

LIBERTY

• CONTENTS •

The Commune of Paris.
By LOUISE MICHEL.

Anarchy not Secrecy.
By "IRELAND."

Church and State.
By G. O. WARREN.

Crime: and Hamon's Definition
By AGNES HENRY.

Can Roman Catholics be
Anarchists?

Why I am a Single Taxer.
By ARTHUR WITHY.

"Ten Men of Money Island."
Between Ourselves.

Government and Organization
By J. TOCHATTI.

LONDON

• 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 II—(Continued).

THE GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE.

As an attempt had been made by the Government to retake the guns of the Place des Vosges, the artillery-men sent there did not choose to undertake the responsibility of bloodshed; and the National Guards, not wishing to be disarmed, sent detachments of the 66th, 80th, 94th, 125th, and 180th battalions, who conveyed the guns to the Buttes Chaumont. They were fifty-six in number. Those journals which the Government accused of inciting to insurrection ceased to appear after March 12th. They were as follows: "Le Vengeur" (The Avenger) conducted by Felix Piat; "Le Cri du Peuple" (The Cry of the People) by Vallés; "Le Mot d'Order" (The Word of Command) by Rochefort—(this paper was started on day following the armistice); "Le Pere Duchesne," by Vermersch, Humbert, Vailaume and Marstian; "La Bouche de Fer, (The Mouth of Iron) by Vermorel Jorrois; "La Caricature," by Pilotelle. Thus in the great silence—the platforms mute, the journals suppressed—insurrection swelled to revolution.

At daybreak, on March 18th, on all the walls of Paris was displayed the following proclamation:

"Inhabitants of Paris! Once more we address ourselves to your reason and your patriotism, and we hope that we shall be heard. Your great city, which cannot subsist without order, is in certain districts profoundly disturbed, and the disturbance in these quarters even without spreading to the others is sufficient to hinder the return of industry and comfort. For some time past, ill-disposed persons, under the pretext of resisting the Prussians who are now no longer within your walls, have constituted themselves masters of a part of the town, have erected obstructions and have mounted guard upon them, forcing you to mount guard with them by the command of an obscure committee which pretends the sole regulation of a portion of the National Guard; which committee thus ignores the authority of General d'Aurelle who is so worthy of his position at your head; wishing to form a government in opposition to the legal Government instituted by general suffrage. These men who have already done you so much harm, whom you yourselves dispersed on Oct. 31st, make pretence of defending you against the Prussians who have done no more than appear within your walls, and whose final departure is retarded by this disorder. They point cannon which, should they be discharged, would merely shatter your houses, and lay low your children and yourselves. In a word, they compromise the Republic instead of defending it; for since they have given rise to an opinion throughout France that a Republic is necessarily a field of disorder, the Republic may be lost. Do not believe these men, but listen to the truth which we tell in all sincerity. The Government instituted by the whole nation would already have been able to take back the guns *stolen from the State*, and which at this moment are a menace only to yourselves; also to remove the ridiculous obstructions which serve no purpose but to impede traffic, and to bring into the hands of justice the criminals who are thus not afraid of bringing about civil war after the war with the foreigner. But the Government desired to give those men who are merely deceived, time to separate themselves from those who deceive them. Nevertheless the time that has been granted to men of good faith to draw away from those of bad faith, is deducted from your repose, your well-being, and the well-being of France at large; therefore it must not be indefinitely prolonged. So long as the present state of things continues business is at a standstill, your shops are deserted, orders coming in from all directions are suspended, your hands are idle, credit cannot be renewed. The capital of which the Government is in need to relieve our territory of the presence of the enemy is not forthcoming. In your own interest even and in that of your city as in that of France the Government has resolved to act. The guilty persons who have pretended to institute a government of their own are about to be delivered over to the law; the guns stolen from the State are about to be replaced in the arsenals, and in order to execute this urgent measure of justice and reason the Government relies upon your concurrence. Let the good citizens separate themselves from the bad, let them aid *public force* instead of resisting it; they will thus hasten the return of comfort in the city and will render the Republic itself a service, which Republic these disturbances have damaged in the estimation of France. Parisians! we thus address you because we respect your good sense, your sagacity, your patriotism. But, this warning once given, you will approve our having recourse to force, for it is useful at any price and without one day's delay that order (the condition of your welfare) should be restored, completely, immediately, and unalterably." Paris, March 17th, 1871. (Signed) Thiers, Chief of the Executive, (whose signature was followed by those of the other members of the Government).

But while the men of the "National Defence" elaborated, printed, and placarded this proclamation, in which were mingled souvenirs of the "order" of Warsaw, and of Napoleon the Third, who in the midst of the slaughters proclaimed that "the wicked tremble and the good are reassured," Paris did not retire to rest: and the sun, rising on the 18th of March, shone neither upon "order" as at Warsaw, nor upon bloodshed such as that of December '51.

END OF THE SECOND PART.

CHURCH AND STATE.

"For always in thine eyes, O Liberty!
Shines that high light whereby the world is saved."
—John Hay.

When a number of individuals assemble and by majority vote decide that all the other members of the community shall act in a particular way, or suffer fine, imprisonment or assault, this assembly of individuals is called the Government. When a number of individuals assemble together and by majority vote decide that all the other members of the community shall believe certain doctrines or suffer eternal punishment, that assembly of individuals is called the Church. Once the Church possessed a very effective method of stifling liberty. The "secular arm" with its hand of steel and fingers of fire was at its disposal, but its secular power is now reduced to the employment of bailiffs and police for the exaction of tithes, royalties, rent and interest; and, as I have said, its chief power now lies in threat of a hypothetical hell in the next world, and social ostracism in this.

But there are no real, tangible things corresponding to the words Church and State. Neither Church nor State has identity, or locality, or dimensions—length, breadth, or thickness; they are not things that you can see, hear, smell, taste or touch; you cannot talk to them, feed them, put them in prison or cut off their heads; you cannot say of either: "See, there it goes; it is green, it is white, it is black, it is long, it is short." The Church is not a thing; it is an idea. The State is not a thing; it also is an idea. Both exist only in the imagination. It would be well if every one clearly understood this, for it would then be quite plain that Church and State are merely convenient expressions used for the purpose of shifting responsibility from persons to an alleged something that does not exist.

For example: A vaccination officer examines my child and either poisons it or compels me to go to gaol or pay a fine to prevent my child from being poisoned. The vaccination officer is really nothing more nor less than a common poisoner, but he satisfies his conscience by the reflection that he is an officer of the Government. But when you clearly understand that there is no such thing as the Government; when you clearly understand that the vaccination officer is simply an individual employed by other individuals to poison babies, then you can understand that the vaccination officer is simply a common poisoner. Now apply the same reasoning to a Custom House officer and you will see that he is just a common everyday thief employed by other thieves to rob travellers.

In Italy there are bandits. They have their captains, lieutenants and privates. In England we have bandits also, with their captains, lieutenants and privates; but we call our bandits Archbishops i.e. upholders of government by physical force; we call their captains members of Parliament; their lieutenants Government officials, and their privates policemen, bailiffs, hangmen, soldiers, and custom house officers. We appeal to the superstition of the people by throwing over our bandits the sacred name of the Government, their attacks and robberies are sanctified as protection and the collection of revenue, so that what is a crime in Italy becomes a virtue in England. But to the clear thinker the only difference between the two systems is that in Italy the bandits are weak, while in England they are many and strong.

What is true of the State is true of the Church. Just as a policeman, who, in his own proper person and acting on his own responsibility would not hurt a fly, will, in the name of the State break open his neighbor's head; just as a hangman or soldier, who if left to himself would not kill a sparrow, will, in the name of the State murder his neighbor—so a person who, as an individual, would not lie or treat anyone unkindly, will in the name of the Church subscribe to statements that he does not believe and cruelly cut the acquaintance of his best friend. Where is there on earth a creed that expresses the individual opinions of the men who made it or subscribe to it? There is not one; and this means that a hundred or a thousand clergymen will get together and, in the sacred name of the Church, declare that they believe what no single one of them believes.

All organized churches and political parties are the enemies of progress because they try to paralyze the brain. The Church forbids her adherents to question her authorized creed, notwithstanding that no thinking person believes the creed in its absolute integrity. The moment a clergyman or politician begins to honestly proclaim his doubts that moment he begins to be treated like a criminal. Promotion is impossible to him. His name is left off all committees. He begins to receive the cold shoulder. He is made to feel that he is unwelcome whenever the church, or the party, comes together. He is

regarded with suspicion. He is treated as a disturber a traitor. Who shall number the honest thinkers that have been killed in this way without ever having been shot, or struck, or stabbed—killed by contumely, coldness and ostracism?

What is the result of this? That only the overbearing and cunning natures take the lead. The frank, the generous, the sensitive hardly dare to think aloud. Many of these do think but they keep their thoughts to themselves. Should they remain in the Church or the party they become time-servers, hypocrites, and they quiet their consciences by persuading themselves that it is wiser for them to go slow, that if they break with the Church or the party it will destroy their influence for good; as if a man could preserve his influence for good by telling lies or withholding the truth, and destroy that influence by being a simple, honest, manly man. Consequently priests and politicians, as such, never help the world along in its religious thinking or social doing. They content themselves with singing the praises of the brave and good after they are dead and gone. The orthodox ministers of today glorify Garrison, but those of Garrison's day were ready to hang him.

A poor drunkard cannot hold a position in Church or State, but a rich drunkard can. A poor libertine cannot belong to the Church or the Senate, but a rich libertine can. A common prostitute cannot belong to the Church or the Senate, but a girl who sells herself in legal prostitution to a rich old man can belong to the Church, and many a man who has "married for money" is in the Senate today. A common murderer cannot belong to the Church, but a hangman can. The hand that adjusted the noose and drew the bolt on Friday can take the communion bread on Sunday. A poor man who habitually tortures and kills his fellow beings cannot belong to the Church or the Senate, but a rich vivisector and vaccinator can. An ordinary thief cannot belong to the Church or the Senate, but a land or money monopolist is eagerly welcomed. A poor person who lives without working cannot belong to the Church or the Senate, but a rich person who lives without working is received with open arms.

The most ignoble criminals in England today are the men who humbug the people at election times, who rob them wholesale by means of corporate monopolies, who starve them by driving them off vacant land and by controlling the issue of money, and these men all belong to the Church, and many of them hold high office in the State. Both Church and State want "God" in the constitution, but they do not clamor for justice in society. They want the Bible in our public schools, but they do not ask for the Golden Rule in business. They say we must not break the Sabbath, but they do not say to the monopolist: "You must not break that poor woman's back over a sewing machine." They call on you to worship Jesus, but if you try to follow his precepts they will call you a madman. They tell the poor to be economical and contented instead of telling the rich to be just. The Church tells the rich to be charitable instead of telling them to stop robbing the poor. It preaches the blessedness of poverty while it revels in the luxury of wealth. It points the eye of faith to another world, but encourages the hand of business to lay up mountains of unearned wealth in this. Both Church and State love respectability more than righteousness, and hate social obscurity more than sin. Both are intrinsically and necessarily bad. They cannot be reformed. They must go!

G. O. W.

About £ s. d.

"TEN MEN OF MONEY ISLAND." By Seymour F. Norton. Appendix by Henry Seymour. (Reeves, 185, Fleet St. 1s).

The author graphically illustrates, by way of a novel, the power of money to enslave the workers. The book opens with a party of ten men setting sail for "pastures new" where the evils of civilization are unknown. They have been disgusted, with good reason, with the everyday world and have determined to become the pioneers of a new society, in which organized injustice passing under the guise of "law and order" shall have no place. Their ship is carried by the fates to an uninhabited island which proves to be rich in all the resources of nature and industry. Step by step their progress is recorded; from chapter to chapter is admirably depicted their evolution from hard labor and individualism to the division of labor and social production. The transition from barter to money is developed. All goes well until one of them, who is a "ne'er do well" and the master of no trade, starts his wits to work to ensure a livelihood at the expense of the community. He seizes on the idea of money to distort it in his own interest. He becomes a full-fledged financier in due course, and under the pretext of facilitating the exchange of commodities in the interest of the community he manipulates the supply of money so dexterously that he eventually becomes the virtual king of the island. A very lucid explanation of the banking business is made, and it is easy to understand from it how bankers are enabled to realize such enormous dividends, as compared with ordinary investments, without any labor or risk on their part.

The moral of the book is that nothing short of a State system of currency will suffice to bring about a more equitable distribution of wealth. Henry Seymour, who contributes some 17 pages of appendix by permission of the author, probably agrees with the publisher that

the book "makes the subject of money so plain and simple that any person can understand it," but he is evidently not disposed to take the author's medicine for the malady, it savoring too strongly of Social Democratic ideals. For he treats at considerable length some economic conclusions of the author which give color to Collectivism, showing that they are founded in economic fallacies. But as we do not hold a brief for either one side or the other, we prefer to leave these subtle differences to the parties concerned.

We have no hesitation in saying that this book will make a mark; that it ought to be read by all reformers whatever their views may be. For it is ably written, is honestly inspired, and brings new light to bear upon the omnipresent labor problem.

There have already appeared three editions in German, two in Norwegian, one in Swedish, besides the American, and the English editions just published. It has also been translated into French, Bohemian, and Hebrew. In a publisher's note it is stated that the book has never before been advertized, and yet over half a million copies have been sold, one copy having sold another. At this rate its popularity is destined to eclipse that of Bellamy's "Looking Backwards."

J. M.

ANARCHY NOT SECRECY.

Those who have read Anarchist literature attentively and who have attended lectures by Anarchists, who have conversed and argued with Anarchists of all shades and opinions and of many nationalities, must be surprised to be told (as they sometimes are) that Anarchists are members of a secret society. The writer of this article holds Anarchist opinions, but he belongs to no society of Anarchists, nor is he aware of any Anarchist who does. It is quite true that there may be found a group of Anarchists, as there may be a group of friends, or a pack of politicians as there may be a pack of wolves, or a flock of voters as there may be a flock of geese, or a swarm of office-seekers as there may be a swarm of locusts. But, because a few Anarchists, for local reasons form themselves into a group, it by no means follows, they are a society, or even a secret society. To belong to a society—such an organization as the word implies—and especially a secret society, would necessitate that which we Anarchists are averse to, namely, to commit ourselves to a number of rules and regulations drawn up by a committee. Is it likely that Anarchists, above all others, who deny the right of any set of men to make laws for others, who are non-invasive, to obey, would commit themselves to such rules and regulations under any conditions. No, certainly not. Such a thing would be impossible among Anarchists. In the first place, Anarchists would not be such fools as to set about manufacturing a number of laws with penalties, and in the second place, no Anarchist would consent to obey them, or even to commit himself to them. I am an Anarchist, thou art an Anarchist, he is an Anarchist, and so on, but I, thou, and he, is committed to no rules and regulations. Leave such things to simpleton voters, and reasoning wolves. Anarchists will have none of them. We have seen quite enough of law and its offspring "order". It is such order that we want to get rid of.

We quite admit that there are secretive Anarchists as there are sure to be men of Anarchist opinions who are non-secretive, and to whom it would be folly to confide anything, which for a time, was to be kept a profound secret. But because there are Anarchists who keep their own counsel, and act in the dark, it by no means follows that Anarchists are in anyway pledged to secrecy. Anarchists are so from conviction, and not because they have signed their names in a book, taken an oath, etc. Anarchy means an absence of all government—liberty pure and simple. Anarchists by belonging to a secret society would be placing themselves at the mercy of their non-secretive confederates.

The babbling friend, however honest, and good intentioned he may be, is more dangerous to his comrades than all the government spies and detectives, who can obtain access to almost any secret society.

The southern Irish, who as a race, are incautious and

non-secretive, have ever been ready to join secret societies in their struggles for liberty as they conceive it. And what has been the ending of all their rebellions and conspiracies? Betrayal, both by friend and foe. Under the soothing syrup of secrecy Irish patriots have marched to imprisonment and death. Governments have been able to undermine and destroy nearly every society the existence of which was objectionable to them.

Why are governments unable to suppress Anarchy? Because it has a scientific basis, being the result of a close study of human society and an accurate perception of those principles which if applied to society would be conducive of human happiness, those principles being believed in by men who have, as a body, no secrets to betray, oaths to break, or documents to sign. In dealing with Anarchists governments have to deal with a number of independent thinkers, who object to be governed, that is, to be dictated to, to have an external will imposed upon them, to be interfered with when not interfering with others, who will resent this interference with the exercise of that equal liberty which they are justly entitled to by passive and active means according to the mental capacity of each individual Anarchist.

As Anarchist opinions spread the difficulties of government will increase. IRELAND.

THE CHICAGO MARTYRS.

COMMEMORATION MEETINGS.

In commemoration of the event in Chicago, on November 11th, 1887, which is handing the name of that city down to posterity in a way its more intelligent inhabitants dread the mention of, the usual meetings in London and elsewhere are being arranged as we go to press.

A meeting will be held on Monday, the 11th inst., at the Lecture Hall, Tidal Basin, opposite the Station, commencing at 8 p.m. The speakers will be Leggatt, Peddie, Turner, Tochatti, Ford, and others.

A meeting will be held at South Place Institute, Finsbury, but the particulars of the arrangements have not come to hand.

A few copies of "The Chicago Anarchists," the remarkably fine drawing by Walter Crane, are left, and may be obtained by sending to our office. Fine copies, post free, 6d.; other copies, 2d.

SEBASTIEN FAURE, the celebrated French orator and Anarchist-Communist is announced to deliver two lectures in St Andrew's Hall, Newman St., Oxford St., W., on Saturday Nov. 2 and Monday Nov. 4. The subjects dealt with will be "The Society of Today" and "The Society of the Future". Tickets (6d. each) may be obtained in advance at Lapie's Library, 30 Goodge St., Tottenham Court Road.

ANARCHIST-COMMUNISM.—The Deptford Working Men's Educational Association announce a Free Course of Sunday Evening Lectures, the first of which will be given on Nov. 3, at Smith's Cocoa Rooms, Deptford Bridge. The lecturers include Olivia Rossetti, J. Turner, and others.

"SOCIALISM IN DANGER," by F. Domela Nieuwenhuis, (Part I) is one of the "Liberty" pamphlets we should like to see very largely circulated. The work, which at the present moment cannot be otherwise than highly interesting to Socialists generally, has not hitherto been printed in English. To our thinking it is one of the clearest expositions of the Socialist position in Germany ever penned, and may be read to advantage alongside a report of the proceedings at the recent Congress at Breslau. Nieuwenhuis is a most painstaking writer, he verifies as far as possible every statement he makes, and supports every opinion he advances by the weight and appropriateness of his quotations. The work has been admirably translated by R. Grierson, the spirit as well as the style being most effectually preserved. We confidently ask our friends to give this little pamphlet all the publicity they can. We are pushing forward the printing of Part II as quickly as possible.

"COMMON-SENSE COUNTRY" is the title of a pamphlet just issued from our office, and written by L. S. Bevington. Speaking of it a contemporary says it is one of the brightest of the LIBERTY series, and is a very cogent exposure of some of the wretched shams of today.

The sad death of Comrade Christopher Boddy, which took place on the 18th of September, owing to an accidental fall from the roof of a house in Tottenham Court Road, has taken from our ranks a young man of considerable promise, who added to a natural kindheartedness an earnest desire to acquire knowledge, and to aid his fellows in all true efforts to obtain more equitable social conditions.

BERKMAN APPEAL FUND.—R. Gundersen writes: I have received for the Berkman Fund: Leveson, Glasgow, 12/6; Price, Chester, 2/6; Subscription List No. 18 (R. G.) 15/-; No. 19 (Starke) 2/-. As funds are much needed I urge upon friends to do their best, and those who have subscription lists to send them to me as soon as possible. R. Gundersen, 98 Wardour St., Soho, W.

"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, 125, Fleet Street, E.C.

..... Acknowledgement and notice of our Exchanges is crowded out of this issue, as is Joe Clayton's "To the Army of Revolt."

LIBERTY.

LONDON, NOVEMBER, 1895.

BETWEEN OURSELVES.

Snow and severe frost predict the rapid approach of winter. It needs no prophet to foretell that winter will bring again to the front the question of "What is to be done for or with the unemployed?" Indeed the fad-dists, including London's representative of mammon—the Lord Mayor, and the political quacks have already intimated their readiness to resume business—on the old lines, of course. The rich must be appealed to, their sympathy must be roused, and their hearts must be touched. The poor must be taught to think themselves lucky in being allowed to beg—the law stands in the way of their doing so generally; they must eat with due thankfulness for the crumbs thrown to them by Dives, and under no circumstances must they look "the gift-horse in the mouth." If this nice little arrangement should—just for once—not happen to work as smoothly as usual: suppose—only suppose—that such a thing as a general rising of "the residuum" should suddenly take place in London and one or two other big cities, What would happen next? Will someone come along with an answer?

One of "Ourselves" says Anarchists are not such fools as to admit that the dispensing of so-called christian charity is the only method of solving the "unemployed" difficulty. The solution, to his thinking, is to be found in a much simpler but more drastic mode of procedure. It is only necessary to give the unemployed the opportunity to do the best they can for themselves, by ruthlessly brushing away all impediments in their way—such atrocities as monopoly, usury, unjust laws, worn out customs, and effete creeds, and then, the ground being cleared, the work to be done would give ample employment to everyone.

Simple enough! So simple that one is astonished so few should be found as yet who have determined to do what they can to put the principle into practice. But the ball has been set rolling, the wide-spread feeling of discontent is nearing the borders of revolution, and this next winter will probably not pass away without existing social arrangements receiving a shaking to their very foundations.

So far as the lockout at Carmaux and the action of the French Government in relation thereto are concerned, the result has been exactly what was to be expected. Governments can do no wrong when they oppress and coerce the weak. In a contest between "might" and "right," the former, having soldiers and police at its disposal, wins the day and becomes "right," and the latter by a neatly contrived illusory trick is suddenly transformed into "wrong." God, or right, is always on the side of the big battalions. Of course, in the opinion of French deputies—at any rate in the belief of such of them as hope some day or other to be office-holders—what the government has done is perfectly in accord with political justice. If a most tyrannical capitalist and employer has been upheld in his base and cruel acts, the support has been "lawfully" given; even if the law has been strained by allowing

the police to endeavour to provoke half-starved workmen to commit acts of violence, such straining has been at once condoned, because, in the opinion of all except the oppressed, it was necessary that a state of affairs dangerous to the continuance of "order" according to law should be ended.

As it is today in France, so it would be tomorrow in this country, if a large body of strikers or the locked out were threatening the citadel of capitalism and monopoly. Whether the Government were Tory or Radical, policemen and soldiers would guard the banner of "law and order," and the former would be told to use their bludgeons vigorously, and the latter ordered to "fire low." What has been will continue to be, given the same incentives and the same conditions. Republicanism in France or in America, Monarchy in Britain, Germany, or Russia—so long as these are the governing forces of social and political life, held in hand and used in the main for the benefit of the moneylord and the landlord, must continue to be the biggest barriers to freedom. The cutest politician has no scheme for rendering such obnoxious forces altogether harmless, and no true social reformer can work to advantage in the deadly shadow of their presence. Has not the time arrived for more vigorous attacks on such inhuman monstrosities? In the words of Gerald Massey, we should like to

"Call the peoples up—
Ring out the Egypt of their slavery!
Ring out the death knell of old tyranny—
'Tis rotten ripe."

The fight all round between the oppressed worker and the oppressing capitalist is approaching a crisis in the United States. One of the writers in the *Firebrand* thus summarises the situation: "Let the unemployed, the American born, once come to the conclusion that it is either fight or die, and they will fight without much reluctance." "Men, tired of looking for work and angry at being repulsed on every hand when asking for food, have been arming themselves, and there are now, it is estimated, over 1000 men in this (Fargo, N.D.) vicinity who are carrying revolvers or guns." "The farmer is gradually being enslaved by the money power." "All that we lack of a revolution tomorrow is the opportunity." Surely the ancient "handwriting on the wall" was not plainer or more significant than this.

The deplorable facts coming to light day by day with regard to impoverished farmers, starving farm labourers, and land going out of cultivation are positively appalling. And the suggestions for tinkering made by men in the position of Salisbury, Devonshire, and others of their class, together with the twaddle written by men unable to see clearly the whole bearings of the question at issue, would justify every honest man in turning revolutionist. Twenty farms will shortly be added to those already unoccupied in Kent—the "garden" of England. Those journals which, like the *Estates Gazette*, record and deplore these facts, do so from the landowners' point of view. They express no sympathy with the men and women who are deprived of work and food when land is left to produce weeds only. Farmers who once farmed hundreds of acres are finding refuge in the workhouses, and their sons and daughters are drifting into our overcrowded cities. While the farmers and market gardeners who manage to keep their heads above water find the railway companies and the salesmen so rapacious that rather than put their produce on distant markets they feed their pigs and fowls with it.

Scrivener C. Scrivener, who writes a remarkably good letter to the *Weekly Times and Echo* on the agricultural situation, shows the utter absurdity of the suggestion that one hundred members of Parliament should form themselves into a pioneer gang, and after making themselves acquainted with thorough cultivation, show the farmers how to cultivate the land properly. No doubt Mr. Scrivener gauges the mental aptitude of the average "member" correctly when he states that "there are not one hundred members of Parliament capable of being trained to teach the science of agriculture. He also recognizes

clearly "that the reason for the existence of both these classes is not to teach, or be taught; they exist to divide". The sooner these pretentious bags of windy rhetoric are pricked the better, and a wider recognition obtained of the fact that every improvement in cultivation will be exploited by the landlord. Mr. Scrivener says the first thing to do is to take the land out of the control of "private persons"; and to this we add, "public persons". Nothing, in the opinion of the Anarchist-Communist, but the Communalization of the land will make freedom possible. The stories horticulturists could tell would sound like fairy tales in the ears of the farm laborer to whom the possibilities of intense cultivation are as a dream impossible of realisation. That "a man with no leisure cannot do his work properly, and, what is perhaps worse, he cannot be taught," necessitates a complete overthrow of the present system.

The strike of the waitresses in the employ of Lyons and Co. throws a lurid light on the sham civilization of today which compels young girls to go a fortnight without dinners, and finds them on some days money out of pocket after long hours of labor; and in other cases give them a few shillings for a week's work. To add to their difficulties, when they propose to appeal to their employers for more humane treatment, the deputation they appoint is refused admission to their masters' presence. Palliative Acts of Parliament that don't palliate, Citizen Sundays, and intellectual feasts on the ethics of factory legislation, are most inefficient remedies for such rank and outrageous evils.

The joy of the angels over the "one" sinner who repented can scarcely have exceeded our gratification as we read the reports of the proceedings at the various congresses which have been held during the past month. Sectarians do, of course, "love one another": they are constantly saying as much, both "in season and out of season". It is however when they attempt to show their love by actions that we find occasion to rejoice greatly, and then because of the show up they give of the miserable superstitions they persist in calling christian principles. The attempt now being made to bring about a so-called "Union of Churches" is to our thinking very little more than an allround admission that the said churches find the ground they have so long encumbered trembling beneath them. The spiritual pilots have become very like rats in a sinking ship, and are seeking to huddle together in order to meet destruction rather than accept their fate singly.

These latest congresses have proved once more how utterly incompetent the clerical mind is when it tries to deal with social affairs. Parsons, of the christening or of the baptising schools, have alike but one remedy for the ulcer of poverty—and that is charity-salve. For hundreds of years they have been advocating the use of this quack medicine and their efforts have been profitable—to themselves. Not one word of approval have they for such a drastic and honest curative as freedom—liberty to think, do, and to live, on pure and simple and unrestricted lines. We are not going to show sympathy for these false pilots in their death agony, because we believe their removal will tend to a purification of the moral and social atmosphere. If there be any men amongst them let them come over to us and live as becomes men.

One of the speakers at the Conference of Women Workers made a few very sensible remarks about the absurd proposal to grant old age pensions. The argument however was not carried far enough. Mere talk about thrift and self denial is out of place. It is rank absurdity to suggest that men and women should "lay up for rainy day" when they do not get enough to enable fully to enjoy the very few sunny days they may have. The system of pensions as it works today is a gigantic fraud, and it is not by bringing the producing classes within its demoralizing and debasing influence that its fraudulent character will be destroyed or even lessened. Look at the pensions given to "rulers", "officers of State" and high or low bred "flunkies" generally. What are they but monies dishonestly obtained from the producing classes? Women workers, and those who assume to speak for them, had better cease talking about pensions and charity. Workers of both sexes want the full result of their labors. Having obtained this, the proverbial "rainy day" will have lost its terrors.

The relatives of Miss Lanchester (a woman whose name has suddenly become a "household word") and the doctor assisting them, who successfully conspired to temporarily confine a sane woman in a lunatic asylum, deserve the sincere thanks of all Anarchists. They have produced an object lesson which promises good results, even if it should do no more than indicate the demoralising character of every Act of Parliament recorded in our Book of Statutes. The laws relating to lunacy arose out of a desire to acquire property, or in other words to steal it. They have again and again been enforced with exactly the same object. Private asylums—dens of cruelty and extortion—have sprung up in all directions owing to the existence of these laws. "One of our dailies, the editor of which is fearful lest he may be called insane in consequence of his utterance, says "the lunacy laws are dangerous enough in any case," but when administered by bigots and amateur scientists, well—this is too much even for an editor of the "rest and be thankful" school. If the gentleman in question will go for the entire abolition of these laws, and others of a like degrading character, we should be glad to assist him. But he won't. So long as Property rules the roost the lunacy laws will remain, what they are widely acknowledged to be today—a standing disgrace to their framers and an insult to the intelligence of every honest man and woman in the land.

GOVERNMENT AND ORGANISATION.

In the last issue of *LIBERTY* mention was made of certain misrepresentations with regard to Anarchists and Anarchism (made by "Tattler" in *Justice*) and the action of the former in connection with the proposed Workers' Congress in 1896. "Tattler" repudiates the charge of misrepresentation: he says a congress is a representative body, and that it is its representative character which gives it any importance: and then goes on to ask, with "sweet illogical unreasonableness", why Anarchists, who do not believe in representation, desire to be admitted to a (not "the") congress. Having asked this somewhat misleading question, "Tattler" proceeds to answer it in his sweetly illogical way by accusing Anarchists of a desire "to break up all organisations of workers and to destroy all conferences and congresses." "Tattler" is disingenuous. How can a workers' congress be representative of workers when a worker who is also an Anarchist is not permitted to be present? Surely "Tattler" does not contend that none but Social Democratic subjects are to be discussed at a conference of workers, or that all topics discussed at such a gathering must be dealt with from a social democratic point of view only? If this is what he means, we protest most strongly against such exclusiveness, and—proceed to a more important point.

"Tattler" says "We are called upon to believe that at one and the same time the Anarchist does and does not believe in representation and delegation. The Anarchist is always assuring us that he can represent no one but himself, and no one can represent him. Now we are told he can represent others, and others can represent him, only not in Parliament. Surely the principle of representation is the same in any case, whether the body in which representation is claimed be a Parliament or a Congress." "Tattler" also says "If one dares to suggest that the Anarchist believed in organisation and all that it involves—voting, agreement, majority rule, delegated authority, and the like, your Anarchist would almost choke with the wrath of his indignant repudiation of such gross misrepresentation. But if one should dare to assert the contrary it appears to be equally gross misrepresentation."

The above statements prove that "Tattler" knows very little about Anarchism, and even less about organisation, and he displays lamentable confusion of thought by using the words organisation, representation, and delegation with but one meaning, and he may be advised to get a correct knowledge of these terms before he again essays to write as a Socialist or rather as a Social Democrat, and in the meantime his attention may be called to the fact that the principle of representation is not the same in a parliament as it is in a congress or conference. Parliamentary representation is achieved by action in accord with orders made in Parliament—orders which must be observed before representation, in part or wholly, can exist. Even then it is in no sense free to act, its authority being delegated to an administration which is so constructed as to favour initiative by the capitalist. On the other hand, voluntary organisation is free, and the interests of all concerned are indistinct. Neither law nor police are needed to give effect to the conclusions arrived at by common agreement, and such an organisation observes the rules it makes simply because it is to the interest of its members to do so: but Parliament compels compliance with its laws by brute force. If "Tattler" will refer to the writings of such well known Anarchists as Kropotkin and Malatesta he will find full confirmation of these assertions. The last named says: "Scientific societies and congresses, international, life-boat, and red cross associations, etc., labourers' unions, peace societies, volunteers who hasten to the rescue at times of great public calamity, are

all examples—among thousands—of that power of the spirit of association which always shows itself when the need arises, or an enthusiasm takes hold, and the means do not fail. That voluntary associations do not cover the world, and do not embrace every branch of material and moral activity, is the fault of the obstacles placed in the way by governments, of the antagonisms created by the possession of private property, and of the impotence and degradation to which the monopolising of wealth on the part of the few reduces the majority of mankind." Kropotkin writes: "Emancipation from governmental yoke, free development of individuals in groups and federations, free organisation ascending from the simple to the complex, according to mutual needs and tendencies."

These views are endorsed by English, American, and continental Anarchists. Can "Tattler" show them to be illogical, unreasonable, or in the slightest degree funny or silly. If he cannot, then his criticism is beside the mark.

Voluntary association means neither majority rule or delegated authority, and agreement and majority rule are contradictory terms. If "Tattler" were to do a little more reading of Anarchist literature, and study a little more closely the arguments used and the facts stated therein, it is possible he might considerably enlarge his sphere of usefulness.

J. TOCHATTI.

IN MEMORIAM.

Mad, as the world calls mad,
See Anarchy's few;
Fighting the False and the Bad
In all that they do;
Forcing a way for the Glad,
The Pure, and the True.

Bolder and clearer it grows—
The Anarchist task;
Liberty's plausible foes
To assail and unmask;
Handing the torch as it glows
To all who may ask.

Great! oh, exceedingly great,
The Anarchists' claim!
Fusing the falsehood of State
In unquenchable flame;
Breaking the fetters of fate—
In Humanity's name.

Breathing with fiery breath
On the mammonite crew;
Fearless, in splendor of faith,
Of the worst they can do;
Blessed, in life and in death,
O beneficent few!

From "Liberty Lyrics," by L. S. BEVINGTON.

REVOLUTIONS are freshets intended to equalize the ideals of the people and the actual conditions of life. They are never arbitrary, but obey certain physical laws, like the cyclone, which re-establishes the equilibrium of the air, disturbed by violent changes in the temperature, or like the waterfall, which is constantly striving to bring two bodies of water to the same level. As often as there is found to be too great a difference between the wishes of the people and the actual reality of things, in obedience to the laws of nature a revolution takes place; it may be dammed up artificially by the organized powers for a while but not for long. Revolutions are consequently the only witnesses of history which allow us to draw conclusions from their extent and aims as to the degree and the causes of the preceding popular discontent.—Dr. MAX NORDAU.

A QUERY.—About what date was the word "Anarchists" first used in the sense of indicating or pointing to a number of men holding and publicly avowing the principles of Anarchy?

"For a picture of pure Communism, showing its necessarily Anarchic character, I recommend 'News from Nowhere' by William Morris."
—Henry Addis, (*Firebrand*).

TRUTH and Freedom are the pillars of society.—HENRIK IBSEN.

ANARCHISM is the natural right of self-preservation; Communism, the concession of that right to others.—Dr. FAUST MACDONALD.

WHY I AM A SINGLE TAXER.

By ARTHUR WITHY.

I can best explain why I am a single taxer by stating as briefly as possible what the single tax is, and by enunciating as clearly as I can its economical and ethical basis.

The single tax is a tax only in form. Economically speaking it is rent, for we single taxers propose to abolish all rates and taxes on labour or labour products, and to derive all public revenues from a single tax levied on the rental value of the land, irrespective of improvements. Rent must be paid in any case. If it be paid to private individuals it will be a monopolistic and speculative rent, which is much higher than an economic rent; and in addition the state and the municipality must meet the expenses of government by levying rates and taxes on trade and industry. If, however, it be paid to the state it will be an economic rent, because the barriers of land monopoly would be broken down and all unused land would be open to labour and capital; and all the rates and taxes that now hamper trade and industry could be abolished.

In this country the first step towards the single tax would be to impose upon the present value of all land the existing tax of 4s. in the £, now levied on the values of 1692, and bringing in a paltry £1,020,000 only. The rental value of the land of the United Kingdom is estimated at £160,000,000 to £200,000,000, so that a tax of 4s. in the £ levied on present values would net from £32,000,000 to £40,000,000, and the existing rates and taxes might to that extent be remitted. We would then proceed by annual increments of 1s. in the £. In nine or ten years the whole of the present rates and taxes, amounting to £128,000,000 per annum, could be abolished; and in 16 years the whole of the rent would flow into the public coffers.

This, however, is only the fiscal aspect of the reform. Its industrial and social aspects are much more important. A substantial tax on land values would inevitably break down the barriers of land monopoly, and give labour and capital freedom of access to all land not actually in use, because the tax would be levied upon the full annual value of the land whether the land were put to use or not, and no landowner could long afford to pay out the tax while receiving no return from the land. This freedom of access to the land would at once solve the unemployed problem and make the workers economically independent; for no man would work for another for longer hours, for lower wages, or under worse conditions than he need work for himself on the land. Each man would, therefore, be his own factory inspector, and each would fix for himself his hours of labour.

I do not regard the single tax as a panacea, or cure-all; but I consider that it is the first thing needful, because, so long as land monopoly continues, no matter what political, social, or industrial reforms may be introduced, the landlords controlling, as they do, the only raw material of industry can compel the workers to hand over to them the whole of the produce of their labour above and beyond a bare subsistence.

I am a single taxer because I believe in freedom—in the equal rights of all men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

If all men have equal rights to life, then, since the use of the earth is essential to the life of all men, all must have equal rights to use the earth. It is therefore unjust that the land should, as is the case to-day, be monopolized by the few. Of the 72,000,000 acres of this country 50,000,000 are owned by 15,000 persons, and of those 50,000,000 acres 30,000,000 are owned by 1,000 only! But all men have, also, equal rights to liberty. Therefore whatever each man makes by the

application of his labour to the soil is his as against the world, for to force him to hand over to another individual, or to the state, a portion of his product would be to make him to that extent a slave to that individual, or to the state.

This is precisely the result of our present systems of taxation and land tenure.

The rental value of the land is created by and therefore belongs to the whole community. Without population land has no value. It can have no value until at least two people want the same piece. As population increases land values rise; as population decreases land values fall; and were population to disappear land values would also disappear. Land values, therefore, form the natural source of public revenue, but at present we supinely allow them to be appropriated by private individuals, and as a consequence the state is obliged to levy rates and taxes upon labour and capital.

What, I ask, could be more in accord with the principles of justice than the single tax, which would appropriate to public purposes the values created by the public, while leaving to individuals undiminished by rate or tax the values created by and therefore belonging individuals?

"But is not the single tax unjust to the landlords?" someone may ask. Assuredly not. As I have shown, the rental value of the land is created by and therefore belongs to the whole community. It is obvious that it is not created by the landowners simply considered as landowners, for if the whole earth were merely "owned" till doomsday no wealth would be produced. And since it is one of the fundamental truths of political economy that no wealth is created except by the application of labour and capital to the land, it is equally obvious that to whatever extent the landlords receive *what they have not earned*, the workers must, directly or indirectly, to that extent go short of *what they have earned*.

CRIME: AND HAMON'S DEFINITION.

As the word "crime," though familiar to every land and every class, belongs to that category of words which seem so easy to understand as not to need any precise definition, all the world uses it according to their individual enlightenment or ignorance, without seeing any necessity to define its exact meaning. Scientists, however, are bound to state clearly what they mean by the things they treat of, and each criminologist, or school of criminologists, has found it hitherto necessary to give a new definition for the word crime.

A. Hamon (whose article, "Definition of Crime," appeared recently in this journal) is not a mere criminologist—he is a student of social phenomena over a much wider field, and when he treats of crime he does not limit his search for, or his recognition of it, to those who act illegally. He finds it, for instance, to a large extent among the military profession. Consequently his definition is much broader and at the same time more radical than all the others. He says "Crime is an act which injures individual liberty."

Where is the man who, at some time of his life or in some way, has not injured the individual liberty of another? In fact there is no one existing who at this rate has not committed a crime. Possibly this is also Hamon's opinion. At the same time he reminds us that everyone is that which his inherited tendencies and his environment during life have made him. Consequently in the words so ably put by Herzen, "the individual is not free to will that he wills but he is free to do what he wills, if no obstacle impedes the execution of his volition." Therefore, even though a man's acts may be deplorable, he cannot be held responsible for them. That brings me to the conclusion that it is unjust to condemn a man for any act.

This in my opinion is true, but it is in perfect contradiction with the usual opinion. With the exception of a few philosophers and some thoughtful Anarchists there is hardly any one who does not believe that individuals are responsible for their actions, and are therefore justly approved or condemned for them. The whole fabric of governmental institutions, such as the judicature and magistrature, is based upon this idea of moral responsibility. To my thinking the idea of crime has arisen out of this notion of responsibility. And by the time people come to accept the definition that crime means an act that injures individual liberty, and to recognise that all mortals—not being angels—do sometimes injure individual liberty, therefore all mortals are criminals, crime will no longer be in their eyes what it now is. It will be equivalent to the inevitable—however regrettable—acts of imperfect beings in an imperfect society. Then it will be impossible to classify men as criminal or non-criminal; all that it will be possible to say is that there are more or less perfect human beings. This brings me to my conclusion that crime is a word which no longer fits in with enlightened comprehension of social phenomena. It is a word which, as society grows more moral will fall into disuse, as being associated with ideas based on an inferior and no longer admissible moral theory.

A. Hamon's definition of crime is as far removed from that which the general public, including learned criminologists, mean by crime as an Anarchist's conception of Anarchy is from the old and less enlightened use of the term.

What would I suggest (it may be asked) in place of this definition? Nothing. I would suggest to give up talking about crime and criminals, and, taking the larger view of humanity, urge the inevitability of anti-social acts under inhuman, unfraternal conditions, which themselves again are mainly owing to ignorance.

A. H.

Can Roman Catholics be Anarchists?

To the Editor,—Sir,—Anarchists have not much difficulty in stating their opinion of the Church of England and its doings. That church is simply a spiritual manifestation of "state" authority; even its own members admit that it would be nowhere in the race to save souls if it were not "established". Nor can Anarchists have sympathy with the actions of the nonconforming bodies, for most of these organisations would willingly be "established" if they had the chance. The Church of Rome has however on more than one occasion refused alike state patronage and support, has in fact declined to be bossed by any temporal authority, and has to this extent been Anarchistic in spirit, although not openly avowing herself possessed of any such noble but much maligned principle. May it not therefore be assumed that the Romish Church stands in a somewhat different position towards the Anarchist movement than the churches above mentioned? The Catholic clergy have, not only in Ireland but in many other countries, stood manfully against the tyranny of government when the personal liberty of any member of their church has been in jeopardy: whilst practising spiritual oppression within the borders of their own churches, they have often dared the political oppressor—the government for the time being—to do his worst. It would be interesting to ascertain how far this liking for and support of the principle of individual liberty can be relied on in the coming contest for freedom—in the struggle for the abolition of all known forms of "government" whatsoever. Would the Romish church's love of liberty remain intact if she became as dominant spiritually as she aims at becoming? Is the principle of individual liberty so fully comprehended by her devotees as to cause them to be favourably disposed towards the only movement (Anarchism) which if successful would give them and their fellows liberty of thought and freedom of action in their very essence? The utterances of the present Pope do not lend much sanction to this assumption. He cannot apparently forget that in Rome he is a temporal prince as well as a spiritual pope. But English Catholics do not talk in that spirit. Unrestricted liberty to teach and practice their spiritual belief is all they ask for. Under these circumstances they should give hearty support to the Anarchist propaganda. Are they prepared to do so. D. B.

In re EMMA GOLDMANN'S LECTURE.—Collection at Lecture 1/15/3, Collected by Emma Goldmann 5/0, Emma Goldmann (donation) 10/0, J. Tochatti (donation) 19/9—total receipts 3/10/0. Hire of Hall 3/3/0, Printing 2000 handbills 6/0, Postage 1/0—total payments 3/10/0.



Liberty Pamphlets.

PRICE ONE PENNY EACH.

IN THE PRESS.

Socialism in Danger. Part II. By E. DOMELA NIEUWENHUIS. Translated by R. GRIERSON.

Parliamentary Politics in the Socialist Movement. By ERICO MALATESTA.

The Why I Ams: (Third Series): Why I am an Advocate of Physical Force, by G. Lawrence; Why I am a Socialist and a Cooperator in Production, by (the late) E. T. Craig; Why I am an Anarchist, by Louise Michel.

Socialism in Danger. Part I. By E. Domela Nieuwenhuis. Translated by R. Grierson.

Jones' Boy: Dialogues on Social Questions Between an 'Enfant Terrible' and his Father. By "Spokeshave."

Liberty Lyrics. By L. S. BEVINGTON.

The Ideal and Youth. By ELIÉ RECLUS.

An Anarchist on Anarchy. By ELISÉE RECLUS.

In Defence of Emma Goldmann and the Right of Expropriation. By VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE.

FIRST SERIES.

The Why I Ams: Why I Am a Socialist and an Atheist, by Conrad Naewiger; Why I Am a Social Democrat, by G. Bernard Shaw; Why I Am an Individualist Anarchist, by J. Armsden.

SECOND SERIES.

The Why I Ams: Why I Am a Communist, by William Morris; Why I Am an Expropriationist, by L. S. Bevington.

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.

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

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

ANARCHY. By ERICO MALATESTA. Price 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.

USEFUL WORK V. USELESS TOIL. By W. Morris. Price 1d.

THE TABLES TURNED, OR NUPKINS AWAKENED. By W. MORRIS. 4d.

TRUE AND FALSE SOCIETY. By W. MORRIS. 1d.

MONOPOLY OR HOW LABOUR IS ROBBED. By W. MORRIS. Price 1d.