

# Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. 6.—No. 63.

FEBRUARY, 1892.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY

## WHAT'S TO BE DONE.

Now that the Anarchist movement has taken a firm hold on what the sturdy old rebel Chatterton is pleased to call the 'disunited kingdom', comrades are asking themselves what they can do to help forward the movement; how they can best work for the establishment of that free condition of society which they so earnestly desire. The answer to the question was given at the conference held at the hall in Lamb's Conduit Street on the 25th of last October. The key note of the new policy was struck on that memorable occasion and we are so satisfied of this and so pleased with it ourselves that we think the date might well be borne in mind for anniversary purposes. If the policy then proposed is acted upon with energy and determination, we feel sure that there will be every reason to celebrate the date by a public meeting this year at which we may record the progress we have made during the twelvemonths and get up steam for another burst of propaganda in the ensuing year.

Anarchists, in fact, must avail themselves of the trade unions. In other words the trade unionists must be converted to Anarchy. This is by no means a very difficult matter. There are now a great many trade unionists who are also Anarchists. Let them start on the job at once. They have an admirable manifesto ready for circulation, which is calculated to awaken thought and prepare the ground for them to converse with and thoroughly bring around their fellow workers. Moreover the trade unionist is naturally inclined towards Anarchism, towards the principle of working out his own emancipation without having recourse to parliament and the legislators. The trade unionist class is in fact the most self-reliant, and energetic portion of the workers. By means of their organisations, we, or rather they, can certainly do very much to lay the foundations of the new society. If it appears to some of us that they are at present as a body rather inclined towards parliamentary methods, let us not forget that this is due to the fact that the Social Democrats have been working amongst them for years and turning their ideas in the direction of state help. Their real inclination however, is towards independent action. It is an undeniable fact that the basis on which all existing trade unions were founded was self help, defence against the extortions of the capitalist class. In most cases the leaders were strong advocates of direct action and it was only when they became imbued with the spirit of officialism, had made positions for themselves and aspired to parliamentary honours, that they turned away from the old traditions of the movement. This is still to be seen in the action of the present leaders of the older trade unionism and their differences with the leaders of the "new" unionism. The former having been corrupted by their intercourse with the capitalist class, though they cling to the old ideas of independence refuse to act upon them thus justifying the criticism of the new school, who profess to be anxious to pass all sorts of acts of parliament for the benefit of the workers. What we Anarchists have to do at this juncture is simply to take up the work where the old, corrupted leaders have left off, to continue the movement but at the same time to give it a broader, wider, more complete ideal, to point out the imperfections of the existing unions and how they may be remedied.

Of course there is much in the existing trade unions which is objectionable. They are far too centralistic in their tendency, the ordinary worker has by no means so large a share of influence as he should have. They are often not managed on sufficiently broad lines. In many unions difficulties are put in the way of workers gaining admission. They are too much inclined to rest on their oars, that is to say they are not sufficiently aggressive, and the official is far too powerful. But all these and the other defects which might be mentioned, are comparatively insignificant. Unions are free spontaneous associations of working men and women waiting to do anarchistic work. The great fault to be found with them is that the economic education of their members is too far back, that their ideal is too narrow. What is that ideal? Merely to defend themselves against the exactions of the capitalist class, to obtain a minimum wage and in some cases to pay a small "out of work benefit." This should be altered. They are already discontented: they must be inspired with the anarchist ideal of being their own employers, their own masters. They must realise that if the worker is to be a free man he must be a joint owner with his fellows of the means of production, and that to obtain the control of these is the end and aim of the labor movement.

To the most men amongst the mass of trade unionists the thought has never occurred that it lies in their power to create a new

state of society in which co-operation will be substituted for competition and in which the exploiting middleman between the producer and the consumer will have disappeared. Once this ideal is explained to them in such a fashion as they will readily understand, they will be only too eager to work for it themselves and to enrol themselves under the banner of Anarchism. Here and there the idea is even now finding ground, but only as a sort of resource for the unemployed members. For example the 'busmen have recently held one or two meetings, at which it was proposed that their union should start a few 'buses, so that the unemployed and boycotted members might have employment provided for them. Here again we see the germ of the idea which we Anarchists ought to put clearly before the workers. What we have to convince them of, however, is that they should aim not merely at starting business "on their own hook," for the purpose of establishing a refuge for the unemployed and boycotted members, but that they should seek to eliminate the capitalist altogether; that they should not only feel a spirit of solidarity with their fellow-unionists but with all workers, that is to say that each trade should look upon it as their business to find employment for all the workers, inside or outside the union, in their particular trade; that they should consider themselves responsible, as indeed they are, for there being unemployed men in their line of business, and seek to provide employment for them. Once this spirit of universal solidarity and this new ideal begins to be generally accepted, the unemployed question, the blackleg question, the overtime question, the eight-hour question, and all the subsidiary matters in which workers interest themselves will solve themselves. For when the union and the unionists understand that the unemployed men of their trade are a burden upon them, that they must be either supported by the funds of the society, or in other words out of the pockets of the members, or that work must be found for them, the workers will begin to see that it is against their personal interest if they work long hours and overtime whilst others are not working at all. If there are a large number of men dependent upon the union, a movement will immediately arise in favor of a strike to reduce the hours of labor, not merely to eight, but to such a degree as will find employment for the unemployed men. Once the workers get controlled by this spirit of solidarity, the capitalist will find himself in an impossible position, for he will be unable to make profit. There being no longer any blacklegs, strikes must necessarily be successful and the survival of the fittest will result in his being crushed out of existence as capitalist, to be converted, if he is a wise man and accepts the position philosophically, into a fellow-worker enjoying the blessings of a higher civilisation in common with the rest of mankind.

The first thing to be done is to encourage the decentralisation movement. Small unions, federated if the members desire it, are the most effective and give the fewest opportunities to scheming ambitious officials. A very great many of the workers see the dangers of officialism and continual grumbling goes on, but they also see the necessity for organisation. A little discussion, a little thrashing out of the subject with these discontented ones and the Anarchist trade unionists will very soon have a host at their back. And this leads us to the question of economic education, one of primary importance. We would suggest that the different unions should be urged to start educational meetings, or that Anarchist unionists should start educational meetings themselves, specially addressed to the members of their union. We shall do all we can to help in the matter by the publication of articles, specially dealing with such matters as require elucidation in order to gain over the trade unionists, and by advertising and noticing such meetings. In this connection we would earnestly invite our readers who are trade unionists to send us all the information they can, to report their personal progress in the way of propaganda, to let us know of such difficulties as they encounter, to make arrangements for our speakers to address their members, and in a word to keep us thoroughly well-informed at the same time that they demand from us such aid as we are able to give. There is also a desire amongst unionists to modify the power of their representatives at congresses and conferences and to make them rather delegates carrying out instructions than representatives who say and do as they choose rather than as those who have sent them there desire. This feeling ought specially to be encouraged, even if it is only that the workers may be induced to gather together more frequently and to discuss their own affairs, instead of leaving them in the hands of a few individuals.

This sort of work may seem very prosaic and insignificant to some of our comrades, but it is work that has to be done, of that there can be

no doubt. By helping to convert the trade unionists to Anarchy you will be laying the foundations of the new society and preparing for the impending struggle. When once the trade unionists get hold of the Anarchist ideal and enlarge their unions so as to include all the workers, agricultural, industrial and clerical, and there is no longer any excuse for a man being outside the guild of his calling, the differences between the workers and the exploiters will be forced to a head, the landlords and capitalists will be compelled to stand aside and let the workers have free access to the materials and tools which are necessary to their living happy lives. Then doubtless will come a struggle, but it will be one in which the force and the victory will be on the side of the workers.

## THE REIGN OF HUNGER.

### I.—THE HUNGER.

WE are hungry. This century, which has witnessed the greatest increase of wealth the world has ever known, has been a century of starvation. Of daily, bodily underfeeding for hundreds upon hundreds of thousands; but it is not of that only or even principally we speak here. Man does not live by bread alone, and this has been a century of the starvation of the whole human nature of untold millions. The whole man in each one of us craves and cries out continually to be satisfied, striving, yearning after the joy of life, stretching out passionate hands of longing towards those possibilities which correspond to its own faculties, impulses, desires. Too often only to dash helplessly against the pitiless wall of fate or grasp at nothingness in the great, blank void.

Think of the broken, blighted, maimed, deformed, depraved existence of a child waking to consciousness amid squalor and filth, foul sights and sounds and odours. Think of his young mind drinking in an atmosphere of thought and feeling as impure, as destitute of all life-stimulating elements as the air he takes into his lungs. Think of his craving for love met with harshness, coldness, bitter words, perhaps blows; the awakening curiosity of his intellect answered with blank ignorance, unjust reproof, or fed with the knowledge of corruption, vice and knavery; his desire to exercise his limbs and voice roughly checked and his boyish vivacity treated as a crime. The existence of such a child, stunted or deformed at every turn, is only a picture in little of the whole lives of numberless men and women amidst the richest and most cultured civilisation the world has yet seen.

Truly we are making the earth a hell to one another, we men and women of the Nineteenth Century. Though there are endless gradations and varieties of misery, is there one of us that escapes the universal hunger curse, at least at that period of his life when he is alive and awake? Is there one who is satisfied?

Very many if not most of us have far more, far larger opportunities, than our forefathers, but the growing complexity of the life which has brought these, has also brought changes in both men and social conditions which are a potent cause of dissatisfaction. Our civilisation has, on the one hand, developed the human being so that he craves for more than his fathers craved, and, on the other hand, whilst helping him to see that the means of satisfying his many cravings exist, at the same time tells him that these satisfactions are not for him, and so undermines and pollutes his pleasure even in what he has.

Look, for instance, at the poorer workers to-day. Less than 150 years ago, the mass of hand workers were living in the country, or in towns so small that the Londoner of to-day would think them almost villages. These country workmen, some of them, were short of food and clothes and were none too well housed; but what food they had was wholesome and unadulterated, they habitually breathed pure air and lived in wholesome contact with nature. Their nerves were too healthy to crave perpetually for morbid excitement, and their ignorance too complete to let them long for the joys of the intellect and imagination. Their physical toil was not excessive, their minds were occupied in directing the labor of their hands, for a large proportion were their own employers. Their own limitations co-operated with the simplicity of their lives to save most of them from the restless dissatisfaction of to-day.

But now the vast majority of the workers are living in an atmosphere and on foods and drinks which cannot do otherwise than render them weakly, white-blooded, morbidly excitable; whilst they are taught just enough to enable them to catch a glimpse of the intenser pleasures hopelessly banished from their lives. And again, as if this were not enough, they are for ever tantalised with the display of masses of material wealth which might supply them with the sensuous enjoyments and luxurious ease which their own unhealthy physical conditions and lives of perpetual struggle and privation specially incline them to desire. Further, many of them are deprived of all interest in their daily work for its own sake. They are portions of the machinery worked by some employer, each everlastingly toiling at one mechanical action in which his mind has next to no part, and having no interest in the finished product. What is there to satisfy a human being in this?

Or take that great class comprising the skilled artisan, small shop-keeper or clerk, lesser agents and middle men of every sort, folks able to supply their most absolute physical needs with fair regularity. A man in such circumstances has a chance to read a few books, see pictures and hear music now and again. Leisure to think and widen the interests of his life a little. And it is possible that he may take some real

interest in his work for its own sake. At all events it to some extent occupies his mind and is directed by himself. But do not the wider possibilities of his life only open out to him the vista of all he is deprived of? How he longs for a good educational training to help him in finding his way and gaining a firm mental footing in that world of ideas which his reading reveals to him. How he loathes the squalid hideousness of the surroundings amongst which he is compelled to live. How he dreams of the delicious thrills of satisfaction to be obtained from the poetry of existence, the harmonies of a life filled with art and beauty. How he longs to travel. How he wishes to have the chance to refresh himself with healthy outdoor sports, with country rambles, with genial social intercourse, instead of being everlastingly tied down to the routine of his workshop or his office or his shop and the weary struggle of getting his livelihood. How he longs for change of occupation. In short, how painfully dissatisfied he feels for himself, and most of all for his children.

Or look at the man of woman who has command of enough wealth to supply such needs as material things can satisfy; who has had such mental training as schools and colleges can give; whose life is surrounded with so much beauty as the sordid ugliness of our commercial and utilitarian age will allow. Perhaps it is such a person as this who is the most *consciously* dissatisfied of all. The poor worker, the struggling shopkeeper believe that if they could only get riches they would be satisfied; but to the dissatisfied amongst the well-to-do it seems as if the want were in life itself. "Vanity of vanity, all is vanity" in a world of unrealities and shams. Such a man's education and social conditions have set him, as it were, in the midst of abstractions, have hemmed him in with conventionalities, have isolated him from the greater part of his fellows and from the rude realities upon which his life and theirs depend. He has society without real, heart satisfying fellowship with other men and women. He has the forms of art without its soul of passionate feeling. He has the knowledge of what has been said and thought by others, and especially of the formulas in which the past experience of the race has been crystallised, but of living realities in the relations of things, what sense, what grasp has he? He lives at second hand. There are exceptions, of course, many individual exceptions, but in general what is the life of ideas, the progress and growth of the world of thought to the "educated" man or woman? A matter of indifference or of the faintest sensation of interest, a thing in which they themselves have no personal, active share, which is no vital part of their inner life. Their education has simply opened fresh doors for dissatisfaction. Their deliverance from material cares is also a divorce from all direct contact with the external realities of man's relation to nature. What is the use of their attempting productive work? They will only be taking some workman's bread out of his mouth. So they merely look on whilst others are engaged in the practical daily struggle for the supply of the common elementary needs of all human lives, and they pay for their aloofness by that ignorance of the properties of things which more than anything else goes to paralyse the creative faculties. In fact, many under these conditions lose almost entirely their natural impulse to work, and they are the most unsatisfied of all. As Guyau says, "To do nothing leads to wanting everything, without having the power of accomplishing anything."

Yes, here we come down to the root of the matter; of all causes that go to make up our universal sense of being unsatisfied, there are two which seem to underlie all the rest.

In the first place, a very large proportion of us are baulked from childhood to old age in one of our strongest, most persistent impulses, and this perpetual frustration casts a leaden shade of disappointment over every department of life. One and all, the normal and healthy beings amongst us long to do, to act, to make something, to form something; to express themselves in some course of action, some process of thought, the fashioning of some material object, which seems to be a good in itself or to fulfil a purpose of use or beauty. This impulse begins to show itself in early childhood; everyone who has had to do with little children knows how they are always trying to construct something, and how, as they get older, it becomes their ambition to construct something which shall have a meaning, be "pretty," or be of "some real use," and if it can be of "real use" to the other people of their little world, then they are prouder and more eager than ever. In these respects men and women are but children of larger growth, and whether their own peculiarities of character, or the stress of circumstances directs the main current of their vital formative energies to abstract thought or material products or some determinate line of action, exploration for instance, the same spontaneous impulse is to be found in every human being not already crushed, mutilated, withered, deadened by misfortune, social pressure or lack of opportunity.

But amongst us to-day what free scope is secured for a factor of such deep significance in the life of each? The majority of the well-to-do are sterilised, as we have said, by their divorce from nature, from the stern reality of things as they are, from actual contact with the prime necessities of human existence. Their energies are frittered away or diverted into the mischievous paths of exploitation and government. And as for the masses, born without the silver spoon in their mouths, all their energy must be spent in the struggle for a living, in doing whatever they can get paid for doing or can make a profit by, regardless of their natural aptitudes and tastes, or of whether the results of their labor seem to them worthy of effort or to serve any rational purpose whatever. Here and there is a happy exception, an artist in some business or craft, who is throwing himself into what he does for the love of it; but what is the toil of the great masses of our factory

hands, artisans, laborers, shop assistants, drivers, porters, seamstresses, tailors, agents, managers, lawyers, doctors, clergymen, teachers and the rest but mere drudgery, performed solely for the sake of the money they can get as wages, fees or profits and not because they are inspired to do that special work by their own sense that its performance is the desire of their heart. Many of them struggle along conscientiously, urged by necessity to do what they can, since they cannot do what they would, and find in the task a sort of stunted and incomplete satisfaction of their natural creative impulse. The sort of satisfaction we all feel in doing a thing as well as we can, even if it is not what we should have desired to do. But this is not the hearty joy of the free worker, acting on his own initiative, expressing himself in what he creates. And even this maimed satisfaction is denied to numberless workers, whose daily toil is mere repulsive slavery to them and nothing more. If from this cause of dissatisfaction alone, what could our life be to-day but restless misery?

There is, however, another source of unsatisfied longing buried deep in the very essence of our lives: our relations with our fellow-men fail daily and hourly to respond to the demands of our social feelings. What true fellowship is there, can there be, between persons who are looking upon one another as tyrants or slaves or rivals, with hearts full of fear, suspicion, distrust, envy or even hostility? What is the relationship between human beings who regard one another as instruments of gain or pleasure? What is the companionship between men and women, when one considers the other as an object of sexual or economic exploitation? What sort of social love exists between the greedy capitalist and the workman he fleeces; between the usurer and his prey; the sweater and his victim; between competing traders or competing wage-workers or rival politicians; between governors and governed; between would-be fashionables and the society folk who try to exclude them; between women trying to out-dress each other, men trying to out-talk or out-sell each other, and boys and girls trying to out-do each other in examinations; in fact what social love can there be amongst a seething mass of human beings each trying to climb upon the shoulders of the others? What confidence can there be in such a state of society, what security, where each is in daily terror lest the rest should trample him under foot?

And yet, amidst it all, and in spite of it all, we are each one of us social animals, beings craving, some craving passionately, for the love, the sympathy, the esteem, the reverence of our fellows. Each feeling his dependence upon the rest, mentally, morally, materially. Each loving, despite all obstacles, at least one, at least a few of his kind. Each liable to be moved and carried out of his narrow egotism by sudden gusts of sympathy with at least some sorts of human suffering, by the impulse to succour at least some human needs. We cannot do without each other. Despite all our hideous cruelties and injustices, despite our malice and selfishness, our lack of feeling and lack of intelligence, we have still enough social feeling ingrained in our nature to force us to co-operate, after a clumsy, imperfect fashion, for existence, enough sense to recognise the necessity for doing so. Our life is not all a struggle, a fight for places. If it were, we should long ago have disappeared from the universe. All that we have has been gained by means of co-operation; all the progress we make is secured by it. It is the main factor in our lives.

No wonder we are miserable; no wonder our unsatisfied and weary hearts cry out with hunger when such terrible contradictions are to be found at the very core of our existence, destroying its harmony.

(To be continued.)

## ANARCHISM IN SPAIN.

(By a Spanish correspondent.)

It was rightly said by a comrade at the late Brussels Congress, that the history of Socialism and of the labour movement in Spain is indeed the history of Anarchism. Workmen's organisations struggling against capital existed as long ago as 1884 in Catalonia; but the movement did not assume a determined and convinced character until Fanelli, an Italian member of the Bakunist Alliance (the Anarchist section of the International) went over to Spain. This happened in 1868; and in June 1870, the first Congress of the Spanish Federation of the great International Association took place at Barcelona. The progress of the Federation, as shown at the subsequent yearly Congresses of Valencia (1871), Saragoza (1872), and Cindola (1873), was so rapid as to astonish politicians and unionists and awake the anxiety of the Government, who, after the *coup d'Etat* of the 3rd January, 1873, prohibited the Association.

The Association, however, did not dissolve, but issued a Manifesto reaffirming the principles and claims of the International, and continued its work in secret until 1881, when it was able to reappear under the name of Branch Workmen's Federation, and held a new Congress at Barcelona. The Federation, whilst professing the principles of Anarchism, retained much of the organisation of the old International. Its statutes also contemplated the union of workmen "without distinction of colour, religion, or nationality." It was not until the Congress held at Valencia in 1889 that the programme of the Association was

revised and brought into entire agreement with Anarchist principles, the name of the Federation itself being changed to that of *Spanish Anarchist Organisation*.

Since then the Anarchists have associated in purely anarchist groups; but they have never retired from the Labour Movement. There is a Convention of Solidarity (*Pacto de Solidaridad*) between 80 trades unions, in which the Anarchists are most prominent and influential. In the province of Vich there is another "Free Agreement" (*Pacto Libre*); and this organisation also is completely anarchist in character. In Valladolid, Sabadell, Reus, Valls, Coruna, Vigo, etc., the local anarchistic trades unions are federated together; and throughout Andalusia, besides the anarchist groups, there are anarchist associations of peasants and workmen.

The Anarchists have always been to the front. All the Workmen's Congresses, the agitation of the 1st May, the great strikes, have been promoted by Anarchists; prison, the fortress, persecutions of every kind have been their lot.

The "Labor Party," composed of former Anarchists, started in 1872 by denouncing the *Alliance*, but in spite of its efforts to get proselytes, it consists of but a few Councils here and there. It is only really strong in Bilbao. Of course the first thought of its leaders was to put themselves forward as candidates; but with very pitiful success. At the last general election they collected in Barcelona, a great centre of workmen, mostly Socialist, 75 votes!

We will next give a short account of the 1st May agitation.

The movement was thoroughly and exclusively anarchist. In March 1890, at a meeting of the anarchist groups in Barcelona, it was decided to put the utmost energy into promoting and furthering the movement. The idea of a general strike had been already propounded at the time of the Barcelona International Exhibition. This idea was now revived, and a commission was appointed to communicate with the different workmen's associations and call on them to declare a general strike on the 1st May, 1890, or, were this not possible, to take part in a great demonstration. The first obstacle they met with was the opposition of the Labour Party; which, whilst the anarchist groups worked actively for the general strike and the anarchist press strongly supported the movement, issued a circular, published by *El Socialista*, of Madrid, recalling the deliberations of the Paris Congress, and convening the people to a manifestation on the 2nd May.

The 1st May arrived and the strike was quite general at Barcelona, Valencia, Reus, etc.; in other parts of the country partial strikes broke out and demonstrations were held everywhere. In Barcelona, factories, omnibuses, cabs, shops, all stopped. During four days no food could be brought into the town. Frequent conflicts took place between the population and the troops; a state of siege was proclaimed, on May 2, throughout Catalonia; the troops occupied the streets and thoroughfares, martial law was enforced, prisons and barracks were filled with prisoners; one man was killed and many wounded. In spite of this repression, the people stood firm; the Strike Committee sent round secret circulars encouraging the people to resist. On Sunday, May 4, a meeting was held in spite of the troops, and at the end of it a bomb exploded at the Club of the Employers. The commanding general invited the capitalists to accede to the demands of the strikers, threatening to withdraw the troops in case of refusal, and the capitalists gave in. The tramway servants obtained a reduction in their hours of labour from 17, 18, and even 19, to 9 and 8; the dockers obtained the 8 hours and an increase of wages (7.50 *pesetas* per day). A number of partial strikes went on for a long time after the general strike was over. The Labor Party not only took no part in the movement, but made itself conspicuous by loud denunciations of the "anarchist terrorism." Its conduct was indeed so shameful that *El Productor*, which bore the second title of "Socialistic periodical," changed it to "Anarchistic."

The situation on the following 1st May (1891) was clearer. In March, at a Congress convened by the Anarchists, 122 trades union representatives declared for the general strike; only 9 against it. The Labour Party was more emphatic than ever in its opposition not only to the strike, but to every street meeting. The Government concentrated troops in Barcelona, swore in new policemen, and brought ships with troops into the port. The strike was general, and a general revolution was expected. The Socialists accused the Anarchists of provoking by their action the bombardment of the town. Unfortunately the people, although sympathising with the movement, were afraid to act, and remained at home; whilst a large number of Anarchists were imprisoned on board the ships. Consequently the movement collapsed for the time being. It merely served to keep up the spirits of the people and their hope of a near revolution.

Since the above was written the movement has risen into activity in Andalusia. As our readers are aware from the daily papers, an insurrection has been attempted at Xeres in which the peasants from the country joined forces with some Xeres Anarchists. The rebels have been defeated, but the affair has produced a considerable stir in the country.

Andalusia is the stronghold of Revolutionary Socialism, amongst the country as well as the town population. In this province there is extreme inequality of possessions. Decaying feudalism has but lately been succeeded by middle-class exploitation, and the workers have no safeguard against the avarice of their employers. The law forbids them to combine. They are even forbidden to read newspapers. Attempts at revolt are frequent.

## FREEDOM.

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.  
MONTHLY, 1d., POST FREE 1½d.

Annual Subscription, post free to all countries, 1s. 6d. Foreign subscriptions should be sent by International Money Order.

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

Address "FREEDOM," 26, Newington Green Road, London, N.

*Freedom Pamphlets.*—No. I., "The Wage System," by Peter Kropotkin, 1d., post free, 1½d. No. II., "The Commune of Paris," by Peter Kropotkin, 1d., post free, 1½d.; per quire of 25, 1s. 4d. No. III., "A Talk about Anarchist Communism between Two Workmen," by Enrico Malatesta, 1d., post free, 1½d.; per quire of 25, 1s. 4d. No. IV., "Anarchist Communism: Its Basis and Principles," by Peter Kropotkin, 2d., post free, 2½d.; per quire of 25, 2s. 8d.

*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.

Received: Publication Fund—H. G., Cape Colony, 10s.; Berner Street Club, towards last 11 Nov., 5s.

## NOTES.

## WALSALL.

We reserve all comment upon the Walsall affair, a brief account of which is given in another column, until more is known as to its origin, purpose, and the persons who have played a part in it. At present, there is nothing but police evidence and the statements of Ditchfield and Deakin, extracted under we know not what amount of pressure. This much only appears certain, that our unlucky comrades have marched into a trap carefully set for them.

## BUT JUST NOTE THE CONTRAST.

What a strange contrast, the zeal of the authorities, with the Home Secretary at their head, over this supposed "plot," which after all they have not shown to have been even intended to seriously injure any human being, and their total apathy when landlords and capitalists actively and violently injure hundreds and thousands "in the way of business." As the "Financial Reformer" truly observes, when landlords, as in Leather Lane, turn dying women and children into the streets, the zealous Guardians of the Public Safety take no steps to prosecute the authors of the outrage. In fact, the law is at their service for its perpetration. Again, during these last few days, we have all heard once more, from Mr. Plimsoll's evidence before the Labor Commission, how sailors' lives are sacrificed wholesale at sea, how shipowners are interested in the loss of ships, how they sit in judgment in their own cases, how Parliament has quietly repealed laws restricting overlading and other murderous practices. But all these monstrous crimes go on for years unpunished and even unrebuked, whilst the secret service agents (for our English Home Secretary has his "Third Section" like any Russian autocrat) are laying elaborate snares for unwary Revolutionists and posing as the Saviours of Society.

## ANARCHISTS AND TRADE UNIONISM.

The meeting held by the Mantle Cutters' Union on Jan. 27th, at Banner Street Hall, St. Lukes, was tremendously successful. Comrade Kropotkin had been expected to speak, but was prevented from doing so by influenza. However, there were a good many well-known Anarchists present, who did not fail in their speeches to emphasize the necessity of widening the boundaries of Trade Unionism, so that it should embrace all creeds and nations, and have for its aim nothing less than the complete emancipation of workers all over the world. These speeches were received with great enthusiasm; and at the end of the meeting a great many gave in their names as members, let us hope, of the New Trade Unionism.

## NOT A NEW RÔLE.

The "Star" of Jan. 26th tried to make out that the advocating of trade-unionism was quite a new rôle for the Anarchists, but such is not the case. Anarchists have always advocated free combinations among the workers. They decried the unions when they seemed to pause satisfied, under the rein of their democratic leaders, waiting for the grass to grow in the fields of the future, to be cut down by Parliamentary scythes when the good time came. Anarchists have always believed and always will believe that the combination of resolute men, knowing well what they desire, is the force that has set the cumbrous and now superannuated parliamentary machine in motion. They think, and they are not alone in thinking, that the use of this force for such a purpose is absolute waste of energy. We want it directed towards mutual aid and free co-operation, which are destined to drag parliament and other effete social machines in triumphal procession at the wheels of the Chariot of Progress.

## THE CHICAGO POLICE IN HOT WATER.

The light which that organ of capitalism, the *Chicago Herald*, is throwing on the recent police outrages in Chicago, is extremely instructive. It appears that after the Haymarket meeting of May 4th, 1886, some 300 of the leading capitalists of America met secretly to discuss the best means of "stamping out" Anarchy. The notorious Citizens' Association was formed and 100,000 dollars subscribed in a few hours. With this they secured the executions of November, 1887. A like sum was guaranteed to be raised every year for the use of the police and their secret agents. Altogether nearly half a million dollars have

been subscribed, although no balance-sheet has been issued.

Last October the capitalists began to get tired of this, and feeling sure that Anarchism was dead in America, ceased subscribing. This was a sad blow to those professional plot-hatchers, the organisers and managers of the Citizens' Association, and to the police, who naturally did not like the cessation of their handsome yearly income. The one object of both was to resuscitate the fund. Finding the capitalists indifferent to lies as to plots, etc., they determined to create a little uproar on their own account. How they set about it was described in *Freedom* for December. But they managed so badly that the police were shown up before the courts and have had to pay 700 dollars out of their own pockets for damages. The public are disgusted and very curious, and the Chicago press is stirring up all this mass of corruption for their edification. Soon, no doubt, still more important facts will be known. Meanwhile quite enough has come out to confirm the statements of our Chicago comrades as to the vile underhand means used to procure the murder and imprisonment of the martyred Anarchists.

It is a fine illustration of "end-of-the-century" capitalism, and the means it uses to make itself loved and respected. Such things bear out the truth of what Mr. Pentecost says: "My private opinion is that if there were a personal devil he would be perfectly satisfied with the way things go in this world."

## DEATH OF A WELL KNOWN PARIS ANARCHIST.

Pompée Viard, Minister of Commerce under the Paris Commune, but of late years a prominent member of the Anarchist party in Paris, is dead. He was a big, powerful looking, good natured fellow and a very ready speaker. He was chosen by the St. Denis Anarchists to defend them in court, when they were tried for making light of the sacred drawing of lots for military service last February and shouting "Hurrah for Anarchy!" After the Commune, he lived for some years in England, and later on the London branch of his varnish making business frequently called him over here, so that he is known to many English Socialists. A correspondent writes:—"Years ago he was a pretty regular attendant at the Old Surrey rooms in the Blackfriars Road, then occupied by a strong branch of the Social Democratic Federation, when that body was at the height of its power, full of revolutionary fervour and earnest men. Only a few weeks ago I had dinner with him in his hospitable little home in the revolutionary suburb of Saint Ouen. All the surroundings showed the nature of the man. He had quite a menagerie of animals—dogs, fowls, guinea-pigs, canaries, rabbits, and a magpie perfectly free from conventionality, which hopped about on the table during the meal, and socialised for his own benefit any piece of meat or vegetable he could lay hold of. Among the guests were another English comrade and the little infant daughter of Descamps (who was sentenced to five years imprisonment through the first of May episode last year, mentioned in *Freedom* at the time). Her foster father was also present. This worthy comrade, although he has children of his own and a hard struggle to make both ends meet, has taken charge of the little one during her father's stay in prison, so as to give the wife of our imprisoned comrade a better chance to get along."

## TOLSTOI ON THE RUSSIAN FAMINE.

Count Leo Tolstói, the great novelist, has been telling his fellow countrymen and the world in general some home truths about the Russian famine. The Russian papers being closed to all such plain speaking, he has published his article in the London "Daily Telegraph" (Jan. 26). With scathing eloquence he rends the hollow pretences of a sympathy that collects famine funds and administers relief, whilst it makes no attempt whatever to remedy the vile injustice which is the cause of the people's misery. "The people are hungry because we are sleek and fed to satiety. . . . Could any people be other than hungry who are condemned to undergo the things which our people endure: who, whilst paying heavy taxes out of all proportion to their means, with insufficient land to till, and in spite of the isolation that conduces to wildness and barbarism, are forced to perform a Herculean labor, the fruits of which we consume, in the shape of plenty, and comfort, and amusement. All the palaces, theatres, and museums in the capitals, cities, and provincial centres in the empire, and all the treasures, pageants, and curios that fill them, are they not all the work of the hands of this same hunger-stricken people who produce these things—worthless to them—solely because they contrive thereby to live? That is, not to live as we understand living, but to stave off death by hunger, which stands eternally menacing them at their open doors. Such is the lot of the people to-day. Such it was yesterday; even such fifty years ago. The masses are always kept by us in a state of semi-starvation. This is our favorite and only method for compelling them to bend their necks and slave for us. This year of grace the semi-starvation has gone just a little too far. . . . Under these circumstances, it ought to be very easy for us to discover why the people are hungry, and, knowing why they are hungry, equally easy to devise a way of feeding them.

"The principal way is," continues Tolstói, "to abstain from greedily devouring everything they possess and produce."

## THE RICH MAY TALK, BUT WHAT ARE THEY DOING?

"At this very moment," we still quote from Tolstói, "that men, women and children are starving, literally dying of hunger, have the merchants, the landlords, the wealthy classes generally manifested their boasted love in a tangible manner? Have they changed one iota in their luxurious mode of living? Have they waived, temporarily suspended, or even abated their demand on the people for that worse than Egyptian drudgery which dries up the very marrow in the bones of the workmen, and drags them down to the level of brutes on their way to

misery and death? Have they desisted from ornamenting their apartments with treasures gathered from the furthest ends of the earth? From banqueting like pagan princes? From racing on steeds, the price of which would suffice to support the population of a village for a year? From lavishing fortunes upon jewels and dresses? And from paying bills with the only coin in such cases—the life blood of these crouching, lowering helots?... Are not all the educated classes enjoying life now as heretofore in cities, devoting themselves ostensibly to what they magniloquently term the pursuit of sublime ideas, and visibly to the consumption and digestion of the food which is daily forwarded in large quantities into those cities for their behoof, and thus taken away from the people, who, having created it, are now perishing miserably for want of it? Home truths for others besides Russians.

#### WHOSE FAULT IS IT?

If many of the rich are apathetic, the efforts of those who are not so have been deliberately crushed by the government. No committee of any kind may be formed in Russia without a special permission from the authorities. When a well known and influential Moscow professor obtained amongst his acquaintance the promise of over a million sterling, when Madam Morosoff (widow of a certain lord) offered over a quarter of a million, when several influential Moscow citizens proposed to raise a fund, and in each case begged to form a relief committee to distribute the money, they were one and all refused and told that money could only be sent through the police. As this simply means giving it to the officials for their own uses, all three offers of help fell through, and nothing more was attempted.

The governor of Orenburg has lately been cashiered for appropriating £7000 relief money entrusted to him.

#### THE ONLY SAFE WAY TO HELP.

Leo Tolstoi is not content with writing about the famine. He and his grown up sons and daughters are working hard amongst the people, distributing themselves all the food they can get, and the government has not yet dared to interfere with the world-famed writer who is one of the most popular men in Russia. An influential committee of well known Englishmen and Russian refugees has just been established in London to get money conveyed directly to Tolstoi himself. Any one who wishes to help the starving Russian peasants can safely send contributions to—Coleridge Esq., 11 Roland Gardens, London S.W.

#### RUSSIAN FREE PRESS.

Arrangements have been made by a committee consisting of Comrades Stepniak, Tchaykovsky, Volkovsky, Kelchevsky, and Shishko to smuggle Socialistic and advanced literature into Russia. The committee are themselves issuing Russian pamphlets, the first of which, "What is wanted," with an appendix called "The Beginning of the End," by Stepniak, has already appeared, and a second, by the same author, is in the press. Offices have also been opened in London and Paris for the sale of revolutionary literature in Russian, French, German, Roumanian, etc., etc. The catalogue (in Russian), price 1d. post free, and literature in large or small quantities may be obtained from J. Kelchevsky, 3, Iffley Road, Hammersmith, London, W. (office hours from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m.) or of E. Schulmeister, 28, rue de la Glacière. Paris.

## THE WALSALL ANARCHISTS.

John Westley, brushmaker; Joseph Deakin, clerk in the employ of the London and North Western Railway; William Ditchfield, saddle bar filer; Frederick Slaughter, *alias* Charles, foreign correspondence clerk to a Mr. Gameson; Victor Caille (Frenchman), employed by Westley, all of Walsall, Staffordshire, and Jean Battola (Italian), a shoemaker in London, have been arrested, and are being prosecuted by the Treasury, on the charge of (1) "conspiring together to do an unlawful act"; (2) "having explosives or materials for the manufacture of explosives in their possession, or under their control, under circumstances which give rise to a reasonable suspicion that such explosives were to be used for an unlawful purpose." This second charge is under the Explosives Act of 1883, a savage measure, rushed through Parliament under the influence of the Fenian dynamite scare that followed the finding of explosives in Westminster Hall. Under every other criminal charge English law holds the prisoner to be innocent until the prosecution has proved him guilty. Under the Explosives Act, the prisoner in whose possession explosives, or materials for making them, are found, is held guilty unless he can prove that he had them for a "lawful purpose." In these circumstances it would be only fair to allow him bail or at least every sort of facility for completely understanding the evidence against him and preparing his defence. But the Walsall prisoners have been kept in gaol during remands which, as we go to press, have already extended over more than three weeks. During this time, they have been supplied only with bread and water enough to keep them alive, with, of course, permission to buy other food *if they could afford it*. They are not allowed to see any relations or friends who speak any other language but English, because none of the Walsall police staff understand foreign tongues. All written communications from them, even to their solicitors, are opened and read by the Chief Constable. Charles complains that notes he has taken during the proceedings to help him in his defence, have twice been taken from him. Chief Constable Taylor confessed in the witness box that he arrested Caille and Charles without any warrant, also that he entered and

searched the Walsall Socialist Club without a search-warrant.

The police also made a raid upon the Autonomie Club in London. Breaking in during the small hours, they only found two members there and the Autonomie publications.

So far the police, who state that they have been watching our Walsall comrades *since July* and make no secret of having employed spies, are at present laboriously trying to prove that each of the prisoners was directly or indirectly concerned in getting some iron castings made which they intended for use as bombs.

Deakin has made a written statement, which has appeared in full in the *Walsall Observer* and in part in all the papers.

He states that he, Westley, Caille and Charles were having some bombs prepared to be used in Russia; being incited thereto by a letter to Caille from an unknown, vouched for by A. Coulon as "all right." Caille had been sent by Coulon to Walsall in the summer, through Charles, who was in correspondence with Coulon, and had himself only arrived in Walsall shortly before. The said letter, enclosing a sketch of the bombs required, was in French, and was read in English translation to Deakin by Charles. It was received at the end of *October* or beginning of *November*. Ditchfield was consulted by the other four and given the order to bore holes in the castings, without being, as far as Deakin knows, expressly told that these articles were intended for bombs and not "electrical cells," as they were described when ordered from the foundry. After letters from Coulon pressing for the bombs immediately, Battola came to fetch them, but when he saw a brass casting of the pattern, said they would not do and went away. Deakin says he makes this statement because on the night of January 15, as he lay in his cell, he overheard Ditchfield and Charles making statements to the officers on duty.

The Chief Constable has twice repeated in the witness box, uncontradicted by Deakin, that Deakin had made a clean breast of it, because he was sure the whole thing was a "put-up job," the work of police spies.

A statement by Ditchfield has been put in evidence by the police, to the effect that he was requested by Deakin, Caille, Westley and Charles to assist them by boring and filing some French lubricators for electric machines, for which he was to be paid 3d. each.

No statement by Charles has been alluded to in the police evidence.

The prisoners' statements can only be used as evidence against themselves, unless the police succeed in proving by other means the existence of a conspiracy. If they do this, the statements will become evidence against those named in them.

The prisoners will probably be committed for trial.

## ANARCHIST MORALITY.

By P. KROPOTKINE.

(Continued from previous number.)

V.\*

The idea of good and evil exists within humanity itself. Man, whatever degree of intellectual development he may have attained, however his ideas may be obscured by prejudices and personal interest, considers in general as good that which is useful to the society wherein he lives, and as evil that which is hurtful to it.

But whence comes this conception, often so vague that it can scarcely be distinguished from a feeling? There are millions and millions of human beings who have never reflected about the human race. They know, for the most part, only the clan or family, rarely the nation, still more rarely mankind, how could it be that they should consider what is useful for the human race as good, or even attain a feeling of solidarity with their clan, in spite of all their narrow, selfish interests?

This fact has greatly occupied thinkers at all times, and it continues to occupy them still. Not a year passes but whole libraries are written on the subject. We are going, in our turn, to give our view of the matter; but let us remark in passing that, though the *explanation* of the fact may vary, the fact itself remains none the less incontestable; and should our explanation not be the true one, or should it be incomplete, the fact, with its consequences to humanity, will still remain. We may not be able fully to explain the origin of the planets revolving round the sun, but the planets revolve none the less, and one of them carries us with it in space.

We have already spoken of the religious explanation. If man distinguishes between good and evil, say theologians, it is God who has inspired him with this idea. Useful or hurtful is not for him to inquire: he must merely obey the fiat of his creator. We will not stop at this explanation, fruit of the ignorance and terrors of the savage. We pass on.

Others (Hobbs for instance) have tried to explain the fact by *law*. It must have been law that developed in man the sense of just and unjust, right and wrong. Our readers may judge of this

\* The author in this chapter and elsewhere seems to assume that "the moral sentiment" is one and the same as social feeling, being only concerned with a man's relations to his fellow-men. It is a view that has been ably argued by various advocates and is finely summed up in Karl Pearson's phrase "Morality is the gratification of the social passion." Some of us, however, are not satisfied with it and conceive Morality to be concerned with conduct in general; with a man's relations not only to his fellow-men, but to animals, to things, to the circumstances and conditions of his life. We are therefore only in partial agreement with portions of "Anarchist Morality."—ED.

explanation for themselves. They know that law has merely utilised the social feelings of man, to slip in, amongst the moral precepts he accepts, various mandates, useful to an exploiting minority, to which his nature refuses obedience. Law has perverted the feeling of justice, instead of developing it. Again, let us pass on.

Neither let us pause at the explanation of the Utilitarians. They will have it that man acts morally from self-interest, and they forget his feelings of solidarity with the whole race, which exist, whatever be their origin. There is some truth in the Utilitarian explanation. But it is not the whole truth. Therefore, let us go further.

It is again to the thinkers of the XVIII. century that we are indebted for having guessed, in part at all events, the origin of the moral sentiment.

In a fine work,\* left to slumber in silence by religious prejudice, and indeed but little known even amongst anti-religious thinkers, Adam Smith has laid his finger on the true origin of the moral sentiment. He does not seek it in mystic religious feelings; he finds it simply in the feeling of sympathy.

You see a man beat a child. You know that the beaten child suffers. Your imagination causes you yourself to suffer the pain inflicted upon the child; or perhaps its tears, its little suffering face tell you. And, if you are not a coward, you rush at the brute who is beating it and rescue it from him.

This example by itself explains almost all the moral sentiments. The more powerful your imagination, the better you can picture to yourself what any being feels when it is made to suffer, and the more intense and delicate will your moral sense be. The more you are drawn to put yourself in the place of the other person, the more you feel the pain inflicted upon him, the insult offered him, the injustice of which he is a victim, the more will you be urged to act so that you may prevent the pain, insult, or injustice. And the more you are accustomed by circumstances, by those surrounding you, or by the intensity of your own thought and your own imagination to act as your thought and imagination urge, the more will the moral sentiment grow in you, the more will it become habitual.

This is what Adam Smith develops with a wealth of examples. He was young when he wrote this book, which is far superior to the work of his old age upon Political Economy. Free from religious prejudice, he sought the explanation of morality in a physical fact of human nature, and this is why official and non-official theological prejudice has put the treatise on the Black List for a century.

Adam Smith's only mistake was not to have understood that this same feeling of sympathy, in its habitual stage, exists amongst animals as well as amongst men.

Pace the popularisers of Darwin, who ignore in him all he did not borrow from Malthus, the feeling of solidarity is the leading characteristic of all animals living in society. The eagle devours the sparrow, the wolf devours the marmot, but the eagles and the wolves respectively aid each other in hunting, the sparrow and the marmot unite amongst themselves against the beasts and birds of prey so effectually that only the very clumsy ones are caught. In all animal societies, solidarity is a natural law of far greater importance than that struggle for existence, the virtue whereof is sung by the ruling classes in every strain that may best serve to stultify us.

When we study the animal world and try to explain to ourselves that struggle for existence maintained by each living being against adverse circumstances and against its enemies, we realise that the more the principles of solidarity and equality are developed in an animal society, and have become habitual to it, the more chances has it of surviving and coming triumphantly out of the struggle against hardships and foes. The more thoroughly each member of the society feels his solidarity with each other member of the society, the more completely are developed in all of them those two qualities which are the main factors of all progress: courage, on the one hand, and, on the other, free individual initiative. And, on the contrary, the more any animal society or little group of animals loses this feeling of solidarity—which may chance as the result of exceptional scarcity or else of exceptional plenty—the more do the two other factors of progress, courage and individual initiative, diminish; in the end they disappear, and the society falls into decay and sinks before its foes. Without mutual confidence no struggle is possible; there is no courage, no initiative, no solidarity—and no victory! Defeat is certain.

Some day we will return to this subject. We can prove with a wealth of examples how, in the animal and human worlds, the law of mutual aid is the law of progress, and how mutual aid, with the courage and individual initiative which follow from it, secures victory to the species most capable of practising it. For the present it is enough to state the fact. The reader will be able to estimate for himself its importance in the question with which we are occupied.

Now, let us imagine this feeling of solidarity acting during the millions of ages which have succeeded one another since the first beginnings of animal life appeared upon the globe. Let us imagine how this feeling little by little became a habit and was transmitted by heredity from the simplest microscopic organism to its descendants, insects, birds, reptiles, mammals, man, and we shall comprehend the origin of the moral sentiment which is a necessity to the animal, like food or the organ for digesting it.

Here, without going further back and speaking of complex animals springing from colonies of extremely simple little beings, here is the origin of the moral sentiment. We have been obliged to be extremely brief, in order to compress this great question within the limits of a few pages, but enough has been already said to show that there is nothing mysterious or sentimental about it. Without this solidarity of the individual with the species, the animal kingdom would never have developed or reached its present perfection. The most advanced being upon earth would still be one of those tiny specks swimming in the water and scarcely perceptible under a microscope. Would even this exist? For are not the earliest aggregations of cellules themselves an instance of association in the struggle?

(To be continued.)

## A N A R C H Y.

BY ENRICO MALATESTA.

(Continued from previous number.)

A government, that is, a number of persons deputed to make the laws, and entitled to make use of the collective forces of society to make every individual to respect these laws, already constitutes a class privileged and separated from the rest of the community. Such a class, like every elected body, will seek instinctively to enlarge its powers; to place itself above the control of the people; to impose its tendencies, and to make its own interests predominate. Placed in a privileged position, the government always finds itself in antagonism to the masses, of whose forces it disposes.

Furthermore, a government, with the best intention, could never satisfy everybody, even if it succeeded in satisfying some. It must therefore always be defending itself against the discontented, and for that reason must ally itself with the satisfied section of the community for necessary support. And in this manner will arise again the old story of a privileged class, which cannot help but be developed in conjunction with the government. This class, if it could not again acquire possession of the soil, would certainly monopolise the most favored spots, and would not be in the end less oppressive, or less an instrument of exploitation than the capitalist class.

The governors, accustomed to command, would never wish to mix with the common crowd. If they could not retain the power in their own hands, they would at least secure to themselves privileged positions for the time when they would be out of office. They would use all the means they have in their power to get their own friends elected as their successors, who would in their turn be supported and protected by their predecessors. And thus the government would pass and repass into the same hands, and the DEMOCRACY, that is, the government presumably of the whole people, would end, as it always has done, in becoming an OLIGARCHY, or the government of a few, the government of a class.

And this all-powerful, oppressive, all-absorbing oligarchy would have always in its care, that is, at its disposition, every bit of social capital, all public services, from the production and distribution of provisions to the manufacture of matches, from the control of the university to the music-hall.

But let us even suppose that the government did not necessarily constitute a privileged class, and could exist without forming around itself a new privileged class. Let us imagine that it could remain truly representative, the servant—if you will—of all society. What purpose would it then serve? In what particular and in what manner would it augment the power, intelligence, spirit of solidarity, care of the general welfare, present and to come, that at any given moment existed in a given society?

It is always the old story of the man with bound limbs, who, having managed to live in spite of his bands, believes that he lives by means of them. We are accustomed to live under a government, which makes use of all that energy, that intelligence, and that will which it can direct to its own ends; but which hinders, paralyses and suppresses those that are useless or hostile to it. And we imagine that all that is done in society is done by virtue of the government, and that without the government there would be neither energy, intelligence, nor good will in society. So it comes (as we have already said) that the proprietor who has possessed himself of the soil, has it cultivated for his own particular profit, leaving the laborer the bare necessities of life for which he can and will continue to labor. While the enslaved laborer thinks that he could not live without his master, as though it were HE who created the earth and the forces of nature.

What can government of itself add to the moral and material forces which exist in a society? Unless it be like the God of the Bible, who created the universe out of nothing?

As nothing is created in the so-called material world, so in this more complicated form of the material world, which is the social world, nothing can be created. And therefore governors can dispose of no other force than that which is already in society. And indeed not by any means of all of that, as much force is necessarily paralysed and destroyed by governmental methods of action, while more again is wasted in the friction with rebellious elements, inevitably great in such an artificial mechanism. Whenever governors originate anything of themselves, it is as men, and not as governors, that they do so. And of that amount of force, both material and moral, which

\* "The Theory of Moral Sentiments," v. "Works and life of Adam Smith" Vols. 4 & 5.

does remain at the disposition of the government, only an infinitesimally small part achieves an end really useful to society. The remainder is either consumed in actively repressing rebellious opposition, or is otherwise diverted from the aim of general utility, and turned to the profit of the few, and to the injury of the majority of men.

So much has been made of the part that individual initiative and social action play respectively in the life and progress of human society, and such is the confusion of metaphysical language, that those who affirm that individual initiative is the source and agency of all action seem to be asserting something quite preposterous. In reality it is a truism which becomes apparent directly we begin to explain the actual facts represented by these words.

(To be continued.)

## AN OPEN LETTER

### From an Anarchist Communist to a Secularist.

We are asked by Comrade T. Pearson (Newcastle Anarchist Communist Group) to publish the following reply to some points raised by Mr. W. G. Foote in a lecture on "Law and Liberty: their Claims and Conflicts," delivered at the Tyne Theatre, December 17th:—

The points in question are briefly as follows: Society may be compared to the Sun and the Individual to the Earth; for the earth has two motions—one round the sun, and one, independently of the sun, on its own axis. This is just the view taken by Secularists of the relations of the Individual and Society. Society has a claim on every individual, while every individual has a claim to personal liberty in matters not effecting Society as a whole. Revolutionary Socialists would have the individual lose, as it were, the motion on his own axis and rush into the sun, whilst Anarchists would have him lose the solar attraction altogether and fly into space. . . . The opposition between progress and revolution. . . . Anarchists want everyone to do exactly as they please, but some sort of Government is necessary. The vote is the guarantee of political freedom. . . . State Socialism is a delusion. Voting is not a solution of the political problem, it is a mere compromise. Fancy taking twelve men and setting them to vote upon the merits of Darwin's theory or Newton's Law of Gravitation. What has government originated? Everything originates in the brain of the individual, is worked out by associated effort, and when it is done, the government comes forward and takes the credit. Government may have plucked the fruit, but it has never sown the seed, watched over its growth nor tended the tree. . . . Law without a penalty is a mere pious opinion. Law depends on policemen, bludgeons and soldiers. You cannot make a hard and fast law to apply to all cases any more than a hat that would fit all heads. Let every individual find out what is best for himself, stick to his own trade and society like water will find its own level. Law can be dodged and circumvented but public opinion never can."

DEAR SIR,—The latter portions of your lecture may well be left to answer one another. They clearly show you to be sitting between two stools. Law and Liberty are opposites which cannot be reconciled. Law involves, as you truly implied, coercion, brute force, authority; Liberty "the right of every one to live out his own life without the interference of government or laws; and a consistent and logical man must be the champion of freedom or of tyranny. After your smart description of the uselessness of government and inefficiency of law, it would be interesting to know how you explain the "necessity" of such institutions in society.

Turning to your fundamental hypothesis concerning the relation between the individual and society, and the definition of Anarchism therein implied, it is most desirable to be sure what you understand by these rival claims of society upon the individual and of the individual to freedom. If by the former you mean that every man or woman who takes advantage of the protection, education and better opportunities which association gives (or at least ought to give) must feel that the human beings with whom he is associated have a claim upon him that he should not injure or molest any of them, and that he should contribute to the best of his ability to their comforts and needs, as they do to his, there we agree with you. And surely no Individualist could recognise any further claim than this. This claim being recognised by the Anarchist, I fail to see how we want the individual to fly off into infinite space. Our position is this: We believe that any given society, *i.e.*, association of individuals, has no right to force any one person into their community or compel him to obey any code of morality or rules which they think right. We believe that each such society should be composed only of those who voluntarily choose to associate together under social conditions entered upon and kept up by mutual agreement. Man is a social animal and if left at liberty to choose for himself, will soon associate with those best suited to his particular temperament and peculiarities. You yourself seem to admit this, for you claimed the "freedom of the individual to live his own life." But perhaps you thought you were getting dangerously near Anarchism, for you added soon after, "any ordinary individual in the hall can see that Anarchism will never be possible." Why this was so, however, you never condescended to explain.

You said, however, that all we have to-day we owe to society; even our knowledge and ideas come to us from past generations. Now this is exactly what we Anarchist Communists say. Everything that separates the civilised man from the savage, we owe to the accumulated

work of past generations. All our knowledge and improved modes of living, the inventions, discoveries, and mechanisms which make life easier for us to live to-day, represent centuries of pain, misery and struggles. And as no one individual can lay any special claim to any of this, we propose that it should be used to prevent want and misery in the future. For no individual has a just claim to monopolise that which is not the work of his hand or brain, or that which he has never rendered a service in return for.

But all this is no reason for supposing that opposition of interests which your hypothesis implies between the individual and society, or better, his fellow men. The personal freedom of each is the interest not of himself merely but of all around him, for their own freedom depends on it. In a community where there are masters and slaves or rich and poor, no one is really free. The only method for men to obtain real freedom is to agree amongst themselves each to respect the other's individuality as he would his own. For every social group that does this, personal freedom is a reality, never otherwise. For there is no hard and fast division that can be drawn between conduct which affects only the individual himself and conduct that affects society as a whole. A man is not cut up into himself and his social relations with others. He in himself is so closely intertwined with the other human beings around him, that all his thoughts, words, actions, act and react, directly or indirectly, upon others, and those of others upon him; Life consists of this endless give and take, and the sooner we fully recognise it the sooner shall we give up our useless attempts to draw hard and fast lines between social and self-regarding actions, which lines are merely a hindrance to freedom, owing to the useless and irritating efforts to enforce them.

"Every one ought to be free to do as he pleases!" Certainly, so far as any law or hard and fast rule is concerned. The binding force which will tend to make him please to do what also pleases or does not displease others is not without but within him, it is the social feeling which makes the society of his fellows a moral need to him, and the sense that he is dependent upon their co-operation for all the joys of his life. Men are separated now by monopolies and privileges which enable some to command others, and prevent many from seeing the necessity for considering and respecting the individuality of those round them, as they would do if they could only obtain the help of others voluntarily. This is why we are so anxious for a Revolution which shall abolish monopoly and privilege.

You do not seem to look upon revolution as an element of progress, but rather as an opposing force? Perhaps if you were a worker suffering from exploitation you would feel differently and recognise the beauty of Victor Hugo's remark in "Les Misérables:" "Yes, the brutalities of progress are called revolutions. When they are over, this is recognised: that the human race has been harshly treated, but it has advanced."

During your lecture, you said that some folks were afraid of free discussion as others were of thunder. If you have any inclination to discuss Anarchism, you will find that we are not amongst these timorous ones.—Yours faithfully,  
T. P.

## USEFUL TRUTHS.

Auberon Herbert has some sound Anarchistic remarks upon politics and morals in his article "Under the Yoke of the Butterflies" (*Fortnightly Review*, Jan. 1892).

Speaking of the waste of energy amongst the English of to-day, he says: "The delirious game of politics has absorbed—like hot sand that drinks in the drops of water as they fall—the good talents that might have been given to so many forms of useful and even brilliant work. In the struggle for place, in the struggle for power over each other, our leisured class has thrown away the great possibilities. Time, wealth, and energy have been drained away into a dead sea, on the banks of which nothing can grow. Of course, political life is an absorbing, a fascinating struggle—absorbing to all, small and great, who plunge into it. To a large part of the rich class it is a delightful and never-ending prolongation of Eton and Harrow, of Oxford and Cambridge, matches; it is at once something more tempestuous than football, more skilful, more capable of artistic development than cricket, more comfortably divorced from moral considerations than horse-racing; to another considerable class it is solid bread and butter, with vistas, ever succeeding each other, of new employment and new offices—indeed, for all such, an endless succession of greased poles, each with its own prize pig at the top of it; whilst to the mass of workmen, with their too-easily corrupted imagination, it is the land of the setting sun, the home of wonders, the El Dorado, the magic mountains, filled with uncounted treasures, which are only waiting to be seized and enjoyed for ever, as soon as a few truculent dragons have had their heads cut off, and their claws have been nailed up on the castle wall. And thus it has come to pass that politics, or the baneful business of looking after your neighbour's affairs whilst you leave your own in disorder, has much to answer for."

Again, on the moral question, Mr. Herbert takes a position which is one of the keystones of Anarchism. A Nineteenth Century young lady is asking what she must do to be saved? "Dare to be yourself," is the reply. "The largest part of your present self is not your true self; it is mainly given up to reflecting the habits and thoughts and feelings which exist all around you. Your present self is an imitative self, living a sort of parasite life on what others think and do. How much of you, do you suppose, is your true self, the thing you really are, the expression both of your best possibilities, and the failings that go with

them? . . . At present, without knowing it, you are the plaything, the chattel of this well-dressed world that fills your drawing-rooms. The great mass of them are not so good, so thoughtful, so desirous of leading a worthy life, as you are, and yet you acquiesce in their stamping upon you their own idle fancies, in their forcing upon you their own unprofitable life. Why are you to be a tablet on which their foolish nothings are scribbled? Why are you to be a mirror, on which their passing reflections are thrown? Your soul belongs to yourself and not to them; why not wake from this poor dream and take it into your own keeping? . . . You want me to furnish you with a complete set of little maxims which will tell you what you are to do each day at sunrise, at noon, and at sun-setting. I can't do it. The world is too big for anybody's maxims. If you want to rule your life by maxims, you must go and enter some sisterhood. If you want to lead the truer and larger life, then the first thing you must do is to break free from this army of shadows which surrounds you, and discover for yourself what you have to do. . . . Don't we all frame—some of us carefully, some of us carelessly—a law for ourselves? Don't we take, whether from Christ or some other teacher, just what we like, and leave what we don't like? . . . Are you and I not to try to cross the wilderness that hems us in just because other travellers have never got further than the outside borders of it, and have left their bones there as a witness for all men? . . . There may be pain and shame and failure; but for all that, it is the only life worth leading, just because it is the only life that has truth and reality in it. . . . It is better, far better, if it must be so, to be frankly bad—bad defiantly in the open sunlight—than to wear a mask over one's nature. . . . No good, no possibility of good, can exist where sores are covered up with rags. Then, also, you may be sure, that as you reverence your own self and the freedom you have gained for it, you will learn equally to reverence the selves of others. The spiritual freedom you cherish for yourself you cannot in the end escape from cherishing for others. . . . You must be free in yourself, you must cease to be a crowd-atom, if you are to know and judge good from evil. . . . Good is only free to prevail in a life of realities. Good is the child of truth, the more strongly you desire what is true, the more surely you will move nearer to what is good. Much of what you think good in you now is not really good—it is only an imitation of good; it has no root, no abiding strength; it is clay, not iron. What restrain you now are the customs, the opinions of others, the shame that would fall upon you from the disapproval of those others; what will restrain you hereafter is the steady and proud consciousness of working out the life which you have deliberately chosen for yourself. . . . Your very falls will help you so long as you have the courage to rise from them and to cling faithfully to your purpose. . . . Snap one after one the bonds that now bind you. Remember that it is not only your everyday faults that bind you, your love of indulgence, your prejudices, fears, selfishnesses, but to some extent the good side of your nature, your very sympathies, your friendships, your tenderness for others—all these conspire against you. They all conspire to make you accept life, to make you drift with the tides round you. But you must not drift, either in thought or action. You are not to do what others do, just because they are doing it. You are not to let the direction of yourself pass into the hands of others. You are not to be their instrument—either for their interest or their pleasure. You are not to join yourself to others because it is convenient to do so, or because it serves some passing end, which is not that of true mental agreement. You are yourself and yourself you must remain. Even when you act under the guidance of a higher knowledge than your own for a definite special purpose, you are not to do so in the spirit of simple submission. You are not to abandon your own steady effort to judge the higher knowledge which is guiding you. The luxury of intellectual submission, if luxury it be, is never to be yours. . . . You are to fear no one, to follow no one, flatter no one, cajole and delude no one: you are to use no one for your purposes which are not also his purposes."

Strange that a man should grasp these moral truths so clearly and yet not realise that a system of monopoly which enables and so overwhelmingly tempts one set of men to use others for their own purposes, is a fatal obstacle to true freedom. As long as we have a monopolist class holding the means of production in absolute ownership, so long will it be impossible for the great mass of the community to enjoy that moral freedom, to lead that true, real life which Mr. Herbert so finely describes as the only life fit for a human being.

What is it but a bitter mockery to say to the wage-slave of to-day that to let oneself be used by another person for his own purposes is unworthy of a man? He can only reply: If I do not submit to this degradation, I must revolt or starve. That is why we Anarchists, who hold the same moral position as Mr. Herbert, feel that, doing so, we must necessarily be Revolutionists and Socialists.

## Correspondence.

### EQUAL FREEDOM AND BLACKLEGS.

Comrade C. C. Davis, of the Gas Workers' Union, writes to us as follows: Judging from my own experience of working with "free" laborers in the Kings Cross Station Gas Works, anyone who speaks of a man being "free to work" under existing social conditions is entirely mistaken. Under the present system a man is compelled to work for whatever wage the capitalist class choose to give him, and under such conditions he cannot be free. Now, your correspondent C. P. thinks that trades unionists are wrong to protest against blacklegs because every man is "free to work," and the unionists might go and work on starvation wages too, if they chose. I, as a trade unionist, cer-

tainly do protest against blacklegs, for the simple reason that, while a vast army of these blacklegs exist, the capitalist class glories, for they give it a better opportunity to crush the organisation and solidarity of labor that is being established all over the world to emancipate the workers from the bondage in which they exist to-day. Moreover, the blacklegs are men who have no sympathy with this organisation and solidarity of labor.

No man is free who has to sell his labor in order to live and labors unwillingly for another. He is simply a slave under these circumstances, an animal to be bought and sold. The worker who stands up and endeavors to assert his manhood by refusing to accept enforced conditions is the only man who can claim the title of "free laborer." The phrase "free laborer" has been adopted by the plutocrat in derision, and the hidden irony it contains ought to be a continual moral lash upon the backs of such as blacklegs who pose as free men. If such people were capable of feeling shame, they would blush every time this title was applied to them, but, as a rule, they are slaves of their own moral degradation as well as of the capitalist.

### INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL.

N. F. D. writes:

In spite of many difficulties our school is still holding its own. The names of over eighty children of all nationalities are on the books, and we hear there are as many more ready to come if we were ready for them. But to take them in we require a much larger staff of teachers than we have at present, as our object is to avoid the hideous poll-parrot system of the Board-schools, and to give the children opportunities of learning to think for themselves and the teachers a chance of getting into personal touch with the pupils. Comrade Cyril Bell, with the devotion of an enthusiast, works among the children all day, also in the evening classes for adults, which have at last been formed. It is proposed to endeavour to lighten his burdens in the afternoons, by having a sufficient number of regular teachers to take the classes from 2 to 4.30 p.m., so as to leave him free either to rest, or to attend to the duties of Secretary which he has also generously volunteered to take. Any one wishing to help in the extremely important work of the school will please to communicate with Cyril Bell at 19, Fitzroy Street, W., either personally or by letter. Subscriptions thankfully received by the Treasurer, H. Stenzleit, 70, Grafton Street, W., for which due acknowledgment will be made.

### ANARCHISM AND ATHEISM.

Comrade Henry Glasse writes:

Permit me to say a few words anent Comrade C. Bell's dictum, that, "to be logical Anarchists, we must also be atheists," for I fail to see the connection of ideas therein. Atheism deals with a question of fact, Anarchism with one of principle. Comrade Bell says,—"Personally, if I could believe in a God, I should also believe in an earthly ruler." Why so? If a man, judging from the phenomena of the universe which come under his observation, is convinced that there is a God, is that any reason for his concluding that men like himself should be his masters? If the connection between Atheism and Anarchism be so close, how comes it that so many Atheists are as hostile to Anarchism as the most bigotted Christians?

Let us keep the Anarchist propaganda clearly apart from that of Atheism, Malthusianism, Teetotalism, and every other "ism" and "ology"; on these subjects, as on all others, everyone has a perfect right to his opinion and to the expression of it, but it would be a sorry day for the prospects of Anarchism in England, if people became persuaded that its profession logically implied the acceptance of any particular form of speculative opinion. They would naturally regard such "liberty" as being too restricted. We have sufficient odds to fight against, let us be wise enough not to increase them.

Comrade R. J. Derfel, of the Manchester Fabian Society, complains of our remark that his very diverse treatment of Anarchist Communism in the two pamphlets noticed last month is inconsistent. He explains that as Communists he considers us Socialists, and as Anarchists Individualists, and he holds Anarchist Communism a contradiction in terms; a view which forcibly reminds us of that so smartly enunciated now and again by the *Boston Liberty*. Extremes meet.

## THE PROPAGANDA.

### REPORTS.

*Great Yarmouth.*—The comrades report good progress, notwithstanding the loss of some of their members who have left the town, and despite the fact of many others being out of work. A large and important meeting of the unemployed is expected to take place within the next five or six weeks.

*Glasgow.*—The cause moves steadily onward here. New comrades are coming forward, and many of them are speaking well at the open-air meetings. There is great hope of doing good propaganda when the weather becomes a little milder.

*Aberdeen.*—Snow-storms and influenza have had the effect of preventing us from holding any open-air meetings during January. We have had to give up the large Oddfellows' Hall, the expenses being too heavy for us, and have taken a smaller hall in the same building for Sunday evening lectures. On Sunday, 10th inst., Comrade Allan lectured on Anarchist Communism, and on the 17th, Comrades Duncan, Shepherd and Allan, gave essays on the unemployed, all the essayists coming to the conclusion that Anarchists could not help the unemployed until they began to help themselves. These Sunday evening meetings have been fairly well attended and the discussions have been lively and interesting. We have been at work among other societies since the New Year. Comrade Shepherd lectured before the House Painters Union Debating Society on "Anarchist Communism" on Sunday, Jan. 7th; Comrade Duncan lecturing on the same subject before the Unitarian Debating Society, while Comrade Allan lectured before the National Secular Society on "Anarchism." All these lectures were well received, and several doughty champions of Law and Order got beautifully sat upon during the discussions following the lectures. At the close of the discussion of Comrade Shepherd's lecture to the House Painters, Comrade Duncan, who was present, but who, not being a member of the Society, was debarred from taking part in the discussion, was asked to give a short address. This he did, and was attentively listened to and enthusiastically applauded.

### NOTICES.

*Glasgow.*—Socialist League meets every Friday evening in the Liberal Association Rooms, 20, Adelphi Street, S. S., at 8 o'clock. Open-air meetings, Park-head Cross and St. George's Cross, every Sunday evening at 5 o'clock. All business communications must be addressed to the Secretary, John G. Anderson, 92, Canning Street.

Printed and published by C. M. Wilson, at the New Fellowship Press, 26, Newington Green Road, N.