

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

Vol. XVI.—No. 172.

DECEMBER, 1902.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

MUNICIPAL SOCIALISM.

In the early beginnings of *Freedom*, some sixteen years ago, there was in our paper an article, entitled *Local Action*, which attracted at that time a good deal of attention in Socialist circles. Till then, the workers had been told that the socialisation of the factories, the mines and so on, could only be accomplished by the State, by an Act of Parliament. However, the Paris Commune had commenced, since 1871, a new era of communal revolutions. It had indicated to us that, in all probability, the Social Revolution would begin in many points of every territory at once. A number of Communes would start it themselves, on their own account; and they would socialise their dwelling houses and their riches, without expecting that all the nation should be ready to do the same thing; they would rely on the force of example for convincing the citizens of other cities that their action was reasonable. And, of course, they would federate as soon as they would have broken the capitalist yoke in their own city.

Starting from this idea, so popular with the Latin nations, our writer indicated the absolute necessity of *local action* since the very beginnings of the revolution. Without local action the revolution of the twelfth century would never have taken place. Without the *local* expropriation of the land in the village Communes of eastern France, and without the *local* revolt of so many French cities in 1789 the great French revolution also would not have taken place. Destroy the monopolies first. Make a new start in your own place; and then only can you see how much and how far the others will be ready to follow you. This is how the Social Revolution will proceed in Latin countries.

English workingmen also liked the idea. In fact, it was evident to the workingman reader that if Bristol, Glasgow, Leicester, Manchester and so on would begin to socialise wealth—without waiting for orders from Westminster—the chances of a Social Revolution would be immensely increased. The best intentioned revolutionary Convention would find its task wonderfully simplified if many cities started the expropriation and took possession—here of the docks, there of the city lands, there again of the mines, and so on.

Sixteen years ago, English workers and even their leaders dared and liked to talk of the Social Revolution. However, owing to many reasons, the revolutionary wave, which ran high in 1886, fell flat; and we have since entered a period of trifling, partial improvements, and of prudent experiments, which have only a certain educational value. Amongst these experiments the so-called Municipal Socialism—that is, the municipal supply of various commodities—occupies the most prominent place. It has taken lately a quite unexpected extension in all countries, and every year it widens its sphere of action. We have now municipal gas, water and electricity; the municipal supply of motive power; municipal farming—Torquay, for instance, keeps its rabbit farm and its dairy farm; we have municipal ownership of docks, at no smaller a port than Liverpool. Besides, municipal ownership and working of coal mines is coming: thus the Manchester corporation, which supplies electric motive power to a very great number of factories and workshops, had to pay lately so much for coal, that the question of buying coal mines for the town is already a mere matter of time and of a favorable opportunity. And, finally, we have, in addition to town libraries and schools, municipal dwelling-houses, which will necessarily lead to the distribution of hot water, and open the way to municipal catering—probably in connection with co-operative stores. In fact, the feeding of the children in the day schools is already done by several municipalities in France.

Of course, all these are mere experiments, and no city has yet gone beyond the experimental stage; but they are interesting for us in that they so well confirm the Anarchist conception of how the Social Revolution will probably proceed. One of our main points is that each city will have to, itself, take the initiative of Socialistic expropriation and that the first duty of every revolted city will be to organise *the supply, by the Commune, of all the first necessities of life*: dwellings, food, and essential clothing. Not to start with *the organisation of labor*, as Louis Blanc said in 1848, because that would lead to an unavoidable failure; but to start with *the organisation of supply*. Satisfy, first, everyone's primary needs, so that nobody should be compelled to undersell his forces to a boss, and then organise production in accordance with the needs. This is the only means to really break the yoke of the capitalist system. *Socialised consumption* of goods will be the distinctive feature of the new non-Capitalist Society, and socialised production will be its necessary outcome,—but not the reverse. Go straight for Communism

—at least in all essential, primary needs—this is what we shall have to do in order to secure success.

And this is also the lesson which the development of the last sixteen years gives us. The only object-lesson worth speaking of which we got for the last sixteen years from those who undertook to render Revolution useless—this one lesson was given by the cities, not by the States. The cities have shown us that the rational way to proceed is just the one that we indicated; namely, to satisfy the needs of the population—some of them, at least—and this will necessarily bring them to the necessity of starting municipal production: to have, for instance, mines and to work them in order to supply coal and motive power at cost price.

Of course, no reasonable man will expect that Municipal Socialism, any more than Co-operation, could solve to any extent the Social problem. What is being done, and this is all that can be done, is mere experiment, mere object-lessons on a small scale.

Indeed, it is evident that every step in so-called Municipal Socialism renders the following steps more and more difficult. The days are not far off when all such attempts will run against a dead wall of landlordism which will have to be broken by force. It was already pointed out in these columns how the very fact of Woolwich having a successful co-operative society and an enterprising town council contributes to steadily raise the price of the land; so that the landlord pockets the best of what co-operation and municipal enterprise permit the worker to economise. "Buy land in Woolwich," the land-agents advertise on their posters. "Splendid opportunities for building workingmen's cottages: a good Co-operative Society, cheap tramways and a free ferry, plenty of municipal Socialism, and strong trade unions to secure good wages!" Co-operators, municipal Socialists and even fierce trade unionists—all are thus made to work for the landlord: he grows richer every day.

And then come in the sharks. Thus, a certain home-made Pierpoint Morgan, who only just begins to fatten, learns that there are schemes afloat of municipal and co-operative house-building at Woolwich. Without loss of time he buys just the land which both the town and the co-operators will want to-morrow, and now he will not sell for a thousand pounds the acre for which he yesterday paid three hundred pounds.

In short, every lamp post planted by a municipality, every foot of municipal tramway, every free library, every gardening school and every co-operative shop raise the value of the land. The price rises so rapidly that very soon all schemes of municipal enterprise will have to be given up—unless the British workers tell the landlords that they have enough of these drones and take back from them their own land—the land of the British nation.

* After all—we need not grumble. Will it not be a nice bit of useful work to begin the Social Revolution in this way? Especially if the claim against the landlords and the like be supported by a general strike, such as these foreign fools propose to us to do one of those days?

This is probably why the ruling middle-classes, seeing whereto we are going, begin to think that it is high time to stop all that "municipal enterprise." It is self-evident that they will not let themselves be expropriated without opposing resistance. They may favor municipal enterprise for a time; but the moment they see that it really begins to reduce the number of paupers in the towns or gives them regular employment, and consequently threatens to reduce the profits of the exploiters, they will soon put an end to it. The recent campaign undertaken by the *Times* against municipal Socialism, in the interest of various electrical Anglo-American companies, shows what the middle classes are capable of doing the moment they see that the so-called municipal Socialism is a real danger to their pockets, and menaces the profits they now get from the unpaid labor of the poor.

So far as object lessons go, we are certainly in full sympathy with all that is being done to widen the attributes of city life and to introduce communistic conceptions into it. But it is only through a Social revolution, made by the workers themselves, that the present exploitation of Labor by Capital can be altered. The revolution will have to be made in every city for itself, either on its own initiative, or to follow the initiative of other nations or Communes, but always by its own inhabitants; and, in making the revolution, the first preoccupation must be the organisation, first of all, of the *Consumption of goods on Communistic principles*.

This is the lesson which we can borrow from the experiments that have been made up till now in so many Continental, British and American cities.

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.

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

All communications, exchanges, &c., for "FREEDOM" to be addressed to

THE MANAGER, 127 Ossulston Street, N.W.

The Editors are not necessarily in agreement with signed articles.

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.

NOTES.

What an excellent thing Parliamentarism is—for the ruling classes! Here is Britain. It was evident that, once the war was over, there would necessarily begin a revival of talk about Socialism, land nationalisation, taxation of unearned increment, and, perhaps, also of Anarchism. Everyone saw it coming, and the cunning ones among the rulers asked: How to prevent it? And they found the remedy: The Education Bill! Their tactic is an old one. The best plan to prevent the people getting some new liberty has always been—to attack some old one. So they are doing now with their Education Bill. And the result is, that instead of talking about how to get rid of the fearful misery in our towns (one third of our town population is in misery), or how to stave off the abominations of the capitalist system, we are compelled to discuss: How to save our children from all sorts of Jesuits, and how to avoid being a party to the evil; how to escape supporting it by paying the taxes? Shelve Socialism and talk Education, please!—unless you come to the idea that it is high time to talk Revolution.

Every thinking Englishman and Englishwoman agrees that if England is beaten all round, in all industries (with perhaps one single exception, shipbuilding), the cause of it is in the lack of education. Not of clerical, or classical education; but of that sort of rationalist, natural education which rears the force of Germany and the United States. And everyone knows that the clergy are the worst sort of educators if education has to be based on the study of natural science. The very turn of mind of the clergyman (casuistical, lawyer's mind) is hostile to the straightforward and matter-of-fact turn of mind which is required for a profitable study of science. Well, what do they propose in their Education Bill?—Precisely to surrender education to the worst scientific educators, the clergy. But why such a blunder? you may ask. Why?—Talk about it with the Russian Jesuit who bears the unspeakable name of Pobyedonostseff. He will tell you all about it. "The study of science," he says, "always leads to free thinking in both political and religious matters."—There is Balfour's cat out of the bag.

Salisbury's "Failure of Science," and his nephew's "Foundations of Belief," were mere preambles to the present general attack on science in schools.

Listen only to the Primrose League ladies. You know them? When the watchword has been passed around among them, every one of them repeats it in the most conscientious way, in all possible tunes. "Gladstone—the traitor!" it was said at the beginning of the war, and every lady in each Primrose League "Habitation"—decorated or not (they give crosses to the ladies for having brought in so many adherents), young or old, very stupid or less stupid—every one repeated it in all intonations.

Listen, then, to the watchword of the movement.—"Hooliganism? Of course! With so many School Board schools, it was to be expected!" And an attitude of utter disgust follows the sentence.

The burning of 80,000 Boer farms, the hooliganism of their Kiplings and of the Stock Exchange "Maffickers"—all that is nothing.

"Don't you see? With so many School Board schools, hooliganism was sure to come!" This is the last word of Primrose League wisdom.

INTERNATIONAL LOVE.—Mr. Pecksniff was to the front in all his glory on November 10th at the Lord Mayor's banquet. Mr. Pecksniff, alias Balfour (some call him "right honorable," but that's a joke), shone prodigiously. His crowning glory was his eulogy of "international love." This placid, smiling, unruffled gentleman did not wish to speak of bloodshed, of concentration camps, of the horrors of war. "Let bygones be bygones. Our theme tonight is love." And the press—the Liberal and Radical press mind you—accepted the Pecksniffian cant and praised it. We are told: "This is Mr. Balfour at his best," "this is the better Mr. Chamberlain," etc., etc., as if there was any better or best in such deep-dyed enemies of human progress!

We need not wonder at the Man in the Street being hoodwinked if the writers on progressive journals show no more discretion than this. For a man who has taken a leading part in the crushing of two brave little States, and who at the present moment has his foot on the neck of the poor, unfortunate Irish nation, to talk of "international love" is enough to make the bosom of the earth heave with disgust. But the fact is, the code of Mr. Pecksniff is the code of the day in politics as

well as in social life. And that is why Balfour is tolerated, and Chamberlain gets his torchlight procession, and Hugh Price Hughes is buried as though he had been an honest man who had served his country well.

It seems a sad fatality that every step forward in the Spanish labor movement is marked with blood. The extensive strikes in the south-west this autumn, led to the horrible massacre of workingmen by gendarmes at La Linea, near Gibraltar; and now we hear of another murder about to be committed in the same district—this time slow, cold-blooded, legal murder, ordered by magistrates or court martial, whatever it be—*nine workingmen are sentenced to be shot.*

Let us hope that the voice of protest of the whole body of the Spanish workers will thunder in the ears of the government in such a way that they will not dare to commit this new crime—at a moment when the indignation of the civilised world begins to be roused over a new series of revelations akin to those of the Montjuich horrors. The truth is made known at last, by the comrades of *Tierra y Libertad* of Madrid and others, concerning the legal proceedings—abounding in torture and lies—against the Andalusian peasants and laborers who, in 1883, were executed or sent to penal servitude for life or for many years for participation in the outrages ascribed to the so-called *Mano Negra* (the Black Hand), an organisation which—as is now shown—never existed at all. The *Temps Nouveaux* reproduces a great part of these materials in French, and we shall resume this new chapter of legal horrors in our next issue.

The repression of the general strike at Geneva—which, however, left the workers there more energetic and hopeful than before—led to many expulsions (which in Switzerland spell: *extraditions* to foreign gendarmes stationed on the frontier) and to the condemnation of comrades L. Bertoni to one year, Steinegger to eight months and Croisier to three months' imprisonment.

THE LABOR WAR IN AMERICA.

The situation in America at the present time is one which should cheer the hearts of all those who are struggling for the emancipation of the toiling masses. The recent (or shall we say the present) strike of the anthracite coal miners typifies the sentiment that is prevailing among the workers of America, and it is well that the attention of the world has been focussed on the capitalistic Republic on the other side of the Atlantic. Not that more violence has been shown than in previous strikes; but the intelligent manner in which the strike has been conducted gained widespread sympathy, practical sympathy, from the general public, who had everything to lose and nothing to gain by a continuation of the struggle. These facts stamp this strike as an exceptional one, and shows that a portion of the workers, at least, are adopting new methods in fighting their masters.

The past five years in America were exceptionally prosperous ones for the country at large. True, there have been murders, suicides, robbery, infanticide, and all the other attendant evils of a capitalist state, and many heartburnings over the cases of child slavery. Yet there was and is prosperity. And yet, in spite of it all, the labor war rages fiercer than ever, strikes are the order of the day, and the trade unions have nearly doubled their membership in the last two years; and, best of all, is the spread of radical ideas in all classes of society.

In 1896, and again in 1900, the Republicans promised "the full dinner pail," and were so elated at their success they felt sure that workers with a full dinner pail would never listen to wicked agitators like Socialists and Anarchists. The *Globe-Democrat*, of St. Louis, expressed their feelings in a cartoon published three years ago, in which a grinning workman was represented marching off with a full dinner pail, while Emma Goldman was making tracks for Europe with a bag full of bombs—disgusted because the workers of America would not listen to the doctrine of Anarchism. These gentlemen, while realising the very important part the stomach plays in the affairs of mankind, forgot there were other things that move the minds of men. Were this not so, those who were more prosperous would have deserted the miners, and they would have been crushed without a doubt. Instead of which we found a great wave of sympathy for them agitating the country and, finally, compelling the acceptance of arbitration by Mr. "Divine Right" Baer and his associates—a thing they had resolutely refused to do for five months. The formation of Trusts has gone on at such an alarming rate that, as we Anarchists expected, it has caused the drawing together of the workers to meet the common foe. This accounts for the increase of the unions and the half-conscious closing of the ranks of organised labor.

The case of the coal miners furnishes an excellent illustration of the strength, not only of our principles, but our tactics. The workingmen of America may be Republicans, Democrats, or even Social Democrats; they may talk of grappling with the Trusts by legal means, and a few be deceived by the professions of Teddy Roosevelt; but deep down in their hearts they feel and know that it is by throwing down their tools and refusing to work for them, that it is possible to bring the capitalists to their knees. This implies organisation, which brings education and a feeling of solidarity; and thus the enormous increase in the ranks of the unionists and a correspondingly intelligent use of their power is accounted for.

The struggle of the miners—and no one but the miners themselves can know what sufferings and privations they had to undergo those weary months—is but a skirmish of the great battle that is coming.

President Roosevelt and J. P. Morgan have received a great deal of credit for helping to bring about a settlement of the strike, credit we are by no means sure they deserve. There was one great fact which impressed itself deeply upon the minds of the coal barons—they saw that the temper of the people of the country was becoming unruly, and the first cold snap would have seen them out of hand. It is one thing to fight 150,000 miners with millions at your back and thousands of well-armed troops at command; but quite another thing when some millions of people are rendered desperate by cold, with coal at impossible prices. The night air is chilly in the Eastern States in October, and \$25 a ton was a limit beyond which the coal barons dare not go; so, to use a slang phrase, they “crawfished” from their assumption of divine right as laid down by Mr. Baer, and agreed to arbitration. Whether Roosevelt or Morgan pointed this out to them, is of no importance; they saw that rioting would inevitably result from the coal famine and they capitulated. Whether the miners get all they ask for or a very small part is subordinate for the moment to what I call “first blood” for the General Strike. If the workers of America profit by the lesson just taught them by the coal strike, there ought to be glorious possibilities for the general strike; and the next few years may furnish results to satisfy the most fiery enthusiasts of our cause.

The sentence of five years’ imprisonment on our comrades MacQueen and Grossman, for alleged participation in the riots arising out of the strike of the silk weavers at Paterson, shows how intense the coming struggle will be. Although a number of witnesses proved that Grossman was in New York at the time, he was condemned along with MacQueen who admitted being present at the riot though taking no part in the violence. An appeal has been lodged, and now is an excellent opportunity for work among trade unions. This is the first conviction under the new Anti-Anarchist laws, and it should be fought stubbornly. If some comrade could only visit every labor organisation in the State of New Jersey between now and the time of the appeal, glorious work could be done. It can be done; and it would be far better for the Defence Committee to put one or two men into the field for this purpose than to spend money in lawyers’ fees. It is a stiff fight and there must be no faltering.

H. M. K.

LITERARY NOTES.

Le Materialisme Economique, by Guillaume de Greef (Paris; V. Giard & E. Briere publishers). The report which was made by Prof. De Greef to the Institut International de Sociologie on this interesting question is now out in pamphlet form, and we hardly need say that the learned sociologist fully confirms what was said by comrade Tcherkezov years ago in the pages of *Freedom* about the sources of what the Marxists describe as “scientific Socialism,” and which they represent as the discovery of Marx and Engels.

“According to Engels,” De Greef writes, “and in this respect Kautsky agrees with him, ‘it was by these two great discoveries, the materialist conception of history and the discovery of the secret of capitalist production by means of surplus-value, that Socialism became a science.’—Engels, *Anti-Dühring*.”

Such is the claim of the Marxists; but, in direct opposition to it, De Greef—who, by the way, fully shares in economics the Socialist standpoint—proves the following:

“It was the classical economists who, in fact, owing to their mechanical and automatic representation of Society, owing to their materialistic point of view (even in the worst sense of the word), and by assimilating the workingmen or the labor-force of the workingmen to a merchandise, as well as by their almost exclusive preoccupation with wealth and the so-called material interests, have preceded Marxism in this direction. The physiocrats and the French and English schools of Adam Smith, Ricardo and Malthus, as well as Mably, Morrelly and, later on, Godwin and Robert Owen [De Greef might have also added especially Saint-Simon] have, all of them, given to the economic factors, and some of them to the forms of production, a prevailing importance.”

Speaking further on of Buckle’s attempt at interpreting history from an economic standpoint, De Greef quotes the following appreciation of the great historian by a Marxist writer, Kautsky:

“He ignored yet that different economic laws correspond to different social forms; he believed still in the political economy of the liberals, for which the laws of merchandise production were the natural laws of all production.”

To which quotation De Greef adds:

“Poor great Buckle! He ignored yet, he whom they represent as a liberal economist, what Adam Smith had explained nearly a hundred years before Marx, in his theory of value! he is described as belonging to the liberal sect of economists, who had made of the surroundings, and more especially of food, the dominating factors of all civilisation.” “To the solution of this problem,” De Greef very justly concludes, “neither Marx nor Engels have contributed any new or decisive solution.”

Passing to the theory of value and surplus-value, De Greef has no difficulty in showing that the pretensions of Marx and Engels in this respect are equally unfounded.

We fully agree with these conclusions of the Belgian sociologist, and we need only add that—leaving quite aside the *educative* influence of Marx, especially in Germany, which certainly was immense—it was the striking ignorance, by our generation, of the work of the Saint-Simonists, the Fourierists, and the followers of the great Robert Owen, that has permitted the Marxists to exaggerate in such a comical way the *scientific* importance of their teacher, from whom they had learned something about Socialism for the first time.

We are glad to notice the reappearance of the French review, *L’Humanité Nouvelle*, published by A. Hamon. It was stopped for some time, but reappears now (3 bis, Cour de Rohan, rue du Jardinot, Paris; 9 francs every six months), and its October number is quite interesting.

Comrade Jean Grave has brought out a very nice novel, *Malfaiteurs!* (editor P. V. Stock; 2/3, post free, at *Les Temps Nouveaux*, 4 rue Broca, Paris). It is taken from the life of the Anarchist circles of Paris, which he knows well from the inside.

The *Almanach de la Révolution*, for 1903, edited by P. Delesalle, is out. It is very interesting and contains a selection of short articles by Delesalle, Elisée Reclus, Descaves, Grave, Kropotkin, Charles Albert, Klemczinski, etc., and illustrations by Steinlen, L. Héroult, Rouille, V. Muller, W. Haume, Couturier, Berger, etc., most of which are excellent (3d., or 4d. post free at *Les Temps Nouveaux*).

Jean Grave has brought out a very interesting book, *Guerre-Militarisme*. It is a big octavo volume, which is composed entirely of anti-militarist articles and abstracts that have appeared in the Literary Supplement to the *Révolte* and the *Temps Nouveaux*. It is an admirable collection of anti-war literature, well selected from the very best authors. The cheap edition costs 2/3, post free, and the *édition de luxe* richly illustrated by drawings of quite a number of young French artists (Heidbrinck, Héroult, Hermann-Paul, Jehannet, Steinlen, Lefèvre, Luce, Signac, Vallotton and Villaume; engraved by Berger), costs 6s., plus postage at the *Temps Nouveaux*.

RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE IN RUSSIA.

For the last twenty years Pobiedonostseff, the present Procurator of the Russian Holy Synod, has organised missionary works in Russia. Of the inquisitorial character of those missions many revolting stories have circulated in the country. Pobiedonostseff, who himself has in reality no religion and in his life as statesman and individual is guided by calculation and personal interest, tries by all means to stop any scientific, moral or religious development of the Russian people. It is well known that under his influence Alexander III. prohibited from public circulation the works of Darwin, Spencer, Huxley, Buckle and others. It is also well known and proved by documents that it was he who again in 1883 proposed to send students and pupils of high schools to military convict service for the slightest offence. The same man has been endeavouring for these twenty years to discredit elementary lay schools organised by municipalities and councils. Alexander III. also under his influence put popular instruction in the hands of the clergy, and the schools were conducted in such a way that not only elementary scientific knowledge but even the percentage of peasants able to read and write began to decrease.

At last even the oppressed Russian people began to protest from different sides. Provincial Councils, many governors, and even the Commander-in-Chief of the Ural Cossacks denounced Pobiedonostseff’s schools as mere irony, as tools, not for instruction, but for destroying any real popular instruction. But this was not yet sufficient for Pobiedonostseff; he wanted to paralyse any attempt for religious freedom. For this purpose he organised a special body of spies from police agents, clergymen and fanatics. The members of this body are well paid from the State Exchequer and their duty is to spy upon dissenters and free-thinkers and to denounce them to the police authorities, by whom they are subjected to a most inhuman treatment.

Everyone knows how the children of Prince Khilkoff, one of the noblest and kindest of men who sacrificed his wealth and privileges and was the intimate friend of Tolstoy, were taken from him. In 1897, by order of Pobiedonostseff, his religious agents took the children of the dissenters of the provinces Samara and Saratoff and distributed them over different monasteries and police establishments. Only under the influence of the mighty protest of Tolstoy, the children were restored to their parents by that Uriah Heep with the power of a Torquemada. However, he took his revenge on Tolstoy by the latter’s excommunication from the Russian Church, so ridiculously proclaimed by the Holy Synod.

Seldom do the facts of their cruelty leak out, especially with the particulars and names of victims and localities, as everybody dreads the merciless revenge of the powerful inquisitor. But this time it is possible to give facts well ascertained. A peasant, Ivan Semerenko, of the village of Plosky (Chernigov province), told Mr. Pavloff, a Baptist preacher in Tultcha, the following:

In 1896 our landlord General Matskovsk’s son had with him a German Baptist, August Kronstein, under whose influence myself and my wife renounced the Russian official Church and especially the worshipping of icons. When this became known to the authorities, I was taken before a missionary and a priest who insisted that I should prostrate myself before the icon; on my refusal I received 15 lashes with the birch. A fortnight afterwards I was taken again before them and subjected to the same corporal punishment. Three weeks later they made several similar attempts to convert me; but when they saw that I persevered in my faith, they tied my legs and arms with a rope and hoisted me up. Two of my torturers lit cigarettes and burned my flesh in different places and one of them pricked me with a needle. I cried aloud with pain and they cut the rope so suddenly that I fell on my head and lost consciousness. No less cruel were they with my wife. One of the tortures

inflicted upon her was to place her breasts between two pieces of wood and press until the blood spurted out.

After that I was left in peace for two months; but on the 1st of December a missionary came with two priests. Seeing that I still persevered, they ordered me to be put in the cold village prison and the local police agent struck me many times with his whip. The 4th of December I was taken to the police station. Passing a blacksmith's shop my torturers began again to speak to me of renouncing my heresy; on my refusal they dragged me in the shop and fixed my left arm and burnt me with a hot iron in ten places; still I persevered, and they tied me by my beard and undressed me, then burnt me along my spine forty to fifty times. Only after this they took me before the missionary at the police station. As I gave no answer to him, they took me back to prison.

Among the peasants, some pitied me and one tried to defend me. The unhappy man was immediately ordered to receive 25 lashes. Seeing this I said: "Punish me, as I am now used to it," with which words I took off my clothes and showed my burned back to the people. The peasants began to cry: "Down with such justice, which burns living people!" This time they let me go, and with the help of some peasants I succeeded in escaping to Roumania.

This martyr, Semerenko, showed his burned body to the above-named Baptist preacher, Pavloff, in presence of the Roumanian Chief of Police and other citizens of Tultcha.

Semerenko is not alone, but the other victims are kept in prisons, in chains, at hard labor in Siberia by order of Pobiedonostseff and his helpers. Such is the religious tolerance which Pobiedonostseff asserts in his article in the *North American Review*.

ANARCHIST COMMUNISM*: Its Aims and Principles.

[From the *Reformers' Year Book*, page 26.]

Anarchism may be briefly defined as the negation of all government and all authority of man over man: Communism as the recognition of the just claim of each to the fullest satisfaction of all his needs, physical, moral and intellectual. The Anarchist, therefore, whilst resisting as far as possible all forms of coercion and authority, repudiates just as firmly even the suggestion that he should impose himself upon others, realising as he does that this fatal propensity in the majority of mankind has been the cause of nearly all the misery and bloodshed in the world. He understands just as clearly that to satisfy his needs without contributing to the best of his ability, his share of labor in maintaining the general well-being, would be to live at the expense of others—to become an exploiter and to live as the rich drones live today. Obviously, then, government on the one hand and private ownership of the means of production on the other, complete the vicious circle—the present social system—which keeps mankind degraded and enslaved.

There will be no need to justify the Anarchist's attack upon all forms of government: history teaches the lesson he has learned on every page. But that lesson being concealed from the mass of the people by interested advocates of "law and order," and even by many Social Democrats, the Anarchist deals his hardest blows at the sophisms that uphold the State, and urges workers in striving for their emancipation to confine their efforts to the economic field.

It follows, therefore, that politically and economically his attitude is purely revolutionary; and hence arises the vilification and misrepresentation that Anarchism, which dencunes all forms of social injustice, meets with in the press and from public speakers.

Rightly conceived, Anarchism is no mere abstract ideal theory of human society. It views life and social relations with eyes disillusioned. Making an end of all superstitions, prejudices and false sentiments it tries to see things as they really are; and without building castles in the air it finds by the simple correlation of established facts that the grandest possibilities of a full and free life can be placed within the reach of all, once that monstrous bulwark of all our social iniquities—the State—has been destroyed, and common property declared.

By education, by free organisation, by individual and associated resistance to political and economic tyranny, the Anarchist hopes to achieve his aims. The task may seem impossible to many, but it should be remembered that in science, in literature, in art, the highest minds are with the Anarchists or are imbued with distinct Anarchist tendencies. Even our bitterest opponents admit the beauty of our "dream," and reluctantly confess it would be well for humanity if it were "possible." Anarchist Communist propaganda is the intelligent, organised, determined effort to realise the "dream" and to ensure that freedom and well-being for all *shall* be possible.

* It would be only fair to state that the Individualist school of Anarchism, which includes many eminent writers and thinkers, differs from us mainly on the question of Communism, *i. e.*, on the holding of property, the remuneration of labor, etc. Anarchism, however, affords the opportunity for experiment in all these matters, and in that sense there is no dispute between us. We have purposely refrained from alluding to the burning question of assassination, as we think it will be time to deal with that when government has explained to us all the moral advantages of its wholesale massacres, slaughtering and plundering.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

FREEDOM Guarantee Fund.—K. 5s., N. 5s., A. M. £1, H. G. 8/9, C. R. £1, Anon 10s.		Leeds list:	
Free Commune Press	2 0	Ike Brassington	3
Simon Badansky	1 0	Tom Walsh	6
Sivey	3	Bardin	6
Sempt	3	Agulsky	1 0
Walt Wood	3	Mat Salet	1 0
J. Walch	3	Livin	1 6
Bossomwirth	3	Gasdon	2 0
Dick Pullon	3	Jane Davison	6
Alf Blumenthal	6		
Ben Scott	2 2	Total	14 5

Sales of FREEDOM.—Newsagents 5/6, Office 3/3, Taylor 2/6.

Annual Subscriptions.—G. Glass 1/6, Snellenberg, Mikol, Task 5/9, Bakker 1/6, Tibaldo 1/6, W. Taylor 1/6.

FREEDOM PAMPHLETS,

- No. 1. THE WAGE SYSTEM. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
- No. 2. THE COMMUNE OF PARIS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
- No. 3. A TALK ABOUT ANARCHIST-COMMUNISM BETWEEN TWO WORKERS. By E. MALATESTA. 1d.
- No. 4. ANARCHIST COMMUNISM: ITS BASIS AND PRINCIPLES. 1d.
- No. 5. ANARCHY. By E. MALATESTA. 1d.
- No. 6. ANARCHIST MORALITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
- No. 7. EXPROPRIATION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
- No. 8. ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. By C. M. WILSON. 1/2d.
- No. 9. ANARCHY ON TRIAL—George Etiévant, Jean Grave and Caserio Santo. 32 pages; 1d.
- No. 10. ANARCHISM: ITS PHILOSOPHY AND IDEAL. 1d.
- No. 11. THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
- No. 12. RESPONSIBILITY AND SOLIDARITY IN THE LABOR STRUGGLE.
- No. 13. THE PYRAMID OF TYRANNY, By F. DOMELA NIEUWENHUIS. 1d.

Other Pamphlets.

- DIRECT ACTION VERSUS LEGISLATION, by J. Blair Smith. Price 1d.
 AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
 A DIALOGUE AND HUMOROUS POETRY BY L. S. B.; 16 pages 8vo. 1d.
 LAW AND AUTHORITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
 EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. By ELYSEE RECLUS. 1d.
 USEFUL WORK VERSUS USELESS TOIL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
 MONOPOLY; OR, HOW LABOR IS ROBBED. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
 SOCIALISM THE REMEDY. By HENRY GLASSE. 1d.
 SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN GERMANY. By GUSTAV LANDAUER. 1/2d.
 ORGANISED VENGEANCE—CALLED "JUSTICE." 1d.
 GOD AND THE STATE. By MICHAEL BAKOUNINE. Price fourpence.
 THE ORIGIN OF ANARCHISM, by C. L. JAMES. Price 2d.
 THE DEISTIC PESTILENCE, by JOHN MOST. Price 1d.

PAGES OF SOCIALIST HISTORY. By W. TCHERKESOV, paper 1s. 3d.

FIELDS, FACTORIES and WORKSHOPS, by Peter Kropotkin, a study for ALL. Paper 1s. net., cloth 2s.

THE CHICAGO MARTYRS. Their speeches in Court and the record of their trial, with the reasons given by Governor Altgeld for pardoning Fielden, Schwab, and Neebe; price 1 shilling. Spies speech in pamphlet form, 1d.

MORIBUND SOCIETY and ANARCHY, by Jean Grave. Paper 1s. net.

MEMOIRS OF A REVOLUTIONIST, by P. Kropotkin, is a work valuable to every propagandist and is worth circulating as widely as possible. American edition (in one vol.) for sale, post free 8/4.

"Free Society." An Exponent of Anarchist-Communism, 331 Walnut St., Chicago., Illinois, U. S. A. Agent for *Free Society's* publications: T. CANTWELL, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N. W.

FREEDOM, FROM 1891 TO 1898 (INCLUSIVE), (IN RED COVER WITH BLACK LETTERING, WHICH MAY BE HAD SEPARATELY) BOUND IN ONE VOLUME TO MATCH COMMONWEAL

"FREEDOM" MAY BE OBTAINED OF

- W. Reeves, 83 Charing Cross Road, London, W.
 O. Mathias, 20 Little Pultney Street, London W.
 Heiligenstein, 39 Charlotte Street, London. W.
 "New Order" office, 26 Paternoster Square, E.C.
 B. Ruderman, 71 Hanbury St., Spitalfields, London, E.
 Blair Smith, 15 Sunnybank St., Dalmarnock, Glasgow.
 Free Commune Press, 11 Briegham Terrace, Adelaide St., Hull.
 P. Josephs, 198 Main Street, Gorbals, Glasgow.
 A. Gorrie 18 Princess Street, Leicester.
 N. Notkin, 242 N 2nd Street, Philadelphia. Pa. U.S.A.
 K. A. Snellenberg, 54 Haskins St., Roxbury, Mass., U.S.