Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. IX.—No. 92. JANUARY, 1895. MONTHLY ; ONE PENNY.

To Our Readers.

We are reluctantly obliged to give notice of a temporary suspension of FREEDOM, *rendered necessary by both financial and personal causes. As shown by the Balance Sheet published some time ago, it is impossible for* FREEDOM *to pay its own expenses, even when every copy "sold" is paid for: the paper must always be largely dependent on donations. And donations we have continually received from the few comrades able to afford them. We take this opportunity of thanking those whose pecuniary support has enabled us to carry on the paper for the last eight years. On the other hand, the number of comrades thus able to assist and their means of doing so are very limited, and it is impossible, even if it were desirable, to bring out a monthly paper regularly if its readers are not willing regularly to pay for the copies they order. Here again we warmly thank those of our subscribers, and especially those groups, who have supported* FREEDOM *by paying regularly for it. Without their moral even more than their financial help, we must have suspended publication long ago. Unfortunately, during the last half-year, the number of these has decreased. We have found it continually more difficult month by month to get paid promptly or even at all for the copies sent out. We have therefore been forced to publish the paper irregularly. For we have always made a point of not carrying on our war against exploitation by ourselves wilfully exploiting others, and have therefore felt bound in honor to pay our compositors at trade-union rates, and to settle the printer's bill for one number before publishing the next. To do this for the last number we had to borrow. The subjoined Balance Sheet shows how we stand after meeting some of our liabilities by means of an entertainment. The crippling lack of pecuniary support from comrades is one cause which obliges us to suspend publication for a while.*

The other reason is our shorthandedness at a crisis which demands special efforts to tide over. Several members of our group are, from one cause or another, obliged just now either to retire altogether or temporarily to stand aside from the work. Amongst these is the comrade who originally started the paper and has edited it, unless during short periods of absence, ever since. Illness in her family has deprived us of her assistance during the last four months, and is likely to render it impossible for her to return to her old work for some time longer.

Under all these circumstances, we think it best to suspend FREEDOM *for a few months. This time will be employed in arranging for its republication, either in its present form as a monthly paper or as a quarterly review, whichever may seem most practicable. All our readers whose subscriptions have not run out will, of course, receive the new publication as soon as issued in place of the old. Meanwhile we shall be glad to receive any suggestions or other assistance from any comrades who desire that* FREEDOM *should reappear and care to help us in the matter.*

We intend to continue the publication of our pamphlets as usual. Turner's "Anarchism and Trade Unionism" is not yet ready, but we hope shortly to print "Expropriation" and "The Defence of Jean Grave." We are waiting only for funds.

As we are giving up our office at 61, St. Augustine's-road, all communications should, until further notice, be addressed :—

"FREEDOM,"
c/o John Turner,
7, Lamb's Conduit Street, W.C.,
London, England.

"*FREEDOM*" ENTERTAINMENT BALANCE SHEET.

RECEIPTS.	£	s.	d.
Sale of tickets	2	18	6
Do at doors ...	1	12	0
Donations		6	0
Rummage Sale	4	16	2
	£9	12	8

EXPENSES.	£	s.	d.
Teas	1	9	0
Cakes		4	2
Programs		3	6
Postage		1	3½
Carriage		4	3
Complimentary tickets ...		2	0
Sundries		1	0
Cost price of jewellery sold on commision		7	5
Value of goods from sale against part payment of loan		9	0
	3	1	7½
Profits ...	6	11	0½
	£9	12	8

"*FREEDOM*" BALANCE SHEET.

Dr.	£	s.	d.
Profits on entertainment ...	6	11	0½
Payments received for Dec. number		6	7¾
Donation	2	9	0
	9	6	8¼
Debit balance ...	5	3	0¾
	£14	9	9

Cr.	£	s.	d.
Loans : Mrs. Hyde 19/5			
,, Dryhurst 11/0			
Mr. W. Crane 6(/0	4	10	5
Rent	2	18	6
Printer	2	10	3
Compositor's wages	2	0	7
Postage		10	0
Removal, say	2	0	0
	£14	9	9

Over £20 are owing to *Freedom* from comrades who have ordered and been supplied with papers for which they have not paid yet.

The State and Social Economy.

1.

WE have seen that, despite the imaginary law of Marxist metaphysicians, the number of exploiters increases. Consequently, the number of upholders of the existing order, with its advantages of misery and ignorance, instead of decreasing in proportion to the "constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital," is growing. It was, in fact, tripled between 1850 and 1889, whilst the population was growing at the rate of less than 40 per cent. This result has been obtained from the official figures of Blue Books ; but if we consult the works of well-known specialists like Mulhall or Giffen, who take a somewhat longer period of time, our results will be still more striking. Let us dwell a while upon the standard works of these authors, for their figures are taken from the very date when Engels and Marx began preaching economic fatalism, social reform by an all powerful State, and political legalism in economic affairs *

From Mulhall's "Dictionary of Statistics" and "Fifty Years of National Progress," and R. Giffen's "Essays on Finance," it appears :—

Firstly, that the number of property owners dying was, in

Year.	Number of Probates.	Amount of Property.	Amount per Estate.
1833	25,368	£54,887,255	£2,160
1882	55,359	£140,360,854	£2,500
Increase	29,991	£85,473,599	£340

"We have the fact that these classes (capitalist) are themselves increasing. They may be only a minority of the nation, though I think a considerable minority, as 55,000 estates passing in a year represent from 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 persons as possessing property *subject to probate duty.*" (Giffen, page 396.)

Secondly, Income Tax was paid—

Year.	From £150 to £500.	From £1000 and over.
1843	By 87,946 men.	By 7,923 men.
1889	,, 333,970 ,,	,, 21,842 ,,
Increase	370 per cent.	Only 228 per cent.

(Id.)

Thirdly, since 1840, the growth of the possessing classss has, according to Mulhall ("Fifty Years of National Progress," p. 24), been four times as quick as that of the population as a whole. It is admitted that in 1840, 97,675 men died owning less than £100, whilst in 1877 this number had already fallen to 92,447, and yet the population had increased more than 26 per cent. (Id.)

Fourthly, reckoning the number of shops and stores—

Year.	Numbers.	Rent.
1875	295,000	£14,300,000
1886	366,000	£18,900,000
Increase in 11 years	71,000	£4,600,000

(Mulhall's "Dictionary.")

It appears that Whitely, Maple, Shoolbred, the Army and Navy and Civil Service Stores, etc., have in no wise diminished the numbers of parasitic shopkeepers, those petty capitalists whom J. S. Mill described so repulsively, and over whose fate Guesde and other Marxist orators so often weep ; for according to the fancied law they are being devoured by the big shops.

Fifthly, in the typically capitalistic operations of banking the like increase in the number of property owners is to be observed.

"There are (1886) 140 Joint Stock Banks in the United Kingdom, with an aggregate paid-up capital and reserve of £100,000,000, held by *90,000 shareholders*. . . . This does not include 47 colonial banks." (Mulhall's "Fifty Years of National Progress," p. 66.)

* The Marxists pretend that their master first gave a materialistic explanation of history. We shall afterwards see how the ideas of Vico, of Locke, of St. Simon, of Quetclet, of Buckle, and of T. Rogers were attributed to Marx. Here I wish merely to point out the tremendous contradiction involved in saying that economic struggle and development are the dominant factors in human life, and therefore that the workers, to obtain their economic and social emancipation, must, above all else, devote themselves to political and legal contests.

No matter from which side we approach the question, the number of exploiters always and everywhere augments. It is something more than simple to continue repeating the absurd statement that the number of owners of capital being reduced by an inevitable law to an infinitesimal minority, the middle classes will gently submit to expropriation voted by Parliament. If, in 1848, they reddened the streets of Paris in their struggle against the Socialistic demands of the victorious people, we may be sure beforehand of their conduct in future, for their numbers have tripled. The Bloody Week of 1871 is not too favorable an augury for optimists and parliamentarians.

II.

If the fatalist law had turned many Socialists from the economic struggle and driven the masses exclusively into electoral agitation, that would have been an evil, but only a partial one. For example, in Germany, where the Social Democratic party boasts so remarkable a success, the conditions of labor are far worse not only than in England, where the masses continue the purely economic contest, but worse than in France.* But this evil has remained partial, for the majority of workers have instinctively kept to the economic battle field of the strike. But if in our times we are witnesses of an injurious and miserable development of the all-powerful Stste, centralising everything, paralysing the productive energy and the intellectual life of nations, enchaining European humanity and eating up whole nations by its millions of functionaries, its prodigious standing armies, and if the masses of the people are submitting to the despotism of the State, the police and any sort of authority, a great part of the responsibility, if not the whole, falls upon the metaphysical, authoritarian, Social Democratic, German school.

Before the doctrines of Social Democracy had so fully developed, all independent spirits, amongst the middle classes and the people alike, attempted by every means to lessen and curtail in every possible way the influence of the State in social life, the number of its officials, and its financial powers. Under the influence of the revolution in North America and the formation of the United States, the ideas of autonomy and federation began to gain sympathy in the popular mind. Before 1848, both Liberal politicians and Socialists were partizans of the complete autonomy of productive groups. Even Louis Blanc, that admirer of the Jacobins and the Convention, with their motto "The Republic one and indivisible," recognised in his project for the "Organisation of Labor" that, "organised workshops and loans to the poor being set on foot, the State has no further right to meddle with the autonomous life of the association." But Social Democracy began to preach that all must be sacrificed to the State, that it must be allowed to absorb and centralise everything; for, thanks to economic destiny, one fine day, instead of Hohenzollerns and Bismarcks, there would be Liebknecht, Engels and Bebel organising a terrestial paradise by means of their industrial and agricultural armies.† All ideas of autonomy were treated as ridiculous, federalism was persecuted in the International, and Liebknecht, with comically reactionary arrogance, declared: "I am the enemy of all federal republics." ‡

We are already sufficiently acquainted with their fundamental economic theory. Let us see if their love for the State has turned out any better than their economic fatalism. In the following analysis I limit myself exclusively to France, with its centralised and all-powerful State.

It is well known to everyone that every event in social and organic life is the result of an expenditure of energy, a use of matter. If the expenditure exceed the advantages of an enterprise, sensible men give up the enterprise. The same thing occurs in social life: a hurtful institution is in the end always rejected. In our fathers' days, when Marxian metaphysic, with its fantastic laws and hypotheses, had not yet invaded Socialism, everyone rebelled against the useless expenses of the State, against the crushing burden of taxation. And what did the State take that our worthy fathers and grandfathers should thus rebel?

Growth of the Expenses of the State in Millions of Pounds Sterling

	1750	1810	1850	1889	Increase from 1750—1889
France	14,200,000	40,000,000	51,000,000	121,800,000	9 times
Germany	7,000,000	11,500,000	23,800,000	154,700,000	22 ,,
Russia	1,600,000	11,000,000	39,000,000	88,800,000	55 ,,
Italy	1,500,000	4,600,000	12,000,000	72,000,000	48 ,,

They were ignorant fellows, those men of the Great Revolution, to rebel against the charges of the State. "Scientific socialism" teaches the people that they must joyfully put up with expenditure 22 and 48 and 55 times greater than formerly. But I, an ignorant Anarchist, I approve the revolt of our grandfathers, and I grow indignant over the completely ruined condition of the people in Russia, where State expenses have increased 55 times, over the misery of Italy, where the expenditure is 48 times as great as before, and over Germany, where Social Democracy flourishes and the workers toil 13, 15, and often 18 hours a day for wages amounting to 1s. 6d.

But we shall be told that, if the expenses of the State are increased, it is the people themselves who profit thereby. Indeed? Let us look into that.

The French Budget for 1892 shows us that the State took 3,780,077,692 francs that year. From this enormous sum,

	Francs
The bourgeoisie received as interest on the "Public Debt" ...	1,284,191,374
The same bourgeoisie, for the administration of Finance and collection of taxes for the Government	1,193,494,440
The same bourgeoisie, for the army commissariat, at least one-third of the military expenses, amounting to	285,142,000
Total allowance to bourgeoisie	2,762,827,814
If we add the military expenses, destined to protect the same bourgeoisie	570,282,000
Remains the modest sum of ... ... for education, post office and public works, which also are largely for the benefit of the bourgeoisie.	446,967,878

To the State budget must be added 500,000,000 francs for the municipal budgets, a third of which is also distributed amongst the rulers and exploiters, and we arrive at the fact that the State, so loved and favored by the Marxian metaphysicians, every year deprives the French people of three millions and a half for the advantage of the bourgeoisie! It is a pretty sum to distribute. It forms a third of all of which the bourgeoisie deprives the people by direct exploitation, For, according to the calculations of Leroy Beaulieu, the annual revenue of all France is equal to 25 millions of francs, which are divided about as follows:—

To the State, returned	4,000,000
To the bourgeoisie, counting the 9 millions of producers who gain for their employers 250 francs per day	8,212,000,000
For the national consumption, counting 50 centimes per day per head	7,300,000,000
The costs of production	5,488,000,000

Three milliards and a half given by the State, 8 milliards and 212 millions extracted under the protection of the same State, altogether 11,712,000,000 francs that the exploiters in France can divide between them each year.

And now, reader, do you understand why the number of capitalists increases without the millionaires eating up the smaller bourgeois? With this enormous sum 11,712 millionaires (in francs) might be created a year, and 23,434 capitalists possessing 500,000 francs; or, as actually happens, the sum may be divided rather more generally and the whole bourgeoisie, who rule us and make the laws for their own advantage, thus prosper and multiply.

But have you noticed that the State not only plays the part of protector of capitalist exploitation, but itself directly accomplishes a third of this exploitation? And the people are told that they must leave to the State the absolute monopoly of economic affairs.

What would you, reader, say if I advised that for the solution of the social question full liberty should be allowed to the exploiters to ruin the people, and that this misery or dishonor imposed upon the people by the exploiters should be submitted to joyfully? Or what would you think of my sincerity if I advised you to acquiesce in your slavery because one fine day all the wealth accumulated and wasted by your oppressors might, thanks to a miracle worked by a fantastic law, become the possession of your great grand children?

But thus stands the case of those gentlemen who preach to you the benefits of the State, without considering its exploiting action in the economy of social life.

W. Tcherkazov.

---

* It is very interesting to compare the results of the Socialist, or rather the Labor, movement in various countries. A comrade wishing to undertake such a work will find curious and interesting information in the Blue Books for 1893 (Consular Reports).

† It appears that these gentlemen are seriously preparing for the command of the industrial army. Bebel, according to his own expressions, attended the last Social Democratic congress at Vienna, not as a mere delegate, but like a general, a crowned head come to review troops.

‡ "... dass ich Gegner jeder Föderativ-Republik bin." ("Volksstaat," March, 1872, p. 2. "Memoir de la Fédération Jurassienne," p. 284.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

POOR PEOPLE'S BREAD.

To the Editor of Freedom.

Dear Comrade,—On the 29th of August, 1894, I asked a lad, of the name of Charles Pigren, 25, Cooper-street, Canning Town, for a half-quartern loaf (notice remarks). "A long loaf, if you please." He said he had not got one left. I then said, "Let me have a 'plain cottage,'" which he gave me. I paid him 2½d., and asked him if it weighed 2 pounds. He said, "Yes, sir." Knowing, however, that his bread had been short in weight on different occasions, I asked the lad to weigh it. He said he had no scales. I then told the lad that his employer was liable to a penalty of £5 for neglecting to carry proper weights and scales. I then had the loaf weighed, which was *four ounces* short. Finding it short in weight, I asked the lad to come with me until we found a policeman. We had to walk all the way from Silvertown right up to Beckton-road before we found one. I then told him the case, and had the loaf weighed again, the policeman—No. K 483—being present, when it was correct as I stated: four ounces short. On August the 30th, 1894, I went to Stratford Police-court, with the intention of getting two summonses out, one for short weight, the other for neglecting to carry proper weights and scales, and refusing to weigh bread on demand. To my surprise, this was refused. The clerk, Mr. Fowler, told me to see the inspector of weights etc., which I did. He weighed the loaf himself on the Government scales, when it was found 3¾oz. short. He tried to help me to get my summonses, but it was no good. In arguing the point of law, as soon as I pointed this or that Act out, they found one to kill it; so the next day I was represented by counsel, but he got on no better than I did. As the Act mentions that they are only compelled to carry weights and scales, or a proper beam for balancing, when the cart or barrow or van is drawn by either a "horse, ass, or mule,"—so long as it is a hand-barrow drawn by a lad or man, the master baker can, without any fear, rob the poor of their daily bread; for no Act of Parliament is in existence to convict him when he uses a hand-barrow in taking bread round to his customers. Now reckon that a family of five persons, of the poorer class, would use about 20 half-quartern loaves a week, robbing from each loaf say only 3½oz., it would come to 1qutn. and 6oz., or about 70oz. of bread. For this bare-faced robbery the baker, at the end of the week, will give you a (supposed to be) half-quartern loaf, but still it leaves 38oz. at the end of the week which he has robbed his customer of, or in value at the end of the year a total of 65 ½-quartern loaves and 10oz., or in money worth 12s. 2¼d. I must now conclude, as me and the pen are not good friends.—Yours in the Cause,

Aug. Czilinsky.

11, Mayfield-road, Canning Town.

NOTES.

MUCH CRY.

The new Emperor of Russia appears to be a young man with many friends. The blessed words "Anglo-Russian Alliance" have been, since they first were whispered mysteriously in the public ear, as a mantle to cover him with glory and honor, and as sweet odours dropping upon his head. Since the days when Russia was the land of evil things, and her prisons and her taxes, her famines and her persecutions were the abominations of the earth, only a few months have passed, but the liberal papers of London have got out their best pink spectacles and the land of "the knout and tears" is steeped in rose colour. Of course, it *is* rather annoying to stand aside and look on at two states acting the balcony scene in Romeo and Juliet together, and getting such immense enjoyment out of the performance as France and Russia evidently got at Toulon; and it is hardly wonderful if the nation left out in the cold was a little inclined to wag her head portentously and suggest that these violent delights have violent ends, or to turn up her dainty insular nose at the "oniony and tobaccoey smotherings in the form of embracings all round," which are so dear to the French patriotic heart. But an *Anglo*-Russian Alliance! That is quite a different thing. Even Alexander III., the Great Peacemaker, the Great Hangman (we choose, at random, from his long list of honorary titles), has become lovely and pleasant since his death, and, from the *Telegraph* to the *Chronicle*, all the great London dailies have done him honour in solemn garb of mourning and retailed his many virtues and graces.

As for Nicholas II., he is the rising hope and joy of every Liberal heart, and his slightest word or action is a happy augury. A newspaper correspondent telegraphs from St. Peterspurg in wild delight that the new Tsar has actually walked into a shop and bought a pair of gloves, and the press clasps its hands and cries: "A Daniel come to judgement!" Afterwards, it appears, that the gloves were bought by Daniel's cousin, the Duke of York;—but that is a trifle. So it is with everything the new emperor does or says, or is reported to have done or said, or might conceivably do or say. He is a thing of beauty and a joy for ever, and all his works are good. Well, well, we have heard before of the virtues of them that have gifts to give.

LITTLE WOOL.

Now let us look at the other side of the question, and see what the new Tsar really has done since he suddenly became an important figure in politics. He has done one good thing, certainly; he has dismissed Gourko, the governor-general of Warsaw, and perhaps of all the Russian officials throughout the length and breadth of Poland the one most universally hated. But beyond that one fact we know of nothing as yet, to justify the hymns of praise that are sung to him on all sides. If he has dismissed Gourko, he has kept Pobyedonostzev, the "Grand Inquisitor" of St. Petersburg. He has not been reigning many weeks as yet, and has already contrived to close the University of Moscow: to place a fresh restriction upon the Jews of Odessa, and to put into force a new circular intensifying the persecution against the Stundists, which had been drawn up in his father's time and left lying idle. Moreover, he has taken occasion to arrest some hundreds of persons (the number is not yet known), on various "political grounds," and to issue a manifesto filled with grand phrases about clemency, but more brutal in substance, more insolent in tone than even that of his father. A manifesto that openly and without shame places the well-being of Russia in "*her boundless devotion to US*," that "graciously cancels" for the peasants of to-day arrears of taxes which have been due since these peasants were babies and which, as all Russia knows, it is physically impossible for them to pay! A manifesto that passes over in silence the persecuted Stundists, and ratifies as a permanent institution the practice of exile and imprisonment by administrative order!—This manifesto is, so far, the chief proof we have had of the young Tsar's "progressive tendencies." Unenlightened by the Liberal press, one would have thought all this a pretty respectable beginning for a good old-fashioned tyrant.

ANARCHISM IN HIGHER EDUCATION.

The revolt amongst the students and professors of the so-called "Free University" of Brussels against the group of capitalists by whom it is financed and governed has resulted in the formation of a new University in that town. The final split occurred when the autocrats of the "Free University" cancelled the engagement of our comrade, the great geographer, Elysée Reclus, to deliver a course of lectures on geography, because of the bomb throwing in France last winter. This piece of bigotry fanned the growing discontent of the students into active rebellion, and many left in disgust. Now the advanced party have organised a new University of their own upon the broadest lines. All arrangements are to be made by students and professors together, the students making their own rules, as in Fellenberg's school, where Robert Dale Owen was educated. The fees are low, but if a poor student has no money to pay for lectures he is admitted free. Any professor who gives satisfactory guarantees that he really knows his subject is admitted as a teacher, regardless of his views. At present, for instance, a Catholic and an Agnostic are both lecturing on history, and the students can attend both courses or whichever they prefer. Perfect sincerity in the search for knowledge, perfect freedom in setting forth the knowledge gained, are the watchwords of the new University. Its aim is "scientific teaching"—that is, "the teaching of what one knows to those whom one loves"—according to the magnificent definition of Elysée Reclus. There are now about 60 teachers and many hundreds of students, and local centres are being formed in the smaller Belgian towns. Reclus, who is one of the professors, has lately been in London, calling the attention of Englishmen to the new departure. Both teachers and students from this and other countries are warmly invited; for part of the scheme is that the University shall be cosmopolitan, setting at naught arbitrary national barriers between human beings who have a common desire to search for truth. All Anarchists and the fast-increasing number of people who, on the education question, are Anarchists without knowing it, will watch the New University of Brussels with the deepest interest.

THE BATTLE IS NOT ALWAYS TO THE STRONG.

A correspondent sends us the following suggestive extract from Foster's "Life of Landor." Speaking of Napoleon I.'s attempt to put Joseph Bonaparte on the throne of Spain by a *coup d'état*, and the "dumb discouragemen and acquiescence" of the bewildered Spanish authorities, Foster says: "Resistance by that time seemed dead beyond the hope or power of revival. Spain had no treasury and no army. Her soldiers had been carried off to the North of Europe, a hundred thousand French veterans were in their place, and French troops garrisoned her strongest fortresses. Humanly speaking, all help and hope had come to an end when the world was unexpectedly enthralled by such a sight as even that century had not witnessed. The Spanish people themselves arose in mass against their invaders. All over the country there sprang suddenly into life local bodies, called Juntas, by whom the powers of government were seized and exercised with a success proportioned to their resolution and audacity. The flame that had at first risen highest in Seville overspread the land with marvellous rapidity. French fleets were seized and French garrisons found themselves isolated in fortresses supposed to be impregnable. Armies were created and organised; a free press was established; the peasantry, self-formed into guerilla bands, strengthened everywhere the national levies, and in the very women and girls the French soldiers found avenging furies." Surely when reactionaries congratulate themselves upon the utter powerlessness of the people in face of artillery and standing armies, they forget such historical incidents as this successful revolt of the Spanish nation against some of the best disciplined and most invincible troops in the world.

A COMMON CASE.

"Incipient pthisis," remarked the consultant physician to the assembled medical students, as he issued from the inner room, where he had just completed the physical examination of a young laborer. "These are just the cases where, properly treated, pthisis is curable"; and he proceeded to expound how. His talk was interrupted by the reappearance of the invalid, who, in his interrogatory, had confessed to being out of work and on very short commons. "I say, my man," kindly remarked the doctor, "can't you get into work?" "Don't seem very likely, guv'nor, this side of Christmas." "Well, you know, you'll have to take care of yourself, or you'll be getting worse; you must be very careful to take your meals regularly. Here are two medicines, the one to be taken before food, the other shortly after." Problem: How is the patient going to get the food to take between the medicines?

Australian Experiences.

FOR some time past, we have been undergoing difficulties and dangers of no trifling character. The authorities, or the cliques who really wield their powers, have been revelling in conspiracy and persecution. In 1892 I was warned that a capitalist plot was on foot to bring about a dynamite affair for ulterior ends, and to involve me in it. The warning being repeated from another source, I investigated, and found that the fact was really so. The motive was twofold: first, to find a means of breaking up the labor movement by force and terror; and, secondly, to produce financial crises which would play the Australian pastoral properties into the hands of the European financial ring, involved in the Panama and the Argentine speculations, among whom the project really originated. The French Government was the medium through which the "Anarchist scare" diplomacy of this clique was made international. An attempt was made through the instrumentality of a pimp who posed as an agitator, to induce the populace to take possession of Parliament House, Sydney. The troops were posted in readiness with machine guns, and the streets barricaded with tram cars, but the temperament of a Sydney crowd is not inflammable—Sydney being notoriously the tamest part of all Australia. Failing this manœuvre, it was resolved to provcke a new labor indignation meeting, and to create a pretext for causing the troops to interfere, the blame to be afterwards cast on the crowd. This was attempted almost immediately after it had been foreseen, verifying the accuracy of Anarchist predictions, but we succeeded in preventing the meeting from being held. We then knew that an attempt would be made to act upon the idea of "discovering" an international dynamite conspiracy for 1st May, 1893; and, in the event of that not coming off satisfactorily, an isolated dynamite outrage would occur away from Sydney, beyond our surveillance, and steps would be taken to *forge* connecting links with this place;—time not later than the end of July or beginning of August, 1893.

The former was attempted in a half-hearted way, but abandoned, and at the time indicated for the last expedient, advantage was taken of the then existing maritime strike to involve Larry Petrie, my old Anarchist companion from Melbourne, who, through having been a union secretary in Sydney, furnished the desired connecting link between "anarchy" and unionism, in an accusation of causing the explosion of an infernal machine on board the Aramac steamship bound to Queensland. He

was remanded repeatedly by the authorities of that colony, on the plea of expecting to receive important evidence from Sydney. This was nothing less than an expected "discovery" about myself; for it appears that, simultaneously with the Aramac explosion, a parcel of dynamite was placed against a vessel at the foot of the Bathurst-street wharf, not many yards from my dwelling. Had the desired thing happened, I, as the reputed "arch-anarchist" and Petrie's friend and associate, would have been evidence enough to convict him of the Aramac affair and, and he, as the accused in that, enough to convict me of this. But fortunately a woman. who passed there early in the morning, discovered the dynamite, and, after it had been an object of curiosity for some time to the children about, some men connected with the wharf and shipping saw it, recognised its nature, and put it out of the way. Another attempt was made to build up a presumption against Petrie by sending a police pimp of the lowest criminal type, who had been literally hunted out of Melbourne, and who had been brought from Sydney to Brisbane to give false evidence against Petrie, back to Sydney to make false accusations of threats having been used against his life in revenge for that evidence; but this intrigue was so bungled that it fell to pieces.

Shortly after this I left Sydney, and, after some wandering on the swag track—that is to say, with my bed on my back, billy, or tin pot, in hand, and "tucker bag" slung forward over my shoulder, sleeping in the open air at times, at other times in abandoned huts, and filling the bag aforesaid with provisions sometimes purchased with the result of a casual article for some country paper, at other times received in response to the inquiry at some wayside house, "Have you got any 'tucker' to spare?"—I arrived at Mudgee. Here I found newspaper men of the "jolly good fellow" sort, enjoyed their hospitality from November to May, and succeeded in getting articles and discussions on Anarchy in half-a-dozen country papers, covering a range of several hundred miles, besides a running of fire of pointed paragraphs in a Mudgee paper weekly during that period. I found, also, that other comrades were "on the track" and had, like myself, been making propaganda *en route*, about 300 miles in diameter having been covered across and across with our mottoes and extracts of literature. I and some converts that I made did a lot of effective personal propagandist work as well.

In the meanwhile, like influences were at work quietly in Sydney, and new converts were made there, although the public agitation had ceased. Among the events which occurred during my absence from Sydney were the prosecutions of Rosa and Macnamara (Socialists) for selling a paper known as *Hard Cash*, containing an alleged criminal libel on the Savings Bank Corporation; and although the corporation could not commit a breach of the peace, and it was not shown that any one else might have been tempted to. the Supreme Court decided (for this special occasion) that the conviction for criminal libel held good. So Macnamara underwent six months' imprisonment and Rosa three. They, being simple confinees, availed themselves of the privilege of providing their own food, thus securing exemption from prison clothing, from labor, and, in Macnamara's case, from shaving—a penalty which otherwise attaches to a sentence of more than three months. The next victim was Joseph Schellenberg (Anarchist), who sold *Hard Cash* in sheer defiance of police orders, and is now undergoing a ten-months' sentence. He elected to be placed on gaol diet, with the consequences of being shaved and set to labor and attired in prison clothing. There were also a dozen arrests for selling *Hard Cash*, for alleged riotous behaviour and imaginary assaults, which either were not followed by prosecution, or resulted in small fines.

After my return to Sydney, the registered proprietors of *Justice* (Socialist paper) were charged with criminal libel on the Minister of Justice, on the strength of a paragraph, for the appearance of which two of them only were responsible to the extent of negligent supervision. The author—not any of them—was known, but not proceeded against. In absolute contempt of supposed legal principles, which express that mere property in the instrument of crime, without complicity, can at most only carry civil, and not criminal, liability, the defendants were sentenced as follows:—William Mason (Socialist) nine months; John Dwyer (Anarchic Socialist) six months; George Macniden (malcontent) one month. Two burglars, named Montgomery and Williams, had been surprised by the police and had knocked them down to get away. They were charged with "intent to murder" and hanged, not having killed anyone. For an article against the condemnation, the same defendants were charged with seditious libel and with incitement to murder. The evidence given at the lower court in support of the latter charge was principally that defendants were agitators; these two charges were subsequently allowed to lapse.

Whilst at Mudgee, I had been printing "A Handbook of Anarchy," which by this time I had ready for publication, and I had in view the re-issue of an Anarchist paper to be called *The Revolt*, for which, since my return to Sydney, I had been making the initial preparations. However, a fortnight after the *Justice* trial, I was committed to gaol for three months, along with two companions (W. H. K. Robinson and Charles Wolfe), without trial, on the mere dictum of a drunken magistrate, who kept howling "You have no right to publish sedition!"—the pretext being that my place of abode was not added to my name on the front as well as the back of the pamphlet. Somebody paid Robinson's alternative fine (his and Wolfe's being £5 each, and mine £20), after a week, and he has disappeared for the time being; Wolfe and I did the three months in Biloela gaol, with prison clothing, rations, and labor—he officiating as warder's cook, whilst I had pick and shovel and wheelbarrow work, and quarrying—and came out last Friday morning, 29th Sept. It being evident that from the increasing prevalence of law and order, person and possession are no longer secure, the idea of resuscitating the *Revolt*, which was to have been issued fortnightly at ½d., has been abandoned; pamphlets and leaflets, complete in themselves, being considered more advisable in view of the insecurity of individuals and possessions from arbitrary violence and plunder consequent upon authority and settled government.

As an instance of this may be cited a case which contrasts strongly with that of Montgomery and Williams. A somewhat prominent unionist named Considine, at Broken Hill, got drunk, and had a scuffle with the police. They went to the police station, got their revolvers, followed him up as he was reeling home, and deliberately shot him to death. *They* were permitted to go absolutely unpunished. Another instance: In Queensland, at a shearing camp, during the strike, a unionist was shot dead. His dying words were calling the camp to witness that the shot was fired by police sergeant Carr. The latter, however, accused one of the deceased's fellow-unionists, and in consequence the sergeant has been honorably acquitted and the unionist whose mate was shot sentenced to death. Meanwhile the capitalist press complains of the mildness and criminal weakness of the Government, and threaten that the capitalists will start shooting the workers down themselves if the State does not wake up to a sense of its duty.

There has been a change of government in consequence of the elections whilst I was in prison. It is supposed to be less unscrupulous, or more desirous of pacifying the mob, and a Labor member holds a portfolio in the Ministry; consequently the malignity of persecution may be relaxed. But I think too much is attributed to Ministers, and that in all probability the control of the police office and judiciary by the intriguing financiers is direct rather than effected through intermidiary political channels.

I shall be glad to resume my correspondence with English, European and American Anarchist papers, groups, etc. At present I have either lost the addresses or fear that in the recent troubles the addresses may have lost their dwellers. Will your exchanges please note this and the fact that, when I am out gaol, I reside at 491, Elizabeth-street, Sydney, and may be communicated with per medium of the New South Wales *Worker*, 215-217, Palmer-street, or the Sydney *Bulletin*, 24, Pitt-street.

Notwithstanding all opposition and, what is far worse, the wretched spiritlessness and intellectual indolence which characterise Sydney beyond any other place I have visited, Anarchy is making great headway, and I am utterly taken aback at the extent to which it has penetrated, when I consider that it is only nine years ago that the first "anarchist" movement was initiated in Austalia by two secularists getting a chance copy of Boston *Liberty* and embracing its doctrines; and that the idea of individualist communism was not elucidated till three years later. Since then we have issued printed, manifolded, stencilled and even written out manifestoes, leaflets, pamphlets, etc., to the extent of about 13,500 impressions, or little better than 2,000 impressions annually; in labor papers, etc., of other denominations than Anarchist Communist we have had, however, about 300,000 impressions, and in the capitalist press, between our own contributions and their bonâ fide reports, reproductions, etc., we have had three-quarters of a million. We have also had any amount of misrepresentation and abuse, the publications most notorious in this respect being owned in the police office.

It seems to me that the capitalist papers are doing good unconsciously—sometimes by lapsing into common sense and asserting Anarchist principles on some side issue, at other times offering our own critique upon the present system in blissful ignorance that they are doing so. Thus the Sydney *Morning Herald* lately remarked that there are people ignorant enough to suppose that the object of labor is to provide wages for the worker, whereas it is to provide increased production to sell for the profit of the capitalist.

I may add a few words about my gaol experience. No doubt the prison population contains, besides sheer victims of the system, a very large proportion of men whose brutality, or whose utter callousness to other people's needs so long as they can supply their own, have been developed by training, or implanted in a high degree by nature. Nevertheless, the whole length and breadth of gaol life seems to be one great round of mutual helpfulness, little acts of self-sacrifice and altruistic consideration. The reason is plain. *In gaol there is no voluntary recognition of authority*, the officials being to all the agents of *a hated power at war with them*, whilst men do not have to operate against each other to procure food and such petty luxuries as are attainable. It is true that the state of subjection may prevent some occasional quarrels from coming to the acute form, but public opinion among the prisoners would always, being ever present in so densely populated a place, find means to keep them within the limits of reasonableness according to circumstances, and the nature of that public opinion in its transcendency over mere affinities of taste and fancy, is strictly enough in keeping with the applied philosophy of Anarchy. In short, my imprisonment has simply confirmed and even elevated my faith in humanity.

J. A. Andrews.

Sydney, 5th Oct., 1894.

NOTICE.

The North London Progressive Society, Milton Hall, Hawley Crescent, Kentish Town Road, N.W.—Sunday, January 13, at 7 p.m., Debate between F. J. Davis and A. Goodrich on "Is Socialism desirable and practicable?"; January 20th, lecture by John Turner on "Anarchism and Trade Unionism." Admission free.

London: Printed and published by C. M. Wilson, at 173, Old-street, E.C. All communications should be addressed to *The Editor "Freedom,"* 7, Lamb's Conduit Sreet, W.C.