

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. XIII.—No. 144.

DECEMBER, 1899.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRACY & E. BERNSTEIN.

☞ Social Democrats in nearly all countries begin to reap what they have sown. For years the propaganda of principles has had to stand back before the reckless strife for votes to conquer political and municipal power, as the phrase goes. Their ranks were swelled on one side by masses of voters, whose real convictions and prejudices remained for the greater part untouched; on the other side, by politicians and self-seeking persons who were on the lookout for a party which would accept them as leaders. Among the inevitable consequences of these superficial flippant tactics are some apparent successes of a kind that makes sincere members of the party blush with shame—like the admission of Millerand, the French Socialist politician, to the Ministry which Galliffet, the slaughterer of the Paris workers in 1871, adorns; or the election of Social Democrats to the Bavarian Diet at the cost of a compromise with the Catholic party, which brought that party into power and means the handing over of public instruction to the priests, as happened in Belgium some years ago.

Another consequence is the increase of ponderous circumspection and diplomatic moderation all round, in order not to alienate the sympathies of particular bodies of electors; examples are furnished by the hopeless confusion of the German Social Democratic party in dealing with the land question and co-operation. It is, indeed, difficult to find even a State Socialist solution of these problems which will suit agricultural laborers and peasant proprietors, co-operators and small shopkeepers alike, all of whom form precious and influential elements of the army of voters. In other countries the question of temporary alliance with bourgeois parties comes to the front (in France, Belgium, Italy, etc.) leading necessarily to efforts to unite the greatest number of voters by all means, at the cost of any principle, in order to be able to enter such an alliance with the greatest possible strength and, consequently, to obtain the most favorable conditions.

Meanwhile, serious economic struggles are not encouraged. I do not deny that the momentary relative prosperity of industry and trade removes in some cases the primary cause of strikes, nor that the increasing solidarity and aggressiveness of the capitalists make a defensive attitude appear more practical to many just now; but it is quite natural, also, that those who represent the political interest of the party should, consciously or unconsciously, regret that energy and funds are used for economic struggles and diverted from the field of political action, and they will strive for the usual cheap political victories which leave the economic position altogether unaffected. The governing classes are quite cute enough to reap the benefit of such "tactics"; they have plenty of Galliffets to couple with all the Millerands who attain that cherished height of political power: a seat in a Ministry. At the same time, they are as implacable as ever in economic matters: federating and preparing for defying and fighting trade unionism; witness the general lockout of organised workers in Denmark last summer, the threatening legislation against coalitions in Germany, the suppression of all right of combination among the Italian railway workers, etc.

This evolution, furthermore, foils the hopes of the believers in the doctrines of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. The expectation that, with the enormous increase of Socialist votes and representatives, the real power of the workers would increase also, has not been realised; and Marxists are anxious to find out the reason of this deadlock. Here their intellectual isolation becomes a bitter obstacle to finding the truth. From their early days Marx and Engels, after transforming the main results of contemporary science and Socialism into an agglomeration of ideas—arranged in their peculiar way and thenceforward self-styled "scientific Socialism,"—erected what may be called a Chinese wall of prejudice around their system, and almost all intellectual progress of mankind during the past fifty or sixty years became an object of sneers and derision to the leaders of Marxism whilst remaining nearly unknown to the mass of their followers. This may appear strange to many; but the investigation of the original sources of Marxist ideas—familiar to readers of W. Tcherkesov's articles,—the Marxists' actions during all their history, the recent action of *Edward Bernstein* (a champion Marxist), and the attitude of the German Socialist party towards it only need closer examination to prove it.

Edward Bernstein in various articles in the *Neue Zeit* and his book, *The Basis of Socialism and the Task of Social Democracy* (in German, Stuttgart, 1899, 188 pages), questioned the truth of several fundamental doctrines of Marxism and, further, advocated a change in tactic for the German Social Democratic Party. It is curious to note that he criticises the same Marxist doctrines which W. Tcherkesov in his *Pages of Socialist History* first attacked, mainly 'the concentration of capital.' Domela Nieuwenhuis remarks on this coincidence in *L'Humanité Nouvelle* (Paris

April 10, 1899, p. 472), and also "A Reader" in the *Daily Chronicle*, (August 17 last). I would not recall this fact if Bernstein had mentioned the priority of this Anarchist critic at all. He is somewhat undecided as to the theory of value, which, during Marx's lifetime not to speak of Engels', had already been criticised inside the party; Marx, from whom a definite explanation was expected, remaining silent. Bernstein now mentions Jevons, Menger, Boehm Bawerk, hitherto so much held in contempt by Marxists. He also looks closer at what the famous conquest of political power really means, and traces it back to Blanquist sources; here, again, alighting not very far from Tcherkesov's ideas, who traces it further back to the French political Radicalism of the thirties, if I am not mistaken.

Having gone thus far, he seems to me more original in challenging the theories of increasing misery of the masses and impending crises and social cataclysms leading to a final breakdown of the capitalist system at a given moment. He is inclined to see that the average wellbeing of the working classes increases, that periods of crises and depression tend to become scarcer and less acutely felt and that there is no sure prospect of a final crisis which would end in the social revolution, at all.

From this particular view of evolution he concludes that the working classes must begin to obtain political and social power in society now, giving up all dreams of a social revolution and sudden utopian changes. They must use the political machinery in central and local matters to the utmost—here he advocates *Fabianism à l'outrance*; they must, also extend and fortify *Trade Unionism* and *Co-operation*; they must give up their attitude of stern negation to the inevitable demands of colonial expansion, etc.—which certainly means *Imperialism*,—and so on. In fact, almost all he saw being done in England by so many independent movements he wants to see done in Germany by the one Social Democratic party, which is in no small degree startled by all these new tasks mapped out by Bernstein.

That country, indeed, now reaps in these matters the result of the doubtful benefit of a united Socialist party. Initiative is lacking; the party is bulky and slow moving. Different local action would often be necessary, but as a rule is evaded if it should be of a more advanced character. Blunders in the reactionary direction, however, are not infrequent. This is easily explained: the more conscientious elements obey the party program, whilst the more indifferent easily relapse into reactionary ways. So the formal unity kills the initiative for progress, but leaves the way to reaction open. Examples abound: at every Congress reactionary provincial, local and individual actions are blamed, yet are always repeated (e.g. the Bavarian Budget voted by Socialist members of the Bavarian Diet, money for armaments unopposed by Schippel in the parliamentary committee, money for church building voted by Stegmüller in Baden, etc.); but no advanced action (which would, also, surely be censured by some) is ever recorded.

To return to Bernstein. The serious part of the practical proposals he made, namely, the strengthening of the economic position of the workers, has also been made before by Paul Kampffmeyer, the present secretary of the Frankfurt Trades Council, in a pamphlet (*Mehr Macht, More Power*) published in Berlin in 1898.

The great stress laid on the economic struggle by Bernstein is a step in the right direction; but it cannot be overlooked that he means to give up none of the empty political ambitions. His most talented defender at the Hanover Congress, Dr. David of Mayence, said distinctly: "He (Bernstein) says: it is false to conquer first political and afterwards economic power; the reverse is false also; both aims must advance side by side, causing and supporting each other mutually." And again: "Bernstein is of opinion that the processes of socialising and of democratising must go hand in hand. The trade unionist and political movements are inseparable."

English readers will see that there is nothing new in Bernstein's tactics and will only wonder that they caused so much stir in the gigantic "scientific" party of Germany that was supposed to know everything. Yet this is only an example to show that they know nothing of what passes outside the pale of Marxism. Bernstein is the only influential Marxist who—having to remain in London as a proscribed even after the fall of the Anti-Socialist law in 1890—peeped over the Chinese wall of Marxist doctrinairism and actually rediscovered the modern labor movement for his fellow Marxists. They had for many years only heard of England as the place of residence of Marx and Engels; later on, of the lamented Avelings, and a country which had the happy destiny of furnishing the materials for *Das Kapital*, by Karl Marx. Later on they were told that the Bloomsbury Socialist Society was the lever of the Marxist social revolution in England and that the great man in the English movement, besides the Avelings, was Will Thorne. Mr. Hyadman was alternately vilified when he was friendly towards

the French Possibilists (Anti-Marxist Socialists), and praised to the skies when the Avelings joined the S.D.F. again. Fabianism was treated with the utmost contempt; the anti-political trade unions declared reactionary; co-operators treated as bourgeois, and the I.L.P. suspected of leanings towards the Anarchists—the arch-enemy. The movements outside the Marxist camp in other countries were treated similarly; and the poor readers of the German Social Democratic press lived in a fool's paradise, thinking that the sainted families, the Avelings and Lafargues, assisted by Liebknecht, Kautsky, Jules Guesde, Iglesias and a few other "fathers of the church" (as they now call themselves) would soon set things right for them. Had not Engels and Bebel prophesied the breakdown of the present system for the year 1898, not to mention earlier predictions¹ (1874, 1889, 1895)!! All other advanced movements and scientific researches were howled down by the bravi and hacks of the party. The astonishment of the German delegates at their rencontre with Non-Marxist and anti-parliamentary Socialists at the London Congress of 1896 was unfeigned and genuine; until they came here most of them sincerely believed that Aveling was England!

So Bernstein's articles and book, commonplace as they are, acted like a thunderbolt. *Bernstein-Apostata* was one of the most polite epithets hurled at him. "With unmistakable herostatic animosity he throws the torch of criticism in the temple of Marxism, leaving no stone in its place," wrote a Stuttgart Socialist. Liebknecht called his book the "solemn renunciation of Social Democratic principles." Further amenities were used by Mesdames Zetkin and Luxemburg, the Russian Plechanov and many others. It was generally believed that at the Hanover Congress a moral stake would be erected to burn the heretic.

This, however, did not happen at that Congress, which ended in what Bernstein must consider is a satisfactory way to him. How this happened and what the true reasons were in my opinion, I will explain in the next and concluding article.

Nov. 16.

A GERMAN DREYFUS CASE.

Albert Ziethen, barber and publican in Elberfeld, has been in prison since 1883, having been convicted of killing his wife between eleven and half-past on the night of Oct. 25 in that year. Our comrade, Gustav Landauer, late editor of *Der Sozialist*, noticing many curious points in the evidence, published them in that paper. They may be summarised as follows:

1st. The doctor called by the police examined Ziethen and his clothing but found no blood spots on him. Gottschalk, a notorious policeman, produced as evidence Ziethen's cuffs, with red spots which the doctor declared were not blood and were not there when he examined Ziethen on the night of the murder.

2nd. Ziethen's apprentice, August Wilhelm, under 18, got very drunk on spirits that night, and was seen by Schwartzmann, a witness, in a stupid and drunken condition standing in Ziethen's doorway after 11 o'clock. He was arrested, but not examined for blood traces. He testified that Ziethen came home at 9 o'clock and quarrelled with his wife; while, on the other hand it was shown that Ziethen did not return till long after 11.

3rd. August Wilhelm 3 years later, in 1887, confessed to his employer, to his aunt, and to the criminal commissary, Merscheidt Hüllessem, that being very drunk and alone with Mrs. Ziethen, he was overcome by lust and a morbid desire for blood; that he struck Mrs. Ziethen down with a hammer, and that it was a lust murder. [This confession was confirmed by the position in which the body was found and the disordered dress.]

4th. Those who knew August Wilhelm said he was callous and apt to be cruel.

The Assize Court at Elberfeld decided to take up the case again; but the superior Court at Köln forbade it on the ground that August Wilhelm was not to be believed, and that he was probably influenced by Ziethen's family. On his release, he said to an official: "If the inquisitor will not believe me, I cannot help it." Since then he has disappeared.

Nearly two years ago, *Der Sozialist*, in Berlin, began to notice this case. In February, 1897, Gustav Landauer, in a letter to the authorities, accused Gottschalk of having furnished false evidence against Ziethen, and thus caused many to affirm his (Ziethen's) innocence. He also pointed out that Gottschalk now occupied a high position as a police official in Prussia.

Some six months later, Landauer wrote again, calling attention to the German law which enacts that if a person, making an accusation of misdemeanour against an official is not called to account within 6 months, he cannot be prosecuted thereafter. Therefore, that period having expired without his being called to account, the accusation remained on Gottschalk.

Several months later, about the end of 1898, the German authorities prosecuted Landauer for "rudely having caused Police commissary

Gottschalk to be suspected," and although many other papers had reprinted Landauer's letter from *Der Sozialist*, and the well known author, the late Von Egidy, had lectured on the case (one audience last summer in Berlin of between two and three thousand persons) to the same effect. The Marxist journal *Vorwärts* used this expression in speaking of the case some months ago: "Ziethen, a man of whose innocence all people have a clear perception;" yet Landauer was awarded six months imprisonment, the editor and publisher of *Der Sozialist* two months, and various numbers of the paper were ordered to be seized and burned, which sentence was affirmed by the Supreme Court (Reichsgericht) of Leipzig—in camera, without touching the question of Ziethen's innocence.

It is asserted that the German Government refuses to allow the case to be retried because Gottschalk, the police officer in the case, acquired an unsavoury reputation in connection with certain plots promoted by provocative agents of the police, resulting in the decapitation of August Reinsdorf and outrageous sentences of imprisonment on other comrades. These cases presented similar anomalous features and discrepancies; and, were Ziethen's innocence established, it is the Government that would be discredited and disgraced.

The German State, by keeping an innocent man in prison for twelve years (Wilhelm having confessed in 1887) in order to maintain the order to maintain the authority and the prestige of the police and the judiciary—that is to say: its authority and its prestige—has received a wound that will not heal.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

During the year 1899 the progress of Anarchism was not marked by any stirring events, but Anarchists well held their ground as far as direct propaganda is concerned; in an indirect way gigantic object lessons were given to the world of the initiative of minorities, the absolute solidarity and identity of the State and authority with all that is mean and rotten, and the impotence of State Socialism to cope with any of these questions that oppress and burden mankind.

The three great questions, the Dreyfus case in France, the resistance of the Filipinos against American invasion, and the defiance of British capitalism by the Transvaal and Free State Boers present striking similarities. In every case a small minority stands up for what it thinks right, and unheeding the threatened utter destruction by the combined forces of Statecraft and mob prejudice, it prefers to fight and to die rather than submit to what it considers to be wrong. In France, a few men challenged the giant of militarism and clericalism; they succeeded in unveiling the dirty squalor hidden behind high-sounding patriotism and military glory. Never before has it been so clearly shown and proved by what reptiles the people consents to be governed, and that which is considered a crime if done by an individual, at once becomes an action of merit—if perpetrated by the State. And whilst the rest of mankind, not least of them the two great Anglo-Saxon nations, gloated over what they declared to be the shame of France alone, their own hypocrisy or self-delusion received two crushing blows.

The American Republicans fight the inhabitants of the small Philippine Islands, their allies of a year ago; and the British Empire fights the two small Boer Republics. These two States, who firmly believe themselves the strongest and most civilised on this globe, at the height of their power know nothing better to do than to plan and try to subdue and practically to destroy two small peoples in the remotest corners of the globe who only want to live independently by themselves and to remain as little touched as possible by the overspreading capitalist plague. Public opinion in the rest of the world is as united on this matter as it was, outside of France on the Dreyfus case.

As Anarchists we can only admire the spirit of liberty, sacrifice, solidarity and initiative shown by these small minorities who are not afraid to defy boldly the strongest powers on earth. Never before has the capitalist character of wars been so manifest to all. What the South African capitalists did not achieve privately by the Jameson raid the British Government is doing publicly for them, and free of charge. And how quickly the organs of "public opinion," the politicians and the press, spread the mantle of patriotism and glory over these sordid financial manoeuvres. People will not forget this; as, in France, they will not forget the exposure of the inside of militarism. On the other hand, some persons who fancied themselves standing up for the people through all these years found out, during these affairs, that their real sympathies are on the side of militarism and authority, and by their profession of this new faith automatically cleared the popular movements of their presence; such was the case with Rochefort in France, such is the case with R. Blatchford, B. Tillett and some others here.

Is this rising and resistance of minorities for apparently hopeless causes the symptom of a new spirit of freedom and revolt spreading at last, or is it only the last desperate stand which the remnants of the believers in independence and human dignity make against the crushing, stupefying action of victorious capitalism and its tool and lackey, infamous militarism? It is for the masses of the people themselves to say which it is to be; it is their own misery which will be perpetuated if the latter explanation be true. They need not expect emancipation by others rising for them; those who rise do so because they feel personal satisfaction in doing so, because to sacrifice all and even to die in revolt is a brighter and happier lot to them than to live comfortably in submission. But not even their victory would set the masses free if they do not themselves desire to be free and feel that they are free. It is this spirit of human dignity and freedom which our propaganda tries to evoke from the slumbering state in which it is found in every living being.

Of evidence of the decay of parliamentary Socialism the events of 1899 produced volumes. A French Socialist, for the first time (since the provisional government of 1848), obtained a seat in the cabinet. In a French pamphlet *La scission socialiste* (The Socialist split; first published in the *Humanité Nouvelle* of Sept. 10) it is well explained how Millerand was selected from among the many French Socialist politicians: he had through all his political career never taken a distinct attitude over any of the burning questions—Boulanger, Dreyfus etc.; he was a *just milieu* "Socialist" par excellence, never committing himself in any way. Now our friends, the Social Democrats, will know how

¹ These predictions were often referred to at the Hanover Congress of September last; see *Protokoll*, pages 141, 168, 186, 210, 218, 228-9, etc. Kautsky hinted that in the case of Engels this prophecy was "strong optimism," whilst in the case of others it would have been idiosyncrasy. Bebel strove hard to deny the pertinency of these prophecies, but was niled down to his assertions pitilessly by I. Auer, the secretary of the party. I myself heard it stated at a recent meeting by a delegate to the Eisenach Congress of 1869, that Bebel at that time, elated with the momentary success, expected the breakdown to happen in 1874.

to behave themselves if the bourgeois are to choose them for Cabinet Ministers! What is more serious is that the action of Millerand is not to any extent opposed by the French Socialists. It is true that Jules Guesde, the Marxist, and E. Vaillant, the Blanquist, and their friends have issued a protest; but they have themselves discredited their party by so many compromises, including the support of the Bourgeois Cabinet by the Marxists, that the sincerity of their protest as a political party, apart from their personal feeling over the matter, is open to doubt. And so Social Democracy in the main glides another step back on the road to ordinary Radicalism.

One man in the German Socialist Party, E. Bernstein, had the pluck to state this openly, and he seems to be proud of it. Such a "climb down" is a bitter pill for that party to swallow; yet their whole conduct, and in particular the doings at their late Hanover Congress (Oct. 1889) noticed elsewhere in this paper, prove that they have no other alternative. [My opinion is confirmed by the great Socialist Congress held recently in Paris, at which the participation of Socialists in bourgeois Cabinets was condemned by one vote, and accepted—under the plea of exceptional circumstances—by another vote!]]

All this is the more absurd as, of late years, in several countries a development of parliamentarism takes place which is the negation of its very principle (the rule of the majority). I allude to systematic obstruction by minorities. A handful of determined persons will upset and make the transaction of business impossible, not only for days and weeks but for months and years (as in Austria). They will resort to all means—not excluding force—as did the Austrian Socialist members, who jumped like tigers over the heads of ministers to the Speaker's seat and threw his papers all over the House, or the Italian Socialist members, who got hold of the ballot-boxes and smashed them to pieces to prevent a division taking place. In Vienna, in November, 1897, these tactics, because seconded by immense popular demonstrations in the streets, brought about the fall of the Cabinet; the same was happening in Brussels, last summer, whilst at Rome the streets kept quiet and the violent protests were ineffective. So the success of these tactics depends on the people outside entirely, but the determination of the members inside has considerable effect on them.

What then is the conclusion? Nothing in favour of parliamentarism, to be sure. It is that in some cases the very upholders of parliament, the members themselves, are driven to revolt against it, to prefer to use force and to smash up everything they can lay hold of, to submitting to majority rule. Is there a more crushing argument against parliamentarism? Without the least optimism or illusion as to the bearing and the importance of this action, we welcome it also; because it is another affirmation of the rights of minorities and individuals, another negation of authority.

Believers in State railways would get wonderful enlightenment from the bill before the Italian parliament, proposing how to deal with the workers of the Italian government railways. The absolute prohibition of coalitions and the military repression of attempts at combinations or strikes are expressed in a number of draconian clauses. It was never more clearly shown that to nationalize a part of the present productive or distributive apparatus means to hand over to the State immense revenues and immense armies of State slaves; the money will be used for extending militarism, the new State slaves will be kept in submission by the very money they earn themselves for the State. Instead of shunning the State like a pest, making a desert round it and letting it decay as far as possible of inanition, every honest man keeping away from it,—State Socialism actually does the contrary, and would achieve nothing but provide new means to forge new weapons for the repression of all true popular aspirations.

Turning our attention more closely to Anarchism now, we find in France the propaganda progressing satisfactorily and by the most varied methods, which is just what is wanted. Whilst the *Temps Nouveaux*, edited as before by Jean Grave is an organ of theoretical discussion before all, accumulating however in its permanent supplement evidence of the progress of free ideas in literature and science, the *Homme Libre*, of Charles Malato and the *Libertaire* of S. Faure and Constant Martin, are before all fighting organs, hitting hard at militarism and clericalism. The same was done by the *Journal du Peuple*, a daily paper, now interrupted, in which E. Pouget and others dealt largely with the economic movements, trades unionism etc. The more intellectual and literary side of our ideas is worked out by various contributors to the *Aurore*, the advanced daily paper which bore the brunt of the fight against militarism. The anti-parliamentarian trade unions keep well together, carrying on the general strike propaganda. By the way, the Committee preparing the "official" Socialist Congress in Paris, 1900, refused at their meeting at Brussels to have the general strike discussed at that Congress, although the French demanded it. It is funny indeed what labour organisations seem to put up with from all sorts of committees which as effectually bar the discussion of questions not suitable to them as any government would. If there was any international organisation, holding its own congress, it would be concerned alone in the action of its committees and we would not refer to it at all. But no such organisation has ever existed since the dissolution of the old International and every Congress is of course autonomous, open to all who come under the description which its title implies. Yet, before every congress, some such private committee of the big leaders meets, usually at Brussels or the Hague, and settles all preliminaries without any right whatever; and these decisions, as well as the resolutions of previous congresses—which are of no binding force, because these are open congresses and not those of a society,—all this mass of rules and restrictions is constantly quoted by the leaders, accepted by the delegates without a thought and carried like an iron chain from one congress to the other. The French trade unionists have had enough of this, and propose to hold their own Congress this time, open to Anarchists and to all, as our readers know.

Of French books we mention: *L'Anarchie: son but, ses moyens* (Anarchy: its aims and methods), by Jean Grave—the author of *Moribund Society*, *Future Society*, etc.; *L'Amour Libre*, by Charles Albert; *Les Feuilles*, by Zo d'Axa, a reprint from his paper *La Feuille* with drawings by Steinlen and others.

Les lois sévères de 1893—1894 (The infamous laws of 1893—4), reprinted from *La Revue Blanche*, by Francis de Pressensé, a lawyer, and Emile Pouget, calls attention to the victims of the unrepented laws of 1893—94, sent to the hell of Cayenne, where so many including the martyred Lorion Girier, have already died.

Marchand—Fashoda by Louis Guétant (Paris, *Temps Nouveaux*) exposes the methods of "civilizing" Africa where all great European nations rival in broadcast incendiarism and slaughter.

Useful reprints are *La Commune de Paris et la Notion de l'Etat* by Michael Bakounine, and *Anarchie et Communisme* by Carlo Cafiero, one of the earliest

expositions of Communist Anarchism in the seventies, both are penny pamphlets (*Temps Nouveaux*, 140 Rue Mouffetard, Paris). *L'Humanisphère*, by Joseph Dejacques, a reprint from a forgotten French paper of New York in the late fifties of a Communist Anarchist Utopian story by one of the isolated forerunners of our movement, edited by the *Temps Nouveaux* group of Brussels, who also published W. Tcherkesov's *Précurseurs de l'Internationale* (51 Rue des Eperronniers, Brussels; 1 franc each). Max Stirner's fundamental work on Individualist Anarchism has also just come out in French.

The *Libertarian School* of Paris, are as yet unable to begin the instruction of children, has opened a series of classes for adults; F. Domela Nieuwenhuis delivered a long address at the opening meeting, which has been published in the supplement of the *Temps Nouveaux* and will appear in *Freedom*.

The presence of Millerand at the Ministry meanwhile creates absurd situations in the case of strikes. He does not want to lose his position instantly if strikers are shot down under his auspices, and he is equally aware that the capitalists, quite alive to the situation, will make no serious concessions whatever. So when a strike happens all is done by his agents to take all the spirit out of it, to make the strikers accept arbitration, which leads to half-hearted results, leaving things the same or worse than they were. This was done at the Creusot strike, when the strikers threatened to march to Paris, but were lulled into submitting to the Prime Minister's arbitration. But this idea of marching to Paris, of action, in one word, during strikes instead of starving at home, gains ground, and recently strikers of Audincourt, in the Doubs department, near the Swiss frontier, took it up again, and marched forward until they were stopped at Belfort, when they were made to consent to march back. This also is a sign of a new fresh, living spirit, outgrowing the old routine lines; and where there is life, there is hope.

In Italy and Spain the breakdown of the present system seems to be most imminent. The population of those countries, suffering though it be from overwork and starvation, was never quite subjugated by modern capitalism. The government and the rich classes might oppress and plunder them, but this is always felt to be oppression and plunder, and resistance and rebellion to be the right and legitimate means to be used against it wherever possible. It is not veiled by cant about the "will of the people" and respectable "business" as in our countries, where even the victims are lulled by glib phrases and the parliamentary masquerade. Italy and Spain may be said to be continually on the verge of revolt, and in the interval tactics are now seriously discussed. Should Anarchists unite with Republican and Democratic parties to bring about the fall of the present monarchy and create a republic where propaganda is expected to be unfettered, or should they carry on the propaganda of Anarchism exclusively? Opinions differ; but I think the most natural solution, and one which is already acted upon, is this, namely, to use the intervals of peace for the most serious and widespread propaganda of our ideas and to give complete, but independent help to all who act in a revolutionary way whenever the situation arises.

At present the Anarchist press is being slowly resuscitated; the *Avvenire Sociale* of Messina, *Pro Coatti* of Genoa, and occasional papers in Imola, etc., are published. *Pro Coatti* has been suppressed again and the editors arrested.

The *Questione Sociale* and the *Aurora* continue publication in America, being divided on the question of organisation versus individual action. *La Conquista del Pane*, a translation of Kropotkin's *Conquest of Bread*, was published at Paterson, and *Il Canzoniere dei Ribelli* (a revolutionary songbook) at Berne.

Efforts were made to interest public opinion in the case of Cesare Batacchi, imprisoned (for life) since November 1878, when a bomb was thrown at a demonstration of "patriots" in Florence by unknown persons. The local Internationalists were arrested in a body and five or six were singled out against whom no particle of proof was produced; still, the jury found them guilty, and all of them served sentences of from ten to twenty years—save Batacchi, who still remains in prison. His spirit is unbroken and he maintains his innocence in the firmest language after all these 21 years (see letter printed in *L'Avvenire*, No. 66, Buenos Aires).

In Spain, the agitation to expose the Montjuich tortures and to liberate the surviving prisoners is continued on a large scale, but meets with the meanest and shabbiest obstacles by the governing gang, who all feel solidarity in crime. The prisoners, transported to Africa, suffer agonies in the penitentiaries, but maintain their fierce attitude, scorning any compromise by royal grace and clamoring for investigation and justice. Besides their pathetic appeals the recollections of Francisco Gana have been published, written in July, 1899, shortly before his death. The torturer, Fortas, has had to leave Barcelona and is held up to execration wherever he goes: Marz, the judge, is dead.

Spanish papers are: *La Revista Blanca* at Madrid and *La Idea Libre* at Valladolid; but the movement has not regained its former energy as can be seen from an article by R. Mella in the *Despertar* of October 6.

Ricardo Mella lately issued *La Ley del Numero* (Vigo), an exposure of the belief in majority rule. A. Pellicer Paraire published *Conferencias populares sobre sociología* (Buenos Aires, 105 pages). In La Plata (Argentine Republic) a series of prize essays is being published as *Tercer Certamen*, the third volume of collected essays all on Anarchist topics, printed in Spanish.

Of other countries I will say but little this time. In Germany, efforts are at last made to heal the effects of the split between the more literary Anarchists (organs: *Sozialist* and *Arme Konrad*) and the more popular ones (*Neues Leben*) by an amalgamation of the papers. I regret that so much importance is given to matters after all only secondary, and welcome more the production of good volumes, independent of party sectarianism, like the Dutch libertarian *Multatuli's* translation by W. Spohr (Minden, 1 vol.), or the promised volume of a selection of R. Reizel's (*Arme Teufel*) writings (Detroit).

In Bohemia, the Anarchist groups have been dissolved by the government and the editors of the three papers are in prison at Prague. One comrade, Cerny, left prison there this year after fifteen years imprisonment for secretly printing a paper in 1884.

In Greece, Bulgaria and Roumania, papers and pamphlets were published by T. Manganaras at Patras, *Neon Phos* (The New Light), by Musou *Emaniciparea Femeii*, a pamphlet, etc. A crowd of peasants was fired upon by soldiers at Slatina, Roumania; 17 killed, 24 wounded (official report); 70 killed, 150 wounded (independent report).

Jean Grave's famous book, *Moribund Society and Anarchy* translated by Voltairine de Cleyre, is now ready. We have some on sale, price 1s., Emma Goldman will have some with her at her lectures.

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

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

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

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

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

THE 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.

"THE GLORY OF IT!"

As a commentary upon the present War, there seems to us nothing more pathetic, more eloquent with meaning, than the subjoined paragraph from a soldier's letter:

"You will be cut up to hear that poor Ferd is among the killed, but he sent four Boers to 'kingdom come' with a bayonet before he fell dead in my arms. I shall never forget it as long as I live, because as he fell he gave a groan and said 'Mother!', and that word has been ringing in my ears ever since. But he died like a British soldier, and I hope he has gone to a better world."

Against the bereaved pity precludes the harsh word, but as Ruskin has said there would be fewer wars, perhaps none, were it not for the women. Men may denounce an unjust war; women never do. Instead of putting on their deepest mourning or making any public protest they send their husbands and sons to a bloody grave and call it glory. "I have two sons at the front and wish I had five," said a mother recently. "Why?" was asked in amazement. "Oh, for the glory of it!" A Boer mother may have some right to talk of "the glory of it", for ardent patriot that she is, it is her country which is threatened with conquest and obliteration; but to Englishwomen, as to any woman worthy of the name, that dying scream of *Mother!* should strike home with the force of cold steel, killing the old and giving place to the spirit of the New Woman, who will talk less of glory and more of Honour, Justice and Truth.

THE REWARD OF "MERIT."

So seldom does merit receive its due reward, that it is with a feeling of satisfaction one has to record that William Melville the First has been suitably requited for his arduous labour in safeguarding the precious personality known as William II. of Germany during his recent visit to Grandma Britannia, by the gift of a gold cigar case emblazoned with the imperial cipher in diamonds. Every man, we are told, has his price, some being dear at Five pounds and some cheap at Fifty, but the exhausting labour of a Chief Inspector of the Special Branch can only be paid for in diamonds. Think of the awful toil entailed, the strain and wear upon the mind, when it becomes necessary to verify the address and whereabouts of the innumerable Anarchists of Great Britain; to open every letter directed to suspects or their comrades; to have bicycle and buttonhole brigades in waiting, to scour Windsor Great Park by night and day, and the sylvan lanes around Sandringham, for the bloodthirsty English Anarchist, who armed to the hilt and mad for notoriety, was bound to be skulking behind some threadbare hedge or meditating butchery in the damp seclusion of a convenient ditch. Not, of course, that he, William Melville the First, did all these things; by no means! Has he not a staff of willing knaves to catch colds and Anarchists on draughty corners, and plenty of P. O. sorters to slit or steam open envelopes, hundreds of mean minds who, like Baden-Powell in his book on scouting think that "better than any other game, is that of man-hunting"! But it is never the willing knaves or the workers who get the reward, but the man who sits comfortably at his desk and does nothing. Like the little princelings who attend our foreign wars, watch the battle under the anxious eye of the General and his staff for fear an impertinent bullet should soil the royal uniform, and get the Victoria Cross and a kiss from Grandma for watching the butchery of Tommy Atkins as he falls with that scream of *Mother!* on his dying lips,—like him, William of Scotland Yard gets a noble reward for doing nothing. Well, no doubt the imperial cigar-case will be treasured as a precious souvenir, until it gets to Uncle's—whither all royal gifts find their way in the end.

THE ANARCHIST OF FICTION.

Most of our readers will be familiar with a tale called *The Dynamiters*, written jointly by Lloyd Osborn and Robert L. Stevenson. This work of fiction—very pure fiction—is as usually happens, simply a travesty upon Anarchists and their principles, the writers seemingly having been at as little pains to inquire into the nature of Anarchism as Richard Whiteing, who in No. 5, *John Street* presents us with a melodramatic picture of a revolutionist—the lean man with the white face, gleaming eyes and unkempt hair—suggesting that this is the normal type of Anarchist, whilst Anarchism is his action, done in feeble imitation of Salvat, when he dies by the premature explosion of an infernal machine thrown at the door of a capitalist. Zola alone seems to have studied Anarchism before writing about it, and from his pen we have the only true and sympathetic portrait of an Anarchist in existence—this same Salvat of *Paris*. All the more interesting does the following passage, from one of Stevenson's Samoan letters, therefore become:

"There is a new something or other in the wind, which exercises me highly—Anarchy—I mean, Anarchism. People who (for pity's sake) commit dastardly murders very basely, die like saints and leave beautiful letters behind 'em (did you see Vaillant's to his daughter? it was the new Testament over again): people whose conduct is inexplicable to me and yet their spiritual life higher than that of most. This is just what the early Christians must have seemed to the Romans. Is this a new drive" [*trieb*, impulse] "among the monkeys? Mind you, Bob, if they go on being martyred a few years more, the gross, dull, not unkindly bourgeois may get tired or ashamed or afraid to go on martyring; and the Anarchists come out at the top just like the early Christians. That is, of course, they will step into power as a *personnel*, but God knows what they may believe when they come to do so; it can't be stranger or more improbable than what Christianity had come to be by the same time."

Stevenson was a man of an intensely reactionary mind, but he had the honesty, when he saw Anarchists in a truer, clearer light, to say so, and we respect him for it.

"THE LETTER OF THE LAW!"

The English nation is said to be one that in its political and social character approaches most closely to that of the ancient Romans. The civic life is founded much on their lines; as with them, no sooner is a tribe or nation vanquished than the first object of the military advisers is to turn the conquered into a disciplined army to protect the newly acquired territory; as to the all-pervading spirit of Law and Order it would be hard to say which of the two, Romans or Britons, respected them the most; so profound indeed was the Roman passion for obedience to law, for subservience to mere rules, such the reverence for the strong arm of the military police, that when a Roman was exiled it was quite unnecessary to send a police patrol to escort him to the frontier or to his place of exile; he quietly girded his loins, took up his staff and went, his name being registered in each town through which he passed until the report came back to Rome or otherwise that he had reached his place of exile. But we question whether even the Roman magistrates with all their worship of law and order would have been guilty of acts such as so often disgrace those on the English bench. The sentence of death passed and carried out in the case of Mary Ansell, is an old story now. The sordidness of her crime, the ready acquiescence of the public in the fiat of her judge, in a sense condones the penalty inflicted; yet who that read the report of the trial but must have felt that the girl, with lunacy on both sides of her family, with near relatives in madhouses, was little more than an incipient lunatic herself? We know only too well that if she had been *Lady* Mary Ansell her judge would not even have donned the black cap. To fling mercy, common sense and the spirit of the law to one side in their passionate devotion to the mere letter of the law, seems the prerogative of English judges when they have the poor and humbly-born before them; when it is the rich and well-born, it is—"Well, for the look of the thing, my noble scoundrel, you must to prison; but, sham ill health, and in six months you shall be free." Only rarely does a judge have sufficient courage and honesty to denounce a law when it is a farce. Where but in England could one hear of an incident so cruel and scandalous as the following:

Yesterday, at Durham Assizes, Mr. Justice Grantham sentenced Francis Joseph Aloysius Smith, twenty-three, a sailor, to death for the murder of Henry Ceeley at Gateshead on July 21. Prisoner was brought into the dock on a stretcher and during the hearing lay propped up with pillows. He was suffering from paralysis, following upon an epileptic fit which attacked him while awaiting trial.

No matter if the sentence in this case may have been a mere formality—how dare Justice be travestied by mere formalities? How dare an English public sit quiet and see a man paralysed from head to foot suffer the mental torture of being condemned to death? What if, paralysed still from head to foot, the sentence has since been commuted to penal servitude for life—why is this torture added, when, since his judges believe in a God

they must admit that he has already been sufficiently punished by the hand of this God? Paralysed for life at twenty-three; in good sooth could any worse punishment be devised? Lately with something of this in our thoughts we asked a Fabian: "Why don't you take up the Capital Punishment question? You howl over flogging and have not a word to say against the hanging of epileptics and the passionate uneducated Poor! Instead of wrangling over education pamphlets and late resolutions against the Transvaal War, do something for the real benefit of your kind!" The astounding answer came "Well, we are; we happen to be very interested in *milk* just now." But it was not the milk of human kindness.

THE INTERNATIONAL, ITS PRECURSORS, AND ANARCHISM.

VIII.

French Socialism—Saint Simon.

Born in the factory English Socialism developed side by side with the labor movement. From thence arose its essentially practical character. French Socialism originated quite otherwise; therefore its history before 1848 was entirely different.

The conspiracy of "The Equals," known as Babeuf's, with its revolutionary Communism, once crushed out, was completely forgotten. *Democratic* militarism, this pest and curse of modern France, gave quite a different direction to the revolutionary movement. The scoundrels of the Directory and of the Empire had filched the results of the great Revolution. Plumed brutes transformed France into barracks and put back the economic, intellectual and social progress of the nation for more than two generations. It is not during a period when the military caste dominates—this symbol of animalism and stupidity—that Socialist reforms can be undertaken. For there are always patriots in their pay, like the Drumonts, Rocheforts and others today who denounce as anti-patriots all friends of the people of progress.

Nevertheless there were independent spirits who preserved the wide views and humanitarian ideas of the Encyclopedists and of the Revolution. Witnesses of the downfall of the "old order" and of the political reforms decreed by the National Convention, many amongst them dreamed of a reforming government that would have inaugurated the new era of peace and wellbeing, based on a more or less perfect economic and social equality. For them, the solution of the social question did not appear as a work accomplished by the people themselves, but as a reform introduced from above. This difference in the conceptions of French and English reformers¹ is very characteristic and very important.

Dazzled by the revolutionary glory of the Convention, they forgot the rôle popular initiative played both before and during the Revolution; the French reformers, whether peaceable, or revolutionary like Barbes and Blanqui, always dreamed of a Government accomplishing the reform or the social revolution. From this arose their absorption in the work of elaborating a complete system of future reforms in accordance with this or that abstract principle, and supported by reasoning equally abstract and metaphysical.

Amongst these reformers the most remarkable both for their creative genius and their striking generalizations were Saint-Simon and Ch. Fourier. They have left us Socialist systems completely worked out in their general philosophy and even in details. They had great influence especially amongst the youth attending the higher schools, where they found men of capacity and talent like August Comte, Augustin Thierry, Victor Considerant and many others. But their influence on the masses was far less profound, because their abstract systems with a terminology often fantastic, especially with Fourier, rendered them inaccessible to the working classes. Thus their schools of thought, in spite of the talent of their disciples and the genius of their founders, have completely disappeared from the contemporary labor movement. Three-fourths of the Socialists of today do not even understand what was the difference between the Socialist schools of Saint-Simon and Fourier, and what humanitarian and Socialist ideas they have left to the present generation. Nevertheless we are indebted to these thinkers for some of the fundamental ideas of modern Socialism.

I will endeavour to expound this briefly.

Saint-Simon and his school have left us a considerable number of political and philosophical writings. To speak accurately, from the point of view of modern science, their works are rather theological than scientific. "New Christianity"² the fundamental work of the school, is a treatise completely theological. On reading the introduction by Enfantin, or the exposition of doctrine by E. Rodrigues, one might think himself in the presence of some of the Old Testament prophets. "That is the last word of our master. . . . It is from thence we have drawn the religious life we love; it is in this first book of the new humanity that we have learned what we teach progressively to the world. There are laid down the fundamental bases of morality, of the doctrine and religion of Saint Simonism." Such are the first words of the introduction written by Enfantin. What were the dogmas of this religion? Always the old stupidity, in the name of which Huss, Giordano Bruno and thousands of heretics have been burnt. In the first dialogue, between a conservative and innovator, we read:
Conservative.—Do you believe in God?

Innovator.—Yes, I do.

C.—Do you believe the Christian religion had a divine origin?

I.—Yes.

After that we could leave on one side their profession of faith did it not contain some new and progressive ideas. "I strongly urge you," the author says to the public, "not to allow yourselves to be biased by the number of ancient expressions I have been obliged to use."⁴ In reality it is not only these words, but the stupid old beliefs that have been the cause of so many evils to humankind; which, in spite of the talents, in some respects genius, of the "master" and such disciples as August Comte, Augustin Thierry, Bazard and others,⁵ sterilised the movement of St. Simonism. It was from its relation to these deistic and ill-omened prejudices that the Dominican, Lacordaire, said of Saint Simonism, "It was the greatest religious movement of the human mind since Luther."⁶ Nevertheless, this bizarre theology included some Socialist aspirations, very vague it is true, but very humanitarian, brotherly.

Here are, in a few words, their views on the society of the future: "The new Christian organization will deduce its institutions. . . . from the principle that all men should act towards one another as brothers. It will direct all its institutions. . . . towards increasing the welfare of the poorest class (page 16); society must be organised in the way best adapted to reach this great aim (page 83) and this society will practice a social justice based on the principle of "From each according to his ability to each according to his work." (p. 124) This rule requires the existence of an administrative hierarchy which, according to Saint Simon, would be composed of experts and selected spiritual chiefs.

In order to prevent the inequality that this hierarchy might bring about he abolishes the right of inheritance: "The abolition of serfdom has placed in other ranks those that serfdom attached to the soil; the soil ceases in its turn to be attached to families, and the abolition of inheritance thus forms the complement to equality amongst men. Everyone has a place in the hierarchy and therefore a right to honors and a retiring pension in proportion to his rank." (p. 207)

At the same time, Saint Simon and his friends preached equality of the sexes and the complete emancipation of woman in these half Communist half theocratic associations. Reformed Humanity would carry out international solidarity and the terrestrial globe would be cultivated by free associations.⁷

Their Socialist conceptions, as one sees, were almost identical with those of the mild Collectivist of our day.

In the report presented to parliament in 1830 Bazard and Enfantin, repudiating Communism, declared that the Saint Simonists desired to make collective property "All the instruments of labor, land, and capital, and that production should be organised by associations of producers under the control of a hierarchy of elected officials."

Their Collectivist formula was not an idea arrived at by accident. On the contrary, it was the logical conclusion of the whole doctrine of Saint Simonism as developed by the master in his works, *Industry, On the Industrial System, Organisation*, and others. As he said, the State and legislators should employ themselves in organising a rational production by the organisation of things; in other words, by rendering all the means of production, including land and capital, collective property.

It is precisely because of this Collectivist idea added to those of the abolition of inheritance, the emancipation of woman, and the cultivation of the soil by self-governing and brotherly associations, that Saint Simon and his school produced a profound impression on French society. In spite of the religious element, and of their philosophy somewhat foreign to the science of today, they exercised great influence not only in France but in every civilised country.

W. TCHERKESOV.

SPECIAL NOTICE.

Workingmen's International Revolutionary Congress, Paris, 1900.

From the second circular of the Paris group preparing this Congress we learn that this group is now replaced by a committee of delegates of the Paris groups. They record the sympathetic reception of their first circular by the revolutionary organisations and press of most countries and communicate the following list of questions proposed for discussion at the Congress:

I. *Theory*; Relation of Communism and Anarchy.

II. *Organisation*: Relations between the groups of one or more countries by means of national or an international committee of propaganda, each group conserving its full autonomy.

¹ Let the readers remember the declarations of W. Thompson and Robert Owen on the rôle of the people, who alone could solve the social question.

² Paris, 1832.

³ *Nouveau Christianisme*, page 9.

⁴ *Ibid*, page 9.

⁵ It is true these remarkable men left this school as soon as they discovered its religious tendency à l'outrance: Auguste Comte a little before 1825, Bazard after 1830.

⁶ Discourse by Geroult. See *Œuvres de Saint Simon et d'Enfantin*, page 251, volume XIII., Paris, 1867.

⁷ Even in 1814, Saint Simon and Augustin Thierry published a pamphlet on the "Reorganisation of European Society," or the necessity and means for uniting the people's of Europe into one political body while preserving to each its national independence.

III. *Propaganda and Action*: The general strike.

The attitude of revolutionary Communists towards Anti-Semitism and Zionism (Jewish nationalism).

Co-operation and Neo-co-operation.

Tolstoyism.

The Committee, whose address is: L. Remy (provisional secretary), 71, rue Buffon, Paris, invites all groups to send their adhesions to the Congress as soon as possible.

(We will add, to make matters quite clear as to the second subject proposed, that the above questions must not, in our opinion, be considered as representing the opinion of the initiators of the Congress, but are simply communicated by them, as they were sent to them by this or that society or group. It will be well, if they are published in good time, to enable comrades everywhere to discuss these subjects among themselves and, if they do not intend to convey their opinion on them by means of a delegate, to do this by means of reports, resolutions, the press, etc. If in this way a number of questions are thoroughly discussed in various countries and the results brought to mutual knowledge by the Paris Committee and the Congress itself, an exchange of ideas will take place from which we are all sure to benefit. Further subjects for discussion should also be sent in good time).

THE HOUSING PROBLEM.

One of the easiest things to do in the world, is to find a solution. Quack remedies for existing disorders crop up, here and everywhere, in quite an alarming manner; if but twenty-five per cent of them were workable, there would be a speedy end to the social question.

Unfortunately, however, for the promoters of these schemes and, perhaps, fortunately for a long suffering public, a scheme is one thing, its practicability another. There is a certain class of Socialists who seem to be quite unable to fix their attention upon any settled view of the social situation, but flit hither and thither ready to take up any freak of the imagination, label it Socialism and imagine thereby an advance to the future. These gentlemen, at the present moment are filled with the idea that they can by some magical touch of the municipal wand, transform the slumland of the worker into a veritable paradise of sanitation and comfort. In other words they want to house the poor better than they are housed just now.

So do we who are Anarchists; nothing would please us better than to think that we could do something toward altering the lamentable conditions of the slum-dwellers. Anything that would tend to make life brighter would receive our heartiest support. But, we venture to affirm that it is impossible, within the limits of the existing society, to appreciably alter the conditions of these people.

Let us take our friend's claims as they occur to us. The Housing of the Working Classes Act gives to Corporations and other local governing bodies, the power to buy out slum landlords, pull down insanitary areas, and in other ways to deal with this matter. Very nice, it sounds well, and the mere statement of these "powers" is calculated to drive an appreciative—but thoughtless—audience to frantic applause!

But what is the extent of the "powers"? These "powers" are limited by the fact that a corporation can only borrow money equalling in value two years rateable value—a sum in any town most miserably inadequate to deal with an insanitary area. Most, if not all, slums are in or near the centre of our towns, and there the rateable values being high, land reaches an absurdly artificial price. We will assume that the slum is pulled down, you cannot put up cottage property on the same ground to meet the requirements of the dispossessed population; they were herded in single rooms before, and sanitation will not permit of that again, you have to increase the accommodation, you can't buy more land, you must deal with that area you have to deal with, and the consequence is that you put up "model" dwellings as you have done in Manchester, London, Birmingham, Glasgow and everywhere else where you have endeavoured the grapple with the matter. Yes, this is the issue: huge, unsightly prison-like barracks, where human beings are packed together, quite in accord with the latest requirements of sanitary "science" but absolutely devoid of all that which tends to make life comfortable and liveable. The inmates are surrounded by a host of vexatious regulations, rules and restrictions. From a standpoint of comfort, these dwellings are worse than the slums. Imagine a man, his wife and, perhaps, four or five children living at the top of one of these five-storied abortions! What chance do the youngsters have of getting out of the miserable whitewashed rooms; it becomes positively an irksome job for the people under these conditions to go out of their domicile at all. Another thing our reforming friends have forgotten: the original dwellers in slumland do not go to these "improved" dwellings, the rents in most cases are far too high, and are necessarily higher than they paid before, so they crowd into another district, and up springs another slum for the philanderers to play with!

The "practical" answers that the reformer had to meet objections with are as innumerable as they are absurd and trivial. Some propose to deal with the land value problem that arises by purchasing agricultural land—at purely nominal sums, you know!—and there at a distance of say three miles from the centre of the town erect cottages replete with all the latest improvements and possessing gardens and all else that the heart of a humble working man could desire. They miss

a point or two here. The agricultural land that they propose to purchase will go up in price the moment any considerable attempt is made, then the tram or train fares added to the rent will make the cost prohibitive to the very class that it was intended to benefit.

Scheme, try as much as our reforming friends like, they are face to face with failure at the best. We, who are Anarchists, have not thought lightly about these matters, one touch of happiness to the degraded and oppressed worker is certainly worth getting if we can, 'tis but human to want to cheer the downcast, to brighten if but with a smile the crooked path of our less fortunate brothers, but we are face to face with stern, cold and hard facts, and we have to have them shifted before we could give the slightest support, in any shape or form, to reform proposals.

The housing problem, inseparable as it is from the social problem, is but the effect of a cause: Capitalism with its protector, Government. People who live in slums, live there because they are poor; they are poor because they are robbed; if you want to get rid of the slum, you have first to better the workers' position; in order to do this you must stop the robber: Capitalism.

This means Revolution, and Anarchism stands for this. No reforms, say we, no tinkering, no halting, but hand in hand to the destruction of Private Property. We want no compromise, so far as our energies go we fight to remove the cause and know that only on the ruins of an effete and rotten society can there spring up that time of happiness for all, the mere thought of which stirs our hearts to still greater enthusiasm, and incites us to redouble our efforts for it.

W. M.

THE SITUATION IN SPAIN.

Since the movement in certain localities has assumed an active form, the regions of Catalonia, Valencia, and the Basque provinces threatening to revolt if autonomy were not granted them, the Cabinet has decided to elaborate a method of administrative decentralisation of so perfidious and jesuitical a nature that the sole Catalanian minister in the Silvela cabinet, Duran, has preferred to quit it. Before doing so, however, he stated to his colleagues that the crown of Castile was on the verge of losing Catalonia as it already had lost the Antilles and Philippines by refusing to acknowledge the moderate claims of those islands.

Prior to the resignation of the Minister of Justice, Duran, there had taken place that of the Minister of War, Gen. Polavieja, the murderer of Rizal, who preferred leaving the Cabinet to introducing financial reforms in his office. Polavieja has been replaced by Azcaraga, late a minister under Canovas and one of the principal organizers of the inquisitorial tortures in Montjuich. Ever since that terrible affair, the only War Ministers possible in Spain have been men of the type of Polavieja, Weyler, Despujols, Azcaraga and other emulators of Torquemada. The Jesuits, masters of Spain, supported by Capital and Authority, ordain that it shall be so; for thus only can be perpetuated a comedy thanks to which twenty innocent men remain in penal servitude, while the investigation which must precede the revision (already officially demanded) of the celebrated Montjuich trial is eternally postponed. This explains the constantly recurring explosions of anger at Barcelona, Saragossa, Cadiz, Castellon and Valencia, and which will probably end in a general strike, already mooted by Anarchist comrades in Spain. It is the only form of protest that remains, unless matters are ripening for what would be better—a revolution. For this the situation seems at present admirable. Economic conflicts mingle with social and political conflicts. The ratepayers of Catalonia and Valencia refuse to pay the newly-imposed taxes; the government replies by proclaiming a state of seige under exceptional conditions—i.e. by placing a refusal to pay the taxes under the head of acts of rebellion punishable by death. Only in Spain and Morocco could such things be witnessed. And it is the tiger Despujols, the Captain-General of Barcelona, who is charged with the execution of this decree. The matter promises surprises.

As for political parties, their bankruptcy has been a *chose accomplie* for long. Conventions and meetings mean absolutely nothing; disinterested, lacking public faith and honesty, they are unable to respond to the aspirations of the people. It is easily understood that this statement comprises all, from the reactionary Catholic party to that of the authoritarian Socialist. In Spain suffrage exists but in name. Ostensibly the people are the electors, but it is the government which elects. Ministerial candidates may be elected, but those among the opposition whom the government *permits to be elected*, are so elected on condition that they will merely make a farce and not a fact of opposition. Everyone knows this, the people best of all. This is why the Socialist political party has never had and never will have numerous adherents. In Barcelona there are but a score, whereas the libertarian Socialists may be counted by the thousand in spite of persecutions, assassinations, tortures and fusillades.

Let us hope then that the revolution will not keep us waiting. For this time it certainly will not be an insipid political movement, but one ushering in the dawn of a true and fruitful revolution—the libertarian and social revolution.

T. del MARMOL.

YOUNG or OLD?

If we want to know how old or how young a person is, we use a measure, time, such as days, months, years.

If you are twenty years old, you are called young; should you, however, be on the other side of forty, you are numbered among the old, as

belonging to the past. Your wrinkled face, your slightly stooping gait, your somewhat husky voice announce to the world that your time is up and that you must make room for the young, the blooming.

And yet how false, how unjust this is sometimes? Not long ago, I met a young man whose face was as smooth as a looking-glass, whose whole appearance proclaimed to you: I am young, I am full of life! And yet, after a few minutes conversation with him, I felt inclined to believe that he was a man of seventy. He had no wrinkles on his face; but how old, how wrinkled must be his heart. I could not detect in it any trace of enthusiasm for anything great, elevating; in his heart there reigned the darkest night, no ideal, no hope, everything therein so ordinary, so everyday-like. I could not help being struck by it, and my heart ached for the dreary and dull life of this young-old man.

Then again I met a man on whose face there were marks of a long and toiling life, creases and wrinkles out of number, the fingers twisted by hard, by life-long labour, his legs thin like sticks, and his hair scanty and grey. I thought how old, how worn out this poor man is! However, only a few minutes talk with him, and it seemed to me as if I stood before a young man who had only just stepped into life. What a bright fire sparkled in his eyes! What a passionate, fiery soul must be hidden in his breast! And I thought to myself: Your face may be ever so creased and wrinkled, you are still young, young, and young you will remain until your last hour will have struck on this earth.

Are you young or old? Are you one, who notwithstanding all the failures and disappointments of the past, still strives again to struggle afresh for that which is dear to you? Are you one who does not wave your hand at everything and say to yourself: "But what is the use of it?" Are you one who still cherishes hopes of winning in spite of all obstacles? Then,—then you are young, though in years you may count seventy.

If, however, you carry about your old wounds, and pick them, grumble over them, and busy yourself with them as if that were the only thing for you to do; just as if the present and future do not exist for you, if you cry and wail after the unreturning past. If in your heart there is not one gleam of hope, not the least inclination to join the ranks and to fight, then you may be ever so young in years, in reality you are old, old, yea dead!

And oh! how my heart grieves to look at you, you young old man. Youth desires to live. Youth desires to strive and fight against all that hinders life. Youth does not get frightened by difficulties; the greater the obstacle the more energy it uses in the struggle against it. The struggle becomes true life for him; the longer the battle the more he likes it. Youth knows not what it is to be tired. There is nothing impossible for youth: with his will he conquers the whole world.

In this sense, to be old is to live in darkness, hopelessness, despair; so called "cool calculation," the stillness of a cemetery, in which are buried the noblest strivings of the human mind.

(From the recently revived Yiddish Anarchist Communist paper "Die freie Arbeiterstimme" translated for "Freedom.")

Oct. 6. 1899.

"Sisters of Mercy."

The Good Shepherd of Nancy is not the sign of a French tavern as at first sight one might suppose, but the corporate name of a convent home for female orphans. The bishop of this diocese lately paid the home a pastoral visit; he seems, as the American colloquialism has it, to have "nosed around" to some purpose, for according to the *Temps Nouveaux* he writes as follows to a prelate in Rome:

"At this convent nothing is given to the orphans even though for five, ten, or twenty years they may have gained a great deal of money for the home by their work. On quitting they are thrust from the home without a penny, nor do the sisters endeavor to procure places for them or as much as invite them to come and see them from time to time. Many of these girls are not only without parents but without friends, and consequently are in peril from the moment they leave the convent. Of the sixty young women that these sisters sent away during the past year all, with the exception of two or three, to whom at my solicitation a little money was given, were turned adrift without resources. The utmost I could obtain, upon protestation to the Superior, was as I mention, a trifle given to two or three so that the donors could affirm they were not in the habit of sending away every girl penniless.

There is here a question not only of charity and morality but of justice, for the money these nuns expend on their building and other operations is almost entirely gained for them by the labor of the girls. We have here, in view of the ultimate fall of the poor creatures, a crime that calls for vengeance. . . . The one aim of these nuns is to gain money. In placing difficulties in the way of the orphans desiring to leave the convent by withholding all remuneration, the sisters find themselves able to retain the services of the cleverest for many years, sometimes altogether, and thus exploit their dexterity and labor to the best advantage for themselves. Among their recognised works of embroidery there is a class of household and body linen of such luxury and beauty, and of such a price, that I am told it is made expressly for courtesans. Someone remarked on this to the Superior, who answered: "they are the goods which bring us in most money," and had nothing further to say. Most, if not all, of the girls are forced to work for longer hours than the law permits, and when a factory inspector makes a call all the children under twelve are hurried from the workrooms; others, during several months of the year, on the plea of pressure of

work, are persuaded to give up their ordinary hours of recreation, while in order to obtain this and other sacrifices from them, promises of remuneration are made which are never kept. I am led to believe that the methods adopted in this convent are usual to all of this order; for were they unusual we should long since have had an indignant protest from the heads of other houses. Since there is silence, it is because these methods if an open are an approved secret."

In comment, another number of the same journal adds: "The bishop is a pastor of souls; he has undertaken the delicate task not alone of directing consciences. He should, thus, not only be a psychologist of the first rank, but understand humanity and society in the minutest detail of their complex organisation if anxious to explain his casuistry. Yet it is not so. Like every priest, like every pretentious meddler ready to play the part of a leader, he ignores the very a b c of his functions. With frank disregard of social facts, he would rouse the papal thunder against the methods adopted by the guardians of an orphan home, in which pious retreat, sheltered by discreet walls which protect from the sacrilegious curiosity of a world going to perdition, our good sisters shamelessly exploit the unhappy orphans given into their gentle keeping. From 4.30 a.m. to 8 p.m. they squeeze all the profit they possibly can from these children, and when at the end of some years they have, so to speak, extracted every drop of juice from them, they thrust them forth penniless into the street, as one might cast a rag into the dustbin.

Our bishop apparently ignores that the exploitation of the weak by the strong is the fundamental principle of a bourgeois society or that the greater the weakness the greater the exploitation. There are already laws regulating and limiting the labor of women and children. The bishop recognises this, and must recognise also that were they applied to the case in point every ingenious fraud that could be devised would be directed to their inefficacy. And this is the whole gist of the question. The most draconian of laws is impotent to protect labor against the rapacity of capital. There are laws prohibiting wolves from eating lambs, under pain of death if caught. Have wolves as yet modified their diet? Knowing the danger of discovery they simply resort to greater cunning. So would the Sisters of the Good Shepherd. So act all exploiters, all robbers of the great workshops and factories, all the stealers of patents, all the cornerers of huge trusts. In spite of the most rigorous laws, wolves still devour lambs. The solution lies not in the multiplication of laws and papal bulls, but in the suppression of the cause that divides the human race into wolves and sheep—Property."

Walsall Relief Fund.

Our comrade Cailes having been released on Saturday the 2nd we held a tea and social evening on Wednesday the 6th, as a reception and introduction. Charles, Cailes and Battola were present and the Treasurer presented each with the £19 9 3½ which the fund exactly divides into, as will be seen below.

Brot forward £47	7	2	X.	2	0	Rounds	1	0
Eyges list 5			Esergal	1	0	Brownsworth		6
J. Wineston	6		Miss T. W.		6	Lazy one	1	0
J. Greenberg	6		Mrs. Clara		6	Enterprise concert		
L. Hyams	6		Berusoff	1	0	2nd instalment	7	6
I. Leibman	6		A.		6	Legsdon's list		
Silverstein	6		list 3			F. T. Schmitt	1	0
Tapel	6		J. Watt		3	C. Fimmermuer	1	0
list 6			J. Gould		3	Rudolph Selinma	1	0
Lief	6		S. Hall		3	M. Gellman's list		
Robinowich	6		W. Hall		3	M. Gellman	1	0
M. Witcop	1	0	J. Hockin		3	N. Silverman	1	6
Louis Hall	6		Nairn Jappe		3	M. Koransky		6
M. Kossoy	1	0	A. Teploff		1	M. Weinberg	1	0
Fanny Vidkov	6		L. Nagel		1	H. Herman	1	0
L. B.	6		C. P.		3	Eyges list 2		
L. B.	6		D. Kozis		3	E. Minka	1	0
T. Eyges	6		Solidor		6	P. Petrashen		6
C. A. B. V. per			Mathias' list			Rosin		6
Weisheit	1	0	Mathias	1	0	Cinovski		6
Norwich Com'tee			X. X. Z.	2½		Total	£58	7 10½
per A. Segon	7	17	Strie	1	0	T. CANTWELL.		
Per Rhodes	1	0	E. M.	1	0			

To the Editor of FREEDOM.

Is the State the enemy?

A note or two in reply to W. M.'s rejoinder under the above heading in last month's "Freedom" may not be out of place. W. M.'s misunderstanding of the remedy for social ills springs from an insufficient grasp of the cause of those ills. His theory that they are not caused by the State is wrong, because at bottom the ills are older than the State.

Life has now three great sides—the physical, mental and moral. When life first appeared upon the earth the evidence goes to show that it was only physical. As evolution proceeded there came a time when mentality began to germinate and develop. Still later in the chain of ascent from the amoeba to man came morality. Morality was a development of reason just as reason was a development of the purely physical existence.

The development of morality is chiefly shown by a growth of mutual trust and goodwill. The modern State expresses the amount of goodwill and mutual trust generated in man up-to-date. This is, as will be seen therefore, precious little. W. M.'s illustration of the crows is misplaced. It does not follow that man is particularly higher than the crows. Man and the crow are the product of different lines of evolution.

The remedy is not to abolish the State; it is to generate more goodwill and trust in one's fellows. The State is only the expression of a great underlying defect of character.

THOMAS REECE.

Emma Goldman's Lecture Tour,

The following is a list of lectures that she is prepared to deliver, leaving it to the judgment of the comrades to select which they please:

- | | |
|---|---|
| I. <i>The Aim of Humanity.</i> | IX. <i>America: the land of the Free and the home of the Brave.</i> |
| II. <i>Religion.</i> | X. <i>Politics: their corrupting influence on Man.</i> |
| III. <i>Patriotism.</i> | XI. <i>Strikes and their effect on the American Worker.</i> |
| IV. <i>The Basis of Morality.</i> | XII. <i>Marriage.</i> |
| V. <i>A Criticism of Ethics.</i> | XIII. <i>The New Woman.</i> |
| VI. <i>The Origin of Evil.</i> | XIV. <i>Sex Problems.</i> |
| VII. <i>Authority versus Liberty.</i> | |
| VIII. <i>Why I am an Anarchist Communist.</i> | |

H. KELLY, *Freedom* office,
127 Ossulston St. London, N.W.

REPORTS.

Our comrade Emma Goldman having arrived from the United States delivered the opening lecture of her present tour at Christchurch Hall, Spitalfields, on Saturday evening Nov. 18 to a large audience. The lecture was under the auspices of the *Workers' Friend* Group and was the first of a series that she will deliver in the same hall. Her subject was "The New Woman" and the lecture was delivered in German. Judging from the size of the audience (from 600 to 700), the frequent and generous applause which marked both the lecture itself and her reply to the questions put to her as well as the comments of various comrades afterwards, the lecture was a complete success.

The following day, Nov. 19, our comrade lectured at the Athenæum Hall, Tottenham Court Rd. at 4 p.m. in English on "The Aim of Humanity" to a fairly good crowd, the lecture was effectively put and well received. The usual number of questions, both silly and sensible, were asked and satisfactorily answered. The discussion brought out some new and some old debaters, there was the man who thought the picture of the unemployed overdrawn and that in most cases men who lost their work did so through their own fault. Then there was a highly intellectual young biologist who informed us that the lecturer in common with other Anarchists wasted too much time on the trivial and unimportant questions of life such as food, clothing, shelter etc.; that, after all, these were mere kitchen questions and not to be compared with the "higher life" etc., etc. he then waded into biological phrasiology and floundered so helplessly that our comrade Muir came to his rescue and landed him on terra firma again. Muir's remarks to the young man on the elements of biology were caustic, but kindly; and may set him thinking. Let us hope so. There was also the bread-and-butter man who had something to say from his standpoint. The critics were answered and a very successful meeting came to a close.

On Friday evening Nov. 24 our comrade delivered her second German lecture at Christchurch Hall; the subject being "Why I am an Anarchist-Communist". The meeting was similar in many respects to the one the previous week; from 400 to 500 were present at this lecture, and in addition to a series of questions there was an animated discussion in which our comrade Wess took part to the evident satisfaction of the audience.

On Sunday afternoon, Nov. 26, she delivered her second English lecture at the Athenæum Hall, on "Woman." The hall was well filled—a remarkable thing for London in these apathetic days; for, barring Kropotkin's lecture, it was better attended than any of the lectures given in this hall last winter. John Turner was in the chair; questions were so numerous that the time for discussion was well-nigh consumed. Two women took part in it, and the bread-and-butter man was again present and amused the audience by his criticism of women and his expectation of a hot time when he got home. Emma replied and we adjourned for tea.

On Saturday evening Dec. 2, she delivered her third German lecture at Christchurch Hall, the subject being "Patriotism." As at the two preceding lectures the hall was well filled and the lecture was a success in every way—if we except the Social Democrat who, because he was not allowed to speak for forty-five minutes in the discussion, protested that the Anarchists did not believe in liberty.

On Sunday afternoon Dec. 3, a third lecture was given in the Athenæum Hall, this time in German. The subject was "Authority versus Liberty" and the hall was well filled. An interesting discussion took place and everybody with exception of the critics seemed well pleased.

Our comrade Goldman went to Leeds on Dec. 10. for a short stay; the comrades there have a number of meetings arranged in Leeds and one at Bradford, so she will be kept busy. She will return to London on Dec. 23. and will remain here until Jan. 19., when she will go to Glasgow and begin her provincial tour. Needless to say, a number of meetings will be arranged in London during her stay from Dec. 23. to Jan. 19.

Friday evening, Nov. 10, saw the Workmen's Club and Institute crowded on the eleventh commemoration of the death of the Chicago Martyrs.

Comrade H. M. Kelly opened the meeting, by reminding us of the object of the meeting and taking us back to the time when this cold-blooded judicial murder was perpetrated by the governing classes of America upon our comrades of Chicago. He also told us that some of the miserable wretches who played a prominent part in this horrible tragedy have gone where they sent our comrades. The chairman of the Court that sentenced our comrades to death, has recently been sent to prison, for embezzling the money of a society of which he was an official. This of course gives us a glimpse into the character of the men who judged our comrades in 1886.

Lothrop Withington, in his usual style then spoke, and after telling us of our brave comrades and their death and the reason of it, called our attention to the present war. He said that this was one of the most shameful, disgraceful wars that have ever been waged by any people.

P. Kropotkin was unfortunately unable to attend owing to his suffering from a severe cold. He sent a letter which was read there, regretting his absence and sending his best wishes to all comrades, he hoped this meeting would meet with success.

Emma Goldman, who was to have spoken at that meeting, not having arrived, we were deprived the pleasure of hearing her on that occasion.

Louise Michel spoke in French. Her speech was translated by Withington. Amongst other things, she said we should be patient and work steadily for the Social Revolution.

T. del Marmol said that we do not want to be patient, but what we do want is to act. Only speaking about things does not do; but action is necessary. Our comrades in Chicago spoke and acted. The Cubans do not speak, but fight for Independence. What we want is action and nothing short of that will bring our ideas into being.

I. Cipplan, who spoke in Yiddish, said that we came there to commemorate the martyrdom of our Chicago comrades, who paid with their lives for the ideas they

held. The most striking feature of that case, and like cases, is: that though the governing classes are at present in a position to dictate to us how we shall live, they cannot dictate to us how we shall die. The death of our Chicago comrades can testify to the truth of that assertion. He asked: how miserably disappointed must have been the officials been who stood there and heard their last words. Comrade Tcherkesov spoke in Russian.

Comrade F. Charles, one of the victims of the Walsall plot, who being present was asked to say a few words and was received with hearty applause, said that he was glad to be once more amongst comrades, to meet some old faces and so many new ones. His experience in the last few years has confirmed still more his Anarchist ideas. He had lived under a sort of State Socialist arrangement. The State provided him with food, shelter and work, but he thought that something more than that was necessary for human happiness. He did not at all appreciate that sort of life. His experiences have also still more convinced him of the brotherly feeling and good nature of human beings. Though the officials with their prison laws are trying their utmost to kill all such feeling amongst fellow prisoners and inflicting most severe punishment for the least help rendered to a fellow prisoner, they would still help one another.

Our talented friend Miss Jenny Atkinson, with her beautiful voice, admirably rendered the song that our deceased comrade Parsons sung on the last night of his life, *Annie Laurie*, which was encored, and others. J. M.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

Freedom Guarantee Fund.—N. 5s., Kampffmeyer 5s., H. K. 5s., N. W. T. 15s., S. K. 10s., Free Commune Group 5s., Canning Town 1/6, D. 5s., Marmol 5s., J. M. 1/6, A. C. 1s.
Annual Subscriptions.—A. D. Taylor 1/6, Hill 1/6, Pyburn 1/8, F. W. Lear 2s., Carter 1s., Ebenhoh 1/5, Trebitsch 1s., Court Norman 1/7, Muirhead to end of 1900 5s., Holland 1/9, Stanton 2s.
Donations Publication Fund.—R. C. M. 1s., Kahn 5s., Surplus from Tea 1/6.
Sales of FREEDOM.—Newsagents 6/3, 2/8½, Leeds 4s., Canning Town 2/8, Office 9s. Liverpool 9s., Norwich 2/8, Notkin 8/6, Leeds 12/8, Withington 1s., Barton 6s. H. Taylor 1/6
Sales of FREEDOM Pamphlets.—Notkin 21/6, Norwich 6/8, Liverpool 3s.

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. BY PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
No. 5. ANARCHY. BY E. MALATESTA. 1d.
No. 6. ANARCHIST MORALITY. BY PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
No. 8. ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. BY C. M. WILSON. ½d.
No. 10. ANARCHISM: ITS PHILOSOPHY AND IDEAL. 1d.
No. 11. THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE. BY PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.

SPECIAL NOTICE.

In future we must request that all orders for pamphlets be accompanied with cash. We are compelled to adhere to this as we need funds for reprinting.

Other Pamphlets.

- LAW AND AUTHORITY. BY PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. BY ELYSEE RECLUS. 1d.
AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. BY PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
The Chicago Martyrs: their speeches in Court. with Governor Altgeld's Reasons for Pardoning Fielden, Schwab and Neebe. Demy octavo, 168 pages with group portrait and picture of the memorial in Waldheim Cemetery on good paper. Published by A. Isaak, 236 Clinton Park, San Francisco, at 25 cents, or may be obtained of T. Cantwell, 127 Ossulston St., London, N.W., for one shilling. Cash must accompany all orders.
GOD AND THE STATE. BY MICHAEL BAKOUNINE. Price fourpence.
THE TABLES TURNED; OR, NUPKINS AWAKENED. A Socialist interlude. BY WILLIAM MORRIS. 1s. each.
(Only a few of these original copies left.)
THE COMMUNE OF PARIS. BY WILLIAM MORRIS, E. BELFORT BAX and VICTOR DAVE. 2d.
SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN GERMANY. BY GUSTAV LANDAUER. ½d.
MONOPOLY; OR, HOW LABOR IS ROBBED. BY WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
BIBLIOGRAPHIE DE L'ANARCHIE par M. NETTLAU. Preface d' ELYSEE RECLUS; Brussels, 51 rue des Eperonniers, 1897; 294 pp. 5 francs; post free for 4 shillings prepaid.
DIRECT ACTION VERSUS LEGISLATION, a new pamphlet by J. Blair Smith. Price one penny.



Cosmopolitan

ALL KINDS OF PRINTING
IN ALL LANGUAGES
AT MODERATE PRICES

T. CANTWELL.

127, Ossulston Street, (Euston Road)
LONDON, N. W.

Printery

"FREEDOM" CAN BE OBTAINED AT:

London,

Otto Matthias, 20 Little Pultney Street, Wardour Street, W.
Heiligenstein, 39 Charlotte Street, Fitzroy Square.
F. A. Jones, 9 Little Queen Street, Holborn, W. C.

W. Reeves, 185 Fleet Street, E. C.

B. Ruderman, 71 Hanbury Street, Spitalfields, E.

E. Pelletier, 56 Charlotte Street, Tottenham Court Road, W.

Free Commune office, 79 Markham Avenue, Harehills, Leeds.

Blair Smith, 15 Sunnybank Street, Dalmarnock.

J. Welsh, 37 King Street, Ardwick.

Can be seen at Laycocks Coffee House, Kirkgate.

M. Maisel, 54 Madison Street.

Philadelphia, N. Notkin, 242 North 2nd Street, Pa., U. S. A.

Printed and Published by J. TURNER, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N. W.