Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. XI.—No. 112. JANUARY, 1897. MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

1896.

A GLANCE at the work of the year through which we have just passed reveals the fact that, despite the disgusting reactionary period through which we are passing, much good propaganda has been done; and, further, that several events that have taken place will tend to give it more than the usual importance in the history of the Anarchist movement.

First and foremost there is the meeting of the International Socialist and Trades Union Congress, which has been dealt with fully in these pages, but the moral effects of which will be better judged as time goes on. Suffice it that the line of cleavage between the parliamentary and non-parliamentary Socialists was acutely manifested, and as to the Anarchists—well, surely no better reasons for the necessity of the Anarchist spirit in the Socialist movement could be given than the working of that Congress by the ambitious and unscrupulous politicians of the Social Democratic party.

The after-effects of the Congress, both at home and abroad, have proved that the tactics of the Social Democrats will always produce a revolution of feeling in the minds of honest men.

In England we have been much impressed by the advanced spirit of the French and the Dutch Trades Unions which the meetings of the Congress made evident. For those of our readers who would like a concise and clear account of the French movement we recommend a perusal of Comrade Métin's article in the "Labor Annual" for 1897.

During the latter part of '96 there has not been wanting some healthy signs of renewed activity in the provinces. Scotland, as our reports indicate, has been quietly and steadily keeping up the propaganda, and Kropotkin has given some highly successful lectures there. We give them our heartiest wishes for their good work in the new year.

In Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, Norwich, and Leicester some revival has taken place, and we feel sure it only needs help and encourgement from London comrades to achieve a vigorous propaganda in the coming year in these important centres.

For the year's work abroad we must refer our readers to our International Notes, where they will find all important events recorded. We cannot, however, let pass this opportunity of expressing our deepest indignation at the fiendish treatment of the Anarchists by the ruling classes in Spain. What has Liebknecht to say to this "petting" of the Anarchists by the Spanish bourgeoisie?

It will scarcely be necessary for us, in conclusion, to remind comrades of the immense yet splendid work that lies before us. With all the difficulties and adversities of our own lives to exhaust our energies, there is no denying that the burden falls heavily upon us. Yet for all that the struggle must be carried on! Otherwise were life worth living?

CO-OPERATION:

A Reply to Herbert Spencer.

BY P. KROPOTKIN.

(Concluded from previous number.)

It was mentioned in the preceding article how widely distributed in Russia are such forms of co-operation and of sharing of earnings, as, in Herbert Spencer's opinion, would imply a higher development of human nature. And it hardly need be added that for *consumption*, similar *artels* are of everyday occurrence in all branches of popular life. As soon as five, six, ten or twenty peasants come to St. Petersburg, or Moscow, or Odessa, to work in a factory or elsewhere, they hire lodgings in company, take their meals in common, and—if their trade allows it—they try to get work for the *artel*—not individually. Even the convicts on their way to Siberia, and in hard labor, live in an *artel* whose elected "elder" is the officially recognized representative of the convict *artel* in its relations with the authorities, food of the *artel*, conflicts with the authorities, work, and so on.

That racial characteristics would be of no value to explain these facts Spencer will see at once, and he will understand, on the contrary, the importance of the *communal institutions* which exist in Russia for the maintenance of that spirit. The more so, as we see also in France that the peasants have been permitted to constitute the *syndicats agricoles;* not only do they largely use that right for a variety of purposes, but facts are known of their treating their *individually owned* plots of land as *common property* (for grazing and the like). To use the words of a recent official report, facts multiply of their putting their plots in common in order to redistribute them *(remuniements collectifs)*.

Why, then—it was asked at the end of the last article—do the Russian peasants, workers, artisans and so on, remain in such terrible poverty although they are so willing to associate, and associate in such an excellent way?

I might mention the ruin of the masses by *taxation*. But this is a very big subject, much neglected by modern economists,* which would require many developments. There is, however, another still more important reason. It is not enough to be imbued with the co-operative spirit; not enough to be capable of working out good forms of co-operation. Men must know *what to associate*, besides their hands and brains.

Spencer, like all middle-class theorists, sees the chief difficulty for the advent of a better state of affairs in the (presupposed) incapacity of the worker to understand his own interests. He is *sure* (that is a matter of religious faith with him) that if to-morrow the workers of such a factory, or mine, or railway become owners of that factory, mine or railway, they would quarrel, and the concern would perish in consequence of their incapacity to agree in the sharing of the profits.

Consequently, he cares little to find out such features in the actual life of mankind as would bring him to an opposite conclusion. Just as, in his great anthropological inquest, which has cost him and his contributors an incredible amount of labor and is now utterly valueless, because the real character of the savage and barbarian institutions does not appear from that preordinated inquest, so also he shuts his eyes to the facts of real modern life which would bring him to conclusions different from those just mentioned.†

But the reality of modern life is this: As soon as the workers or the peasants, of any nationality, are brought by any circumstances to the common ownership of anything, and as soon as the State ceases to interfere by creating artificial differences of wealth and power among them, they admirably find out in a relatively short time the ways of managing that common property in the general interest.

Let me mention one or two examples out of thousands. There was in the Urals a royal ironworks, Votkinsk, which it was decided to abandon. The workers proposed to take it, as an *artel*. The State agreed, and gave to the *artel* some of those contracts which are given to various private ironworks. The *artel* prospers for several years since. Or else, in several places in Russia, where petty trades are much developed, the Ministry of War began a few years ago to give some of its contracts—on a pretty large scale—not to sweaters, but to the artizans themselves, if they undertook it as *artels*. In such cases it made advances of money. A couple of months ago, the *Official Messenger* published the results—excellent on all accounts. Many County Councils (zemstvos) have done the same, with excellent results.

Under the present conditions of capitalism—the English co-operators know it perfectly well—the chief difficulty is not so much in the organisation of production, not so much in finding an equitable way of sharing the earnings, but in the sale of the produce. When it comes to the market, the small concern is unavoidably crushed out of existence; it is killed by underselling and by thousands of wicked tricks of the other dealers. And this is why the English co-operators, who failed with their co-operative production when they had to find buyers in the commercial market, succeed now that they have their own market—more honest than the usual commercial market,—in their thousands of distributive co-operations.

But this is only a small part of the difficulty. The other, much greater part is—*what to associate*. At the present time, land, capital, knowledge, State and Municipal concessions, even education (how many children work in factories, mines, as newspaper sellers, and so on?) —all these are *constituted monopolies* in the hands of the rich. And, so long as these monopolies exist, all efforts of the co-operators are bound to remain extremely limited in scope. More than that. All their attempts are bound to remain *imbued with a narrow egotistic spirit which stands in direct contradiction to the spirit which Co-operation is intended to develop*. Started to counteract the narrow egotistic feeling of capitalism, brought to life with no other purpose but to break down and to crush out of existence that capitalistic spirit,—Co-operation, under the present system of monopolies, becomes itself imbued with that same spirit of capitalist monopoly which it pretends to combat.

This is only normal and natural. And this is so evident, that as soon as a single one of these monopolies is done away with, or is only

* Its importance has lately been brought into prominence in the twenty-second *Annual Report* of the Illinois Labor Bureau.

† Every anthropologist knows how valueless is that immense work produced at Herbert Spencer's expense and at his instigation, and therefore will prefer Waitz's *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, which was compiled without preconceived ideas, or Post's *African Common Law*, and so on,—to say nothing of the original works, which are still better sources of information.

limited in its application, the co-operative spirit grows in proportion. If that spirit, if that capacity for sharing the earnings is so immensely developed in Russia, or in some French villages, it is only because those Russian or French peasants are—to some extent at least—freed from one of those monopolies, land monopoly. They own land in common, and this alone is sufficient to develop among them the co-operative spirit which Spencer longs for and is ready to consider as a higher ideal to be reached in times to come by the human race. Take *one* of the monopolies away and the co-operative spirit develops much more than through half a century of practice in individually egotistic "Co-operation."

This is why Spencer would do infinitely more for human progress if, instead of directing his attention to the invention of panaceas for preventing workers from "jealousies" in the sharing of profits, he would inquire into the substance of those institutions which breed jealousies, and of those which diminish them. While what he does now is to endeavour to conciliate two opposite currents of ideas and habits which exclude each other.

As to the still more limited panacea of piece-work, which he so warmly advocates and exaggerates in its consequences, it hardly need be criticised here, as the practical commonsense of several correspondents to *Labour Copartnership* has sufficiently shown the utopian character of that panacea. One of the correspondents puts it especially clearly in its proper light, in this way. A thousand clothiers, he says, are holders of £1 shares, and they start a cloth factory. But, with the present cost of machinery, a capital of £1000 is nothing, a trifle, which will not be enough to give work even to a hundred clothiers. Let us say, nevertheless, that they start a factory for a hundred men. They introduce, on Spencer's advice, piece-work; and by the exercise of much cleverness, ardor in work and so on, the production is increased so much that each of the hundred workers has to be paid £2 or £3 more. What will the shareholders say to that? Surely they will say: "Myself, I can hardly reach 26s. in the factory which I work in. Why should I—employer of these hundred workers—be paid less than they are? They must not have more than 26s." No fine reasoning will induce the capitalistically-reasoning shareholder to pay his worker more than he earns himself. And the utopia, which was going to reform mankind and capitalism, falls to the ground.

We admire Spencer when he comes forward to claim the land of the country for all those who live and work on it. We admire him when he comes forward to claim the power of higher principles in politics. We admire him, also, when he appears as the champion of the Individual against the State (in theory, at least, though not in many of his practical reasonings). But he might leave the workers to find out for themselves how to come to an equitable distribution of what they have produced—when they, themselves, own the necessaries for production. Their systems will be more equitable and more practical than whatever may be invented in his study by the evolutionist philosopher.

This, at any rate, he perfectly well knows himself: Great changes in society are not produced by small tricks. Great changes in mankind's moods of thought are not produced by such petty means as "Dutch auctions" and "piece-work wages," which are borrowed from the old mood of thought itself.

Herbert Spencer knows the value of *principles*.—Need he be reminded of them?

WHO IS THE CALUMNIATOR?

The True Facts concerning the "Vooruit" Affair.

A comrade writes to us from Holland:—

Liebknecht, calumniator of old, has vented his spite against Nieuwenhuis and against a Ghent comrade, Pol de Witte, who in *Recht voor Allen* criticised the affairs of the co-operative society "Vooruit," as well as its manager Anseele. Liebknecht, without any knowledge of the question, naturally sided with Anseele because he is a friend of the "international family."

The *Vorwärts* [Liebknecht's paper] calls Pol de Witte (1) an Anarchist.

The *Vorwärts* calls Pol de Witte (2) a friend of Nieuwenhuis.

The *Vorwärts* calls Pol de Witte's action (3) Anarchist knavery.

Three lies are contained in this preamble.

No. 1. *Pol de Witte is no Anarchist.*

Mr. Liebknecht here follows the well-known method: Every opponent is, first of all, an Anarchist and, secondly, a rogue.

Thus he treats Pol de Witte.

Should anyone wish to know who Pol de Witte is, we can answer: An old comrade. Anseele himself states in the newspaper *Vooruit* that he knows nothing against de Witte's private life,* and he owns never to have been more pained than when he heard that Pol was the writer of the articles against the "Vooruit."

Neither does he say that Pol is an Anarchist; this invention was reserved for Mr. Liebknecht's fertile imagination.

No. 2. *Pol de Witte is no friend of Nieuwenhuis.* Nieuwenhuis was expelled from Belgium years ago; and although he formerly lectured in Ghent, he has never been there during the last few years. He does not know Pol. But he is of opinion that a workers' paper must keep its pages open for the expression of any worker's grievance. He cannot understand why the "Vooruit" should be treated as a sacred shrine, and he believes that criticism of a business concern like the "Vooruit" is as justifiable as that of any capitalists' factory. Employers and workers stand inimically opposed to one another, here as elsewhere. The paper *Recht voor Allen* is a free tribune in which assailants as well as defenders can state their case.

No. 3. *Pol de Witte has been guilty of no knavery.* He has criticised, and his only misdeed is to have been guilty of *lèse*-Anseele, and that no doubt is deserving of excommunication.

To recapitulate the controversy at length would require too much space; so we shall try to put it as short as possible.

Pol de Witte wrote that the girls in "Vooruit" usually made 31 snaffles an hour, or 310 in ten hours. The forewoman was ordered to see how many snaffles she could make in an hour with the greatest expedition of energy. She made 45. The workers were also made to try, but most of them only succeeded in making 36, and but few 39. The employers tried to oblige them all to make 39, but they answered that the number attained by the forewoman was excessive; that they worked till the perspiration flowed from them; that 39 was too much, and they could not stand such work nine hours consecutively. They even had courage enough to threaten to strike. At last the employers decided to be satisfied with 36. That made 334 snaffles in nine hours, or 24 more than formerly, with one hour's less work. Employers may well sigh for such a shortening of working hours.

And what does the chairman of the commission of inquiry, who was elected at a party meeting, write? We reproduce his letter which he had the courage to give publicity to.

"Ghent, Septemher 23rd, 1896.

"Please allow me a little space.

"I have consciously carried out the task I undertook—the examination of the work-girls' grievances in the needlework, as well as in the embroidery department, of the 'Vooruit.' The conclusions I arrived at during the inquiry I was wiiling to sign, and the facts exposed in *Recht voor Allen* I would also readily subscribe to.

"This newspaper gave us to understand that a species of piece-work or minute-system had been introduced into the 'Vooruit,' and it turns out to be true. Nor does *Recht voor Allen* swerve from the truth when it writes regarding the snaffles:

"'Formerly girls made 31 snaffles an hour, now they have to make 36.'

"Nay, more; they must now make 39.

"I saw the forewomen make 45 every hour.

"As, according to my belief, the sense of the text of Pol de Witte's public letter in the *Recht voor Allen* is not calumny, I cannot conscientiously sign a report in which the writer of the criticism is accused of lies and calumnies.

"It is true that the embroiderer's wage—reckoned by working hours—is higher in the 'Vooruit' than in other factories, and that with the introduction of an eight-hours' day the wages have risen. I saw names of needle-women on the list who formerly, on average, earned 23 centimes an hour, and now they receive 36 centimes; yet more is produced in less time, and so *less* is paid by the piece. This is confirmed by the needle-women.

"I readily admit that the 'Vooruit,' by virtue of the law of competition and necessity, and wishing to exceed the standard of wages in other factories, has been forced to adopt a system by which it obtains the greatest production in the shortest possible time, but it is doubtful if we can bring about Socialism by such means.

"Here stands the 'Vooruit' manager, and as such he cannot act differently.

"Inquiring into the needle-women's grievances, we also found that, although the wages are raised, less is paid by the piece; only 'Vooruit' proved that it cannot be otherwise.

"I must confess that, during the inquiry, the needle-women agreed with the directors of 'Vooruit' as to wages paid. It was only the shirt-makers who protested against the inaccuracy of the statement of wages for piece-work; and as regards this question, I wished to refrain from voting with the committee in case the report did not contain (by which I also meant the report in the newspaper *Vooruit*) what the shirt-sewers, who had been questioned, had declared.

"The protest was not published.

"Again I protested against the fact that a report was signed with my name, to which remarks like these had been added: 'The calumniators of "Vooruit" stand condemned,' and: 'That all accusations that have appeared in *Recht voor Allen* are false,' as also: 'The commission condemns the author of the said letters in the above-mentioned newspaper.'

"Yours respectfully,

"P. Braeckman."

Strange behaviour, is it not?

The accused himself, Anseele, writes the report of a commission which was appointed to examine his guilt, and signs it with the names of the chairman and secretary without their knowledge. This Braeckman is a compositor working on *Vooruit*, and his was a courageous action, as it proved that Pol de Witte had not calumniated, but had spoken the truth.*

The party meeting had also its comic side. The needle-women had written out their grievances and had given them to a member to read. He was unable to speak, partly because the directors spoke very long, and partly because much noise was made when any one of the opposition ventured to say anything. At last, a certain De Meyer was able to ask a few questions, which the needle-women answered in the affirmative.

"Is it true that Anseele is brutal?" he asked.

All the girls in chorus: "Yes."

"Is it true that Anseele made Palmise d'Hové (one of the girls) cry?"

All in chorus: "Yes."

"Is it true that Anseele said that he buttered her bread for her?"

All: "Yes."

Anseele interrupting: "That is not true."

Protest from the girls.

One of the speakers said that in Holland they had nothing to do with what happened in Ghent, and so *Recht voor Allen* had no business to take up the matter.

De Meyer asked: "Is it true that money has been sent from Ghent to Holland to support such men as Troelstra, Vliegen, and such like, who try to raise quarrels in the Socialist League there?"

* Pol de Witte is the brother-in-law of Anseele.—F. N.

* Pol Braekman repeated these statements as a witness before the court of law at Anseele's trial. For this he got the sack from the Social Democratic daily *Vooruit*. The Ghent Compositors Union declared, with 143 against 7 voices, his dismissal to be an "unjust act," and with 99 against 29 (and 9 abstentions) they decided to give him material support.—F. N.

They answered: "Yes."

"Where was that decided upon?"

"At a Board meeting, by the directors."

"If the Board had adopted this resolution, we should be able to find it in the books. May we look at books?"

Van Beveren: "No."

The meeting becomes noisy.

Anseeele said: "Those are the people who want to annihilate the 'Vooruit.' They wish to have the books to go to law with them. The books are in perfect order, but they wish to find things to make remarks about. No, they shall not have them."

At last a committee of 30 members was appointed.

Pol de Witte said in a later letter, which is to be found in *Recht voor Allen* of October 1 and 2, that he cannot understand the use of a committee; for a resolution had already been adopted that had pronounced his letters to be full of lies and calumnies.

Let us not forget that the question of bread plays a great part. Many that could speak must be silent. They know that the criticism is true, and yet they must be silent or say it is false.

The first man who was called upon to vote said: "I abstain, because the affair is not quite clear"; but he received such a blowing up from the party directors that the others lost courage and did not dare to abstain.

The *Vorwärts* tells us that two factory inspectors knew of the commission of inquiry regarding "Vooruit," and that the allegations made by the "accuser" Pol de Witte were branded as calumnies by the authorities.

We shall now publish word for word what the inspectors wrote as to the result of their investigations:—

1. That the women's wage is fixed according to a double basis: the duration of the work (their wage per hour) and the amount of work delivered.

2. That the first basis serves to determine a fixed wage that is paid to each workwoman, whatever may be the quantity of work delivered.

3. That the two bases serve to value the compensation—i.e., the extra wage that is due to those workwomen who have delivered work over and above a certain minimum (extra-work).

4. That the girls only obtain payment for extra-work done during four months if they were not below the minimum beforehand; that should a deficit have taken place, it should be deducted from the extra-work.

5. That, considering the knowledge the girls have of the standing custom to pay for extra-work and of the list that serves to reckon up the extra-wage, as also of the system of payment mentioned in rule 4, this extra-wage is not to be considered a premium paid out of kindness and voluntarily by the Co-operative Society, but constitutes an addition that is due according to special contract.

6. That, in fact, the girls (as also the above-mentioned person, Jan Pankoek) look upon this extra-wage, at least as regards the past, as belonging by right to the workers.

7, That from this part of the wage only 60 per cent. is paid to the girls—the rest is kept back by the company to be invested as follows: 15 per cent. to the treasury of the needle-women's union, as strike fund and means of propaganda among fellow-workers of other factories; 25 per cent. to a travelling fund, which remains in the keeping of the "Vooruit."

Questioned on the subject, Mr. Anseele answered in Flemish that he was responsible for the way in which the wage was paid to the "Vooruit" work-girls; and he added that the extra-wage was no regular wage, but a "gratuity." He concluded by saying that the "Vooruit" made no profit out of the above mentioned deduction of wages, and that the deductions were made with the girls' consent.

Considering that these deductions are not included among those that are permitted in article 7 of the law of August the 16th, 1887; that therefore the fact of having done so is a contravention of the law, without its being necessary to examine whether these deductions have taken place with or without the work-girls' consent, nor whether they brought in extra profit to the "Vooruit," as for example: the interest that this society has in the propaganda of certain ideas that have been the cause of its establishment, and have brought about its success.

Considering that the above-mentioned facts took place during the last six months—

We declare Mr. Anseele, member of parliament, mentioned above, guilty of contravention of articles 1 and 7 of the law of August the 16th, 1887.

To confirm our statement, we have drawn up this report for the King's Prosecutor, and send a copy of it to the transgressor of the law.

Signed, EDMUND FABRE.
Ghent, 24th September, 1896. P. DE BUCK.

The *Vooruit* newspaper, drunk with victory, writes:

The enemies of the "Vooruit" have lied and calumniated when they said that the "Vooruit" had kept back the girls' wages, that the "Vooruit" profits by their extra work.

Where was the deduction of girls' wages or of profit accruing to the "Vooruit" from the extra-wage mentioned? Nowhere.

The inspctors declare that part of the extra-wage is not kept back by the "Vooruit," but only put into the reserve fund and into the girls travelling fund.

Again, *that* was not the question.

Nobody said that the "Vooruit" kept back the extra-wage, but that the "Vooruit" was bound to give it to the girls, and not, as it did, give 60 per cent. to the girls, 15 per cent. to a reserve fund, and 25 per cent. to a travelling fund.

Anseele said the same, only he called it a "gratuity." As regards the travelling fund, it was no wonder that the girls considerd it unfair that the "Vooruit" deducted this money, as they never travelled. When they made a little journey, they paid for it themselves. And the 15 per cent. was put into the travelling fund, but, somehow, in the books we find: 13th May, 1896, a sum of 202fr.46c., and copied 15th May, 1896, a sum of 125fr. for the May Festival. "Is this true or not?" asks Pol de Witte.

The girls explained to the police commissary that the 40 per cent. was kept back contrary to their will; that they have never seen this money; that they never travelled with this money; that, on complaining, they received this answer from the Board of directors: "Be happy that you get 60 per cent."

And yet *Vooruit* dares to say that the girls' declaration was favorable to them.

They complained that the author of the letters in *Recht voor Allen* remained anonymous; but what else could he do? Everybody in Ghent knows that the tyranny in the "Vooruit" is great; and if the diretors can, every accuser is mercilessly made breadless. It has not yet been forgotten what treatment was meted out to Penning, who had eight children to support.*

We don't wish to discuss the Co-operative Society ("Vooruit"), but think we have proved sufficiently whether it was calumniated or not. We believe we have acted for the best by publishing official documents, so that each may judge for himself, and not through others' spectacles. The *Vorwärts* has proved nothing, and its readers know nothing.

Now we know that Co-operation robs Socialism of many of its best adherents; and if in Ghent there are twenty conscious Social Democrats, we have not counted too few.

Van Beveren once said that Co operation was Socialism; of course in this sense there are many Socialists in Ghent; but insuch sense it needs only publication—it needs no contradiction.

Tolstoy and Anarchism.

Recently J. C. Kenworthy wrote to Leo Tolstoy, sending some copies of *Freedom* and describing the position of Anarchism in England, at the same time commenting upon the approach which is taking place between the general Anarchist movement and those who hold "Christian Anarchism"; which is a not unjust term for the doctrine taught and the life lived by Tolstoy himself. To this letter Tolstoy replies as follows:—

"I was very glad to read what you write about the Anarchists. I thought always that they cannot be one-sided Christians, as are the Socialists and Communists. Sutaieff, of whom I think you have heard—a peasant with radical Christian views—when asked, how the Christian life could be sustained, and what Christians could oppose to aggressive violence, answered with the greatest conviction, 'We Christians have something which is strong er than the armies of the whole world, and which nothing can resist. It is Christian love.' Some may consider Sutaieff's resource not sufficient; but he *has* a method, and is logical in putting forward his method, believing in it. But I never heard from any Socialist, Communist, or Anarchist, an explanation of how the Communist or Socialist system will work; of why the egoistic men will cease to be egoists; and of what will prompt them to sustain a system which will not be so advantageous for them personally. And I never could comprehend what advantage Anarchy will have over the existing state of things, or how Anarchy could be founded to last, if the hearts of men are not changed, if men have not accepted the Christian point of view." †

So far Tolstoy. It is evident to thoughtful Anarchists that the first days of our revolution in thought are past. Not that we have for one moment gone back from our first principle and ceased to believe that freedom, the freedom essential to humanity, can only come through the cessation of physical violence, of coercive government, in society. But men like William Morris, Kropotkin, and Tolstoy are pointing us onward to the complementary half of our conception of social truth, by declaring that a new and true morality is necessary to us, as the means of establishing and carrying on the true order and free life of society when coercion shall be ended. In his claim for "Christian love" as being that necessary morality, Tolstoy points us, by no means to orthodox Christianity, but precisely away from that, and to its destruction. What he has striven, and does strive, to show, is, that original Christianity was a vast world-monument, inspired by the teaching (now so perverted) and the example (now so misunderstood) of Jesus of Nazareth, which led men directly away from Church and State, and drew them into a new, free, Communist, fraternal association, such as the first "Christian Churches" were. The so-called "Christian Churches" of to-day are, in Tolstoy's view, and judged by the Gospel itself, a complete perversion, a concealment, a parody, of the original Christian truth and life. There has been no Communist more thorough than Jesus, who communised his own life for the general good; no Anarchist more perfect than he, who gave even his euemies entire freedom to do as they pleased with him. And all this we shall come to understand as our movement grows in completeness of doctrine and right comprehension of the past. J. C. K.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE UNION CONGRESS.—At the last Trade Union Congress (writes James Mawdsley in *Reynolds's Newspaper* of Dec. 27) the Parliamentary Committee were instructed to issue a circular to the various trades, asking if they were in favor of an International Trade Union Congress being held in 1898, to be called on lines similar to those of the British Trade Union Congress. This would mean that all Associations, except Trade Unions pure and simple, would be excluded. Of course, this would not exclude Socialists, as there are any number of them connected with Trade Unions, and Trade Unions choosing Socialists, Anarchists, or any other person to represent them would be entitled to have their delegates admitted. This circular is now being discussed by the various trades of the country, and is supported by many, among others by the Amalgamated Association of Operative Cotton Spinners, who, on Saturday, agreed unanimously to support such a Congress and to be represented if held.

* See also the above-mentioned case of P. Braekman's resulting from this very inquiry to which so much public attention had been drawn.—F. N.

† Surely both Tolstoy and Kenworthy will admit that, independently of all perversions by the ruling classes and all the evils of a State church, there are many things in Christianity which no sensible person can accept. And necessarily so, since it is a compost of the teachings of many and various individuals, good, bad, and indifferent. To regard all this as the "word of God" is really too childish. It is indisputable that as to the character of Jesus himself, regarded from the human point of view—and this is the only view that can be discussed—there is some doubt and confusion. As one of the great teachers of the world, he has his place; but it seems to us much wiser to give our attention more to the amelioration of humanity from its present evil conditions than to the persistent upholding of the life of Jesus as a model for us all to live by. Kenworthy says there has been "no Anarchist more perfect than he [Jesus], who gave even his enemies entire freedom to do as they pleased with him." From this we entirely dissent, since it is obviously a criminal thing to teach men to allow others, whether friends or enemies, to do as they please with them. It is simply a downright encouragement of all the tyrannies and infamies that mankind has suffered through the long ages. I feel quite sure Kenworthy would not literally carry out the practice of this principle; and for ourselves we are free to maintain that until something like justice obtains in society we would prefer to follow another of the sayings attributed to Jesus: "I come not to bring peace, but a sword."—ED. *Freedom.*

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.

Consolations of North Pole Expeditions.

Now that it has come to light that Nansen is to receive close upon £15,000 for a description of his journey to the silent ice-regions and a work upon his observations there, we find the well-informed journalist of the Mammon-worshipping character is glibly writing of the consolations of North-Pole expeditions, as though Nansen undertook this brave and perilous task as a purely financial speculation. We wonder whether any of these gentlemen would have sufficient moral and physical courage to undertake such a journey even as a financial speculation. Let us recollect Nansen is an explorer and human scientist first, and that financial results in his case were purely accidental, or rather circumstantial; and that it matters not in what age a Nansen might live, his intense physical powers and mental capacity will always result in his pursuits being the outcome of his love—so typical of the race from which he descends.

The innumerable dangers encountered in his journey, the swim for life, his never-ending battle with the elements, his readiness to risk life itself, his simple and honest description of the same in the *Daily Chronicle*, are all sufficient answers to the worthless insinuations of that corrupt journalism which now attempts to cover his grand work with the nauseous cloak of commercialism.—J. P.

A Sample for Marxist ladies.

WE are great admirers of literary form. A humanitarian idea arrayed in beautiful shape always was appreciated; and mankind ought to sacredly preserve it for the edification of the future race. One cannot resist the desire to preserve for the benefit of the future generation the wonderful passage from the article by E. M. A. in *Justice* of Oct. 31, 1896. We specially recommend it to our feminine readers; gentleness and tenderness are the best adornments of women:

"Indeed . . . the Social Democratic Party cannot be split up. The *Junge Unabhängige* [The Young Independents] tried. Where Is that Party now? A poor little tail *wagged by the police-enginered Anarchist body.* (I was going to say 'dog,' but I know such really honorable doggies that I don't wish to be rude to them.)"

Young women, imitate this style, and you will become popular writers among the Social Democrats; and possibly you will also be admitted into the family of Engels and Marx.

Not so "Shaw" as usual.

IN the X'mas number of the *Labor Leader*, a very full report is given of a lecture by G. B. Shaw, on "What Socialism will be like," in which many will be agreably surprised to find ideas expressing a broader and deeper view of social life than G. B. S. is generally credited with forming. In a general way, it is a slap in the face for Social Democracy, which partisans of that cause will not greatly relish. For instance, he says, "It would damp my ardour for Socialism very considerably if I thought that everything would be done by the County Council." And he proceeds to point out that, if, for instance, the County Council ran the papers, they would be "bad news papers"; and "if the County Council produced a newspaper which told the truth boldly, every Councillor would lose his seat in a week." Far be it from us to deny the truth of all this, and the comfort that Social Democrats can derive from the moral of it they are certainly welcome to.

We notice also that G. B. S. develops into a full-blown Anarchist at the thought that the State should attempt to prevent him exercising his individual right to start a newspaper. "If so, I would start a revolution against Socialism the very next day." What a bold, bad Fabian!

What is Theft?

THE *American Federationist* (the official organ of the American Federation of Labor), for December last, quotes Kropotkin's statement in *Freedom* that a worker who is paid wages continues to be "a slave or subordinate of the one to whom he is forced to sell his labor force." The *A. F.*, remarking upon this, says, "So would he be were he forced to accept the following dictum of Kropotkin, *viz.*, 'A society, having recovered possession of all riches accumulated in its midst, can literally assure abundance to all.' Society cannot recover 'all accumulated riches' without theft."

Surely, our friends of the *Federationist* are having a little joke over this. For can they really think that wealth as "accumulated" and used to-day is a just arrangement? If so, then every Trade Unionist who tries to raise wages is robbing his employer. Of course, we shall all agree this is ridiculous. But suppose a worker and his comrades have been robbed by their employer for years and years, and this stolen wealth has been used to build a palace, then if these worker should take possession of this palace—in preference to being robbed still further in rack-rented slums—is that theft? Are we to understand that the worker becomes the thief and the rich idler an honest and injured person when the former recovers possession of the fruits of his labor of past years? But perhaps the *Federationist* imagines Kropotkin to be advocating a general raid on watches and chains. Anyhow, we should be glad if they would prove to us that *expropriation* is theft.

County Council vagaries.

THE spectacle presented by the L.C.C. during the past few weeks must be a very disappointing matter for democrats and "advanced politicians" generally to reflect upon. This important governing body of London is a standing proof of jobbery and stupidity, and of the incapability of such elected bodies to redress any of the grievances which its supporters claimed would result from its formation. They can't settle the Tramways business (though precious little good would result if they did), but they can spoil our open spaces by railing and fencing-in at every opportunity, and pester us with their notice boards, in their anxiety to let us know how well they are looking after our interests.

Only the other day the *Chronicle* was bewailing the inefficacy of the Parish Councils. "There are many Acts of Parliament," it exclaimed, "which are ill-drawn; but we doubt if ever there was an Act that contained so many insoluble conundrums as the famous Local Govoernment Act of 1894—commonly called the Parish Councils' Act. . . It reminds one strongly of the irreverent person who said that the law 'was a hass.'" Very true, and those "irreverent persons" are getting more numerous every day. Yet how the Fabians and the Democrats asked us to look up to the mother of all evil—the State—and be thankful for the gifts she had given us in these jumbles of fraud and folly, these precious "Acts." Why, everyone must see by this time that the only "Acts" that have any effect are those that benefit the ruling classes. Parliament is the grave of the workers' hopes!

"White" Barbarians.

HUMAN nature is a plastic thing. It will rise and fall largely in accordance with circumstances. If you want to lower a man below the level of a beast do one of two things: either make him a government official, or send him to South Africa to exploit the natives. This is by way of introduction to the following quotations, cut from a paper called *The Critic*, and sent to us by Comrade Finn from Johannesburg.

The Government does a fine trade at Pretoria Gaol by selling coloured female prisoners. It appears to be customary, when any of these unfortunate people are committed to prison for non-payment of a fine, that any burgher who is willing to pay the fine may take away the offender as his servant.

"The quality of mercy is not strained" to any great extent by the vrederechter of Belfast, if one may judge by some of his recent sentences on kaffirs. Quite recently a native was charged with creating a disturbance at the Belfast butchery. The accused stated that on entering the butchery to purchase some meat, a youth (the son of the chief constable), who is employed there, put out his foot and tripped him. He remonstrated, and was given over to a native constable and taken to the tronk. The kaffir was, for this, sentenced to *three months imprisonment.*

My attention has been drawn to the very improper conduct of Mr. A. Bot, Postmaster and Issuer of native passes at Komati Poort. I am informed that this official, not satisfied with the emoluments pertaining to his office, has for some months past been engaged in a private business of his own, and that he buys and sells kaffirs for profit. Although at first he conducted his dealings with a certain amount of secrecy, he now does the thing openly and on a very large scale. He has established himself as a Native-Labor Agent, and employs runner to go in search of kaffiirs and uses the native police for the same purpose. His position as Issuer of Passes of course gives him exceptional facilities, as all kaffirs entering the Transvaal at this point of the border have to go first to his office for passes. If these kaffiirs are not accompanied by a white man, he orders them into his compound, telling them he will send them on to Johannesburg or Barberton by train. The boys are then detained in the compound until Mr. Bot finds a purchaser. Among those who have thus bought kaffirs I may mention Mr. E. Gould, the labor agent for the Robinson Gold Mining Company, Mr. A. D. Molison, Mr. A. H. Murphy, labor agents, and Mr. E. B. H. NcNicholas. I believe the N.Z.A.S.M. has also done a deal with him. I learn that formal complaints of this man's conduct have been sent to his superiors at Pretoria, but so far it has remained for *The Critic* to make the scandal public property.

I am further informed that on Sunday the body of a murdered kaffir was lying on the Stanhope property, and that it was still there on Wednesday morning, but some pigs living in the vicinity of the spot had committed terrible havoc, and it is possible that by this time very little of it remains. I shall be glad to learn the names of the police who are supposed to patrol these two neighborhoods, and whether they were on duty on Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.

After this, what can one say? Isn't the present system a thing that even a decent donkey might kick with disgust?!

Mrs. Percy, writing on behalf of our Comrade Percy, who is still unfortunately in hospital, acknowledges the receipt of £2 13s. forwarded by us as the result, up to Christmas eve, of cash received on account of benefit concert, says: "He told me to write to you and the comrades thanking them all for their kindness to him, and he hopes soon to be with them all again and helping in the cause. He trusts he may be able to meet them at the *Freedom* Social on January 18th at Holborn Town Hall."

W. Wright: Thanks for letter and suggestions. We shall make some reference to it in our next number.

REMINISCENCES OF WILLIAM MORRIS.

By A Working Colleague.

(Continued.)

It is often said that Morris regrets the art of the middle ages, and, indeed, he himself says he does; but his reason for this is that "the medæval craftsman was free in his work." In the "Aims of Art" he says, "Come, let us put it in the way least respectful to the mediæval craftsman, most polite to the modern hand; the poor devil of the fourteenth century, his work was of so little volue that he was allowed to waste it by the hour in pleasing himself and others; but our highly strung mechanic, his minutes are too rich with the burden of perpetual profit for him to be allowed to waste one of them on art; the present system will not allow him—cannot allow him—to produce works of art"

The best illustration of this that I know of is the railing around the tomb of Henry VII. in Westminster Abbey. The most wonderful piece of handicraft I have ever seen, every panel displaying new thought, new beauty, no repreduction of a leaf, a flower, or a feather; a work that will repay all who can spare the time to visit it. When I saw it last, it had a card bearing the information that the workman took 32 years to complete it; that is, he was allowed time to think out his subject, and to put in such work as will bear scrutiny for ages to come. But let the craftsman of to-day be set to do a piece of work to suit the requirements of capitalism, and if he spent a month on it he would be discharged for having taken too long on the job.

The inevitable result of this hurry, this greed for gain, is the production of the sordid, hideous habitations of our towns and villages, and even the decorations in our recreation grounds display this ugliness, this vulgarity.

I remember passing through that portion of Victoria Park which is set aside for flower-beds, one Sunday afternoon, after one of our demonstrations there. Pointing out to Morris the flowers laid out as a plume of feathers and geometrical figures of all kinds, I asked him what he thought of our artistic flower-beds. "O, just the same," he said, "as of everything else around here—*damned ugly!*" Pointing to the other side of the pathway, he said: "There, that's what I call pretty; where the flowers grow as nature produces them."

I believe that Morris, seeing no hope for Art while present conditions last, broke loose from his old surroundings—that is, as he often said, of a hanger-on of the upper classes—and devoted himself to the task of ending the present starvation, over-work, dirt, ignorance, and brutality. In other words, he became a Socialist; and, many-sided as was his character, I believe this will outlive all the others in the affections of the people of the world.

The press of the country has been flooded with notices of him since his death, but principally as a poet and artist. For my part I connot see how he could be a true artist without being a Revolutionist.

I remember being in Norwich at a demonstration some years ago, at which Morris, Faulkner and several others were present. Monday being at our disposal, we made a party to visit the beautiful cathedral there. It is the custom, I suppose, to have a guide for each party of visitors; anyhow, there was a party preceding ours with such a guide. Morris, of course, fell into the place of guide to us, and in his rough, sailor-like fashion was pointing out the difference in the architecture of different periods and the beauty of all, when one of the ladies from the other party, who had evidently been paying more attention to our guide than her own, asked Comrade Faulkner who Morris was. He answered her politely. Replying, she said, "The poet, I suppose, not the Socialist." This time Faulkner asked very gruffly in return, "How can he be Morris the poet without being Morris the Socialist?" Notwithstanding his Socialism, the other party joined ours—guide and all.

When the scribes did condescend to notice his Socialism, it was with a kind of under-current of apology, for which, had he been living, he certainly would not have thanked them.. As an instance about the time of the Jubilee, the name of Lewis Morris was very prominent before the public, he having written the Jubilee Ode in consequence of the indisposition of the Poet-Laureate. Morris delivered a lecture in Birmingham, and the reporter confused the two names. Lewis thought it necessary to contradict the report. Seeing it, I pointed it out to William. Having read it, he indulged in a hearty laugh, and said he was very glad he had done it, as he certainly would not like to be mistaken for Lewis.

One paper contained in a leading article the, to me, astounding information that in his later years he became a Socialist, but that his Socialism was not of the *wild* type of Robert Owen's. This reminds me of a lecture delivered by the Rev. Sinclair Evans on "Ruskin's Message to Working Men." The chair was occupied by a well-to-do tradesman of the town. After the lecture, the drift of which was that men should be in comfortable circumstances, and the ordinary needs of life secured to them, before it would be possible for them to appreciate and enjoy artistic life, the chairman, rising afterwards to make a few remarks, said, "It is all so very pretty, but so impracticable." I suppose this means the same as "the wild Socialism of Robert Owen." Whether Morris's Socialism was wild or tame, he certainly put into it an amount of energy and determination as if it was the sole end and aim of his life.

I was at the Hyde Park Franchise demonstrrtion, when a large meeting of Socialists was held after the political one was over, at which John Burns referred to Bright as a silver-tongued hypocrite. This was enough for the radicals of that day; our banners and platform were torn and broken up, and some of us were being run to the Serpentine for a ducking. Morris fought like a man, with the rest of us, and before they had taken us half way to the water we had succeeded in making a stand, and I remember Morris calling on Burns to finish his speech. Being on level ground, and our opponents still fighting, Burns said he wanted something to stand on. That day we had only our first pamphlet, "Socialism made plain," of which Morris had a large bag-full at his side. These we placed on the ground in a heap, and Burns mounted and continued his speech, while Morris, and a dozen more of us, were fighting to keep back the more infuriated of the people. Some of our friends found fault with Burns for using language to irritate the crowd, but Morris's opinion was that they would have to be told the truth, and that it was as well to tell them first as last. We know he has done his part in carrying on the fight until it has become possible to address meetings on this subject wherever we go. He was not only prepared to face the brutality of the ignorant policeman, but went still further and faced the still more brutal laws enacted by the aid of the people.

During the strugle for freedom of speech at Bell Street, Edgware Road, after the committal of two speakers to take their trial at the sessions, and when we all thought that a long term of imprisonment would be the result, he volunteered to speak in the interval between the committal and trial; and, when reminded of the general impression that imprisonment would be the result, he simply said, "Well, it will be another experience, and we must not allow the fear of consequences to interfere with our duty."

He was not of the opinion of the City Missionary who was preaching a little way up the same street, on the same Sunday morning, at whose meeting I stayed a while. In the course of his address, the missionary mentioned the masters command to his disciples, "Go into the highways and byways," etc. Wishing to know what kind of metal he had in him, I asked the constable on duty whether he had not received "instructions to remove all persons causing an obstruction in the street." He replied in the negative, and added, "Do you wish to complain?" I said I would like him to tell the speaker what was being done at the other meeting. He complied, and the speaker at once came off the stand. I asked the man what he meant by disregarding the injunction of his master, and he said, "Oh, you know we must obey the policeman!" I left, thinking the cause had lost nothing by preventing a weak-kneed, half-hearted creature like that to stand up for it.

(To be concluded.)

S. Mainwaring.

"News from Nowhere" in Russian.—Our readers will be glad to hear that some chapters of William Morris's "News from Nowhere" are now appearing in Russian radical magazine *Russkáyá Misl* (Russian thought), published monthly at Moscow.—D. Z.

The Barcelona Anarchists.

The horrors of the Barcelona trial surpass everything known in the history of Anarchist—nay, of almost all other—persecutions since the days of the Holy Inquisition. About 300 Anarchists were arrested, most of whom will be transported to African islands without trial. Eighty-seven were tried during last month, and the Government prosecutor demanded the death sentence for not less than *twenty-eight* of them.

From a Spanish daily paper we gather that the method resorted to by the prosecution is to make the whole of the members or of the attendants at meetings of a workmen's club, the "Centro de Carreteros," responsible for what could evidently only have been arranged (if so) by a very small number of persons who might or might not, accidentally, have been members of this society as well—namely, for the bomb explosion in the Cambios Nuevos street, when the religious procession passed. This absurd accusation is based on the evidence of three men—the chief accused—Tomas Ascheri, Antonio Nogues, and Luis Mas: and how this "evidence" was obtained is clear to those who have followed the analogous procedure resorted to in 1894, when after the manifestly *individual* acts of P. Pallas and Salvador Franch scores of comrades were in a similar way brought to trial—seven of whom were executed, after having been tortured in the most incredible way (see *El Proceso de un gran crimen*, summarised in an article published in *Liberty* in the summer of 1895). Similar witnesses are coming forward now; so a letter to Rochefort (published in the *Intransigeant* of Paris'), by one of the gaolors in the fortress of Montjuich—where all this takes place—says: they were flogged, their nails torn off, their genital parts compressed until the agony of suffering led these three to sign whatever the inquiring judge wanted them to say. Among the other methods used are the feeding on salt fish without any water and the privation of sleep, the prisoners being forced for days and nights to walk along their cells; if they drop to sleep they are beaten until they rise again, and after reaching in that way the highest point of nervousness they are interrogated. And yet some are said to have resisted all these tortures—Jose Molas, F. Faner, J. B. Oller, and others; many also made spirited declarations before the court martial.

There is yet another innovation; this time not even the sentences were made public after the trial finished; only a week afterwards we hear that *eiget* have been sentenced to *death*; *forty* to *twenty years* and *twenty-seven* to *eight yeaes penal servitude! One thousand and sixteen years of penal servitude*, every day of which means life in a hell upon earth.

Those who would disbelieve even these accounts I refer to the *Pall Mall Gazette* of Dec. 19, where an extract from Prince Bismarck's Germar paper is reproduced—the paper which, of all, is the most bitter enemy of Socialists and Anarchists, and often recommends measures against them which fall very short of torture. It is a communication from Manila, in the Philippine islands, where, like in Cuba, the inhabitants have risen against Spanish rule, which benefits them by infesting their beautiful country with hosts of greedy officials and zealous priests. After telling how 59 prisoners perished in a *black-hole*, it goes on to say: "The instruments of torture from the time of the Inquisition, which were still preserved here"—(the priests evidently understand to bide their time!)—"were made use of. Thumbscrews, Spanish boots, and all such inventions of the Middle Ages, are again the order of the day."

And what do we hear by Reuter's telegrams—not from New York, which might seem to be coloured in favor of Cuba, but from *Madrid*—about Maceo's death (see the *Daily Chronicle* of Dec. 11): After a skirmish [if not a treacherous ambush, as has since been maintained] the body of a wounded Cuban was found. "The guide [of the Spanish column] pulled a ring from the finger of the wounded Cuban, who thereupon pressed the guide's hand and asked him: "Are you a Spaniard?" The guide replied by snatching away his hand and firing a revolver at the mulatto, which finished him. Lieutenant Acha . . . tried to bring the bodies away. He tied them to the tails of two horses," etc. And the news of this was received with rejoicing all over *official* Spain, the Queen-regent congratulated the wife of the officer chiefly concerned, and adopted his son, etc. After this, we recommend her to adopt rhe children of the torturers of the fortress of Montjuich and of the Manila blackhole as well.

But the bow seems to be overstrained; many victims will still fall, but in the West (Cuba), in the far East (Philippine islands), official Spain is at last attacked, and these movements will inevitably find an echo in the country itself.

* *

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

In Paris the Socialist protest against the prostration of the Republic before the Tsar was very feeble and some, like P. Brousse, the leader of the French municipal Socialists, openly sided with the Government. "*The Socialist party is becoming a Government party*," Brousse wrote on Sept. 6th; hence, he concluded, it must act as governments act. The outcome of political action cannot be clearer defined than it has been done here: Socialists, believing to get political power, are really falling victims to it; political power, government, is unchangeable, whether wielded by Socialists or capitalists; all are equally ground down by it to the dead level of brutal and impotent officialism. The more there are Socialists in Parliament, the nearer they are to office, the more they become similar, and in the end identical with the ordinary office-bearers, and the more Socialism goes to the wall.

The news from the Hamburg Dock Strike is not encouraging, whilst in the beginning we heard so many good tidings how in the ports of other countries the dockers had spontaneously refused to have anything to do with Hamburg ships. All is silent now in this respect, and the usual dull routine work seems to have prevailed over this spirited outbreak. At the meetings held in Hamburg on Dec. 19th, 7,265 voted for the continuance of the strike, and 3,671 against it. What did the Socialist M.P.'s do? The *Vorwaerts* says—as we read in the *Daily Chronicle* of Dec. 21st—that the Social Democratic members of the Reichstag who were present at Saturday's meetings advised the strikers to resume work in accordance with the wish of the Senate (the local government of Hamburg). What more can we expect these men to do who—out of sheer fear to be mistaken for revolutionists—are sure ever to side with law and order by all means?

More recent news show the strike still going on, the M.P.'s urging on arbitration and the blacklegs blackmailing the employers—demanding double pay as if they were *men*.

The German Social Democratic Party met in congress at Gotha in October. No greater question being before the Congress, the quagmire of dissensions, jealousies, intrigues became the more conspicuous. Old Liebknecht had to fight hard for his own skin; his paper, the *Vorwaerts*, was torn to pieces as the most incompetent and dullest of papers, and he was bluntly told that he had better withdraw from it. However small respect we can have for a man of so bad faith in combating his opponents (as his attitude towards the Anarchists amply shows) we feel disgusted at the way in which he is treated by his own party, the dirty work of which, at any rate, he always executed to the best of his abilities. His opponents, robust, well-pampered men in the forties, now want to get rid of the old man of seventy and tell him with an incredible amount of cynical brutality that he is too old, and ought to go. We might well shudder if we thought that a time would ever come when *these men* would be our masters. Liebknecht himself hardly seems to realise his position, and with an equal amount of cynicism and an utter want of dignity sticks to his office like glue. By the way, he told the Congress he only went to England this spring: "because I believed that I could not be dispensed with there" (*dort unentbehrlich zu sein*), (*Vorwaerts*, Oct. 14th).

One very characteristic feature of this Congress was the debate on *modern literature and art*. A weekly illustrated Socialist paper (*Neue Welt*) had opened its columns to works of modern art, whereby the sense of morality and decency of the usual Social Democratic paterfamilias was immensely shocked. Mr. Frohme, a Socialist M.P., denounced the editor, who ably defended himself; the other delegates either contributed their bundle of wood to the stake upon which modern art was to be burned, or defended it with some reservations. It became only too plain that the onesided electioneering propaganda combined only with the sterile and criticless teaching of Marxian "economic metaphysics" or centralised trade-unionism left the bulk of the members of the party on the intellectual and artistic level of the average Philistine. We do not forget that in Berlin and some other towns for years efforts have been made to make modern art accessible to the workers, chiefly by creating popular theatres on which, before a private audience of both workers and authors and artists, the most advanced plays have been acted with great success; but these efforts originated with independent Socialists and Anarchists and were never favourably looked upon by the leaders of the party, who really grudge the workers every step they make towards *intellectual freedom*. For they know that this must lead them sooner or later to Anarchism.

How much these bosses of the party are concerned in keeping down all efforts of freedom gaining ground we gather from an incidental admission by one of the inner circle of the party (Pfannkuch) that the leading committee had already years ago ventilated the question of an *inspector* who should travel from town to town to "control the press of the party;" this was not carried out "before all"—this being the chief reason—because no proper person could be found, that is because none of the various cliques would entrust this post to one of its opponents.

Of the *Anarchist* movement but little news can be given save stating the fact that a general revival takes place all round. Persecutions are frequent, above all in Spain; also in Germany and Denmark. In Toulon three sergeants, who made Anarchist propaganda among the soldiers were arrested, and will be sent to *Biribi*, the discipline companies on the border of the African desert, where tortures of quite a Spanish character are daily occurrences.

Many new papers have been started: the *Idee libre* (Agen), *Jeunesse nouvelle* (Lyons), and the *Agitateur* (Marseille, to be published soon) in the French provinces;—the old *Anarchist* resuscitated (Amsterdam);—*La Vérité* (Ensival, Belgium);—*Der arme Konrad* (Berlin, a popular paper besides the more literary *Sozialist*);—*Matice delnicka* (Vienna, Bohemian). In Italy *La Favilla* (Mantova) and *Il Nuovo Verbo* (Parma) will soon be published. In Spain *El Productor* of La Coruna seems to be the only paper. In the United States *Der Kampfer* (St. Louis, German) and *The Age of Thought* (Columbus Junction, Iowa, Individualist-Anarchist), besides two numbers, I believe, of *The Match* (Boston) In the Argentine Republic *La Fuerza de la Razon* and *La Federacion Obrera* in the provinces; Comrade Creaghe's paper, *Oprimido*, is now published at Buenos Ayres, and the review, *La Questione sociale*, is published as its supplement.

We will just mention the discussions on Anarchism at the International Ethical Conference held at Zurich, and at the Congress for Criminal Anthropology held at Geneva (both in August), also that in the *Temps Nouveaux* of Dec. 10th. P. Kropotkin's second intended Paris Conference—*The State: its roll in history*—began to be published.

On the whole, Anarchists have no reason to complain of the progress made in 1896. It does not mean that an "epoch of rest" has come; but we ought to be encouraged and inspired to do still more work.

* *

ANARCHISM: ITS PHILOSOPHY AND IDEAL.

By Peter Kropotkin.

(Continued.)

Ah, if men were those superior beings that the utopians of authority like to speak to us of, if we could close our eyes to reality, and live, like them, in a world of dreams and illusions as to the superiority of those who think themselves called to power, perhaps we also should do like them; perhaps we also should belive in the virtues of those who govern.

With virtuous masters, what dangers could slavery offer? Do you remember the Slave-owner of which we heard so often, hardly thirty years ago? Was he not supposed to take paternal care of his slaves? "He alone," we were told, "could hinder these lazy, indolent, improvident children dying of hunger. How could he crush his slaves through hard labor, or mutilate them by blows, when his own interest lay in feeding them well, in taking care of them as much as of his own children! And then, did not 'the law' see to it that the least swerving of a slave-owner from the path of duty was punished?" How many times have we not been told so! But the reality was such that, having returned from a voyage to Brazil, Darwin was haunted all his life by the cries of agony mutilated slaves, by the sobs of moaning women whose fingers were crushed in thumbscrews!

If the gentlemen in power were really so intelligent and so devoted to the public cause, as panegyrists of authority love to represent, what a pretty government and patronal utopia we should be able to construct! The employer would never be the tyrant of the worker; he would be the father! The factory would be a palace of delight, and never would masses of workers be doomed to physical deterioration. The State would not poison its workers by making matches with white phosphorus, for which it is so easy to substitute red phosphorus.* A judge would not have the ferocity to condemn the wife and children of the one whom he sends to prison, to suffer years of hunger and misery and to die some day of anemia; never would a public prosecutor ask for the head of the accused for the unique pleasure of showing off his oratorical talent; and nowhere would we find a gaoler or an executioner to do the bidding of judges, who have not the courage to carry out their sentences themselves. What do I say! We should never have enough Plutarchs to praise the virtues of Members of Parliament who all would have Panama cheques in horror! *Biribi*† would become an austere nursery of virtue, and permanent armies would be the joy of citizens, as soldiers would only take up arms to parade before nursemaids, and to carry nosegays on the point of their bayonets!

Oh, the beautiful utopia, the lovely Christmas dream we can make as soon as we admit that those who govern represent a superior caste, and have hardly any or no knowledge of simple mortals' weaknesses! It would then suffice to make them control one another in hierarchical fashion, to let them exchange fifty papers, at most, among different administrators, when the wind blows down a tree on the national road. Or, if need be, they would have only to be valued at their proper worth, during elections, by those same masses of mortals which are supposed to be endowed with all stupidity in their mutual relations but become wisdom itself when they have to elect their masters.

---

* The making of matches is a State's monopoly in France.

† *Biribi* is the name given in France to the *punishment battalions* in Algeria. Every young man who has been in prison before he begins his military service, is sent to such a battalion. Many soldiers, for want of discipline, undergo the same punishment. The treatment in these places is so horrid that no Enlishman would believe it possible. A very few years ago, the pear-shaped hole in the ground, where men were left for weeks, and some were actually devoured by vermin, was an habitual punishment. At the present time, it is quite habitual to let a man, handcuffed and chained, lay for a fortnight on the ground, covered by a bit of cloth, under the scorching sun of Algeria and through the bitterly cold nights, compelled to eat his food and to lap his water like a dog. Scores of the most terrible facts became known lately, since Georges Darien published his book "*Biribi*" (Paris, 1890, Savine, pulisher) based on actual experience, and full of the most horrible revelations. One of my Clairvaux companions had to spend two years of military service in such a battalion—his condemnation at Lyons, as the editor of an Anarchist paper, being already a reason to be transported to Algeria. He fully confirmed, on his release, all that was written by Descaves.—P.K.

All the science of government, imagined by those who govern, is imbibed with these utopias. But we know men too well to dream such dreams. We have not two measures for the virtues of the governed and those fo the governors; we know that we ourselves are not without faults and that the best of us would soon be corrupted by the exercise of power. We take men for what they are worth—and that is why we hate the government of man by man, and that we work with all our might—perhaps not strong enough—to put an end to it.

But it is not enough to destroy. We must also know how to build, and it is owning to not having thought about it that the masses have always been led astray in all their revolutions. After having demolished they abandoned the care of reconstruction to the middle-class people, who possessed a more or less precise conception of what they wished to realise, and who consequently reconstituted authority to their own advantage.

That is why Anarchy, when it works to destroy authority in all its aspects, when it demands the abrogation of laws and the abolition of the mechanism that serves to impose them, when it refuses all hierarchical organization and preaches free agreement—at the same time strives to maintain and enlarge the precious kernel of social customs without which no human or animal society can exist. Only, instead of demanding that those social customs should be maintained through the authority of a few, it demands it from the continued action of all.

Communist customs and institutions are of absolute necessity for society, not only to solve economic difficulties, but also to maintain and develop social customs that bring men in contact with one another; they must be looked to for establishing such relations between men that the interest of each should be the interest of all; and this alone can unite men instead of dividing them.

In fact, when we ask ourselves by what means a certain moral level can be maintained in a human or animal society, we find only three such means: the repression of anti-social acts; moral teaching; and the practice of mutual help itself. And as all three have already been put to the test of practice, we can judge them by their effects.

As to the impotence of repression—it is sufficiently demonstrated by the disorder of present society and by the necessity of a revolution that we all desire or feel inevitable. In the domain of economy, coercion has led us to industrial servitude; in the domain of politics—to the State, that is to say, to the destruction of all ties that formerly existed among citizens and to the nation becoming nothing but an incoherent mass of obedient *subjects* of a central authority.

Not only has a coercive system contributed and powerfully aided to create all the present economical political and social evils, but it has given proof of its absolute impotence to raise the moral level of societies; it has not been even able to maintain it at the level it had already reached. If a benevolent fairy could only reveal to our eyes all the crimes that are committed every day, every minute in a civilised society, under cover of the unknown, of the protection of law itself,—society would shudder at that terrible state of affairs. The authors of the greatest political crimes, like those of Napoleon III.'s *coup d'état*, or the bloody week in May after the fall of the Commune of 1871, never are arraigned; and as a poet said: "the small miscreants are struck for the satisfaction of the great ones." More than that, when authority takes the moralisation of society in hand, by "punishing criminals" it only heaps up new crimes!

Practised for centuries, repression has so badly succeeded that it has but led us into a blind alley from which we can only issue by carrying torch and hatchet into the institutions of our authoritarian past.

Far be it from us not to recognise the importance of the second factor, moral teaching—especially that which is unconsciously transmitted in society and results from the whole of the ideas and comments emitted by each of us on facts and events of every-day life. But this force can only act on society under one condition, that of not being crossed by a mass of contradictory immoral teachings resulting from the practice of insitutions.

In that case its influence is *nil* or baneful. Take Christian morality: what other teaching could have had more hold on minds than that spoken in the name of a crucified God, and could have acted with all its mystical force, all its poetry of martyrdom, its grandeur in forgiving executioners? And yet the institution was more powerful than the religion: soon Christianity—a revolt against imperial Rome—was conquered by that same Rome; it accepted its maxims, customs, and language. The Christian church accepted the Roman law as its own, and as such—allied to the State—it became in history the most furious enemy of all semi-communist institutions, to which Christianity appealed at its origin.

Can we for a moment believe that moral teaching, patronised by circulars from ministers of public instruction, would have the creative forcethat Christianity has not had? And what can the teaching of men, who are truly social, against the whole teaching derived from anti-social customs?

The third element alone remains—*the institution itself*, acting in such a way as to make social acts a state of habit and instinct. This element—history proves it—has never missed its aim, never has it acted as a double-bladed sword; and its influence has only been weakened when custom strove to become immovable, crystallised, to become in its turn a religion not to be questioned when it endeavoured to absorb the individual, taking all freedom of action from him and compelling him to revolt against that which had become, through its crystallisation, an enemy to progress.

In fact, all that was an element of progress in the past or an instrument of moral and intellectual improvement of the human race is due *to the practice of mutual aid*, to the customs that recognised the equality of man and brought them to ally, to unite, to associate for the purpose of producing and consuming, to unite for purposes of defence, to federate and to recognise no other judges in fighting out their differences than the arbitrators they took from their own midst.

Each time these institutions, issued from popular genius, when it had reconquered its liberty for a moment,—each time these institutions developed in a new direction, the moral level of society, its material well-being, its liberty, its intellectual progress, and the affirmation of individual originality made a step in advance. And, on the contrary, each time that in the course of history, whether following upon a foreign conquest, or whether by developing authoritarian prejudices men become more and more divided into governors and governed, exploiters and exploited, the moral level fell, the well-being of the masses decreased in order to insure riches to a few, and the spirit of the age declined.

History teaches us this, and from this lesson we have learned to have confidence in free Communist institutions to raise the moral level of societies, debased by the practice of authority.

To-day we live side by side without knowing one another. We come together at meetings on an election day: we listen to the lying or fanciful professions of faith of a candidate, and we return home. The State has the care of all questions of public interest; the State alone has the function of seeing that we do not harm the interests of our neighbour, and if it fails in this, of punishing us so as to repair the evil.

Our neighbour may die of hunger or murder his children,—it is no business of ours; it is the business of the policeman. You hardly know one another, nothing unites you, everything tends to alienate you from one another, and finding no better way, you ask the Almighty (formerly it was a God, now it is the State) to do all that lies within his power to stop anti-social passions from reaching their highest climax.

(To be continued.)

THE PROPAGANDA.

[*Will comrades in the London and provincial Groups make a point of furnishing us with reports of their meetings and progress by not later than the 20th of each month.*—ED.]

REPORTS.

LONDON.

Deptford.—Things here have slightly improved. Comrade Leggatt spoke on Sunday, Nov. 29th, on "Mental Chloroformers" to a large audience, exposing the religious and political brain-stultifiers. A religious fanatic, mounted on a box, warned the people not to listen to the "Hanarchists," who, he said, were the "agents of the devil"—whoever he may be. Of course, the effect of this was that the crowd swarmed around *us*, and deserted *him*. Annoyed at this, he came over to our meeting and persistently and continuously interrupted Leggatt, until, unable to bear it any longer, Leggatt threatened to test his Christian principles by giving him the opportunity of "turning the other cheek." That silenced him. Screech, the Christian Want-of-Evidence "Lecturer," was in our audience for some time, but hadn't the pluck to oppose. We also had the honour (doubtful) of the presence of nine policemen, several detectives, and a number of the black police. Collected 3s. and sold a number of *Freedoms* and pamphlets. Dec. 6th, comrade Young spoke to a large crowd on "Patriotism," and, to our surprise, had not the slightest interruption and could get no opposition, notwithstanding the fact that several of the "Gentle Jesus" brigade were present. Collected 1s. 5d.; literature sold fair. Dec. 13th, Leggatt again spoke on "Do the capitalists fear the teaching of Anarchism?" to an enormous crowd. Our comrade had the sympathy of the audience right through, with the exception of towards the close of the meeting a clique of "meek and lowly ones," who are quite experts in the art of kicking (all for the glory of God) endeavoured to break up the meeting by rowdyism. A prominent and continuous interrupter at our meetings is a canting hypocrite who professes belief in Christianity and opens his shop on Sundays for the sale of "penny dreadfuls" and other vile literature of the *Police Gazette* type. He reads his Bible, as comrade Leggatt told him, thus: "Six days shalt thou labour, but on the seventh thou shalt sell papers." Comrade Sullivan also spoke; collection, 1s. 6d. A word to the Deptford comrades. You are asked to turn up every Sunday regularly on the Broadway at seven sharp and surrouud the platform, and not leave the whole of the work to two or three comrades, who also have to put up with the insults and kicks of these Christian brutes. We also appeal to comrades in other parts to come and help us. One good lesson in "Ballyhoolyism" will silence these curs for ever.—H.

Hoxton.—We have been holding meetings here as usual on Sunday mornings, but the weather has been much against us. Presberg has spoken for us, but climatic perversities marred the efforts of the speaker. On Sunday, Dec. 20th, John Turner spoke on Anarchism and the Labour movement. A good crowd assembled, and the meeting proved highly successful; 1s. 6½d. collected. Next month we hope to give a fuller report of our work here.

Stratford Grove and Mile End Waste.—The meetings here grow larger every Sunday in spite of wet and cold weather, the large lamp (60-candle power) showing a fine light draws a large crowd. A friend who paid for the lamp £1 has now paid 5s. for a stand, thereby showing some practical sympathy with our propaganda. Leggatt speaks about two hours every Sunday (weather permitting), the only exceptions being when he spoke at Deptford (see Deptford report). At Stratford Grove the crowds of well-dressed, respectable working men never budge, but stop till the last, sometimes till past ten p.m., collections about five or six shillings, with literature included. We still use the tree with a thick rope hanging from the branch till our stand is finished; we should like some help with *speakers*—if possible, Turner or Stockton. The police attend and are always attentive and courteous listeners, which is a good sign, I think.

Sunday, December 20th.—John Turner spoke to a large meeting here, assisted by Morton, Leggatt, and two Russian comrades. It was a most encouraging meeting, and all the speeches were attentively listened to. There is good propaganda being done in this quarter.

At Mile End Waste also fine meetings; from 5s. to 7s. collection; "Freedoms" and pamphlets sell well here, and no opposition; crowd help put up platform and assist speakers to sell literature and bring refreshment while speaking, showing at least a friendly feeling to those who are trying to wake up the sleepy and apathetic Englishman.—E. LEGGATT.

PROVINCES.

Edinburgh.—Since last report we have held our position wonderfully, mainly through the staying-power of comrade Hall, who, as far as speaking is concerned, has had the heavy end of the plank. Reversing the old Biblical truth (?) that man "in the sweet (and also bitter) by-and-bye" is to be brought before the judgment-seat of God, Hall, taking time by the forelock on November 22nd, brought "God before the judgment-seat of man" and, needless to say, he found Him or "It"—according to A. J. Balfour, guilty of almost all the crimes that have hitherto afflicted the human race, and sentenced Him unceremoniously to oblivion. A good discussion followed. Nov. 29th, comrade J. H. Bell was to have lectured for us on "Anarchism v. I.L.P'ism." Unfortunately, to the great disappointment of all, our comrade through ill health was unable to appear. As a consequence, Hall, who happened to be in good form, readily took his place and gave a short survey of the two movements, giving many examples of lives that have been utterly wasted inside of Parliament, and emphasising the necessity of working outside the House of Commons, This was one of the best all-round meetings we have had. Dec. 6th, comrade Doris lectured on "Public Opinion," proving by various examples that public opinion in this capitalistic society of to-day was a mere phantom; that with regard to public institutions the public had no opinion at all; not having the necessary knowledge and time to enable them to form any opinion. The affairs of the public were simply monopolised like other things by monied men; and, as money could buy the opinion of the starving, it fell to a question of money, not opinion. The lecturer took care to point out that our mission was to create a public opinion. The lecture was varied at intervals by the *private* opinion of an unsocial democrat who, like Burns when he met with his imaginary friend, Death, "was na fou but jist had plenty," whose ejaculations and ultimate attempt to order the discussion to his own pattern became so annoying that it looked as if we would be forced to the painful obligation of persuading him to the door. We persevered, however, and a good discussion followed, many of the speakers agreeing with the lecturer. Dec. 13th, comrade Hall again lectured, his subject being "Production under Anarchy." In the course of his long lecture, the title of which, by the way, was rather misleading, he characterised as a monstrous absurdity the idea of going to Africa and other countries for the purpose of bettering oneself. As to the ethics of the present system of production, if there was such a thing, the lecturer declared it was the ethics of barbarism. Although the audience was not so large as usual, the discussion was all that could be desired, which makes us all hopeful of the future.—G. R.

Leicester.—The outdoor meetings of the Leicester Anarchist Group were, this year, discontinued somewhat earlier in the season than usual, on account of the wet weather. But whilst they were continued the audiences were as large and enthusiastic as ever before. A considerable quantity of Anarchist literature has been sold and distributed in the town and district, and we are daily meeting with evidence that the steady, persistent propaganda which has been continued here during the last nine years has not been in vain. Since dropping the outdoor meetings, some, at least, of our Group have been exceedingly active in carrying the torch of Anarchy into such benighted regions as those inhabited by Land Nationalisers, I.L.P'ers and Hutchinson-Trust-Lecturers; to Debating Societies, Baptist, Unitarian, and Congregational Chapels, Christian Social Unions, Co-operative Meetings, Labour Clubs, etc. This form of propaganda, which has been coupled with a constant distribution of leaflets and other printed matter, has been "good business."

At one of the Hutchinson Trust Lectures, for example, our comrade Bent scored very heavily (or so the audience seem to think, judging from their enthusiastic applause) against the lecturer, Enid Stacy. He contrasted the Anarchist action of Leicester folk in successfully defying both the Imperial Parliament and the Board of Guardians in the question of compulsory vaccination with the retrograde proposal of the fair Enid that all laws ought to be dutifully obeyed. The audience, and even some of the I.L.P. men, seemed of opinion, and openly expressed the view, that if such was the kingdom of Socialism, it would be a more hopeless slavery than the existing system.

The local branch of the I.L.P. still continues to occupy a position, unshared by any other branch in England, by refusing to allow discussion at their meetings. This we consider to be at once a compliment to the power of Anarchist principles and a proof of local Anarchist activity; as their unique position has been adopted solely to ward off Anarchist criticism. Nevertheless very strong expressions of dissent have been generally used by the Leicester I.L.P. members against the exclusion of Anarchists from the late Congress;—that kind of majority-tyranny produces, as might be expected here as elsewhere, nothing but feelings of disgust in the minds of all who desire, not official position, but justice and fair play. Many of the younger members of the I.L.P. in Leicester are openly with us, and others are so strongly opposed to the State-Socialist bossing that they may be said to stand trembling on the brink of Anarchy.

As to the future, we have high hopes and good prospects of a very active year in 1897. J. C. Kenworthy is with us on Jan. 19th, and P. Kropotkin on Jan. 26th, both lecturing in the Co-operative Hall. Others of our old friends have promised us a lecture, and amongst them we hope to include John Turner.

Anarchism in Leeds.—At last the Anarchists of Leeds have decided upon a policy. In Leeds the real Anarchists are not many in numbers, but there are some who I might call "political" Anarchists (if it wasn't for the contradiction) who belong to the I.L.P. but believe in Anarchy as their ideal. Talking over matters led to the arrangement for a conference, which was held on the 28th of November. The agenda ran as follows:—1st. What is Anarchism? 2nd. The relation of Anarchism to Political work. 3rd. The formation of a society for propaganda. About thirty comrades turned up. Letters from J. C. Kenworthy, John Turner, and W. Banham were read by McQueen. After some warm discussion comrade Hatton moved the following resolution: "That this meeting form itself into a society called the Leeds Socialist League, having for its object the fullest economic and political liberty realisable in the Communal ownership of the means of production by free Communes freely organised; also the gradual withdrawal from the present exploitative system by means of federal co-operation."

It was also decided that the League take no part in Parliamentary action. The resolution was supported by McQueen, and carried by a large majority. This concluded the business of the meeting, and on Dec. 15th, in the Leeds Labour Church, we had our first lecture. This was given by J. C. Kenworthy. He gave an interesting account of the co-operative colony of Croydon, which produced some discussion. In the new year the League will be fairly started, and we hope for good results.—F. F.

Holborn Town Hall,

MONDAY, JANUARY 18, 1897,

A NEW YEAR'S SOCIAL AND DANCE in aid of the "Freedom Fund," will be held at the above hall. Concert will commence at 7 o'clock. Dancing at 9 to 12 p.m. Single Ticket 9d. Double Ticket 1s. An excellent programme will be provided.

Earlier in the evening **A Children's Party** will be given, from 5 to 7 p.m. Songs, Dances and Games. Tickets 2d.

THE LABOUR ANNUAL for 1897: a Year-Book of Social, Economic and Political Reform. (*Clarion* Office, 62, Fleet Street, E.C.; pp. 272, designed cover, 1s. net; blue cloth gilt, 2s. net.)—For the third year we heartily welcome the appearance of this excellent and indispensable handbook to the most important questions of the day. Again enlarged, profusely illustrated—there are no less than 130 new "features"—and well got-up, it should this year command the attention of all who are interested (and who is not?) in Social Reforms. Its full and unique Directories of Journals and Organisations, of Lecturers and Useful Addresses, its comprehensive Indexes, its specially appropriate Articles, Biographies, and innumerable other contents, should commend it to all busy men and women. As an up-to-date reference work it will be of extreme service to officials, students, reformers, and thoughtful folk of all classes and schools. Both the Publishers [Labour Press, Manchester) and the Editor are to be congratulated on the issue of so useful a work, and we sincerely recommend our readers to order or send for the volume at once. Copies may be obtained, by return post, on receipt of price and 3d. postage, from the Editor: JOSEPH EDWARDS, Wallasey, Liverpool, England.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

of cash received during December.

TO SALES OF "FREEDOM": Swift, 2d.; W. Reeves, 2s.6d.; Jones, 2d; O. Matthias, 1s.; Gunderson, 1s.4d.; Norwich Group, 4s.; R., 3s.4d.; Milton Hall, 1s.6d.; E. C., 2s.; Glasgow Group, 10s.6d.; W. Wess, 4s.; J. W. Wallace, 4½d.; T. Cantwell, 5d.; B. Feinstein, 4s.6d.; H. Taylor, 4d.

TO "FREEDOM" SUBSCRIBERS: Dr. Boulting, 10s.; N.F. Rose, 5s.; Lear, 1s.6d.; J. Bouladen, 1s.6d.; J. Finn, 2s.6d.

Donations.—"FREEDOM" PUBLICATION FUND: Moore, 1s. 6d.; Katritzky, 2s. 6d.; Gabriel, 6d.; H. Meister, 1s.; A. M., £1 13s.; profit on Athenæum Hall, Nov. 26th, 13s.10½d.; Lear, 6d.; J. P., 5s.; W. Wright, 1s.; Anon, 8s.6d.

TO SALES OF FREEDOM PAMPHLETS: H. T. H., 6s.4d.; E. H., 2s.6d.; MacQueen, 1s.4d.; Rudash, 8s.; J. Jaffe, 14s.5d.; Hazelip, 10d.; Reeves, 15s.; T.C., 8d.; Office sales, 8d.; E. Leggatt, 2s.5d.; Leeds Group, 7s.6d.; W. Quale, 1s.6d.; St. George's Hall, 11d.; Manchester Group, 8s.; Office sales (Dec.) 10d.

CHICAGO MARTYRS COMMEMORATION.

(Holborn Town Hall, Nov. 11, 1896)

INCOME.

By Aberdeen Group, 11s.; Workers' Friend Group, 17s.7d.; Hoxton Group, 2s.; German Group, 10s.; Deptford Group, 2s.10d.; Croydon Group, 12s.6d.; Newcastle Group, 4s.; Canning Town Group, 3s.; Edmonton Group, 4s.; collection Hoxton Church, 1s.9d.; Ditto delegate meeting, 5d.; Ditto Victoria Park, 1s.8½d.; a Social Democrat, 10s.; M. Galbraith, 4s.; Tom Primmer, 1s.; J. Friend, 6d.; Harry Graham, 2s.; N. F. D., 1s.6d.; Comrade Copt, 2s.; Comrade Guerino, 4s.; Lizzie Turner, 6s.; Gunderson, 1s.6d.; F. N., 3s.6d.; collection Holborn Town Hall, £7 8s. 7¼d.; loan by a Social Democrat, £3.—Total £15 15s. 4½d.

EXPENDITURE.

To Holborn Town Hall, £5 5s.; Co-operative Printery, £2 2s.6d.; Messrs. Partington and poster, £3 4s.; use of piano, 10s.6d.; Choir expenses, 12s.6d.; advertisement *Labor Leader*, 12s.; ditto *Clarion*, 12s.; ditto *Justice*, 7s.6d.; gratuity to Hall porter, 5s.; ditto to bill poster, 1s.; postage, £1 7s.3d.; stationery, 7s.2d.; fares, 1s.7d.; wire, 8d.; return of loan, £3.—Total £17 16s. 2d.

Total expenditure	£17	16 2.
Total receipts	£15	15 4¼.
Deficiency ...	£2	0 9¼.

All those comrades who have received Subscription Lists but not yet returned them are requested to do so immediately, as the above deficiency must be met.

J. PERRY.

J. TURNER'S WELCOME.

(Athenæum Hall, November 26th, 1896)

RECEIPTS.

To Sales of Tickets: Per W. Wess, £1 7s. 6d.; Lizzie Turner, 15s.6d.; J. P., 5s.6d.; J. Blatt, 4s.6d.; A. St. John 4s.; R. Gunderson, 4s.; M. Gabriel, 2s.; O. Stenzleit, 1s.6d.; O. Matthias, 1s; W. Wright, 1s.; contribution, 5s.5d.; profit on refreshment, 6s.1½d.—Total £3 18s. 0½d.

EXPENDITURE.

By hire of Hall, £2 2s.; pianist, 10s.; printing tickets, 7s.6d.; gratuity porter, 4s.; postage, 8d.—Profit, 13s.10½d.—Total £3 18s. 0½d.

All comrades having tickets for above are kindly requested to return the same immediately, as we are unable—while there are tickets not accounted for—to get at the precise result.

J. PERRY.

COMRADE PERCY'S BENEFIT.

(Dec. 18th, 1896)

RECEIPTS.

To Sales of Tickets: Per Mrs. Percy, 15s.; T. Primmer, 11s.6d.; Lizzie Turner, 6s.6d.; J. P., 6s.; C. Morton, 4s.; M. Galbraith 3s.; A. St. John, 3s.; Taylor, 1s.; Robson, 1s.; Jacob, 6d.; *Hart*, 6d.; Blatt, 6d.; Young, Is.; Stenzleit, 1s.; Graham, 1s.6d.—Total £2 16s.

EXPENDITURE.

Fares, 1s.; gratuity, 6d.; postage, 1s.; refreshments to artistes, 6d.—Sent to Mrs. Percy, £2 13s.—Total £2 16s.

*** *A report of the Social Gathering to welcome back Jack Turner on his return from the United States has been crowded out, but we shall publish shortly a full report of a course of lectures on his tour, which he is to deliver.*

A Course of Three Lectures

ON HIS TOUR IN AMERICA WILL BE GIVEN BY

JOHN TURNER

— AT —

CHRISTCHURCH HALL, HANBURY ST., SPITALFIELDS,

ON THE FOLLOWING DATES:

Monday, Jan. 25th—Subject: "The Social and Industrial Condition of America."

Monday, Feb. 1st—Subject: "The Labor Movement in America."

Monday, Feb. 8th—Subject: "The Revolutionary Movement in America."

Doors open at 8. Commence at 8.30. Admission free.

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