

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. XV.—No. 161.

OCTOBER, 1901.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

SHALL WE ALWAYS SUBMIT?

Our government of money grubbers, clergy, and landowners, is openly engaged in the work of destruction and abolition of all rights and liberties gained by our forefathers in popular revolts and struggles against exploiters and oppressors.

They are destroying even our imperfect and meagre education, knowing that the enlightened and reasoning worker is not submissive enough to their yoke of moral and economic enslavement.

They have deprived the workers of the right of combination and practically killed the trade-unions, because, they say, organised and united workers cannot be tolerated there where privileges and the right of extortion must be guaranteed to the nobility, clergy, and plutocracy.

They are starving the whole population of different localities (Grimsby, Penrhyn), forcing on the workers the will of the masters by brutal police and military assaults.

Encouraged by the popular apathy in their wholesale destruction of two small courageous republics, they began to treat the workers of this country in the same way as they practice in South Africa.

Last week at Grimsby we saw the police rushing on the people and mercilessly batoning the heads of peaceful onlookers, women, and children.

But that is the old and natural way of the growth of despotism and oppression. The enemies of the people, and all such as George III., Lord North, Salisbury, and renegade Chamberlain, begin their policy by brutalising public opinion in the name of national interest, and when the national conscience is sufficiently poisoned with sentiments of savage extermination abroad, they direct the same brutal hordes of mercenary soldiers against the people at home. But against the oppressors of former centuries always popular discontent, agitation, and revolt were roused. Quite different, however, is the spirit of our generation. Instead of resisting the brutal force of our oppressors, instead of opposing to those organised robbers a vigorous popular defence of our rights, of the fruits of our labour, of the future of our children, we are cowardly submissive and indifferent. When last April at St. Petersburg the Cossacks treated the people as the police did the crowd at Grimsby, at least some honest and courageous men appeared to give a warning to the all-powerful ministers of the Tzar.

But here! Who will have the courage to say to the second governing family, that of Salisbury, with his sons and nephews in power, to the third governing family of Chamberlain, that their policy of South-African massacre, of suppression of schools, of abolition of the right of combination once conquered by revolutionary struggle—that all their policy of exploitation and oppression is a disgrace to the country, to our traditions, and that they deserve to be damned by history and posterity.

Barely a few will be found. Because our organised workers embodied by State Socialists, the Independent Labour Party, Democratic League, and others have been too long deluded by politicians into the belief that a parliamentary government is neither more nor less than their elected servants, and that the people can always impose their will on their elected servants by ballot. That the days for using violent means in a revolutionary movement have passed, that at present peaceful propaganda is sufficient to obtain social reorganisation, that the criminals who possess power, capital, the brute force of army and police of a vile and mercenary press; that the whole powerful organisation of injustice, this quintessence of social robbery and oppression, will submit before naive declamatory phrases and ballot.

Men like Chamberlain, Rhodes, Milner, and their equals, servants of the men in the street! Not only are they masters, but the most rapacious and rascally masters, who will not fail to treat us as they have treated the brave inhabitants of the Transvaal, Orange Free State, and Cape Colony. But the

people of those States resist courageously, whilst here no political, no Socialist party exists of stout enough hearts to offer opposition by the force of a popular revolt.

The people of the present time forget that if during the last fifteen or twenty years they have enjoyed some rights, some shadow of liberty of conscience, of free speech, of labour combination; that all this was obtained by incessant struggle. As soon as that spirit of revolt was lulled by reformers and State Socialists, men often quite honest, if artless, the policy of oppression began which of late years was inaugurated by the coalition of nobility, church and capitalist brewers.

This formidable coalition is only to be checked by the resistance of the people. Therefore we ask you, exploited workers, scorned, oppressed and condemned to ignorance, these vital questions:

Will you allow your children to grow up in misery and ignorance?

Are you disposed to live under the absolute power of your masters, without the right of combination?

Will you calmly submit to the oppression of your unscrupulous exploiters?

If not—rise and do what your forefathers did when they suppressed absolutism and slavery.

A LETTER FROM AUSTRALIA.

Many thanks for the parcel of *Freedom*; it arrived in safety, which is a pleasant surprise, as literature of that kind is in unaccountable ways delayed or stolen or destroyed, anyhow often papers sent do not reach us here. We are aware that, so far as Anarchist prints are concerned, the conspiracy to destroy them is a very real one and the press censorship active.

Sydney is to my mind as free as any other part of the Australian continent, and in some respects in a sort of way more radical in its style of tolerating opinions; but Anarchism—well, the line must be drawn somewhere, as a leading light in the world of Australian politics, a cabinet minister also, once said to the writer—and this remark was made not very long back. This attitude is pronouncedly and sternly comical when exercised by the commercial profit-making daily papers, which print whole pages of "Agony," quack doctors', time payment and loan office trap advertisement, but who refused virtuously and indignantly to print a single word of announcement that the Sydney Anarchist Group intended to hold a May-Day celebration in the "Domain"; and, strange, the labor paper, *The Worker*, also being the organ of the New South Wales parliamentary labor party, refused to mention that the Anarchists held a meeting on May-Day—despite the fact that their meeting was three or four times larger than any other meeting held on May-Day Sunday. *The People*, another sheet that probably would not now be in existence had it not been that Anarchists put their hands deep in their pockets awhile ago and kept it alive when it was called *The Socialist*, while crying aloud for all Socialists to unite, misses no opportunity of reviling Anarchism and Anarchists in this city. *We, however, are always heard by the people gladly.*

Of course, Australians have much to be proud of, and some of them don't know where the hub of the universe is, but are positive it is in Melbourne or Sydney, yet, for all that, on the Sunday afternoon before "His Nibs from London" (known by the nickname of the "Duke of York") landed in Sydney, and while a man born in Australia was speaking in the public Domain of Sydney, N.S.W., two policemen deliberately interrupted the proceedings to inform the speaker that he would get into serious trouble if he did not take care and moderate his language. (The speaker was quoting some remarks made on the "House of Brunswick" by the late Charles Bradlaugh.) The police after the meeting was stopped took our comrade's name, address, occupation and other particulars, and threatened if he refused to give them to take him to the lock-up and make him give them an answer there.

We were informed privately and from a source which we had no doubt in accepting as authentic, that on the next Sunday following the incident before mentioned all the Anarchist speakers would be "sent along," not upon any straight out charge, but on some faked-up concoction, or anyhow upon some side issue.

We acted upon our information and held no formal meeting; but some of the comrades were on the spot and, sure enough, plenty of uniformed police and its accompaniment of dingoes (native dogs) in the

shape of detectives and pimps were undoubtedly in evidence. We smiled serenely and did our propaganda work all the same, thanks to our experience (gained, certainly, in jail during the 1894 reign of terror in Sydney by some among us); we were able to burst up the idea of another Anarchist hunt in Sydney in 1901 in honor of the "dear little Dook" of York.

Since writing to you on date 13th inst., we have had whispers of trouble in Melbourne. An incident occurred there yesterday which will put some of the law-and-order reformers on their mettle—it is Labor Member Findley, of the Victorian State Assembly, now, and not a bally, blanky Anarchist. He is expelled over the reprint in *The Tocsin* of the *Irish People's* article on Edward Rex. It strikes me, however, that there are other people in Melbourne and elsewhere in this country of Australia who are the marks aimed at. Will write next mail.

The Sydney comrades send you greetings. JOHN DWYER.
June 26, 1901.

P.S.—The weather is bitterly cold, almost like an English winter.

DEAR Freedom,—As I promised some more news from Sydney, N.S.W., here it is, but not of the stirring kind of the old world. We here have what some people consider Utopian: such as State or Government owned Railways and Tramways, State labor eight-hour days, legal and compulsory early closing, factory acts, labor bureaus, parliamentary labor parties, minimum-wage clauses, arbitration acts, and last week here in Sydney the first payment was made of the New South Wales old age pensions; and there is considerably less formality about getting the latter than is experienced by many old soldiers when they apply to the English War Office or military officials. But, you may say, what has this to do with Anarchism? This much, that we few in number in Australia have been practically the means of forcing ideas and circumstances equally in our favor. What old-country people would look upon with suspicion as an innovation, is accepted and acted upon and there's no more about it. Fancy what holy wrath would have been kindled if your Home Secretary interfered at a critical juncture in a big labor strike and loaned government steamers to the public for nothing, or agreed to let the strikers have the use of the government dock if the master of the big dry docks failed to get labor, which under the circumstances (all the labor being unionised) was impossible.

We Anarchists don't do too much yelling, but we are there every time. I was telling you how the police authorities, or somebody running them on a string, tried to work up some sort of a scare; well, it did not come off; people laughed at it. The day after it was announced that three whole live Italian Anarchists had arrived in Albany with His Ducal Nibs (this was placarded outside the newspaper offices in the city), another cable contradicted it; but now it leaks out (weeks after the affair happened) that several cabinet meetings were held to discuss the situation (Anarchists) and (see Sydney *Evening News* last week) "considerable stir was created in official circles at the time." As your humble servant told a big crowd at the public meeting held by us under the red flag in the Domain, these Italians would probably turn out to be decent, peaceable ice-cream makers, fruit merchants or musicians, and accessions to the community; and they proved so to be.

Now this is not high philosophy that I am writing, and may be a bit strange; but, comrades, what can you expect but contradictions from a continent where the birds don't sing but laugh; where trees don't shed their leaves but drop their bark; and animals never walk or run, only hop all the time, and Xmas pudding is eaten on the grass at 90° to 100° in the shade.

August 7, 1901.

Your comrade,
JOHN DWYER.

NORWAY, SWEDEN and DENMARK.

Looking at the course of events in the Scandinavian countries during recent years a revolutionary observer becomes pessimistic. Social conditions have become worse, particularly in Norway and Sweden, but also in Denmark, and the revolutionary movement has not yet had an impetus to make itself felt.

Touching events in Norway and Sweden during the past ten years, politically the contest between the politicians of the two countries has resulted in blinding the population to their unscrupulous misuse of power and the growth of a military system quite beyond the range of the national resources. Until recently neither army, navy or fortifications were on a war footing; now everything has been brought to the pattern of the greatest military states. Military service has newly been made compulsory in Sweden; in Norway it was introduced earlier, and while the term is short as compared with the larger European states the units have been largely increased, with a corresponding expenditure of money. The bugbear of civil war having ceased to impress the public, militant politicians did their best arouse fear by drawing attention to the presumed hostile intentions of Russia, and so obtaining votes for the increase of the army, etc. The suppression of Finland especially, and the fact that Russian spies were said to be busy in Norway and Sweden—a practice common to every state—were magnified by the bourgeois press until the public, hypnotised by the possibility of an approaching conflict with Russia, passively allowed itself to be hoodwinked into increased expenditure and armament. Norway was the first to feel the economic pressure upon the population. Before the military fever began, early in the nineties, industries were increasing steadily if slowly. Soon, however, military preparations had become so expensive that the government exchequer needed replenishing. The politicians then rep-

resented to the industrial capitalists how enormously they would gain by a protective duty upon their products, so also the farmers and land owners with a tariff upon agricultural products, and immediately such protective tariff was introduced: books, stuffs, furniture, corn and provisions are now all taxed. This duty put an end to cheap Swedish industrial and agricultural products, and the capitalists expected to make money. Factories were founded everywhere; the towns, especially Kristiania, were enlarged, and the nation took to speculation. For four years business flourished, and many grew rich, the banks readily lending money. Emigration almost stopped and there was work for all; wages increased, but also the prices of the necessaries of life owing to the tariff duty, therefore the consuming power of the people diminished in ratio.

The capitalists made money, built country villas and drank champagne; but their ventures were hazardous, and ended with fraud.

In 1899 there came a crisis. Bankruptcies followed each other in every class of industry, more especially the timber trade, and speculating merchants and land owners swiftly came to ruin. It was worst of all in Kristiania, where the swindling had been greatest. Naturally the country was dragged into the mercantile reverses. Soon there came to be a lack of employment and the prices of the necessaries of life increased, for the capitalists, landlords, merchants, etc., had no intention of bearing their own losses, the workers must be made to suffer and capitalists know best how to make them do so. At present the necessaries of life are dearer in Norway than in any country of Europe excepting perhaps Russia and those bordering the Mediterranean.

Later, the paralysing influence of the South African and Chinese wars made itself felt in Norway as elsewhere. Two years have passed since the crisis and still the bankruptcies go on. Wages have fallen in many trades, and in numerous factories there is only work for a reduced number of hands and for little more than half a day. More persons have emigrated in these last two years than for the 15 previous. All has gone down;—but the military expenditure has not gone down. Ten years ago the credit of Norway was excellent; today the bourgeois press dilates on the imminent danger of the State credit. Statisticians assert that Norway per individual spends 12/8 for military purposes; only the great European states spend more. In reality, this means that in Norway militarism is even more rampant than anywhere else; because the country from its mountainous and northern position is unfruitful, its long cold winters make life expensive, and its economic faculty is small. The national debt in proportion to the number of inhabitants is heavy and the taxation per individual higher than in other countries. Militarism empties the country of capital; therefore, many of the sources of national wealth are being exploited by foreign capital, as for instance, a newly-founded project for utilising a waterfall into electrical power for driving the factories of Kristiania; electrical power is largely used in Norway, this concern will be one of the greatest of its kind in Europe, but it passes out of our hands, as surely also will the great iron formations lately discovered in the north of Norway and half of the entire mining system.

Under these circumstances one would suppose that the politicians would shorten sail and cease to continue military preparations. On the contrary, only a month ago the Storting acceding to the Government proposal voted new millions for new fortresses and announced a further contribution for a later period; a new loan was also arranged. Such being the situation, it would be expected that the revolutionary spirit would grow. But up to now there seems no perceptible increase. The proletariat is quite indifferent or satisfies itself by voting with the Radicals, with the Social Democrats (who are divided into two parties, each hostile to the other), or with the Conservatives. Very few are actual revolutionists. The students and literary people are as a rule utterly indifferent to social questions. It is true that the percentage of voters has decreased during the two last elections, from which one would like to infer that the number of believers in parliamentary action is decreasing; but of real opposition to parliamentary methods and the State system one hears very little.

Many strikes are taking place. In the copper mines of Røros the workers have been on strike for three months owing to the company threatening a decrease in their miserable pay of 2/2 per day. Still the strikers show no revolutionary tendencies. Suffering, so far, has had a soporific influence only; it has made a few think, but the majority sleep. One day the awakening will come—would that it might be soon!

In Sweden until about eight years ago there was no standing army. Then a 90 days drill was introduced for the troops. Later, the navy was increased. Two months since, the Riksdag voted compulsory service, with eight months service for infantry and one year for other arms. Sweden for nearly 20 years has been a protectionist country. The corn duty, above all, has been grievous for the proletariat; and wages, particularly for the agricultural laborer, are low. The State owns the greatest part of the railroads, Sweden in proportion to its size having the greatest system of railways in the world. As Sweden is an industrial country these railroads are bringing the State a good income and the exchequer being in fair condition the public debt was until recently comparatively small; but now owing to the military spirit it is increasing, and our latest news is that business is decreasing and the people fear a crisis such as Norway is passing through. For the last five years there has been a series of great strikes and lockouts owing to wage questions and the right of combination; these have been fought out energetically by each side with varying success. But in Sweden as a rule the workers are not revolutionary although many of their votes go to the Social Democrats.

In Denmark the situation is almost similar. Social Democracy has

many adherents, the trade unions are large numerically and strongly centralised, but revolutionists again count few—even the great lockout of two years ago did not increase their number to any extent.

Under these circumstances you will understand that the propaganda of Anarchist ideas is surrounded with difficulty. The paper *Til Frihet!* has scarcely 200 subscribers, chiefly in Norway, and from Jan. 15 of this year until now only seven small numbers could appear. Our comrade Nils Wessel of Malmö, Sweden, edits *Brand*, the organ of the Socialist Associations of Young People. The members of these associations are mostly Social Democrats, and as a rule intelligent, without prejudice or fanaticism; a few have revolutionary tendencies and are ready to discuss with Anarchists. There are similar associations also in Denmark and Norway, but they are not as revolutionary as our Swedish comrades. Four 8 page numbers of *Brand* have appeared, one half of its contents being translations from Anarchist authors such as Reclus, Kropotkin, Severine, Reitzel, etc., as well as other Anarchist literature. I trust that the paper will continue to show this healthy lack of bigotry not later be filled up with the products of Social Democratic pens. *Brand* as well as the Associations mentioned is agitating against Militarism, the pressure of which in Sweden is now much felt and the compulsory service system increasingly unpopular. The troops are urged not to shoot down their brother-workers when forced to face them in strikes, etc. Comrade Helene Ugland, a Norwegian, is at present in Sweden where she often speaks in the different Young People's unions, being one of our best orators. With the two papers named and this movement amongst the younger population in Sweden, the only bright point in the revolutionary movement in Scandinavia is that, in some of the trade unions in Norway, there is a fraction which desires the unions to turn their backs upon politicians.

As I close, I note that the bourgeois papers have started a discussion upon Trusts. One of the dailies says: "The Trusts will further the Social Revolution, with the result that we shall see a Co-operative Republic."
K. HANSTEEN.

PARIS CONGRESS REPORTS, 1900.

The General Strike.

Prior to giving a definite explanation of a General Strike, it may be useful to state the reasons that lead us to circulate the idea. To begin with it seems to us unnecessary to include within this Report any profound criticism of society as it is, in order to show either what are or from whence arise the moral and physical sufferings of countless humble producers on the one side whilst on the other are seen so many not only favored by fortune but in a position to abandon themselves entirely to the joys and pleasures of existence, things which all should share in, and which all may have a chance of doing in the future society where every man will feel a member of one family. For long years our proletarian fathers, imbued more or less with generous and humane ideas, never hesitated to take up the sword to obtain what there might be of justice, equality and legality. We recognise and deeply deplore the blood shed in 1792; we are averse to massacre, but despite this repugnance we are obliged to declare that in order to bring about the collapse of the present social condition, a collapse inevitable owing to its disintegration, events may lead us to surpass the acts even of our predecessors.

The year 1792, by its grim violence, produced remarkable effects throughout Europe, startled every sovereign were he weak or powerful, yet failed to found a society durably just, or wherein all should find prosperity and wellbeing. Again, we know the results of the revolutions of 1830, 1848 and 1871. It seems therefore the duty of each of us to examine patiently into the economic and political situation of the country as it appeared before and after each rising and to ascertain how these manifested themselves; then, comparing the past with the present, we shall learn how necessary it is for the proletarian to seek a new base of action before endeavouring to plant the seed of a great, not merely national, but international rebellion. For this is the end to which we expect to put the General Strike, in these days recognising it as the only method by which to advance our cause. At the same time, we wish our adversaries to understand that we have no intention to disseminate the idea dogmatically—that is, as an irrefutable argument—alas, no! But at least before renouncing a propaganda that we deem efficient, we expect our opponents to offer some comprehensive, workable scheme in its place, and not a secret one as claimed by our comrades of the P. O. F. (*Parti Ouvrier Français*)

We consider also that every man claiming belief in revolutionary Socialism should accept any and every method, general strike or not, that may lead to our end, abstaining not only from criticising principles but doing his best to help the promoters in the spread of such ideas; otherwise these captious revolutionists are little more than talkers, fallacious reasoners, from whom we should keep as far as possible.

Other comrades may say: Instead of circulating such revolutionary ideas, why not pledge the people to send representatives to their executive and administrative bodies capable of carrying through the popular demands? Alas! what are we to expect from a *regime* where all is founded upon personal ambition? Is not the existence of parliaments the actual cause of the great apathy among the proletarians, owing to its keeping alive the hope of future prosperity through methods known to the enemies of ambition, to all enlightened men, as futile? In any case, does not the Past lie before us to prove that Humanity in its march to Emancipation has no halting-place unstained by blood, and it is this

very Past which urges us to say to all: If you desire what is essential to your welfare, take it.

We will now examine into the possibilities of this great movement and explain the real meaning of the phrase: General Strike.

We do not believe in encouraging partial strikes; we think them of little use even when appreciable results are obtained, because these results are never commensurate with the sacrifices entailed and are powerless to permanently improve the social position. Who, indeed, could undertake to prove that partial strikes have so far been a means of relieving the proletariat? Do we not still remember the famous strike of English engineers, of an organisation numbering thousands, which in spite of international encouragement ended pitifully, little it must be confessed to our surprise, since it is an undeniable truth that meagre earnings of a stated number of workers are hardly likely to win in a struggle against the colossal sums owned by the masters. It is, therefore, useless for the worker to enter into a struggle against finance. Looking then at the situation from this standpoint and taking into consideration the support the employers receive from the administration which places at their disposal all the organised social forces, such as the magistracy, the police and the troops, many intelligent workers have fully grasped the futility of partial strikes and believe that perhaps more can be done through the organisation of unions and groups when attempting decisive action in the future.

We do not think that a general strike can be decreed in advance; it is impossible to predict the moment when it should break out, but what we do believe possible is the preparation for that moment, and it is with this end in view that we urge the federation of groups and unions everywhere and the union of all such federations into a confederation, empowered not only to spread the idea but to watch over economic and political events, any one of which might prove capable of precipitating a declaration of the movement; by means of its organisation this confederation would be able to communicate instantly with all the federated bodies and so secure combined action. At the close of 1899, there were both preparation and declaration, but they failed. The chief cause of this failure was due to the then government, which confiscated all correspondence addressed to the unions. In view of this, we suggest as a practical method not the utilisation of the mails alone as in the past, but the despatch of a body of delegates charged with the custody of a duplicate circular to the various organizations.

We shall not cease to preach organisation upon this subject; for it is certain that in the past many revolutionary movements which might have had a chance of success have been started, and if the people were unable to derive any benefit from them it was simply owing to lack of sufficient preparation. We also consider that the general strike, if it is to bear fruit, should not be merely provincial or national, but international in the widest sense; for the annals of history prove that the reason most of such revolts have hitherto failed is due to the movement having been enclosed in too narrow a circle; this it was that really killed the Commune of 1871. At the present moment we are forced to admit that the word Revolution no longer terrifies our class opponents, because they are prepared to parry every phase of an insurgent movement; whereas a general strike, on the contrary, is to them an absolutely unknown quantity, since its strength has never been measured. But it is needless to dwell on the fears of the bourgeoisie with regard to this matter; barely had the workingmen's congresses voted upon it when parliament broached several laws destined to cancel the right to strike of certain classes of workers, nor would the famous Merlin-Trarieux scheme have been voted upon but for the threats of a general strike then rife. Also, was it not the commencement of a general strike proclaimed in Belgium in 1893 that advanced the cause, even if only partially, of universal suffrage in that country? We think that these incidents are too significant for the efficacy of the principle we advocate to be ignored.

And if, comparatively speaking, the proletariat is so capable of manoeuvring a partial strike, how easy it might be to start a general one.

Partial strike: the chief question at stake a rise in wages, and no possibility of carrying the struggle through without a certain amount of money for individual or collective distribution, the financial position always determining our success or failure.

General strike: here, on the contrary, if we wish that it end promptly and according to our requirements, as little money as possible, even none would be best, each man satisfying his own special needs where he can, with the one aim in view of acquiring the fullest emancipation possible.

We conclude by inviting all who are anxious as to their future, not only to accept this principle, but to assist us in the task of propaganda.
(By the Revolutionary Socialist Party, Paris.)

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

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

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

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

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

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

Wholesale Price, 1s. 6d. per quire of 27, carriage free to all parts.

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

THE MANAGER, 127 Ossulston Street, N. W.

The Editors are not necessarily in agreement with signed articles.

Notice to Subscribers.—If there is a blue mark against this notice your subscription is due, and must be sent before next month if you wish to go on receiving the paper.

NOTES.

VICTIMS OF CAPITALIST SOCIETY.

Society is guilty of murder—cold, cruel, deliberate murder. It announces the fact itself, and makes no amends for the crime. It officially notifies the number of its victims, and in the next breath hypocritically eulogises the murderous machinery—the capitalist state—that has accomplished those assassinations. Fifty-three deaths from starvation in London in one year (1900) of course only account for those whose fate the Home Office is bound to acknowledge. In reality a whole army of unfortunate victims of the present social organisation perish every year from starvation indirectly; for Huxley told us years ago that there was a complete list of diseases due entirely to lack of sufficient food. This is true; but when it comes to tracing the cause of these tragedies there is none but the Anarchists, the Socialists, and a handful of reformers who dare face the situation, and tell society in plain language that every man and woman who heedlessly permits these things to go on without protest is responsible for these deaths, and all those who uphold the present system for the gratification of their idle, vain lives and base ambitions, are the enemies of their kind. We will quote some remarks from the *Daily News* and the *Star* which may help "respectable," law-abiding people to understand why even kings, emperors and presidents sometimes become "victims" to the wild justice of revenge which our present society constantly provokes. The *Daily News* says:—"In this grim form that ancient wail of the forsaken and abandoned rises to us who sit at ease. We recommend the close perusal of this brief document to those excellent bewildered persons who have of late been seeking round for the cause of the spread of Anarchism. When men become outcasts and die in the street, some of them, like dying dogs, will bite before they die.....Here indeed is a fairly serious indictment against our civilisation. In the midst of the richest city in the world, in a year of unexampled prosperity, over fifty, men, women and children died of literal starvation and exposure." And the *Star*: "'Tragedy,' says Mr. William Archer, 'is a massage of the emotions.' Yet these tragedies do not massage our emotions to any great extent. We all prefer to forget and ignore the ugly side of life—until a Czolgosz thrusts it in our face."

THE STRIKE AT GRIMSBY.

Let us look now at Grimsby. The social war in this case is in another phase, but it arises from the same cause—inhuman exploitation by property-owners. Here we have a few men "owning" ships that they never made, and which, so far as they are concerned, they could not and would not use, but which they will allow to be used by the disinherited fishermen of Grimsby—or anywhere else—on one condition, viz., that thereby profit shall flow into their coffers. Failing this the fishermen of Grimsby with their wives and families may starve to death, or clear themselves out of the way in any manner they choose, so they do not impede the smooth working of the capitalist system. In other words, as human beings they have no interest for the propertied classes; they are only necessary for exploitation. But it happens these poor fisher-folk don't take the same view, having the will to live as strongly planted in them as their cowardly and unscrupulous masters. And being at the same time ready and anxious to toil hard—even to risk life and limb for their bread—they fail to see the justice of all the monstrous conditions imposed by the employers, and they strike. Hence social war in Grimsby.

CAVE DWELLERS.

Just lately there has been a little fluttering of the official

conscience in St. Pancras, owing to the outbreak of small-pox in that parish, and the sanitary inspector reports a hundred cases of families living in underground cellars, with scarcely any light or air and rack-rented to the last farthing by inhuman monsters calling themselves landlords. The *Daily News* compares these wretches to man-eating tigers, and we are not going to quarrel with the comparison. But the *Daily News* should be careful in its remarks about the conduct of the propertied classes. Such epithets nowadays are only allowable when speaking of Anarchists; in that case the more bloodthirsty the remark the more it will be appreciated by the sainted souls who pretend to be horrified at the assassination of one man, whilst revelling in the assassination of a whole nation.

Many of these unfortunate victims of landlordism are dying a harder and a slower death than McKinley. But who will weep for them? What paper will go in mourning on their account? Who will trouble to bring the assassin to justice?

In the foregoing "Notes" we have remarked upon a few of the more prominent features of a social war which is being waged every minute of every day in every year, and in all parts of the world where capitalism exists. Suddenly or slowly its victims die by tens of thousands, by "accidents," by slow poison, by starvation. But it happens once in a hundred thousand times that the victim in this war is the head of a state. Then dismay seizes on the priestly gang, and a cry for blood goes up against those who recognise this social war, boldly point to its cause, and demand that it shall be ended by overthrowing the present system and replacing it with bread, liberty, and justice, for all.

Brevities.

The British Association has been discussing the "Housing Problem" and "Trade Unionism." How many members of that august body are exceeding wroth with Trade Unionism for attempting to palter with the sacred laws of supply and demand. And the capitalist newspapers all over the country are taking up the cry that Trade Unionism will ruin the country; that it will drive trade away. Well, who cares? Of course, the capitalist does, and the countless hangers-on of the middle and upper classes; but, so far as the workers are concerned, what will it really matter? It always seemed to me that this cry of foreign competition compressed in a nutshell, amounted to this: "If the British workman refuses to work long hours for low wages, amid sordid, health-destroying surroundings, instead of an Englishman making a fortune, some German, American or Frenchman will make the fortune." We can understand this question of foreign competition is a pretty vital one to the middle classes, not only of this country, but of every commercial country. But it appears to me they are asking too much when they exact the working classes to forego leisure, culture, refinement, art and science—practically to deny themselves life and content themselves with vegetating—even for the sake of "Trade."

Trade! why the sooner we lose it entirely, the better will it be for the great mass of the workers. For, work they ever so hard today, sweat they ever so much, they are condemned even at the best to but a poor and wretched existence. When our "trade" departs, perhaps we will have the time and opportunity to turn our attention to the men and women of the country. These—and little children too—we have been sacrificing year after year to this fetish of trade. And perhaps the killed and wounded of our industrial shambles are not the saddest feature of it all. Think of the women and men grown grey with lonely labor and scant delight. Ah, the pity of it all! The poor, rag-clad, bent figures with the grey hairs, the withered hands and tottering legs, gasping, coughing and choking as they struggle in the dark and fog of a winter morning to their employment. For the "siren" has called, and they must obey—the siren of modern industrialism, which summons to destroy. The Dignity of Labor! Bah! Look at the hordes of shattered wrecks of humanity, the listless automatons, the vacant, expressionless features, and then ask if even "Trade" is worth this hellish sacrifice of manhood and womanhood which is going on today.

Several members of the British Association have also been going it strong on the old wheeze that "if a man do not work, neither shall he eat," and say that there has been a good deal too much sentimentality about this question. We agree with them. But what a woeful picture the House of Lords would present if its members were compelled to submit to one of these alternatives. Agitations for the abolition of the House of Lords! Why, with a week of this regime beloved of the British Association, every noble lord would have gone to join his ancestors—and a good many of the House of Commons as well, to say nothing of others. Of course, the British Association was discussing the question of tramps, etc. In my opinion there is a subject more worthy of discussion, and that is: "If a man work, that he shall eat."

The public are too prone to point the finger at the rag tag and bobtail tramp who sleeps in casual wards and gets his food by begging. Would that they could turn their attention to the unemployed at the other end of the social scale! If we could have done with their robbery, the loafer

and the tramp need not trouble us greatly; they are, comparatively speaking, but a trifling charge upon society. But the other loafers—

So the Trade Union Congress is over for another year. The usual resolutions have been passed, and the same old speeches delivered. There has been a movement for a number of years back on the part of Congress to take more part in political action than hitherto. I believe that this political wave is now about spent, and we will in future find the unions and Congress less anxious to find distinctions for their leaders and more desirous of solving the economic problem set to them. The recent decision of the House of Lords on the liability of unions may assist them. The problem, the solution of which is their real business, is: "How can the workers obtain effective economic control of the country?" Politics can help them but little; a development of the spirit of unionism will.

I should like to suggest here that a Conference of British Anarchists would be very desirable at the present time. When I say "the present time," I mean any time between this and the following spring. We might arrange a meeting either at Xmas or Easter in one of the Midland cities, when the fact of the gathering together of speakers from different parts of the country might be made the occasion for a large meeting, and good propaganda done. I am aware—having been at conferences before—that conferences don't do much; but I think some agreement could be arrived at for carrying on the propaganda for the coming summer in a more effective fashion. At any rate, I submit the suggestion; the columns of *Freedom* will, I suppose, be open for its discussion.

NORTHMAN.

Hermann Jung.

One of the most remarkable international Socialists, Hermann Jung, was killed in London, on September 5th, in his 64th year.

By origin a Swiss, an excellent watchmaker, of good instruction and knowing nearly all European languages, Jung distinguished himself from his youth, by the ardour of his Socialist convictions and by the energy with which he propagated his ideas in France, England and elsewhere.

He was well known by all fighters for the social emancipation of suffering humanity.

Jung was one of the first who could call himself a true internationalist by his propaganda and by his relations with the revolutionists of the civilised world. Italian, Spanish, French, German and Russian political refugees have known him intimately and held him in great respect.

But the greatest moment of his life was undoubtedly the creation of the International Workingmen's Association and the active part which he played in it. It was often said that the International "was the child born in the workshops of Paris and put to nurse in England." Among the Englishmen who received this historic child were Odger, Hales and other workers, but the man who took the child from the French parents was Hermann Jung, who faithfully transmitted the idea and purpose of its originators to the English people.

And, during the whole existence of the great Association, Jung was in the most active correspondence with the Internationalists of Switzerland and France. So great was his influence that Marx and Engels, who provoked the scission in the organisation, insisted that Jung should accompany them to the Hague Congress of 1872 to save the unity. Jung, however, knowing the real source of the division honestly declared to Marx and Engels his willingness to go on condition that they stayed away. And he was not present at that memorable Congress when Marx and Engels triumphed and the International was killed.

From this time Jung retired from the active movement, but he always remained the good-hearted and high-minded, noble comrade and man, helping every active Socialist, political refugee and even every unhappy victim of capitalist society.

W. TCHERKESOV.

Sympathy for American Comrades.

The Freedom Group sends to Emma Goldman and to comrades of *Free Society* its sincere sympathy, and trusts that the good work they are doing for American propaganda will not be impeded by the vile calumnies of a corrupt press and police.

METHODS.

The Anarchist is often taunted with the fact that he has no method whereby his ideal can be realised. To lay aside the obvious fact that the principal method is education; the cultivation of the desire and hope for a readjustment of the social and economic conditions, it might be well on occasion to take up the challenge and prove conclusively to the worker that, after all, there are several alternatives to parliamentary action, each of which is superior to political action; and they have this advantage that all alike can be utilised for the realisation of our ideal; that they are merely roads diverging a little, but yet all converging upon the same point. The parliamentarian who charges the Anarchist with having no method, forgets the fact that our field of action extends

over the whole range of human activities. It is he, after all, who has narrowed his range of activity. By limiting himself to parliament, he has practically closed for himself all the various avenues through which he might march to the conquest of social and economic freedom.

It is one of these alternatives that I wish to present now; and in doing so I don't mean to insist that it should be adopted, or that it is the only method, but merely one, which, if the working classes concentrate the same time, attention and energy upon it as they do now upon parliament, will realise for them in much less time far greater results.

At all times there are periods of marking time in forward movements; at other periods progress advances by leaps and bounds. We have advance followed by reaction; but each advance reaches a higher watermark than the one previous.

Today we have been passing through a period of reaction; but we are leaving reaction behind. To use a hackneyed phrase: "The darkest hour is just before the dawn," and even now we can see the glimmer of light which heralds the rebirth of the forward movement. The light is still grey; but it brings with it the promise of day.

What direction will this forward movement take? Will it continue to waste its energy in running its head full tilt against the stone walls of parliament, or will it evolve new methods, adopt new tactics for the realisation of its aims? The answer to this will greatly depend upon the amount of Anarchist and anti-parliamentarian propaganda which is going on in the country meanwhile; and whether the people have presented to them an alternative method which offers better promises than those which have preceded it.

Now it seems to me that in the struggle which is bound to ensue between government and the possessing classes on the one hand, and the workers, organised and unorganised, on the other, victory will ultimately rest with that side which has the economic advantage. In nearly every strike which has yet taken place, the employers, having the economic control, could subject the workers to a slow process of starvation and compel them to submit to the terms dictated by the employing classes. Even the aristocratic and powerful A.S.E. was beaten into submission a few years ago, after futilely wasting half a million of money, which might have been used to better purpose.

It is scarcely surprising therefore to find politicians declaring that the days of Trade Unionism are numbered; that strikes belong to the old order which is dying. But still the worker stands by his trade union and resorts to strikes in spite of the politician; because, notwithstanding, he has still less faith in parliament.

After all, there is very little to prevent trade unions from being invincible. It is not that they lack the power; it is the will they lack.

The worker must clearly understand that a slight rise in wages will never better his condition; because with the advance in wages there is also a rise in the cost of living. For instance, take the miners: during the last few years many of them have been earning one-third to one-half more than for some time previous; but the price of coal was doubled and trebled in some cases, causing a consequent rise in the necessaries required by the miners, to say nothing of the rise in house rent as well. Many more instances of a similar nature could be cited. My contention is this: that so long as the landlord and capitalist have economic control the condition of the workers will, for all practical purposes, remain the same. The great question is: How can the worker gain possession of this economic control?

They cannot gain it by parliamentary effort; what other method can be adopted?

This method might be adopted. A closer alliance could be formed between trade unions and co-operative societies; for after all we must remember that the aim of Co-operation is the elimination of the capitalist. Instead of trade unions investing their money with private enterprises, they might purchase land and give better opportunities to the overworked, underpaid agricultural laborer. While at the same time assisting to some little extent to prevent the depopulation of the rural districts and the overcrowding of cities, it would help to raise the status of the agricultural laborer all over the country.

In the event of a strike, instead of throwing half a million away uselessly, many of the strikers could be employed in erecting houses, buildings, machinery, etc.; helping to strengthen the cause instead of weakening it as even a victorious strike does today. The co-operative societies would also at the same time endeavour to employ as many as possible. The power of the capitalist would be to a considerable extent broken, while a splendid object lesson on the uselessness of masters would be taught to the people, preparing them for the general strike which, with the food supply in the hands of trade unions and co-operative societies, could not fail to be successful.

A series of movements could thus be inaugurated, having for their object the complete abolition of government and monopoly, culminating in the general strike and the wholesale non-payment of rent and taxes.

To reach this goal it is necessary, I must reiterate, for the workers to be animated by a new ideal; to broaden their conception of life; to inspire both trade unions and co-operative societies with a new motive force. And how can this best be accomplished? By pointing out on all possible occasions the possibilities of a movement on these lines. Encourage trade unions and co-operative societies to rely more upon the force of public opinion than upon law.

After all, faith in parliament is (strong though it may appear) rapidly vanishing. Ask the ordinary worker who is not a rabid politician what he hopes to get from parliament; and his answer will be more terse than complimentary. All that is required today is a working alliance between Trade Unionism and Co-operation; energetic action upon non-political lines, and the battle for the worker is won. When we cease following the will-o'-the-wisp of politics and make some attempt to

solve the social problem for ourselves, the realisation of our hopes will have drawn appreciably nearer. Mistakes we may make, and many, but the correction of these mistakes will be within our power and at our hands. So long as we keep our faces steadily towards freedom, and step by step secure economic control, so long shall we be safe.

This, after all, is but one method—one among many others, which can be used simultaneously—but one which adopted by the workers would carry them triumphantly through the dark stormy days of the near future to the calm and peace and harmony of a free society. The grey light which is in the skies today will have given place to the brilliancy of a day full dawned.

J. BLAIR SMITH.

ORGANISED VENGEANCE, called "Justice."

In the year 1837, Adolphe Blanqui (brother of the revolutionary leader from whom the Blanquists took their name) wrote a book, *The History of Political Economy*. He showed in it the importance which economics had in the history of humanity for the determination of political forms and also for the building up of current ideas on Right, Morals and Philosophy. Sixty years ago, Liberals and Radicals concentrated their thoughts on politics, and were altogether unaware of the new industrial conditions which were in course of formation out of the ruins of the old regime. It was from Blanqui's point of view quite legitimate that in order to draw attention upon economics and upon the Socialist movement which was then beginning, he should have gone so far as to build the whole history upon economics. Some one-sidedness was not to be avoided, was even perhaps desirable; other factors being under investigation, already more or less known, he needed not to speak about them, and all the strength of his argumentation was to be thrown upon the hitherto unknown factor.

His exaggerations have been pursued by the German school of Social Democrats, forgetful of all other aspects of the development of society. In our turn we, the Anarchists, have shown the great importance of that other factor, the State; and it rests with us to have its bearing upon society clearly established.

However, while laying stress upon the hierarchical, centralised, jacobin, anti-libertarian principles of the State, we are, perhaps, apt to neglect our criticism of what has been called *Justice*. This report has been written with the special desire to draw attention on the origin of this institution and to invite a discussion which would throw light upon that subject.

A careful study of the development of society forces upon us the conviction that *State* and *Justice* are two institutions which not only co-exist in society down the stream of history, but are connected together by the bond of cause and effect. Whosoever admits the necessity of separate, chosen members of society for the special function of distributing punishments to those who have broken the law, needs a body which enacts these laws, codifies them, establishes standards of punishment—needs special schools for teaching the manufacture and interpretation of laws—needs gaol, gaolers, police, hangmen and army—needs the State.

The primitive tribe, always Communist, does not know of any judge: within the tribe theft, homicide, murder *do not exist*. Customs are sufficient to prevent them. But in the very rare cases in which a member would disregard the sacred rules of the tribe, he would be stoned or burned to death by the tribe as a whole. Each member of it would throw his stone or bring his bundle of wood, in order that it should not be this or that man who has put the culprit to death, but the tribe in its entirety.

When a member of another tribe has injured someone, then *the whole tribe* of the wronged one is responsible for the carrying out of an equal injury; and *the whole tribe* of the assailant is responsible, so that any of its members as opportunity arises may be chosen by any member of the wronged tribe for the retaliation—according to the principle of life for life, tooth for tooth, and so on; wounds to be inflicted exactly as they were received, the grain of corn being the standard of measurement of each wound.

That is the primeval conception of justice.

Later on, in the village life of the first centuries of our era, the conception changed. The idea of Vengeance is by and by left aside—very slowly, of course, chiefly among agricultural populations, still surviving among the warriors—and the idea of Compensation is developed; compensation to the wronged man, or to his family or to the tribe. As the patriarchal family appears, in possession of cattle and of slaves stolen from other tribes, Compensation takes more and more the character of *Evaluation* of the damage done—the value being different according to the rank of the wronged one: so much for a slave killed, so much for a peasant wounded, so much for a chief abused. The scales of *valuation* form the first barbarian codes. To fix the amount, the village community met; the bare facts of the case were ascertained by the enquiry of jurymen chosen in equal number (6 or 12) by both parties or their families. The old members of the village or, better still, the *bards*, to whose memory the tradition is entrusted, or perhaps outside judges invited by the community, decide the compensation (simple restitution for theft) and the fine to the commune or to the gods.

But gradually, during the immigration of different tribes, many free communities are enslaved. On the same territory live, side by side, conquerors and conquered. Then come the priest and the bishop, feared sorcerers, and by and by the jurymen, the bards, the old men

of the tribe are superseded in the valuation of Compensation by the delegates of the bishop or of the local lord. The fine becomes more and more important; the compensation to the wronged one less and less; the share of the community in the fine comes to naught; the whole payment is pocketed by the chief. The *Old Testament* provides these delegates with the necessary traditional example of judgment. Thus we see the modern judge evolving out of chosen jurymen at the same rate as the feudal system evolves out of the village community. The idea of *Punishment* is born, and soon drives away every other conception, especially under the action of the Church, which taking example by its Hebrew predecessors wants to reign by terror. An injury to a priest is no longer an injury to a man, it is an injury to the divinity, and no punishment is severe enough to chastise such a crime. The cruelty of the judgment increases as time goes, and secular power imitates the clerical power.

In the 10th and 11th centuries the mediæval city appears. Revolution after revolution, city after city expel the judge of the bishop, of the lord, of the duke. The cities make their *Conjuration*. At first the citizens swear to drop all contests arising from the law of the Talion and, if new contests arise, never to appeal to external powers, but to settle everything among themselves. The Guild, the Parish, the Town community are the different degrees of jurisdiction. Bailies, chosen by the members of the guild the street, the parish or the town, decide the compensation to be granted to the wronged party. In specially important cases, the guild, the street, the parish or the town, convoked to a general meeting, pronounce the sentence. Besides, *Arbitration* in all the stages between individuals, between guilds, between parishes and cities takes a very large extension.

But that organisation lasts but a few centuries. Christianity and a revival of the study of Roman law find their way into the ideas of the people at large. The priest harps incessantly upon the anger and wrath of God. His favorite argument—still the same in our day—is that eternal punishment will be inflicted for trespass against the law of the Church; applying the words of the Scripture concerning those possessed by evil spirits, the Church discerns a demon in every wrong-doer; she invents all sorts of tortures to drive the demon from the body, and then burns him that he may not relapse. From the very beginning, Priest and Lord act together; the priest is often himself a Lord; the Pope is a King; therefore the one who has broken the law of civil society is by and by treated as the one who has trespassed against the Church. The clerical and the civil powers go hand in hand, the clerical only slightly ahead, their laws and refined tortures increasing steadily in ferocity. The Pope, himself supreme umpire, gathers round himself lawyers, experts in Roman and feudal laws. Common sense, knowledge of usage and customs, study of human nature, are left more and more in the background; they are said to foster bad passions, to be an invention of the devil. "Precedent" ranks as law, and the older a judgment is the more important, the more respectable it appears to be. "Precedents" are therefore sought for from imperial Rome and from Hebrew judges.

Arbitration disappears slowly before the rising power of the bishop, the lord, the king, the pope. As the alliance of civil and religious powers becomes closer, amicable settlements of disputes are forbidden; compensation to the wronged party becomes a thing of the past;—vengeance in the name of a Christian God or of the Roman State being the main point. At the same time, the atrocious character of the penalties inflicted is such that it is almost impossible to read the description of the judicial scenes of that period.

The fundamental ideas of Justice, essential to every society, have thus totally changed between the 11th and the 16th centuries. In our article on *The State and its historic rôle* we have endeavoured to explain how the State took possession of the free cities; let it be sufficient for our present purpose to remark that, when the evolution took place which brought the cities under the sway of the State, the communities had already forsaken, *even in ideal*, the principles of arbitration and compensation which were the essence of popular justice in the 11th century. When the State laid its hands upon the cities the old conception had entirely gone. Christianity and Roman law had already made States out of free cities. The next step was simply this, that the State established its empire upon the now enslaved cities.

Certainly, it would be interesting to study how economic changes happening during that length of time (five centuries), how distant commerce, exportation, creation of banks and of commercial loans, how wars, colonisation, and capitalist production taking the place of communal production, consumption and commerce—to study how all these factors influenced the leading ideas during the same period and helped to that change in the conception of Justice. Some splendid researches are here and there to be found in the works of the historians of the free cities. A few original researches upon the influence of Christian and Roman ideas also exist (though such studies are of a much more difficult nature and always heterodox). But it would be wrong to trace everything back to economics; it would be just the same sort of mistake as if, studying botany, we should say that the amount of heat received by a plant determined its life and growth, forgetting humidity, light and other important factors.

This historical *resumé*, short as it is, shows nevertheless how the State and the evolution of Vengeance, called Justice, are related institutions—derived from one another, supporting one another, being historically one.

But a moment of quiet thought is sufficient to understand how both institutions hold logically together, how both have a common origin in the same idea: *Authority* looking after the security of society and exer-

cising vengeance upon those who break established rules or laws. If you admit the existence of judges, as specially selected members of society entrusted with the care of applying codified traditions, it does not matter by whom chosen or elected,—you have an embryo of State round which other powers that may be will gather. On the other hand, if you admit the centralised structure called State, one of its functions will be to administer justice. Hence the judges.

But can we not have judges elected by the people? Let us see where it leads us to. First it must be said that the idea of *laws* directly made by the people has never been seriously entertained; their drafting must always be left to some more enlightened man (hero, *Ueberrnensch*). Then besides the judge and the lawmaker (legislator), other men will be needed to explain such laws, to interpret older ones, to study their connections and leading ideas: law universities with staff of teachers and students, acting like a drag on society with all the weight of their inherited traditions and their hair-splitting about the letter of the law. But that is nothing compared with the auxiliaries needed by the judge: on one side the gendarme, the police, the prostitute, the spy, the *agent provocateur*; on the other, the gaoler, the executioner and all the sequel of turpitude which necessarily accompanies them. Finally, you must supply some supervising body to keep all that army of functionaries going. You must not forget to provide money for their maintenance and so on. In short, there is not one function of the State today whose services can be dispensed with if we want to keep the judge—be he elected by the people or not.

But what about the Code? The Code, all codes, represents a gathering of traditions, of formulas borrowed from old conceptions absolutely repugnant to all Socialistic ideas of today; survivals of our slavish past, slavish in action, slavish in speech, slavish in thought. It is of no consequence that some of the leading moral ideas may be in accordance with our own; the moment a punishment is decreed for the non-fulfilment of a good action we will have nothing to do with it. A Code is the past stereotyped and put across the path of human progress.

Every legal punishment is legalised vengeance, vengeance made obligatory, and we must ask ourselves what is the use of vengeance? Does it help maintain social customs? Does it ever prevent the small minorities of breakers of good custom from doing so? Never. On the contrary, to proclaim the duties of vengeance is simply helping the existence of anti-social customs. Think of the amount of filthy perversity thrown into society by the police institution, far more dangerous to society than any act committed by criminals. Think of the "well-intentioned lies" of magistrates meant to get the truth out of the criminals. Think of all that happens round us and you will understand why Anarchists have no hesitation in declaring that Punishment is worse than Crime. And everyone studying those questions and going to the bottom will come to the same conclusion, and will try to find some other means of protecting society against the evil-doers.

Everyone will see that arbitration, arbiters being chosen by the contending parties will be sufficient in the very great majority of cases to quell arising disputes. Everyone will admit that the policy of non-interference now so greatly favored is a bad habit acquired since the State found it convenient to assume the duty of keeping order. Active intervention of friends, neighbours, passers-by would prevent a large proportion of conflicts. Let it be everybody's duty to assist the weak, to interfere between fighting people, and police will not be required at all.

The student cannot help being struck by the fact that for a couple of centuries there has been a parallel development going on: on one side legal punishment and vengeance have been less and less bloody, not to say milder, torture has been abolished, penalty of death has been limited to fewer cases and in some countries totally abolished; on the other hand anti-social acts have diminished. There is a far greater security in our every day life than in that of our forefathers. Many factors have helped towards softening of manners, but softening of punishment is certainly one of them. Should we not continue in the same line; or should we suppose that a Socialist or Communist society would be inferior in that respect to a capitalistic government?

We can do without judges in society, as well as we can do without bosses in production.

CONCLUSIONS.

So called Justice is a survival from a past serfdom based, for the interest of the privileged classes, on the Roman law and on the ideas of divine Vengeance.

In the history of society, organisation of Vengeance under the name of Justice is coterminous with the State; they imply one another; they were born together, flourished together and are doomed to perish together.

Coming from an age of serfdom it helps to maintain serfdom in present society; through its police, prisons and the like, it is an open sore, throwing out a constant stream of purulence into society, a far greater evil than the one it is supposed to fight against.

Any society founded on better economics than ours will certainly come also to the conclusion that it is unwise to keep any punitive institution.

The way of doing without it will be found in voluntary arbitration, in greater effectual solidarity, in the powerful educative means which a society will have that does not leave to the policeman the care of her public morality.

PETER KROPOTKIN.

Methods of Propaganda.

I can't find anything in Blair Smith's remarks to quarrel with except the word "homologate," which I do not remember seeing before, and which therefore offends my conservative instincts.

I don't think I put any stage as lower than the other. One comes before the others in point of time, I think, but afterwards they alternate and mix with varying moods and circumstances, and should be run to best advantage according to opportunity.

With regard to class-consciousness, I agree with Blair Smith, I think. We want to remind people that they are divided into classes, but that they should not be. And individually it appears as a duty to some of us, at any rate those who have got out of the only class worthy of respect—the working class, to emancipate themselves, not always an easy job. I suppose a society in which all are of one class, is the same as one of no classes.

With regard to living on the labor of others, we all do that to some extent. But it is disgraceful not to contribute according to one's capacity towards the fund of life. Now I suppose half the workers are engaged at mischievous or useless work. So we have to cultivate two points of opinion in this matter: (1) It is disgraceful not to work. (2) It is only honorable to do useful work. A man who does useless or harmful work is not only living on the labor of others, but he is hindering them in their labor of supporting him, and this whether he is a top-hatted lawyer or a shoddy-clothed laborer in the arsenal. Don't let me be mistaken, I respect the latter more than the former. But I would have the latter see that he is a hindrance and in an immoral position. And, after all, there is not much to choose between the two—the lawyer and the arsenal laborer—they are each "earning their living" according to their lights.

I should much like to see an effective No Rent and No Tax movement, as mentioned by Redcap. I have neither to pay myself, so can't join in example. But I am inclined to think that, after all, perhaps the best and most effective way of fighting rents and taxes will be somewhat on the lines pointed out by E. Howard in his *Garden City* scheme, namely, to buy up agricultural or neglected land and build up fresh capital on it which shall belong to the new community settled on it. (Vide: *Tomorrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform*, by E. Howard; Sonnenschein.)

Tom Cantwell has not convinced me that more pay and shorter hours do not tend to follow prosperous trade. The building up of such trade under capitalism is at terrible cost to the poor. But after the trade is established, I think, the workers get some little share of the general rise in prosperity. However, I confess I don't know much about it, and don't think it much worth going into. I am bent on finding ways out, or cultivating a determination to get out of the system. I agree with him as to employers; "We mean to do without 'em" is the song we have to sing.

ARTHUR ST. JOHN.

THE DILEMMA OF AUTHORITY.

McKinley's death calls for little comment from us, so much having already been written upon it. That what has been written, as concerning Anarchists and the movement, is filled with falsities does not alter the case. Truth wears a grim face and is not beloved of penny-a-liners. It might be well, however, if the glib journalists who strive so eagerly to gull the public mind could for once appreciate the difference that lay between McKinley, private citizen, and McKinley, President of Trusts. McKinley, private citizen, may have been, possibly was, a blameless individual. Now, it is only the Newspaper Anarchist who kills the blameless individual. The bullet that, probably aided by his physicians, finally ended McKinley's career, was not aimed at the blameless individual, but at McKinley—unscrupulous imperialist and crafty politician—at McKinley, ignorer of the rights of working men, defender and supporter of the infamous Trust system of the United States—at the President of a "Free" Republic, who, spurning the title of monarch, possessed more power than all the autocrats of the world rolled into one, and never in one single instance used that power other than to foster the privileges of the rich—to ameliorate the condition of his less fortunate countrymen seems never to have entered his thought.

A George Washington as ruler is never likely to have a shot aimed at him except by some disgruntled politician. Presidents of the Washington type are not foisted into the White House on the back of a bank cheque; Washington was not the embodied representative of the greed of monopoly that today, under the cloak of commercialism, grinds down the American workers and rouses the bitterest animosity against a system and a class of which the human mind is capable. Hall Caine's contention that the worker who struck this latest blow at capitalism was but fulfilling a natural law, is just. America, he further remarked, like every State, must in its turn reap the fruit of the centuries of oppression that have devastated the nation. A few as serious-minded men write in a similar strain. For Time brings its own revenge, and the militant Anarchist of our day is only one of the instruments by which its insistent hand adjusts the pendulum of Justice. "Anarchists," says our far-sighted friend Mr. Dooley, "is sewer-gas," and implies to "Mr. Hinnisey," that there would be no such gas if it wasn't for the sewers.

Exactly; but for the gross abuses festering the earth—abuses of power, wealth, position, commerce—abuses patent to all but their blind and hardened purveyors—there would be no militant Anarchists. Fill in the sewers and you will have no deadly gases; drain the swamp and malaria ceases; remove the wrongs under which millions of men and women hopelessly struggle, and you destroy at once the breeding-places of discontent and rebellion. But what do capitalists care about the suffering upon which they batten? What does militarism care for the slain upon whom it treads so carelessly and incomes—of clericalism, what reck it of the human intellects paralysed by its blighting grasp? But the Anarchist thinker and worker does care—cares at times so much that as has been proved, one might say to excess, he is ready at the bidding of a resistless impulse to face death in the expression of his fierce indignation at wrongs that can be remedied but are never remedied until the sufferers weary of suffering revolt. Czolgosz dies, as the American judge put it, to teach a class of people that the law must be supreme, a class which must be given, “a terrible example of the majesty and irresistible force of the law that they would tear down.” Oh, most blind judge! How many “terrible examples” has this “class” not had, and what has been the result but an increased contempt for the majesty of “law” that never since it fell into the hands of Authority has worn other than a smile for the rich and a scowl for the poor.

Death!—Rest. No, Judge, the majesty of your “law” thus translated has little terror for the Anarchist. Were you to reverse the process and electrocute a few of your Trust fiends, your wheat cornerers, your municipal boodlers, your senators who do not believe in educating the negro, but make an eloquent plea in justification of lynching him—were you to kill off a few of these noble upholders of the law we wretched Anarchists have the courage to despise—it would do your soul good to see how terror might inspire honesty in the ranks of the rich. Anarchist literature may be suppressed, Anarchists themselves throttled off the face of the earth in groups or singly, but Anarchism will live and grow. We are tired of repeating this. But as Emma Goldman once wrote: “What makes the work of propaganda so hard is fighting the prejudice against Anarchy, that popular belief so eagerly spread by police and press that Anarchy means Beer and Bombs. It is difficult to get people to understand that Anarchy as a philosophy has nothing to do with either. Lately,” she continues, “I addressed a meeting of liberal thinkers, and they told me that what I expounded as Anarchy was Socialism, not Anarchism, because as they were taught to understand the principles of Anarchism, these meant Violence and Destruction. I am doing my best to disperse these nonsensical notions.” She has always done her best to do so. But the rapid spread of Socialistic ideas throughout the world is terrifying princes, churchmen, and bureaucracies alike. Anarchists do not make plots in these days; they know that in every case where bomb throwing is advocated the suggestion comes from a police pupil or a police dupe—that is, from men in the pay of those who know that the breath of Liberty is in the air, that Liberty spells loss of power and empty pockets to them. Thus Authority will fight for all it is worth, will not only not put out one finger to right the wrongs of the people, but will not even expend a thought on them until compelled by force of fear, preferring to misrepresent the opinions and acts of their enemy rather than buy a penny pamphlet on Anarchism, with a view to understanding or explaining a philosophy that inculcates a hatred of tyranny and injustice in all their forms. Cleanse your sewers, Capitalists and Kings, for death lurks within their slimy depths, and Time the Avenger, when it means retaliation, is not particular in its choice of instruments. If the rights of the rich are many—the wrongs of the poor, who shall number them? Men like Bresci, Czolgosz—and when they lose their heads over the same.....??

Lectures at Athenaeum Hall:

(73 Tattenham Court Road, W)

Sunday Oct. 6,

“An Anarchist View of McKinley” H. KELLY.

Sunday Oct. 20,

“Education and Commerce” A. ST. JOHN.

“FREEDOM” MAY BE OBTAINED OF

W. Reeves, 83 Charing Cross Road, London, W.
O. Mathias, 20 Little Pultney Street, London, W.
Heiligenstein, 39 Charlotte Street, London, W.
B. Ruderman, 71 Hanbury St., Spitalfields, London, E.
Blair Smith, 15 Sunnybank St., Dalmarock, Glasgow.
W. MacQueen, 10 Baldovan Place, Harehills, Leeds.
A. Barton, 12 Olive Terrace, Owlerton, Sheffield.
A. Gorrie 18 Princess Street, Leicester.
N. Notkin, 242 N. 2nd Street, Philadelphia. Pa. U.S.A.
K. A. Snellenberg, 54 Haskins St., Roxbury, Mass., U.S.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

FREEDOM Guarantee Fund.—N. 5s., Kampfmeier 5s., S.K. 10s., Spanish Group 1s., T. del M. 5s., £1.

Annual Subscriptions.—S. 1/8, Taak 2s., Notkin 4s.

Sales of FREEDOM.—Newsagents 3/2, K. S. 4/5, Smith 13/4, pamphlets 6/8, Office 4/2, Notkin 22s.

BRESCI PORTRAITS, Carte de visite size, 3d. each. For benefit of prisoners.

WANTED: “FREEDOM” for 1886 (except Oct. and Dec.); Jan., June, Aug., October 1888; Jan., Feb., 1889; Feb. 1890; March 1891.



“Free Society.” An Exponent of Anarchist-Communism, 615 Carroll Ave., Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A. Agent for Free Society's publications: T. CANTWELL, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N. W.



Cosmopolitan

ALL KINDS OF PRINTING
IN ALL LANGUAGES
AT MODERATE PRICES

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

Printery

FREEDOM PAMPHLETS.

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

Other Pamphlets.

- GOD AND THE STATE. BY MICHAEL BAKOUNIN. Price fourpence.
- THE CHICAGO MARTYRS. Their speeches in Court and the record of their trial, with the reasons given by Governor Altgeld for pardoning Fielden, Schwab, and Neebe; price 1 shilling. Spies speech in pamphlet form, 1d.
- MORBUND SOCIETY AND ANARCHY, by JEAN GRAVE. One shilling.
- DIRECT ACTION VERSUS LEGISLATION, a new pamphlet by J. Blair Smith. Price one penny.
- AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. BY PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
- A DIALOGUE AND HUMOROUS POETRY BY L. S. B.; 16 pages 8vo. 1d.
- LAW AND AUTHORITY. BY PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
- EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. BY ELYSÉE RECLUS. 1d.
- CHANTS FOR SOCIALISTS. BY WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
- USEFUL WORK VERSUS USELESS TOIL. BY WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
- MONOPOLY; OR, HOW LABOR IS ROBBED. BY WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
- AN ANARCHIST ON ANARCHY. BY ELYSÉE RECLUS. 1d.
- THE COMMUNE OF PARIS. BY WILLIAM MORRIS, E. BELFORT BAX AND VICTOR DAVE. 2d.
- SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN GERMANY. BY GUSTAV LANDAUER. 1d.

All the Freedom Pamphlets notified above can be obtained of W. REEVES, 83 Charing Cross Rd. W., and of T. CANTWELL at 127 Ossulston Street, N.W.

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