

LIBERTY



• CONTENTS •

Between Ourselves.

The "Alliance" Manifesto.

Superstition.

By G. O. W.

What I Understand by
Socialism.

By J. SKETCHLEY.

Emma Goldman in London.

Our Contemporaries.

Reply to J. C. Kenworthy.
By TOUZEAU PARRIS.

The Commune of Paris.
By LOUISE MICHEL.

Priest and Prophet.
By J. TOCHATTI.

W. M. Rort

• 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.

The new Government was composed as follows:—Thiers, (Chief of the Executive) Jules Favre, (Foreign Affairs) Ernest Picard, (Minister of the Interior) Du Faure, (Justice) Le Flo, (War) Pouget Quertier, (Finance) Jules Simon, (Public Instruction) Pothnon, (Marines) Lambrecht, (Commerce) De Larey, (Public works) Jules Ferry, (Mayor of Paris) Vinoy, (Governor of Paris) Victor Hugo, Rocheforte, Malon, Tridon and Kane, resigned their posts as deputies, from the outset.

The conditions of peace were the cession of Alsace and a part of Lorraine, with Metz; the payment within three years of 5,000,000,000 under the title of war indemnity; the occupation of territory until this payment should be completed. The evacuation of territory was to take place by degrees, and in proportion to the sums paid off.

On the 27th of February a report having spread of the entry of the German army into Paris, a call to arms was beaten in the night; the Champs Elysees and Passy were covered by National Guards. These knew that in the Place Wagram a park of artillery had not yet been removed in view of the approaching entry of the Prussians. They were the guns that had been purchased by the subscriptions of the National Guards of Belleville, La Villette, Montmartre, and La Chapelle, and which consequently belonged to these districts. At the Place des Vosges were the field pieces purchased by the battalions du Marais. Men, women, and children yoked themselves to the guns; those of Montmartre were wheeled to the boulevard Ornane, and mounted there on the highest point. Those of Belleville, and La Villette were mounted on the Charmont steeps. Those of the battalions du Marais were left in the Place des Vosges.

At a meeting of two thousand delegates, the Central Committee of the National Guards had on Feb. 24th drawn up and published the following resolution:

"The National Guard protests by the organ of its Central Committee against every attempt at disarmament; and declares that in case of need, it will resist by force of arms."

On Feb. 28th, the same Committee published a manifesto which ran thus:

"General feeling appears to be against opposing the entry of the Prussians into Paris. The Central Committee of the National Guards which had given expression to a contrary opinion hereby declares itself to have formed the following resolution:

"Around all those quarters to be occupied by the enemy, a series of barricades will be erected, so as to isolate this part of the city completely. The inhabitants of the district so circumscribed should immediately move away. The National Guard in concert with the army forming a cordon around the district, will take care that the enemy thus isolated on ground which will no longer be that of our city, shall be cut off from all means of communication with the intrenched part of Paris.

"The Central Committee then engages the whole of the National Guard to lend its concurrence in the execution of measures necessary to this end; and to avoid all aggression, which could only lead to the immediate overthrow of the Republic.

"(Signed) The Central Committee of the National Guard."

The army retired to the left bank of the Seine, and the National Guard carried out its program alone.

That night was a deeply impressive one for everybody. It was cold. One seemed to see further into time, as if standing at a point whence one could look across an abyss. In the great silence the tocsin sounded. The moment had come when the Reaction was about to attempt its work.

The Federal Republican Committee of the battalions of Montmartre acted in conjunction with the Central Committee. It was felt that we were in danger of a monarchic restoration, there was scarcely time to take much heed of the regulations that they made under the name of Federal Republican Federation of the National Guards, but their proclamations kept the population awake whom it would not do to let slumber before escaping from the snare.

The Assembly at Bordeaux entered on a series of reactionary measures. Not only did it desire to place beyond all power of opposition the courageous men whom it designated as the infamous dregs of the

faubourgs. But it attacked the small tradesmen already undermined by the law relating to overdue bills. Two hundred and seventy five protests were made from the 14th to the 16th of March.

Although the so-called National Assembly had no intention of affronting Paris, it was preparing a coup de force for the recovery of the guns of the faubourgs, especially those of Montmartre, to disarm the "citadel of revolution," the "acropolis of insurrection," which we on our side called the "sacred mount," the "citadel of freedom."

The gendarme Valentin, prefect of police, was the man of the occasion. Aurille de Paladine was commander-in-chief of the National Guard. Thiers could not have made a better selection in view of conflict with the "vile multitude." But first of all it was needful to disarm that multitude.

All the groups for their part amalgamated to meet the common danger. Even those who only desired the municipal elections were under no mistake as to the situation. Revolutionists hoped that out of the struggle would come deliverance;—the republic; social, equal, and communistic. Internationalists, Communists, Communalists, Blanquists, and simple patriots formed a single army. Perhaps in some such way will all revolutionary Europe one day unite, as events increase in magnitude.

Thiers holding at his disposal his colleagues of the "National Defence," inspired the lamentable journeys of Jules Favre to Ferrière. The latter hesitated for some time, but came round to viewing as an heroic action the shameful cowardice he was about to perpetrate.

A whiff of freedom was in the air. The provinces had to be deceived, so that the whole of France should not rise in rebellion, and perhaps, as in 1792, sow revolution broadcast over the world.

For everywhere that breeze of liberty was stirring. In 1870 there chafed in the dungeons of Russia men, belonging for the most part to the student youth; women, who adhered to the principles of the International. They had tried by means of an active propaganda to rouse from their torpor the moujiks (Russian peasants) bowed for long past over the hard zemlia (fields). By means of imagery—simple words such as would appeal to simple people—the propaganda was carried forward. "Les Paroles" was written by Bakounin in the kind of language that suited them. Said Bakounin, "The Russian people are at present under conditions precisely similar to those which forced them into rebellion under the Tzar Alexis, father of Peter the Great. At that time it was Stenka Razine, the Cossack leader of the rebels, who placed himself at their head, and pointed out to them the road to emancipation. In order to rise to-day, the people only await a new Stenka Razine. But this time a single leader will be replaced by the legion of un-classed young men who now live in the life of the people. It is, as if Stenka Razine stood behind these collective heroes, and the same invincible power will inspire all this magnificent young blood, over whom his spirit still hovers."

In a poem by Ogaroff (the friend of Bakounin) entitled "The Student," young people of ardent spirit and who were enthusiastic for a life of struggle, read of one of their own student class, living in poverty for science and the love of humanity, by means of his own laborious work. An object of the Tzar's and the nobles' vengeance, compelled to a nomadic life because of persecution, going about from sun-down to sunrise urging the peasants to assemble and to revolt, and finally taken by the Imperial police; finishing his life amid the snows of Siberia, and with his dying breath, appealing to men to die for the world, and for freedom.

At the moment when they were trying the Commune, the trials of the Internationalists in Russia had just terminated in the gallows and Siberia.

Algeria, in 1870, quivered under the weight of military conquest. "Our administration," said Jules Favre, "thus reaped the sad fruits of the policy to which for long years the interests of colonial subjects had been sacrificed.

Towards the end of February, the Arabs, who knew enough about military despotism, but were ignorant of civil despotism, and preferred a known to an unknown evil, preferred to have their own compatriots in the Arab bureaux rather than the Frenchmen by whom they had been conquered. Doubtless the idea that the new administration would reach even into the Arab family, aided those who dreamt of freedom to prepare the insurrection. The old shiek, Haddab, who for upwards of thirty years had been confined in a cell, and his two sons, Mohammed and Ren Azzis, the shieks El Mokrani, Ben Ali Cherif, and others stirred up La Kabylie. Their army amounted to about 30,000 men.

In the middle of March the Bachaga of La Medjana sent a declaration of war to the Governor of Algeria, and the Arabs besieged Bordj-bon-Arriidj. The siege had lasted a week; when Colonel Bouvalet arrived with a column of several thousand men.

One of the shieks then dismounted from his horse, and seeing the dispersion of his own men, slowly and with head erect, climbed the steep escarpment of a ravine which was being swept by the bullets.

He received the death which, (according to those who witnessed the touching scene) he sought, with the proud dignity of a man who had triumphed."

The Government, which in the name of patriotism, shed tears before its conquerors, simultaneously shot down the Arabs who rose in the name of the same patriotism. Is it not always thus?

Brunel and Piazza who on Jan. 28th, had been chosen as leaders by the National Guards, were condemned by court-martial to two years imprisonment. But in the night of Feb. 26th—27th, they were released by the revolutionists, who were backed by the crowd.

To be continued.

A REPLY TO J. C. KENWORTHY.

By TOUZEAU PARRIS.

Comrade Kenworthy says the title "Christian Anarchist" is most misleading; he does not label himself but others do. We have the idea that the "others" hit the mark more nearly than our comrade. He is an Anarchist, a moral suasionist, therefore opposed to the use of physical force. With this position we do not quarrel. But when he defines where the Christian Anarchist parts company with his fellow Anarchist—who theoretically advocates violence, and practically uses it, at any and every opportunity—Kenworthy distinctly labels himself Christian Anarchist.

The Anarchist who repudiates the discredited coercive means, common to all class governments, is not we admit necessarily a "feeble creature," but may be a thoughtful person, who questions the wisdom of all such acts, one who can weigh the causes, producing in some opponents of government that hatred of oppression, which, when they themselves are subject to its tyranny, sweeps away all reasonable control, and fear, of personal action, culminating in some terrible but usually futile attempt to destroy the tyrants.

The wide-spread belief in physical force, as the only and best means to improve human nature, cannot be irradiated by constant appeals to it by those who preach Liberty, which means free life, without State coercion.

As there are Anarchists who quite as strongly deny the wisdom of violence in the form of reprisals for the tyrannies of the Governments or their officials, and who repudiate the name Christian, we deem it most misleading, as well as unfair, for Christians to take the credit of these views and to fancy they are the peculiar property of Christianity, and its professors. Comrade Kenworthy affirms he is a Christian—and without doubt he is an Anarchist of a particular kind—so why he should repudiate being a Christian Anarchist seems to us strange.

Let us briefly consider the character of the reasons he gives for being a Christian. The prime reason alleged by him is, "that he knows no other doctrine true to life and fact, capable of supplying the motives, guidance, powers, which we need." By doctrine of course Teaching is meant. And this teaching we are told is to be found in the New Testament. But we are warned against orthodox perverters, "who read black where you should read white," if you want to get at the mind of Christ. This is very amusing, and the result would be probably more amusing still. Our Comrade, however, does not leave us to work out the problem in this wonderful way. He sums up the doctrine of Jesus "as something like this": "Men are the creation of an all-powerful, all-wise and all-loving Being." Our comrade no doubt believes this, but we defy him to prove any one of these statements. We do not believe one of them.

Again, he says, "This life is a preparation for another life, the human spirit or soul entering that other life on the death of the body." This may be his belief and hope, but here again we want proof. Nay, as he has appealed to the New Testament, as the source of his belief we make bold to say that, though the Christian writings teach a future life, there is not a single passage in them declaring that the human spirit or soul enters the other life upon the death of the body.

With regard to the lesson of intelligent love, we doubt whether that is in New Testament language, or that it is the peculiar property of Christianity. The reference to Purgatory is very loose. If it means suffering in this life, we should agree with the statement; if, as is usual, it refers to a period after death, we ask for New Testament warranty, and, failing that, some reliable information about the unseen world that should carry conviction to any reasonable mind.

With respect to social conditions and property, we

probably agree. But how comes it that with the motives guidance, and powers of Christ's teaching Civilization—Christian Civilization, as it is called—should be based upon stupidity and hate, and a practical denial of the love principle? which Comrade Kenworthy no doubt looks upon as the central idea of Christianity.

The radical error that blinds our friend to the true position of the Christian Religion is made manifest in his implied belief in the supernatural in the phrase "motives, guidance, and powers." The Christian religion is simply the natural product of limited human aspiration. Its motives, etc., are either natural or supernatural, but in both cases, history for two thousand years shows their complete failure—as stated by our friend. Nay if men want to improve this life, they must do the very reverse of that which our comrade desires them to do. Instead of rising above the idea that their lives are bound with their bodies, the more they realize that this life is all they know anything about, the more likely are they to strive to make the best of it. Those who make little of this life, and much of a life to come—who use the former as a preparation only for the latter—have always deemed it a wilderness, and themselves only strangers and foreigners, quickly passing through (and the quicker the better) and as not worth the attention necessary to make it habitable, much less enjoyable. Indeed the tendency has been to condemn all earthly and physical enjoyment as wicked and therefore reprehensible.

The Autocracy of God is the pattern of all Autocratic Governments, and the Theocracy of the Old Testament will be repeated in the fulfilment of New Testament prophecy—when the kingdoms of this world become the Kingdom of God and his Christ.

Not, however, if we Anarchists can prevent it.

WHAT I UNDERSTAND BY SOCIALISM.

By J. SKETCHLEY.

I am asked to explain further some points in my brief sketch in the August No. of Liberty. I am asked why Socialism is incompatible with government by representation. The question is a very simple one, and the answer equally so. Either the people are sovereign or they are not. If they are sovereign they are supreme, and their sovereignty is the negation of every form of government. Sovereignty, supremacy, and freedom are all one and the same thing.

But, it is asked, cannot the people, by virtue of their sovereignty, in the full exercise of their sovereign right, elect men to govern them? Or in other words cannot the people elect for themselves representatives if they choose so to do; that is, cannot the people vote away their own sovereignty and thus become voluntary slaves? Can a man transfer to another his right to think, his right to the freedom of speech, his liberty of conscience, his right to life? Yet this is what is meant by government. Government is a power external from and above the people. Logically it claims, in virtue of its very existence, the right to direct and control the people; to tax them and to coerce them. Without these attributes, it would not be a Government. Nor does it matter whether the government be the Church of Rome, the despotism of Russia, of Austria, of Italy, or of Germany, or the governments of France, America, England, or elsewhere. All governments have the same essential attribute, claim the same powers, and rest on the same principle. Take the right or rather the claim to direct and control. If the people of any district want a branch railway, however short or however essential, they must get permission from the government; if they want to make any great improvements, or take over the gasworks or buy out a water company, they must go to the government.

The very fact of having to go to government, to a power external to and above themselves, humbly praying and promising ever to pray shows the degree of abasement, the depth of degradation of a people under government. But going to the government is a very expensive affair, to say nothing of the waste of time. On the deposit of the Petition or Bill, fee £5; for each day the bill is being examined to see if it agrees with the Standing Orders £5; on presenting the petition to the House for the Bill £5; on the first reading of the Bill £15; on the second reading of the Bill £15; if the committee report on the Bill £15; on the third reading of the Bill £15. Again if the money to be expended under the Bill be £100,000 and under £500,000 all the above fees are doubled. If 500,000 and under 1,000,000, the fees are three times the above. And if £1,000,000 or more, the fees are four times the above. And this is one of the essentials of government, the right to plunder for a favor granted. Oh, People, where is thy boasted freedom! Then it is asked, is it not right for the people to try and capture the parliamentary machinery? When will they

do it? will they do it in the remaining years of the 19th century or during the 20th century? Will they ever do it? But suppose the people could, at the next election, return a majority to the House of Commons, and suppose there was a Cabinet in agreement with the majority; what would the majority with its Cabinet do: would they attempt to remove the burdens that at present crush the workers: to do so they must become revolutionary in relation to all the other classes of society. Why your banking classes alone, in forty-eight hours could paralyse the whole trade of the country, could close every factory, and throw into the streets millions of the workers. This was done in France in 1848; and would be done in every European State. The parliamentary majority with its cabinet would have to inaugurate the very revolution they profess to be so anxious to avoid. Take the following attempt to coerce the House of Lords. In 1832, there was a Liberal government; the Lords refused to pass the little Reform Bill; what did the Government do? It arranged for a revolution, expecting it would be a bloody one. Lord Melbourne was at the Home Office, and his private secretary, Mr. T. Young, wrote to Gen. C. J. Napier, in reference to his taking the command of the insurgents at Birmingham. In that letter the whole plan of action is stated. There was to be a "run on the Banks, barricades were to be raised in all the great towns," while the agitation in London was to be so vigorous as to prevent troops being sent into the provinces; the letter goes on—"No doubt the discipline under which soldiers live might have proved a stronger element than the public enthusiasm, i.e. unless the latter were universal or very extensive, and then it would have carried all before it." This was not even for the abolition of the Lords, but what would it have been if the question had been the nationalization of the land, etc., or the abolition of usury, etc., etc.

But there is another and a far higher consideration with regard to government by representation. Every government, whatever its form, as a power external to and claiming to direct and control, to govern the people, rests on the principle of usurpation: its very existence is a violation of the rights of the individual, of the people in their collective capacity. All government is the negation of the sovereignty of the people, of their supremacy, of their freedom. Usurpation is a crime against humanity, and all Parliamentary action is a recognition of the principle of Usurpation. The recognition of the principle of usurpation is to share in the crime, and to be an accomplice of the usurpers.

Still parliamentary action will go on, more years will be wasted, till the people see their folly, or circumstances shall arise to supersede such action. The clearest evidence will not convince some men; but the strongest despotism will fall before a mere flourish of trumpets, like Jericho of old. Then again there is the old cry of constitutional action, when it is well known that such action is impossible beyond a certain stage. It is like the immoral cry of passive obedience and non-resistance to oppression. What is termed constitutional action is folly.

He who believes in the sovereignty of the people, in their supremacy, their freedom, will never recognize the principle of usurpation, or ever become an accomplice of the usurpers.

Since writing our note on the proposed Congress we have received the following: A number of London comrades are energetically taking up the question of next year's International Socialist Workers and Trades Union Congress, and also the proposed International Anarchist Congress. At an international meeting of delegates from the various London groups, held at Grafton Hall, on September 26th, a committee was appointed to enter into communication with all Anarchists at home and abroad for the purpose of finding out how opinions run, and to bring about concerted action. It was also thought advisable to ask the committee to select a secretary in the place of F. S. Paul, who has filled that post provisionally, there being considerable friction between this comrade and those upon whose behalf he was supposed to be acting.—R.

Daniel Hoan is dead (so writes William Holmes in "The Firebrand"). Mr. Hoan was a manufacturer in comfortable circumstances, and was highly esteemed in the community in which he lived for his honest simplicity and strength of character. Although not professing adherence to any school of social philosophy, he was radical in all his views; was at heart a Communist, and often expressed to me and others his longing for universal human brotherhood. It was to this good man, and to the beautiful town (Waukegan, Wisconsin) where he had his home, that Comrade Parsons, with a price upon his head and the bloodhounds of the law hot upon his trail, retreated in safety that memorable May morning when I grasped his hand on the dusty road that leads from the little village of which I was then a resident. It was from that safe harbor that he delivered himself to certain death on the morning of the opening of the great trial in Chicago.

Joe. Chatterton has (in a contemporary) asked, and endeavored to answer, the question "Is Anarchism Possible?" If our friend will put in an appearance at Lovell's Coffee Tavern, Carlton Bridge, (close to the Westbourne Park railway station) on Sunday evening next, Oct. 6th, when James Tochatti lectures on "Why I am an Anarchist," he may hear of something to his advantage—as the lawyers say.

"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.

LIBERTY,
LONDON, OCTOBER, 1895.

BETWEEN OURSELVES.

For wilful misrepresentation few could excel "Tattler" in his notes (in *Justice*) on the Anarchist-Communists and the Congress to be held in 1896. He states that we do not believe in representation or delegation. This however is not true with regard to trade unions and other organizations, but we do not believe in Parliamentary representation—which is quite another question. We appeal for fair play because it is announced as a Universal Workers' Congress. Had it been a Social Democratic Congress, an Anarchist sitting and voting therein would certainly be out of place. An appeal for fair play may to "Tattler" be synonymous with howling and whining; but most people who are tolerant and in earnest will (we venture to say) think otherwise.

F. S. Paul, who has already displayed much zeal in his efforts to institute an Anarchist movement against Social Democrats, is exceedingly desirous of winning the support of comrades generally by his actions. That such support is not forthcoming is evident. This result may perhaps be owing to the fact that Paul is as yet new to the movement, and, we think, lacking in the qualifications necessary for the position he aims at.

The action taken by him, together with that of a few comrades, in issuing a manifesto relating to the proposed Universal Workers' Congress, has led to the events described in the next paragraph.

On the evening of the 26th ult. there was an International meeting of comrades held at Grafton Hall, for the purpose of electing a committee, to consist of delegates representing the nationalities of Germany, Italy, Spain, France, and England (two for each), to consider the desirability of holding next year an International Anarchist Congress. The business at the first meeting of the committee, to be held at an early date, will be the appointment of a secretary, who shall have the confidence of the whole of the comrades. One of the principal points to be considered by the committee will be its attitude towards the forthcoming Universal Workers' Congress, which has been suggested and is being organized by the Social Democratic Federation. Whether the Committee will endorse the manifesto recently issued in our contemporary *The Torch* remains to be seen.

The incessant labor devolving on the more active Anarchists has told heavily on some well-known comrades. Blair Smith of Glasgow, Tom Bell of Edinburgh, and H. Duncan of Aberdeen, are all more or less incapacitated by ill health. The cause in the north must suffer when such active spirits are thus driven from work, unless the other comrades stick closer than ever to the extra duties thrust on them. Our comrades have one consolation in their illness—they have the knowledge that Anarchist principles are every day becoming more widely known and thoroughly appreciated throughout the land of Burns.

By-the-by, the necessity for more workers in the cause suggests the question "What is our old friend Joe Bur-

goyne doing?" Surely he has not retired altogether from the active part he has so long taken in the progressive movements of the age. Nor can it be that Inverness is so far north as to place him out of reach. He, at any rate is not forgotten: neither is his work. We shall be pleased to hear from him.

That the wheat crop this year is one of the smallest ever known in the United Kingdom is a fact of considerable interest, even to Anarchists, who are sometimes accused of indifference with regard to such subjects. That in the event of a war breaking out the people of this country might absolutely be without a supply of grain is the "bogey" generally trotted out on these occasions. Occasionally also—as was done the other day in the *Chronicle*—a correspondent points to the system of more intelligent cultivation recommended by Kropotkin. These ideas are, however, beside the question really at issue. What is necessary in order to solve the agricultural problem is the abolition of the present landlord system—in other words the (comparatively speaking) free use of land. Nothing short of this will put the cultivator of the soil in a position to truly benefit himself and the community at large.

Politicians, including some of the I. L. P., are beginning to notice the cloud "no bigger than a man's hand" that is rising on the horizon and which will overshadow the next School Board election. It is evident—clear as noonday—that the sectarians (Catholic, Church, Dissent,) have already acquired a power over the machinery of public education that is bound in the end to destroy anything and everything tending to promote secular and unfettered teaching in our schools. This is the outcome of pandering to compromise on a subject that should years ago have been placed outside the influence of both creeds and parties. As Anarchists we are called upon to support free education in the fullest and most comprehensive definition of the term. To all sectarians—be they of the class tolerant or intolerant—our warning is "Hands off. Teach your mysticism, or your theology, if you must teach such things, in your own schools, but not in public schools or with the money of the public."

Friends and comrades in America are about to appeal for a commutation of the sentence on Berkman, and a fund is being subscribed for paying the expenses which must be incurred. The injustice and illegality of the sentence passed on Berkman is described in the address given by Emma Goldman, on the 13th ult., and reported in this issue. It is earnestly hoped that English Anarchists will render all the assistance they can. Contributions will be received and thankfully acknowledged by Comrade Gunderson, 98, Wardour Street, Soho Square.

In answer to numerous enquirers we state with very much regret that the health of our Comrade and earnest co-worker L. S. Bevington remains in a very precarious state. Every reader of *LIBERTY* will join with us in sincerely hoping that rest, quiet, and bracing sea air may tend to ultimate renewal of vigorous life.

The labour war is being carried on at Carmaux by the strikers there with great pluck and determination, in defence of the right of organization, which in theory is allowed by law. Any attempt, however, to put the law into practice is immediately met by that brutal form of suppression so characteristic of the bourgeoisie. It is a marked feature in connection with this strike, that not one of the men will draw a franc from the strike fund so long as he has anything to sell or pawn. The fund in existence will require augmentation as the battle goes on, and if English comrades can assist and will send on their contributions to the office of *LIBERTY*, we will acknowledge and forward to the proper quarter.

EMMA GOLDMAN IN LONDON.

PUBLIC MEETING AT SOUTH PLACE INSTITUTE, FINSBURY.

Emma Goldman, the woman who voiced the sufferings of the unemployed in New York in 1892, and who consequently suffered imprisonment for this so-called breach of the laws of the U. S. A., arrived in England on the 22nd of August. Her first appearance in public was in Regents Park, where she spoke to a large crowd. At later periods she addressed meetings at Hyde Park, Whitechapel, Canning Town, Barking, and Stratford, her speeches being received in every case with marked approval. And on Friday evening the 13th ultimo she delivered an interesting address in the South Place Institute, Finsbury.

The meeting was called to consider the subject "Political Justice in England and America." The chair was occupied by R. Peddie, and on the platform and amongst the audience were Louise Michel, Touzeau Parris, E. Leggatt, Henry Seymour, Amy Morant, C. Morton, G. Lawrence, and James Tochatti.

The Chairman having briefly stated the object for which the meeting had been called, Comrade Leggatt spoke on his imprisonment and said that a magistrate was always more severe on a man if he happened to be an Anarchist than upon an ordinary man, and that he as a working man would continue to assert his right to ride in comfort.

J. Tochatti said the question of Political Justice in England no one could afford to ignore, whatever their political views may be, nor could we allow the Continental system of "agents provocateur" to be introduced without strenuous opposition. Justice was not administered in accord with equity but used by the classes to suppress all advanced thought which threatened their interests. Acts of Parliament passed in panic had been strained in order to brutally punish men who had been trapped by the police. It had been admitted by ex-detective McIntyre that the Wallsall Anarchists were victims of a police plot. It was difficult to believe that in England men like Charles and Battola were suffering through the infamy of men like Coulon and the reptile detectives of Scotland Yard, but such was the case.

Henry Seymour said the case of Berkman, who got 22 years for a 7 years' offence because he happened to hold anarchistic views showed, according to American law, that if 7 years' imprisonment was a sufficient punishment for an attempt to kill, 15 years' imprisonment was the adequate penalty for daring to hold an opinion that American law was rotten. The case of the Chicago Anarchists made it manifest that the United States police were capable of every conceivable villainy. Turning our attention to our own country, the Wallsall Case showed that the Secret Service, in the light of the revelations of Inspector M'Intyre, was an abomination not to be endured. Having recently taken an interest in the Maybrick Case, he said he was acquainted with its details, and could speak with assurance of the scandalous way in which the police manufactured evidence to secure a conviction, and an acquaintance with the case of John Hay revealed that Home Office officials were open to barefaced bribery. We might agitate and secure the reduction of unjust sentences in a few cases, but it must be understood that there is no radical remedy for this state of things except to put an end to the present inequitable economic conditions which permit the privileged few, who control the government, to live in opulence and ease at the expense of the degradation of the masses.

Emma Goldman dealt with the subject from an American point of view. She said three years had past, since Alexander Berkman, the noble youth, attempted to avenge the wrongs inflicted upon the strikers at Homestead, during the labor troubles of 1892. Three years of struggle, hardship and privation for the working class, and wealth, extravagance, amusements and pleasure, for a privileged few.

"What (she asked) was Berkman's crime?" Had he stolen the wealth labor had created? Had he robbed mankind of the necessary means of life? Had he invested the hard earned pennies of widows and orphans in swindling schemes? Had he built factories, where men women and half grown children, were slowly tortured to death? Had he plagued, cheated, enslaved, and tyrannized humanity? No! Had he done all that, he might have remained a free man, he would have been honored and respected as a good citizen, have had a chance of being elected to Parliament, Senate, or Congress, or chosen as President of the U. S. A. Berkman was in prison, because he hated and opposed all this, because he was strong, and let the act follow the thought, because he attempted to destroy the life of a man, who had brought disaster and privation upon thousands of people. The condition of the workers in America was just as miserable as in other countries, the strikes that had taken place within the last ten years demonstrated the long suppressed sufferings of the working classes. It was the Homestead strike of 1892, which revealed to the public the dreadful condition of the amalgamated steel and iron workers, and the brutal treatment they were subjected to by Frick, the superintendent; the workers were actually owned by Carnegie and Frick; the barracks they lived in belonged to Carnegie and Frick, the food, tools and clothing had to be bought at Carnegie's shops, and the prices they paid for these necessities were enormous. The result of such tyrannical treatment was the strike of July 1892. The men were determined to fight for their homes and families, they were ready to die if necessary, they would not endure a life of drudgery any longer. Frick seeing the earnestness and seriousness of his slaves, engaged a number of Pinkerton's men at two dollars per day, smuggled them into Homestead and gave them the order to shoot and to kill. On the 6th of

July these armed assassins charged upon a crowd of men and women, killing eleven and wounding many more. The strikers fought a brave battle, they energetically defended themselves and drove back the hired blood-hounds; Frick called upon the government to send the militia to his assistance. Of course the Government complied. What was the army in America for? what was an army kept for in England, or on the continent, if not to protect private property? But the militia would never have been permitted by the strikers to enter within the boundaries of Homestead, they would have had to pass over the bodies of the workers. The authorities saw the people were in earnest, they understood that to use force would mean a war, so they decided to use a trick. The strikers were promised full protection against the Pinkerton's men and that "scabs" should not be put to work in the mines; the poor deluded and confiding strikers, did not see this trap and the militia were allowed to march into the town cheered and applauded by the people; those people afterwards shot down like dogs by the cowardly brutes in uniform. Frick who schemed all those things, and who gave the order to drive the sick wives and starving children of the strikers from their homes, he who caused the death of the eleven victims on the 6th of July, who expressed the intention to have the workers massacred, rather than let them win the strike, was not in the least molested. It was then that Berkman appeared; though not a striker himself and not suffering from the brutality of Frick, he keenly felt the wrongs inflicted upon his brethren. Alexander Berkman decided to strike a blow at the cause of the evil. His hatred of tyranny gave him the requisite courage, and on the July 23rd, 1892, he made an unsuccessful attack on Frick, only wounding him but creating consternation in the enemy's camp. Utterly terrified and fearing a similar attack from other quarters the authorities hurried Berkman away to prison, where he remained months without trial, after which time he was taken before a prejudiced judge and jury, and without counsel, or an opportunity to defend himself, was on the 20th of Sept. sentenced to 22 years' imprisonment. Such a trial was illegal and without precedent in the history of American jurisprudence. It was an open secret that America was ruled by a band of thieves who monopolized the land, machinery, rail-roads, mines and factories, in fact all the wealth of the country. All laws were made and enforced by the few. The rights of free speech, assembly and the press, were things of the past, so far as the interests of the workers were concerned, and the constitution which provided equality before the law, had never been observed in the U. S. Men who were in power and had the almighty dollar could commit any crime, seduction, theft, etc. and remain unpunished. Every official from the policeman to the President could be bribed; but those not possessing the means were lost—were helpless. Frick and Carnegie used their stolen money freely in order to obtain a long sentence for Berkman, and they succeeded. Twenty two years' imprisonment! Did it not make one's blood run cold to think of it? Could they imagine what it meant to be shut out from the world, to be buried alive for such a long term within prison walls? Could they grasp what it was to suppress one's feelings, wishes, passions and thoughts, to become a mere automatic machine, to see the same cold cruel faces of the watchmen, to hear the same harsh voices of the officials week after week, year after year—to have darkness around you all that time? No! no one who had not been in prison could understand it. Such however was the lot of hundreds of men and women in Siberia—in modern bastilles all over the world. Berkman was one of the great army of free thinkers, revolutionists and Anarchists, who had sacrificed their life and liberty for the advancement and welfare of mankind. Frick to-day was in perfect health, was enjoying his ill-gotten wealth. The Brutus of the 19th Century was languishing in one of the prisons of America, but was dreaming of the dawn, of a day of perfect liberty when labor would no more be crushed beneath the iron heel of Capitalism. Behind the prison bars, his big warm heart still throbbed with the hopes and fears of the down-trodden, he still watched the events of our times and when permitted to write to his friends encouraged them to continue the fight. No word of complaint had escaped his lips during those three weary years, although he had been subjected to even more rigorous discipline than prisoners usually were. The pistol shot of the 23rd of July had found an echo in the hearts of the oppressed and opened the eyes of many people to the fact that the Anarchists were not a gang of ruffians, as Society was pleased to call them. Anarchism meant the destruction of the existing brutal system of exploitation and robbery of the masses, but not by unnecessarily violent means, and its aim was to establish a society of complete freedom, and respect for one another, free access to the means of life and to every individual unrestricted liberty to own the proceeds of his labor, and the right to learn, study, enjoy, love and live according to his own tastes and desires. The acts of Berkman, Caserio, Henri, Vailant, Pallas, and other brave heroes were but the heralds of the coming Social Revolution.

Louise Michel addressed the meeting in French to the effect that the speakers preceding her had spoken of English and American justice, but had not mentioned French justice, probably out of politeness as there was nothing good to be said of it. As she was not a patriot but an Internationalist she would complete the picture without talking politics, which is the art of deceiving others for your own benefit. When they saw the robberies committed in the Southern Railway scandals and other Panamas known and unknown, and the immense Madagascar cemetery, they found that French justice was very hard on the disinherited and most gentle towards the privileged. It was the most unequal justice in the world. And this we call a republic! Res publica, a public thing representing all, but this republic only represents capitalists acting against the workers who were condemned in

advance, while the capitalists were absolved. All French statesmen were thieves, some murderers, yet justice crept before those offenders, it was bribed by those whose crimes were heaped as high as heaven. Even the Empire of bloody memory dared not have committed such injustice for fear of being destroyed. Tyrants did well in showing themselves in their true light. It was good for propaganda. The political farces are nearly played out. Anarchists despise weapons used by the enemy for human butchery. When an obstacle to the Social Revolution is to be removed it may sometimes be necessary to use violence. French potentates however, for the time being, may rest in peace. They are too useful in showing the crimes that power commits for the Revolutionist to desire their immediate removal by any means, violent or otherwise.

T. Parris thought that the object of the meeting might have been more emphatically stated as "Legal Injustice" instead of "Political Justice." Unless the latter was intended to be sarcastic, and that was not apparent from the reading of the bill. He emphasised the fact that justice literally meant, what the law yielded us. Equity was usually meant when the word justice was used, but it was frequently proved that the laws were anything but equitable. However in the present case they had met to protest against punishments being given by Judges through prejudice, that even the law, that harshest of all taskmasters, had allotted for the offences charged against the prisoner Berkman. The cause of this was class and social prejudices. Our rulers were the property class, and the laws were made and strained for the conservatism of their privileges. Our duty and work therefore was not to use their discredited means of coercion, but to educate the people in the principles of Socialistic Anarchism. And when so educated the power of the privileged classes would pass into the hands of the people, who would use it to destroy the present legal systems and promote equality of opportunity—the only possible basis of liberty.

Miss Amy C. Morant, of the Independent Labor Party, delivered an address which was received with considerable applause.

C. Morton told the audience that there had been a great deal of talk about brotherhood, but that he failed to see how that would improve matters, as brothers quarrelled and robbed each other. What was wanted was the abolition of government and exploitation.

Lawrence said that as those in possession of the wealth of the countries of Europe were the educated classes. It would be vain to preach the use of the weapons of brotherhood to the half educated workers, but seeing that the possessing classes are at all times prepared to use force to prevent the workers bettering their condition there was but one course open, and that was to teach resistance by like force.

A comrade having spoken in Russian, the meeting was brought to a close, having lasted three hours.

Emma Goldman left London for Scotland on Saturday 14th of September, and on the following evening addressed a large audience in Bredalbane Hall, Glasgow. The welcome accorded her by Glasgow comrades was most hearty. During the week she was very busy, her engagements including meetings in Edinburgh, and Maybole, as well as in Glasgow. Her appeals on behalf of the Berkman Release Fund were productive of good results—23/10 being collected by the cigarette makers of Glasgow, and at a social gathering 11/3 were subscribed. The various meetings were in every other way a great success, being largely attended, and the applause given to Emma Goldman and the other speakers most sympathetic. Our Comrade desires us to say that the reception she has met with in England and Scotland fills her with hope and energy for the strenuous continuance in the future of her labors for the cause of Liberty.

We have a few "Berkman Subscription Lists," and will gladly forward one to any comrade who will undertake to get it filled up.

OUR CONTEMPORARIES.

We acknowledge with thanks the following publications: "The Firebrand," for the burning away of the Cobwebs of Ignorance and Superstition," (Portland, Oregon).—"The Torch," (London).—"Freedom," (London).—"The Anarchist," (Sheffield).—"La Sociale," (Paris).—"Volne Listy," (Brooklyn, N. Y.).—"La Verdad," (Rosario de Santa Fe, Argentina, S. A.).—"L'Avenir," (Montevideo).—"El Despertar," (Brooklyn, N. Y.).—"Freie Wacht," (Philadelphia).—"La Question Sociale," (Paterson, N. J.).—"Les Temps Nouveaux," (Paris).—"Die Zukunft," (Vienna).—"La Education Integrale," (Paris).—"Der Sozialist," (Berlin).

The plucky little "Firebrand," which by-the-by, has hitherto prided itself on having been the only Anarchist-Communist periodical published in the English language in the U. S. A., is doing excellent work, and notwithstanding the fact that one of its contributors was "run in" and fined for delivering an address at a street corner, is not deterred from continuing its "burning" propaganda. The article that appeared in our last number, over the signature of W. C. Owen, was taken from "The Firebrand." "The Altruist" issued from the same office has been stopped, but its writers will throw their energies into "The Firebrand."

The list given above testifies to the fact that the United States are not without vigorous Anarchist-Communist periodicals in other than the English language. The latest addition is "Volne Listy," the number of which to hand contains an article by Elisee Reclus.

"Der Sozialist," with its interesting Literary Supplement, contains articles by Kropotkin and other able writers.

Pouget's "La Sociale" adds to its always striking cartoon a popular song. "Pere Peinard's Almanac for 1896" is announced for publication this month (October).

PRIEST AND PROPHET.

Have ye noticed it—Lazarus?—Dives?

'Tis certain to-day as of yore,

The priest is the friend of the rich man

The prophet is friend of the poor.

The priests are conservative—Orthodox;

Prophets face Truth as a whole;

Priests seek for power and preference,

Prophets, Free Life for the soul.—L. S. B.

The General Election has revealed to us once more the Priesthood, with but few exceptions, fighting on the side of privilege, and showing in an unmistakeable manner that now as so often heretofore, they consider their own class interests before those of the Commonwealth. And even in the Socialist movement those who were at one time prophets have become priestly and represent the prophets. It was while thinking of this, that on August 4th we wended our way down to Kelmscott House, Upper Mall, to hear Grant Allen on "The Man of Letters as Prophet." "The prophet," he said "was the man who had something to say that no one wanted to hear, who uttered the truths that society kicked against, and which were unpleasant only because they happened to be true. Much of the finest literature of the world, was literature in revolt." As evidence of this fact, he adduced Ibsen with his prophetic messages; Byron, Shelley, Voltaire, Rousseau, Whitman, Plowman and others. The practical proposal, however, that the lecture contained, was a recommendation that some "good" capitalist should create an endowment for young men with a prophetic message. He was to be taken whilst young and fresh, and saved from all the hardships and struggles of life. Passing to the literature of to-day, the lecturer sarcastically remarked, that the one thing utterly unforgiveable in a man of letters now was that he should have an idea which ran counter to generally received opinions, these opinions were termed common sense, this much vaunted "common sense" of the English people being really a stolid incapacity for seeing your principles.

Society to-day did not attempt to stifle those who had great truths to utter, but won them over to their side in a different way, which reminded him of something he had heard or invented, he thought invented, which was as follows: There came to London one John Baptist Jones, who was clothed in Dr. Jaeger's wool clothing and whose food was Hovis and wild honey. He went from Tottenham Court Road to Westminster and from the Strand to Cheapside preaching "Simplicity of Life." And it came to pass that the aldermen and Lord Mayor of the city of London went out to hear him; and having heard his words, behold! they invited him to a banquet at the Mansion House. And arriving there he sat down to the feast; and besides being fed on ox-tail soup and many good things he was afterwards presented with a golden goblet set with precious stones and which bore this inscription, "Presented by the Mayor and Corporation of London to the prophet John Baptist Jones in grateful acknowledgment of his efforts to bring about 'Simplicity of Life.'"

At the close of his lecture, Grant Allen was asked whether he considered Kropotkin and Reclus were prophets and whether they were not kicked at by Socialists? He replied that he "really didn't know much about them, but from what he had heard about them he would answer in the affirmative."

He was ironically questioned as to whether it would not be more Socialistic to get the Vestries and County Councils to create the proposed endowment.

Now as regards the proposal of Grant Allen, we think that the imbecility of it will be apparent to those who know anything of literary men and of society. Were it adopted we should create a new parasitic class, for we

believe that the prophet when endowed would become a priest and oppose new truths, and would use his abilities to mislead the people in the interests of the class that nurtured them. There is reason to-day to be glad that there are prophets who will not "sit down to the feast."

With what bitterness do we realise that literary men have persistently misrepresented our principles, and to-day are to be found in great numbers in the ranks of the enemy. When the interests of the Man of Letters is not the same as the workers, he at once became a parasite. What most concerns us, however, is that the great truths uttered to-day by the prophets, shall be recognised, and that religious and political superstitions shall receive their death-blow; then the priest, like Othello, will find his occupation gone.

Intelligence in the heads of the workers is now more necessary than the oracular literary man; until the workers are free, Art and Literature can and must remain in the background.

Mr. Grant Allen's proposal is based upon the fallacy that the prophet cannot proclaim new truths, and at the same time earn his daily bread. But a very superficial knowledge of biography and history proves on the contrary that no prophet evolves new truths from his inner consciousness alone, it is his conflict with nature that enables him to discover new scientific facts; he preaches his new gospel regardless of all difficulties. His struggle for existence results in his proclaiming a higher morality in spite of, and in face of governmental and priestly opposition.

JAMES TOCHATTI.

SUPERSTITION.

A superstition is a belief in something that is not true—such as the existence of an arbitrary, man-like God, the necessity for a Government by brute force, the idea that one man has a right to control as much land as he can acquire by fraud, force, or purchase, that money must be made of gold and silver or based on them, that vaccination prevents small-pox, that the possession of a child's caul is a sure preventive against drowning. All these are beliefs which rest upon nothing; indeed are contradicted by facts. But the conduct of the vast majority of the human race is determined not by the observation of facts, but by believing fictions. This involves for them mental slavery, and mental slavery carries with it physical slavery.

In this age of steam and electricity a very small amount of labor is required to produce everything—food, shelter, clothing, etc.—that we require; and yet the bodies and minds of nine tenths of the people are broken down by excessive, grinding toil, in order to procure a bare subsistence. This results from their superstitious beliefs. Just as they used to believe that kings had a divine right to rule over them and be supported in idle luxury out of their labor, so now they believe that politicians who can beg, buy, or steal a majority of votes have a right to rule over them and be supported, not exactly in idle luxury but in harmful and luxurious activity; also that if a man owns some bits of parchment or paper, (titles to land, government bonds, railway or brewery shares, etc.) other men must purchase his consent before they can go to work and so support him in idle luxury.

If you go into certain churches you will see a priest hold a glittering bauble up before the people, who cringe and bow down before it in abject awe. These people have been taught from their earliest childhood that there is an eternal life to come after this present life, and that it must be spent in torment or bliss according as they believe implicitly what the priest tells them, and accept blindly his interpretation of a certain book called the Bible, the said book having been entirely in the hands of the priests for many hundreds of years and portions duly interpolated in their interests. Because of this foolish superstition the priest can make the people support him. They will drink bad beer and buy him the best wine; they smoke clay pipes and buy him choice cigars; they live in tenements and mud cabins and put him in a large mansion and even a palace; they go hungry to keep him fat. He does not have to force these foolish people to give him anything. They give him a large part of their hard-earned wages willingly, because they are hypnotised by superstition.

It is just the same in secular life. The sight of a seal of office, a title deed, a bond, or a certificate of stock produces the same effect upon the ordinary man as the elevation of the host, or the family Bible, does on a devout Roman Catholic or Protestant. The people have been taught from childhood that it is quite impossible for them to live together in harmony without a host of insolent and blundering officials minding everybody's business except their own, that they can only go to work by buying access to the land from some landlord, and by buying the use of capital from some gold-owner.

"You see," say the politicians, landlords, and money-lords, "here are our seals of office, our paper titles, bonds and stocks. You laborers can only go to work now by first providing us with the things we want—horses and carriages, yachts and opera boxes, wine, women and cigars. Whatever we want you must get, or starve." They do not have to use force to make the foolish laborers get all these things for them; indeed, the only force they have is drawn from the laborers themselves. They simply appeal to their superstitions. The laborers believe that they have no right to use land without paying rent, and no right to use any kind of money except what the money-lords issue, so that if you plant a sovereign in the right place it will have twelve little pennies growing to it at the end of a year. Because they believe these foolish things they bow and scrape to a monopolist, and vote and yell for him at election times.

If you walk up Fifth Avenue in New York you will see a white marble palace on one side of the way, and a brown stone mansion on the other. The man who lives in the marble palace holds up before the people a cross, and they forthwith drop on their knees before him, and take the bread out of their children's mouths that he may have game and salmon and wine. The man who lives in the brown stone mansion holds up before the people a bundle of government bonds and railroad stocks, and the same effect is produced upon the people by them. They will go without proper clothing in order to buy him orchids. And they laugh and think him great when they hear him say in that lofty way that millionaires have: "The people be damned!"

The priest and the politician; the landlord and the gold bug; brothers in roguery and prosperity—all supported in princely luxury by laboring people who are enslaved by ignorance and superstition. It is a great scheme, this, to hold up a cross, or an office seal, or a bond in one hand, and pick a poor man's pocket with the other; to befuddle a mind in order to enslave a body; to fill a brain with falsehood in order to empty a pocket of cash; to stock a priest's, or a politician's, or a monopolist's cellar with wine distilled from fruit that should be on a working man's table; to upholster their furniture with leather and velvet and satin that should be made into shoes and clothing for the wives and children of workingmen. And the worst of it all is that the priest and the politician and the monopolist think they do right in taking, as the laborer thinks he does right in giving. The priest and the politician tell the laborer that they love him: the monopolist tells him that he gives him employment, and the laborer loves them all, fights for them all, works for them all, and dies in the belief that because he impoverished himself and his family to enrich his masters he will thereby enjoy everlasting bliss in a heaven that does not exist.

It is all wrong, so palpably wrong, that a child eight years of age should be able to see the wickedness of it. And yet at the end of this nineteenth century, the few men who understand and expose it are jeered at as cranks and dreamers, if not denounced as thieves and assassins. But wrong cannot go on for ever crucifying right. True thoughts once formed, right words once spoken, do not perish; the blood of the martyrs has not been spilled in vain; Chicago and Siberia have swallowed the bodies of the Prophets of Liberty, but before they died they spoke, and hundreds of thousands of hearts are now moved by their eloquence.

Nothing can hinder the decay of superstition. The Pope is powerful but he cannot kill the worm of doubt that gnaws away the churchman's faith. The politicians and monopolists are mighty, but the advance of thought undermines them and is too subtle for them to control. The sun of truth is rising and shedding light upon the causes of poverty, and as these causes come out in yet bolder and bolder relief they will be removed, little by little, one after another, and by and bye the millionaire will have to sell his horses and yachts, and the tramp will buy a coat; the "society" woman will wear fewer diamonds, and the workman's wife will have a comfortable home. The prince is coming down the palace stairs and the pauper is rising from the gutter, and some day there will be neither prince nor pauper, but two men, and they will clasp hands and look each into the other's face and call each other brother.

G. O. W.

"Was Jesus Christ a Socialist, Communist, or Wise Teacher?" is the question put and answered by Conrad Naewiger in a two-penny pamphlet published by Forder, (Stonecutter St. London). For the man who has freed himself from the Teachings of the mystical and theological schools the subject has very little interest: for the many who have not yet determined to enjoy their existence—who are not yet free from the bandages of creeds, Naewiger's pamphlet, by showing that the alleged teachings of Jesus were, for the most part, contradictory and impracticable, should act as a most invigorating stimulant towards mental health and strength. To such we heartily recommend it. The question is put with a judicial clearness and force characteristic of the writer, and the answer is placed on a sound basis of reason and fact that should carry conviction to the minds of all who are disposed to accept truth.

"Freedom" since its re-issue, has been well worth reading and reflects great credit upon the comrades connected with it.

All provincial comrades should help Nicoll's "Anarchist" as it is well worthy of their support.

"The Torch," generally good, is somewhat marred in the current number by a weak attempt to satirise the Social Democrats.



Liberty Pamphlets.

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.

16 pp., 8vo., printed on toned paper, Price ONE PENNY.

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 ELISÉE RECLUS.

An Anarchist on Anarchy. By ELISÉE RECLUS.

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

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.

The Why I Ams: Why I Am an Anarchist-Socialist, by Errico Malatesta; Why I Am an Advocate of Physical Force, by G. Lawrence; Why I Am a Socialist and a Coöperator in Production, by E. T. Craig.

Liberty Bookshelf.

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.

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.

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