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PART II.

THE REPUBLIC OF THE FOURTH OF SEPTEMBER, KNOWN AS "THE GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE."

CHAPTER II. (Continued). THE GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE.

It is needless at this point to quote further from the remarkable work of this "Artillery Officer of the Paris Army." The events shortly to be related will finish the biography of Thiery, as of many another, before the end of this book.

We certainly were far from sharing this artillery officer's desire of succour from sovereigns, be they who they might. But we well knew that the aid of the free men of all countries of Europe, would not have failed us but for governmental hindrances. Is it not certain that Bismarck and William would have preferred the restoration of an empire in France, when he once had conquered her, to a republic, the very name of which spoke of hope to spirits desiring progress? Paris wished to conquer in order to preserve the name of republic. The name, indeed, was retained, at the cost of much bloodshed; as to the reality—it has never existed yet.

A few words may here fitly follow concerning the clubs and "committees of vigilance." The principal committees of vigilance were those of Montmartre, Vaugirard, Grenelle, Montmartre, Les Deux Moulins, L'Attilé, and Belleville. The clubs were opened directly the nominal republic was proclaimed.

Sometimes in these clubs the rolling tide of popular feeling brought to the surface some stranger whose words sounded prophetic. On January 13th, for instance, in the Rue d'Arroux, an unknown young man spoke as follows: "Trochu has caused the death of thousands of men, at Bœuf-àt, and elsewhere. The situation is desperate. The Commune alone can save us. She will appeal to science and to youth. She will replace the Prussians with indomitable energy. But she will not betray them; "I leave you the choice between a democratic and social republic, or death! They will not hesitate, and we shall offer our hand, and mark the era of the welfare of the peoples."" Another stranger cried at that same meeting: "We no longer require these men! (the government.) What is wanted is Anarchy. Leaders have been our ruin; Anarchy alone can save us!" The profound silence imposed by the empire on the servile masses was temporarily broken during the days following Sept. 4th. Clubs and committees were formed spontaneously in order to join their efforts against the enemy. The clubs were the voice of the people, heroic and stately. The Committees of Vigilance were also heroic; they kept watch on the enemy outside, and also on the enemy within the city—the wretchedness, weakness, treachery. Forgetting of nothing but themselves, they remained ever on the alert, giving no heed to privations or fatigues. Internationalists, the Blanquists, energetic men of the social revolution of every shade, and old and brave republicans, all assembled as on the eve of battle.

The Montmartre Committee of Vigilance was at the centre of events! It was the terror of the reaction. The two Clubs of the Revolution were objects of horror for the enemies of revolution. One of them was presided over by Ferru; the other, a women's club, by myself. But the word "preside" meant then a very different thing from what it means to-day. The platform of an enthusiastic revolutionary club was a post of combat, needing an energy equal to the occasion. The battalions of the "order" showed themselves there with fixed bayonets, yet without being able to disperse the club, or make the revolutionary occupant of the platform descend. These two clubs had been founded by the Committee of Vigilance. A third, similarly started on the Boulevard de la Chapelle, was presided over by Buriot in the same manner.

It is Cipriani who gives the following account of the battle of Montmartre, and of the alliances which took place against the enemy; not indeed as we have desired, but such as the fates permitted. Cipriani says: "I belonged at that time (Jan 19th '71) to the 19th regiment, commanded by the brave Rochebrune. We quitted Paris in the forenoon of the 18th, and camped that evening near Montmartre. On the 19th, at 5 a.m., after taking some bread and a glass of the field of battle, entering into line there by wine, we marched on towards a creek. Already fighting had been going on for two hours. Rochebrune rapidly advanced to the thick of the battle; a battalion commanded by Boulot returned at the farm-house de la Pouilleuse; two companies took up a position at the pavilion Le Chayre, and the rest of the regiment did boldly in the front ranks. The fighting continued for another two hours; then Rochebrune turned to me with the order to fetch up the battalion from the farm-house de la Pouilleuse. On arriving there, I met the 20th, under General de Boulen. His reply was, 'An order from the general in command is necessary before we march.' 'What!' said I astonishéd. 'Your colored demands it because of the exigencies of the battle, and you refuse?' 'I can't do it,' said he. So I had to take back this cowardly answer to Rochebrune, who on hearing it bit his lips with rage, explaining 'Treachery everywhere!' and mounting off the wall which closed us in on this side, he gave the command to follow him. He had no sooner spoken than he fell mortally wounded. 'I have taken part in several battles, but in no other have I seen soldiers placed in such perdition as were the brave national guards on this fatal 12th of January. In front they were shot down by the mitraillettes of the Prussians, while, from behind, Mont Valerien sent us its shells, mistaking us for the enemy. There in the fort of Mont Valerien, was the famous Governor of Paris who would 'never surrender!' From the right we were also fired upon by a French battery, placed at Roel, who somehow managed to take us for Prussians. In spite of everything however, not a man budge from his place, and those who had used up all their cartridges took those of the dead.

'At 4 p.m. as the battle had now lasted nine hours, an order came from Ducrot to retreat. We refused, continuing the fusillade till nearly ten in the evening; we might have continued indefinitely, for the Prussians, who had already decamped, showed no desire to surprise us. That day, January 19th, 71, but for treachery or imbecility, the opening would have been made, Paris released, France delivered. Trochu, Ducrot, Vinoy, tutti quanti, did not desire that. The Republic, if once it had been victorious, would have ended for ever all hopes of the Empire, and would have proved once for all the incapacity of the generals of Napoleon III; it was necessary to an imperial restoration that the republic should be wrecked; and this was what was aimed at.

Throughout the whole time that the battle of Montmartre lasted, I saw Ducrot hidden behind a wall, a priest at his side, and before them extended at their feet a negro whose head had been shot away by a shell from Mont Valerien. This battle cost the lives of some thousands of men. Towards 11 p.m., what was left of the 19th regiment marched back to Paris to bury Rochebrune.

'The news of the defeat of Montmartre had agitated the Parisians to such a point that the valiant Trochu no longer dared to show himself; Vinoy took his place. The following day, Jan 20th, we were summoned to Boulevard Richard-le-Noir to attend the funeral of our poor friend Rochebrune. On all hands one heard it said that it would be needful to get rid of those who had betrayed everything so far. There was a talk of taking possession of Rochebrune's corpse, and of marching to the Hotel de Ville. There had been no time to give notice to the members of the Garibaldian Legion, of the Republican League, and of the International. A handful of resolute men assembled at the rendezvous; but it was all the more insufficient because those in whom the crowd had confidence were in prison. There are unfortunately days on which the crowd puts no faith in unknown men. The funeral of Rochebrune, therefore, passed off uneventfully. I saw Boulon there, who attempted to shake hands with me, calling me a "brave man." I declined the proffered hand, replying "Be it as it may, you at any rate can know little about it; since you kept out of the way. You are a traitor." To finish the account of this miserable failure, I may relate that I met him again a few days later, when in my statefaction I beheld him decorated with the Legion of Honour, as a colonel! The uniform of the wage of, his treachery! Another man who was decorated was Captain Dommane, who had not appeared at all throughout the battle. Thus only the two shirkers whom I saw at Montmartre were made Knights of the Legion of Honour. Is this not a strange thing?"—Andrieu Cipriani. London, Oct. 19, 1894. On the evening of Jan. 21st delegates from all the clubs met at the Reine Blanche in Montmartre. We had formed groups at the clubs of the 15th in order to reach a supreme resolution before the noon defeat had yet completed their work.

The companies of the National Guard on the return from Rochebrune's funeral had shouted all along the streets "Dechéance! Dechéance!" Those of them belonging to the faubourgs were to assemble, armed, next day at noon, in the open Place of the Hotel de Ville. The women were to accompany them, in order to protest against the latest rationing, which was starving Paris. I found that...
ON THE DEFINITION OF CRIME.

By A. HAMON.

(Reprinted from "Les Archives d'Archéologie Criminelle," edited by Labatut, Lyons, 1881; by permission of the publishers.)

Every study on criminology presupposes a precise definition of the word crime. Otherwise, people who make criminology their study would be led to understand widely different things by this same term; consequently, it would be impossible, or at best fruitless, to compare their theories and documents, for the former would rest on different bases, and the latter would not be analogous.

Thus, science necessitates a precise terminology, so as to be able to discuss phenomena observed and pointed out by men of science. Thus in physics, in chemistry, in physiology, the technical terms used are well defined, whereas in classic philosophy the terms are sufficiently indefinite to allow of the greatest latitude. When a physicist speaks of density, gravitation, hydrostatics; when a chemist speaks of oxygen, carbon, salts; all other physicists, all other chemists understand exactly the question at issue. It is not the case in criminology, and when a criminologist treats of crime we do not know what he terms crime, or if we do, his definition differs from that of other criminologists.

Thus, Lombraso speaks of criminals in all his works, but he abstains from defining crime, leaving to each the trouble of doing so according to his intellectualism. It follows that he calls people criminals, whom others would not consider as such, and even criminals. A course which reveals a mind of little method or precision.

Other men of science, of a more methodical intellect, have understood the weakness of this unscientific course, i.e., not being scientific in the treatment of an undefined subject, and they have attempted to define crime.

Men of law call all breaches of the law crime or misdeemour. I have proved in a preceding article that we cannot discuss scientifically on this basis, as laws are constantly being modified; as the customs that bring forth these laws evolve still more rapidly; as intellectually developed beings are continually violating them, showing their absurdity and noxiousness.

To define crime, Garofalo has had recourse to the moral feelings of pity and honesty. All offences against these two feelings constitute crime. This definition, preferable to the preceding one, is not of much value. In fact, infanticide and the putting to death of the aged offend the sense of pity in civilized countries, whereas among certain savages of the present day it does not, and formerly did not do so, even in Europe. It is an undeniable fact that feelings change, not only as regards time and distance, but even with individuals at the same time, in the same place. To determine crime on the basis of our actual offence against such variable feelings is to give an unstable definition of it, and to make a serious study of it impossible.

M. Tarde has proposed another definition; "The idea of crime essentially and naturally implies, the violation of a right or a duty." To explain this definition we must determine the words "right and duty." Tarde endeavours to do so in very obscure pages of pure metaphysics. "Right and duty" are prejudged as

"Crime et Criminaliste, in Almanach de la Question Sociale pour 1898.


fixed, determined alike in all times, in all places, which is false, as "right, duty" have changed—the history of sociology proves it by the observation of facts—according to time and place, according to social customs accepted by man. The killing of the aged is a duty for certain savages, therefore it is not a crime if we accept Tarde"s definition. Infanticide was a right for the ancient Greeks. Hence it results that M. Tarde gives to crime a definition that changes with time and place; a very tattering basis to build the science of criminology upon.

Emile Durkheim thus defines crime: "Every act that in any way causes its author to suffer that characteristic reaction called penalty."

"Crime he says," wounds the feelings that are found in all healthy consciences of the same social type." This definition of crime has something in common with the three preceding ones.

Like M. Garofalo, Durkheim bases his notion of crime on the wounding of feelings; but he does not define them, which the Italian criminologist did, it is enough for him to say that these sentiments are to be found in all healthy consciences? Which are these healthy consciences? It would be difficult for him to say. For instance, in the case of the Chevalier de La Barre, are the healthy consciences those of the "volechasse" (local tribunal) of Abbeville and the "Parlement" (Parliamentary Courts of Justice) of Paris, or those of Voltaire and the philosophers? With the lawyer and Tarde, Durkheim implies in his definition of crime the violation of a law, of a duty, of a right, for he has written that crime is an act which causes the characteristic reaction called penalty. If that reaction does not exist, there is no crime. The Esquimaux, according to Paryt's rules, are all strivers for the least scratcl; there is no penal reaction, these thefts are not crimes. It follows then, that according to time and place, the same act will be a crime or a not. Stating his definition more precisely, Durkheim writes: "An action is criminal when it offends the firmly established conditions of the collective conscience," this constituting the whole of the beliefs and sentiments common to the average members of a society. "What then are these powerfully defined conditions?" Durkheim forces to explain with precision. From his definition of the collective conscience we conclude that it is perpetually changing by the efforts of an intellectual minority in revolt against the common beliefs. Therefore an offence against that conscience varies, and the same act will be considered crime or not according to the state of that so-called conscience of the same society at different times. The acts committed during the Reign of Terror in 1792-94 are crimes for some, and not for others, if we accept Durkheim's definition; it will depend on the instruction received during the Jacobin period, according as the acts will have been approved or disapproved by historians and professors. In short, the definition put forward by Durkheim is obscure, and gives an eminently variable notion of crime and one unfit for the basis of scientific criminology.

(to be continued)

Get Thee Behind Me, Satan!

(First Part.)

FATHER.—Why don't you work, my son? If you only knew how much happiness work brings you, you would begin at once.

SON.—Father, I am trying to lead a life of self-denial, in which happiness cuts no figure. Do not tempt me.

A DISASTROUS SUBSTITUTE.

Every religious or civil law is made only to supply the place of will and liberty.—FELIX PYAT.

* De la division du Travail Social." Paris, 1893.

† Quoted by Letourneau, in "Evolution de la Morale."
waving the rag just mentioned over the devoted Joseph's head!

And such is Government according to the ballot box and the general fitness of things. We smile—what else can we do? In connection with these shifting of Tweedledee and Tweedledum we shall presently be deluged with pithouse and platform orations, and some people will be casting to the winds the little common-sense they possess in order to prove that whatever is, is right.

Meanwhile—yes meanwhile—signs of the coming deluge accumulate. The American Irish put into acts the expression of Maegregor when he retired from Parliament asserting that the thing was not good enough for him; they are calling for money and for drilled men, and they are not unlikely to get both. When they ask for arms and ammunition Chamberlain's constituents will be eager to supply both to any extent.

Meanwhile the environments of the trader and the worker—the producer and the distributor—remain and become intensified, our asylums and our workhouses are overcrowd with the flotsam and jetsam of crushed humanity. "anywhere, anywhere out of the world" is the cry of the wretched suicide; give us work, give us bread is the heartrending appeal of the starving unemployed. For an answer to all this the Omnipotent (the only power capable of such a devilish trick) sends us a "change of government".

Continental Governments (according to an ancient and highly respectable "weekly" are at their wits end for new and acceptable sources of revenue. We should consider this good news if it was probable that when governments do not find anything to steal they ceased to exist. But they wont die, naturally—they have to be killed: when they cannot tax (steal) they borrow, on the security of property not their own.

The British Government is not exactly without resources as yet, but it may come to that distressing position, in which case we hope it will accept the advice of the ancient journal above mentioned, and start business in the insurance line by making insurance against death and fire both universal and compulsory, and thus obtain a "gigantic revenue"—in other words expropriate the source of revenue of the existing insurance companies. Fascist weeklies recommend expropriation! Imagine Government destroying monopolies in order to set up a gigantic monopoly of its own! Perhaps the de-throned monopolists will then come over to the side of the Anarchists.

We rejoice to find that the movement for the release of our Walsall comrades is making such headway, and we urge upon all comrades the necessity of helping the agitation. All willing to help should communicate with D. J. Nicoll, 7 Broomhall Street, Sheffield; or O. Lawrence, 26 Mayo Road, Willesden, N.W.

The struggle for existence on the part of some of the London "Weeklies" has become exceedingly severe. This is evidenced in their continual efforts to outdo each other in size and in the extent to which they find it necessary to puff their own and other people's worthless wares. The battle of the "Sunday editions" is both fierce and deadly. Even the old established Dispatch has to put up new sails in order to save itself from sinking in the maelstrom of competition. In putting on its new rigging our old friend had a good deal to say about its past—about the time when its articles helped to form public opinion. In the "thirties" and
WHY I AM A RAILWAY EXPROPRIATOR.

By THOMAS BOLAS.

I advocate the confiscation of all railway property mainly on the ground that everything which is systematically used as a tool or engine of robbery or fraud should be taken from the person or persons so misusing it; a principle fully admitted in every code and system of law of which we have record. Moreover, such confiscation is in no way worse for punishment; but a preliminary to, or an incident accompanyings punishment.

Scores a day passes in which the confiscation of property considered to have been unlawfully obtained at one or another of the metropolitan police courts. To-day perhaps the magistrate orders the confiscation of a pawnbroker’s goods as having been obtained by the defrauding of an honest man; yesterday he may have ordered the confiscation of the fittings and appliances of a private distillery or of the stock and plant of some person who has sold beer without a legal warrant to do so. In another case it has been ordered that the telegraph message of Brown or Jones, but put into bottles upon which is stamped the name of Robinson; while at the next police court it may be the tools of a burglar that are confiscated, or the harness and stock of a cattle dealer who has ventured to sell his wares in a street where the Local Authorities have forbidden him to sell.

Indeed, so extensively is confiscation involved in every day practice of the law that at first sight it may seem surprising that a party of expropriators or confiscators has not become a power in Parliament, strong to deal with landlords and monopolists of every sort. All surprise ceases, however, when we consider the constitution of Parliament—Parliament being a close corporation into which he who is rich in being others may enter easily; but to the impoverished victim of organized robbery, entry there is more difficult than for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle.

Meanwhile, a strong party, pledged to labor for the expropriation or confiscation of all property used as a means of tool of robbery, has been formed in Parliament, and already both on a day and a day grows perceptibly stronger week by week. I belong. I only label myself a “Railway” expropriator because I look upon the railway property as particularly easy to deal with; moreover it forms about one third of the “invested” property, and the metals of the railway monopoly, the “invested” property, and the metals of the railway monopoly, have now so aroused the anger of the people, that when the shareholder’s one element of strength is broken down, railway monopoly and abuse comes to an end. The only strength of the railway monopoly, its capacity to pay, is thus reduced by such a law, so that the corruption of the corrupt plutocratic governments—whether Liberal or Conservative—and when this one point of strength is broken down, the recovering will come; and one result of this reconditioning should be the condition of a district where there are not only better means of transportation, but also better means of education; a district where the money of the railway monopoly with its heavy tribute to non-working shareholders, and the working of the British Railway System solely in the interest of the people generally.

Let us practice some items which may bear on the final recondition. Those who use the British Railway System pay in fares and rates, a total of about 80 million sterling annually, and of this sum about half serves to pay all working expenses, salaries, taxation, etc.; the other half is handed to shareholders. There is a very vague notion as to shareholders—who and what they are. In the first place no Englishman, as an Englishman, has any claim or legal right to know who are those shareholders who take half the total receipts; he has no interest whatever in him, to the limit of the amount he may be prepared to pay for the possession of an official. In the case of the Stock Exchange, the case is different, as by paying a small fee any person can refer to the list of shareholders. Only shareholders in a particular company can obtain lists of their fellow shareholders, so those who talk half the total receipts of a railway company, consisting of individuals indistinguishable to the general public and having sufficient influence to turn elections and to determine majorities in the house of Commons.

The railway passenger as a whole already realises the existence of this class of predatory individuals, and when he looks upon the fashionable riders in the parks, and other useless burdens upon society, he fails to recognize them as the class that lives principally upon the proceeds of the railway receipts, and that goes for service and legitimate expenses. Neither does the ordinary passenger ever imagine that in most cases the magistrate who adjudicates in support of some railway extortion—and convicts as fraudulent the person resisting such an extortion—himself a railway shareholder, and one of the parties who ought really to stand in the dock to be convicted.

It is quite obvious that half the total receipts go to idle non-workers and the other half serves to pay all expenses, the fares and rates and double at least double what they need be; but as a matter of fact they are at least ten-fold what they need be: if the shareholders were expropriated; as when a railway is once established the cost of taking passengers in well filled trains is at the rate of from forty to fifty million for every.

Let us look for a moment at the case of the London and South Western Railway; the stock of which, by reason of the enormous dividend paid, has run up on the stock exchange to double the nominal value; this in itself being an indication of a dividend which is paid even according to the capitalist view of the railway expropriator, a very important matter is to see how an enormous dividend at 74 per cent. on the original stock (second half of 1894) is “earned” and how such inflated stock exchange value at 220 to the original stock; and it is, whether by methods which an ordinary man of business would regard as fair, or by doings so strained, cruel or unfair as shall—when the time of reckoning comes—fully justify not only expropriation but fairly distinctly unpleasant personal consequences to the shareholders.

A principle mainstay and source of this high dividend on the L. and S. W. Railway is the frequent practice of demanding special high fares (sometimes three fold), and refusing to take passengers at public prices when special events occur or during the races. (See leading article in the Times, Dec. 12th 1885.)

I have watched this system carefully for about ten years and have come to the conclusion that the misery and painfully lingering death of people disturbed upon sick, weak, and helpless old people in a Scottish station, and an end of the day, who would have been executed by Brown or Jones, but put into bottles upon which is stamped the name of Robinson; while at the next police court it may be the tools of a burglar that are confiscated, or the harness and stock of a cattle dealer who has ventured to sell his wares in a street where the Local Authorities have forbidden him to sell.

Indeed, so extensively is confiscation involved in every day practice of the law that at first sight it may seem surprising that a party of expropriators or confiscators has not become a power in Parliament, strong to deal with landlords and monopolists of every sort. All surprise ceases, however, when we consider the constitution of Parliament—Parliament being a close corporation into which he who is rich in being others may enter easily; but to the impoverished victim of organized robbery, entry there is more difficult than for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle.

Meanwhile, a strong party, pledged to labor for the expropriation or confiscation of all property used as a means of tool of robbery, has been formed in Parliament, and already both on a day and a day grows perceptibly stronger week by week. I belong. I only label myself a “Railway” expropriator because I look upon the railway property as particularly easy to deal with; moreover it forms about one third of the “invested” property, and the metals of the railway monopoly, the “invested” property, and the metals of the railway monopoly, have now so aroused the anger of the people, that when the shareholder’s one element of strength is broken down, railway monopoly and abuse comes to an end. The only strength of the railway monopoly, its capacity to pay, is thus reduced by such a law, so that the corruption of the corrupt plutocratic governments—whether Liberal or Conservative—and when this one point of strength is broken down, the recovering will come; and one result of this reconditioning should be the condition of a district where there are not only better means of transportation, but also better means of education; a district where the money of the railway monopoly with its heavy tribute to non-working shareholders, and the working of the British Railway System solely in the interest of the people generally.

Let us practice some items which may bear on the final recondition. Those who use the British Railway System pay in fares and rates, a total of about 80 million sterling annually, and of this sum about half serves to pay all working expenses, salaries, taxation, etc.; the other half is handed to shareholders. There is a very vague
The numerous other returns of the L. S. W. Ry., unfairly "earned," or expenses saved at the cost of life, health, or wellbeing of the workers, are inordinately less financial weight than the special high finance system; but in the aggregate they may be estimated as making up fully half the present dividend. Subjoined are a few examples in the form of notes: and I may mention that I have the fullest records of each class of offence, ready to be used when the proper time arrives.

Closing the women's working places before the business of the station ceased (the charge for these was abolished on the L. and S. W. in 1892); thereby saving a little gas, but inflicting on women untold torture and in many cases permanent injury. The South Western has advertised "covered war from Addison Road station to Olympia," as an inducement to passengers: but to avoid the disturbance required by the owners of the station for full use, its trains have regularly stopped quite beyond the shelters. It has thus broken faith with passengers and perhaps caused numerous deaths.

To avoid legitimate working expenses the L. and S. W. Company has systematically and day-by-day broken the law as to shutting trains over a level crossing: thereby inflicting loss on the users of the road.

Further than this the same company failed to provide a bridge or subway at Mortlake Station, even after their attention had been called to the danger and to previous fatal accidents; thereby another person was killed (See leader in the Times Dec. 12th 1885.).

The victims of railway robbery or extortion have no remedy, neither police man, magistrate, Board of Trade, nor Railway Commission will help them: all being virtually appointed by the railway company and brought under their control by means which I shall shortly expose: but the workers are compelled to pay all these agents of the enemy. All these things make me far more than a mere railway express agent; but I would go as far as an expatriation because substantially one half of the total revenue is handed down to non-working shareholders; worthless persons such as one may see sitting about Hyde Park in carriages on a fine afternoon. Sometimes the shareholder is called an interest-taker, a bond-holder, or debenture-holder, but effectively on one or another he gets half of every penny that the workers pay for railway travelling. Sometimes as in the case of the London Chatham and Dover Railway one set of these sharks gets the better of another set and the out-cry about the line not paying is from those who want to rob, but fail. Still the following block representation shows substantially how the amount paid to the railway companies is divided: whether the company pays no dividend on "original stock" as in the case of the L. C. and D. Ry., or 4% on the original stock as in the case of the L. and S. W. Ry.

What you pay for a ticket.

The portion devoted to the railway and the workers.

The portion taken by idle shareholders who do no work.

When the New Commonwealth is proclaimed and the time arrives for dealing with the shareholders, the will may be so far taken for the deed, that the holders of Chatham original stock will be treated precisely as the holders of South Western original stock: but I sincerely hope that whatever views the law courts of the future may hold as to constructive murder, we may not see a fulfilment of the sad foreboding of the Railway Times of Oct, 28th 1889, that: "Railway shareholders need look for nothing better than a short shift and a sure cord if the Socialists ever come into power in this country.

Nicholas Joukowsky.

One of the surviving pioneers of the Russian and International Revolutionary Movement N.B. Joukowsky, died at Geneva, on the 11th of last May. Born in Russia on November 3rd 1833, he took an active part in the Russian movement, preceding the Polish insurrection and had to seek a refuge in London, where he arrived in the summer of 1862, meeting here Hezen, Ogorz, Bakumin, etc. During the Polish insurrection he remained in Germany, ostensibly studying at an university but in reality one of the connecting links between Herzen in London and the Russian and Polish revolutionary parties. Later on he settled in Switzerland, leading the hard and poor life of an exile, sent here or there by the cause and having to work for a living. At the Congress of Peace, held at Geneva in September 1867, he met Bakumin again, who shortly afterwards, went to live in the environs of Vevey and Clarens together with Joukowsky and others. The latter acted from then until the autumn of 1869 (when Bakumin left for Geneva, as his secretary, carrying on the open work of a propagandist in the "Peace and Liberty League" and private work in the extensive circle of Bakumin's friends in many countries, who were then united in the "International Fraternity,"); Bakumin himself who thought nothing of writing a dozen or more letters at a stretch, expected the same activity of Jouk as everybody called him and when the cause required it, simply wrote: 'Jouk must write right today,' so Jouk must multiply himself, or the like—and Jouk did do so.

Soon after the Congress of Basel Joukowsky came to Geneva, where early in 1870, he became secretary of the famous section of the Alliance, the better known of Karl Marx—in reality a small knot of various propagandists who did their best to arouse the degraded spirit of the other Geneva sections of the International, which were entirely in the hands of Radical wirepullers and their allies, Marxist intriguers.

After the defeat of Bakumin's efforts to bring about a revolutionary movement in Lyons, in Sept. 1870, another effort was made at Marseilles, which for a time was more successful, Joukowsky was there, but also after the definite failure in November 1870 he had a narrow escape and returned to Switzerland.

He was for many years afterwards one of the moving spirits in the Swiss International, and took part in the Congresses of the Hague, (1870) where the packed Marxist Majority won a Pyrrhus victory over the Anarchists, who at St. Imier and, next year, at Geneva reconstructed the hitherto openly Anarchist International, freed from the deadweight of politicians and ambitious dictators. Joukowsky also took part in other Congresses at Brussels and Berlin.

Latter on Joukowsky retired from the active struggle and was even not in sympathy with some features of the more recent movement; but in his time he bore a good deal of the struggle then waged against anarchists from all sides—from Bismarck as well as from Marx. By the immediate activity of the few energetic and enthusiastic workers like Joukowsky and the sound revolutionary instinct of the masses, authority was repelled and a victory for Anarchy was won, thanks to which our ideas have since made such progress.

We cannot enter into his long connection with the Russian and Polish movements. His writings are many, mostly anonymous articles, dispersed in Swiss and Russian socialist papers, but his chief work was his personal action. He was up to the last an enthusiastic with a large and artistic mind, who watched every sign of progress with interest and content, and who would have seen signs of progress which sometimes others could not discern, so hopeful and confident was he of the soon coming social change.

We saw him last in a Savoy valley, close to Mont Blanc, in the summer of 1884, in apparently good health and certainly in the best of spirits, and relieved for a few weeks from his irksome life of struggle. The very next morning a band of gendarmes arrested him and others and expelled them from France as Anarchists. That was his last persecution, and well might he, who had seen and taken part in events of the utmost importance, have a smile of disdain for the shabby action of the great republican government which had nothing better to do than to grudge an old man a few weeks rest in a remote Alpine Valley. Now he is gone and with him, we believe, the last of the older circle of Russian Revolutionists, Hezen, Bakumin, Ogorz, etc., who all died long since.
The Great Vote Trick.

(Being an extract from Jean Grave’s chapter on “Authority,” in Société Mornante et L’Amorakio.)

The bourgeoisie [having destroyed the divine right of autocrats and substituted parliamentary government,] still feared the people, and were willing to make them any concession. The bourgeoisie held the power, and wished to retain it. The workers, therefore, in order to obtain universal suffrage had to make a revolution. Those of the bourgeoisie who thought it possible to implant a republic were already at work when they saw the middle class avert the thrust of the new-born bourgeoisie, to save its head and to establish order, and to retain the weapon of the monster by which they expected to be devoured. It was only by degrees, and by dint of watching the working of universal suffrage, that they discovered it was not at all dangerous to leave the people to their own devices, that it was in short, only a sort of fire on which one must know how to play; and that this famous weapon of self-assertion which the workers believed themselves to have acquired, and which had for pay-off their buckets, their bricks, was in reality a perfected instrument of domination, subjecting and enslaving precisely those who made use of it with a view to their own emancipation.

For after all, what is universal suffrage but the right of the governed to choose their own masters, the right of the dogged to the whip which is to flog them? The electors are sovereign to elect their masters, but is he not free to desire no master at all? [for should he abstain from voting, then] the master chosen by his neighbours will be his also. From the moment he has placed his votes in the ballot-box, he has signed his own abdication; he has nothing further to do than to bend pliantly to the caprices of the masters of his choice; they will make the laws, they will apply them to him, and will put him in prison if he resists.

As for the actual working of universal suffrage, we discover that all, it is not the majority which governs, but an infinitesimal minority, drawn from another minority which, in its turn, is but a selected minority from among the governed masses.

I. It is only by arbitrary arrangement that women and minors, who are also said to be excluded from the right of the suffrage are on the other hand in the majority.

II. In the actual case, on the day of election, theoretically it is the majority who have to decide on the choice of a representative of the constituency. Practically, however, the choice of the electors is distributed among six, eight, or even more candidates; and mention those electors who, failing to find among the troop of candidates anyone who represents their special views, vote contrary to their own ideas. The member chosen is thus once more the product of a second minority.

III. Again, when at last the elected persons meet, it is still the majority who are theoretically supposed to decide among themselves. But here once more opinions divide them into numerous groups and subgroups, and it practically happens that small groups of ambitious men, standing midway between the extremes of interests and benefits, are compelled to choose to those of whom they get the advantages, thus decide, the issue.

It is easy to see, by what we have said, that the pretended sovereignty of the electors amounts to very little; yet it must be noted that (as we shall see later) we have simplified our criticism, and have supposed each man to act logically and correctly.

But if we take into account the intrigues, the jobbing, the ambitions of calculation—if we point out that before the law is finally defined, it has to be the better man, the better known, the Senator, who is nominated by another category of electors—if we bear in mind that the legislative power is composed of 580 deputies and that each only nominates one of them, and that so his will amounts to less than one hundredth; we will find again the same result, and that the reign of democracy is prolonged by the veto of the Senate—we end by perceiving that individual sovereignty forms such an infinitesimal fraction in the national sovereignty that it practically disappears.

But this is not all: universal suffrage has a still more disastrous effect. It gives rise to the reign of nullities and mediocrities; and we can prove it.

Every new idea in advance of its time, is such necessarily in the minority to begin with. But even if we forget to adopt or defend it, there is still a chance of ultimately prevailing. This is a recognised fact, and the consequence is that individuals of really large and intelligent ideas are always in a minority. The greater part of the public press, such muddling views as are actually prevalent, is actually current. It is the part which forms the foundation on which tomorrow will elect the deputy who, in order to get nominated, will be bold on his guard not to jar with the prejudices of his electors, nor to come in collision with received ideas. To the contrary, in order to get as many people as possible to vote for him, he will be bold on his own views, and to make choice of a stock of commonplaces to retail to those whose suffrages he desires. In order not to frighten them off, he must raise the value of their stupidity. The more contemptible the more useful; and inside the princess electors will be his chances of election.

He who seeks truth and desires to see it prevail has means, while at no time to succumb to the mean intrigues of the green-run; he is certain to be beaten in the election contest by a debater who has a talent for concealing and accepting those most widely current, will have so much the less trouble in keeping his angles (if he has any) safe out of the way, so as to clash with nobody. The more one desires to please the world, the more carefully must that middle course which one adopts be observed of all or even of all human; consequently the emptier, tamer, and more ordinary it has to be. Here is the truth about the suffrage; it is an asa’s hide, which only sends forth a grey before the blows of those who desire to make it speak.

Note.—Government of all and sundry by the arbitrary will of one hereditary despot is, in our day, commonly recognised as monstrously unjust, and a Government of all and sundry by the votes of disfranchised persons is equally unjust and far more absurd. And being at bottom a trick, it is far more corrupting, like to rulers, and ruled; fools and furies, and fooled.—(Translator.)

...Bourgeois "Education."

"The true has no value beyond the sham," wrote Browning; but assuredly how great is that value when we are surrounded and oppressed by so many shamms. In how much of our modern bourgeois education, for instance, is there opportunity giver to truth being discovered and shams avoided? Very little it must be confessed. On the contrary there are plenty of ways offered to children to become mechanical word-repeaters, and with this accomplished, to pass as "well educated." And we can hardly expect otherwise, so long as the idea prevails that every child is to learn to repeat or write, pages of words, without being trained or aided to think and know about some at least of the real things of human life. Yes, to feel and to know—that is what we want for our children, so that they may develop all their natural capacities. At present they have their finest and best feelings quite stunted by the monstrous methods of "rubbing" into them such much of which is called "general information"; information, which is in many cases composed of mere trivialities.

Let us claim "freedom to develop" for our children.

T. CLAYTON.

The Walsall Victims of the Secret Service.

To the Editor of Liberty.

My attention has been called to your editorial note in the last issue, reflecting, as it seems, upon my attitude in a recent speech referred to several cases of arbitrary treatment by the Home Office, and omitted any reference to the Walsall case. You may be aware that any such omission was not intentional, for it has all along been obvious to me (and I suppose to everyone else) that the alleged Walsall plot was a police conspiracy got up to secure promotion for a gang of Irish, these having been too numerous to be tolerated. If this were not so, may I say that I had the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with one of the victims, Charles, some years ago; and as everyone who knew him will readily admit, he was the best of men. This estimate of his personality is the more valuable inasmuch as his writings in conformity with his own. His one trait was, personally, consolate in an excess of zeal to render service to others in need of it than himself. Once known, how could such a man be forgotten?—Yours, faithfully.

Henry Sedmore.

Marat on Criminal Legislation.

"In a world where everything is in the possession of others, where the indigent have nothing to think of but their own, they are obviously reduced to a state of hunger. Now, since they derive nothing but a poor mortifying rate from the vagaries of society, are they obliged to respect its laws? Doubtless, no! If society abandon them they re-enter a state of nature, and when they reclaim by force those things which would not have parted with except to secure greater advantages, all authority that opposes them is tyrannical, and the judge that condemns them to death is a cowardly assassin.—Jean Paul Marat.

How many more Years' Trial?

"An age of relentless criticism—fearless, accurate, logical—has just approached.... If after so many centuries of trial, the political and social institutions of even the most advanced nations of the earth have fallen far short of the legitimate aspirations of man; if man has shown his potential for evil rather than good, the theory on which they are based must be pronounced a failure."—(The Editor of Burke’s Vindication, 1850.)
MAN'S BIRTHRIGHT "MADE OVER."

In a recent number of the Twentieth Century was printed a list (as given below) of "enormous tracts of American land which have been "made over to English syndicates." "Made over" is a term of somewhat dubious meaning, and we are surprised that an American

journalist did not find words more befitting the action. The money

mongers who have been "the lords of so much of soil covering the

so-called Land of the Free" would assert on oath if necessary that

they have bought the said land and paid for it with their own money.

As Britishers we deny the truth of at least a portion of that state-
m ent—a part of that purchase-money had been stolen from the

producers of it. If we were Americans we should assert most emph-

ically that every inch of land "made over" was stolen: although

the owners, we had no share in the transaction, and our Legislators

simply threw dust in our eyes while they diddled us out of our birth

right. Now for the extract from our contemporary:

Enormous tracts of land, all along the Northern Pacific to Montana

and across to California, not only public domain, but the habitation

of settlers, have been made over to English syndicates, of which

Lord Brassey is a central figure. Already the British have breweries

and cattle-raising ranches; now they are monopolising the land and

lumber. Viscount Scully is a large holder and wirepuller-in-chief.
The greatest of English holdings, and the persons interested, are these:

The Texas Land Union—3,000,000 acres. Interested peers: Baro-

n, Lord Hardwicke; Lord Galway; the Duke of Beaufort; the Duke

of Buckingham; Viscount Scully; Lord Faringdon; Lord Biddulph; Lord

Marquis of Tweedale; 1,750,000 acres.

Philips, Marshall & Co., London—1,800,000 acres. This firm has

the whole peculare for its clients.

The Anglo-American Syndicate, London—750,000 acres. The

funds of widowed peers are largely invested here. The lands are

in the South and West.

Byran H. Evans—700,000 acres. Mr. Evans resides in London.

His lands are in Mississippi.

The Duke of Sutherland—125,000 acres.

The British Land Company—320,000 acres. This company has

land in Kansas.

William Whalley (the late)—310,000 acres.

The Missouri Land Company—300,000 acres. This company owns

Missouri domain and has headquarters at Edinburgh.

Robert Tennant—280,000 acres. This is all farming land. Mr.

Tennant lives in London.

Dunedal Land Company—247,000 acres.

Lord Dunmore—125,000 acres.

Benjamin Newgaz, Liverpool—100,000 acres.

Lord Hospital (in Florida)—60,000 acres.

English Land Company (in California)—50,000 acres.

English Land Company (in Arkansas)—50,000 acres.

Alexander Grant, London (in Kansas)—35,000 acres.

Syndicate No. 6—110,000 acres. This syndicate includes the Earl

of Verulam and the Earl of Tankerville. The land is in Wisconsin.

M. Elfenthaler, of Halifax—600,000 acres. The land is in West

Virginia.

Syndicate No. 1—50,000 acres. This is a Scotch concern, and its

land is in Florida.

It is claimed that fully 20,000,000 acres of American land are thus

owned by great land-owners in England and Scotland. This does

not include the Holland Syndicate, which owns 3,000,000 acres of

land in the Western States, nor the German Syndicate, owning

3,000,000 acres in various States.

The absence of English landlords have introduced the system of ex-

tracting rents by agents and bailiffs. A Committee of American

tenants has presented a memorial to London demanding the

removal of the rent and the abolition of the feudal system.

At the same time the owners of the land also own the people of that
country, our boasted freedom is seen to be a delusion and the war

of the revolution a lamentable failure.

There is no mention in the above list of the Gospels, who are

reported on good authority to be the holders of large quantities of

American securities. The larger portions of the sums above men-

tioned were directly stolen from the workers through rent, interest, pro-

fit, and it would probably not be an impossible task to show that in

the case of the Peanuts, the Cadogans, the Hamiltons, etc., some of

the very money with which they purchased American land had been

accumulated by the overtaxing of their English tenants-farmers.

Probably they or their descendants will try on American farmers the

same theibish game. In a country that is really Free there will no

land owners and capitalists.
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