Ryley, Peter. "Anarchist communism in the era of outrage." *Making Another World Possible: Anarchism, Anti-Capitalism and Ecology in Late 19th and Early 20th Century Britain*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013. 117–154. Contemporary Anarchist Studies. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781501306754.ch-005>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 13:19 UTC.

Copyright © Peter Ryley 2013. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

5

Anarchist communism in the era of outrage

Even as individualist anarchism continued to evolve, it was anarcho-communism that was becoming dominant, both in the anarchist movement as a whole and in the popular imagination. It was in the late Victorian period that a negative image became stubbornly attached. The notions of the bomb-wielding anarchist, the nihilist terrorist, the conspiratorial enemy of civilization are all the product of the nineteenth-century mind. Partly, this had a base in reality, as Europe experienced a number of terrorist attacks by self-professed anarchists. Only one bomb ever went off in Britain, however, in Greenwich in 1894. The only casualty was its maker, the French anarchist Martial Bourdin. This did not stop anarchist communism becoming ensnared within a nineteenth-century 'war on terror' as scares about the 'dynamitards' took hold. The reaction was familiar; moral panics, lurid exposés in the popular press, miscarriages of justice with their accompanying personal tragedies, and the arbitrary abuse of power by the state. Anarchism was now intrinsically linked in the public imagination with violence and 'outrage'.¹ One supposedly serious and avowedly dispassionate text was not only published inside a vivid red cover with an exploding bomb on it but also contained, amongst many wild inaccuracies, statements such as the following:

The evil of Anarchism is that, in its gospel of destruction, and advocacy of personal licence under the misnomer of freedom, it attracts under its banner those who hold the very basest of impulses, and the most diabolical instincts.²

Yet, this stereotype was contested. Some novels, such as the semi-autobiographical *A Girl Amongst the Anarchists*, by the Rossetti sisters writing under the pen name Isabel Meredith; Ethel Voynich's *The*

Gadfly, with a character modelled on Charlotte Wilson; John Henry Mackay's *The Anarchists*, drawn from his personal experiences in London; and, more obliquely, Richard Whiteing's hugely popular *No. 5 John Street*, all give a more sympathetic, though not always uncritical, depiction of the revolutionary milieu. Given the number of supportive articles in mainstream periodicals, such as *The Nineteenth Century* and the *New Review*,³ essays by leading writers such as George Bernard Shaw and Oscar Wilde (though Wilde's essay *The Soul of Man Under Socialism* is known as a classic text, his creative work also reflected his political views. For example, the children's story, *The Selfish Giant*, published in 1888, is a beautiful and touching argument for Christian communism), it becomes clear that the negative image was not the only one fighting for attention.

Joseph Conrad's novel, *The Secret Agent*,⁴ is often cited as an illustration of the popular terrorist stereotype. Yet, Conrad was a better writer than that. The single act of outrage in the book, loosely modelled on the Greenwich bomb, is commissioned by a foreign government and carried out by an agent provocateur. Though anarchists are portrayed as humans with all their various frailties, anarchism itself is absent. It is the figure of 'the Professor' that haunts, even though he is not one of the main protagonists and appears infrequently. He is portrayed as an ascetic believer in ultra-violence who indulges in murderous eugenicist fantasies, 'calling madness and despair to the regeneration of the world'.⁵ The character may demonstrate Conrad's ignorance of anarchism itself, but this isn't the point. The Professor is there as the spectre at the progressives' feast, a symbol of what Conrad saw as the latent savagery inherent in modernity at the beginning of the twentieth century. He was certainly prescient. And this is the point, the bombs were real, calls to violence were genuine, and so anarchists who advocated revolutionary change had to examine their attitude to the means of making a revolution and the consequences that might flow from them. Much of this chapter describes how they did so. It remains a vital question for today.

Late Victorian Britain was a bustling market place of radical ideas, esoteric religious beliefs, sexual liberation and alternative lifestyles. Groups were founded and dissolved, experiments were tried and idiosyncratic political enthusiasms have left continuing legacies around the country, including Walt Whitman's stuffed canary sitting in Bolton Library in Lancashire.⁶ Anarchism was well recognized as both a contributor and competitor within this milieu. All of which prompted Mark Bevir to confront the stereotype by arguing that a commitment to revolution was being matched and eclipsed by a new ethical anarchism⁷ based on communalism and non-violence. He wrote:

To the Victorians, anarchism was an individualist doctrine found in clandestine organizations of violent revolutionaries. By the outbreak

of the First World War, another very different type of anarchism was becoming equally well recognized. The new anarchists still opposed the very idea of the state, but they were communalists not individualists, and they sought to realize their ideals peacefully through personal example and moral education, not violently through acts of terror and a general uprising.⁸

Bevir doesn't get it quite right, however. As we have seen, it was individualists who were wedded to non-violence and he wasn't the first, or the last, to group Kropotkin with Tolstoy as apostles of non-violence, even though Kropotkin *did* see anarchism coming about through a general uprising. Yet, if two such striking images could be contesting with each other at the same time, it is clear that there had to be more than one anarchist communism. I would argue that it consisted broadly of three strands.

The first came from an indigenous working-class radicalism that rather relished the idea of the slaughter of the rich. It tended to be militantly atheist and emerged from physical force Chartism. It too had intellectual roots in the early part of the century, drawing on the political economy of another of the Ricardian Socialists, William Thompson.⁹ Thompson was a significant figure in the development of socialism and, in his writings with Anna Wheeler, an important early feminist. His arguments for direct, co-operative ownership and communism in exchange distinguished him from Hodgskin, even if they shared a similar critique of capitalism rooted in the labour theory of value. Thompson, however, was no advocate of the insurrectionary and riotous traditions of British working-class protest and it was these that when combined with an anti-statist, collectivist political economy produced this aspect of anarchist communism. It found its place in the milieu predominantly through the Socialist League and its journal, *Commonweal*.

The second was to be found mainly in the group of intellectuals and writers associated with the newspaper *Freedom*. Co-founded by Peter Kropotkin and edited by Charlotte Wilson, the paper drew its ideological stance from Kropotkin and its organizational effectiveness from Wilson. Charlotte Wilson herself was typical of the new middle-class activists. She was from a wealthy professional background, married to a stockbroker, though maintained her economic independence and feminist ideas. As was fashionable, she retreated to live a simple rural life on the edge of Hampstead Heath, which is now part of one of the most affluent areas of suburban London. Her rented farmhouse, *Wylde*,¹⁰ became a focus for intellectual debate and the anarchist literary circles of the time. Wilson had been active in the Fabian Society during its more libertarian phase, leaving it in 1887 to devote her energies to anarchism.

Intellectually, the Freedom Group's roots lay in European anarchism as brought to Britain by Kropotkin and further developed by other exiles,

notably the Italians Saviero Merlino and Errico Malatesta. It fostered a range of British thinkers too and *Freedom* was by no means the only anarchist paper of its era. It was joined by James Tochatti's *Liberty*, probably the best of the journals of the time and a lively forum for competing anarchist visions. Tochatti was a Scottish merchant tailor. He was born Moncure Douglas, but took the name of his Italian grandfather. Tochatti formed *Liberty* with the anarchist poet Louisa Bevington, after falling out with *Commonweal* and the Socialist League precisely over its stance on violence. *The Torch* was more unusual still. First produced as a hand-written journal by the teenage Rossetti sisters, Olivia and Helen, it also evolved into an influential periodical of anarchist communism. As the daughters of William Michael Rossetti, one of the founders of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, they were helped by their entrée into artistic and literary circles given to them by their family. At its height, the now printed journal attracted a number of distinguished contributors. As advocates of revolutionary expropriation, in sympathy with the ideals of the bombers whilst being ambivalent about violence, all the anarchist communists in this strand had to face contradictions in their ideas as they explained and defended their beliefs against the prejudices of their day.

There was no ambiguity in the final strand, the often-overlooked Christian anarchist movement. Absolutely pacifist and committed to non-violence, Christian anarchism opposed both the church and the state in favour of a literal reading of Christ's teaching that saw it as preaching communal communism on earth. In doing so, they neglected the mystical in favour of the earthly Jesus. Their concern was not with the divinity of Christ, nor his self-sacrifice, but his teachings on how to realize the kingdom of heaven on earth. That meant rejecting external authority in favour of the realization of the divine within each human being. There were two distinct strands. The first was a spin-off from Christian socialism, except it sought to realize a socialist world without the state. Its most prominent advocate was John Morrison Davidson,¹¹ a Scottish radical journalist and a convert from Presbyterianism to Arianism. The second drew its inspiration from Tolstoy and his doctrines of abnegation, self-reliance and non-resistance. The best-known Tolstoyan activist was John Coleman Kenworthy, who was to found the Croydon Brotherhood Church. Both are largely forgotten today.

However distinctive these three anarchist communisms might have been, they were not hermetically sealed from each other, frequently shared platforms and interacted with others within the broader radical milieu. Their visions of a future anarchist society were similar. Yet, they were very different in their understanding of how people were going to achieve their common dream of an egalitarian, stateless and propertyless future.

Anarchism, atheism and insurrectionism

The main vehicle for the insurrectionary tradition was the Socialist League and its paper, *Commonweal*. This was not always so. The League started as a breakaway from the Social Democratic Federation, the main Marxist movement in Britain. The split was headed by William Morris, who took the more libertarian-minded socialists and the anarchists out of the SDF in response to Hyndman's growing authoritarianism. Despite Morris' status and funding, the anarchists came to dominate the League and Morris withdrew under pressure. The vigorously anti-anarchist E. P. Thompson denigrated anarchist control as a coup by 'a curious assortment of cranks and fire-eaters'.¹² John Quail was much more sympathetic to the take-over, however, arguing that the split occurred due to tactical rather than doctrinal differences. It was a victory for the activists over the theoreticians. He perceptively identified the central conflict.

While he (Morris) had made out a strong case against the policy of riot he could not (and did not) expect the Anarchists to accept it. The reasons are clear enough. For them, Morris's position implied doing nothing and doing nothing implied defeat. At the back of the Anarchist rejection of Morris's 'defeatism' was a feeling, never fully articulated, that people learned their power – and what to do with it – through riotous action.¹³

This is clearly evidenced by the more rhetorical, populist and uncompromising tone of *Commonweal* under the editorship of David Nicoll and even more so when it was revived with H. B. Samuels in the editor's chair, a man whom Quail described as 'an advocate of the random slaughter of the upper class in the name of the class war'.¹⁴

Yet, this was not the only platform for working-class native anarchism. There was also the organization of Jewish workers around the Yiddish paper the *Arbeter Frait* established through the formidable efforts of Rudolph Rocker.¹⁵ Even here, the issue of anarchist outrage caused friction. According to Rocker, the editor of the *Arbeter Frait*, Saul Yanovsky, left London for New York to found the *Freie Arbeter Shtimme*, due to the hostility he faced as a result of his opposition to anarchist terrorism.¹⁶ In addition, some of the most intriguing publications were not the major ones, but those that spun out of small, often independent, groups. Those that survive in the archives include *The Free Commune*, published in Leeds, and, from a branch of the Socialist League, the East London Anarchist Communist Group's *Anarchist Labour Leaf*. But the most astounding of all was the vivid, eccentric and very independent *Chatterton's Commune; The Atheistic Communistic Scorcher*.

The sole author, Dan Chatterton, was a noted eccentric and well-known character who lived in grinding poverty and latterly earned his living through bill posting and paper selling. It is irresistible to include him in any account of late Victorian anarchism. His output is hugely entertaining, if frighteningly bloodthirsty in its exhortations to gory revolution. All his sundry pamphlets were self-published and the *Scorcher* was hand-printed¹⁷ using second-hand type, sometimes on very cheap paper. Later issues were all produced on flimsy, yellow tissue paper. His output is fully preserved as he deposited a copy of every one in the British Museum Library.

Born in Clerkenwell in North East London, Chatterton had, by his own account, been apprenticed as a bootmaker and served in the Crimea. He was a veteran of both political and secular campaigns and was also a constant presence at meetings and acknowledged as one of the great ‘characters’ of the revolutionary movement. He was often depicted in novels and memoirs. John Henry Mackay fictionalizes him as an ‘old, gray-headed man with ... sharp features ... who was hurling his wild accusations against the existing order with such youthful passion and defending his ideal of fraternity and equality with such youthful warmth’.¹⁸ Yet, to describe Chatterton as simply an angry old man is to miss the point. The pictures given of him were all affectionate but often patronizing. He can be seen as a more significant, if idiosyncratic, figure than an exotic adornment to the anarchist movement. Andrew Whitehead’s comprehensive article¹⁹ takes up John Quail’s plea to rescue him from oblivion.²⁰ He writes:

The History of the left has conventionally been written as the story of movements and organisations. Those who left no institutional legacy, who were not pioneers of party or union, whose pamphlets have not been collected by libraries, have been more-or-less neglected. There’s an injustice in this – not so much a personal injustice, as an injustice to the generations that follow who are deprived of a proper sense of the complexity of the past. Those mavericks who kept aloof from organised politics and struggled alone to preach and persuade according to their own idiosyncratic values could have quite as much importance in transmitting ideas, in however a vulgarised form, to a popular audience as the closely printed journals and the in-house political rallies.²¹

Whitehead concludes that this ‘haphazard, maverick tradition’ may have been ‘inconsistent, sometimes immodest, often quixotic but which did not mean they are unimportant’.²² Moreover, Chatterton’s significance is not just evidenced by his minor contemporary celebrity, but also by the quality of his writing.

Today the internet could have been made for Chatterton. However, he would almost certainly have been lost to posterity unless he had acquired

cult status for his blogs. His ubiquitous presence and direct intervention in meetings gave him his status as much as his writing, yet his efforts to see his publications preserved showed how determined he was to leave his mark. Though a stranger to orthodox grammar and punctuation, there is a raw power and intelligence in his pamphlets and journals. He was a tabloid revolutionary, simplifying issues with clarity and insight. This extract from his column *Notes, by the way* is a typical example. The grammar, punctuation, spelling and layout of all quotations are as per the original.

A, Tiny Picture by John Van Eyke – one of the Burghley House collection, – was sold by Messr's Christie on Saturday, for 2,500 guineas.

Daily News June 11th 88.

Eliza Sweeny. aged 33, was found dying in a van, – No home no friends. clad in rags tied on with string. Removed to St. Gile's Workhouse, She died the same evening. from an effusion of serum on the brain, accelerated by irregular habits and exposure.

Who – did Murder Eliza – Swoeney.? – Why the Bloke that legally misappropriated the 2500 guinea's To be sure.²³

This raw anger at injustice was not the only aspect of his output. Chatterton was tireless in his championing of female equality and emancipation (in contrast to most writers of the period he was also assiduous in avoiding gender bias in the use of generic terms), published a popular booklet of guidance on contraception, was violently republican and also unfailingly exhorted the masses to a murderous class war.

Workers, is it worth your while to demonstrate peaceably? Oh! No! Stand away from both, rascals.

Revolt. Let your next demonstration be one of Force, for your own emancipation.²⁴

And, more spectacularly

BLOW OUT
BLAST OUT
BURN OUT
WAR to the BLOODY KNIFE.
Masses, kill the classes,²⁵

All witnesses recount that this violent rhetoric was in complete contrast to his gentle, if belligerent, personality. Perhaps the most moving of his writing is on the atheism he carried forward for all his adult life. In his article, *Where are you going to when you die?*, he was particularly eloquent.

Sisters and Brothers, do not waste your existence in such accursed folly – Rather make the granduer of Life while you are a sensitive entity, Throw God and the Devil to the wind's as relics of the old Barbarism.

Though we cannot – live for ever without a break in the link, – Though nature has so much brutal force in her composition, – Yet Utilise the beauty that lays well in her bosoms fold. The limpid refulgent Love – gleaming in my Sister womans eye, The honest grasp of my Brother Man The – deep draught of every pleasure finds Me. an old man with heart and brain leaping bounding with – exquisite knowledge of Life well lived, (we need no Heavens) – we. want no God. We fear no Devil. Sister Woman – we revel in your Love, Brother Man We. glory in your respect, Ay'e we have taken our fill and we still Enjoy.

OH Christian, you may say you have a glorious certainty of joy in Heaven. But your only hope is blind faith, your basis is Fear, The teaching of Priestcraft in youth, – How many commit suicide in a Religious monomania – A doubt whether they are saved at all – We are free from such brutal Fear, – Calmly we faces the forces Life and Death, To Day We are so better than your God. that we should shudder to be like Him. There is no Monster God.²⁶

Chatterton was on the fringes of anarchism. He advocated an annually elected Senate of twelve people who would submit laws for approval by referendum, but described himself as an anarchist and opposed all authority. Perhaps the most important role that he played was to give voice to the working-class traditions of combative British radicalism as it merged with the ideas of Continental intellectuals. He was a living link with the physical force tradition of Chartism and the popular secular radicalism of the early nineteenth century. Dennis Hardy claims that anarchist communism 'developed in England more as the result of ideas brought from the Continent by political refugees and foreign workers, than from a continuing tradition of native anarchism'.²⁷ Chatterton shows he is only partially correct.

That voice of working-class radicalism could also be heard in Joseph Lane's *An Anti-Statist Communist Manifesto*, written for the Socialist League in 1887 but rejected by William Morris. Lane was born in Oxfordshire, had little formal education and had been a farm labourer before coming to London and becoming involved in a number of radical organizations together with other anarchist activists, including Frank Kitz.²⁸ Max Nettlau thought highly of Lane and Lane's manifesto is not

just indicative of working-class radical sentiment, it also shows the importance of the autodidact tradition and the role of working-class politics in fostering self-education. Although Lane eschewed the label anarchist for his manifesto, it eloquently articulated all the main tenets of belief of the anarchists in the Socialist League and is a testament to the later accomplishments of someone starting out without a formal education.

The manifesto is built on three basic principles: atheism, anti-statism and communism. The attention Lane gave to atheism is significant for two reasons. First, militant atheism indicated the importance of freethought in fostering libertarian ideas and, secondly, it highlighted the importance of counter-culture as part of the anarchist worldview. It may seem anachronistic to use a twentieth-century term such as counter-culture in a nineteenth-century context, especially one carrying the self-indulgent hedonistic baggage of the 1960s, but it is a highly appropriate way to describe the anarchist perception that social change and the ability to pursue a chosen lifestyle were just as much a part of the process of liberation as political economy. Eschewing Marxist-derived notions of economic determinism, many anarchists of this period saw culture as the main generator of the hierarchy they opposed as they challenged the mores of Victorian society.

Lane is explicit about the importance of culture; his analysis of power is not purely materialist. He based his thinking on a clear distinction between the two founding oppositional principles of society, authority and liberty. The maintenance of authority against liberty needs an ideology and that ideology is religion. Monarchy and nationalism alike derive from religious thought. Religion is essential to authority, not only justifying injustice as divinely ordained, but also leading to the favouring of 'fiction over reality'.²⁹ Military force has its part to play, obviously, but it is only second to religion in the hierarchy of tools for domination.

Lane was challenging the liberal doctrine that the rise of capitalism was contingent on the increase in certain liberties. Instead, he argued that capitalism grew under the umbrella of an all-pervasive authoritarianism and is an expression of it. Therefore, it is the destruction of the state as an institution that will precipitate the transformation of the economy and not the other way round. There can be no compromise between liberty and authority and atheism is the key to social revolution.

It is by the aid of this notion of a God governing the world, that all forms of servitude, moral and social, have come into existence and been established religion's despotism, classes, property, and the exploitation of man by man. To enable men, therefore, to attain to freedom and to knowledge, that is to realise the object of the Revolution he must first expel God from the domain of knowledge and consequently from Society itself. We can therefore only consider as true revolutionary socialists, conscious of the object they pursue, those who, like ourselves, declare

themselves Atheists and do whatever in their power lies to destroy this corrupting notion of God in the mind of the masses.³⁰

The working-class revolutionary voice was firmly secular.

Lane's anarchist communism is unexceptional. The state is simply an expression of authority and must be destroyed and with it the notion of politics itself, or, as he called it 'the science of government'.³¹ The destruction of government ends a continuing cycle of repression as each new regime exercises its powers in its own interests against the people. This applied as much to socialism as it does to capitalism. He wrote: 'we oppose with all our might the reactionary notion which consists in the pretence that the revolutionary socialists must seek to seize upon the political machine, and to acquire power for themselves.'³²

On political economy, Lane rejected any Fabian attempt at amelioration. He subscribed to the nineteenth-century socialist orthodoxy of the iron law of wages, that the capitalist recoups any gain in wages by the workers through higher prices, rendering attempts at improvement within the system ineffective. Rejecting both political power and monopoly capitalism, Lane called for a form of syndicalism, 'the organisation of industrial and agricultural groups, having studied and being able to apply the laws of exchange possessing the key and secret of the contradictions and antagonisms of the bourgeois political economy, standing possessed, in a word of social science'.³³ The faith in social science is typical of its time and it is on this that he bases his optimism about the capacity for rational self-organization without the market, which, in turn, allows for the rejection of property.

Lane dismissed any idea that either property or possession (he made no distinction between the two) can be liberating. Private property is simply a 'direct emanation from the principle of authority, and is based upon the theory of remuneration, or reward for individual efforts',³⁴ whereas all production is collective and so there should be no individual reward.

Social wealth has a threefold source: the forces of nature, the instruments of labour, and labour itself. An individual does not create the forces of nature, and therefore he cannot appropriate them to his own use; at most they are the common property of all men. An individual does not create the plant and machinery of work. He therefore cannot appropriate them to his own use. It is the generations of men that from century to century have transformed the raw materials into tools of production, and consequently the theory of plant and machinery being regarded as a stock of property held in common must be the only principle accordant with equity and justice ... It follows therefore that private property cannot be regarded as legitimate from any point of view.³⁵

Instead, he advocated a society with 'every member working to his ability and receiving according to his needs'.³⁶

Interestingly, it was property rather than religion that he saw as the fundamental cause of the oppression of women. Unlike Chatterton, he was not careful about the use of gendered language in his writing, but he was just as ardent a feminist. As far as Lane was concerned, gender relationships in Victorian society rendered women as property, dehumanizing and enslaving them. In his advocacy of female liberation, he was a fundamentalist. Ending legal marriage was insufficient, a mere palliative. And rather than asserting a right to self-ownership, he was adamant that the whole concept of property itself, whether in material goods or the person, must be eradicated, heralding a complete social revolution.

Both Lane and Chatterton, in their very different ways, give us a glimpse of a working-class anarchist communism that drew from a British heritage of ideas and action. Most had few inhibitions about revolutionary violence as a method of change, though not all shared the bloodthirsty relish of a Chatterton or Samuels. However, the activists gathered loosely around *Freedom* newspaper had more reservations. So too did those who worked with James Tochatti and his paper *Liberty*. Predominantly, though not exclusively, middle class, they were forced to define their position against the growing popular image of anarchism as a terrorist movement and, in doing so, they had to refine their own revolutionary theories and come to terms with the practice of 'outrage'.

Making the revolution: Violence and education

Whereas the individualist anarchists saw the use of force as legitimate only in self-defence, mainstream anarcho-communists argued that there was no way in which a revolution could take place without the use of violence. Errico Malatesta, himself no friend of 'outrage' despite E. P. Thompson's hostile and inaccurate description of him as 'the stormcock of Anarchism and inheritor of Bakunin's conspiratorial mantle',³⁷ is typical of those communist anarchists who justified the use of violence as a revolutionary tactic. Even so, he sought to stay within the individualists' more generally acceptable stance by stretching the definition of self-defence to the limit. Writing in *Liberty*, he blurred the issue of moral agency:

Violence is not in contradiction with Anarchist principles, since it is not the result of our free choice, but is imposed upon us by necessity in the defence of unrecognized human rights which are thwarted by brute force.³⁸

This idea that the placing of a bomb is not an act of free choice is a novel variation of the concept of freedom. However, such a description was understood, if not fully accepted, by those who were not enamoured by the taking of human life in a revolutionary struggle but who, nevertheless, shied away from outright pacifism.

A typical approach was that of Louisa Bevington. She has been thoroughly misrepresented as an unconditional opponent of violence, notably by Bertrand Russell. In a footnote he wrote:

The attitude of all the better Anarchists is that expressed by L. S. Bevington in the words: 'Of course we know that among those who call themselves Anarchists there are a minority of unbalanced enthusiasts who look upon every illegal and sensational act of violence as a matter for hysterical jubilation. Very useful to the police and the press, unsteady in intellect and of weak moral principle, they have repeatedly shown themselves accessible to venal considerations. They, and their violence, and their professed Anarchism are purchasable, and in the last resort they are welcome and efficient partisans of the bourgeoisie in its remorseless war against the deliverers of the people.' His [sic!] conclusion is a very wise one: 'Let us leave indiscriminate killing and injuring to the Government – to its Statesmen, its Stockbrokers, its Officers, and its Law.'³⁹

However, Bevington certainly did not denounce violence out of hand. She understood and sympathized with what drove the bombers and refused to condemn them. She had an eschatological view of the revolution that would bring about an anarchist society, which would itself be inherently non-violent, but saw how impatience, anger and oppression compelled the anarchist to take up arms against the violence of the state. Her opposition is not to violence *per se*, but to 'unintelligent' violence, which she sees as being 'inexpedient'. The section Russell omitted makes this clearer.

Killing and injuring are intrinsically hideous between man and man. No sophistry can make 'poison' a synonym of 'food', nor make 'war' spell 'peace'. But there are cases where poison becomes medicinal, and there is such a thing as warring against the causes of war. No Anarchist incites another to violence, but many an Anarchist repudiates, as I do, the hypocritical outcry against Anarchist militancy raised by those who pass their lives in active or passive support of the infamous institutions which perpetuate human antagonisms and effectually hinder the arrival of that peace and prosperity for which the world is waiting.⁴⁰

Charlotte Wilson appeared more determined to distance herself from violence, but still engaged in justificatory arguments. She asserted, on behalf

of the Freedom Group, that violence is neither integral to anarchism nor is it necessary as a form of political action. She wrote

The man who in ordinary circumstances and in cold blood would commit such deeds is simply a homicidal maniac; nor do we believe they can be justified upon any mere ground of expediency. Least of all do we think that any human being has a right to egg on another person to such a course of action. We accept the phenomenon of homicidal outrage as among the most terrible facts of human experience; we endeavour to look such facts full in the face with the understanding of humane justice; and we believe that we are doing our utmost to put an end to them by spreading Anarchist ideas throughout society.⁴¹

However, this did not lead to outright condemnation of the bomber. In fact, Wilson went on to argue: 'The guilt of these homicides lies upon every man and woman who, intentionally or by cold indifference, helps to keep up the social conditions that drive human beings to despair.'⁴² It is an elaborate sophistry that allocates equal guilt for murder to both the murderer and the politically apathetic or the sincerely hostile. Even in the wake of 9/11, the 'the Americans had it coming to them' school of thought only sought to blame the foreign policy of the American government and not all the people who lay outside the small circle of the American left. Wilson does not quite express the chilling, and reprehensible, view shouted by the bomber Emile Henry⁴³ and reiterated by the Marxist terror groups of the 1960s and 70s that 'there are no innocents', but she comes perilously close.

Nothing could be more explicit in exposing the difficulty for revolutionaries in developing a coherent stance on the tactic of outrage than this moral equivocation. Outrage engendered conflicting emotions; moral revulsion at the taking of human life, the dismay of the damage being done to the image of the Anarchist cause, the longing for revolution, and a sense of solidarity with fellow anarchists, expressed as an 'understanding' of their actions. The result was far from Bevir's description of a non-violent movement committed to moral education. Instead, although there was, especially amongst middle-class intellectuals, a repudiation of the bombers, it was often hesitant and equivocal rather than absolute.

Yet, education also played an important role in the making of the revolution. It was not seen as separate from revolutionary violence, but was integral to it as a necessary precursor. Those who believed in a spontaneous revolution arising out of a growth of class-consciousness had to face an inescapable fact. Anarchism was the aspiration of a minority and even faced considerable hostility from both left and right. If the revolution was to take place by the masses acting freely without guidance or coercion then there had to be a more general understanding of anarchist ideas and aspirations. The only alternative to despised Leninist vanguardism was education.

Education was the key way that anarchists could address popular misapprehensions and, without doubting their own beliefs, persuade the working classes of their power and interests in creating a revolution. However, education is not just a pacific course of action. Advocates of propaganda by deed viewed the very process of struggle as educative. For example, H. B. Samuels could write an endorsement of education without backing too far away from his enthusiasm for the prospect of bloodshed.

... there is but ONE means and that is EDUCATION – which gives knowledge and leads to action. The education that bitter experience teaches us, the education that is gained by strikes and lock-outs and revolts, the education that makes us think and act like men, the education that can only be acquired by learning the lessons that the struggles of the past and present teach us; and this education cannot be gained through the ballot-box or through legal enactments; those who say it can, are liars, rogues and cowards, and prove our natural enemies.⁴⁴

The synthesis of education through action with the making of a revolution was most effectively expressed by Errico Malatesta. Malatesta's roots were in the Italian labour movement and, despite a modestly prosperous upbringing, he earned his living as a mechanic all his life, giving him a practical insight into the views of working people. His four periods of exile in London gave him influence in the British anarchist movement, as did his close friendship with Kropotkin. That friendship was not uncritical however. They fell out over the First World War and there were doctrinal differences as well. Malatesta felt that Kropotkin was too 'optimistic' in asserting that working-class consciousness and spontaneity would be the source of revolution and its sole organizing principle. This he laid at the door of Kropotkin's scientific determinism, claiming that, despite his valuable insights, Kropotkin used science selectively to defend preconceived notions.⁴⁵ Revolution and the future Anarchist society were not an inherent reflection of nature and natural law. He put this succinctly in his last published writing, a critical reflection on Kropotkin.

If it is true that the law of Nature is Harmony, I suggest one would be entitled to ask why Nature has waited for anarchists to be born, and goes on waiting for them to triumph, in order to destroy the terrible and destructive conflicts from which mankind has always suffered.

Would one not be closer to the truth in saying that anarchy is the struggle, in human society, against the disharmonies of Nature.⁴⁶

Rather than relying on spontaneity, Malatesta argued that the revolution, and the post-revolutionary period, had to be organized.

Malatesta's rejection of the biological foundations of human society meant that he saw conscious action as the only possible source of change. That change would of necessity be violent. He felt that the state would not collapse of its own accord. Violence was the essence of the state and was the way in which it deprived people of their freedom. Counter-violence would have to be used against it. Malatesta remained deeply pragmatic about violence though. He rejected pacifism but he was vehemently opposed to 'outrage':

It is interesting to observe how both the terrorists and the *tolstoyans*, just because both are mystics, arrive at practical results which are more or less similar. The former would not hesitate to destroy half mankind so long as the idea triumphed; the latter would be prepared to let all mankind remain under the yoke of great suffering rather than violate a principle.⁴⁷

Not only did he reject Kropotkin's 'optimism', he also opposed insurrectionism for both moral and practical reasons. Most importantly, he thought that any insurrection at the present time would be crushed.⁴⁸ The alternative of revolution by industrial action through a general strike also met with his scepticism. A general strike would not cause the collapse of capitalism and the workers themselves would feel some of the worst hardship. He did not share the conventional wisdom of the time that there were large surpluses waiting to be liberated and redistributed by the masses. So, a general strike without revolutionary action would soon be crushed, as the workers would be denied the essentials for survival and starved back to work. The only way of preventing this, Malatesta argued, was for action to organize production and distribution. Seizure of the workshops, factories and land were, for him, the essential forms of expropriation if the revolution is not to fail. As a result, a general strike could only be a preliminary to a revolution, not the revolution itself.⁴⁹

Malatesta did not relish violence and, particularly in his later writings, he was fully aware of the potential that violent means could produce tyrannical ends: 'If in order to win (the revolution) it were necessary to erect the gallows in the public square, then I would prefer to lose.'⁵⁰ For violence to be used intelligently and effectively as *anarchist violence*, then education is obligatory. Education is not the alternative to violence; it is its necessary precursor. It ensures that force is used constructively, and does not become counter-productive.

The main aim of education is to break the metaphysical beliefs that surround and support the state. He argued that though government is essentially a protector of domination and exploitation it also has other, more positive functions. As such, it makes it harder for people to

conceive of living in a stateless society, especially given the nature of mass indoctrination.

... someone whose legs had been bound from birth but had managed nevertheless to walk as best he could, might attribute his ability to move to those very bonds which in fact serve only to weaken and paralyse the muscular energy of his legs ... Just imagine if the doctor were to expound to our fictional man with bound legs a theory, cleverly illustrated with a thousand invented cases to prove that if his legs were freed he would be unable to walk and would not live, then that man would ferociously defend his bonds and consider as his enemy anyone who tried to remove them.⁵¹

Breaking indoctrination is not enough; people have to develop their solidarity, a sense of unity.

Malatesta saw humans as possessing two instincts, self-preservation and the preservation of the species.⁵² This is the conflict between individualism and socialism. Malatesta asserted that ultimately it is solidarity that is the 'state of being in which Man attains the greatest degree of security and well being'.⁵³ This cannot be forced; such a state is only conceivable when 'the interests of the individual and those of society coincide'.⁵⁴ Solidarity is not spontaneous; it has to be learnt through action. That is the fundamental purpose of working-class and anarchist organizations. They are both forms of experiential education, forged through class struggle.⁵⁵ This, by itself, is not sufficient to reach the state where individual and collective interests coincide. For that to happen it is necessary to undermine the forces that allow for some people to prosper at the expense of others by removing the twin institutions of government and property. This means the use of violence, because it is through violence that the state oppresses and robs the working classes.⁵⁶ The revolution will be a violent upheaval, which takes time and organization to prepare for. It will be a process that abolishes property through expropriation of the means of production. It is after the revolution that government collapses and then there begins a gradual, evolutionary reconstruction of society based upon interdependence.

Malatesta's advocacy of the need for educative struggle was not a short-term vision and reflected his pragmatism, which, in turn, was based on his day-to-day contacts with working people that set him at a distance to the predominantly middle-class revolutionaries who placed such great faith in the romantic notion of the revolutionary spontaneity of the masses. For instance, Charlotte Wilson wrote: 'We Anarchists, who desire neither to rule nor to serve, prefer to trust the reason of the workers, enlightened by their bitter experience of past slavery.'⁵⁷ For Malatesta, it is not the experience of slavery that brings enlightenment, but the solidarity of intelligent and organized struggle against it.

The expropriation of property

If there was one thing that united all sections of the revolutionary communist movement, it was the need to expropriate property and eradicate it from human society. Louisa Bevington was a typically vigorous advocate.

I advocate and I look forward to wholesale expropriation because I do not believe there is any such thing as a right to property, and because I hold that it is disastrous, nay, fatal, to the welfare of all individuals composing the community, to have to regulate their lives and affairs in accordance with a fictitious abstraction which has no warrant and no basis in the natural laws of life. I desire universal expropriation, not merely because the power that property-holding gives to man over man is in wrong hands, and consequently abused, but because it seems clear to me that property-holding is all abuse in itself, and that to hold property is to make wrong use of anyone's hands at all. I desire to see the bottom knocked out of the noxious property idea itself, for good and all.⁵⁸

For Bevington, property embodied domination and oppression. Furthermore she denied any idea of natural rights in property: 'there is no such thing as a natural title to what is after all an artificial and merely nominal relation between a man and his product; a relation having no basis in reality.'⁵⁹

A man who has made such use of material that a hat is the result, has made a hat. That is all he has made. He has not made a 'right to property' in the hat, either for himself or anybody else. Before this exercise of his faculty there existed the materials, tools, and himself. There exist now, the tools, and himself, and the hat. He is related to the hat as its **producer**, not as its owner. If he has no hat and wants one, the obviously fit place for the hat is on his head. He then becomes further related to the hat as its **wearer**; and still the word 'owner' remains a term without special meaning. But say that he already has a hat and the first passer-by has none, and wants one, then the fit place for one of the hats is on the passer-by's head.⁶⁰

She thought the very idea of ownership was an absurdity and an obstacle to the proper use of resources.

From the point of view of social common sense it is as preposterous to own a pin as to own a planet. To 'own' merely means to constitute yourself, or let others constitute you, an arbitrary hindrance between the pin and the first person really in need of it.⁶¹

Redistribution and a change of ownership would merely create a new class of owners and thereby allow the return of oppression. The entire concept of property has to be eradicated.

Charlotte Wilson placed her opposition to private property in her general political economy, arguing that the 'usufruct of the instruments of production – land included – should be free to all workers and groups of workers'. She went on to describe how voluntary organization would arrange specialization of voluntary labour before goods are 'massed in large stores and markets' from which 'each individual should supply his needs therefrom as his self-knowledge prompts'.⁶² Somewhat disingenuously, and surely to the alarm of most liberals, she describes this as 'the theory of *laissez faire*, modified and extended to meet the needs of the future, and avoid the injustice of the past'.⁶³

The prevailing sentiments in the movement were more romantic than Wilson and an apposite illustration is the lyrical pamphlet produced by the Aberdeen anarchist, H. H. Duncan.⁶⁴ It encapsulates much of the anarchist communist vision. It is a celebration of nature and dreams of a future society that drew strongly on Kropotkin and reflects the anti-industrialism of the arts and crafts movement. Duncan was certainly a critic of capitalist progress. He wrote that well-being was unrelated to the continuous growth of production. However much additional wealth has been produced, capitalist industrialism failed to change the status of the worker, who remains a slave despite any marginal increase in affluence. However, Duncan also talked ecologically. The price of industrialism and the increasing wealth of the few have not just been paid by the worker but by nature itself.

Instead of green fields with their sweet fragrance, or the woods with the rustle of the leaves, and the song of the winged choristers; instead of the ever active burn, gurgling down the hillside, eager to join the river and so flow gently to the sea, we now have huge factories, filling the air with smoke; instead of the wood we have the stifling alley. The song of the bird is gone, and instead we have the poor street singer. The happy burn is supplanted by the common sewer. The rivers are polluted. Nature in her marvellous beauty is ruthlessly destroyed, all for the sake of the grasping landlord and the unscrupulous capitalist.⁶⁵

But the revolution will come, abolishing law, government and all coercion. Society will be reordered.

In such a state of freedom men will naturally form communes or villages all over the land; they will associate because they are of a sociable disposition, because they love the companionship of their fellows. They will also combine for purposes of work because they know by experience the saving of energy resulting therefrom.⁶⁶

Here then is an ethical, bucolic vision of an earthly paradise; only it is one that will come about through the power of a mighty revolution. It is Mackay's dream of perfect happiness.

Though the acceptance of the use of violence as a necessary means of liberation was common in the anarchism that sought to end class struggle through the triumph of communism, there was also a tradition of non-violence and pacifism, with equally deep roots in radical thought. The idea that revolutionary means and ends were intrinsically bound together in a chain of cause and effect was beginning to produce a preference for non-violence. Though secularists also embraced it,⁶⁷ non-violence found its most prominent expression in late nineteenth-century Britain through Christian anarchism.

Christian anarchism: Community and non-violence

The visionary and utopian aspect of anarchism, projecting a view of the future society as a peaceful and collaborative commonwealth, attracted a group of writers and activists who saw this as essentially a Christian vision. Their entry into the fray was not without resistance. Frank Kitz was particularly hostile: 'The intrusion of Christianity into the Socialist movement today is designed to vitiate it and thwart its aims.'⁶⁸ Louisa Bevington was even more vehement still. Asserting 'Religion is mankind's greatest curse!', she continued:

Unfortunately, religion is not kept out of the labor movement. Priests and parsons, who should be a horror to mankind, as their presence adds an additional element of corruption, sneak into it, and labor politicians use their services as the Liberals and Tories do. There is actually in existence a body of persons who prostitute the noble word 'Labor' by coupling it with the disgusting word 'Church', forming the 'Labor Church', which is looked upon favorably by most of the prominent labor leaders. Why not start a 'Labor Police'?

We are Atheists and believe that man cannot be free if he does not shake off the fetters of the authority of the absurd as well as those of every other authority. Authority assumes numerous shapes and disguises, and it will take a long period of development under freedom to get rid of all. To do this two things are wanted, to rid ourselves of all superstition and to root out the stronghold of all authority, the State.⁶⁹

Though Bevington did add in a grudging footnote – 'This open statement of our convictions does not imply any spirit of persecution on our part

against those who believe in the absurdities of the different religions'⁷⁰ – this scarcely amounted to a welcome. Yet, despite the virulence of this hostility, by looking at handbills together with the anarchist and mainstream press it is clear that, far from being excluded, prominent Christian anarchists shared platforms and publications with the secularists. Although they were not in the majority, they were still a significant part of the milieu.

Of the two leading Christian anarchists, J. C. Kenworthy and J. Morrison Davidson, Davidson had the wider public recognition. He was a Scottish journalist and popular historian. Qualified as, and publishing under the title of, Barrister-at-Law, he never practised law and earned his living from his writing and journalism. He was a pioneer of labour history,⁷¹ and a prolific author. He moved through radicalism to collectivist socialism and finally to anarchism and each tradition left a trace on every phase of his subsequent intellectual development. Though London based, Davidson's sense of his Scottishness and his commitment to Scottish nationalism never left him. The execrable Peter Latouche wrote of him patronisingly: 'although a man of great learning, (he) speaks with a marked Scotch [sic] accent.'⁷² Davidson's religion was central to his politics; the two cannot be divorced. His Christianity and anarchism were mutually reinforcing and he took unswervingly radical positions in each. In his view, the anarchist communism of his day was the realization of Christ's teachings. His was a version of liberation theology.

Davidson corresponded with Tolstoy and proudly displayed the Russian's endorsement of his *Gospel of the Poor*⁷³ in advertising material, but although he shared Tolstoy's commitment to non-violence he did not fully adopt his particular political philosophy. What he did share, though, is Tolstoy's denunciation of organized religion and the 'official Christianity' of the established churches. This was simply an unholy alliance of religion with both mammon and the state. Davidson's prose is redolent with his dislike of what he sees as a corruption of the Christian message. The Victorian church was simply a state religion, which was capable of endorsing war and capitalism alike. Its doctrines concentrated on the birth and death of Jesus, elevating mythology and suffering, whilst treating his life and teachings as an embarrassment. Davidson's Christ is a revolutionary, and his politics are all elaborations of the principles laid down in the New Testament and the practices of the Early Church. As he vividly put it,

The vile Imperial homicide Constantine ... craftily contrived to wed the Church to the State in an incestuous union, and from then till now Christianity ... has borne on its dishonoured forehead the sign of the State Beast.⁷⁴

The political economy in Davidson's work is an amalgam of mainstream anarchist ideas, though he always related it back to his religion. He argues

that rent and profit are unnatural extractions from the labour of the worker: 'How wages are to be made to swallow up rent and profit is the whole problem on the correct solution of which depends the economic salvation of mankind.'⁷⁵ His answer is collectivism. Davidson's collectivism is highly eclectic. He drew ideas from many different sources. From Kropotkin comes the belief in integrated industrial and agricultural labour, made possible through the appliance of advanced intensive agricultural methods. This is linked with one of his pet obsessions, free public transport. Identifying the growing centrality of mobility to a modern economy, Davidson saw how it is important for building the possibilities of integrated but dispersed communities, allowing the movement of goods and people between industrial and agricultural areas. He argued strongly for a collectivized, and free, public transport system as a basic right.⁷⁶

From the individualist anarchists he took up the cudgels for monetary reform. He wrote often about the gold standard, which, typical of his use of the Bible as an ideological reference point, he referred to as '*the Cult of the Golden Calf*'.⁷⁷ His analysis was identical to Seymour; gold is a device that allows for the extraction of value by its monopolists as interest. Also, his writing is infected by the same anti-Semitic tropes describing finance capitalism as 'Shylockism' and invoking 'Lendlord Rothschild and the robbers by *Usury*'.⁷⁸ In more than one publication, he attempts to define how value can be measured and translated into a paper currency.

What is the root fallacy of Moneytarism? It lies in this, that *gold is not, never was, and never can be a measure of value*. Value is a Ratio between Commodities – a mere 'mental affection' – and ratios are not to be *measured by metals* or anything else. They can only be *expressed by numbers*. Thus:

Bushels of corn.	Gallons of wine.	Number of sheep	Yards of cloth
20	20	1	10

That is twenty bushels of corn exchange for twenty gallons of wine, or one sheep, or ten yards of cloth. Divide their Least Common Multiple by each number respectively, and we find their true exchange relations ...

Now, take the integer *one* as the unit of purchasing power and print on pieces of durable paper of convenient size ... single units and multiples of units of such purchasing power, and you have an ideal medium of exchange which cannot be cornered, nor made the subject of usury.⁷⁹

Whereas Seymour's analysis was based on natural right, Davidson's was firmly ethical. Currency reform is a device that was not merely a form of economic justice, but the 'reconciliation of ethics and economics'.⁸⁰ The basis of his thinking is once again biblical. He quoted St Paul's doctrine

that 'he that will not work, neither shall he eat'. Such moral sentiment lay behind the workhouse in nineteenth-century Britain (and modern authoritarian approaches to welfare). However, Davidson had a different interpretation. He asserted that those 'who will not work' actually referred to the rich living on interest and rents. Wealth is not a reward for virtue, but for sin – the sin of theft.

And, Alas! Those very men whom the Apostle would have condemned to death by starvation by reason of their enormities, are precisely those before whom we all fall down and worship. Like the Jews of old, we crucify the Communist Christ and release Barrabas, of whom it is emphatically recorded, 'Now Barrabas was a robber'.⁸¹

Currency reform is a way of abolishing sin. But Davidson's commitment to Christian communitarianism would always make him uncomfortable with individualism. Elsewhere he backed away from currency reform in favour of exchange based on labour value (see below). However, unlike many anarchist communists, he still envisaged exchange and reward for labour as essential, though, in contrast to the individualists, he rejected the market and competition in favour of scientific administration by the community in a propertyless society. Private property, especially in land, is for him 'an institution at constant war with the benevolence of God'.⁸²

Davidson's theology also lay behind his rejection of other conventions of Victorian liberal thought. For instance, he derided Malthus' essay on population as 'perhaps the greatest libel ever perpetrated on Divine Providence'.⁸³ Davidson was clearly, in current vernacular, 'pro-life', but not in the conventional anti-abortion sense. Instead, he argued that God would not give life where it could not be sustained. Poverty and starvation is a product of human society, not divinely created nature. He also made two very pertinent points. First, he saw population as producing rather than merely consuming wealth: 'Malthusianism is an attempt to increase wealth by decreasing the number of wealth producers!'⁸⁴ Secondly, the key to the prevention of overpopulation is, in fact, affluence: 'There is, moreover, good reason to believe that human fecundity declines with increase of comfort.'⁸⁵ Davidson was clear that the apparent link between overpopulation and poverty is chimerical; deprivation is merely the result of human institutions.

He also had no difficulty in totally rejecting the commonplace solutions to poverty posed by conventional Christians. Thrift, temperance and even vegetarianism raised his ire. They are diversions away from a proper analysis and collectivist solution. Self-improvement through moral restraint could never bring anything other than marginal gain to the workers. Davidson subscribed to the theory of the 'iron law of wages', that remuneration 'always tends towards the minimum on which they (the workers) are willing to subsist'.⁸⁶ Trade unions were too limited in aim and were seeking

merely to create a labour aristocracy whose improved conditions are at the expense of other, less skilled workers.⁸⁷ The solution to Davidson could only be Christianity and that meant embracing communism.

The true Founder of Socialism or to be accurate, Communism, was Jesus of Nazareth, and all genuine Collectivists are, consciously or unconsciously, His followers.

... Some, it is true, have the hardihood to speak of Christ as an Individualist, but this is completely to misunderstand both His precept and practice. The Founder of Christianity was absolutely without selfishness which is the essence of Individualism. The Father in Heaven, whose divine attributes were so splendidly reflected in the Son of Man, had certainly nothing in common with the cruel God of Supply and Demand. To conceive of Christ as a member of the Personal Liberty and Property Defence League is to call sweet bitter and bitter sweet. His entire system of moral philosophy is altruistic.

His response to the rich young man who asked what he should do in order to enter the Kingdom of Heaven was staggering: 'If thou wilt be perfect go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in Heaven, and come and follow me.' For the young man the ordeal was too severe. 'He went away sorrowful for he had great possessions.' The fact is not recorded, but he doubtlessly eventually joined the Personal Liberty and Property Defence League at Jerusalem and became a Vice-President.⁸⁸

Leaving aside his faith in its literal truth, Christianity played an essential role in reinforcing and confirming Davidson's political ideas. His conception of Christian ethics provided the base for his vision of life in a future communist society. It performed the same intellectual function for Davidson that mutual aid did for Kropotkin. 'The Spirit of Jesus is needed to put a soul into materialistic Socialism.'⁸⁹ That 'soul' was the idea of community, based on Davidson's contention that the Early Church was just such a community rather than an institution. It is community that he posited as the replacement for the state.

At one stage, he was torn between state socialism and anarchist communism and sought a compromise. He wrote about how there is the need for 'an economic Columbus to discover for us the true stepping-stone or just mean between two competing Socialisms, viz., State Socialism and Anarchist Socialism'.⁹⁰ There is an almost Fabian approach to gradualism in his writing, seeing devolved local government and the new parish councils as a move to communal autonomy and containing the possibility of establishing the common ownership that would undermine the state.⁹¹ However, he consistently leant towards anarchism. His scepticism about the state would always take him there: 'the State has never been known to

do what is obviously right, and if we have regard to its base and bloody origin, probably cannot.”⁹² By the latter part of his life, he was firmly inside the anarchist camp. He had always rejected the Victorian liberal state and the institution of representative democracy as embodying a system that protected monopoly and transferred power from the people rather than give it to them. The state was in its essence anti-Christian.

In truth, to Christ the state was, in its very essence, a thing of evil – an institution in all its objects in necessary antagonism to the Kingdom of God or Kingdom of Heaven which He came to establish on earth.⁹³

Instead of the state, Davidson called for a ‘Voluntary Commune’ which embodies the Christian community. It is this concept that is rightly called ethical, though it is also rooted in socialist political economy. ‘His talisman – that little word *Love* – dissolves the State with its compulsory sanctions and establishes the voluntary commune. *Patriotism* ceases and *Humanitarianism* takes its place.’⁹⁴ This would be without property as ‘Holy Writ tells you emphatically that “the Earth is the Lord’s”, not the landlords, and that “the earth He hath given to the sons of men”’.⁹⁵

Davidson took some care to describe his utopia in detail. Land and resource restoration is the key, avowedly owing more to Thomas Spence than Henry George. His central theory was that there are currently two sources of value, labour value and scarcity value. The former is universal and natural; the latter is the product of monopolization. Therefore, ‘The first mortal blow ... to be dealt at the “classes” is for the community at large to assume control of every natural monopoly or “scarcity value”’.⁹⁶ The collectivization of natural monopolies provide all with access to everything they need, eliminating the need for credit and hence starts the process of eroding interest, or usury as he usually terms it, which is based on monopolization. Both free exchange and fair reward for labour ensue. Davidson, having abandoned his earlier schemes for currency reforms, tried to ensure this through a time book system, where hours of work are recorded and exchanged for goods whose value, in turn, is calculated in accordance with the time taken to produce them. This is similar to the scheme of the American individualist anarchist, Josiah Warren, though Davidson’s views subsequently changed. The whole question of exchange slipped out of his worldview as he became increasingly immersed in communist ideas. He later wrote of the future consisting of ‘A *moneyless* Communistic brotherhood where there was *neither buying nor selling*, and where the distinction between *mine* and *thine* should be unknown’.⁹⁷

With collectivization comes the end of competition and profit. ‘Competition is the method by which avarice asserts itself; Profit is the resultant plunder. The former says: Thou *shalt* covet. The latter: Thou *shalt* steal.’⁹⁸ The market would be abolished as production and distribution

would be on need alone and not be speculative. Distribution would be scientifically controlled through a centralized depot with local branches 'in constant communication through telegraph or telephone ... with the Bureau of Statistics', thereby allowing a precision 'that will make the blundering greed of existing Individualism at once ridiculous and contemptible'.⁹⁹ It is odd to think that Davidson is one of the precursors of the bar code.

Reading this, Davidson appears more like a state socialist, especially given his advocacy of collective ownership of the railways, referenda, and his habit of talking about a 'Socialist State'. In fact, this represented both his residual, more orthodox, socialism and the fact that he used the term 'State' loosely and interchangeably with 'community'. He never envisaged government in the same light as Marxists and his views were closer to Proudhon's federalism than to the idea of a workers' state.

With the coming of this new community, law and contract will disappear. Inheritance would be abolished with property passing into the hands of the community on the death of the property holder. Furthermore, 'for the first time since the world began, woman will, in every respect be the equal of man.'¹⁰⁰ Education will be transformed. He shared all the positivist prejudices, wished to abolish the classics, promote science and to establish a single, scientifically constructed, universal language. Again, his arguments are familiar: 'All the modern languages ... are but jungles of verbiage, which retard rather than facilitate human thought.'¹⁰¹ This 'scientific' monoculturalism was reinforced by his insistence that religion will persist and that it will be Christianity. The Church will go, there is no need for a corrupt clergy to intercede between Humanity and God, but the triumph of communism *is* a victory for Christianity. It is the only possible religion. His Eurocentrism and confidence in cultural uniformity is discomfiting to a modern reader and reflects the worst of Victorian progressive conceit.

Davidson's journey towards anarchism gave his writing the feel of a compendium of radical ideas. He was constantly assessing and reassessing their worth and thus he did not present a fixed vision, rather a dynamic intellectual voyage. The one consistent theme is his radical Christianity and, though it is not fully developed in his later work, he is beginning to express a more fully Tolstoyan position.

Verily the State is the Evil. Back to the Land! Back to the Simple Life!
Away with Governments, Palavers, *Dumas*, and Courts of Law!
LONG LIVE THE COMMUNE!¹⁰²

The bulk of his work, however, was not Tolstoyan. The most prominent advocate of Tolstoy in British anarchism was John Coleman Kenworthy.

Tolstoy's philosophy can seem bleakly ascetic and it is certainly challenging. Arguably, it is rooted in his mental crises, precipitated by a personal sense of sin and failure, and at its heart is a moral vision. Tolstoy

wrote with exceptional clarity and painful mental honesty. For him, all is interdependent.

We live as though we had no connection with the dying washerwoman, the fifteen-year-old prostitutes, the woman fagged out by cigarette-making, and the strained, excessive labour of the old women and children around us who lack a sufficiency of food; we live – enjoying ourselves in luxury – as if there were no connection between those things and our life; we do not wish to see that were it not for our idle, luxurious and depraved way of life, there would not be this excessive toil, and that without this excessive toil such lives as ours would be impossible.¹⁰³

Wealth impoverishes the poor but it also corrupts them, creating envy and the unsustainable desire to live like the rich. This compounds the corrupting effect on the rich, creating selfishness and a wilful ignorance of the effects of luxury on others. The direct responsibility for this state of affairs lies with us all and demands an individual response, which rests on his contention that there are no rights, only duties.

There is an inseparable unity of religion and politics in Tolstoy's political thought. He did not see Christ as a socialist, he saw him as a redeemer. Personal redemption can only come through the renunciation of sin and the greatest and most corrupting sin is wealth, which is solely possible as a result of the continuing misery of others. Secular anarchist communists saw redemption as being social, not personal, and material rather than spiritual. A new society would be ushered in through collective action. Oscar Wilde could write sardonically: 'Property not merely has duties, but has so many duties that its possession to any large extent is a bore ... In the interest of the rich we must get rid of it.'¹⁰⁴ In contrast, Tolstoy insisted that individual duty is inescapable. It is central to our relationships with each other; we cannot live in a libertarian arcadia. We therefore have to repent, embrace duty and choose to live differently.

And therefore the man will never answer the question: *What to do?* until he ceases to deceive himself, and repents. And repentance is not dreadful, just as the truth is not dreadful, but is equally joyous and fruitful. We need only accept the truth completely and repent fully, to understand that no one possesses any rights or privileges or can possess them, but has only endless and unlimited duties and obligations; and man's first and most unquestionable duty is to participate in the struggle with nature to support his own life and that of others.¹⁰⁵

To liberate others, people have to refuse to live off their labour and, instead, work for themselves. They must voluntarily renounce wealth, comfort and privilege. Kevin Manton referred to this as 'an abstentionist position'.¹⁰⁶

However, for Tolstoy it was anything but. The act of renunciation and repentance *is* activism and engagement. Through changing yourself, you change the world. Above all, that change is non-violent. Tolstoy's acceptance of the Sermon on the Mount's injunction to 'resist not evil' was absolute. Doing good and self-reform is revolutionary.

Kenworthy accepted these principles, as well as Tolstoy's rejection of church and state, and became the main vehicle for their expression in Britain. He visited Tolstoy in Russia, sending back star-struck reports,¹⁰⁷ and became an effective and popular speaker. A prolific writer, with a somewhat excessive use of capital letters, radical Christian morality was at the heart of his beliefs.

Economic principles are ... governed by Moral considerations. Morals are, finally, dependent upon our conception of the solution of the great mystery – What is to become of us hereafter? That is, Morals are based upon Religious Belief. Which is as much to say, that Economic questions are, finally, Religious questions.¹⁰⁸

Tolstoy's call to work for oneself is a moral choice to remove the burden that one individual places on others.¹⁰⁹ This morality was, according to Kenworthy, the distinguishing feature of his anarchism. He described the differences among anarchists as being between those who favoured force and those who advocated persuasion.

Two camps are formed; in the one are Santo, Vaillant, Henri, and the dynamitards; in the other are – whom can we name besides Tolstoy? – and the so-called 'Christian Anarchists' ...

The real root of difference which divides The Anarchist into the opposite groups of the Violent and the Peaceable is not sufficiently understood. It is the *Materialist* Anarchist who becomes the dynamitard. ...

The 'Christian Anarchist' ... is then one who believes that Jesus taught the renunciation of all that is not held in perfect Honesty and Love: and that he was right in so teaching. Today discipleship of Jesus must mean what it meant to Francis of Assisi, what it meant to Tolstoy; namely first to set one's own life in order ... then by the power of words and *example* to induce others to do the same.¹¹⁰

The basis of Kenworthy's political economy is fairly orthodox. Malthus is rejected for the same reason Davidson gives; it is a 'blasphemy'.¹¹¹ The unholy trinity of rent, interest and profit are seen as the basis of exploitation. Both church and state are rejected: 'State and Church are twin sisters, prostitute to Mammon.'¹¹² The church has nothing to do with Christianity; it is purely an instrument of indoctrination, 'necessary for the

classes to persuade the people that wrong is right, and folly, good sense'.¹¹³ Parliament is a sham, 'a cunningly devised deceit for protecting the work of oppression and exploitation. Not that the Members know it! Men's worst deeds are done mostly in ignorance'.¹¹⁴ Law is more insidious still. It is the embodiment of force and domination. Kenworthy felt that there are only two types of governing principles. Custom 'is the direct Will of the People, enforced by spontaneous action'; Law 'is the will of a Privileged Class, maintained by violence over the rest of the People'.¹¹⁵

This distinction between custom and what he called 'force-law' is important. Kenworthy talked of the need for governance in economics, yet he was not advocating a residual state but a 'multiplicity of councils' working by consensus,¹¹⁶ administering the needs of the community. Interestingly, and drawing on Ruskin, he weaves moral concepts fully into his economics. A clear example is the way he distinguishes between 'Wealth' and 'False Wealth'. His definition of Wealth is that it 'comprises those products of Labour which are good to be used and enjoyed by man'. False Wealth is 'bad to be used or enjoyed, such as adulterants of food, unhealthy luxuries, pestilential dwellings, bad books and pictures'.¹¹⁷ Thus, wealth production is not simply good in itself, there has to be a judgement made about its worth in moral terms. The criteria Kenworthy proposed for such judgements are 'Usefulness' and, rejecting Tolstoy's despair about the worthlessness of his own literary work, 'Beauty'.¹¹⁸ Kenworthy did not argue that unemployment and poverty were the result of under-consumption caused by the extraction of surplus value. They were related to over-production of 'False Wealth', which displaces the production of necessities, raising their costs, whilst producing a competitive market that, in turn, depresses prices and forces the labourer down to subsistence level. What should exist is commonality of interest between producer and consumer in satisfying work producing good quality products to replace the current exploitative alienation.

At the heart of his economics is property. Kenworthy rejected unconditional and unlimited ownership, which leads to monopoly. However, he seemed to contradict himself in some of his writings. In *'From Bondage to Brotherhood'*, published in 1894, he seemed to be a full communist, arguing that 'rather than kill to protect property', we should 'destroy property to save life'.¹¹⁹ Writing of the state of abundance that would exist in a future society, he writes:

As to dwellings, houses such as are needed are built for those who need them. There is no talk of 'ownership', as the houses belong to everybody, and are used by those whom they best suit, for so long as they are suitable.¹²⁰

However, in *'The Anatomy of Misery'*, first published a year earlier but subsequently reissued several times, he apparently broke away from the

complete denial of property and adopt a more Proudhonian approach to possession based on the idea of utility.

Our principle of Possession, or Ownership must therefore be, That Property is to be distributed to all according to their ability to Use it; or, in other words, according to their Capacity and Need. This principle we will term Use-possession.

It follows that some articles, such as food, clothing, houses, etc., will come into the Possession of Individuals. Other articles, such as manufactories, roads, railways, ships, etc., will be Possessed by the groups of individuals who are concerned in their Use. Use-possession will necessarily be Individual or Communal, as circumstances require.¹²¹

In this book, Kenworthy is not a monist in his approach to ownership. He advocated – much as Proudhon did – individual possession for use. This is not unconditional; it is only acceptable where it is beneficial to the community as a whole. Land, however, is to be collectively owned by the community and freely open to all.

The reconciliation of this apparent contradiction is to be found in Kenworthy's concept of community. The tenor of his writing and all his journalism is communist. However, the community Kenworthy envisages collectively controlling all wealth is not global but highly localized. In contrast to Davidson's demand for free railways, Kenworthy thinks that they would be abolished and even shipping would be sharply reduced as 'few goods are brought in, and but few sent out'.¹²² His vision is of predominantly self-sustaining small communities, held together by the Christian ethic of brotherhood, being able to order their own affairs through custom, including the regulation of possession.

It is this idea of community that is central to Kenworthy's description of the nature of change that will bring an anarchist society.

Clear-headed and practical men have again realised that the workers must possess their Land, and pay no Rent; that they must possess their Capital, and pay no Interest; that they must themselves conduct Trade, and allow no Profit; that they must govern themselves, and pay no Taxes to a class-government; that the organisers and managers of business must be chosen by, and must serve, those under them – the greatest being the servant of all, as Jesus commanded.¹²³

This liberation cannot be achieved through violent revolution.

No Violent Revolution has ever ended oppression ... the struggle and passion of warfare destroy in men the right feeling, the clear judgement, necessary to establish a beneficent social system.¹²⁴

Neither can a simple change of government bring about the new communal anarchy.

Government itself is the oppression from which we suffer. Put men into a position to bear rule over others, and back them up with armed force, and they will inevitably use their power to aggrandise themselves. To give any man, or class of men, the power to force the will of another man or of another class, is to debauch the one and enslave the other.¹²⁵

For the radical Christian that Kenworthy was, the corruptibility of humanity is balanced by the possibility of its perfectibility. However this involves moral reform: 'There is no remedy for social evils, except that each man shall 'cease to do evil and learn to do well''.¹²⁶ Morality is the device that ensures that oppression cannot return. The process of learning the new morality of brotherhood is not intellectual; it is practical. Brotherhood comes from working together and 'earning our livings honestly from our own resources'.¹²⁷ Through work and co-operation people learn the principles that, for Kenworthy, lay at the heart of the Christian ethic. He further argued that morality is entirely natural as Jesus' teaching is 'the most truly scientific conception of life which the world has, so far, produced'.¹²⁸

As a result, Kenworthy did not offer the vision of a sudden transformation.

Those who understand the power of the modern commercial machinery, know, past doubt, that if you workers so willed, the General Strike and General Co-operation would gain England for you in a week, and turn it into Paradise in a twelve month. This is fact, and no fairy tale.

But the revolution will not come thus heroically. Ours is the day of small things; of spreading abroad the new spirit; of uniting our men and women; of framing and executing plans of business organisation; of reducing principles and preaching to complete practice in our deeds. Yet out of small things, the great shall come; who can say, how soon?¹²⁹

This would usher in his utopia, a stateless society where 'marriage has become free and pure', where people 'well balanced and healthy in mind and body, are no slaves to, but masters of their passions', where 'Art thrives everywhere', and 'a profound earnestness underlies all'.¹³⁰ It sounds terribly boring.

Kenworthy had already given up a prosperous business career to become a writer and propagandist and now his followers were as good as their word. The first Brotherhood Church had originally been established by John Bruce Wallace in London in 1891; now Kenworthy's supporters were to add to the network by establishing one in Croydon. A range of experiments in communal and co-operative ventures followed. Kenworthy was deeply involved in the colonies in Purleigh in Essex, and Whiteway in the

Cotswolds,¹³¹ and he inspired a prosperous cycle manufacturer, G. Gibson, to set up the Leeds Brotherhood Workshop on communist principles in 1897. Everyone who wished to could turn up and work, there were no rules or formal membership, the only accounts were to record simple profit or loss, and there were no wages, everyone could take what they needed from the general fund.¹³² Needless to say, it was not a commercial success.

This experimentation was the high point of the Christian anarchism of the period. Though most of their attempts at establishing anarchist communities collapsed, the Brotherhood Church still exists, as does the Whiteway Colony, although it was forced to abandon its Tolstoyan principles. Christian anarchism sits awkwardly amongst the secularism of both individualist and communist variants and it is tempting to treat it as a footnote to the movement in Britain. But to do so would see anarchism as being composed of hermetically sealed and separate components. This is not so. Whatever the considerable differences between the parts of the movement, even a cursory reading of the anarchist press reveals significant interaction and debate. Nellie Shaw, in her history of the Whiteway Colony, gave a memorable picture of this diversity in her reminiscences of Sunday at Kenworthy's Croydon Brotherhood Church.

It may be doubted if ever a more mixed and diverse crowd ever gathered within four walls than used to assemble weekly at the old Salvation Army tin tabernacle in Tamworth Road. Every kind of 'crank' came and aired his views on the open platform, which was provided every Sunday afternoon. Atheists, Spiritualists, Individualists, Communists, Anarchists, ordinary politicians, Vegetarians, Anti-vivisectionists and Anti-vaccinationists – in fact every kind of 'anti' had a welcome and a hearing, and had to stand a lively criticism in the discussion which followed.¹³³

In addition, the Christian anarchists were pointing to another development – the growing attachment of one part of the movement to non-violence and pacifism, something that would gather momentum in the twentieth century. The debate over means and ends that anarchist outrage had inflamed was to be long-lasting. Christian anarchism was not only an active part of the late Victorian milieu; it left a legacy.

Taken as a whole, the picture that emerges of anarchist communism is of a diverse and dynamic movement that was united on the central vision of a future human society living without government or property, but was divided as to the means by which it was to be achieved. There were those that favoured non-violent direct action and social experimentation, whilst others sat inside the tradition of class struggle and revolutionary upheaval. The division exists to this day, whilst the common dream is no closer.

This rift augmented the polarization between individualism and communism. And the movement was to diverge again. One path, revolutionary syndicalism, rooted in the idea of social transformation through class struggle, is beyond the scope of this study. The other, a forerunner of social ecology, was to develop a distinctive ecological perspective that offered the possibility of synthesis between disparate anarchist ideas. Its foremost advocates were natural scientists as well as social critics. The foundations were laid by the Reclus brothers and were built on in Britain by the work of the remarkable figure of Patrick Geddes.

Notes

- 1 Outrage was the name given to what we would now call acts of terrorism.
- 2 Peter Latouche, *Anarchy! An Authentic Exposition of the Methods of Anarchists and the Aims of Anarchism* (Everett & Co.: London, 1908), p.123.
- 3 Including one by Wordsworth Donisthorpe – ‘In Defence of Anarchy’, *The New Review* (September 1894).
- 4 Joseph Conrad, *The Secret Agent: a Simple Tale* (Methuen, 1907).
- 5 Ibid p.171.
- 6 A summary, together with a picture of the canary, can be found here <http://www.boltonmuseums.org.uk/bolton-archives/walt-whitman/> (accessed 23 August 2012). The story of the Bolton Whitmanites is recounted in a splendid short book, Paul Salveson, *With Walt Whitman in Bolton – Spirituality, Sex and Socialism in a Northern Mill Town* (Little Northern Books: Huddersfield, 2008).
- 7 Mark Bevir, ‘The Rise of Ethical Anarchism in Britain, 1885–1900’, *Historical Research* (Vol. LXIX, No. 169, June 1996), pp.143–65.
- 8 Ibid p.143.
- 9 See Richard K. Pankhurst, *William Thompson (1775–1833): Pioneer Socialist* (Pluto Press: London, 1991), p.30.
- 10 The house still stands and is now Grade II listed. It was offered for rent in 2010 at £2,500 per week. It no longer represents the simple life.
- 11 Oscar Wilde was certainly a libertarian Christian socialist, though he stood apart from the two mainstreams of Christian anarchism.
- 12 E. P. Thompson, *William Morris: Romantic to Revolutionary* (Pantheon Books: New York, 1976), p.567.
- 13 John Quail, *The Slow Burning Fuse*, p.97.
- 14 Ibid p.161.
- 15 Recounted in his memoir of the period: Rudolph Rocker, *The London Years*.

- 16 Ibid p.63.
- 17 There is a story that his somewhat corpulent wife used to press the type by sitting on it, though this may well be apocryphal.
- 18 John Henry Mackay, *The Anarchists*, p.33.
- 19 Andrew Whitehead, 'Dan Chatterton and his *Atheistic Communistic Scorchers*', *History Workshop*, No. 25 (1988), pp.83–99. According to his website, <http://www.andrewwhitehead.net/dan-chatterton.html> (accessed 25 August 2012), Whitehead is planning to write a more substantial biography of Chatterton. I really hope he manages it.
- 20 John Quail, *The Slow Burning Fuse*, p.62.
- 21 Andrew Whitehead, *Dan Chatterton*, p.83.
- 22 Ibid p.97.
- 23 Dan Chatterton, *Chatterton's Commune: The Atheistic Communistic Scorchers* (Vol. 1 No. 14).
- 24 Ibid Vol. 1 No. 1.
- 25 Ibid Vol. 1 No. 14.
- 26 Ibid Vol. 1 No. 29.
- 27 Dennis Hardy, *Alternative Communities in Nineteenth Century England* (Longman: London and New York, 1979), p.165.
- 28 Nicolas Walter's 1978 short biographical essay on Joseph Lane is available here: <http://www.geocities.com/~johngray/joelane.htm> (accessed 27 August 2012).
- 29 Joseph Lane, *An Anti-Statist Communist Manifesto* (Cienfuegos Press: Sanday, Orkney, 1978), p.24.
- 30 Ibid p.28.
- 31 Ibid p.28.
- 32 Ibid p.28.
- 33 Ibid p.30.
- 34 Ibid p.33.
- 35 Ibid p.33.
- 36 Ibid p.39.
- 37 E. P. Thompson, *William Morris*, p.567.
- 38 Errico Malatesta, *Liberty* (September 1894), p.71.
- 39 Bertrand Russell, *Proposed Roads to Freedom: Socialism, Anarchism and Syndicalism* (Henry Holt and Company: New York, 1919), E-text version from the University of Virginia Electronic Text Center. <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/toc/modeng/public/RusProp.html> (accessed 11 March 2005), 1997, p.55.
- 40 L. S. Bevington, *Anarchism and Violence* (James Tochatti, 'Liberty' Press: London, 1896), pp.9–10.

- 41 Charlotte Wilson, 'Anarchism and Homicidal Outrage', in Nicholas Walter (ed.), *Anarchist Essays* (Freedom Press: London, 2000), p.79.
- 42 Ibid p.79.
- 43 Marie Fleming, *The Geography of Freedom: The Odyssey of Elisée Reclus*, introduction by George Woodcock: (Black Rose Books: Montréal and New York, 1988), p.159.
- 44 H. B. Samuels, *Commonweal*, November 1893.
- 45 Errico Malatesta, 'Peter Kropotkin – Recollections and Criticisms of an Old Friend' (1931), in Vernon Richards (ed.), *Errico Malatesta: His Life and Ideas* (Freedom Press: London, 1965), pp.257–68.
- 46 Ibid p.267.
- 47 Errico Malatesta, *Anarchia* (Numero Unico, August 1896), in Richards (ed.), *Malatesta*, p.61.
- 48 Errico Malatesta, 'The General Strike and the Revolution', *The Torch* (August 1894), p.6.
- 49 Ibid p.6.
- 50 Errico Malatesta, *Pensiero e Volontà* (1 October 1924), in Richards (ed.), *Malatesta*, p.173.
- 51 Errico Malatesta, *Anarchy: A New Translation from the Italian Original* (Freedom Press: London, 1974), p.12. Later in the pamphlet, latent anti-Semitism surfaces again. He wrote: 'Rothschild does not need to be either a Deputy or a Minister; it suffices that Deputies and Ministers take their orders from him' (p.20). Though Malatesta is using Rothschild as an example of the rich and not of the Jews and so may not be being overtly anti-Semitic, he is repeating a common anti-Semitic trope about the world being controlled by a cabal of Jewish bankers.
- 52 Ibid p.24.
- 53 Ibid p.28.
- 54 Ibid p.28.
- 55 Errico Malatesta, *l'Agitazione* (18 June 1897), in Richards (ed.), *Malatesta*, pp.89–90.
- 56 Errico Malatesta, *La Questione Sociale* (25 November 1899), in Richards (ed.), *Malatesta*, p.51.
- 57 Charlotte Wilson, 'Anarchism by an English Anarchist', in Nicholas Walter (ed.), *Anarchist Essays*, p.21.
- 58 L. S. Bevington, 'Why I am an Expropriationist', in *The Why I Ams: G. B. Shaw, Why I Am a Communist and L. S. Bevington, Why I am an Expropriationist* (James Tochatti, 'Liberty' Press: London, 1894), p.10.
- 59 Ibid p.11.
- 60 Ibid p.14.
- 61 L. S. Bevington, 'Property', *The Torch* (December 1894), p.7.
- 62 Charlotte Wilson, 'Anarchism', in Walter (ed.), *Anarchist Essays*, p.21.

- 63 Ibid p.21.
- 64 H. H. Duncan, *A Plea for Anarchist Communism* (James Blair: Aberdeen, 1893).
- 65 Ibid p.6.
- 66 Ibid p.12.
- 67 For example the Dutch anarchist F. Domela Nieuwenhuis, whose pamphlet *The Pyramid of Tyranny* was serialized in *Freedom* between May 1900 and February 1901.
- 68 Frank Kitz, *Recollections and Reflections* (Opuscula Socialista, Vol. 1, Carl Slienger – originally published by Freedom Press: London, 1912 – London, 1976), p.7.
- 69 L. S. Bevington, *An Anarchist Manifesto* (issued by the London Communist Alliance, Metropolitan Printing Works: London, 1895), pp.7–8.
- 70 Ibid p.8.
- 71 J. Morrison Davidson, *The Annals of Toil: Being Labour History Outlines, Roman and British* (William Reeves: London, 1899).
- 72 Peter Latouche, *Anarchy!*, p.209.
- 73 J. Morrison Davidson, *The Gospel of the Poor* (William Reeves: London, 1893).
- 74 J. Morrison Davidson, *Christ, State, and Commune* (C. W. Daniel: London, 1906), p.12.
- 75 J. Morrison Davidson, 'The Old Order and the New', in *Individualism to Collectivism* (7th edn, Francis Riddell Henderson: London, 1904), p.30.
- 76 J. Morrison Davidson, *Free Rails and Trams* (Politics for the People, No IV, William Reeves: London, 1890).
- 77 J. Morrison Davidson, *Four Precursors of Henry George and the Single Tax as also the Land Gospel According to Winstanley 'The Digger'* (Labour Leader Publishing Department: London and Glasgow, 1899), pp.139–51.
- 78 J. Morrison Davidson, *The Annals of Toil*, p.462.
- 79 Ibid p.466.
- 80 Ibid p.467.
- 81 J. Morrison Davidson, *The Old Order and the New*, p.75.
- 82 Ibid p.61.
- 83 Ibid p.107.
- 84 Ibid p.107.
- 85 Ibid p.108.
- 86 Ibid p.107.
- 87 Ibid p.110.
- 88 Ibid pp.89–90.

- 89 J. Morrison Davidson, *The Gospel of the Poor* (William Reeves: London, 1893), p.144.
- 90 J. Morrison Davidson, *The Annals of Toil*, p.490.
- 91 See especially J. Morrison Davidson, *The Village for the Villagers: The Village Magna Charta: The Parish Councils Act 1894* (4th edn, William Reeves: London, 1895).
- 92 J. Morrison Davidson, *The Annals of Toil*, p.468.
- 93 J. Morrison Davidson, *Christ, State, and Commune*, p.7.
- 94 Ibid pp.10–11.
- 95 J. Morrison Davidson, *The Village for the Villagers*, p.2.
- 96 J. Morrison Davidson, *The Old Order and the New*, pp.150–1.
- 97 J. Morrison Davidson, *Christ, State, and Commune*, p.8.
- 98 J. Morrison Davidson, *The Old Order and the New*, p.154.
- 99 Ibid p.157.
- 100 Ibid p.164.
- 101 Ibid p.166.
- 102 J. Morrison Davidson, *Christ, State and Commune*, p.31.
- 103 Leo Tolstoy, *What Then Must We Do*, trans. by Aylmer Maude, introduced by Ronald Sampson (Green Books: Bideford, 1991), p.130.
- 104 Oscar Wilde, *The Soul of Man Under Socialism*, p.6.
- 105 Leo Tolstoy, *What Then Must We Do*, pp.199–200.
- 106 Kevin Manton, 'The Fellowship of the New Life: English Ethical Socialism Reconsidered', *History of Political Thought* (Vol. 24 No. 2, 2003), pp.282–304, 293.
- 107 John C. Kenworthy, *A Pilgrimage to Tolstoy: Being Letters Written from Russia to THE NEW AGE in January 1896* (The Brotherhood Publishing Company: Croydon, 1896).
- 108 John C. Kenworthy, *The Anatomy of Misery: Plain Lectures on Economics* (3rd edn. John C. Kenworthy from the Clarion Office: London, 1900), p.96.
- 109 John C. Kenworthy, *Tolstoy: His Teaching and Influence in England* (The Brotherhood Publishing Company: Croydon, 1895), p.7.
- 110 John C. Kenworthy, 'The Gospel of Freedom', in *The Croydon Brotherhood Intelligencer* (Vol. 1 No.10, October 1895), pp.1–2.
- 111 John C. Kenworthy, *From Bondage to Brotherhood: A Message to the Workers* (Walter Scott Ltd: London, 1894), p.7.
- 112 Ibid p.37.
- 113 Ibid p.35.
- 114 Ibid p.42.
- 115 John C. Kenworthy, *The Anatomy of Misery*, p.47.
- 116 John C. Kenworthy, *From Bondage to Brotherhood*, p.52.

- 117 John C. Kenworthy, *The Anatomy of Misery*, p.29.
- 118 Ibid p.30.
- 119 John C. Kenworthy, *From Bondage to Brotherhood*, p.57.
- 120 Ibid p.49.
- 121 John C. Kenworthy, *The Anatomy of Misery*, p.49.
- 122 John C. Kenworthy, *From Bondage to Brotherhood*, p.52.
- 123 Ibid pp.136–7.
- 124 John C. Kenworthy, *The Anatomy of Misery*, p.92.
- 125 Ibid p.124.
- 126 Ibid p.125.
- 127 Ibid p.131.
- 128 Ibid p.121.
- 129 Ibid pp.139–40.
- 130 Ibid p.54.
- 131 For a full account of the Anarchist colonies, see Dennis Hardy, *Alternative Communities*.
- 132 *Freedom* (November 1898), p.75.
- 133 Nellie Shaw, *Whiteway: A Colony on the Cotswolds* (C. W. Daniels: London, 1935), p.21.