

# Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. 5.—No. 55.

JUNE, 1891.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

## THE RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT AND THE JEWS.

Who has not read the description of a whale chase? Who has not read how the monstrous beast, who would hardly know it if he swallowed a man, is pursued in cockle-shells of boats, any one of which he could overturn—and he often does it—by one lash of his tail? Who does not know that despite this enormous disparity of physical strength between the whale and his foes, he sinks in the end before their intelligent combined action, and floats a lifeless mass upon the waves, the victim of the skilful manœuvring of harpoon and line? But first, what floundering and splashing and spouting, what hair-breath escapes for whale and men! And sometimes the whale gets off, and sometimes the men are drowned, and sometimes, when the whale seems to have got away scot-free, he only rids himself of one crew of enemies to be pierced to the quick by the harpoons of another.

There are monstrous agglomerations floundering in the social life of to-day, which somehow suggest a whale diving and spouting and lashing the water to destroy its would-be destroyers; corporations and classes united into one body by some fancied common interest, and beset by the needs and aspirations of the rest of mankind. In every progressive community one sees them striking out blindly in this direction and that, wildly endeavouring to save themselves at any cost and by any means. The more desperate their situation, the more frantic their struggles. "Those whom the gods will destroy they first make mad," says the old Greek proverb.

That monstrous aggregation of human beings bound together by prejudice, ambition, greed, and fear, and collectively known as the Russian Government, certainly seems "fey" just now, and its furious contortions are affecting the social life of the civilised world. For in our times of international trade, and finance, and easy communication, a government cannot reduce itself to the verge of bankruptcy by reckless gambling and universal corruption, turn out its population wholesale, grind down those who remain to a state of desperation, and by every sort of barbarous persecution crush out the intelligence and enterprise of its more enlightened citizens, without seriously affecting the condition of its neighbours. At the present moment, when the social atmosphere is charged with revolutionary electricity, it is impossible to say in which direction the storm may first break forth; but financial complications are still more likely now to play their part in precipitating the outburst than in the last century, when they contributed so handsomely to bring about the French Revolution. And Russia is a standing menace to the peace, such as it is, of the financial world. The Russian Government stands desperately in need of money, with its immense crowd of officials, whose stickiness of finger even beats that of their like in the U. S. A., the enormous expenses of its standing army, its would-be first-class navy, and its innumerable gang of police agents. It has borrowed from the capitalists of other countries vast sums of money, which it has no means of repaying, when they fall due, except by borrowing afresh. To get these new loans it must keep its credit good, and especially pay the covenanted rate of interest regularly in gold. This interest is paid from as much of the produce of the State gold mines as does not slip into the pockets of contractors and officials on the way. Some millions sterling are lodged with some great financial house in Western Europe who lend at interest as much of it as is not immediately wanted. This Russian business is a doubtful blessing to the financier who accepts it, for the Russian Government, being hard-up and reckless, are liable to call their balance in at three months' notice, and by so doing have ruined two successive agents of theirs in the last few years, *i.e.*, the Comptoir d'Escompte, in Paris, and, last year, Baring Brothers, in London. Baring had lent the gold to the Argentine and Uruguay Governments, who could not repay it on call, and everyone remembers the threatened panic and disturbance of English industry, which the Bank of England rushed into the breach to stave off. Now, even according to the confessions of the Minister of State Domains, in his last official report, the proceeds of the State gold mines were falling off 11 per cent. every year, on an average, between 1883-8, as compared to 1879-83. Thus while it becomes yearly more difficult to wring the taxes from the miserable peasants, and the enormous import duties bring in less than the Finance Minister expected, because the people are too poor to buy at the exorbitant prices they cause, the gold supply with which the foreign interest must be paid is actually decreasing. No wonder the Russian Government is fidgety with their European

balance. After Baring's failure they were obliged to transfer their business to the Jewish House of Rothchild; no other financier being strong enough to take the risk. And to Rothchild (the Paris House) was confided the conduct of a conversion scheme, for the details of which we refer our readers to an article on "Russian Finance" in the *Fortnightly Review* for February last. Suffice it to say that the object of it was to meet present difficulties by postponing the repayment of a loan until M. Vishnegradsky and Co. should have gone over to the majority, and be no longer liable to suffer from the disagreeables of national insolvency and probable revolution.

It seems inconceivable that men in their senses should thus put their fortunes into the hands of a powerful clique, and then proceed to flout and insult those connected with them by blood and interest. *Punch* had an excellent cartoon last month: the fawning Muscovite in the character of Antonio borrowing the three thousand ducats from Shylock, who stands indignant in his flowing Jewish gabardine, and turns upon him:—

"You come to me and you say,  
*Shylock, we would have monies*; you say so;  
You, that did void your rheum upon my beard,  
And foot me, as you spur a stranger cur  
Over your threshold; monies is your suit!  
What should I say to you? Should I not say,  
*Hath a dog monies?*"

Probably the Russian Antonio reckoned the Shylock of to-day an Individualist pure and simple, holding considerations of humanity for so much maudling sentimentalism. But it is never safe to reckon without human solidarity, even amongst thieves. The Jewish trading community stand by one another far closer than the traders of other races, and all over Europe its ramifications are prodigious.\* There is competition of Jew against Jew, and exploitation of Jew by Jew, but amongst classes of Jews with an interest in common there is a keener appreciation of the mutual utility of standing solid, than amongst most other people. For instance, the Jewish firms on the London Stock Exchange, and they are the majority of the wealthiest firms there, help one another through difficult times, as the English firms never do, except in cases of special personal friendship. Partly it is the natural drawing together for self-defence of a race who for ages have sojourned as persecuted strangers in a strange land; partly it is the native farsighted shrewdness which has shown them that mutual aid pays.

Be all this as it may, the Russian Government have reckoned without their host. Messrs. Rothchild, since the Jews have been exiled wholesale from Russia, have found the state of the markets inconvenient for the proposed conversion scheme. The Russian Government are making desperate efforts to get gold for their present needs, have drawn off a million last week from the London Rothchilds and will draw more, are buying all they can get in New York, and generally keeping the money markets of the world in a fluster. They will get along for this time no doubt, but it behoves all revolutionists, watching the danger signals of the time, to keep an eye upon them and the disturbances in credit which they cause. For credit is the air-bladder which floats the capitalist system, and with it the lives and fortunes of the workers who are its slaves.

But why this mad outburst of the Russian Government against the Jews? Space fails us to more than allude to the harpoons clinging on all sides to the monster's flanks. There is the out and out revolutionary movement. There is the irritating countenance and support its constitutional side has found in England and America; the outcry about Siberian atrocities, the exposure of Polish iniquities, the Exile Escape fund, the Refugee fund, public meetings of protest, and *Free Russia*. There is the continual agitation and disaffection amongst the peasants, and the increasing difficulties of flogging out their ever growing arrears of taxes. There is the ever-lasting discontent of the town workmen, the students, the middle class, the upper class, dissatisfied

\* Take, for instance, the city of Warsaw, in relation to which the statistics of the proportion of Jewish to native traders happen to have been lately published by Consul General Grant. The trades and industries of the city are almost entirely in the hands of Jews; higher branches of commerce 16 Jews to every 3 Poles; lower branches, 19 Jews to 2 Poles; agency and brokerage businesses, 43 Jews to 1 Pole; large industrial enterprises, 63 per cent in the hands of Jews. There is hardly a business centre, London included, where a considerable portion, if not the majority, of the most successful commercial and trading houses are not Jews, and these larger firms are connected with endless small ones.

with the restrictions on education, on science, on literature, on business, on every profession and avocation of daily life. The victims of "Russification," whose comparatively free national institutions, and even their native language, have been suppressed, the victims of religious persecutions, who have been imprisoned or exiled for not conforming to the State church, each and all go to swell the chorus of dissatisfaction. The financial position we have seen is a perpetual menace. The government must do something to divert public attention—so it has fallen foul of the Jews; driving honest, hardworking citizens, by hundreds of thousands, from their homes and all they possess, to wander poverty-stricken and wretched to foreign lands, on the plea that these are the cause of the national want of prosperity. Exploiters of any race are a curse to the community where they dwell, but the blind wrath of the Russian Government has fallen in chief part on the poorest of the Jewish workers, and in any case, where in Russia can be found an exploiter so abominable as the Government itself?

## FREEDOM AND PROPERTY.

### IV.

THE producer has an acknowledged claim on the produce, we have said. A claim rendered confused and vague by the wage system and by the property law of to-day, but still generally recognised amongst civilised men as having theoretically some justice in it. Why? To discover we must make a careful analysis of the relation between producer and produce. It is a relationship not quite so simple as may appear at the first glance to those who have been accustomed to take it for granted without thinking much about it. As there is no question which leads us more directly to the root of the Anarchist position, we propose to dwell upon it at some length.

When a man claims a thing on the ground that he is its producer, he certainly does not mean that he has made it out of nothing, as God was supposed, in the ancient Jewish legend, to have made the world. No man has yet succeeded in adding a single element to those which, as far as can be discovered, singly or in combination are the component parts of every existing object. And each element possesses its own inherent properties, its own inherent force which man can neither diminish nor increase. All that any man can do is to set these elements in motion, causing them by force of their own natures to part company, to associate, to coalesce in various forms, to unite in different proportions. As J. S. Mill says: "Putting things into fit places for being acted upon by their own integral forces, and by those residing in other natural objects, is all that man does, or can do, with matter." The relation then of the producer to the produce, upon which his claim to ownership in it is founded, depends solely upon this "setting in motion," this "putting"; in fact, upon the transmission of the energy in the man to the substance wherewith he is dealing. Therefore, when the producer of a material product directly (or indirectly through some medium) sets in motion the matter of which it is to be formed, he is actually putting something which was in him into it. The thoroughness and closeness of the relation he thus enters into with the product depends on the completeness with which he expends the energy of his whole being in the process, added to the amount of energy he expends. When a man puts into the production of anything the energy of his muscles, his will and his mind, with the utmost intensity of which he is capable, during the whole of the most energetic period of his life; his relation to that thing as its producer is the completest and most thorough possible. Thus the strength of the relation between producer and produce varies according to its completeness, to its intensity while it endures, and to the length of its duration. And, we hold, with the strength of the relation between them varies the strength of the producer's claim (in the character of producer merely) to the product. In other words, the more the thing fashioned embodies of the personality of the fashioner, the stronger his claim to decide how it shall be used.

So much for a general summary of our position. Let us now work it out more in detail; and to begin with, let us take a very simple and trivial example and look closely into the various essential factors concerned in the productive process.

Harry, a very ordinary, Nineteenth Century young Englishman, is walking along a country lane and sees a stick that takes his fancy growing in the hedge. He climbs the bank, cuts off the branch, trims and peels it, carries it home, steams it and ties the top to a curve he likes for a handle; then he lays the stick to dry and harden and finally polishes it and puts on a steel ferule. Obviously this smart walking stick differs considerably from the branch growing in the hedge. It is still wood, but wood whose form, surface and tissue have been modified by the action of many agencies, which we may classify, according to their nature, in three divisions.

In the first place, these changes have been effected by the action and counter-action of that combination of matter we call wood, with all its inherent properties and forces, and a succession of other combinations of matter, with their inherent properties and forces—steel, steam, string, air, polishing materials, etc. If any of these had been wanting, or had been in themselves other than they were, the result would not have been produced. So here we have class one of essential agencies—the non-human.

In the second place, that these substances should have been so combined and arranged as to act upon one another for the production of the walking stick implies the strenuous activities of countless human

beings for countless ages. Firstly, all the activities which have gone to prepare the natural agents which we have seen acting upon the stick. Secondly, all the activities which have gone to prepare the idea of a walking stick, as it exists for the community whereof Harry is a member. Thirdly, all the activities which have gone to prepare Harry in mind and body to use that idea and those natural agents effectively. It is bewildering to attempt to realise the vast amount of human energy which is thus, indirectly but essentially, a factor in such a simple productive process as we are considering. If Harry had been living in England many thousand years ago and wanted to cut himself a tough staff, he would have had to hunt about for a sharp stone or piece of the bone of some dead beast. Later he would have had a ready-split flint flake for the purpose and later on again might have possessed a flint knife, tied into a rough wooden handle. Long ages after that a bronze dagger would have been an available implement. The other day, so to speak, if Harry had been one of the earliest Englishmen to emigrate from the mainland to this island, he might have been able to cut his stick with an iron blade. A steel-bladed, folding pocket knife is a very modern luxury. As with the knife, so with all other agents employed in the transformation of the branch into the walking stick. The string, the steaming apparatus, the polish, all involve the muscular and mental activities of numberless men; from the first wild savages who happened to bethink them of trying to divide something by rubbing it with a sharp stone or bone, or fastening things together with grasses and withes of creeper, or heating water, etc., etc., on to the expert steel founders, cutlers, string makers, etc., etc., of to-day. So again as regards that general idea of a walking stick which is the common property of the society where Harry was born, so that he and all around him received it as they received impressions of horses or trees, without intending to do so or taking any trouble about it. Nevertheless the perception of a walking stick differs from the perception of a growing branch just by reason of the activities of human beings involved therein, from the ingenious expedient of those primitive ape-like animals who thought of picking up a broken bough to support their shaky steps when they walked on their hind legs, to their far more intelligent descendants who conceived the idea of purposely breaking off branches to lean upon. And so on through those endless generations of men who have exercised their brains and hands upon the manifold diversity of staves and crutches which have been forerunners of the modern walking-stick. Further, there is Harry's own fitness in mind and body to use what has been prepared for him, a fitness in which the activities of the human beings surrounding him have played a considerable part. We are not speaking of his faculties and perceptions in general. His faculties have been developed, his perceptions suggested by his education and social surroundings and in bearing their part in the whole of his mental and physical life, have all been strongly influenced by the activities of other human beings. Such general considerations would lead us here too far afield; but if we glance only at the knowledge and skill directly required to enable him to make use of the non-human and human agencies required for making his stick, we see at once that he is immensely indebted to the activities of others. He has learnt from others the uses of knives, string, steam, etc., the practical capacities of these things, and where to get and how to apply them for the special object he has in view. In fact both the main idea and the processes for its realisation have been given to him by means of other people's activities. Here then we have the second class of agencies essential to the production of the walking-stick, *i.e.*, the indirect human activities involved.

However there is evidently another essential factor in the case, a third agency, without which the other two could not be brought into action, and this, of course, is—Harry. Whatever it may have received from other things and other people the piece of wood has received something special and definite from him. "Well," you may say impatiently, "it is quite obvious what he has done. He has applied some energy, which before was lying stored up in himself, or which he was expending otherwise, in setting the wood and the other agencies concerned in motion." True; but so general a statement is something like the first rough charcoal sketch for a picture. It enables us to realise very faintly what is actually implied by it. Let us take the first stage of the productive process and examine it more particularly.

By an expenditure of his nervous and muscular energy Harry severs the bough from the parent plant. But he would have done exactly the same—expended just as much nervous and muscular energy if he had been scrambling through the hedge and broken the branch off accidentally. And the energy transmitted by a stone, if it effected the same result in rolling down from the cliff above, would be much the same in amount. Yet under these circumstances, Harry would be about as likely as the stone to put forward a claim to the broken bough in the character of its producer, if he should chance afterwards to discover he had broken it. Obviously, in severing it for a walking-stick he has expended more than the nervous and muscular energy required by the mechanical action of severing. He has severed the piece of wood of set purpose. He has put into the action energy of will.

It is a common-place of observation how fast and how thoroughly a man may exhaust his energy by the exercise of his will. We all know that when a man "works with a will," "puts his heart [it should be "his will"] into what he is about," he is sooner knocked up and obliged to rest before he can go on again than if he is merely exerting himself mechanically or listlessly plodding along. And this happens just the same if the work he is about is work of brain or of hand. Further, we know that a man may be utterly exhausted without stirring a finger, simply by having to make a great effort of will. What ever the human will may be—and no one seems yet to have lit upon

a satisfactory definition or explanation of it—there is no doubt that its exercise involves expenditure of energy. Therefore when he cuts the branch, Harry is expending his energy in a twofold manner; through his muscles and the nerves which direct their mechanical action and through his exercise of will. But this two-fold expenditure of energy on his part would have taken place just the same if he had intentionally cut off the stick merely because it was in his way when he wanted to get through the hedge. And if he had picked the severed stick up and, being in a bad temper, had carried it away with him and hit all the stones and bushes he passed until he had smashed the stick to pieces, he would most probably have expended as much energy both of muscle and will as if he had taken all needful measures to transform the rough bough into a walking-stick. Evidently then Harry's energy, when he sets about producing a walking-stick, is expended in some third way, which we have yet to analyse.

## A T A L K

ABOUT

## ANARCHIST COMMUNISM

BETWEEN TWO WORKERS.

BY ENRICO MALATESTA.

(Continued from previous number.)

*William.* But now tell me: how would it be if an arrangement were made with the owners of property: they to contribute the land and capital and we the work; the produce to be shared between us and them? What do you say to that?

*Jack.* First of all I say that if you were willing to go shares, ten to one your master would be willing to do nothing of the sort. You would be obliged to use force to bring him to it. But in that case, why do things by halves? Why content yourself with a system which allows injustice and parasitism to continue and prevents the increase of production? And further, what right have certain men who do not work to come and take half of what is produced by the workers? Besides, as I have told you, it is not only that half the produce would go to the employers, but that the sum total of produce would be less than it might be, because where you have private property and isolated labour less is produced than by working in common. It is like when you want to move a rock: a hundred men would not succeed by trying singly, whereas by uniting their efforts two or three can raise it easily. If one man wished to make a pin, I don't know if he could get through it in an hour; whereas ten men working into each other's hands can make thousands of pins a day. Economists, many of whom have let themselves be scandalously biased by class prejudice, have often said that poverty is not the result of the seizure of property by the upper classes, but of the scarcity of natural products, which would, say they, be quite insufficient, if they were distributed to all men. This enables the said economists and their disciples to conclude that poverty is an inevitable thing, against which no measures can be taken. Don't believe a word of it. Even as things are organised to-day, the produce of the earth and of industry is enough to enable every man to live in comfort; and if it is not more abundant, that is the employers' fault. They think of nothing but how much they can gain, and even go so far as to destroy articles or let them go to waste merely to keep up the price. Whilst they pretend there is not enough natural wealth, they are leaving large tracts of country uncultivated and numbers of workmen with nothing to do. But, answer a certain school of economists, even when all ground is brought under cultivation and tilled as intelligently as may be, still the productive power of the earth is limited and the increase of population is not. Therefore there must always come a moment when the production of food stuffs will be stationary, whilst population will go on growing indefinitely and with it famine. The sole remedy, they conclude, for social ills is that the poor should have very few children. I'm not very learned about the law of rent but I'm sure this remedy is no cure for our social evils. You have only to look at countries where there is plenty of land and a scanty population; you will see as much or more poverty as where population is dense. We must change our social organisation and bring all the land under cultivation, and then, if the population seems growing too fast, we can consider how to check it. But let us go back to the question of produce-sharing between property-owner and workman. It is a system which used to exist in parts of France in field work. It still exists in Tuscany, but it is gradually disappearing because the landowners find day-labour pay them better. Now-a-days, what with machines, scientific culture and foreign produce, the masters are obliged to farm on a large scale and employ hired labourers. If they don't, they are ruined by competition. If the present system goes on, I believe that property will be more and more concentrated in the hands of a few, and the workers reduced to utter wretchedness by machinery and rapid methods of production. We shall have a few big financiers and capitalists masters of the world, a certain number of workmen attending upon the machines, and a number of servants and police to wait on and defend the aforesaid big men. The mass of the people will have to die of hunger or live on charity. The beginnings of such a state of things may already be seen; small

properties are disappearing, the numbers of out-o'-works increases, the gentlefolks, from fear or from pity, busy themselves with soup kitchens and the schemes of General Booth. If the people do not wish to be reduced to beg their bread from rich philanthropists or Local Boards, as they once did at the gates of monasteries, let them lose no time in taking possession of the land and machinery and working on their own account.

*William.* But how would it do if Government were to make some good laws to force rich people not to make the poor suffer?

*Jack.* The same old story, William! Isn't the government made up of gentlefolks, and is it likely that they will make laws against themselves? But even supposing the poor could manage to take their turn at governing, would that be a reason for leaving the rich with the means of getting the upper hand again? Rely upon it, wherever there are rich and poor, the poor may make their voices heard for a moment during an outbreak, but the rich will always get hold of the power in the end. This is why we, if we are the stronger for ever so short a time, must at once take property away from the rich, so that they may not have the means of putting things back as they were before.

*William.* I understand. We must have a real Republic, make all men equal, and then the man who works will eat, and the man who does nothing can go with an empty stomach. Ah me! I'm sorry I'm old. You young folks will see a good time.

*Jack.* Softly, softly, friend! By the word "Republic" you mean the Social Revolution, and for those who understand you that is all very well. But you are expressing yourself badly; for what is commonly understood by a Republic is not at all what you mean. Get it well into your head that republican government is a government like the rest; only instead of a king there is a president and ministers, who really have just the same powers. We see that very plainly across the Channel, and even if the French had the democratic republic promised by their radicals, they wouldn't be any better off. Instead of two Chambers they would have one, the Chamber of Deputies, but wouldn't the people be forced to be soldiers and to work like slaves all the same, in spite of all the fine promises of the gentlemen deputies? Don't you see that as long as there are rich and poor, the rich will have the upper hand? Whether we live under a Republic or a Monarchy the results which spring from private property will always exist. Whilst economic relations are regulated by competition, property will be concentrated in a few hands, machines will take work from working men and the masses will be reduced to misery. Have any of the Republics that exist seriously bettered the condition of the working classes?

*William.* Well to be sure! And I always believed that Republic meant equality!

*Jack.* Yes, the republicans say so, and this is how they make it out; "Under a really democratic Republic," say they, "the members of parliament who make the laws are elected by the whole people. Consequently when the people are not contented, they change their M.P.'s for better ones and everything comes right. And as the poor are the great majority, it is practically they who govern." That is what the republicans say, but the reality is something quite different. The very poverty of the poor causes them to be ignorant and superstitious, and they will remain so as long as they are not economically independent and are unconscious of their true interests. You and I who have been lucky enough to earn more than some and to be able to teach ourselves a little, may have intelligence to understand where our interests lie and strength to face the employers' revenge; but the great mass will never be able to do so as long as present conditions last. In a time of Revolution one brave man is worth a score of timid ones and draws along with him numbers who, left to themselves, would never have the energy to revolt. But in front of a ballot-box character and energy go for nothing. Mere numbers are all that tell. And in the present state of things the greatest number will always be for the men who hold their daily bread in their hands and can give or withhold at their pleasure. Haven't you happened to notice as much? To-day the greater part of the electors are poor, but how often do you see them choosing men of their own class to represent them and defend their interests?

*William.* No, most of 'em don't like to run the chance of offending the landlord, the parson, or their employer. If they do, they are as like as not to be turned off and even evicted.

*Jack.* Not a hopeful outlook for the benefits to be expected from universal suffrage, is it? The people will always send middle-class men to parliament, and these will always be contriving how to keep the people as dependent and submissive as possible. Even if we were to have paid members and the poor were to take advantage of this to send working men to represent them, what could they do in so corrupt a medium? The few that have been tried have not cut a very brilliant figure in any country. No! during the next revolution the people must not allow themselves to be hoodwinked as they have so often been by democrats and republicans. Over and over again the people have dropped their arms on being promised a Republic, because they have been taught to believe that it is the best possible form of social organisation and will work marvels in their condition. Next time they must not rest content with empty words, they must resolutely lay hands upon property.

*William.* You are right. We have been deceived so often, it is time we opened our eyes. But still there must always be a government, for if there is no one to give orders, how can things go on?

(To be continued.)

## FREEDOM.

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

MONTHLY, 1d., POST FREE 1½d.

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

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

Back Numbers.—Volume I., October 1886 to September 1887 (No. 2 sold out) price 2s. Volume II., October 1887 to September 1888 (Nos. 16, 17, 18, 19, sold out) price 2s. Volume III., October 1888 to December 1889, price 1s. 6d. Volume IV., January to December 1890, price 1s. Carriage: single volumes, 2d., four volumes, 4½d., throughout the United Kingdom.

Address "FREEDOM," New Fellowship Press, 26 Newington Green Road, London, N.

Freedom Pamphlets.—No. I., "The Wage System," by Peter Kropotkin, 1d., post free, 1½d. No. II., "The Commune of Paris," by Peter Kropotkin, 1d., post free, 1½d. Per quire of 25, 1s. 4d.

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.

Donations.—J. E. B., 5s.; H. G., 10s. (pamphlet fund.)

## NOTES.

## THE FIRST OF MAY.

May-day of '91 will not be memorable for any marked display of revolt on the part of the workers. But it will be remembered, bitterly remembered, by the workers for the wonton and cowardly brutality with which their rulers, craven with fear, shed the blood of poor women and children, as was the case at Fourmies. One of these days in the near future a crime like this will be the beginning of the end. It is very probable there is more news still to come as to events from other parts; for, as every honest person knows, the capitalist press is a liar by trade, and would certainly suppress news of revolutionary interest, if so minded. Still after making all allowances, it is evident there has been a period of "calm" this year which may be attributed to several things, but which to our thinking principally indicates a dying-down of the enthusiasm for an eight-hour day. In London especially this seemed to be the case, the third of May demonstration having nothing of the fire and enthusiasm of the year before. Perhaps the men are disheartened at the sight of their "leaders" playing the fool on royal commissions. In this case it is to be hoped they will soon see the necessity of making a new departure, in other words, of thinking and acting for themselves. In fact it seems to us this is the only course open to them, since it is being admitted on all hands that the problem of the organisation of labour in East London is too vast for either government or Trade Unionism to cope with. Very much to vast, we think; and we are convinced that if the workers cannot solve it themselves no one can solve it for them.

## THE ANARCHIST PROTEST.

The only spark of last year's enthusiasm discernable amongst the London workers on May the third was struck out amongst the audience round the Anarchist platform; where comrades from several groups met together to protest publicly against the LEGAL eight hour day and political methods in general. The direct revolutionary action and out and out Communism advocated by Cantwell, Louise Michel, Yanovsky, Mowbray, Kropotkin, Mainwaring, Wess, and Nicoll roused a livelier response than any of the parliamentary platitudes of the professional labour leaders. Meetings of like character were also held by several comrades on May the first, in Hyde Park and on Mile End Waste.

## THE EVOLUTION OF THE "COMMONWEAL."

Last month the 'WEAL came out again as a weekly, and, better still, as a "Revolutionary Journal of Anarchist Communism." We heartily wish our comrades of the London S. L. success in the decided step they have taken. As long as the paper was the "Official Journal of the Socialist League," supposed to express the united convictions of a loose aggregation of "branches," wherein was represented every shade of Socialistic opinion, from the mildest parliamentary Social Reform to the most revolutionary Communist Anarchism, it could not be thoroughly satisfactory to any one. But that state of things has passed away, and now that the ancient centralised League, with no political creed, has evolved into a number of friendly but independent local groups, most of whom tend more and more to become definitely Anarchist, the paper has evolved also. May it have the best of good luck in its new departure. It has long ceased to be the parade ground of the Marxists, and has done much useful propaganda with its free and revolutionary Communistic articles. We feel sure that the avowal of thorough-going Anarchist opinions will strengthen and enlarge its influence for good.

## WILLIAM MORRIS.

By the way, we are glad to notice the present editors of the "Commonweal" denouncing, with the contempt it deserves, the lying assertion of the capitalist press that the 'Weal has turned upon its former editor. Comrade Morris is not avowedly an Anarchist by conviction; but in character he is a born-Anarchist, and in very much of his writing—for instance, "News from Nowhere"—the most hypercritical of Anarchists would have to borrow a pair of spectacles to discover serious points of disagreement. Like other people, Anarchists admire his art-

istic genius, but, in addition, there is not an Anarchist worth his salt who, being acquainted with William Morris, does not respect him as a good comrade and an honest man.

## JUDGE NOT THAT YE BE NOT JUDGED.

Possibly this adage may have crossed the mind of Captain Verney when sentence was pronounced upon HIM,—he who had so often sentenced the unfortunate victims of our present system, the criminals so-called. Yet Verney differs probably from a multitude of men like himself in this fact only that he has had the misfortune to be found out. And however much we may despise the man, it is after all not much use expressing our contempt while we leave the wealth and power which he used to buy women's bodies in the hands of numbers of men no better than he. To our mind however he is infinitely more despicable than the majority of such offenders from the fact that he voluntarily chose to become a maker of laws for our general guidance and improvement. Think of his solicitude for poor men's morals; of his Liberal Principles; of his admonitions from the bench as a J. P.; of his speeches as a legislator in the House of Commons! What a double-died hypocrite. What a typical saint of this middle-class Nineteenth Century.

## ANOTHER NAIL IN THE COFFIN OF LEGAL MARRIAGE.

Since the decision in the "Queen v. Jackson" case, many magistrates, to whom ill-used wives appealed for protection and order of maintenance, have declined to grant the order, saying that if wives did not like their husbands they were free to leave them as Mrs. Jackson had done. Such decisions are no doubt bitter pills to wives who are also mothers, but they must be swallowed, if the social evil we call marriage is ever to be eliminated. The despotic husband and the dependent wife are fast vanishing amidst the dusky shades of antiquity, but so also must vanish the chivalrous man and the woman whose wounded affections can be healed by thumping damages awarded by a sympathetic jury, before we can hope for a better state of things between men and women.

## GETTING THROUGH THE HEDGE.

Those who are unlucky enough to find themselves mated with uncongenial spouses should find a useful lesson in the doings of a certain Mrs. Buck, who quietly took herself off one day, leaving her husband Johannes a little note to the effect that she did not mean to return, as she could not stand his grumbling any longer. Johannes accepted the situation, and, moreover, the care of a year old child. Later on he met a woman, who was more congenial and who, knowing the position of affairs, was brave enough to take him for her husband. An anonymous busybody drew the attention of the police to Johannes' new-found happiness and he was marched off to the lock-up. Next day, however, as no one appeared to prosecute, the magistrate practically dismissed the case. And so mutual consent effected a divorce, without any of the parties being the worse for it, which our precious laws can never be said to do.

## SONG IN THE LABOUR MOVEMENT.

The voice of Labour soundeth shrill,  
Mere clamour of a tuneless throng,  
To you who barter at your will  
The very Life that maketh song.

Oh! you whose sluggard hours are spent  
This Rule of Mammon to prolong,  
What know ye of the stern intent  
Of hosted Labour marching strong?

When we have righted what is wrong,  
Great singing shall your ears entreat.  
Meanwhile in movement there is song,  
And music in the pulse of feet.

ERNEST RADFORD.

## SOCIETY ON THE MORROW OF THE REVOLUTION.

Translated from the French of JEHAN LE VAGRE.

## CHAPTER XIV.—THE INDIVIDUAL IN SOCIETY.

THAT the earth is a common property, that its products ought to supply without distinction the needs of everybody, these are truths which are still denied by some and regarded as utopian by others, but which are accepted by all those who think and have succeeded in getting rid of some of the prejudices instilled into them by the injurious education received from the present society. This is then acknowledged, but another truth which has not been clearly brought to light is that sentiment of liberty which exists in an absolute form in the brain of every individual but which most people do not try to fully understand, as it has not yet been clearly defined and at present amounts to this, that, whilst claiming complete liberty for himself, each wishes laws to regulate the actions of his neighbours, and as a consequence of that fatal prejudice which desires that the individual shall be the slave of the society in which chance has caused him to be born, being himself considered only a part of that

society which is looked upon as a complex being entitled to swallow up the whole of humanity.

This is wherein lies the error of all those who speak of Humanity, of Society, etc. Influenced by the present situation, they look upon humanity only as a whole to which each individual finds himself attached from his birth and cannot remove himself without making an attempt upon the rights of this entity, society, created by themselves. We Anarchists on the other hand consider humanity only as a vast field of evolution offering to all temperaments, to all ideas, to all conceptions, the place and the means of evolving freely according to their tendencies and their manner of looking at things.

It is this mistake which up to the present has misled all makers of social systems and which has caused them to regard the individual only as an accessory, more or less important, of society, whom they may consequently more or less sacrifice to the organisation of their social system.

It is evident that every group that is formed ought to associate itself on a basis arranged beforehand, it is evident that every individual who enters this group engages himself to respect its internal regulations from the moment that he freely enters it, that he engages himself to conform to its methods of working whilst he remains a member of it, but if this group no longer responds to the aspirations of the individual, why shall he not be free to leave? Why from this union of forces, which is made only for the purpose of improving the condition of individuals, may not the contrary result to some: the loss of their individuality and of their self-government?

Certain socialists claim as a support for their centralising ideas the expression of opinion put forward by Hæckel. "Let anyone," they say, "look at any order of facts whatsoever; for instance, in very different categories, take the cosmogonic theory, drawing, by means of a progressive condensation of scattered particles of matter furrowed by eddying currents, the starry worlds, whose masses mutually submit to one another's action. Take again the perfection of the nervous system and consequently of the intelligence, growing with the concentration of the cells which subdivide according to the various limitations imposed by a central organ; take the linguistic development going from the succession of invariable and independent words to the union of words with the constituent elements of their active or passive relation and the modification of the words themselves according to the agreements existing between them. From all these points of view evolution operates always by the form becoming more and more consolidated, passing from a diffused state to a concentrated state, and in proportion as the concentration of parts becomes greater their reciprocal dependence augments, that is to say that less and less can they extend their individual activity without the help of the others."

To this pretended scientific affirmation we shall let a middle class man reply.

"Does the centralisation of which Mr. Hæckel speaks really exist amongst them? (organisms having more than one cell.) Are their cells divided into ruling and obeying cells, into masters and subjects? All the facts which we know reply with the greatest distinctness in the negative.

"I will not insist on the real autonomy which it is manifest that every cell of every pluricellular organism enjoys; neither Mr. Hæckel nor any one else has in fact denied this autonomy, but it is important to point out plainly the nature of the limits in which it is exercised. We shall thus see that it is much more considerable than is generally admitted and that if it is true that all the cells depend upon each other it is also true that none commands the others and that the pluricellular organisms, even the highest, are in no particular to be compared to a monarchy or to any other authoritarian and centralised government."—J. de Lannessan, "Le Transformisme," page 183.

Further on he says: "Autonomy and Solidarity, these two words resume the conditions of existence of the cells of all pluricellular organisms; autonomy and solidarity would be the basis of a society constructed on the model of living beings." (Id. page 196.)

"From every point of view," we are told, "evolution always operates by passing from an incoherent form to a more or less consolidated form." But we Anarchists have never said the contrary. We have always said that we recognise that in leaving to the individual autonomy the work of production it is probable that in the beginning the attempts would not be very logical, that a good many mishaps may take place in the establishment of the new social order. But seeing the evils from which we suffer under the present social organisation, it is preferable to pass through this elementary stage, to undergo these mishaps rather than to have recourse once again to authority. Let us leave people free to search for themselves, let us permit all ideas to come to light, and we shall see in a very little time all the vagueness, hesitation, errors and troubles disappear to make way for a better understanding and a better form of organisation.

Society is not an organism existing by itself; its existence is not independent of the individuals who compose it, it is nothing by itself. Destroy the individuals and there is no longer any society. If the association is dissolved, if the individuals return to an isolated condition, they will live badly, they will return certainly to the savage state, falling back again to an animal condition, but they will still continue to exist. Society then has no reason for its existence except on condition that those who form a part of it find in it a greater degree of comfort and of liberty; it has only one end: to produce a greater amount of enjoyment with a less expenditure of strength. Moreover, as wants are various, as temperaments are not the same, it follows that this state of association may include many forms; innumerable may be the groups that will

certainly be formed whenever the free initiative of individuals is able to follow its course; it results then that it is a mistake to make the efforts of all converge towards a social improvement that does not regard the happiness of the individual. It is going against common sense.

If we develop the field of evolution of individuality, we shall obtain a good social evolution. If we wish that the operation of this association of forces which we recognise as indispensable may not be hindered, it is necessary that the individual in this association may not be wronged in any of his aspirations, hampered in any of his movements. The only reason as far as he is concerned for the existence of the social state is that it gives him an advantage, and social harmony can only exist if all find these advantages in it. If a class of individuals find themselves wronged, they can no longer see any necessity for the association and they must have as a consequence the right to retire or to revolt against this organisation if anyone desires to impose it upon them.

If we examine the history of humanity we shall see that, arrived at a certain period of development, man has sought out the society of his fellows urged by an ill-defined want of sociability, but certainly also because he found in this association a greater security, a greater well-being, with a relatively smaller expenditure of force.

There can be no doubt that the first human societies were temporary associations on the basis of the most perfect equality, to which each contributed his portion of effort; and this attempt to pass from the natural isolated state to the state of association indicated only that man had understood that it was only by uniting his forces that he would be able to resist his enemies who were better armed than he for the "struggle for life," but when he allowed himself to be dominated that was in no respect a mark of progress. Because the cleverest and the strongest knew how to turn to their exclusive profit these first attempts at association, to the detriment of a great part of humanity that cannot be taken to mean that this exploitation is therefore the more legitimate.

And if these attempts have from the beginning gone wrong, does it follow that they ought to continue so? If our ancestors have been simple enough to accept the yoke of servitude which the exploiters of the time have imposed upon them, or if they have been too feeble to be able to resist, must their descendants who now understand their rights and know their strength continue to suffer the burden which crushes them? No!

All the revolutions which have marked the halts of the working class, all the revolutions which have been made against the powers that be, prove to us that if it has been possible to repress the demands, it has not been possible to destroy the sentiment of independence that lies deep in the heart of every individual, a sentiment which may sleep but which reawakes when the individual is directly oppressed.

If after every revolution we fall back into the rut of oppression and authority it is due to the prejudices of which we have before spoken; but now when these prejudices are attacked, when these sentiments of independence are clearly formulated, we have good reason to believe that on the day of the Revolution people will know how to organise themselves very well without any direction or authority whatsoever.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### COMMUNISM AND ANARCHY.

A reply to "N."

#### COMPETITION.

Comrade,

I was pleased to see that you have done what comrade Bailie has up till now refused to do, notwithstanding my request, namely, given a definition of emulation as against competition. You say you understand it to be "benevolent, harmless competition, which brings no detrimental loss to the loser." Now I am unable to understand competition being either "benevolent" or "harmless" in the sense of not being "detrimental to the loser" to the amount of loss sustained.

All who engage in competition must do so with the belief that the thing they wish to gain is worth their endeavour to win; and when they lose the measure of their loss will be great or small in proportion as it is detrimental to lose or advantageous to win. Your definition of emulation, strange to say, includes the very word—competition—of which it is supposed to be the very opposite, which renders it anything but satisfactory. Your illustration of "playing children," and "members of a family each striving for the common good," are indeed a strange mixture, and difficult enough to answer.

Now I really dislike childish examples of either communism or competition, because the establishment of either must depend on whether they satisfy men and women, and not children. However, as you will have it so, let us see what we can do with them. The first thing to be settled then is, Are children communists in their gambols, or are they competitors with each other? I think they are sometimes the one, and sometimes the other; but I am quite certain that they more often compete than otherwise.

Nor are the "members of a family, each striving for the common good" any less competitors, because the object sought is the common good of the circle; they do not hesitate to compete for the best opportunity to serve the family, and thereby obtain the name for disinterestedness of motive, and the ability to do most for it. You say that "equal opportunity never exists, as people are of different strength, ability, &c." Of course I mean nothing more than a free opportunity for each, consequent upon the nonexistence of artificial restraints mostly of a governmental character. I am quite aware of the diversity of men's

\* Gabriel Deville, "L'Anarchisme."

abilities, and I am unable to conceive of a system of society in which it will not be so; and I fail to see the beauty of abolishing such differences in individuals even if it were possible, which it is not. I am entirely unable to see how voluntary submission can in any sense be coercion. To me coercion means SUPPRESSION (not submission) by governmental rule to the will of the majority, without the consent of the suppressed, in a word, suppression by physical force.

I am not afraid of those who win in competition by "working harder than the others." They ought to win more than those who do not work so hard; and I am somewhat surprised at your dictum that those who win more by their hard work are little better than robbers and monopolists. I agree that competition as carried on to-day mostly rests for its chance of success on fraud or coercion; but I deny that under equal freedom, wherein all may compete without let or hinderance, special privilege taking no part therein, that fraud and coercion will find a place.

You seem afraid that free competition among individuals would result in an accumulation of advantages with some, which they would make their opportunity to exploit others who are not so fortunate. I do not believe this.

The supposed monopoly that will result from the highest ability will find a natural limit when all have equal opportunities. Those who contend for artificial limitations, whether they be State Socialists or Communists, affirm the necessity for government. I must remind you that men are not so exceptionally different in ability as you and many others seem to think. That which makes up the difference between the wage-slave of to-day and his master is not the difference of ability in the two men, but the direct result of the PRIVILEGE as conferred by governmental restrictions on the one over the other. I think you will admit that many, if not all, our masters to-day, if they had been born in a society wherein equal freedom for each obtained, and, therefore, had only their natural ability to start them in life and keep them afloat, would have found it impossible to monopolise anything of any importance; and in order to live they would have had to work like all other persons. It would have been impossible, for instance, for a few to monopolise a tract of country over which one could not ride in a day, while others with equal ability, willingness to work, and desire to cultivate land, were equally free with themselves; and what is here contended with regard to land is equally true of anything else. Hitherto I have said nothing respecting cooperation, which I am confident would play a most important part in the life of the community; but if it is to be a success it must be voluntary, not compulsory. As I have already said, there is but very little difference in men's abilities, generally; and when they are left free to apply those abilities, none having special privileges to rely upon, I feel convinced that your picture would not, nay, could not exist. In fact your whole contention seems to me to amount to a denial of freedom. If, as you contend, monopoly and, therefore, slavery was to be brought to life again after the establishment of equal freedom, it would only result as a consequence of the fact that the people were not prepared for freedom; but to assume that we would veer round to slavery again just because we are free, seems to me paradoxical and to reverse the Prudhonian axiom, which says "Liberty is the mother of order;" in effect you say: liberty is the mother of slavery, which is a contradiction in set terms.

#### COMMUNISM.

I am not satisfied with the manner you deal with Communism. The assurance that when compulsory communism is brought about the people will fall into the habit of regarding it as the best possible institution, fails to convince me of its beauty, even if I could bring myself to believe it; and I am surprised that you cannot see the fallacy of the contention. Most people to-day have become accustomed to wage-slavery, and think it the only possible and, therefore, the best institution; but these ideas both you and myself and a few others agree are fallacies, and we do not cease to believe these fallacies simply because most people believe them right.

Neither am I satisfied with your representation of the school of communism. As I understand it communism is a compulsory institution, under whose regime private property is not permitted. To contend that private property will be permitted "within the limit of communism," is very much like contending that freedom is permitted within the limits of slavery.

I must repeat what I have said elsewhere, that I am not necessarily opposed to communism; but I am opposed to any compulsory form of it. If it is to become an important affair in life I believe it is only necessary to be free from privilege and monopoly in order to find this out; and when once it is found to afford the best opportunity to each, I am certain it will obtain as a voluntary measure.

You refer me to the second article on "Freedom and Property," I refer you to the translation of comrade Mella's position in "Freedom," April 1891, as a clear and concise examination of the difference between individual liberty and compulsory communism.

#### PROPERTY OWNING.

Under this head you say "we cannot know beforehand, nor dictate, speculate about, etc., as to how many things Communism will extend. This will depend on the progress of time, on the locality, the physical condition of the country, the inclinations and wants of the people of particular parts," etc. With every word of this sentence I am in hearty agreement with you; but (and this is a big 'but') it destroys the whole of your former contentions. It is a plea A FORTIORI for personal freedom of action in which private property may play an important part.

Those things to which Communism does not extend, of necessity, will be subject to competition; hence you admit property-owning and competition.

This seems to me especially inconsistent as coming from one who affirms that private property and competition are the creators of "monopoly, law and reaction," and who so unmistakably contends that to be free we must declare all things common property, so that each may take according to his needs. Of course you will tell me that you do not wish to coerce any one, not even the Individualist-Anarchists, whom you will allow "to live in their own way"; but this generosity only makes your inconsistency the more glaring, and it appears to be an admission entirely unwarranted by the tenets of the Communist school as well as by your former contentions in criticising my position.

You have said nothing that has shaken my belief in freedom.

H. DAVIS.

#### FREEDOM AND COMPETITION.

The question having been asked by comrade Davis whether competition and freedom are necessarily opposed, I think there is still a word or two to be said in reply.

The position of Anarchist-Communism in regard to this question is clear and intelligible after a little consideration. First of all we are Anarchists and do not deny the right of anyone to compete till he is black in the face, if that is his conception of his highest good. But what we ask is: is it the best condition for us to strive for? Why should we compete to live when we can live so much better by combining? Do we need to make productive labour a battle as between man and man instead of a battle as between man and nature? In other words, is it necessary to make the conditions of life most favorable for those whom nature has already favored most? No! we want the most favorable conditions for all, if that is possible, and to this end we advocate Anarchist Communism.

Let us try to discover if competition imperils freedom. We will imagine a group of men, or a nation if you like, starting on equal terms under free competition. If we can suppose them starting in line we should almost at the very outset become aware of the fact that the line was becoming irregular. After a very little while we should observe the line had practically vanished, and that in its place we had a stream of people, a small number of whom would keep pretty well to the front, closely pressed by a struggling mass, from among whom a good supply of strugglers would be constantly falling back,—those unfortunate victims in the competitive struggle termed the "unfit." Now we have to remember that those who are in the front are those who are materially the best off, whilst those in the rear are the needy and the helpless. They are not necessarily on this account the least desirable, the least gifted or the most idle of human beings, because we have to remember that in such a struggle as this all manner of vicissitudes may beset the strongest and most capable, and leave them temporarily or permanently injured. So that we have no guarantee that competition has ensured the survival of the fittest, unless by the fittest we mean the luckiest. On the other hand, we may be sure that competition has found a place for those who only thought of themselves; and herein lies the danger to freedom, because these people have gained advantages in the struggle which gives them the power of lending help to those who by weakness or misfortune have become the necessitous, and it must not be forgotten that the individuals who would gain the utmost possible for themselves in such a struggle would be precisely the ones who would take the fullest advantage of their neighbours' necessities. The "self-made" man has invariably the least sympathy for the "unsuccessful." What should we suppose, then, would happen at this critical juncture, which, after all, is only the natural outcome of the competitive ideal? Shall we delude ourselves by supposing that the needy will get help from such folks unless they see some advantage to be gained by the help thus given? No, the possessor will exact his tribute from the non-possessor in this case as he does to-day. Competition gives him the privilege, why should he not accept it? And here we have the first step towards the re-enslavement of mankind. All inequalities, whether inherited or accidental, must be increased and accentuated by competition, or competition would have no RAISON D'ETRE, and some such results as here indicated must be the inevitable outcome.

Is not competition, therefore, a danger to freedom?

What I have to say on Communism and private property must stand till next month.

M.

## THE HERALD OF ANARCHY.

A MONTHLY EXPONENT OF CONSISTENT INDIVIDUALISM.

Shows how Rent and Interest can be abolished by free competition, and defends the right of the labourer to the fruit of his own toil.

Published at the New Fellowship Press, 26 Newington Green Road, N.

DER ANARCHIST: A FORTNIGHTLY JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM. Post free to Great Britain for One shilling per quarter. Address: C. Timmermann, P.O. Box, 758, St. Louis, Missouri, U.S.A.

## FREIHEIT.

INTERNATIONAL ORGAN OF THE GERMAN-SPEAKING ANARCHISTS.

EDITED BY JOHN MOST.

Address all communications to John Müller, Box 3135, New York.

Subscription, 2s. per quarter; under cover, 4s.

## VALUE IN USE AND VALUE IN EXCHANGE.

[Continued from previous number.]

Let us study this phenomenon a little more closely. Let us suppose that a family has nothing but potatoes to live upon. More albuminous food is wanted in its daily allowance. Suppose therefore that we give the family one pound of meat a day. Consequently the further increase of albuminous food, *i.e.* meat, is less necessary than it was before; and if we now give the family another pound of meat a day, their need of more meat *per diem* is still less. It is easy to perceive that this want is steadily decreasing with every new pound of meat a day which we give the family, and it is evident that every new addition of another pound of meat to the daily allowance will soon become a nuisance instead of being very useful.\*

Let us now repeat our experiment with a slight alteration. We offer the family which is living on potatoes only, the choice between one pound of meat and one quart of cider a day. Our family is sure to choose the meat. But after having raised their daily portion of meat to six pounds, if we again let them choose between another pound of meat a day and a quart of cider, it will not be quite so certain that meat will be preferred. It is possible that they will be doubtful as to what to take. The need for more meat a day has gradually diminished with every additional pound a day, until at last this want is not stronger than the desire for a daily quart of cider.

The power which commodities have, on account of their physical, chemical, æsthetic, and other qualities, of satisfying human wants is called in the language of economics their *value in use* or *utility*. We call their power of satisfying a certain *kind* of want, for instance the want of meat, their qualitative value in use or their qualitative utility. Thus, for instance, meat utility is the qualitative utility of meat. The power of commodities of satisfying us in different *degrees*, when consumed in different *quantities*, we call their quantitative value in use or quantitative utility. The quantitative utility of a seventh pound of meat a day for our consuming family is thus not so great as the quantitative utility of the first quart of cider a day, although the quantitative utility of the first quart of cider was very much smaller than the quantitative utility of the first pound of meat *per diem*.

Our inquiry into the nature of consumption has shown us that the special wants differ, not only as to quality, but that also every kind of want may vary as to quantity, or degree, and that this being so, we may compare, and put the sign of equation between, two wants absolutely different as to quality. Thus it follows from the definition of value in use, or utility, that the utility of a commodity always is fixed as to quality, but that it may vary in a quantitative sense as the quantity consumed varies. The value in use of the first pound of meat a day in our example is meat-utility, and the value in use of the seventh pound of meat a day is also meat-utility. But the value in use of the first daily pound of meat is ever so much greater than the value in use of the seventh daily pound of meat.

In the above instance we found that the quantitative utility of a pound of meat a day under certain circumstances may be the same as the quantitative utility of a quart of cider a day. True that we, in our instance, spoke only of one consuming individual—a family taken as a unit—but it is evident that the quantitative utility of commodities differing as to quality may under certain circumstances, and in a certain sense, also become equal for different individuals who know nothing of each other. Let us suppose that we have two families to deal with. One of them has only got potatoes to eat, but has as many potatoes as they can possibly consume a day. The other family has as much as they can possibly consume a day both of potatoes and meat. Both of them have as much water to drink as they want. If we now offer the first family the choice between a pound of meat a day and a quart of cider, they will be sure to choose the meat. But if we offer the other family the same choice, they are as sure to prefer the offer of cider. What does this imply? That cider has a greater quantitative utility than meat to the latter family, but meat a larger quantitative utility than cider to the former. Let us now suppose that there is a commodity which has utility to both families, for instance, matches. If we now let the first family choose between consuming a pound of meat or using a box of matches a day, and offer the second the choice between a quart of cider and a box of matches a day, we may be sure *that to begin with* the first will prefer the meat and the second the cider. But if we continue to let both families choose between these two things, while we are gradually satiating the former with meat and the latter with cider, it will necessarily happen that the quantitative utility of meat for the former and the quantitative utility of cider for the latter will be very much diminished. The first family *now* is doubtful whether to choose one pound of meat more a day or a box of matches, and the second family is in the same position as to the choice between another quart of cider and a box of matches a day. We now perceive that for two *different* consumers the quantitative values in use or the utilities of two *different* quantitative amounts of two *different* commodities may become equal to the quantitative utility of the *same* quantity of a third commodity. The quantitative utility of a pound of meat and the quantitative utility of a quart of cider may become equal to the quantitative utility of a box of matches for *two different* consuming individuals.

(To be continued.)

\* As we are only studying consumption, we suppose that the meat must only be used as food for the family, or otherwise utilised or destroyed, but not exchanged for other commodities.

## A SOCIETY WITHOUT GOVERNMENT

A COMMON-PLACE objection to Anarchism is; "It is contrary to human nature as it is now to live peaceably without the control of a government; you can't point to a single society, large or small, which is not living under some sort of government." The eminent scientist and land nationaliser, A. R. Wallace, gives a capital example of practical Anarchy which he observed when he was travelling amongst the islands of the Malay Archipelago. His testimony is valuable, not only because he is a most reliable and careful observer, but because he is rather inclined to be an admirer of governments and cannot say enough in praise of the Dutchmen's rule over their East Indian colonies.

In January 1857, Mr. Wallace went in a native trading boat to the Aru Islands, and stayed at Dobbo, the settlement inhabited by the traders of various nationalities who visit this island every year, and live there for from four to six months. In February Mr. Wallace writes: "I daresay there are now five hundred people in Dobbo of various races, all met in this remote corner of the East, as they express it, 'to look for their fortune,' to get money any way they can. They are most of them people who have the very worst reputation for honesty as well as every other form of morality—Chinese, Bugis, Ceramese, and half-caste Javanese, with a sprinkling of half-wild Papuans from Timor, Babber, and other islands—yet all goes on as yet very quietly. This motley, ignorant, bloodthirsty, thievish population live here without the shadow of a government, with no police, no courts, and no lawyers; yet they do not cut each other's throats, do not plunder each other day and night; do not fall into the anarchy" [Mr. Wallace is too thorough a governmentalist not to use the word in its evil secondary meaning of confusion] "such a state of things might be supposed to lead to. It is very extraordinary! It puts strange thoughts into one's head about the mountain-load of government under which people exist in Europe, and suggests the idea that we may be over-governed. Think of the hundred Acts of Parliament annually enacted to prevent us, the people of England, from cutting each other's throats, or from doing to our neighbours as we would *not* be done by. Think of the thousands of lawyers and barristers whose whole lives are spent in telling us what the hundred Acts of Parliament mean, and one would be led to infer that if Dobbo has too little law, England has too much."

The Dobbo people, Mr. Wallace continues, are all traders, "and all know that peace and order are essential to successful trade, and thus a public opinion is created which puts down all lawlessness. Often in former years, when strolling along the Campong Glam in Singapore, I have thought how wild and ferocious the Bugis sailors looked, and how little I should like to trust myself among them. But now I find them to be very decent, well-behaved fellows; I walk daily unarmed in the jungle, where I meet them continually; I sleep in a palm-leaf hut, which any one may enter, with as little fear and as little danger of thieves or murder as if I were under the protection of the Metropolitan police."

An occasional Dutch Commissioner, from Molucca, turns up once in the season sometimes, to hear complaints, settle disputes, and now and again to carry off some heinous offender. The year that Mr. Wallace was at Dobbo this personage did not appear.

Twice our author had an opportunity of seeing the little community under circumstances of difficulty. During his first visit a man was caught trying to steal a piece of iron from a neighbour, in whose wall he had made a hole for the purpose. That evening most of the traders met to discuss the affair and decided to give the would-be robber twenty lashes then and there. "They were given with a small rattan in the middle of the street, not very severely, as the executioner appeared to sympathise a little with the culprit. The disgrace seemed to be thought as much of as the pain; for though any amount of clever cheating is thought rather meritorious than otherwise, open robbery and house-breaking meet with universal reprobation."

After a visit to the natives in the interior, Mr. Wallace returned to Dobbo and one evening saw dispute going on over a game of football. There was a great row, he says, and he feared the disputants would betake themselves to their knives, not only the two who began, but a dozen or twenty of their backers on each side. But no. "After a large amount of talk it passed off quietly, and we heard nothing about it afterwards." In fact, during the whole seven months that Mr. Wallace was at or near Dobbo there does not appear to have been any serious disturbance or act of violence. Where this is possible amongst a casual population of rough and ready traders, one of whose principal amusements is cock-fighting, it should not be impracticable in a settled industrial community, where the motives for peaceful mutual understanding would be far stronger than amongst the semi-socialised self-seekers of Dobbo.

### THE PROPAGANDA. REPORTS.

St. Pancras Communist-Anarchist Group. — Sunday, May 17th, H. S. Salt lectured at the North Western Coffee Tavern, on "Shelley as a Revolutionist." The inclemency of the weather prevented as many being present as had been expected, but it in no wise interfered with the eloquence of the lecture. Mr. Salt showed that it was only within recent years that Shelley's genius had met with any of the recognition it deserved. During his lifetime he was vilified both as a man and as a poet, after his death apologies were made for him as a man and his gift of song was admitted; now all those who have the best right to pass judgment in such matters claim for him a high place as a thinker and poet. When his writings become more widely known among the workers, in whose

\* "The Malay Archipelago," New edition, p. 335.

cause the best in them was written, his revindication will be complete. To the cause of labour and for the emancipation of women, Shelley devoted his best energies. Though he had no clearly-defined vision of a social state wherein government should have no part, the whole tenour of his thought and feeling was opposed to authority in every shape and form, and he was never tired of attacking the shape in which it appeared to him most oppressive to humanity. He had a rooted abhorrence of rulers, priests, and lawyers—whom he continually denounces as the enemies of mankind. In practical politics he advocated immediate reforms which were drastic enough considering the times in which he lived: the entire emancipation of women, the abolition of capital punishment, standing armies, the national debt, State churches, &c.

**East London.**—Good meetings were held during the month at the International Working Men's Club, Berner Street, and at the "Sugar Loaf," Hanbury Street, addressed by Comrades Yanovsky, Ruttenberg, Weinberg, and others. On the 26th April, the Berner Street club had its annual celebration, consisting of a Tea, Concert, and Dance. Stirring speeches were made on the occasion by Comrades Kropotkine, Louise Michel, Tchaykovsky, Ruttenberg, Yanovsky, and others, and the members and friends had a jolly time of it, only breaking up at midnight.

**Manchester.**—Now that the inclement weather that has characterised the beginning of the year has at length departed, we are vigorously carrying on our outdoor propaganda. Meetings have been held in Stevenson Square, Higher Chatham Street, and New Cross, with good effect and considerable sale of *Freedom*, *Commonweals*, and pamphlets, and we are expecting to largely extend our field of operations during the next few weeks. Besides this we have done considerable propaganda during the last month or two at the different in-door meetings held in Manchester by various organisations. The Fabians who have established here a pretty strong society of the "arm-chair" sort, which, generally, understands little of Socialism and still less of Anarchism, have been attacked in full force by our comrades, and their weekly meetings and discussions have all turned on the crucial points of revolution and anarchy. Our success may be gauged by the sorrowing remark of a Fabian visitor from London "that the Anarchists appeared to have captured the Fabian meetings here, as they had already done in London, for the discussion of their impracticable and reactionary ideas!" Anyway, one result of our efforts was a lecture given before the Society on "Anarchist Communism," by Comrade Barton, and many of their members seem shifting in a more advanced direction; one of them has already joined our group. We have also devoted considerable energy to capturing the churches. After taking part in several discussions at the Upper Brook Street Free Church, Comrade Barton gave an address on "Competition as a motive to Industry," which provoked a lively discussion, and aroused much interest. A series of meetings at the Knott Mill Mission Hall have also been attended by our comrades. The first lecture, on "Capital and Labour," by a popular temperance lecturer, Mr. Thomas Hardy, ended in that gentleman leaving the discussion and platform, "as there seemed to be a very strong element of Socialism in the audience, and he wished to have nothing to do with either Socialism or its advocates," which one of our comrades answered to the audience, "that as Mr. Hardy ran away from our arguments, so would Capitalism retreat before the advancing forces of Socialism." Since this many meetings have taken place at the same Hall. They have consisted chiefly of working-men, and our comrades have lost no opportunity of holding forth the ideal of Anarchy and Communism. One of them, Comrade Stockton, gave an address on, "Is government necessary?" which was well received. Altogether, our comrades in this city have worked well to sow the seed of discontent and hope amongst the helpless and oppressed, seed which will bear fruit in that Social Revolution that will sweep away Property and Authority, and make a free world based on equality and harmonious association. Comrade Wess (of London) who has been visiting Manchester, writes as follows:—"I addressed large and attentive meetings at the International Working Men's Club, 25, Bury Street, New Road, Strangeways, on April 11th, 12th, 19th, and 26th. Good meetings there were also addressed by Comrades Diemshitz, Schur, Alirgant, and others. Interesting discussions followed, and good propaganda was made. On Sunday, April 12th, I spoke in Stevenson Square, with Comrades Barton and Stockton. In the two years since my last visit they have become such capital speakers that I felt quite delighted. On April 22nd there was a meeting of the local Fabian Society, where Leonard Hall (Social Democrat) delivered a lecture. Barton, Stockton, Ritson, and I defended Communist-Anarchism in the lively discussion that followed. The Anarchist remarks were very favourably received, and at the close of the meeting it was announced that Comrade Barton would give an exposition of Anarchist Communism the next week. In fact our principles seem to be going ahead in Lancashire."

**Leeds.**—Good Anarchist propaganda is being carried on here, both by the Leeds Socialist League Club, at Clarendon Buildings, with Comrade George Cores as its most energetic and indefatigable worker, and the International Working Men's Club, 23, New York Street, Kirgate, the members of which are mostly Yiddish-speaking proletarians. Comrade Wess, of London, addressed a large meeting on the Labour Question from the Anarchist point of view, at the International Club, on Saturday afternoon, April 25th. The lecture was followed by a number of questions which were satisfactorily replied to. A large quantity of *Freedom*, *Commonweal*, and *Worker's Friend* were sold.

**Liverpool.**—On Sunday afternoon, April 26th. Comrades Schur, Wess, and Diemshitz came down here, and, for the first time, held a most successful meeting of foreign Jewish workers, in Camden Hall, Camden Street. Stirring speeches were made, and the greatest enthusiasm was evinced by the audience. The whole supply of the current issues of *Freedom* and *Worker's Friend* was soon exhausted, and the rest of the audience had to content themselves with back numbers of those papers, a large quantity of which were distributed gratis. The speedy formation of a club in that city is promised.

**Leicester Socialist Society.**—After a long cessation from outdoor propaganda, we recommenced six weeks ago, our usual three Sunday meetings, and as several of our younger members are beginning to speak, we hope to increase this number in the course of about a fortnight to at least five. Fred Charles has been with us for three weeks and has not been idle. He has been twice to Derby holding Saturday and Sunday meetings and with Barclay has visited Hinckley where there are 2000 out on strike, and spoken to large audiences. Our propaganda during the past two years is bearing fruit manifestly in the town, particularly amongst the Trade Unionists, and even the religious community are becoming nervously aware that Socialism must be faced—to the great disgust of many of them. The Rev. Martin Anstey, M.A., has just concluded a series of "Talks with Working Men" on "Labour and Capital" in his chapel, which has been filled for six Sunday afternoons. As discussion has been invited we have used the opportunity and are very well satisfied with the effect produced. On the 10th inst. we had a debate on Socialism with the rev. gentleman, Comrade Peacock of Nottingham, leading off on our side in grand style. A vote was sprung on us at the conclusion and even the Anarchists had to hold up a hand; 59 voted that the Socialist claim was "just and practicable," and only 71 were against it, a vote which was very annoying and surprising to our opponents. We expect to have a vigorous summer campaign here this year both in the town and neighbourhood and our preaching will be Anarchist Communism. The S. D. F. are sending Quelch here on the 31st. There is only one of our members true to the S. D. creed.

**Great Yarmouth Socialist Society.**—The Cause goes marching on in Yarmouth since we have taken over the new premises; the sale of literature has increased greatly, several new members have joined, the Sunday evening discussions in the Club Room have been a gigantic success, the room being crowded to excess on

several occasions. Amongst the new members are several who can take part in an indoor discussion, but not out-doors on account of the boycott of the local capitalists. On Sunday 26th April, a large attendance in the evening, in the Club Room. Comrade Saunders opened a discussion on "Some objections to Socialism," several other comrades taking part. A Radical friend who was present thought it would be impossible for any Society to continue for long without the capitalist, he also defended Bradlaugh's position, but no one else in the room would support him; May 3rd a successful meeting was held on the Priory Plain in the morning, on Labour May Day, opened by Headley, followed by Poyntz of Norwich; slight opposition was offered at the close, but was easily disposed of. In the afternoon, on the Hall Quay, another successful meeting was held, opened by Comrade Saunders (this is the first time he has spoken in the open-air) and Poyntz; in the evening, interesting discussion in the Club Room, on the Cheap Bread leaflet. May 10th, interesting discussion in the Club in the evening on the "Present methods of Revolution." May 14th, a large meeting was held at Gorleston, under the auspices of the English Land Restoration League, with their van; Mrs. Leach occupied the chair. Addresses were delivered by Comrade Shaw Maxwell of the Glasgow Branch of the Socialist League, and Mr. Boon, of London. Both speakers exposed the evils of land monopoly and contended for universal co-operation. May 17th, in the morning, on Priory Plain, a gigantic meeting was held, close on 1000 people being present. Shaw Maxwell delivered a lecture on "Socialism and True Co-operation," assisted by Poyntz and Headley; time Headley was speaking, some police rushed into the ring and tried to break up the meeting by trying to throw over the platform, but they had to be satisfied by taking the names of Maxwell, Saunders and Headley, owing to our determination to resist force by force. The police interference was the result of our audience increasing considerably; the meeting lasted for two hours, amidst general excitement. In the afternoon another meeting on the Hall Quay addressed by Maxwell, Poyntz and Headley; the meeting after lasting for an hour adjourned to the Club-room, where speaking and singing continued another hour and a half; in the evening the Club-room was crowded to hear a discussion on Anarchy versus Democracy, which was continued until a late hour. May 18th, social gathering in the Club-room, a few comrades from Norwich being present. May 19th, in the Club-room, a grand Socialist tea, followed by a large Socialist and Anarchist jovial gathering. The feature of this gathering was the large attendance of female comrades of Norwich and Yarmouth. The Norwich comrades, numbering thirteen or fourteen, lost their train and had to stay all night, the gathering therefore continued until almost 3 a.m. Good sale of *Freedom*, *Commonweal*, and other literature.

**Aberdeen Revolutionary Socialist Federation.**—About a month ago the Anarchist and Revolutionary Socialist sections of the Aberdeen Socialist Society seceded from the Social Democrat section. "We were not agreed," they say in their manifesto, "on questions of economics; neither as to the proper policy that ought to be pursued in the securing of our emancipation from the slavery of to-day. Furthermore we were not agreed as to the moral standard required to be attained and kept by the men who would remodel society. We think that the individual must endeavour to free himself from the passions which tend to debase him before he can effectively preach the new ethic." A new Socialist organisation was therefore formed. "We adopted our present title," writes Comrade Duncan, "to satisfy the Revolutionary Socialists, but since then several of them have gone back to the old Society. Thus we are now, with two exceptions, a body of Anarchists. We only number about twenty, but we are enthusiastic in our work. We have been very successful in the sale of literature. *Freedom* now sells well and we shall require in future a larger supply." Another comrade, the secretary of the Federation, sends a report of work done. The Federation has been very successful, as yet, having splendid meetings on Castle Street, on Sunday evenings, at which Comrade Duncan speaks, and his revolutionary sentiments appear to be well received. He is at present, unfortunately, our only out-door speaker, but he can keep on for about an hour and forty minutes. The audience generally numbers about 400. An old lady who is very anxious about our souls, occasionally assists us in getting a crowd by coming into our midst and screeching "Come to Jesus, He will save you"; but she cannot stand and bear the sound of the "Marseillaise," so when we want to rid ourselves of her we sing and she turns her back on us. We expected when first we came to Castle Street that the police would interfere with our meetings, but in this we have been as yet mistaken. When the Socialist movement first began in Aberdeen Comrade Mayor was arrested and Comrades Duncan and Scathes threatened with prosecution, but the case against the former falling through, we heard no more about it. Now, however, there is a rumour abroad that the ex-grocers, tallow-merchants, etc., who "govern" us do not think it is good for us or the workers to talk of the Revolution in a public way on the Sabbath, and they mean to put a stop to our meetings. If this rumour is correct, and the constant presence of the Police Superintendent and the fact that four Town Councillors were about our meeting last Sunday give colour to it, lively times may be expected. We have held five indoor meetings at which lectures have been read and discussed. We find that the indoor public meetings are not a success, and we intend to drop our one during the summer months and take to a more vigorous outdoor propaganda; in this we shall not overlook the country villages which lie around and near the town. We can always manage to sell *Commonweal* out; *Freedom* and other literature go well also. We have formed a French class to enable us to read those Revolutionary works which are published in French, and hope ere long to have quite a knowledge of the French Anarchists.

**Dublin.**—The Socialist Union will only hold meetings once a month during the summer. Our correspondent there tells us that "the eternal [we hope not] Parnell business engrosses every one." The idea is gaining ground over there that the attitude of the priests will kill all chance of Home Rule. The upshot of this idea may be the formation of an Anti-Clerical party, "but Irishmen have such a terror of what John Mitchell used to call 'their pauper souls,' that they cannot be relied upon to oppose the priests for any considerable time. However the formation of Socialist societies in Waterford points the way the wind is blowing in Ireland, and so does the holding of a Socialist meeting in the Phoenix Park, largely attended in spite of bad weather.

## NOTICES.

**London.**—*St. Pancras Communist Anarchist Group.*—Meetings will be held at the North Western Coffee Tavern, 249 Great College Street, Camden Town, every Sunday evening, at 8 p.m. May 31, Crime and Punishment; opener Alfred Marsh. June 7, Progress and Reaction; opener W. Wess. June 14 and 21, Reading: translation of "Anarchist Morality," a new French pamphlet by P. Kropotkine. Admission free. Discussion invited.

**East London.**—Discussion meetings every Tuesday evening at 8.30, in the Hall of the I. W. M. Club, 40 Berner Street, Commercial Road, E.

**London Socialist League.**—A lecture every Sunday, at 8 p.m., in the Hall, 273 Hackney Road. Admission free. Discussion invited.

**Leeds.**—International Workingmen's Club, 23 New York Street, Kirkgate. Members meet every Friday evening; lectures and discussion every Saturday at 4 p.m. Reading-room open every evening. All Anarchist literature on sale.

**Manchester.**—International Workingmen's Club, 25 Bury New Road, Strangeways. Members meet every Friday evening. Lecture and discussion every Saturday evening. Reading-room open every evening. All Anarchist and labour literature on sale.