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PART II.

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

CHAPTER II.—(Continued).

THE GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE.

The new Government was composed as follows:—Thiers, (Chief of the Executive) Jules Favre, (Foreign Affairs) Ernest Pichard, (Minister of the Interior) Du Faure, (Justice) Le Flo, (War) Pougner Querrier, (Finance) Jules Simon, (Public Instruction) Pothinon, (Marines) Lambechere, (Commerce) Du Barce, (Public works) Jules Ferry, (Mayor of Paris) Vinoy, (Governor of Paris), Victor Hugo, Rochechouart, Malon, Treil and Pater, signed 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 Pasay yielded to the National Guards. Those knew that in the Place Vagras 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 Ornano, and mounted there on the highest point. Those of Belleville, and La Villette were mounted on the Charnon steeps. Those of the battalions of Marais were left in the Place des Vosges.

At a meeting of two thousand delegates, the Central Committee of the National Guard 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 Central 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 Guard, which gives 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 should be erected, so as to isolate this part of the city completely. The inhabitants of the districts so surrounded 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 consent 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 seem further into time, as if standing at a point where one could look across an abyss. In the great silence the tocsin sounded. The moment had come when the Revolution 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 presence was an inspiration to 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 drags of the fanbourgs. 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 hostile province of the fanbourgs. On the 14th of the month of the "citadel of revolution," the "acropolis of insurrection," which we on our side called the "sacred mount," the "citadel of freedom." The gloire was prefect, of police, was the man of the occasion. The prefect of Police, Le Flore, 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.

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, independent, communal, international. The monarchy of Blanqui, and simple patriots formed a single army. Perhaps in some such way will all revolutionary Europe one day unite, as events increase in magnitude.

In closing his address to his colleagues of the "National Defense," inspired the lamentable journeys of Jules Favre to Ferriere. The latter hesitated for some time, but came round to viewing as an heroic action the shameful cowardice he was about to perpetrate.

The atmosphere of freedom was thick in the air. The prelude of the announcement was the cry, that the whole of France should not rise in rebellion, and perhaps, as in 1792, now a revolution broadside over the world.

For everywhere that breezes of liberty was stirring. In 1789 there chanted in the dungeons of this men, who now were the mouth piece to the student youth; women, who adhered to the principle of the International. They had tried by means of an active propaganda to rouse from the torpor the mongrils (Russian peasants) bowed down over the hard necessity, by means of imagery—simple words such as would appeal to simple people—the propaganda was carried forward. "Les Paroles" was written by Bakoumin in the kind of language that suited them. Said Bakoumin, "The Russian people are at present under conditions precisely similar to those which forced our forefathers to rebel in the year 1862, facing a similar danger. At that time it was Stekina Rastine, 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 now only await a new Stekina Rastine. But this single leader will be the support of a legion of unclassified young men who now live in the life of the people. It is, as if Stekina Rastine stood behind these collective heroes, and the same irresistible power will inspire all this magnificent young blood over whom his spirit possesses."

In a poem by Oparevo (the friend of Bakoumin) 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 and the dangers of the Butchers, by means of a ballad. An object of the Tsar's and the nobles' vengeance, compelled to a nomadic life because of persecution, going about from sun to sun, from town to town, urging the peasants to assemble and to revolt, and finally taken by the Imperial police, finishing his life amidst 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 for which long years the interests of colonial subjects have been sacrificed.

Towards the end of February, the Arabs, who knew enough about military despotism, but were ignorant of civil despotism, preferred a known to an unknown evil, preferred to have their own compatriots in the Arab bourses 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 dreamed of freedom to prepare the insurrection. The old shiek, Haddad, who for thirty years was known to the sheikhs of thirty years in the new shiekh, Mohamed and Ben Aziz, the sheikhs El Mokrani, Ben Ali Cherif, and others stirred up La Kahiyas. Their army amounted to about 30,000 men. At the middle of March the Baches de La Medjiana sent a declaration of war to the Governor of Algeria, and the Arabs besieged Bordjbon-Arrijid. The siege had lasted a week; when Colonel Bouval arrived with a column of several thousand men. Filled with the blasts that had passed, 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 bullet.

He received the death which, (according to those who witnessed the terrible scene) 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, and these last days, in their turn, released the revolutionists, who were backed by the crowd.
A REPLY TO J. C. KENWITHY.

BY TOUEAU 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 stands 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 examines the wisdom of all sorts of 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 freedom, 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 irradicably 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 repressals for the tyranny 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 marked kind—but 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 purveyors, "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 wonderfull 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 has no doubt believe this, but we defy him to prove any one of these statements. We do not believe one of them.

Again, he says, "The 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 integral with the New Testament, we doubt, 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 "motive, 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 what which our comrade desires them to do. Instead of rising above the idea that their lives are bound with the 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 towards whom 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 usually the better) and as not worth the attention necessary to make it habitable, much less enjoyable. Indeed the tendency has been to commend 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 fulfillment of New Testament prophecy when the kingdoms of this world become the Kingdom of God and his Christ.

Not, however, if 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 incompatable 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, as well as power and freedom are all one and the same thing.

But, it is asked, 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 to act in their place so to do that, is, cannot they exercise 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 a Government. It is a power external from and over 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 that of Rome, the despotism of Russia, or Austria, or 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 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 government, or lay out a water company, they must ask for permission.

The very fact of having to go to government, a power external to and above themselves, humbly praying and promising ever to pay shows the degree of subservience, the depth of degradation of a people under government. But going to the government is a very simple affair, to say nothing of the waste of time. On the deposit of the Petition or Bill, fee 45; for each day the bill is being examined to see if it agrees with the Standing Orders 45; on presenting the petition to the Committee 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 10,000 and under 50,000 all the above fees are multiplied. If 50,000 and under 100,000 the fees are three times the above. And if 100,000 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. Only this is the whole essence of Government! 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 constitute the astronomical leverage of the House of Lords? Would they promise or attempt to do something that must become revolution in relation to all the other classes of society. Why your banking classes alone, in forty-eight hours could paralyze the whole trade of the country, could close every factory, and throw into the streets millions of the working classes. This was done 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 Land League for one. Suppose the House of Lords in Ireland were to pass through "as 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 Melborne, the Home Secretary, 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 was stated. There was to be "a run on the Bank of Ireland," and if the agitators 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, etc., 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 land, 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, rests on the principal 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 Parliament is a reconciliation of the principles 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 shall rise in their folly, on their restorings 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 and abiding constitutional action, which it is well known, 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. Hence the boycott 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 Trade Unions Congress, and also of the proposed International Anarchist Congress. At an international meeting of delegates from the various London group, held at Grafton Hall, on September 26th, a committee was appointed to enter into communication with all Anarchist and labor delegates in order to form a purpose of finding the 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 a complete friction between this committee and those upon whose behalf he was supposed to be acting.—R.

Daniel Hoan is dead (so writes William Holmes in "The Firebrand") a free thinker 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 (Waukesha, 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 determined 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 Lovel's Coffee Tavern, Carlton Bridge, (Close to the Westbourne Park railway station) on Sunday evening next, Oct. 5th, when James Tochati 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 well-written, substantial, and not more than 2 columns in length. The writer of each article will be accountable for the opinions expressed, and the Editor in all matters reserves to himself the right to reject any article.
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LIBERTY,
LONDON, OCTOBER, 1895.

BEWEEN OURSELVES.

For wilful misrepresentation few could excel "Tattler" in his notes on 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-
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 at the South Place Institute, where she spoke to a large audience. In the 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 18th ultimo she delivered an interesting address in the South Place Institute, Finsbury.

The meeting was called to consider the subject "Police Justice in England and America." The chair was occupied by E. Peddle, the platform on the amongst the audience were Louise Michel, Toussan Parris, E. Leggett, Henry Seymour, Amy Morant, C. Morton, G. Lawrance, and James Tochatti.

Ms Goldman having briefly stated the object for which the meeting had been called, Comrade Leggett 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 the right to rule in comfort.

J. Tochatti said the question of Political Justice in England no one could afford to ignore, whatever their politics. Viewers may be, or not, we allow the Continental system of "agents provocateur" to be introduced, without strenuous opposition. Justice was not held in order 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 brutality punish men who had been trapped by the politicians. The Walliams Anarchists were victims of a police plot. It was difficult to believe that in England men like Charles and Battista were suffering through the infamy of men like Coulon and the republican detectives of Boulard Yard, but such was the case. Tochatti concluded by saying that he had spent 12 years a prisoner on a charge of the same nature as Walliams, and that the police had put the anabomination 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 manufacture of evidence and the accusation with the case of John Hay revealed that Home Office officials were open to barfaced 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."

Goldman dealt with the American point of view. She said three years had past, since Alexander Berkman, the noble youth, attempted to avenge the wrong inflicted upon the strikers at Homestead, during the labor troubles of 1892. Three years of struggle, hardship, and privation for the working men, wealth, excitement, amusements and pleasures, 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? Had he invaded the sacred temple of widows and orphans in swindling schemes? Had he built factories, where men and half-grown children, were slowly tortured to death? Had he plagued, cheated, enslaved, and tyrannized humanity? Had he done all that, he might 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 spoke to, and talked to, the people, 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 were the result of 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 kind of treatment they were subjected to by (interchange) the workers were actually owned by Carnegie and Frick; the barricades they lived in belonged to Carnegie and Frick, the food, tools and clothing had to be bought at Carnegie's shop, and the prices they were forced to pay were exorbitant. The medical 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 had theodness, 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 those armed assassins charged upon a crowd of men and women, killing eleven and wounding many more. The strikers fought a brave battle, determined to defend themselves and many of their kin who had been attacked. Was the army in America for the protection of the people or for the protection of property? Of course, if the strikers had supported the army, they would have been justified in using force to defend themselves. But the strikers were not afraid of the army. They stood their ground and were prepared to resist any attempt to enslave them.

The authorities saw what was happening and the strikers fought back. They had support from the people and were not isolated. The strikers were not afraid of the army. They stood their ground and were prepared to resist any attempt to enslave them.

The political farces are nearly played out. Anarchists despise weapons used by the enemy for human butchery. When an obstacle to the advance of the Revolution is reached, there is no necessity to use violence. French potentates however, for the time being, may rest in peace. They are too busy in showing the crimes that power commits for the Revolutionists to desire their immediate removal by any means, violent or other. The matter is not likely to turn to their advantage.

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 the former was intended to be sarcastic, then the meeting was a failure. The French government has been criticized for its treatment of the workers and the workers have been treated badly. The French government has been criticized for its treatment of the workers and the workers have been treated badly.

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 quarreled and robbed each other. What was wanted was the abolition of all government and exploitation.

Lawrence said that as those in possession of wealth had the whole of the countries of Europe were the educated classes. It was vain to preach the use of the weapons of brotherhood to the half educated workers, but that the possessors of the power of the workers had not been in prison could understand it. Such was the case with the strikers at 1989, 14th September, and on the following evening addressed a large audience at the U.S. Hall, Glasgow, and by the strike comradry was most heartily. 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 strikers were in vain, and the workers took their merriment of her work and the strike. Despair, (Brooklyn, N.Y.), — “Freie Wacht,” (Philadelphia), — “La Question Sociale,” (Paris), — “Di Zucht,” (Vienna), — “La Education Integra,” (Paris). The list goes down and we can see that the movement is not being stifled.

The lucky little “Firebrand,” which by-the-by, has hitherto prized itself on having been the only Anarchist-Communist periodical published in the English language in the U.S. A. is doing excellent work. The issue of the “Firebrand” is full of fighting spirit, and the “Alborzian” is very good, and the strike comrade has been of enormous assistance in the strike. The same office has been kept open by the strike comrade, and their energies have been turned into the “Firebrand”.

The list given above testifies to the fact that the United States are not without a vigorous Anarchist-Communist periodical published in the English language. This is the latest addition to the list, and is a welcome addition to the number of periodicals that can be procured for your library.

Fougé’s “La Sociale” adds it to the list of periodicals that can be procured for your library, and is a welcome addition to the number of periodicals that can be procured for your library. The number of which is not known, and which is not known, and which is not known.

Our contemporaries.

PRIEST AND PROPHET.

Have ye noticed it—Lazarus?—Dives?
The 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—Bishops;
Prophets face Truth as a whole;
Prophets 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 unmistakable manner that now as so often heretofore, they consider their own class interests before those of the Common—

The truth, however, is that the common people are the true priests and prophets. It was while thinking of this that on August 4th we wended our way down to Kelmscott House, Upper Mill, to hear Grant Allen on "The Man of Letters as Prophet." While, he said, he cannot understand the term "prophet," and the preacher is the true "prophet." 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 unforgivable in a man of letters was that he should have an idea which ran counter to generally received opinion. These common men means common sense, this much venerated "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. Jager's wool clothing and whose food was Hovis and wild honey. He went from Tottenhym 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 Socialist 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 misinterpreted our principles, and to-day are to be found in great numbers in the ranks of the enemy. The true prophet, 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 prophet, 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 in, 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 power as he can acquire from the other; that money must be made of gold and silver or based on them, that the conduct of the majority of the human race is determined not by the consequences of facts, but by believing fictions. This involves for them mental slavery, and mental slavery carries with it physical slavery.

At the age of steam and electricity a 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 belief. 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 bapthumb 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 to 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 perverted and 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 their houses are large mansions and their life is luxury; they must have a paymaster and a 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 hypnotized 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 to obey the priest 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 scales of office, our paper titles, 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 earrings. Whatever you want you must get, or starve." They do not have the 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 that no right to use any kind of money except what the money-lords eman! They demand, and the state of the people is nothing more than a game at saloon and wine. The man who lives in the stone mansion holds up before the people a bundle of government bonds and railroad stock, and the same effect is produced upon the people as money has been made. The state of the people is nothing more than a game at saloon and wine. The man who lives in the stone mansion holds up before the people a bundle of government bonds and railroad stock, and the same effect is produced upon the people as money has been made.

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 bundle of government bonds and railroad stock, and the same effect is produced upon the people as money has been made. The state of the people is nothing more than a game at saloon and wine. The man who lives in the stone mansion holds up before the people a bundle of government bonds and railroad stock, and the same effect is produced upon the people as money has been made.
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