while we, as unbelievers, were placed in this country as a punishment. But, oh, we happy Greenlanders! Oh, dear native land! How well it is that you are covered with ice and snow; how well it is that if in your rocks there are gold and silver, for which the Christians are so greedy, it is covered with so much snow that they cannot get at it! Your unfruitfulness makes us happy and saves us from molestation!

Pania! we are indeed contented with our lot. Fish and flesh are our sole food; dainties seldom come in our way, but are all the pleasanter when they do. Our drink is ice cold water; it quenches thirst and does not steal away the understanding or the natural strength like that maddening drink of which your people are so fond. Our clothing is of unsightly thick-haired skins, but it is well suited to this country, both for the animals, while the skins are still theirs, and for us when we take them from them. Here then, thank God, there is nothing to tempt anyone to come and kill us for its sake. We live without fear. It is true that here in the North we have the fierce white bears; but to deal with them we have our dogs, which fight for us, so that we do not run the slightest risk. Murder is very seldom heard of among us. It does not happen unless someone is suspected or accused of being a magician and of having killed some one by his witchcraft, in which case he is killed without remorse by those whose duty it is, who think they have just as good right as the executioner in your country to take the lives of malefactors; but they make no boast of it, and do not give thanks to God for it like the great lords in your country when they have killed all the people of another land, as D. has told me.

It surely cannot be to the good God of whom you teach us, who has forbidden us to shed blood, that they give thanks and praises; it must but to another, who loves slaughter and destruction. I wonder if it is not to Tomarsuk (the devil). Yet that cannot be either; for it would be flying in the face of the good God to give any honor to Satan. I hope you will explain this to me at your convenience. I promise not to tell my countrymen about it. It might lead them to think like Kana, who dared not become a Christian for fear he should come to be like the wicked sailors. I will not tell you anything about the conversion of my countrymen, for I know that our teacher has given you all information. The thing you desired me to look into I will, as far as I am able, attend to. I have not been able to make the experiment with the compass, since the cold this year has been only moderate. The cause of the two conflicting currents is no doubt what you say. Since you value so much the two fishes almost turned to stone, I shall try to procure more for you; they are found in clay beds, as you suppose.

* Paul Egede was for many years a missionary in Greenland, but had, at this time (1756), returned to Copenhagen.

† Pania or Pavia is the Eskimo corruption of Paul.

‡ Evidently the earthquake at Lisbon.—TRANSLATOR.

§ Probably the Dutch and English.—Surely rather the French and English.—TRANSLATOR.

Now I seem to have been speaking to you and you to me—now I must close my letter. The skipper is ready and the wind is fair. The mighty Protector of all of us guide them over the great and perilous sea and preserve them, especially from the wicked men-hunters, of whom I see they are most in dread, so that they may come scatheless to their fatherland and find you, my beloved, with gladness.

Greenland, 1756.

PAUL GREENLANDER.

This letter, as well as what has been stated in the earlier part of this chapter, surely justifies us in saying that the primitive morality of the Eskimo stands in many respects close to that of ideal Christianity, and is even in one way superior to it; for, as the letter-writer says, the Greenlanders know nothing either of a god or a devil, believe neither in punishment nor reward after this life, and yet they live virtuously none the less.

Many people will, no doubt, think it astonishing that we should find so highly developed a morality among a race so uncultured, and so unclean in their outward habits. Others will perhaps find it more surprised that this morality should have been developed among a people who have no religion, or at any rate a very imperfect one, as we shall presently see. Such facts are inconsistent with the theory which is still held in many quarters, that morality and religion are inseparable. A study of the Eskimo community shows pretty clearly, I think, that morality springs from and rests upon natural law.—From *Eskimo Life*, by Fridtjof Nansen.

ANARCHIST ORGANISATION.

I deeply regret to see a retrograde movement within the Anarchist party. It appears that in England you have had various meetings at which proposals have been made for the collective action of all assembled, and as the natural consequence of this absurdity either nothing has been decided or strong groups have been split up into weak ones, covering in a less effective way the ground upon which they were united,* and being distinguished by the addition of the matters by which they became divided. This difficulty arises solely from the fact that the State idea has not been wholly got rid of. Why the deuce did you want to have a particular thing done in the name of a combination of individuals not formed in view of that particular thing? Just as if a meeting, a group, etc., were a living being with a voice and a choice of its own! English Anarchists, you are very slow in realising the meaning of your own opinions. Individuals exist and act; groups are only the condition of individuals being associated, or the persons so associated. There are so many people who combine to establish regular meetings, at which they may make the acquaintance of each other, exchange ideas, and be in a position for such of them as have any project in view to find others who will assist in carrying it out. But now someone coolly proposes that the aggregate of persons so associated shall commit themselves to some particular course which is not at all essential to the purposes already being fulfilled. For instance, it is proposed that an expression of sympathy be accorded to some movement or other, or that a certain book be obtained, or a demonstration made on a certain occasion—no matter what the proposal may be—the man who makes it never thinks of simply laying it down and inviting those who feel so disposed to join with him in a special combination for that express purpose only; he waits “the group” or “the meeting” to adopt it collectively, and, strange to say, they never think of doing anything else but to accept or reject it collectively. Consequently, not being all of one opinion on the matter, it only remains for them to become so or for some to withdraw from the group, dividing and weakening it for its original purpose, in order to have two or more bodies that will be of one accord within themselves (though not with each other) upon the new additional purpose. Whereas if, instead of a proposal for the collective action of a group, there had been an *invitation to the individuals* to associate for the collective action of *those who found themselves of one opinion* the old grouping would not have been broken up, and the new purpose would have had just as many people grouped around it as it actually gets.

What is the fault: that the Anarchist idea has been pushed too far, or that it has not been carried far enough? Certainly the latter. Nevertheless, certain comrades have come to the astonishing conclusion that (this is what it really amounts to) Anarchy has proved a failure, and that for collective action it is necessary for the minority to accept the decision of the majority; that “the idea of the minority being willing to guide its own action in accordance with the expressions coming from the majority was an absolute necessity in any substantial and intelligent organisation”!!! A society has been formed among you on these lines, having a fund to which each member is pledged to contribute according to his means, but which is at the absolute disposal of a majority—regular officials elected by the majority; special rules in each group, passed by the majority, and from which the individual has no escape but by abandoning the association; whilst in other matters, when “collective action” is proposed, the individual is left to choose whether he will participate or not, but if he wants to take part he becomes a voter, and is pledged in advance to go with the majority whatever they resolve, unless he secedes from the association. This is sheer “voluntary State Socialism.” No more complete back down could be well imagined. If a division of opinion inevitably occurs there is nothing objectionable in the individuals of the minority choosing to go with the majority *because* they would, in the circumstances of the particular case, rather do so than stand aloof; I may think the right hand road is worse than the left, and yet *rather travel with you*, whichever you choose to take, *than go alone or leave you to go alone*. But this can happen equally if I stand for the majority and you for the minority—especially if, as in the nature of things must often happen, the majority have only a slight preference, whilst the minority, on the other hand, have a decided conviction. What is objectionable is undertaking in advance to go with the majority, while it remains unknown whether the case will commend itself as one for that course or otherwise; and if one is to isolate himself as the only alternative to this course, it is a mere mockery to call him free.

So far as this particular Society is concerned, the evil is very glaring. The fund, for example, might be contributed to by a number of people who were all in accord so far as they knew; in Melbourne, for example, ten years ago, we were all united because we had gone no further than the general idea of getting rid of authority; but when we came to a closer study of the application of this to economic institutions, one party concluded that Property was a form of liberty, while others held that it was not, and some, like myself, presently concluded that it was a form of authority;—in such a case the vote of the majority could have appropriated what the Communists had saved up, and used it to publish manifestoes denouncing Communism and calling Communists traitors, thieves, exploiters, loafers, State Socialists and everything else that is vile. The clause providing that additional “agreements” (rules) may be legislated on to each group by a majority completely upsets the assertion of the promoters that an individual can isolate himself from any “collective action” without seceding altogether. And each group is to have certain officials whether those

associated therein think them necessary or not;—by the way, they are compelled to have a librarian, but they need not have a library. But what I take most exception to is the name, *THE ASSOCIATED ANARCHISTS*. The general public would infer from this that there was a general union of the Anarchists of all groups and sects under this title. Those who have assumed it may have had the intention of implying that we others are the *dissociated* Anarchists; but, if so, they have bungled into an act that is grossly unfair to the movement. They are right in seeing that there is an evil to cure, but the way to cure it is to be more Anarchistic, and not, as they have done, to throw up the sponge and hand over the name of Anarchy to the nearest sect of Social Democracy. And as they admit this is the light in which many will view their change of front, to adopt a name conveying to the outside world that the Anarchists in general have combined to surrender their principles and eat humble pie to Majority seems decidedly more like an act of malice than one of stupidity, though probably only the fruit of a silly vanity or the spirit which prompted the three tailors of Tooley Street to call themselves “The Citizens of London,” or that which impels John Smith, retail draper, to call himself The United Cotton and Wool-len Manufacturers of Great Britain and America, and French, Italian, Indian and Chinese Silk Syndicate, Unlimited.

J. A. ANDREWS.

4 Rule Street, Richmond, Victoria, Australia.

PARLIAMENTARISM.

Parliamentarism is the art of making sufferers have patience eternally. It is in its last throes to-day; the tuft of grass to which the old world clings is about to give way and sink into the abyss—it is the hour in which the masses, always deceived, see the worthlessness of lying promises and the reality of their misery.

It is also the hour when humanity has reached a stage so close to the new world that truth can no longer be denied. The true ideal, the happiness of all in peace and liberty, is revealed so clearly that it is but necessary to open our eyes to see it.

Parliamentarism in vain throws a veil over social rottenness; it is visible in spite of all, so bloody, so tainted, that there is danger to all in not burying it as soon as possible. Humanity, having reached a viril age, can no longer be content with parliamentary lies, for man can verify their results; the time has gone by when they lulled men to sleep in order to bleed them tranquilly; parliamentarism must come to an end; the instinct of self-preservation, reasoned by the light of scientific discoveries, experience and history, by an irresistible call of progress, tends towards a general improvement of the human race. All circumstances prove it. The animal, egotistical and miserable order of society is becoming dislocated in all quarters; it is not parliamentarism, itself in a state of corruption, that can improve matters.

Lafontaine, without thinking he was doing so, once drew a picture of parliamentary methods. A pedant holding forth to a child fallen in the water is a good example of parliamentarism—“My friend, help me out of danger, you can lecture afterwards,” answers the child (fable by Lafontaine). Such is the case, with this difference, that the child had fallen by chance, but that it is parliamentarians themselves who deepen the abyss, attract people into it, and try to keep them there till death.

With this difference, too, that the people do not dream of calling parliament to the rescue.

“Heroic times are over,” said Gambetta, an incarnation of parliamentarism. On the contrary, heroic times are coming. We are reaching them, hearts are tempered by the whirlwind blowing from all quarters like the steel of swords in the furnace. A new public opinion answers to Liberty’s call; corrupt parliamentarism has had no part in producing this new spirit. On the contrary, at a time when all is action and life in transforming the human flock into true humanity, the works of parliamentarism are as usual but empty words, and this is proved by the way one of its chief organs, *Le Temps*, May 1st, speaks of one of the heroes who come from all quarters to help the Cubans to win their independence. It says: “A Frenchman who is among the filibusters of the ‘Competidor’ will be court-martialled to-morrow.”

It is by the evil influence of parliament that Spaniards, Frenchmen and Italians die for the conquest or preservation of colonies, where the real filibusters, those of the State, fatten according to parliamentary fashion.

Parliamentary promises to the people are like those made use of by the Reading ogress to gain the confidence of the poor wretches who gave her their infants. The result is the same, immensely magnified; and, like the Reading monster, parliamentarism in its delirium commits all sorts of crimes as if hallucinated. It is the end. Not too soon does the dawn of a new era rise and dissipate the horrible nightmares that haunt the agony of this vampire society.

LOUISE MICHEL.

OBITUARY.

The Cause has suffered a loss through the sudden death of comrade A. Mc Dougall, who died in the Royal Infirmary, Glasgow, on Sunday, May 23, 1896, leaving a widow and three children.

Our comrade’s whole life was devoted to the Cause, and he rendered it incalculable service through trade union channels and with his pen; some of his works we intend to publish soon. A profuse reader, a profound thinker and one who naturally formed a comprehensive idea of Anarchism, possessing a broad tolerance, quick perception and easy suasive disposition, we never felt any reluctance in asking him for explanations of any abstruse point; and he would explain everything in such a lucid manner and with such charming address and infinite pains that you were left in no doubt that he had gained as much pleasure in giving explanation as you had in receiving same. This is only one of the many genial traits in his character. A loving husband, a kind father and a true comrade, we all deeply regret his early decease and send our heartfelt sympathy to his widow in her bereavement.

Our comrade is now at rest amongst the great unnamed:

But sad and unseen in their silent grave—

It may be the sand or the deep sea wave,

Or a lonely desert place;

For they need no prayers and no mourning bell—

They were tombed in the true hearts that knew them well.

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.
Other communications to the secretary, J. PERRY, at above address.

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.

The Editors are not necessarily in agreement with signed articles

NOTES.

BIG THIEVES AND LITTLE THIEVES.

Whilst statute law has been busy lately pronouncing sentence with blind ferocity and wreaking its vengeance inhumanly on those wretched victims, the little thieves, Nature's laws have been calling to account several members of that class of thieves who live high in society and are regarded as ornaments to what we call our civilization. Baron Hirsch, Colonel North, and now Sir Augustus Harris have been by Nature's hand laid low with the Seamans, the Milsoms and the Fowlers, and brought to an equal state. They are all types of men which our age produces by those specific conditions which are based on dishonesty. But how different the channels in which their lives ran! On the one hand the little thieves born in poverty and wretchedness, with their hopeless struggle against economic conditions and the brutal hand of the law; on the other the big thief exploiting right and left—but oh, so legally!—with the smile of a false society for perpetual encouragement, and the gnawing of an insatiable ambition urging them on. In the path of the little thief we notice here and there a victim and then the long blank years of penal servitude. In the path of the big thief the victims lie in hundreds, and there are no interludes in the mischief and cruelty of his career. But the extremes meet in the end; the artificial barriers break down and big and little are brought under one law at last. After all, Nature will have equality; and let it be understood that we must have equality if these abominations are to end. For a false and dishonest society exists only so long as those grossly unequal conditions exist; and the big thief and the little thief will depart when men live as equals in a regenerated society.

LEGISLATION FOR THE MINER.

There is, perhaps, no branch of industry where securing conditions for the safety of the lives of the workers has been so shamefully ignored as in mining. The loss of life in coal mines alone, directly attributable to the selfishness of the "owners," is an indictment against the present system which condemns it as outrageously unjust and inhuman without further proof being needed. The *Chronicle* has done well in keeping a statement of the mine-owners' iniquity before the public. In this statement it gives the following figures: "A thousand miners are killed and more than 100,000 injured every year. Since 1851 48,219 miners have been killed and 4,500,000 injured. How much longer will the Government wait?" How much longer? Why, as long as the present system lasts. 'Tis a pity it should be so, but it is better to state the truth. The Government will not, cannot, save the miners' lives. Public opinion will do a little, science may do something; but a government measure—nothing. Mr. Plimsoll's measure did not save the sailors; our factory acts have not saved the workers—read the daily papers for proof of it; the adulteration acts have not saved our food. It is too bad to trust once more to this broken reed to help the poor miner. Better by half educate him to revolt against the whole system which murders and mutilates him wholesale to enrich a few useless idlers. And if one day he should grasp the grand idea of working the mine on principles of humanity, that is to say for the benefit of himself, his comrades and the community at large, then those evils will cease. And it will not cost 48,219 killed and 4,500,000 injured to accomplish his end.

YVES GUYOT AND COMPETITION.

M. Guyot's ideas about our present economic system, as given forth by him to the Economy Circle of the National Liberal Club, we suppose are held in all seriousness. But to us it reads very much like what we should expect to hear from a humorist—Mark Twain, for instance,—who was satirizing the present system.

First, he asks where an ethical motive force can be found, and replies that "such a force was to be found in the existing state of society where a majority of persons were engaged all their lives in doing good to others by engaging themselves in productive functions. The producer did not produce for himself; he produced for others." *Sans doute*, as the French say. That is an undoubted fact. But what about the interest of the producer? Here is M. Guyot's answer to this query: "His own interest obliged him to think of others—asking not the slightest gratitude

for the trouble he gave himself on their account." By this reply we must confess M. Guyot holds out no false hopes to the workers; they know what they've got to expect and there's no doubt about their getting it.

Now as to the capitalist: where does his "ethical motive force" come in? "M. Guyot went on to say that the capitalist was also an altruist when he let the producer have the use of his capital." If this statement doesn't produce an "audible smile," nothing will. The capitalist in the character of an altruist is just a trifle more grotesque than a clown playing Hamlet; and Mr. Hyndman was quite right when he replied that, according to this theory, Rhodes was an altruist and Beit was a benefactor of humanity. The producer we have already been told must not ask for "the slightest gratitude for the trouble he gave himself." Neither does the capitalist. What he wants and what he gets is interest. That's his altruism. But it is useless arguing with a man like Guyot. The only argument to convince him would be to give him six months' seeking for a job at the Dock Gates.

NUNQUAM'S NOTIONS.

It is a refreshing experience for an Anarchist Communist to read such courteous and kindly expressed criticism of the Anarchist position as that contained in Nunquam's remarks in the *Clarion* of May 30. We may in all friendliness say a few words in reply to Nunquam's views, as we feel sure that fundamentally there is very little antagonism between his ideas and ours.

First of all, let us remark that Nunquam's Communism, as we understand it, is in all essentials *our* Communism; and this makes it so difficult to understand how he can express himself thus: "But I do not believe that the ideal of the Anarchist could be realized," for the reason that "every man is allowed to be a law unto himself." We fancy a little further on his own ideal of society contradicts this; but we shall see. He goes on to remark that, "unless the liberties and rights of the majority [why not all?] are safeguarded by some form of popular government," clever and unscrupulous people will try to reinstitute monopoly and privilege and tyranny, etc. Undoubtedly they will if you give them the chance; and, unfortunately, Social Democracy *does* give them this chance, as Nunquam's next paragraph explains better than we can. Here are his words: "Your hero is an edge-tool, and should be warily handled. Your leader is prone to become your driver; your benefactor too often elects himself your master. The prayer of the Democrat should always be—'Save us from our friends.'" All this is only too true; but the Anarchist has no need to echo this sentiment; he can address his fellow-men in the words of Walt Whitman:

None but would subordinate you—I only am he who will never consent to subordinate you; I only am he who places over you no master, owner, better, God, beyond what waits intrinsically in yourself.

You see, Anarchism does more than safeguard the rights of minorities and majorities: it safeguards the individual; its ideal is the liberty and equality of *all*. Nunquam believes that government would attain this end for us. But government is an instrument of oppression—always has been and always will be, no matter who may constitute that government. You will no more get justice from it than you will get blood from a stone. That road lies destruction for the Socialist movement. What, then, is to be done? Here again Nunquam seems to answer himself in such an admirable manner that we must once more quote his own words. After drawing a contrast between human conduct in public and private life which ought to "get home" to every honest person, he adds: "What is the reason of this difference between the standard of public and the standard of private life? The difference, I think, is due to the fact that in private life we can within limits act as we *wish* to act—justly and kindly; whereas in public life we act as we *must* act, or think we must act,—with relentless selfishness." The italics are his own.

Yes, you have really stated it very finely. To act as we wish, limited only by the equal claims of others, produces the greatest amount of happiness and harmony in social life. But, dear Nunquam, this is Anarchism. For, surely, to act as we wish means to be free from the restraint which authority and officialism try to impose upon us and which would naturally be worse if the State managed everything. Do not forget your own words,—“Your leader is prone to become your driver; your benefactor too often elects himself your master.” Let us, then, be Anarchists—acting “as we wish” within the limits of others' equal claims; and if you fear that tyranny may again arise under Anarchism, let us remind you that Anarchist Communism destroys the very machinery whereby the tyrant works his will: the State, the guardian of private property, the personification of all the tyrannies, the political and economic enslaver of mankind.

An Appeal

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST WORKERS' & TRADE UNION CONGRESS,
Anarchist and Anti-Parliamentary Committee.

COMRADES.—On Monday, July 27, the International Congress will begin at St. Martin's Town Hall. The Congress Organizing Committee have misinterpreted the Zurich resolution by refusing to acknowledge Anarchist Communist groups as Socialist workers bodies. Nevertheless, the Congress is supreme, and on Monday, July 27, this question will be tested by voting in nationalities. It is, therefore, important that groups in London, and especially the provincial and Scottish groups, should each send a delegate to the Congress supplied with credentials from his group and present them as a claim to take part in Congress. But, should the Congress decide against us, we can safely anticipate another congress being held by those excluded, as at Zurich in 1893.

On Tuesday, July 28, a great public meeting will be held in Holborn Town Hall to welcome delegates attending International Congress, and as this meeting and others likely to be held involve considerable expense we appeal to any and every comrade to support us in this work by sending in financial subscriptions as early as possible. The success of our efforts will be doubly assured by a liberal monetary response to our appeal.

Those comrades having subscription lists should return them filled in by not later than Wednesday, July 22.

This we ask you to do, without emphasizing the importance of its obtaining your immediate attention.

Fraternally yours,

J. PERRY, Secretary.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

The First of May demonstrations on the Continent are declining. Austria is almost the only country where they are kept up as before, numerously attended but more and more deprived of any revolutionary significance. At Vienna, where more than 50,000 working men and women crowded the Prater, demonstrations before a boycotted restaurant which many had entered by inadvertence led to a ferocious attack by the police on the crowd, many being badly wounded and nearly fifty arrested. Those were sentenced to nearly 25 years of prison and penal servitude, several among them getting 2½, 2, and 1½ years for stone-throwing at windows or at the police.

These outrageous sentences did not rouse the Social Democratic press to a feeling of shame for themselves, when they (above all, the Vienna *Arbeiter Zeitung*) denounced those who took part in this demonstration as blackguards, scum and rabble, imitating closely the tactics of the Berlin *Vorwärts* of Liebknecht after the Berlin unemployed riots of 1893. They told with evident glee how a Social Democratic committee-man had tried to get hold of the first stone-thrower to hand him over to the police; how another citizen held up a boy of twelve by the ears and used very bad language to him because this wicked boy had hooted the police; how the chief leader of the Austrian Socialists, Adler, was nearly laid hands on by the police, when they recognised him and withdrew reverently, etc.

Why did not the composers of that paper have sense enough to refuse to print these infamies, as was done after the First of May by the composers of a Liberty and Property Defence organ in Vienna (*Arbeit*), who would not set up the lies and insults of the editor about these riots? This was announced by the editor to the subscribers in a hectographed circular, telling also that the leading article of that particular number had to be altered, "for, in the form it was first written by us, it was rejected by the composers." If such an example were followed, and workingmen generally refused to do the dirty things they are ordered by their employers to do—and which they execute under the shabby pretence that, if it is not they who do it, some one else will be ready to do it,—things would soon become lively.

At Pesth similar police attacks took place, and a few days later, near Reichenberg, in Bohemia, three workingmen were fired upon by gendarmes and killed.

How far the pretensions of authoritarian Socialism go was illustrated by the central committee of the German trade unions—a body, however, representing only a limited portion of the German trade societies—at the Berlin Trade Union Congress, in May, when this committee proposed the creation of a central strike fund, out of which this committee would vote funds for those strikes which it approved of; the committee would also decide under what conditions strikes might be settled. This was too much, even for Social Democrats, and was rejected. But they succeeded in withholding from the Congress a letter addressed to it by the French Federation of Labor Exchanges, which said:—

"The Federation of Labor Exchanges of France, being Revolutionary, Communist and anti-Statist, fights against patriotism, and proclaims the organisation by trade unions for two purposes:

"1. To prepare the way for a general strike in the most essential branches of production.

"2. To make it possible for the workers after the overthrow of the present system, to reorganise production without a central power which would, under cover of 'purely administrative control,' re-establish authority already vanquished."

This was not allowed to be read to the Congress—not by the police, but by the trade union authorities in power.

The extermination of races which are in the way of the capitalist Jugger-naut car continues. For the Armenians goaded into the Sassoun revolt by the predatory attacks of Kurds and Turks, at any rate, tears of sympathy, however sterile, were shed in England. For the Matabele, provoked in the same manner by the Chartered Company and now butchered wholesale, their homes destroyed, etc., no pretence of sympathy is shown. Madagascar has just been made a French colony, and it is announced that the French Government will not abolish slavery there for the present. The money sweated out of the starving Egyptian fellaheen is wasted in crushing the independent Soudan tribes under Turkish power, which is so denounced in Crete, Macedonia and Armenia, by England herself, who otherwise pretends to sympathise with the aims of nationalities under Turkish sway that aspire to freedom; or, what is closer to the mark, the Soudan tribes must be made, by fire and sword, to buy the shoddy European goods for which they have no need. Wherever we look, unscrupulous murder and thieving goes on, sanctioned by State and Church and swallowed by a gullible public with the help of phrases like patriotism, christianity, civilisation—as well as of bribes, stock-exchange profits, employment for bad characters, etc.

After Alexander II., Garfield and Carnot, the Shah of Persia, Nasr ed Din, happened to be assassinated. The Czar, Nicholas II., was crowned at Moscow at a cost of about £4,000,000 and 4,000 human beings—killed outright,—and how many lives were blighted while those £4,000,000 were wrung from the poor Russian peasants? I cannot have any sympathy with the victims of their own flunkeyism; for no honest man would have gone near that place. Nor do I think their particular ignorance ought to be insisted on, as western European crowds are equally servile. It is believed that this event will be generally considered a bad omen by the Russian peasant, even if he is unaware that a similar catastrophe occurred at the coronation of Louis XVI. and Marie Antoinette who some years afterwards were decapitated in the same place. Such superstitions may be worked upon by political revolutionists; but our cause, which is that of enlightenment and

the destruction of prejudices and not one of profiting by them, can scarcely be advanced in this way.

A bomb was thrown into a religious procession at Barcelona and about a dozen of men, women and children were killed. Thereupon a great outcry is raised against Anarchism all over Spain, and the Spanish parliament is just now forging a new law which will punish with the penalty of death the remotest participators in "outrages," and at the same time does away with all means of peaceful propaganda,—proclaiming societies, meetings, papers, etc.

Those who believe the denunciations in the Press and persecutions by the government to be an argument against Anarchism we beg to remind of a few facts taken at random from an ordinary daily paper and happening under the British flag:—

"A THOUSAND MINERS ARE KILLED, AND MORE THAN 100,000 INJURED EVERY YEAR. SINCE 1851, 48,219 MINERS HAVE BEEN KILLED AND 4,500,000 INJURED."—*Daily Chronicle*, June 22.

"'Women and children are not to be injured.'—Proclamation of the general officer in command against the Matabele; from which the conclusion must obviously be drawn that cases have happened in which women and children were injured by the heroes of Rhodesia."—Telegram received by Mr Chamberlain." *Daily Chronicle* June 19.

"Death is said to be preferable to dishonor; yet when the *Standard* published a telegram that the women of Firket, after a thousand dervishes had been massacred, were given as a prey to the lust of the Egyptian soldiers commanded by British officers, the government gave but a sneering, callous, indifferent reply to a question asked in parliament about this fact; and the general public, the 'Nonconformist conscience' and all the rest remain silent."—*Daily Chronicle*, June 13.

"'It is great fun potting niggers off and seeing them fall like ninepins,' wrote a young gentleman from Buluwayo home."—*Daily Chronicle*, June 12.

How can people who by their silence endorse these enormities argue whether a question of humanity is involved in the Barcelona explosion?

Nor are women spared in other countries. In April 1890, copies of two Anarchist leaflets published in London were sent to various people in Berlin in closed envelopes. The police traced them to four persons, three men and one woman, and at the trial (for incitement to high treason and offending the German emperor), held at Leipzig on July 10, 1890, this woman, our comrade Mrs. Reinhold, a tailor's wife, took everything upon her shoulders and managed to get the three men (her husband among them) acquitted, whilst she was sentenced, for having posted those closed letters, to six years penal servitude. These she is now doing up to the last day, and on July 10 she will leave the penitentiary and be once more with her friends. Her home is broken up in the meantime, and the Berlin comrades will try to help her on; she is now forty-seven years old. Her joy will be great when she sees that in place of the scattered few who upheld our ideas in Berlin six years ago there is now a large and flourishing movement, not only in Berlin but all over Germany—a progress hardly to be hoped six years ago, but realised in fact, partly owing to the stupidity, intolerance and meanness of our enemies in both the bourgeois and the State Socialist camps. We welcome her in our midst once more.

Re the International Congress, the Austrian Social Democratic Congress, held in April at Prague, decided without any discussion that Bebel's (in)famous rule should be upheld by the Austrian delegates. The Netherlands Socialist Federation published the true facts about that rule in a circular identical in argument with a letter published by them in the *Labour Leader* on January 25th. A similar protest against this rule was published in Spain, and translated in *Les Temps Nouveaux* of May 16. The Berlin comrades appointed Landauer and Pavlovitch as delegates, both present at Zurich, and who had since then to undergo lengthy terms of imprisonment. Austrian and Bohemian comrades also intend to be present.

The horrors of the Italian transportation colonies still continue. Five comrades, who escaped in a boat from one of these island colonies and crossed the Mediterranean, were arrested when they reached Tunis by the French authorities, and without any trial handed over again to their Italian gaolers.

From Lisbon 28 comrades were transported to Portuguese Africa; every public utterance on Anarchism is being now stamped illegal in Portugal; a secret paper is published, *O Luchador Anarchista*, and even the prisoners started a paper which circulates from hand to hand.

Pietro Gori after leaving San Francisco lectured at Los Angeles, St. Louis, and Kansas City; he is making his way by Pennsylvania back to New York and Paterson. John Turner started there and lectured at Philadelphia, Boston, etc.; he is now going West.

Le Libertaire, of Paris, was seized for republishing the defence of Emile Henry and of some notes he jotted down when awaiting execution. I will translate a few of those remarks:

"Every one of us has a special physiognomy and aptitude by which he is differentiated from his comrades in the struggle. Hence we are not astonished to see revolutionists so much divided on the question of where to direct their efforts."

"It is asked, 'Which are the right tactics?' All tactics are, in proportion to the amount of energy devoted to action."

"But we do not recognize that anybody has the right to say, 'Our propaganda is the only good one; there is nothing besides ours.' This is an old excuse of authoritarianism.....which free men must not uphold."

"To those who say, 'Hatred does not beget love,' reply that love, living love, often begets hatred."

"Hatred which is not based upon low envy, but upon generous feeling, is a healthy and essentially vital passion."

"The more we love our dream of liberty, vigour and beauty, the more we must hate all that wishes to prevent the realization of this future state."

"The Socialists do not care to understand that freedom of the individual is necessary for the true freedom of the people."

"One of the first teachings of Anarchy is: Develop your life in all directions; oppose to the fictitious riches of capitalists the real riches of individuals full of intelligence and energy."

NEW PUBLICATIONS.—*L'Insurge* (Brussels), *Ariete Anarquista* (Barcelona), *Sturmglöcken* (The Tocsin, a German Anarchist paper of the *Endehors* type, Chicag.), *Ni Dios ni Amo* (No God, no master, Buenos Aires), *La Lotta Umana*

(Ancona). The publication of new Italian papers at Palermo (*Arte*) and Leghorn (*Sempre Avanti*) is announced as forthcoming.

La Société future, by Jean Grave, is published in two Spanish editions (Madrid and Buenos Aires); Zo d'Axa's chief articles in the *Endehors* and the correspondence on the Free Bread proposition of Barrucand in France have been reprinted in two books (*Endehors* and *Le Pain gratuit*) at Paris, one franc each. Elisée Reclus' lecture, *L'Anarchie*, is published in pamphlet form by the *Temps Nouveaux* (Paris 1d.), also in a Flemish translation at Malines. P. Kropotkin's *Coming Anarchy* (*Nineteenth Century*, August 1885) is accessible now as a French pamphlet, *L'inevitable Anarchie* (Brussels).

Juan Montseny published an elaborate treatise on Anarchy, *Sociologica Anarquista* (Biblioteca de El Corsario, La Coruña, 203 pp.).

P. Kropotkin's series of papers on Mutual Aid (begun in the *Nineteenth Century* of Sept. 1890) is brought to an end by *Mutual Aid among Ourselves*, in the *Nineteenth Century* of June 1896. The whole series of eight articles may be expected to be reprinted some day in book form; it demonstrates the enormous influence of voluntary association upon progress throughout the whole series of animated phenomena, among animals, savages, barbarians, in the mediæval city, among modern men (January 1896), among ourselves.

Kropotkin's latest publication is *L'Anarchie: sa philosophie, son idéal* (Anarchism: its philosophy, its ideal), the full text of the lecture which he intended to give in Paris three months ago, but was prevented through his expulsion by the Radical Government. It forms a booklet of 59 pages, published by V. Stock at one franc, but can be obtained from the *Temps Nouveaux* for sixpence. An English edition is in course of preparation.

CHARITY: TRUE AND FALSE.

BY J. C. KENWORTHY.

To day, not for the first year in history by thousands, there is a movement which seeks to place government by goodwill in place of government by force; which seeks to bring about social order, not by compulsion, but by power of right principle. This movement is generally described by the not very happy term "Anarchist," and includes in its ranks prophets of violence, like Bakounine, and of peace, like Tolstoi.

So far the movement has done no more than further and, one may say, complete the general Socialist criticism which has, for thinking people, already destroyed every justification, excuse, for the existing social chaos. And it has refrained from, and exposed, the mistaken activities of those who resort to political methods, to legal compulsion, in the hope of bringing about a better state of affairs. It has, in effect, given us a man who says: "Existing society is wholly wrong; the support of force, of police and soldiery, upon which it rests, must be withdrawn and men left free to produce a new society by the power of those better instincts and knowledge which are now helpless under this present rule of brute force."

Entirely good! But, somehow, we who agree with, who are, this man, find that our cause having come so far is arrested, does not march. And we begin to see that the negative criticism which has been our main stock-in-trade so far is insufficient. The old society may, in reason and morals be riddled and wrecked; but people will not leave it until they see some clear and tangible better thing to turn to. In short, our cause needs a program of reconstruction, a definite propaganda of the new society, to logically forward the work of destroying the present evil.

Now, our demand is for a free society inspired by *principles*, principles operating in wholly free men. And I submit that the main business of every person who calls himself, or who may be termed an Anarchist, is to discover, to announce and to realise the principles which will and must rule in that new, free society which we seek. With that object I ask the very serious and careful attention of all readers who at all care for human welfare (which includes their own) to the following thoughts put together under this heading of "Charity: true and false."

Every man confesses, and, whoever he is, must confess, that human beings come together and continue to live in society for mutual benefit, to do each other good, for the sake of the advantage they can get from and give to each other. Getting advantage means that advantage must be given; it cannot be all "getting." Fundamental instinct tells us that this is the ground-plan of society, of absolute necessity acknowledged and acted upon by every member of society—even by Rockefeller and Bill Sikes. The queen confesses this when she sends a £5 note to the sufferers by a colliery disaster; the beggar confesses it when he shares his meal with his fellow-beggar.

And yet, though this need of mutual help exists, and is confessed, society is found in a state of misery for the more part; and all civilisation is, as civilisation always has been, in ferment and unrest, shaken by volcanic threatenings in its foundations. The thoughtful few know that these troubles are caused by errors in social practice which have destroyed the balance of social advantage among individuals; so that some do nearly all the "getting," and others do nearly all the "giving." And the problem before us is: How can we best understand and apply the fundamental and indisputable principle, that society exists for the mutual advantage of its members, for the interchange of good among them.

Obviously, our first consideration must be of things that come first. The primary and absolute needs of every life are food, clothing and shelter. If I myself have those things, so far, good, I can live. But, so living myself, I see others around me, men and women, with the same needs, which they cannot satisfy. I think to myself (whether consciously or not), "This is unpleasant, I should not like to feel as those people must feel; and, while it is possible for other people to get into this state, it may be possible for me to do so, also, and I should not

like that. So I had better do something towards making this people comfortable and secure."

Upon this feeling and view, every individual in society more or less acts. Where is the human creature who has never from this instinct, this motive, helped another? The fact is patent; the only question can be: How often, and how far ought individuals so to act? Shall I give a few £5 notes out of my millions, as the queen does, or shall I give the coat off my back like Francis?

Upon this feeling and view an elaborate method and enormous work of what is believed to be helping others has sprung up, which we speak of conventionally as "charity"—a word which properly means "love, affection." From Russia to the United States, either way round the world, everywhere there are similar institutions to our English workhouses, hospital, almshouses, asylums, relief societies, and habitual "almsgiving." Such undertakings are everywhere regarded as highest works of religion, of duty to God by whatever name He is called.

We in England, as elsewhere are in the way of boasting of the size and munificence of these institutions among us. But a few people ask, not "how large?" or "how expensive?" but, "how effective are these institutions?" And the answer, the only one honestly discoverable, is: "They do no more than touch the fringe of poverty and misery, which gather and grow, so that it would seem the more 'charity,' is done, the more need for it springs up. A fourth of the people of London, besides those cared for by all forms of 'charity' and 'relief,' are in chronic destitution as Charles Booth says. They deserve the workhouse and cannot get even that. For every one helped by a hospital, maybe ten or a score die in unaided need. One old person is put into an almshouse where a hundred are desired. All the private and public charity does not prevent thousands of deaths annually from or through destitution."

And the people who are relieved are not grateful. They go to the workhouse sometimes; occasionally killing themselves rather than go. They object to be taken to hospitals, and must be forced there by laws. It is a servile thanks one meets in the almshouse. For all that is given by "philanthropy" the answer of the recipient (when the giver's back is turned) is, "Well, they can afford it and more too." Our "charity," then, is inefficient and ill-received, as everybody knows.

Now the true spirit of charity—love—cannot be satisfied with this, and must enquire. To this charity the problem stands simply thus: Here are, in England alone, millions, actual millions of people needing to be fed, clothed, and housed comfortably and reasonably. We make some attempt to satisfy this need; and fail hopelessly. What is wrong? Why cannot we get and serve round to all enough food, clothing and shelter?

Political economy has made a study of the question, and with many of her tongues (not quite all, however) answered thus: There must always exist in society this margin of want and misery; Nature cannot support all her children; there simply is not enough to go round. And besides, many of these poor are idle and improvident, and are destitute from want of industry and thrift.

One can thus imagine the spirit of Political Economy taking the spirit of Charity, newly come from heaven, on a walk of inspection through the east end of London for proof and explanation. And Charity sighs, and says, "Yes, it seems too true; what a host of people, and how little room for them! And how bad their habits seem!"

But the two walk on together westward, discussing. Mile follows mile. At last Charity says, "Ah, this seems much better!" A roomy square, with grass and trees in the middle and mansions on each side, succeeds the streets of more or less squalor. "Much better, this. Let us go in here and see how these people get along." It is a house where a family of five live in twelve great rooms, with six servants in four little rooms at the top. A six-course dinner is cooking; and two grooms in the stable behind are preparing two horses and a carriage to drive to the theatre.

"But how is this?" asks Charity. "You told me Nature had not enough for all; and here are five people living in twelve rooms, instead of twelve people in one room. And, out of the five, two women have fifty dresses between them, and chests of drawers full of all kinds of clothes; and the men have many suits of clothes, and they all have the most extraordinary luxuries, so that occasionally they are ill from easy living and too rich feeding. And yet you said there was nothing to be had for those poor creatures whom we saw shivering as they ate things picked up from the gutter! I am astonished, please explain?"

"Ah, well, you see," says Political Economy, "these people pay for all they have. They give value for all this."

"Indeed," says Charity, "they must all of them do a vast amount of work to produce the value which they give in return for house and clothes and food, and the work of these servants."

"No, I cannot say that," answers Political Economy; "as a matter of fact, they don't work at all; but they give others the opportunity of working."

"But I fail to understand," says Charity. "Do you mean that they give value, give a fair return for all they get by letting other people make what they get?"

"No, I would not say that. But they have property, capital, and out of that they are able to give work to very many people and to pay these people wages which keep them."

"But by wages you must mean food, clothing and shelter, the things men work for. And if these five people do no work themselves, how can they possibly have any food, clothing and shelter to pay wages with? That is, unless they take these from somebody else who works and makes them. But that would be robbery; and really it seems to

me it must be so. Perhaps those poor people in the East End, whom we saw working, are robbed in this way."

And then Political Economy begins a long series of justifications and explanations, which no one, not even Political Economy's self, can understand and establish. Because they are false.

(To be Continued.)

ANARCHISM: ITS PHILOSOPHY AND IDEAL.

It is not without a certain hesitation that I have decided to take the philosophy and ideal of Anarchy as the subject of this lecture.

Those who are persuaded that Anarchy is a collection of visions relating to the future, and an unconscious striving towards the destruction of all present civilization, are still very numerous; and to clear the ground of such prejudices of our education as maintain this view we should have, perhaps, to enter into many details which it would be difficult to embody in a single lecture. Did not the Parisian press, only two or three years ago, maintain that the whole philosophy of Anarchy consisted in destruction, and that its only argument was violence?

Nevertheless Anarchists have been spoken of so much lately, that part of the public has at last taken to reading and discussing our doctrines. Sometimes men have even given themselves the trouble to reflect, and at the present moment we have at least gained a point: it is willingly admitted that Anarchists have an ideal. Their ideal is even found too beautiful, too lofty for a society not composed of superior beings.

But is it not pretentious on my part to speak of a philosophy, when, according to our critics, our ideas are but dim visions of a distant future? Can Anarchy pretend to possess a philosophy, when it is denied that Socialism has one?

This is what I am about to answer with all possible precision and clearness, only asking you to excuse me beforehand if I repeat an example or two which I have already given at a London lecture, and which seem to be best fitted to explain what is meant by the philosophy of Anarchism.

You will not bear me any ill-will if I begin by taking a few elementary illustrations borrowed from natural sciences. Not for the purpose of deducing our social ideas from them—far from it; but simply the better to set off certain relations, which are easier grasped in phenomena verified by the exact sciences than in examples only taken from the complex facts of human societies.

Well, then, what especially strikes us at present in exact sciences, is the profound modification which they are undergoing now, in the whole of their conceptions and interpretations of the facts of the universe.

There was a time, you know, when man imagined the earth placed in the centre of the universe. Sun, moon, planets and stars seemed to roll round our globe; and this globe, inhabited by man, represented for him the centre of creation. He himself—the superior being on his planet—was the elected of his Creator. The sun, the moon, the stars were but made for him; towards him was directed all the attention of a God, who watched the least of his actions, arrested the sun's course for him, wafted in the clouds, launching his showers or his thunder-bolts on fields and cities, to recompense the virtue or punish the crimes of mankind. For thousands of years man thus conceived the universe.

You know also what an immense change was produced in the sixteenth century in all conceptions of the civilized part of mankind, when it was demonstrated that, far from being the centre of the universe, the earth was only a grain of sand in the solar system—a ball, much smaller even than the other planets; that the sun itself—though immense in comparison to our little earth, was but a star among many other countless stars which we see shining in the skies and swarming in the milky-way. How small man appeared in comparison to this immensity without limits, how ridiculous his pretensions! All the philosophy of that epoch, all social and religious conceptions, felt the effects of this transformation in cosmogony. Natural science, whose present development we are so proud of, only dates from that time.

But a change, much more profound, and with far wider reaching results, is being effected at the present time in the whole of the sciences, and Anarchy, you will see, is but one of the many manifestations of this evolution.

Take any work on astronomy of the last century, or the beginning of ours. You will no longer find in it, it goes without saying, our tiny planet placed in the centre of the universe. But you will meet at every step the idea of a central luminary—the sun—who by its powerful attraction governs our planetary world. From this central body radiates a force guiding the course of the planets, and maintaining the harmony of the system. Issued from a central agglomeration, planets have, so to say, budded from it; they owe their birth to this agglomeration; they owe everything to the radiant star that represents it still: the rhythm of their movements, their orbits set at wisely regulated distances, the life that animates them and adorns their surfaces. And when any perturbation disturbs their course and makes them deviate from their orbits, the central body re-establishes order in the system; it assures and perpetuates its existence.

This conception, however, is also disappearing as the other one did. After having fixed all their attention on the sun and the large planets, astronomers are beginning to study now the infinitely small ones that people the universe. And they discover that the interplanetary and interstellar spaces are peopled and crossed in all imaginable directions by little swarms of matter, invisible, infinitely small, when taken sepa-

ately, but all-powerful in their numbers. Among those masses, some, like the bolide that fell in Spain the other day, are still rather big; others weigh but a few ounces or grains, while around them is wafted dust, almost microscopic, filling up the spaces.

It is to this dust, to these infinitely tiny bodies that dash through space in all directions with giddy swiftness, that clash with one another, agglomerate, disintegrate, everywhere and always, it is to them that to-day astronomers look for an explanation of the origin of our solar system, the movements that animate its parts, and the harmony of their whole. Yet another step, and soon universal gravitation itself will be but the result of all the disordered and incoherent movements of these infinitely small bodies—of oscillations of atoms that manifest themselves in all possible directions. Thus the centre, the origin of force, formerly transferred from the earth to the sun, now turns out to be scattered and disseminated: it is everywhere and nowhere. With the astronomer, we perceive that solar systems are the work of infinitely small bodies; that the power which was supposed to govern the system is itself but the result of the collisions among those infinitely tiny clusters of matter, that the harmony of stellar systems is harmony only because it is an adaptation, a resultant of all these numberless movements uniting, completing, equilibrating one another.

The whole aspect of the universe changes with this new conception. The idea of force governing the world, of preestablished law, preconceived harmony, disappears to make room for the harmony that Fourier had caught a glimpse of: the one which results from the disorderly and incoherent movements of numberless hosts of matter, each of which goes its own way and all of which hold each other in equilibrium.

If it were only astronomy that were undergoing this change! But no; the same modification takes place in the philosophy of all sciences without exception; those which study nature as well as those which study human relations.

In physical sciences, the entities of heat, magnetism, and electricity disappear. When a physicist speaks to-day of a heated or electrified body, he no longer sees an inanimate mass, to which an unknown force should be added. He strives to recognize in this body and in the surrounding space, the course, the vibrations of infinitely small atoms which dash in all directions, vibrate, move, live, and by their vibrations, their shocks, their life, produce the phenomena of heat, light, magnetism or electricity.

In sciences that treat of organic life, the notion of species and its variations is being substituted by a notion of the variations of the individual. The botanist and zoologist study the individual—his life, his adaptations to his surroundings. Changes produced in him by the action of drought or damp, heat or cold, abundance or poverty of nourishment, of his more or less sensitiveness to the action of exterior surroundings will originate species; and the variations of species are now for the biologist but resultants—a given sum of variations that have been produced in each individual separately. A species will be what the individuals are, each undergoing numberless influences from the surroundings in which they live, and to which they correspond each in his own way.

And when a physiologist speaks now of the life of a plant or of an animal, he sees rather an agglomeration, a colony of millions of separate individuals than a personality one and indivisible. He speaks of a federation of digestive, sensual, nervous organs, all very intimately connected with one another, each feeling the consequence of the well-being or indisposition of each, but each living its own life. Each organ, each part of an organ in its turn is composed of independent cellules which associate to struggle against conditions unfavorable to their existence. The individual is quite a world of federations, a whole universe in himself.

And in this world of aggregated beings the physiologist sees the autonomous cells of blood, of the tissues, of the nerve-centres; he recognizes the millions of white corpuscles—the phagocytes—who wend their way to the parts of the body infected by microbes in order to give battle to the invaders. More than that: in each microscopic cell he discovers to-day a world of autonomous organisms, each of which lives its own life, looks for well-being for itself and attains it by grouping and associating itself with others. In short, each individual is a cosmos of organs, each organ is a cosmos of cells, each cell is a cosmos of infinitely small ones; and in this complex world, the well-being of the whole depends entirely on the sum of well-being enjoyed by each of the least microscopic particles of organised matter. A whole revolution is thus produced in the philosophy of life.

THE POET OF FREEDOM.*

Many poets have written of Freedom. Byron, Wordsworth, even Southey and many other less notable men, have had their dreams of liberty: more or less fleeting visions, one might say, of a higher destiny for mankind. But no man in the whole range of English literature had a higher conception of the deep and profound necessity for Freedom in the evolution of social life than Shelley. For this reason, if for no other (though there are many other reasons), the Anarchist should study the life and writings of this great poet.

Mr. Salt's volume on Shelley offers to the general reader one of the best opportunities of gaining a sympathetic insight into the poet's life and work. He commences by pointing to the fact that there have

* Shelley: A Biographical Study, by H. S. Salt, W. Reeves 185 Fleet Street.

Printed and published by J. TURNER at 7 Lambs Conduit Street, London, W. C.