



LONDON

• CONTENTS •

Between Ourselves.

Association and Liberty.

By A. HAMON.

Legalist Socialists
and Revolutionary Socialists.

By E. MALATESTA.

The Whereabouts of Property
Ethics.

By L. S. BEVINGTON.

The Commune of Paris.

By LOUISE MICHEL.

"Das Christenthum und der
Anarchistische Communismus."

(Christianity and Anarchist Communism.)

(REVIEW.)

International Notes.

W. M. ROWE

• A JOURNAL OF •

• ANARCHIST COMMUNISM •

THE COMMUNE OF PARIS.

By LOUISE MICHEL.

PART II.

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

CHAPTER I—(Continued).

Jules Favre concludes his account of the episode of Oct. 31st with the arrival of the 106th battalion. "Messieurs Ferry and Picard had not wasted their time." They never wasted it when it was a question of opposing Paris. And, blinded by power, Jules Favre admits as much:—

"This assistance was due from us, especially as regarded M. Picard. Hardly had he crossed the threshold of the Hotel de Ville, than he sought admission to the Governor (Trochu). No orders had been given. Everyone was waiting, without coming to a resolution. No one wished to accept the responsibility of deciding on any course. M. Picard was not baffled for an instant by such vain formality, he ordered the signal to be given to summon the military immediately to the Hotel de Ville. M. Jules Ferry, and his brother Charles at once placed themselves at his disposal and displayed no less coolness than intrepidity.

"As fast as the National Guards could be got together they were massed around the Hotel de Ville occupying all approaches.

"When General Trochu was let go, he found the attack already organised, and had nothing to do but to fill in the details

"Orders were given to the battalion of *mobiles* who were quartered in the Napoleon barracks, to pass through a subterranean passage communicating with the Hotel de Ville.

"These brave fellows plunged courageously into the narrow dark subway, the outlet of which was unknown to the insurgents; and in less than half an hour the battalion had reached an inner court-yard, and was master of the place. Meanwhile, outside, the National Guard was ready to commence an attack from the front," etc.*

No comment on these fragments is necessary. The avowals which they contain are eloquent enough.

CHAPTER II.

THE GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE.

No sooner were the bills posted in which the mayors of Paris called on the electors to nominate the Commune, than the posters were torn down, and replaced by others in which the Government announced that the promises to elect a Commune had been illusory, and that the insurrection was disgraced. The sworn oath that no prosecutions would follow was likewise violated. Blanqui, Millière, Flourens, Jaclard, Vermorel, Felix Piat, Lefrançais, Eudes, Levrault, Tridon, Ravvier, Razoua, Tibaldi, Goupil, Pillot, Vésinier, Legère, Maurice Joly, and Eugène Châtelain were arraigned; and a number of further arrests were made at random with a view to making an impression which should scare the bourgeoisie. Then it was that Emile Adam, prefect of police, who, on his return from a ballooning expedition, had been witness of the given *parole*, refused to make the arrests, and gave in his resignation. The incidents of Oct. 31st had had too many witnesses to remain unknown, and the crowd made no secret of its sentiment as regarded this violation of sworn faith. "Is the Empire coming back?" asked some. Truth to tell it had never departed. The men of Sept. 4th in confining themselves within the administrative machinery as left by the Empire, bore a fatal resemblance to the latter. To this mill, constructed for grinding the people, they attached themselves like the blind horse to the wheel he has to turn. Nothing had changed.

The affair of Oct. 31st was indicted as follows:—

1.—Criminal attempt, with the object of exciting to civil war by arming citizens against one another. 2.—Arbitrary sequestration. 3.—Menaces under conditions. Querenet, examining magistrate of the Empire, presided over the case; the other magistrates were Henri Didier, solicitor general—the same man who had formerly defended Megy. This caused surprise, but Leblond admitted that in the present case he was merely the proxy of Jules Favre, and of

Emmanuel Arago, who abided by the traditions of those in power.

Then for some weeks there followed a great talk about the defence of Paris; and the subscriptions that were got up for guns were not only not prosecuted, but were actually encouraged. The Parisians were called upon for a veritable plébiscite—to say "Yes" or "No" as to whether they desired the maintenance of the government. For the most part they declined to take part in this farce; they assembled in the clubs, (whereof more anon) and loudly expressed the will of the people; to die, if need be; but, in any case to release Paris. Nevertheless, nearly 70,000 went to the ballot-boxes to give in the word "No" in reply to the question of the Government. But the plébiscites of the Empire had been too notorious for Paris to be duped by what is called "following the will of the people;" which in fact means taking count of those who dare not have a will; by adding to these the simple and the corrupt, the product is always the reply desired by the authorities; and governments less than anyone can cherish illusions. A few concessions were, however, made. Each district was to elect, not a commune, but a mayor and three deputies. The faubourgs clearly expressed their will in choosing by way of protest some of the imprisoned Socialists, or men known for their opinions. It was necessary to leave the result to the faubourgs; so the Government of National Defence appointed a municipal commission to occupy office for the prisoners nominated; and despite all protests, this commission functioned until the 18th of March.

Thus, Ravvier had been chosen mayor for the 25th district; Millière, Flourens, and Lefrançais as deputy mayors for the same. Jaclard had been nominated as one of the deputies for Montmartre, where Clemenceau was mayor, the other deputies chosen being Dereme and Lafont. The names of Malon, Aeligon, Tolain, Murat, Vernorel, Valles, Blanqui, and Felix Piat also figured as elected in protest against the imprisonments. Mouchetout and Buzenval changed nothing as to external conditions; but they showed the authorities that Parisians were not sparing of their lives; which indeed they knew already.

The "National Defence," feeling itself menaced, employed the ordinary expedients of power. All Paris demanded a general sally—a sally of desperation, which after all might save the city. One thought many times of Moscow in flames.

The women, bourgeois and proletarians alike, cried "cowards!" as regarded those who spoke of armistice. Thiers continued on his travels in search of tranquility for the "classes;" concerning himself not at all about the people, (whom he had already designated as the "vile multitude") except by way of having them shot down when troublesome. He carried on the work of framing the armistice, while Paris was crying for a torrent-like sally against the enemy, and for a battle of desperation, as the only chance of possible deliverance.

At this point it may be as well to sketch for the English reader the biographical features of Monsieur Thiers; to the French he is only too well known. I transcribe the following from the second number of a series of brochures entitled "La Verité;"* the writer being "An Artillery Officer of the Army of Paris."

In passing I give the silhouette of the mischievous dwarf. His hands were large and spatulous; he resembled a gorilla in the powerful shoulders, yet a monkey in the meanness of the general build; the humble, blinking eyes, the heavy jaws, the projecting cheek-bones, reminding one alternately of Quasimodo, Napoleon III, and Robert Macaire. All this, however, was the work of nature; let us look at the work of Thiers himself. His whole life was of one pattern:—

"Was he not an infamous paid spy and traitor in the matter of the arrest of the Duchess of Barry? Can it be forgotten that his benefactor, Lafitte, was shamelessly betrayed by him? That on his first term of ministry, his first care was to sell to the highest bidder such places, ranks, and offices as depended on him. And then, the massacre of Rue Transnonain! Yes, this man has continually persecuted the people with ferocious and implacable hatred Well, this individual at once ridiculous and sinister, knew that he might reap advantage from the disasters following the 4th of Sept. The republic—that thing of the people, the detested people—had just been proclaimed. His rage would have been great had he seen men of conviction at its head. But it made him smile to see the Government of National Defence. Such men as these would necessarily become the accomplices and instruments of the first comer who knew how to manage them. In '48 the title of president would have flattered the monstrous ambition of "Foutriquet;" but France had been at that time too vigorous to submit to the blandishments of an old

* See Jules Favre's "National Defence," Vol. I, pp. 341 and following.

* Published at the International Printery, 18, Claremont Place, Judd Street, London, 1871.

man: a vigorous bandit took possession of her by force, by securing her limbs. In September '70, on the contrary, poor debilitated France could do no more than cry for help against the advances of this man. And because all around her remained deaf to her cry, the future president went his way all over Europe. Italy—and on this point we have confidential letters which preclude all doubt in the matter—Italy was going to send 100,000 men to release Lyons . . . This diversion (of the German forces) would have released Paris and prevented the hideous comedy of the siege . . . This single fact would have made the republic an honest one, a republic of republicans. But with such a republic, worthies like Foutriquet would count for nothing; it was, then, needful at any price to prevent the sending of those 100,000 men. He went the right way to work, the horrible old man! a well-worn way enough, and one which always succeeds; he exhumed the hydra of anarchy, that famous bogey of which kings have such fear. He described Paris as given up to the red party, and from two or three letters which he caused to be sent to him *ad hoc*, he pointed to the terrible details of outrages and assassinations which, according to his account, had become the every-day life of the besieged Babylon. 'And it is for such brigands as these that you would go and fight!' said M. Thiers, in concluding a long conversation with one of the ministers of Victor Emanuel. So to the great regret of the king the 100,000 men, just ready to start, were retained in their respective quarters.

"On comparing this authentic account with what was really the case in besieged Paris—the calm, honest, austere resignation, the virile energy—it is obvious what kind of man is this "Foutriquet" and to what a depth of degradation a being so devoured with ambition is capable of sinking. In England, in Austria, in Russia, his method was the same. And when he had made sure that France, thanks to his calumnies, would no longer inspire Europe with anything but disgust and pity, he returned to watch over the capitulation of Paris, and the ignoble peace which should be afforded him by the terribly mutilated country, and this People on which he would presently be avenged. But things did not go altogether according to his keen desire; and his vengeance was compromised more than once by that Unforeseen which occasionally upsets the most ingenious plans.

"We must mention to begin with the annoying enthusiasm of those defenders of Paris, who desired to fight, who were willing even to die fighting, and to whom it was necessary to administer, first, famine in increasing doses, and then, the blood-lettings of Bourget, of Avron, of Champigny, of Buzenal," etc. . . .

(To be continued.)

LEGALIST SOCIALISTS AND REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISTS.

By ERRICO MALATESTA.

Of the two sections constituting the Socialist party, one must naturally have less repugnance to parliamentary tactics than the other, because (excepting a period during which the economic renovation of society would be effected in a revolutionary way) the political form to which it aspires is a form of parliamentaryism. The aim of this section must be to maintain respect for authority in the masses, and develop in them the propensity to abdicate all initiative and vigour. But in thus accepting parliamentaryism, such as the present economical system has made it, this fraction will cease to be Socialistic in practice and become simply Democratic, with universal suffrage for its sole programme—with the exception, we admit, of certain claims that universal suffrage can no longer realize.

What will happen then? Democratic Republicans say: "Let the people give effect to their will by means of an assembly elected by universal suffrage." But assemblies obey the will of the owners and politicians of which they are composed, and this will continue so long as present economic conditions obtain. Socialists should therefore answer (under pain of no longer being

Socialists) that the masses cannot do what they would, and cannot know what they ought to do, so long as they are economically enslaved. But having by electoral necessity and personal expediency, at first neglected, and then opposed revolutionary propaganda, they will be forced to yield, and nothing will then differentiate them from the opponents of Socialism.

The acts of turncoats, traitors, compromisers—which parliamentary tactics engender—have produced in the Socialist camp a long period of doubt and confusion which has paralyzed the movement; but to-day the position is limpid and clear. The evolution of ideas and facts, and the logic of method, have brought about the condition that true Socialism can no longer be anything else than free Socialism, which by its nature is antiparliamentary and revolutionary. Socialist teaching can only be understood in the meaning given to it by its apostles and martyrs, who have made of it the powerful lever destined to overthrow the bourgeois world. Socialism must not signify that hybrid collection of burlesque reforms, contradictory aspirations, and impudent lies, which form the basis of so-called "Socialist" electoral programmes such as those of William of Germany and Leo XIII. These men never understood Socialism as taught by Karl Marx, who revealed the lies of political economy; or as expounded by Bakunin and our comrades of the International who opposed Mazzinism and Radicalism; or as understood by all who have sacrificed peace, youth, love and liberty to Socialistic propaganda.

Socialism—freed from the speculations of philosophers, the dreams of Utopians, and popular riots—Socialism presents itself to the world as the good tidings of the new era. It is a promise of superior civilization; it is a rebellion against all tyranny and injustice, it is the abolition of all hatred, competition and war; it is the triumph of love, the co-operation of peace, the coming of well-being and liberty for all; the approaching realization of that Paradise which the imagination of nations and poets, imbued with idealism and ignorant of history, placed at the origin of humanity. It is pre-eminently the struggle of humanity rising above distinctions of race and countries, above religions and schools of philosophy, above class and caste. It embraces all men in a holy ideal of equality and solidarity. It does not ask for the substitution of one party for another, one class for another, nor the advent to power and riches of a new social stratum—the proletariat, but the abolition of classes, the solidarity of all human beings for work and enjoyment. Socialists feel that they carry a world within themselves; they have a consciousness of their sublime mission, which makes them proud, courageous, and good.

"Saint and Devil," by John Mark, is a fairly meritorious attempt to satirise the dominant creeds, customs and beliefs of to-day. In a few instances the author hits the right nail on the head, but in some cases the ridicule is weak and lacking in good taste. The following is a sample of the conversation between the leading characters described in this little work: Says the Devil—"The Church tells men that they are all miserable sinners, that this world is a vale of tears . . . That's what makes me so angry. Here am I trying to make people happy all the week, and the Church goes and spoils all my work on a Sunday."—"Satan, (says St. Peter) You ought to tell men that happiness can be found even in a church." "I can't tell a lie," answered the Devil.

"The Labour Annual for 1895." It is not too late to mention that this very useful publication has reached a second edition, and that by adding sixteen pages of new matter it has been brought well up to date. There are so many good and useful features in this work that we gladly refrain from noticing any of its few faults. We heartily congratulate the Editor on the result of his arduous labour, and recommend every comrade to add the book to his library.

"Master and Man," by Tolstoi, seems to us like a piece of unfinished work by a great master. It is nevertheless worth reading, for underlying—or perhaps we should say connecting—its few tragic incidents, there is the inculcation of a great truth dear to all lovers of the higher possibilities in humanity.



"LIBERTY" is a journal of Anarchist-Communism; but articles on all phases of the Revolutionary movement will be freely admitted, provided they are worded in suitable language. No contributions should exceed one column in length. The writer over whose signature the article appears is alone responsible for the opinions expressed, and the Editor in all matters reserves to himself the fullest right to reject any article.

We would ask our contributors, to write plainly and on one side of the paper only.

All Communications should be addressed.—The Editor, Liberty, 7 Beadon Road, Hammer-smith, W.

Subscription, 1s. 6d. per year, post free. Per quire of 27 copies, 1s. 7d. post free. The trade supplied by W. Reeves, 185, Fleet Street, E.C.

RECEIVED—"Firebrand," "Anarchist," "Torch," "La Manifestation du 1^{er} Mai," "L'Enclos," "Le Magazine International," "Was Jesus Christ a Socialist, Communist, or wise Teacher," by G. E. Conrad Newiger. (R. Forder, 28 Stonecutter Street, E.C.)

LIBERTY,

LONDON, JUNE, 1895.

Between Ourselves

The Socialists will make headway by hook or by crook. Many are the tricks of the advertiser. Mr. Keir Hardie some time ago invited the Anarchists to open a discussion in the columns of the *Labor Leader* upon the respective merits of Anarchism and Socialism. He certainly said he could not promise to find space for all contributions sent. He did, notwithstanding, manage to find a two-column space for articles of representative Socialists, but narrowed down representative Anarchists to a dozen lines, and in most cases, excluded their contributions altogether. From which we may infer what kind of fair play is likely to happen under Social Democracy.

At a recent meeting at the Lecture Hall, Greenwich, Mr. H. Seymour (who has recently become the Secretary to an influential committee which is pushing an agitation on behalf of Mrs. Maybrick) effectually denounced Mr. Asquith in particular, and the dark practices of the Home Office in general. He referred to Asquith's underhanded treatment of a memorial presented to him urging a re-consideration of the Maybrick Case, and exposed his scandalous treatment of the cases of Potter and Kelsall, recently released by public pressure being brought to bear. Has Mr. Seymour forgotten other victims of the secret service, the Walsall Anarchists, the plot for which they were convicted and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment, being got up by the police? Or are these not entitled to public sympathy because they are—Anarchists?

Dr. Macgregor has at last realized the hollowness and hypocrisy of political life, and has refused any longer to be the dupe of the political tricksters: he says

"I consider political life a delusion and a snare. I have found it impossible to do an honest, straightforward day's work, and have long been smarting under that feeling."

"That is not good enough for me" declared Macgregor—a conclusion we Anarchists arrived at long ago, and we trust the workers will soon hold the same opinion. How many of these object lessons do the

people want in order to discover that not only are politics a delusion, but that Representative Government is a sham?

Every effort should be made to secure the release of our Walsall Comrades. The chance of succeeding must depend on the intelligent co-operation of all lovers of freedom. Those who know anything of the case agree that our comrades are the victims of an infamous police plot, the recent admissions of ex detective McIntyre confirming this up to the very hilt. Not a moment must be lost, since the life and liberty of our comrades depend on immediate action.

When Pot appeals to Kettle it is indicative of Pot having no other friend to appeal to. When the Belgian Government appeals to Pope "Pious" to help them to suppress Belgian Socialism it may with certainty be assumed that the Belgian authorities have sunk to a very demoralised and demoralising stage of existence. In the Pope attempting to stop the advancing wave of Socialistic thought and action we have a revival of the redoubtable farce of "Mrs. Partington, her mop, and the Ocean." In a few years the Ocean will still be living and moving, but where will Mrs. Pope Partington be?

Hand to hand, and heart to heart, across oceans and across deserts! And why not? This would seem to be the spirit in which the appeal from British Socialists to Socialists all the world over has been issued. Humanity is but one family after all. With its many divergent features, it has much and should have more in common. When its atoms understand each other better, and mix together in thought or action more frequently, their common interests will stand out more clearly, and the long and weary battle of right versus might will be nearing its end. Some of the most pleasing results of the publication of LIBERTY have been the many kind expressions of sympathy received from comrades in all parts of the globe. Such links cannot be too numerous, or forged with too much strength. True Socialism can have but one goal and, towards that goal "our host is marching on."

The poor old *Echo*, which has got the Jingoists badly just at present, doesn't like the Labor-Day movement at all. It wants a nice "law'n order" Sunday holiday with plenty of empty show, and no significance whatever; as of course all her Majesty's faithful capitalists—sweaters, will join *Echo* in desiring. Could we have a better sign of the real value of the May-Day effort; or a plainer proof of what we revolutionists have maintained all along—that the Sunday demonstrating does not mean or say anything, nor shake anything real before Johnny Bull's optics? Poor, disturbed old *Echo*! It makes believe the weather on the 1st was too much for us all; for it wouldn't do to be truthful just here and notice the auspicious fact that water isn't wet enough to melt up an Anarchist meeting; though it so effectually dispersed the parliamentary demonstrators. *Echo* was altogether afraid to allude to that; and after all, what could it say? poor old thing! It is another good sign. We must keep our countenances, and not laugh too much at such a manifest little editorial predicament.

Dear old *Echo*.—Thank you for your stunning leader about our May-day effort in the Park. We think it a very good sign that you and your sort didn't like it; and just bears out what we Anarchists are always saying, that the exploiters and profit-mongers are not a bit afraid of plenty of empty show, brass bands, on a legitimate law and ordered holiday; because it don't mean nothing significant, done that way. No, we are not going to "dwindle into insignificance," as you put it. No fear! Significance don't lie in numbers and show; but in spirit, and proof of a determination to do things independent. You know that, right enough, dad. Look here; in '93 only us held

a May-day meeting in the Park—and preached the meaning of it. In '94 the S.D.F. didn't like to be left behind, because the people are taking to the idea of "no politics" too fast for them; so they turned out too. In '95, there's us, and S.D.F., and I.L.P., and Unions; that's "dwindling," ain't it? And what puts you out, worst of all is the obstinate fact that the rain washed away all the parliamentary demonstrators, and left us and our attentive crowd with the field to ourselves! It takes something wetter than a May shower to "damp the zeal" for truth, daddy. And as the people walked away, they were heard saying "it was plainer every year which lot was in earnest and which was only playing at it." Earnest is just about the mark; it's the anti-politicians what don't get fewer. "Insignificant" fact, eh?—Yours, etc., Frank.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

The Anti-revolutionary bill has been rejected by the German Parliament and a blow aimed not only at Socialist and Anarchist propaganda but, in no less degree, at the propagation of the results of science and every modern progress, has been frustrated. When this defeat of the Government, over which the Social Democrats are triumphant, leaves us cool and pessimistic as before, it is because the events of last year have shown that this Government needs no extension of its powers to do what they like to suppress Anarchist propaganda.

Thus whilst only the editor signing a paper is legally responsible for its contents, the printers and manager of the *Socialist* of Berlin were arrested and sentenced as well, and when this blow was parried by entrusting all these functions to one comrade, not only was he arrested but all the books, lists of addresses and correspondence seized which, finally, forced the comrades to give up the publication of the paper.

From an article in the Paris *Temps Nouveaux* we see that the last 45 numbers of the *Socialist* cost no less than 80 months of prison, and still, after the arrest of the last editor, when on his road to prison a dozen comrades volunteered to take over his post.

Unfortunately in the months of repression following, the old, long exploded idea of co-operation crept up again among the Berlin comrades, and some have published quite a phantastical appeal in favour of creating an independent power outside the State by free co-operation—as if, quite apart from the economic impossibilities, the political persecution would ever let such enterprises take root.

Under these circumstances the announcement of a new paper and new pamphlets to be published abroad comes not a moment too soon to prevent, by the consequent exposition of our principles, this movement which is only a few years old, from being drawn away in fallacious side-tracks.

No such voices of momentous despair were heard in the French movement, which is started again, and three of the comrades who in the monstrous trial of the thirty last summer were represented by the accusation as a band of criminals and threatened with transportation for life, are now as vigorous as ever at their work again. *La Révolte* is succeeded by *Les Temps Nouveaux* (the third number of which begins a series of articles by Elisee Reclus, entitled "Anarchy"), and *Le Père Peinard* by *La Sociale*, and besides Comrades Grave and Pouget, the editors of these papers, Sebastian Faure starts a series of lectures and debates which are attended by numerous audiences.

It is not to be forgotten how many of our comrades are suffering in the prisons of the Republic, on the sun-burnt and fever breeding islands off Cayenne, and in New Caledonia.

E. Pouget in *La Sociale* publishes a series of articles in reference to those who were forgotten by the amnesty, in which, leaving for the moment aside those who were sentenced for really having done something against the present system, he tells the story of those who are sentenced to long terms of prison whilst they never did anything even in the eyes of ordinary law, but were sentenced simply because the lies and excitement to hatred of the public prosecutors had influenced the juries to find them guilty!

At a time when the Italian Comrades suffer in the prison of Porto Ercole (sent there, not for having done something, but simply because of their opinions—sent there by the administration, just as in Russia), when all these horrors are exposed in France, etc., do we not feel tenfold confidence in the truth of our opinions, which will triumph like every good cause has triumphed in the end?

"Let Liberty alone: fanatics fear her more than they fear persecution: in her own unaided strength she knows how to overcome her enemies."—ERNEST RENAN.

"No one is bound to live as another pleases, but is the guardian of his own liberty."—SPINOZA.

"Liberty" Sustenance Fund.

LIBERTY has up to the present time been carried on with considerable difficulty and heavy personal sacrifices in time and money, which only those who have some idea what editing, printing, and publishing a paper mean, can realise. We have received some few contributions and have acknowledged them. We give below a list of other sums just to hand, and at the same time make a further appeal to all who can assist us in strengthening our propaganda, and in tiding over the present difficulties. All subscriptions to be sent to James Tochatti, Carmagnole House, 7 Beadon Road, Hammersmith, London.

H. C. D., £1; "X. B.", 2s. 6d.; N., 5s.

SHEFFIELD ANARCHIST GROUP.—The winning numbers in the draw are as follows:—

107, 111, 115, 330, 354, 364, 379, 383, 411, 479, 482, 566, 744, 844, 842, 911, 973, 987, 1076.

THE WHEREABOUTS OF PROPERTY ETHICS.

By L. S. BEVINGTON.

In Mr. Seymour's useful rejoinder (see April No.) to my recent survey of his position, he charges me with "sophistry." Which may pass: readers will judge.

The present article concludes my share in this particular controversy, and before saying farewell to my courteous opponent, it may be well to draw our mutual readers' attention to the valuable verbal concessions we free communists have obtained from him. The preliminary questions have been answered precisely in the fashion which was to be foreseen. They were awkward questions. To ask Property what its identical use is, if not to force your own way with, is much like asking Government how it would get on if Property didn't hire its services. No answer is possible, in either case, which when honestly analysed does not "give away" the property position, as inimical to the progress of men, and of Man.

The original questions put to Mr. Seymour as an Individualist were these: "What is an 'own' labor-product? What is 'appropriation'? What is a 'right'?" I prefaced the controversy by challenging Mr. Seymour to trot out a man who should have "conceived or carried out all by himself the production of a commodity," and who, further, should be bound to that commodity, when produced, otherwise than by his "need or fitness to be its consumer or user."

And I challenged him to show that any extra bond (beyond this of need and fitness) between a man and a product, should be "other or more than a legal, conventional, and removable concession on part of other people."

In LIBERTY of Oct. '94, Mr. Seymour gives the desired reply as to the "individual producer." He admits that the term cannot be taken literally, since he means by it "each contributor" to the joint product of indefinitely many individuals, each of whom shall have paid his way as a worker; buying his tools, and, by expenditure of personal energy, acquiring—what? The natural fruits of such conduct?—increased aptness as worker and purchaser?—increased usefulness as producer and coöperator?—increased personal facility as economist of personal powers and resources? No; it is something perfectly irrelevant to his activity which Mr. Seymour conceives him to

ASSOCIATION AND LIBERTY.

By A. HAMON.

Capitalistic society is now giving birth to a socialistic society. Pregnant with a new social form, bourgeois society sees with fear the moment quietly approaching when all the present social organs will have successively given place to new organs, which exist in embryo already. Against this unavoidable delivery the infatuated bourgeois in vain erects gallows, guillotines, prisons, and galleys. Whether willingly or not, the bourgeois society carries in its bosom the socialistic society of to-morrow, just as the inferior animal forms of other times carried in them the germ of the present superior animal forms; these again no doubt being the embryos of still more perfect animal forms.

The world is bringing forth a new form of social life, and the throes of this birth are so unmistakable that every one perceives them readily. Two different tendencies dominate in these agitations: Association and Liberty; Sociality and Individualism.

In the associations of working men the economic and political life of the future is preparing. Man urged by an exact idea of his own interests, and by inborn tendencies—implanted in him through an evolution of ages—associates with other men with similar interests in the same town in which he lives. These associated units form a trades union, which is a new unity, and the source of other associations, branching off in two different directions.

On the one hand, all the trades unions in the same town associate, forming a new and larger unity, a federation. The municipal federations in the same district form themselves into a still larger unity, a regional or provincial federation of different trades. This, in its turn, unites with similar federations in the country, and with them forms the national federation of all trade unions. A day will come when these great unities will unite into an international federation, the embryo of which exists already.

On the other hand, the unions of the same trade in one district unite to form a larger unity, the district federation of the same trades. These unities throughout the land unite to form national federations of the same trade, and soon these national unities will form a new one—the international federation of the same trade.

In these processes the unity becomes greater and greater. It includes fewer and fewer individual unions, while all the time comprising more and more human beings. These two processes operate conjointly. Like all phenomena they are complex, they entangle one another. Here, the union of all the trade's unions in a nation is more firmly established than the federation of all the unions of the same trade. There, the contrary is the case.

In the district or regional, national and international associations of the same trade are found, in an embryonic state, the economic organs of that society which is slowly elaborating in the social alembic; while the germ of the political organs lie in the municipal, communal, regional, national and international unions of the different trades.

Everywhere—I mean in Europe, America and Australia—these phenomena are being accomplished. The working men unite in unions, the unions associate in federations. Everywhere the organs of the future society come to life and are developing slowly in the present society, just as the infant takes form in the mother's womb.

These working-men's associations, the germs of the society of the near future, are still in the period of infancy, but the sociologist perceives clearly the time

when, arrived at maturity, they will have completely taken the place of the present social organs. Of the latter, then, only such traces will remain as are dear to the historian or archeologist of the age.

Then, thanks to his sociability, man tends more and more to associate. On the other hand, thanks to his tendency towards liberty, he goes further and further towards individualisation. These two directions—Association, Individualisation—contend incessantly one with the other, and strive continually towards a perfect compact, essential to perfect harmony, a summit to which humanity doubtless will never attain.

The strife between these tendencies results in an equilibrium of which the rupture inevitably throws men under the despotism of the individual or group.

The tendency to liberty is as pronounced and as general as the gregarious tendency. Every human individual aspires to be autonomous, and claims liberty more and more; every individual group has the same aspirations. Everywhere this libertarian effort comes to light; he is blind who denies it. Some even, for dread of authority, wish to liberate themselves of all association, they forget that associated efforts grow and increase, and for fear of the despotism of the group, they tend towards the despotism of the individual.

Everywhere the proletarian world, more conscious of its aspirations, tends to augment the liberties it possesses. It claims the liberty of union, of association, of the press, of the commune. It tends to decentralise, to weaken the unity on which is based the social form; and this it does in the desire for liberty. More and more, man wishes to act for himself, to liberate himself from other individualities. If one considers the strikes, the congresses, the unions, one avers the diminution of individual influence, the growth of aggregation. Among men, under the educative influences of environment the individual differentiations disappear; the individuals assimilate, and thus necessarily results the diminution of individual, and the growth of gregarious influence. Enfranchisement spreads, and the desire for liberty augments as the inevitable result.

To attempt to maintain authoritarianism, to uphold the influence of individualities with excommunication or other penalties as sanction, is to wish to impede the flow of evolution on its natural course. To wish to maintain authority, even while mitigating it, as some schools of socialists wish to do, is to try to stop humanity on its march towards absolute liberty, to which doubtless it will never attain.

To be in harmony with the social evolution, which past and contemporaneous social phenomena indicate to us, it is necessary to develop conjointly the tendencies to solidarity, association and sociability, and the tendencies to individualism and liberty.

We Leave them without Regret.

"The ever growing desire for freedom impels the individual to leave his ancient beliefs behind. To-day we see them eternally shattered. Knowledge, truth, science, slowly but surely undermine all that is left, and leave supernaturalism, the naked and unmistakable force of reaction, and conservative decay, like a great mountain seen through a mist from which man is steadily receding as he goes forward in pursuit of his freedom.—*William Bailie*.

Liberty or Death!

"What we want is liberty, and the power in common with our so-called superiors of enjoying the gifts of nature: it is true our wish may not be gratified, but this one thing is certain, our attempt to obtain it will end only with our lives."—*Robert Kett (1549)*.

"Das Christenthum und der Anarchistische Communismus." (Christianity and Anarchist Communism.)

By H. Joachim Gehlsen.

Readers of German may find many points of interest in this little work, which is one more opinion, offered from a standpoint outside our movement, as to the fundamental resemblance of the modern social Ideal with the free communism preached by the Galilean agitator whom "law and order" executed for stirring up the people in the days of Tiberius Cæsar. Herr Gehlsen's point of view is however neither that of the revolutionary socialist, nor of the orthodox Christian. The gist of his booklet is as follows:

I. The goal of human progress is a social state based on Free Communism in which shall be found no class distinctions, nor political demarcations; no rich, nor poor; no idlers, nor starvation, no church and no State. But such a society, in which Liberty and Equality are to be the order of the day, can only exist as the outcome of Fraternity.

II. Fraternity, however, depends on a character and sentiment formed in individuals, and as such, can neither be imposed by politicians or priests, nor brought about by violent revolution. Its establishment can only result from the slow outgrowing by mankind of greed and rancour, *pari passu* with the slow expansion of institutions in conformity with the expanding character and rights of citizens.

Towards this Ideal—free communism, based on fraternity, or regard for the "neighbour"—Herr Gehlsen considers that the general life of mankind has continually tended; the Individual's interest in the interests of the whole becoming increasingly manifest. The idea is "divine," (whatever that may be) and hence eternal and inextinguishable; and it is repeatedly re-born in specially gifted men who, making its proclamation the great concern of their lives, are its special apostles. This happened (he considers) in completest conceivable degree in the case of Christ, whose doctrine hence becomes an all-sufficient touch-stone for moral guidance and social aspiration.

The existing institutions of Church and State have, of course, nothing either in their spirit or organisation that at all corresponds with the eventual needs of free humanity. Their true office at present should be (in Gehlsen's view) to check one another; the State standing for Progress and providing against stagnation; the Church representing Reaction and providing against precipitancy. (p.36) As a fact, however, the two have ever perverted this provisional utility by contending against one another as rivals for political and worldly supremacy. (Chap. IV.)

The existence of State and Communal organizations in society at all times testifies to the extinguishable effort of mankind towards fulfilment of the communistic Ideal. (This seems to us a fantastic view of the situation, at variance with all the facts of the *natural history of Government*. Herbert Spencer's view of Government, as "begotten of aggression and by aggression," is surely truer. And governments, set up and manipulated by the stronger, have obviously made it their first object to keep the strong in position and in possession. Not with a fundamental view to the advantage of all in common, but with the bottom idea of protecting private and national property, has the State ever legislated and functioned.)

Of Social Democracy Herr Gehlsen says: "As is the case with all movements towards human emancipation and the ideal freedom, so also in the social democratic agitation of the past 30 years the leading thought and sole point of vitality has been its communistic feature. That this party, however, should have set itself the fabulously stupid task of establishing Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity by means of a complicated administrative apparatus is only a proof of its insignificance, its political lifelessness, its moral impotence." (p. 29.) Again: "Social Democracy in Germany has decidedly forsaken the open road towards the peaceful establishment of the freedom of citizens. . . . It has made but small use of the opportunities open to it of cooperation with, and independent initiation of reforms in the direction of freedom, having set up instead the phantom of a new State for whose establishment the overthrow of the existing State is an indispensable condition. Thus Social Democracy has sacrificed the strength which lay in its communistic Ideal to a fantastic nothing, and has been morally guilty of treachery to the people. This treachery to the people has had as immediate result the revolutionising of a great part of the lower class population, and has breathed the breath of life into Anarchist Communism. To be sure, Social Democracy with laudable repudiation of its own revolutionary tendency, emphatically points to the great gulf fixed between its own goal and that of Anarchism, and also to the activity in legislative reform which it has developed; whereas Anarchism condemns all parliamentary labors. This gulf, however, is only artificially constructed, and owes its existence solely to the inconsistency of Social Democracy, which is afraid to draw a logical conclusion from its own teaching. The law-riveted, air-built future State of the Social Democrats has already long fallen to ruins within their own camp; and the doctrine of Compulsory Equality has had to steer clear of the doctrine of Free Society." (pp. 29. 33.)

Of Anarchist Communism, however, as at present preached, our writer appears to me to take a rather unfair view, inasmuch as he ascribes to its adepts a slighting of the idea of Fraternity, (the needful basis of Equality and Freedom) and a desire to explain away or get round morality; ("der Versuch die Moral zu umgehen" p. 35.).

"The aim," says Gehlsen, "of Anarchist Communism is plain

enough; because it is purely materialistic, force is its only means of reaching its goal. The attempt of its prophets, from Bakunin to Kropotkin, to give it a moral garb must be regarded as abortive; for to hope to establish a human morality while denying the highest moral power—the divine spirit—is folly or blindness."

Here of course is the fundamental point of difference between Herr Gehlsen's ethical interpretation and ours. For him, human morality consists in loyalty to a pre-established code imposed by a divine spirit, and absolute in its prohibition of certain means and methods in the attainment even of legitimate ends. For us, morality lies in loyalty to human nature, human interests, human progress; and the value or admissibility of this or that procedure is relative, not absolute, since changing conditions change the emphasis of moral sanctions. But Fraternity, whether professed or not, (and Anarchists are shy of popular shibboleths) is surely nowhere more genuinely desired than among the international comrades whose ideal claim from the fellow creature is "according to ability," and whose ideal concession to him is "according to his need."

Two final quotations from this interesting little book most readers will endorse: "For the future Anarchist Communism certainly deserves the attention of the whole political world; and the sooner the attention of all thinking mankind be turned upon it, without passion or idiotic fear, so much the better for the general welfare. . . ." "Communism and Anarchism can scarcely be taken separately; Anarchy results from communism, and thus the Latin school (French—Italian—Spanish) have rightly described their adherents in all literary productions as "Anarchist-Communists," to distinguish them from those communists who in earlier social movements regarded Communism as realisable by methods of law. In Germany, for instance, it would be of great advantage to politicians to bear in mind that Anarchists are, before all else, Communists."

L. S. R.

Liberty Bookshelf.

The following can be obtained from the Editor, or will be forwarded on receipt of stamps.

AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. By P. KROPOTKIN. Translated from the French. 1d.

ANARCHIST MORALITY. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.

THE COMMUNE OF PARIS. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.

THE PLACE OF ANARCHISM IN SOCIALISTIC EVOLUTION. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.

REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT. Price 1d.

REVOLUTIONARY STUDIES. 32 pp. Price 2d.

JONES' BOY: Dialogues on Social Questions between an 'Enfant Terrible' and his Father. By "Spokeshave." 1d.

AN ANARCHIST ON ANARCHY. By ELISEE RECLUS. 1d.

"It is a pity that such men as Elisee Reclus cannot be promptly shot."—Providence Press. This criticism is sufficient to show that the pamphlet is a strong indictment of the present iniquitous system of private property and government.

THE IDEAL AND YOUTH. By ELISEE RECLUS. Price 1d.

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. By ELISEE RECLUS. Price 1d.

A TALK ABOUT ANARCHIST COMMUNISM Between Two Workers. By ERICCO MALATESTA. Price 1d.

This pamphlet has been translated into various languages, and is widely read in Italy and France.

ANARCHY. By ERICCO MALATESTA. Price 1d.

IN DEFENCE OF EMMA GOLDMANN AND THE RIGHT OF EXPROPRIATION. By VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE. 1d.

THE WHY I AMS: Why I am a Socialist and an Atheist, by Conrad Newiger; Why I am a Social Democrat, by G. B. Shaw; Why I am an Individualist Anarchist, by J. Armsden. 1d.

THE WHY I AMS: Why I am a Communist, by William Morris; Why I am an Expropriationist, by L. S. Bevington. 1d.

LIBERTY LYRICS. By L. S. BEVINGTON. 1d.

ANARCHY AT THE BAR. By D. NICOLL. 1d.

THE WALSALL ANARCHISTS. By D. NICOLL. Price 1d.

CHICAGO MARTYRS: Their Speeches in Court. With an appendix by J. P. ALTGELD, Governor of Illinois. 6d.

ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. Price One Halfpenny.

Printed and Published by J. Tothart, at 60 Grove Park Terrace, Chiswick. All communications should be addressed—The Editor, Liberty, Carmagnole House, Hammer-smith, London, W.