

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

Vol. XVII.—No. 179.

AUGUST, 1903.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

THE COMING REVIVAL OF SOCIALISM.

There is not the slightest doubt that we are on the eve of a new revival of the Socialist movement in this and other countries. In what form the revival will shape itself we cannot yet foretell with certainty, we can only guess. But some such revival as we had in the forties, and again in the eighties, is undoubtedly near at hand.

It is self-evident that when we speak of a revival of "Socialism," we don't mean a revival of "Social Democracy." The writers of this last school have done all they could to make people believe that Social Democracy is Socialism, and Socialism is nothing but Social Democracy. But everyone can easily ascertain himself that Social Democracy is only *one fraction* of the great Socialist movement: the fraction which believes that all necessary changes in the Socialist direction can be accomplished by Parliamentary reforms within the present State; or, at least, that only such reforms need be spoken of; and that when all main branches of production shall be owned by the State, and governed by a Democratic Parliament, and every working man will be a wage worker for the State—this will be Socialism. This is their creed. There remains, however, a very considerable number of Socialists who maintain that Socialism cannot be limited to such a meek reform; that it implies much deeper changes, economical and political; and that even the above reform cannot be realised within the present State by its representative institutions. Many begin thus to see that it is not by acquiring power in Parliament—under the unavoidable penalty of ceasing to be a Socialist party, and gradually becoming a "Moderate Radical" party—that the changes required by *Socialism* can ever be realised. Social Democracy is the right wing of the great Socialist movement—not this movement itself. It is, then, a revival of Socialism altogether that we see coming,—one of its causes being precisely the failure of Social Democracy to bring about the great changes which mankind needs and claims at the present moment of its history.

What immediate cause will provoke the coming revival of interest in Socialism it is difficult to say, because there are so many causes which may produce it. It may be a severe industrial crisis—such as was lived through in these isles in the forties, and again about 1886; or it may be some great international cause, including great wars, which may result in a revival of the international Labour movement; or it may be an intellectual revival, such as we had in 1857-1865, when it was combined with the political revival that was provoked by the efforts of Italy and the glorious attempts of Garibaldi. To speculate about the probable immediate cause would be idle. But it will not be idle to examine into what can be done in order that the experience of the preceding movements in the forties, the sixties, and the eighties should be utilised, and should help us to make of the next movement a real step in advance upon all previous ones.

When we examine the state of mind of the democracy in this country during the years which culminated in the French Revolution of 1848, we can sum up its distinctive features as follows:—The movement was religious to a great extent. It was Republican, Democratic, but it was not revolutionary. Economical questions were prominent, but the most advanced writers and thinkers did not go beyond State aid to associations of workers. Experiments with such associations, as well as with agricultural and mixed associations, were in great demand.

Under the influence of the Christian Socialists, Socialism was often represented as a return to Christianity. "The Christ a Socialist" was a favourite saying. True, that the preaching of Robert Owen was independent of Christianity, and that

Fourier's criticism of Christianity was superior in substance, if not in its form, to that even of Nietzsche. But Lamennais, with his "Words of a Believer," had produced a deep impression; so did also Maurice and Charles Kingsley, with his "Message of the Church to the Labouring Man." Among the middle-class Socialist writers there was a decided tendency to represent Socialism as a religion so beautiful that it would be sufficient to prove its relation to the teachings of Christ in order that it might conquer the world. Natural sciences at that time had not yet made the sudden progress which they made twenty years later.

The movement in England was not revolutionary. The Socialists, when they had seen to what terrible lengths the middle classes were prepared to go in the repression of the Labour movement—a free distribution of sentences of hard labour in Australia was their reply to Robert Owen's "Trades Union"—when they saw this, they submitted. They began preaching co-operation on the one side, as a means of accumulating money in the hands of the working classes for future struggles, and secret Labour war on the other hand. Besides, many of them fell into an error which we still see existing at the present day: that of expecting from the Royal power and the landed aristocracy—the King and the Tories—help for the emancipation of the factory workers. The teaching, and partly also the practice, of the Socialists was directed towards this end. When they saw what resistance they would meet with from the middle classes, they began to show a leaning towards Toryism: Kingsley, for instance, supported the House of Lords! They flirted with the Pretender to the throne of France, Napoleon, in the hope that he, who had written a book on the proletarians, would be the man to accomplish Socialist reforms if he became Emperor; just as at a later epoch the German Socialists supported Lassalle in his flirtations with Bismarck, helping the iron minister to defeat the Liberals and to govern without Parliament. It was only natural, therefore, that the Radicals of the forties, both English and foreign (Mazzini, Herzen, Ledru-Rollin), should look on the Socialists with suspicion.

On the other hand, the British Radicals themselves were only Radicals half-way. After having obtained the abolition of the corn laws, some extension of the suffrage, and some factory legislation, they took no more interest in the economical conditions of the labourers. The campaign which had been started for "the land for the people" was dropped. The rapid extension of the industries of Great Britain, due to the rapid extension of the railways and steam navigation, promised such sources of enrichment for the country, if she could only be first in the conquest of distant markets, that the economists had no difficulty in persuading the working classes to keep quiet: they would benefit from that growth of commerce, provided they would support their Government in such a policy and let the British producer take hold of the markets,—an illusion which really *was* accepted by the British workers, is nourished still, and has prepared the latest evolution of Imperialism.

All attempts at compelling the factory owner and the landlord to share the immense revenues accruing to them from the sudden growth of the industries and the world trade, were thus dismissed by most Radicals as too Utopian and dangerous to the very foundations of the economical life of the country. The Republicanism of the earlier Radicals was gradually abandoned, too, as dangerous for the security of trade; and in proportion as the more uproarious elements of the country found an outlet in emigration, both to the States and to the now rapidly growing Colonies, and in proportion as the trade-unionist movement began to be more and more legalised (as a first step towards the muzzling of it, which is attempted now), Radicalism became tamer and tamer. It chiefly made its influence felt in religious matters and in the slow, constructive, educational work, especially in the industrial centres.

As to the economical conceptions of the Socialists, they also

underwent a gradual deterioration. Formerly the very word "Socialism" did not exist. There were Communists only, who did not make any difference between what is needed by the worker for *producing*, and what is needed for *living*. They proclaimed the right of everyone to live, and discussed the means of guaranteeing this. But then, gradually, they began to speak of "Socialism" instead of Communism, and limiting their conceptions thereof more and more, and going from one concession to another, they came to represent Socialism as the State's aid to working men's productive associations.

After the defeat of the Revolution at Paris, in 1848, and the crushing down of the Paris proletarians, even that was found too advanced. Socialism was almost forgotten; the Socialist literature, which was so abundant before 1848, disappeared, and there came a blank of nearly twenty years before a new revival of the movement began, in the sixties, on the Continent, and brought about the foundation of the International Working Men's Association.

The echoes of this second movement in England, and the effects of the great war which broke out in 1870 between France and Germany, and put an end to this new phase of the Labour agitation, were so important that we shall speak of them at some length in our next issue.

CRIME AND HEREDITY.*

I.

In his very fine *Vindication of Anarchism* now appearing in *Free Society*, comrade C. L. James takes up a position with regard to crime and criminals which appears to me to raise some questions for discussion on this important subject. He practically accepts the teaching of Lombroso and his followers, as I understand him, whilst the majority of anthropologists, at any rate on the Continent, do not agree with Lombroso, and the number of his adherents yearly grows less. I cannot agree with comrade James' position for two reasons:—First, the theories of the Lombrosian school are supported by no adequate evidence, what little evidence there is on the question seeming to point to their falseness. Secondly, because the assumptions which underlie the theories of Lombroso are such as to provide, if they are true, a very formidable argument against the progress of the human race.

Let us first see what is Lombroso's theory, and what is his evidence for it. The important part of it is the assertion that there exists a class of born criminals. At any rate, the question on which I wish to lay most stress is whether what Lombroso calls "born criminals" are really such, or whether they are made criminals by their environment, *i.e.*, by the events and surroundings of their lives. This is for us the vital point in the theories of criminology. Lombroso's theories on this point have already been sufficiently disputed by anthropologists of the greatest ability,† so that in any case we ought to guard ourselves against their apparent plausibility, and examine the evidence in its favour and against it very carefully. Space will not permit a proper discussion of the question; but one or two points are worth noting.

As Manonrier points out, the methods of the Lombrosians are almost identical with those of the phrenologists, and open to the same objections. Only, instead of one bump of criminality, they find bumps all over your body. If your fingers are badly shaped, or your features are not symmetrical, if your teeth are not normal, or you are club-footed, you are a criminal. And what is the method by which they arrive at this wonderful and invaluable knowledge? They examine criminals, and note down the irregularities of their features—and that is all. They do not attempt to show why there should be any connection between anatomical irregularities and criminal tendencies, except by the use of the vague term "degeneration," and the misuse of the term "atavism" (*cf.* Manonrier). The use of the term degeneration does not explain anything, even if it is useful in other ways. For if we say that criminality is one form of degeneration, and irregular teeth, say, is another form, yet what reason have we to suppose that one form of degeneration must be accompanied by another. I repeat, for it is the vital flaw in their reasonings, that these ready theorists have not attempted to show of what kind is the connection between their physical signs of degeneration and the supposed accompanying mental signs. There is only one possible way in which they could show that there was such a connection. They could measure according to their anthropometric standards a large number of men and women, chosen haphazard, and measure similarly an equal number of criminals. They would thus obtain the average type for mankind in general, and also the average type of criminal. Their case would be proved if their figures showed a distinct and satisfactory difference between the type of the average man and the type of the average criminal. According to every rule of logic, this is the only method by which they could obtain evidence for the truth of their theories. This they have not attempted to do. But instead? They set up an imaginary type of human being—called the normal—arrived at by hopelessly unscientific methods, and then proceed to show that the criminal differs consider-

ably from this normal, without troubling to find out whether the average of all men does not differ just as much, as is probably the truth. A good example of their style of argument is that which connects criminality with tattooing. Since Lombroso will have it that these men are born criminals, I suppose he will say that these men are born with such a character that they will one day want to tattoo themselves. This is actually what he appears to mean when he refers to tattooing as a sign of atavism. Suppose that tattooing is more common among criminals than among men of the same class and social position who are not criminals—a fact not by any means proved—well, the explanation seems to me to be very obvious. Tattooing shows that a man is uneducated, that his æsthetic instincts have never been developed, but have remained at the stage at which we find them in savages. It may well be that his moral instincts have remained undeveloped too, and that in this respect also he has never risen above the level of a savage. But if there is any connection between these two facts, the explanation is probably to be found in his lack of education, and in the brutalising conditions of his childhood and youth. All this metaphysics of atavism seems unnecessary to explain so obvious a thing. Much more might be said to show the absurdities of this so-called science of criminology. But the reader will already have had, I hope, enough to prevent him accepting, without considerable thought, the position of comrade James.

II.

Besides the absurdity of their evidence, the Lombrosians have omitted at the beginning the very important matter of defining what is meant by a criminal—psychologically, that is to say.

Let us attempt to do it for them, and then see what difference it will make to their theories. We may define a criminal as a person whose moral sense is lacking or imperfect. You all know what is meant by "moral sense." In thinking of certain actions you feel that you do not want to do this or that,—you feel that it is wrong, and this sense of its wrongness is in most cases strong enough to prevent your doing it. Our moral sense it is that tells us what is right and what is wrong, and it acts moreover by impelling us to do the right and avoid the wrong. Without the moral sense in the individual, society would be impossible. And it is through the evolution of society that the moral sense has developed. In obeying the moral law, *i.e.*, in following the guidance of the moral sense, we act in accordance with our own best nature, itself the product of centuries of social life and mutual aid. But society as it is to-day thinks that this moral sense is not sufficient alone. So it makes laws, and threatens those who disobey them with punishment. Without doubt the laws and customs of early societies, enforced by public opinion, resulted in a further growth of the moral sense of the individual, making the laws after a time, unnecessary. This is the explanation of the place of law and custom in social evolution. And while nations were small it had its effect. But in modern societies the laws and the punishments threatened to those who break them do not have this effect. That is why we Anarchists hold them to be unnecessary, even if they were good. The moral sense of the individual depends on the training of his early years, and on the influence of those persons with whom he comes into immediate contact. The Statute Book has no influence upon him. It does not matter for our present purpose whether laws and the fear of punishment deter a man from doing an action when his moral sense would not. And this is not the place to discuss the point as to whether the moral law and the statute law coincide. In general our definition of the criminal as a person who disobeys the moral law is correct,—at any rate correct enough for a general discussion, though the term crime is used to denote only the breaking of certain particular moral laws. For example, it is not called a crime to tell a lie except under certain specified conditions,—in a court of law (perjury), etc. But, psychologically considered, all wrong actions are alike, though society punishes some and not others.

There are various sorts of criminals. There is, first, the person with no moral sense at all, who does not feel that any action is wrong. Such persons have been called "moral imbeciles" (Ellis), and are classed by Lombroso as born criminals. There are others who have a moral sense very undeveloped, ungrown. And, again, there are persons who have a fairly well developed moral sense, *i.e.*, they know what is right and what is wrong, but have not sufficient strength of character to resist a sudden temptation. Their moral sense is weak.

Now let us see what can be possibly meant by the phrase a "born criminal." Does it mean a man born without a moral sense? But so are we all. A baby has no idea of right and wrong. What it can only be taken to mean is a person born so that it will be impossible by education and the best moral influences of life to create in him a moral sense. This is the startling metaphysical assumption that the Lombrosians make. For the life of me, I cannot understand what it can mean. How do they imagine it to come about? They offer no explanation. Do they think that the moral sense is situated in one particular part of the brain, and that this part is deficient in such persons? I do not think they would get any psychologist or physiologist to agree to that. But as I have said, the whole thing is pure assumption, and until it is proved we have the right to disregard it.

Let us look at the other side. Think for a moment of the haphazard way in which all education is carried on at present, particularly moral education, which is made an appendage of religious teaching. Think of the influence which surround a child in that class of modern society from which the largest number of criminals come. Badly

* *Free Society* March 22, March 29, and April 5, 1903.

† For example, Manonrier, *Atavisme et Crime, Les Aptitudes et les Actes, &c.*

nourished, in unwholesome surroundings, with only the poisoned air of cities to breathe, a child grows up with an enfeebled brain and nervous system. No care is taken to instruct the child as to its position in the world and in society; it has no opportunity of coming under the raising influences of art and literature; on the contrary, it is accustomed daily to coarseness and brutality in word and deed. Can we wonder that the most notable product of our civilisation, apart from lunatics, is the class we call criminals? In these facts we have explanation enough of the prevalence of crime, without needing recourse to the metaphysical theories of Lombroso.

A word more in reference to my assertion that if the assumptions underlying the theories of the Lombrosian school were true, they would be in direct opposition to views otherwise well proved. The first writer to give a full argument for Anarchism based his argument on the fact that "the characters of men originate in their external circumstances."* And every writer on Anarchism since has practically assumed the same position. The usual argument against Anarchism is that it is impossible while men are what they are. And if men were bound to stay what they are, with the superstitions and prejudices they have at present, then some of us at least would have to acknowledge that Anarchism is a vain and impossible dream. But we hold, on the contrary, that men change as their circumstances change. Men are made what they are by present social conditions, and if the social conditions were changed, men's characters would change with them. This is the basis of our argument for the possibility of Anarchism. And we hold it to be capable of scientific demonstration.

Our message to the makers of prisons and to the ignorantly learned professors is this: provide healthy and pleasant surroundings for the children of our great cities, such as ought to be given to every human being, instead of the unwholesome and miserable influences that to-day debase and brutalise them, and your prisons will be empty, and your professors will find some more worthy subject for their ingenuity.

THE LAY OF THE LABOURER.

A spade! a rake! a hoe!
A pickaxe, or a bill!
A hook to reap, or a scythe to mow,
A flail, or what ye will—
And here's a ready hand
To ply the needful tool,
And skill'd enough, by lessons rough,
In Labour's rugged school.

To hedge or dig the ditch,
To lop or fell the tree,
To law the swarth on the sultry field,
Or plough the stubborn lea;
The harvest stack to bind,
The wheaten rick to thatch,
And never fear in my pouch to find
The tinder or the match.

To a flaming barn or farm
My fancies never roam;
The fire I yearn to kindle and burn
Is on the hearth of Home;
Where children huddle and crouch
Through dark long winter days,
Where starving children huddle and crouch,
To see the cheerful rays,
A-glowing on the haggard cheek,
And not in the haggard's blaze!

To Him who sends a drought
To parch the fields forlorn,
The rains to flood the meadows with mud,
The blight to blast the corn,
To Him I leave to guide
The bolt in its crooked path,
To strike the miser's rick, and show
The skies blood-red with wrath.

A spade! a rake! a hoe!
A pickaxe, or a bill!
A hook to reap, or a scythe to mow,
A flail, or what ye will—
The corn to thrash, or the hedge to plash,
The market team to drive,
Or mend the fence by the cover side,
And leave the game alive.

Ay, only give me work,
And then you need not fear
That I shall snare his Worship's hare,
Or kill his Grace's deer;

* Godwin's *Political Justice*, Book I. chap. iv.

Break into his Lordship's house,
To steal the plate so rich;
Or leave the yeoman, that had a purse,
To welter in a ditch.

Wherever Nature needs,
Wherever Labour calls,
No job I'll shirk of the hardest work,
To shun the workhouse walls;
Where savage laws begrudge
The pauper babe its breath,
And doom a wife to a widow's life,
Before her partner's death.

My only claim is this,
With labour stiff and stark,
By lawful turn my living to earn,
Between the light and dark;
My daily bread, and nightly bed,
My bacon, and drop of beer—
But all from the hand that holds the land,
And none from the overseer!

No parish money or loaf,
No pauper badges for me,
A son of the soil, by right of toil
Entitled to my fee.
No alms I ask, give me my task:
Here are the arm, the leg,
The strength, the sinews of a man,
To work, and not to beg.

Still one of Adam's heirs,
Though doom'd by chance of birth
To dress so mean, and to eat the lean
Instead of the fat of the earth;
To make such humble meals
As honest labour can,
A bone and a crust, with a grace to God,
And little thanks to man!

A spade! a rake! a hoe!
A pickaxe, or a bill!
A hook to reap, or a scythe to mow,
A flail, or what you will—
Whatever the tool to ply,
Here is a willing drudge,
With muscle and limb, and woe to him
Who does their pay begrudge.

—Thomas Hood.

AN APPEAL FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE GENERAL STRIKE IN HOLLAND.

The National Committee which has been formed in Holland to aid the victims of the late General Strike solicits the assistance of all English men and women who sympathised with the resistance of the Dutch workers against the Strike Laws.

The funds are nearly exhausted, and still 1,200 persons must be helped every week unless they are to starve. The employers have determined to take no striker back, and 2,000 men are still locked out.

It must be remembered that the Dutch workers only declared a General Strike when every other means had failed in the defence of their common rights as free men and citizens.

Not only in Holland, but in all countries, the attempt is being made (or has already become law), as in Victoria (Australia) and New Zealand, to rob the workers of their last weapon in their fight against Capital by making Labour Strikes illegal and liable to severe punishment.

Let us all who love Liberty and Human Progress remember these signs of international reaction, and unite to help the Dutch workers who fell as victims in a courageous resistance against a Clerical, reactionary Government.

All donations should be sent to

A. W. AMMERLAAN,
President of the National Committee.
164, Rozengracht, Amsterdam.

Or to our address, 127, Ossulston Street, London, N.W.

Politicians are a set of men who have interests aside from the interests of the people, and who, to say the most of them, are, taken as a mass, at least one long step removed from honest men. I say this with the greater freedom because, being a politician myself, none can regard it as personal.—Abraham Lincoln.

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. 4d. per quire of 27, carriage free to all parts.

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

THE MANAGER, 127 Ossulston Street, N.W.

The Editors are not necessarily in agreement with signed articles.

Notice to Subscribers.—If there is a blue mark against this notice your subscription is not paid and must be sent before next month if you wish to go on receiving the paper.

In future all Money and Postal Orders should be made payable to J. Turner, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W.

NOTES.

"LEADERS" AND "MISLEADERS."

The writer of "British Industrial Notes" in the "American Federationist" is responsible for the following absurd remarks on the recent labour dispute on the Clyde:—"The cloudy-brained critics of Trade Unionism heralded the action of the Clyde men as a protest against the 'tyranny of the Labour leader.' Such nonsense met its due reward in thinking circles, and now it is evident that the Clyde men and the general executive are in harmony.

"The final remark to be made in this episode is the more urgent need for discipline among British trade unions, now that the funds are liable to seizure for so-called damages which an employer can 'legally' prove he has suffered."

This, in spite of the fact that he admits in a previous paragraph that the men balloted on the question and the vote was *against* accepting the reduction of a shilling a week. We suppose the men who are the direct sufferers have no rights which the executive are bound to respect. Leaders, forsooth! Elected to *lead*, they end by driving the men to accept a reduction of their standard of living. It was ever thus with leaders. As to the urgent need of discipline to prevent their union funds from being seized, that is a policy as cowardly as it is hypocritical, and one which will stifle any attempt at improvement—and all honest persons know it. The talk of "so-called damages" to the capitalist is on a par with Rufus Isaac, K.C.'s, statement in his defence of Richard Bell, that no harm was meant in calling a man a blackleg, it was not a bad name, and so on. How is it possible to win a strike except by inflicting damage on the capitalist, or the fear of it. Such talk deceives no one—except perhaps the one who utters it—least of all the capitalist; and the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants had to pay in lawyers' fees and all nearly £50,000 for damages they did inflict, and rightly too, on the Taff Vale Railway Company. The unions have got to face the issue and fight, and hard too, if they wish to preserve their existence, and we believe some of them know it. Now what strikes us as unfortunate for the readers of the "Federationist" is that they should have such trivial nonsense served out to them as reliable information on the Trades-Union movement in England. It is bad enough to have to combat the errors and falsifications of the capitalist press. Surely Labour papers should at least be fair to their own class. To attain this all that is needed is that labour-editors should take pains to ensure that trustworthy persons, endowed at least with an ordinary amount of intelligence and common sense, and possessing at any rate an elementary knowledge of the labour movement, should supply their news.

H. M. K.

GUILTY.

It is fast becoming superfluous for Anarchists and Socialists to denounce the infamies of the present system. This good work is being so well done by such intelligent and well disposed students of the present system, that the more important work of educating the workers so that they can take action with a clear conception of their own welfare is the task that could and should absorb the energies of all Socialists who are not deluded by the snares of politicians.

Mr. Charles Booth's latest book is such a crushing indictment of the capitalist system, that only liars or hypocrites can ever again sing its praises. Poverty, misery, crime, on every hand. Deterioration, degradation, decay—these are the fruits

we are gathering from landlordism, capitalism and the schemes of the financiers. The whole terrible story is told simply and without anger or passion. But for those who can read between the lines it is easy to see that the world is approaching a struggle in which the workers will have to fight for a regenerated society or fall to a depth of slavery that the world has never yet seen. We hope Mr. Booth's book will be well read, and will induce many who have leisure and opportunity to devote themselves to the good cause of human emancipation from economic slavery.

IN THE LAND OF SOCIAL DEMOCRACY.

We quote the following from the *Morning Leader*:—

WHERE SPEECH IS NOT FREE.

BERLIN, July 8th.

In February last a workwoman, named Wilhelmina Adam, living at Halle, was one day drinking a cup of coffee with her neighbours Herr and Frau Ehrlich, also working people.

The conversation turned on the Kaiser's speeches, and Frau Adam made an improper remark about the Kaiser's friendship with the Sultan. Some time afterwards the two families quarrelled, whereupon Herr Ehrlich went to the police and informed about Frau Adam's rude reference to the Kaiser.

For this *lapse lingua* the poor woman has now been sentenced to two months' imprisonment.

Now, Social Democrats, with your 3,000,000 votes, rise up in protest, and demand a little elementary justice for this poor woman so vilely betrayed. Don't be alarmed, we are not asking for the Social Revolution. That would be expecting too much from you. But after all your boasting cannot you make it possible for an honest person to live in a country where you have so much "political power"?

WHAT IS ANARCHY?

It is such a common device of the capitalist press to abuse its political opponents by calling their rule "Anarchy" that it may appear useless to make any protest against this subterfuge of gutter journalism. But we see no reason why the *Star* should descend to these tactics, because as a Radical journal it must be fully aware of the meanness of the trick, and moreover it can convince no one of the justness of its own position by calling the Government's passing of the Education Bill "Anarchy," and regarding the passive resisters as law-abiding citizens. We have nothing but detestation for what Mark Twain would call the "awe-inspiring imbecility" of Balfour and his myrmidons; but they are the Government, and they make the laws, which the *Star* has always told the Anarchists to respect. Consequently the Nonconformists are the rebels, and in resisting the law are acting in an Anarchist spirit. We hope they will keep on resisting; it is their only chance of success. But the *Star* must not try to confuse the logic of the situation. It cannot have it both ways. If the Liberals want liberty of conscience, so too do the Anarchists—and a good deal more beside. They aim, indeed, at that full conquest of the liberty of the individual which includes the *Star's* narrow view of this great need as the greater includes the less. In the great battles for progress it is time this elementary fact was learned, even by Liberals: To resist means Life; to submit means Death! The Nonconformists need not be ashamed of the Anarchist spirit. It has stood them in good stead before, and will again.

AN APPEAL FOR CANTWELL.

In making this appeal on behalf of our old and valued comrade T. Cantwell, it will scarcely be necessary for us to remind our friends of the long and trying illness that has overtaken him, and from which he has not even yet recovered, and his consequent need for our aid in his present condition. He would be the last to ask for any reward for his long and arduous labours in the movement, but help in the spirit of "mutual aid" will, we are sure, be welcomed by him as a real expression of solidarity.

All amounts will be acknowledged in *Freedom*.

					£	s.	d.
H. Glass	...	...	...	...	1	0	0
A. M. ...	...	...	...	...	0	5	0

Nothing is more odious than the majority; for it consists of a few powerful leaders, a certain number of accommodating scoundrels and subservient weaklings, and a mass of men who trudge after them without knowing their own minds.—Goethe.

SOCIAL DEMOCRACY AND RADICALISM.

Everywhere the Social Democratic Party is now concluding alliances with the Radical and the Liberal political parties. After having tried for a number of years, according to the text of Marx and Engels, the alliance with the Conservatives, they seem to have realised at last what Gladstone had once told them, namely, that with Conservative help not one single representative of Labour would ever be elected. So we see now the Social Democrats all over Europe turning their backs to the Conservatives, and seeking alliance with the Radicals and the Liberals.

From France we have just received the appeal for the Congress of "the Radical Socialist political party," which is to be held in Marseilles on October 8-11. Such a Congress was first held in 1901, and the appeal of the committee speaks of it as follows:—"The Congress of 1901 was a revelation for the party, which was not at that time aware of its own existence. The Congress of 1902 was a constituent assembly. Let that of 1903 open an era of permanent and methodic action." The elections of 1901 to the Chamber, and of 1902 to the Senate—so successful for the French Social Democrats and the Radicals—were the results of this union between the middle-class Radicals and the Social Democrats, established at the Congresses of 1901 and 1902. The next Congress will have to prepare, we are told, the joint action of the parties for the coming municipal elections. This, at least, is frankness and fair play.

The German Social Democrats are now doing the same. The last elections have been made by them with the support of the Liberals. The hatred which Lassalle had vowed to the National Liberals is gone; and the theoretical, "scientific" considerations, which are thrown as dust into the eyes of the public to support that hatred (while in reality Lassalle only did what the cunning old Bismarck wanted him to do, as he gave him some protection in exchange and so long as he wanted him to fight the Liberals)—all these scientific lucubrations have now been turned the other way, when it came to electoral considerations. Of course, we have absolutely nothing against such an alliance between Social Democrats and Radicals; we predicted it long ago. The Social Democrats are Socialists no more. In all their electoral programs during the last elections there was no Socialism at all. They fought for Free-trade against the Agrarians, just as all other Radicals in Germany did, and exactly as the Free-traders of the so-much-hated by the Marxists school of Cobden ("the Manchester School," as they used to say) are doing in old England; and in attacking the Conservative Agrarians they were quite right. As to Socialism—as to doing anything in the Socialist direction—there was no question of it at all. Being now mere Radicals and Democrats, the Social Democrats are certainly quite right in ceasing to combat the Radicals and in seeking alliance with them. Only we should be still more pleased if they honestly and frankly took the name of Radicals or Democrats, and dropped the now misleading word of "Socialist." This would be fair play, and they would thus leave the field open for the constitution of a Socialist party free from all Parliamentary pre-occupations, and therefore free to adopt a really Socialistic program of action.

LAWS IN THE UNITED STATES REGARDING ANARCHISM.

We take from the *American Almanac* for 1903 (page 226) the following abstract, which an American friend sends to us:—

"Among the important matters of legislation which occupied the attention of the Congress of the United States during the Session of 1901-2 was that of protecting the life of the President. Especial attention had been directed to this subject by the assassination of President McKinley in September, 1901. The fact that Mr. McKinley was made a sacrifice to Anarchical fanaticism caused the proposed legislation to include measures for the suppression of Anarchism. In relation to the question of Anarchism the Government of the United States, like that of Great Britain, has declined all overtures of other governments to unite in some form of repressive action. This declination was based on the unwillingness of these two Governments to open a possible way for the extradition of political offenders. While that position is still adhered to, it is not considered that it would be affected by the adoption of laws to suppress the movement and all of its manifestations within our own country.

Accordingly the Senate passed a Bill which fixed death as the penalty for any attempt, successful or unsuccessful, to take the life of the President, his possible successor, or any representative of a foreign Government visiting the United States. Aiding, abetting, advising or counselling such an attempt was to be punished by imprisonment for twenty years; and threatening by written, printed or spoken words the life of any such person was to be punishable by ten years' imprisonment. On June 9th the House of Representatives passed a substitute Bill, which not only contemplated the punishment of crimes against the President, his possible successor, and against the heads and representatives of foreign Governments, but also legislated to some extent against the general profession or teaching of Anarchy. The two branches of Congress were unable to come to an agreement upon legislation covering the ground, and the Bills here

described got no further than to be referred to a committee of conference, representing the two Houses. The necessity for some law in the line of the measures proposed will inevitably bring the question again before the national legislators.

The Legislature of the State of New York, acting upon the suggestion of Governor Odell, made in his annual message on the opening of the Session of 1902, considered the question of Anarchy, with the result that a Bill was passed and approved. Governor Odell, in his message, referred to the assassination of President McKinley, and declared that "those whose utterances have a tendency to incite to disorder or murder should be punished." The law enacted, which is now Chapter 371 of the Laws of 1902, defines "criminal Anarchy" thus: "Criminal Anarchy is the doctrine that organised government should be overthrown by force or violence, or by the assassination of the executive head, or of any of the executive officials of government, or by any unlawful means. The advocacy of such doctrine, either by word of mouth or writing, is a felony."

THE GROWTH OF FRAUD.*

I. *Average Yearly Number of Crimes (Indictable Offences) Reported to the Police. England and Wales.*

During the period	All Crimes not Including Fraud.	Frauds.	TOTAL All Crimes.
1885-1889	85,024	1,879	86,903
1890-1894	81,763	2,068	83,831
1895-1899	76,860	2,599	79,459

II. *The Number of Frauds Committed, compared with the Number of Persons Tried for Fraud. England and Wales.*

During the period	Average Yearly Number of		Percentage of Persons Tried for Fraud to Number of Frauds Committed.
	Frauds Committed.	Persons Tried for Fraud.	
1885-1889	1,879	1,025	54.6
1890-1894	2,068	1,027	49.6
1895-1899	2,599	1,003	38.6

These figures speak for themselves. While all crime other than fraud has considerably decreased from 1885-1899—a decrease of 9.6 per cent.—fraud has increased 38.3 per cent. during the same period. Moreover many frauds are never reported. Perhaps there is no serious crime which is so much understated in the official records as fraud. We must, therefore, take Table I. as considerably understating the amount of fraud annually.

Table II. shows us that while the number of frauds has increased, the number of persons tried has decreased, emphasising the fact that persons who commit fraud often escape legal punishment.

We may add the following remarks:—1. Bear in mind that one fraud does much more harm to society than one crime of any other kind. 2. Remember what class of society it is that commits these crimes—solicitors, bankers, agents, directors, trustees, business managers, and clerks,—not the criminal lower classes.

The writer in the *Contemporary Review*, whose figures we quote, says:—"To no small extent the growth of fraud is due to the great modern increase in luxury, to smartness, to the deliberate and cynical disregard of an honest and simple mode of life. . . . Men cannot make money fast enough to meet the expenses of the luxurious life of to-day, and so they get money by fraud."

The blessed results of our advancing civilization!!

THE INCUBUS.

The Incubus sat on the Workingman's shoulders.

"Get up," said the Incubus as he struck in his spurs, "this is a question as to whether we or the miners are to run our business."

"But I cannot keep on carrying you unless I get more to eat," said the Workingman.

"You have a full dinner pail," said the Incubus, as he ordered a bottle and a bird; "as for me—although God in his infinite wisdom has given me control of the property of this country—I get no more than board and clothes."

"But," objected the Workingman, "I often do not get that."

"I will give you a library to carry on your back," said the Incubus.

"How could the like of me get a chance to read?"

"Be content," said the Incubus, "in that station of life to which it shall please me and God to call you."

"But you grow heavier all the time," said the Workingman.

"Every man has a chance to ride," said the Incubus, "Why didn't you get up here? There's plenty of room at the top."

"I think," said the Workingman, "it was intended that both of us should walk."

"That," said the Incubus, "is blasphemy. If I should get off your back it would shake the foundations of Society."

From *Life* (American).

LITERARY NOTES.

Resist not Evil. Clarence S. Darrow. Charles H. Kerr & Co.: Chicago. 3s.

The book contains a series of essays stating the author's reasons for holding the doctrine of non-resistance to evil as advanced by Tolstoy. They are written in a spirit of wide-minded thoughtful gentleness, though they strongly and fearlessly denounce all those theories that justify the existence of huge machineries—States, armies, navies, courts of law, etc.—for combating the "natural evil" in man. The State, though to-day a complex whole, is nothing more than a domination of the weak by the strong, a natural development out of the early history of the human race, when "the strongest savage seized the largest club, and with this weapon enforced his rule upon the other members of the tribe." Every form of government exists for the purpose of ruling men through violence and force. Even a democracy, although seemingly so far ahead of autocratic rule, "begins with a great mass of regulations inherited from the autocratic powers that have gone before." So, too, all the vast machinery for the meting out of so-called justice is only an attempt to readjust the wretched order of the world by increased injustice. The right way to counteract the evil in the world is to give fair conditions of life to all, when the need for violence and the cause of violence will both disappear. The keynote of the work is contained in its last sentences: "Hatred, bitterness, violence, and force, can only bring bad results—they leave an evil stain on everyone they touch. No human soul can be rightly reached, except through charity, humanity, and love."

Les Esprits Directeurs de la Pensée Française du Moyen Age à la Révolution. Theodore Suran. Schleicher Frères, Paris.

From these publishers appears a series of sketches of the great French thinkers, including Rabelais, Montaigne, Descartes, Voltaire, Montesquieu, Diderot, Jean Jacques Rousseau, written with the usual French brevity, clearness and brilliancy of style, which makes such fascinating reading. Though the author does not go into details, he gives a very vivid and bright exposition of the dominating ideas of those great thinkers, which contributed to the creation of modern French thought.

The Service of Man. By Cotter Morrison. Rationalist Press Association. Price 6d.

It is a fragment or collection of fragments handling certain topics of religion and social morals in a critical spirit, and proposing to substitute for them the "Service of Man." The belief in Christianity, says the author, is in a state of decay, because it is and will be more and more undermined by the conflicting logical discoveries of science. Men still hesitate to abandon religion, however, because it seems to best satisfy the human yearning for sympathy, and also because it appears the best known support of morality. These two claims the author then proceeds to disprove, showing that, as regards the so-called consolations of Christianity, they are at best selfish sentimentalisms, while on the other hand the terror-striking ideas of hell-purgatory have been continual sources of anguish to the truly devout. Christianity as a guide to conduct also falls short of any degree of excellence, because its doctrine has always postponed morality to repentance and faith—hence the very low state of morals in the ages of faith. As a political influence, Christianity has been always positively harmful, because ever since it became the State religion of Rome it has taught the divine right of kings, and the subjects' duty of abject obedience. While allowing to Christianity some stimulating power in the region of speculative thought, some saint-producing force on specially susceptible characters, the author boldly states that religion's day is done, and wishes to put in its place the "Service of Man," "pursuing human well-being as a conscious aim with good prospects of success."

Der Wecknif. A German-Swiss fortnightly paper of Socialist-Anarchism. Geneva.

We welcome the first number of this new periodical, a close comrade of *Le Reveil*, now in its fourth year of life. The leader which introduces the *Wecknif* to its readers breathes a strong spirit of hopefulness and belief in the successful future of Anarchism. "Thrust back one hundred times," says the writer, "we boldly make our hundred and first attack." And again, "A doctrine which draws its recruiting powers from the general wretched state of affairs in the world to-day may be pushed into the background for a time by brutal official force or by those demagogues who play with the intellectual backwardness of the masses, or best of all by both factors combined—but destroyed it can never be." All success to the new venture!

In fact, in all civilised societies which have preceded our own, the absolute supremacy of the unrestrained and selfish right of private property has been the forerunner of decadence, the main cause of ruin. A more enlightened humanity having at last succeeded in creating sociological science, may, we would believe, avoid the rock whereon Athens and Rome were shipwrecked.—Professor Letourneau in *Property: Its Origin and Development*.

OUR RULERS, "BOODLE" AND "BUFFY."

[This picture from "Bleak House," by Charles Dickens, may remind readers of the present Ministry.]

"There are also ladies and gentlemen of another fashion, not so new, but very elegant, who have agreed to put a smooth glaze on the world, and to keep down all its realities. For whom everything must be languid and pretty. Who have found out the perpetual stoppage. Who are to rejoice at nothing and be sorry for nothing. Who are not to be disturbed by ideas. On whom even the Fine Arts, attending in powder and walking backward like the Lord Chamberlain, must array themselves in the milliners' and tailors' patterns of past generations, and be particularly careful not to be in earnest, or to receive any impress from the moving age.

"Then there is my Lord Boodle, of considerable reputation with his party, who has known what office is, and who tells Sir Leicester Dedlock with much gravity, after dinner, that he really does not see to what the present age is tending. A debate is not what a debate used to be; the House is not what the House used to be; even a Cabinet is not what it formerly was. He perceives with astonishment, that supposing the present Government to be overthrown, the limited choice of the Crown, in the formation of a new Ministry, would lie between Lord Coodle and Sir Thomas Doodle—supposing it to be possible for the Duke of Foodle to act with Goodle, which may be assumed to be the case in consequence of the breach arising out of that affair with Hoodle. Then, giving the Home Department and the Leadership of the House of Commons to Joodle, the Exchequer to Koodle, the Colonies to Loodle, and the Foreign Office to Moodle, what are you to do with Noodle? You can't offer him the Presidency of the Council; that is reserved for Poodle. You can't put him in the Woods and Forests; that is hardly good enough for Quoodle. What follows? That the country is shipwrecked, lost, and gone to pieces (as is made manifest to the patriotism of Sir Leicester Dedlock), because you can't provide for Noodle!

On the other hand, the Right Honourable William Buffy, M.P., contends across the table with some one else, that the shipwreck of the country—about which there is no doubt; it is only the manner of it that is in question—is attributable to Cuffy. If you had done with Cuffy what you ought to have done when he first came into Parliament, and had prevented him from going over to Duffy, you would have got him into an alliance with Buffy, you would have had with you the weight attaching as a smart debater to Guffy, you would have brought to bear upon the elections the wealth of Huffy, you would have got in for three counties Juffy, Kuffy, and Luffy, and you would have strengthened your administration by the official knowledge and the business habits of Muffy. All this, instead of being as you now are, dependent on the mere caprice of Puffy!

"As to this point, and as to some minor topics, there are differences of opinion; but it is perfectly clear to the brilliant and distinguished circle, all round, that nobody is in question but Boodle and his retinue, and Buffy and his retinue. These are the great actors for whom the stage is reserved. A People there are, no doubt—a certain large number of supernumeraries, who are to be occasionally addressed, and relied upon for shouts and choruses, as on the theatrical stage; but Boodle and Buffy, their followers and families, their heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, are the born first-actors, managers and leaders, and no others can appear upon the scene for ever and ever."

WALL STREET ON STRIKES.

(Extract from a recent speech by a New York Lawyer.)

"We have in this day and age come face to face with labour troubles where riotousness and violence are continuous and unsurpassed; to a time when the man who violates no law is not permitted to earn his bread because he has not secured permission from some man he knows not; to a time when persons have taken the law into their own hands and enforced it with the torch, the pistol, with dynamite, in order to destroy. When these men dare take the administration of the law and the conduct of affairs into their own hands, it has gone beyond mere sedition. It is war, and I tell you it should be treated as war.

"History tells us of the Reign of Terror in Paris, where armed mobs, unrestrained and unrestricted, imagined that they were the power, and where the miserable authorities came to believe that this was so, and the streets of the French capital ran red, and the scaffold and the guillotine were busy.

"Finally they reached the doors of the Assembly and met there a man whose name was Napoleon Bonaparte. The first to raise his hand in violence gave the signal, and the quiet man at the door there shot them down, cut them down, chased them through the streets—and that reign of terror was order.

"This should be done here. With such a man in command here, the first to raise a hand against anyone whose desire was to labour peacefully would be shot down, until not a Thug of them remained."

AMERICAN NOTES.

There is a crisis impending in America, and stocks and shares are on the downward grade. Things have been at high pressure for the past few years, and those who have given the question any consideration know that they cannot be continued indefinitely. "As one capitalist put it to me recently, "I expect the impetus of the grain crop (it is unusually large this year) will carry us over another year." Others say the same thing, and there are quite a number of them looking after their interests in Europe at present so that when the slump comes they can pour some of their surplus products into these dark (?) corners of the earth.

There are some ninety thousand textile workers on strike in Philadelphia for the shortening of the hours of labour to fifty-five per week. The conditions in this trade are appalling in the South, and very little better in Philadelphia. For years there was no union and the employers had it all their own way, at last the workers began to organise secretly, and this is the result. At the present writing about fifty per cent. of the employers have conceded, and the prospects a complete victory are good. We have some very energetic comrades there, and without having direct news from them I am sure they are aiding in the struggle to the best of their ability. May they win is the heartfelt wish of every lover of freedom.

Clarence Darrow has stirred up a hornet's nest in a recent speech of his, supplemented by an later article on the methods and principles of trade unions. He accuses them of restricting the output and striving for an increase of wages, and points out that the mere increase of wages will not settle the economic question. That the increase is gobbled up by the capitalist in increased prices on his commodities. Among others who have replied to him is Samuel Gompers, who, while paying tribute to Darrow's honesty, ability, and zeal for the cause of Labour, denies that he understands the Labour movement, quibbles on the question of the restriction of output, and in general spoils a good case by the fear of facing the fundamental question. As to Darrow's contention that the mere question of raising wages, in and by itself is a delusion and a snare, and that the small merchant raises his prices, and that the question resolves itself into a never-ending circle we beg to differ. Society is so complex that men have individual as well as collective interests, and for one man or one craft not to strive for a higher wage, which means increased comfort, as there is a possibility, and perhaps a very remote one, that the workers in some other trade will demand an increase of wages, thereby causing a corresponding rise in the prices of living, is, to say the least, shallow reasoning. Society is not an organism, and does not progress along geometrical lines. It may take the baker five years to see what the bootmaker sees in five minutes, or *vice versa*, and as a result he will have five years more increased comfort than his fellow. If all the working men of America joined their various unions and demanded a mere increase of wages on the same day, the price of commodities would rise and the standard of living would remain the same. But such an event will never happen; one set of men will always have ideas in advance of their fellows, and by the time one set of men grasp the ideas set forth by others, a portion of those who held the ideas first will have abandoned them and advanced to greater and higher ideals. Each individual man will struggle to better his condition—or should—and in so doing will show the way for others to follow. On the other hand, to quibble on the question of restriction of output serves not to advance, but retard, the growth of unionism and solidarity. It is true that no union as such advocates restriction of output, for that would serve to prejudice some people, and would get them into trouble for conspiracy; but that restriction of output is almost universal it would be idle to deny. I speak from twenty years' experience, and know as a positive fact that in almost every factory or workshop where a number of men are engaged in doing the same thing there is an unwritten law as to what constitutes a day's work. And why should there not be? Must the workers cut each other's throats to benefit those who exploit them? It is the law of human solidarity that the strong shall not crush out the weak, and by combining together, with the determination that a certain standard is the very worst they will submit to, the workers have progressed to their present position. If we had a bit more restriction of output we would hear less of the "too old at forty" cry, and fewer men using hair dye to prevent being forced out because they cannot keep the pace of the young man of twenty-five. I am not advocating laziness, for a movement based on such a principle is bound to fail; but misdirected energy is worse than no energy at all, and amidst the propagation of ideals for the advancement of humanity, none is more important than solidarity, and the making the workman cognisant of the fact that if he wants to live he must let live.

Inequality is the source of all revolutions, for no compensation can make up for inequality.—*Aristotle*.

This great truth which I have now to declare—to declare to you—is that the system on which all the nations of the world are acting is founded in gross deception, in the deepest ignorance, or a mixture of both. That, under no possible modification of the principles on which it is based, can it ever produce good to man; but that, on the contrary, its practical results must ever be to produce evil continually.—*Robert Owen*.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

BELGIUM.—During the International Congress of Miners held lately in Brussels, it was decided to devote a sitting to the question of a general strike, whereupon the British delegates objected and declared if it were discussed they would vote against it. Revolutionary methods as a rule have always been distasteful to the average placid Englishman, but one notes with pain how little that same Englishman seems able to grasp the labour situation on the Continent, and his unwillingness, if not impotence, to sympathise to the full with the frightful hardships and hideous toil imposed on the foreign worker in his effort to win a daily crust. In Belgium, six million people are struggling for bread, the vast majority in the rich coalfields. The mines are the deepest, the worst ventilated, and the most dangerous in the world. Numbers of the miners themselves emigrate to France to work in the safer collieries there. The girls cannot emigrate, and remain to begin work as pitmen when fourteen, working 4,000 feet below "grass," for twelve hours a day for a pitiful wage, under terrible conditions. Perish, then, the general strike, but let little children labour on in mine and factory—this seems the logic of the English delegates.

We note with pleasure that Comrade Robyn (Hardy) has been provisionally released from prison, where he was sent for an "incendiary article," and has at once improved the occasion by bringing out a new weekly called *L'Insurgé*.

HOLLAND.—We mentioned the misfortunes of the Blaricum colony in our July issue. Holland boasts of five colonies based on Communist principles. According to *L'Ere Nouvelle*, the two largest are the settlements of Blaricum and Walden.

Blaricum has been in existence nearly four years, owns some 30 acres of land, and a general fund of over £1,000. The land being poor, the agricultural portion of the community is seceding, and is to be replaced by blacksmiths and tailors.

Walden, so named after an old home of Thoreau, has lasted five years under the guardianship of Dr. Van Eden, who retains his practice as physician, and enriches the funds with his fees. It seems to be in a fairly thriving condition, and is more co-operative than Communist. The three other colonies are less important. That of *Huizen*, founded a year ago, has seven inmates, and was chiefly formed to create a small iron foundry. The *New Harmonie*, a year old now, took up its site near Walden on lands which by skilful cultivation are becoming rich, the produce being sold in Amsterdam. Lastly, the *Apeldoorn* colony, which, being near a large town and having fertile ground bordered by a river, is likely to well materially.

POLAND.—Here, as in Russia, Socialism is permeating the country, and we do not speak of Russian Poland only. The slice that Austria holds is no less uneasy for its rulers to handle. It is only eighteen years since Socialism made its way into the country. In 1893 the various groups united to form a Socialist Party, which is now strong enough to carry on secret printing with success, and much propaganda by literature. The aim of the party, however, is purely political, the desire being for a Republic in place of the present tyrannical government. The ranks of the enthusiasts are being constantly denuded by prison and Siberia, and as constantly replaced by young and ardent rebels, while the powers and numbers of the secret police are increased in proportion; but all to no purpose, for the agitation increases slowly and steadily. A new Jewish revolutionary committee representing 100,000 members was discovered only a few weeks ago.

Good news of a similar nature comes from Russia proper. The discontent and agitation augments, is not to be repressed, and the peasants and villagers are making and forcing their demands in no uncertain spirit. According to the daily papers, a princely landowner was shot down by twenty men a few days since when driving, and no arrests have yet been made. Now the simple, long-enduring moujik must be driven hard before he lifts an angry weapon, so we may imagine what style of oppressor that landowner was, and how strong is growing the determination of the proletarian in all lands to live the life of a man and less that of a beast of burden.

War is the harvest to governments, however ruinous it may be to a nation. It serves to keep up deceitful expectations, which prevent people from looking into the abuses and defects of governments. It is that which amuses and cheats the multitude.—*Thomas Paine*.

Just cast a glance at this society, and tell us whether it acts from virtuous, divine, or even moral motives? Is it not, in fact, a *bellum omnium contra omnes*? Does it not resemble a racecourse where every one does all he can to outrun or even destroy the other? Are we not tempted to say of this society what Burmeister says of the Brazilians? Every one does what he believes he can do without incurring punishment. He cheats and abuses others as much as possible, being convinced they would do the same to him. Anyone who acts differently is treated as an idiot.

Is it not the most refined egotism, which is the spring of this social mechanism, and distinguished authors, who best know human society, do they not constantly depict in their narrations the cowardly disloyalty and hypocrisy of this European society?—*Force and Matter*, Dr. Louis Büchner.

TESTIMONIES.

The object of all government is to render government superfluous.—*J. G. Fichte.*

England is the Paradise of the rich, the Purgatory of the wise, and the Hell of the poor.—*Theodore Parker.*

All for ourselves and nothing for other people seems in every age of the world to have been the vile maxim of the masters of mankind.—*Adam Smith.*

Yes! Those who know how to appreciate the ideas we defend, which are so vehemently attacked by the whole clique of pharisees, hypocrites, mystics, Jesuits, and pietists, may be able to imagine that at some future period there may be a more ideal social edifice, which may have for its foundation human dignity and human equality.—*Force and Matter, Dr. Louis Büchner.*

I am convinced that those societies (as the Indians) who live without government enjoy in their general mass an infinitely greater degree of happiness than those who live under the European Governments. Among the former, public opinion is in the place of law, and restrains morals as powerfully as laws ever did anywhere. Among the latter, under pretence of government, they have divided their nations into two classes—wolves and sheep. I do not exaggerate. This is a true picture of Europe.—*Thomas Jefferson.*

While hitherto isolated communisms, as suggested, have existed here and there and from time to time, now for the first time in history both the masses and the thinkers of all the advanced nations of the world are consciously feeling their way towards the establishment of a Socialistic and communal life on a vast scale. The present competitive society is more and more rapidly becoming a mere dead formula and husk within which the outlines of the new and human society are discernible.—*Civilisation, by Edward Carpenter.*

Commonweal.—Any comrade having the following numbers of *Commonweal* to spare, will greatly oblige by forwarding same to *Freedom* Office:—Nos. 6, 7, 8 (1885); 12, 38, 39, 45 (1886); 131, 140 (1888); 180, 189 (1889); 232, 233, 240, 256 (1890). Good price will be given.

MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

Translated from the Russian by DAVID A. MODELL, and revised by the Author.

CONTENTS.

- I. Two Fundamental Tendencies in Society: The Popular and the Governmental.—The Kinship of Anarchism and the Popular Creative Tendency.
- II. The Intellectual Movement of the XVIII. Century; Its Fundamental Traits: The Investigation of all Phenomena by the Scientific Method.—The Stagnation of Thought at the Beginning of the XIX. Century.—The Awakening of Socialism: Its Influence upon the Development of Science.—The Fifties.
- III. Auguste Comte's Attempt to Build up a Synthetic Philosophy.—The Causes of His Failure: The Religious Explanation of the Moral Sense in Man.
- IV. The Flowering of the Exact Sciences in 1856-62.—The Development of Human Ideas and Institutions.—A Theory of Evolution.
- V. The Possibility of a New Synthetic Philosophy.—Herbert Spencer's Attempt: Why it Failed.—The Method not Sustained.—A False Conception of the "Struggle for Existence."
- VI. The Causes of this Mistake.—The Teaching of the Church: "The World is Steeped in Sin."—The Government's Inculcation of the same View of "Man's Radical Perversity."—The Views of Modern Anthropology upon this Subject.—The Development of Forms of Life by the "Masses," and the Law.—Its Two-Fold Character.
- VII. The Place of Anarchism in Science.—Its Endeavour to Formulate a Synthetic Conception of the World.—Its Object.
- VIII. Its Origin.—How its Ideal is Developed by the Natural Scientific Method.
- IX. A Brief Summary of the Conclusions Reached by Anarchism: Law. Morality.—Economic Ideas.—The Government.
- X. Continuation.—Methods of Action.—The Understanding of Revolutions and Their Birth.—The Creative Ingenuity of the People.—Conclusion.

READY THIS MONTH.

Published by the SOCIAL SCIENCE CLUB of Philadelphia.

Price 1s.; Post free 1s. 3d.

LONDON: FREEDOM OFFICE, 127, Ossulston Street, N.W.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

FREEDOM Guarantee Fund.—H. G. 10s., D. (four months) £1, A. M. 10s.
Sales of FREEDOM.—Paisley 2s. 8d., J. Bernstein 4s. 2d., Wormald 2s. 8d., Free Commune Press 1s. 6d. (also 1s. 6d. for June), Baxter 1s. 6d.
Pamphlet Sales.—H. G. 5s., Paisley 1s. 4d., M. M. 1s. 2d., A. Barton 6d., Office 6d., Meuk 2s., Fleming 3s., Free Commune Press 1s. 6d., Leon 3s.
Annual Subscriptions.—N. Morris 1s. 6d., G. Senior 1s. 6d., O. Karmin 1s. 6d., J. A. D. 2s., S. H. K. 2s., N. F. 2s., A. Holt 2s. 6d., Fleming 3s.
Donations.—Nelson 1s., Golding 1s.
Subscriptions to Free Society.—G. Glass 1s. 6d., Paisley Sales 4s.

NOW READY.

POLITICS AND SOCIALISM.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

Freedom Pamphlet No. 14. Price One Penny.

There being every probability of an early GENERAL ELECTION, this pamphlet will be very useful in counteracting the Ballot-box mania.

PAGES OF SOCIALIST HISTORY.

The Teachings and Acts of Social Democracy.

By W. TCHERKESOV.

A work that should be studied by all Socialists who would understand the two opposing currents in Socialist evolution.

Price 1s., post free 1s. 3d. 127 Ossulston Street, N.W.

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. 1d.
- No. 7. EXPROPRIATION. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.
- No. 8. ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. By C. M. WILSON. 1d.
- No. 9. ANARCHY ON TRIAL—George Etievant, 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.
- No. 14. POLITICS AND SOCIALISM. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 1d.

Other Pamphlets.

- DIRECT ACTION VERSUS LEGISLATION, by J. Blair Smith. Price 1d.
 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 ELYSEE RECLUS. 1d.
 USEFUL WORK VERSUS USELESS TOIL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
 MONOPOLY; OR, HOW LABOR IS ROBBED. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
 SOCIALISM THE REMEDY. By HENRY GLASSE. 1d.
 SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN GERMANY. By GUSTAV LANDAUER. 1d.
 ORGANISED VENGEANCE—CALLED "JUSTICE." 1d.
 GOD AND THE STATE. By MICHAEL BAKOUNINE. Price fourpence.
 THE ORIGIN OF ANARCHISM, by C. L. JAMES. Price 2d.
 THE DEISTIC PESTILENCE, by JOHN MOST. Price 1d.

"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.
 "New Order" Office, 26 Paternoster Square, E.C.
 B. Ruderman, 71 Hanbury St., Spitalfields, London, E.
 Blair Smith, 15 Sunnybank St., Dalmarnock, Glasgow.
 Free Commune Press, 1, Brigham Terrace, Adelaide Street, Hull.
 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.
 D. Baxter, 127, Trongate, Glasgow.

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