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But while the men of the "National Defence" elaborated, printed, and pacified this proclamation, in which they were again soured 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 as at that of December 61.

END OF THE SECOND PART.

CHURCH AND STATE.

"For always in this state, O Liberty! Shines that light whereby the State is saved."

—John Hay.

When a number of individuals assemble by and majority vote decide that all the other members of the community shall act in a particular way, or suffer fine, imprisonment or assault, that 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 not follow certain doctrines or suffer external punishment, that assembly of individuals is called a church. Once the Church possessed a very effective method of stifling liberty. The "secular arm" with its band of steel and fingers of fire was at its disposal, but its secular power is now reduced to the employment of ballis and police for the suppression of fellows, who are not interested, and, as I have said, its chief power now lies in the 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 hands; you cannot say of either: "See, there it goes; it is green; it is white; it is long; it is short." The Church is not a thing; it is an idea. The State is not a thing; it is also an idea. Both exist only in the imagination. It would be well if everyone clearly understood this; for it would then be quite plain that Church and State are mere 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 good or pay a fine to prevent my child from being poisoned. The vaccination officer is really nothing less than a common poisoner, but he satisfies his conscience by the reflection that he is an officer of the Government. 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 Aristocrats instead of employing the word of government by physical force; we call their captains members of Parliament, their lieutenants Government officials, and their privates palaces, bishops, hamlets, towers, and castles. We appeal to the superstition of the people by throwing over our bandits the sacred name of the Government, their attacks and robberies are thus made as respectable and the collection of revenue, so that which is crime in Italy becomes as respectable in England. But to the clear thinker, the only difference between the two systems is that in Italy 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 murderer, will do so 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 there is there is in the Church's name the destruction of individual opinions of the men who made it or subscribed to it. There is none; 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 members to think for themselves: her members are theologians rather than thinking people, and she has thus destroyed the intellect of France, and the country is not yet fully recovered from the effects of this destruction. No organized religion should be tolerated in the land. It is a sin to the thinking man to believe in a creed which is the result of fallible human intelligence. The moment a clergyman or politician begins to honestly proclaim his doubts that moment he begins to be treated like a criminal. Freedom is impossible to a man left off all certainties. He begins to receive the cold shoulder. He begins to feel as if he is unwelcome whenever the church, or the party, comes together. He is
ANARCHY NOT SECRECY.

Those who have read Anarchistic 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 find (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 adverse to, namely, to commit ourselves to a number of rules and regulations drawn up by a committee. It is likely that laws be made for 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, are 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, for which 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 any way 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 the government spies and detectives, who can obtain access to almost any secret society.

The southern Irish, who as a race, are incantations 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 end of all their rebellions and secret societies? Betrayal, both by friend and foe. Under the soothing syreep of seedy 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 Anarchism? 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 a ulterior motive to the idea of a voluntary external force. Governments are not bound to be interfered with when not interfering with others, who will resent this interference with the dignity 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 the anniversary of that city down to posterity in a way its more intelligent inhabitants dread the mention of, the usual meetings in the various cities 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 Leggett, Peddie, Turner, Tocchetti, Ford, and others.

A meeting will be held at South Place Institute, Finsbury, but the particulars as to 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.

BERNHARD FAHRN, 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 Socialist Society." Tickets (5d.) may be obtained in advance at Lapte's Library, 30 Goodge St., Tottenham Court Road.

ANARCHIST-COMMUNIST.—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 DANZIG," 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 absolutely interesting to Socialists generally, has not hitherto been printed in English. To our thinking it is one of the clearest and most weighty 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 not a pamphlet 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 only aspersion being that it is not sufficiently preserved. We confidently ask our friends to get 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, written by L. B. Barington. Speaking of it a contemporary says it is one of the brightest of the Liquor control pamphlets, and is a very cogent exposition 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 his natural kindness and frankness 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, 12½; Price, Chester, 12½; Subscriptions List No. 18 (R. G.) 12½; No. 19 (Stark's) 2½. As are much needed I urge upon friends to do their best, and those who have subscription lists to send them to us as soon as possible. R. Gundersen, 28 Gardour St., Soho, W.
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A "Acknowledgement and notice of our Exchanges is crowded out of this issue, as is in Joe Clayton's "To the Army of Revolution."

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 fatalists, 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 generally rising of "Anarchism" should suddenly take place in London or one or other of two 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 of earning bread for themselves, by ruthlessly brushing away all impediments in their way—such atrocities as monopoly, usury, unjust laws, worn out customs, and effectus 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 day will come when such a widespread 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 with all the force at their command. In a contest between "might" and "right," the former is as sure of victory as the latter. But the new 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 condemned, 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 lockedout were threatening the citadel of capitalism and monopoly. Whether the Government were Tory or Radical, police 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, both in hand and used in the main for the benefit of the moneyed 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 Mr. Massey, we should like to clearly "that the reason for the existence of both these classes is not to touch, or be taught; they exist to divide." The sooner these pretentious bags of windy rhetoric are pricked the better, and a wider and a deeper understanding obtained of the fact that every improvement obtained 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 use it for the benefit of "public persons." Nothing, in the opinion of the Anarchist-Communist, but the Communists can 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 real cultivation 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 civilisation of today which compels young girls to go a fortnight without dinner, and finds them on some days without a pocket after long hours of labor. "The employers," say 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 are refused a lien on the masters' property. The Palliatire Arts of Parliament that don't pull along with them in 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 repents can scarcely have excelled our gratification as we read the reports of the proceedings at the various congresses which have been held during the past year. Secularists do, of course, "love one another"; they are constantly urging that both "in season and out of season" they have however when they attempt to show their love by actions that we find occasion to rejoice greatly, and then because of the show up the gibe of the miserable superstition, they persist in calling christian principles into question, the attempt now being made by the "congregations 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 underneath them. The spiritual pilots have become sailors 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 in its dealings with social affairs. Parsons, of the christening or of the baptising schools, have alike but one remedy for the ills of poverty—and that is charity-saving. For years they have been singing their songs of poverty, the efforts of which have been a long catalogue of failure. The system of charity has been the system of gratuitous fraud, and it is not by bringing the producing classes within its demoralising and debasing influence that its fraudulent character will be destroyed or even lessened. Look at the pensions given to "meritorious" officers of State and high and low black "flounders" generally. What are they but moral slurries obtained from the producing classes? Women workers, and those who assume to speak for them, had better cases 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 terror.

The relatives of Miss Lancaster (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 proved an object lesson which promises good results, and which no more than indicate the demoralising character. of any 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 are precisely the same object. Private sanuaries—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 made insidious in consequence of his perseverance, says: 'It is too dangerous enough in any case, but when administered by bigots and amateur scientists, well—is too much'; even for an editor of the "rest and be thankful" school. If the gentlemen in question will go for the entire abolition of a 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 congress, or that all topics do not concern a 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 is 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 accordance with orders made in parliament—orders which must be observed before representation, in part or in whole, 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 identical. 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;
For the sake of the Glad,
The Pure, and the True,

Bolder and clearer it grows—
The Anarchist task;
Liberty's pliable foes
To assault and unsheathe;
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. BRIDWELL.

REVOLUTIONS are frothbets 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 water which is constantly striving to bring two bodies of water to the same level. As often as there is found to be a great 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.—HERMANN ICtin.

Anarchism is the natural right of self-preservation; Communism, the concession of that right to others.—Dr. FAUST MACDONALL.
WHY I AM A SINGLE TAXER.
By Arthur Witby.

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 capital, 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, for 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 5,020,000 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 not £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 £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 toil over them the whole of the produce of their labour above and beyond 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 they do not actually 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 to 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 legally. 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 in vital liberty. Which 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 anyone 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; and it will be possible to say that there are some 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, unnatural 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 in the Church of England and its doings. That church is simply a spiritual manifestation of the state authority; it is an entity of the non-interfering body, for most of those organizations would willingly be established if they had the chance. The Church of Rome has however on more than one occasion refused to acknowledge sacrament and support, has in fact declined to be bussed by temporal authority, and has to this extent been Anarchist in spirit, although not openly avowing himself possessed of any such noble but much-maligned principle. May it not therefore be assumed that the Roman 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 firmly against the tyranny of government when the personal liberty of any member of their church has been in jeopardy; whilst maintaining the spirit of the churches above mentioned. The Catholic clergy have, not only in Ireland but in many other countries, stood firmly against the tyranny of government when the personal liberty of any member of their church has been in jeopardy; whilst maintaining the spirit of the churches above mentioned. Consequently, the Anarchists and the Anarchists may be relied on in the coming contest for freedom—in the struggle for the abolition of all known forms of government whatsoever. Would the Roman church's love of liberty remain intact if she became as dominant spiritually as she appears to be 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 seeks a just and peaceful end to the suffering of the present world? They 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 is not their aim, and 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.
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