

LIBERTY



• CONTENTS •

Between Ourselves.

Kropotkin on Agriculture.

(Concluded.)

The Turkish Atrocities

*Is there an English Anarchist
Movement ?*

The International Congress.

Let Us be Just.

By W. TCHERKESOFF.

Society and the Individual.

Vol. III., No. 9. Sept.-Oct., 1896

ONE PENNY.

LONDON

W.M. ROWE

SOCIETY AND THE INDIVIDUAL.

It is due to society and the individual having been misunderstood that they have lived together in complete antagonism. The one revolting from time to time against the other, but always falling back again, crushed by the formidable weight of institutions it has helped to develop and defend.

Like the legendary magician who became a prey to the monster, animated by his incantations, every progress of human intelligence, every perfecting elaborated by individualities, has aided those, who set themselves up as guides of collectivity, to tighten the chains of the individual. Poor social beings. Centuries have gone by since they began struggling for happiness; since they made revolutions to emancipate; since they taxed their ingenuity to change the machinery that ground them.

But they had no sooner made experiments with their new combinations, than they were caught in the teeth of the machine and could only escape by leaving some of their quivering flesh behind, some of what metaphysicians have called "soul" what, not to have to invent a new word for, we can continue to call so, divesting it of all metaphysical idea; contenting ourselves with denoting it as a particular mode of vibration of matter of which we are composed, and that can be thus defined: "self-consciousness".

The struggle is carried on through history, not only between races, between nations of the same race, but even between individuals of the same nation, and between the individual and the social State. Everywhere, in all stages of formation of collectivities, the interests of individuals, of groups, rise antagonistic one to another.

Nevertheless, when individuals came together, they only did so, urged by the hope of finding some advantage lacking in their previous state. The need of uniting their forces to vanquish a natural impediment, the need of mutual help to capture prey that defied their solitary efforts, the urgency of close contact to resist a more powerful enemy; whatever may be the reason that justified the association or human individualities—or of the human ancestor, if association took place before his faculties were broadened into human reason,—all goes to show that in uniting their efforts, individuals did not abdicate their liberty but tried to co-ordinate their faculties with the object of acquiring a more effective power and more liberty, in consequence,

This association certainly took place without preliminary debates, without discussions and contracts, under the pressure of needs and circumstances each individual implicitly reserving his liberty of action; no doubt these first associations lasted only as long as the effort to be made lasted, and was broken up when the result was obtained. It must only have been progressively that families having joined forces to make an effort, continued to live side by side when the effort was over.

In the midst of these temporary associations, some men realized imperceptible advantages to the detriment of their associates. No doubt freely consented to by the latter, they ended by becoming the right of those who had appropriated them; later on they were extended, and brought other privileges in their train. And the study of primitive peoples traces this evolution, showing us the grouping of only a few individual, without the shadow of a difference between them, then passing by those in which the chief's authority is always subordinated to the desire to obey of those who recognized it, and ending in our most complicated political organizations.

Authority to establish itself has had to insinuate itself. And yet no, that is not the right word; for that would let us suppose that the theory was already formulated in the brains of those who profited by it, whereas the reality must simply be that authority and exploitation developed gradually when those who reaped the first advantages, perceived that trickery and force were excellent means to deceive fools and crush refractory individuals.

If authority and exploitation, armed at all points, had attempted to enter the first rudimentary associations, they would have failed, because as soon as their effect was felt, revolts began against this deviation from the social evolution.

Brought up under governmental guardianship, individuals have, in the course of time, accepted the fact as a "natural law". The encroachments of privileged persons, till force was assured to them, must have been imperceptible in the course of an individual existence. Generations passed without perceiving that their chains multiplied. When they perceived oppression, individuals rose against it, but too late. Authority had taken root, had created interests round itself that were ready to defend it. And even those who rebelled, rose against men in power, but without daring to question the legitimacy of authority. Already used to shackles, it seemed impossible to men to do without them.

When those in power had been changed pretty often, men at last perceived that it made no difference to oppression; but man's mind is limited; his his conceptions vary but little, and the changes brought about by the boldest spirits went no deeper than the surface, when, as it often happened, it was only a change of name.

Before destroying you must know how to reconstruct" is a current axiom in sociology as well as in politics. Before destroying his shanty that is falling to pieces, and leaves him exposed to the inclemencies of the weather, the owner bethinks himself at least a temporary shelter. Likewise, before getting rid of the shackles they were laden with, the principle preoccupation of those who wished to emancipate themselves, was to say: "These shackles cramp us; with what could we replace them?"—"The government of such a one thwarts us; whom could we put in his stead"

The wisest went as far as dreaming of a change in the form of government. The time had not yet come to say: "Government hampers us; let us no longer be governed!" That was too simple for brains deformed by prejudice. There were only a few select spirits who dared state it, without, however, deducing all consequences from it. In vain they changed men first, and the forms of authority itself later on. Finding themselves always oppressed, the evolution of the idea took place little by little. At each new deception, individuals became more sceptic as to the necessity of power. Today, the step has been taken, and after having seemed a paradox, "No more authority!" has a right to be quoted, and seem no longer so absurd. Instead of crushing it with laughter and disdain, it is accepted for discussion. The idea is formulated and become precise; we are only impeded by the ignorance of wanting to know "how things will go" the day when there will no longer be an authority to hold individuals in mutual respect of their liberty.

Better still, doubt! doubt that hinders all flight; doubt that disarms all those who are no longer certain of defending a just cause; doubt, destroyer of all belief, all virility when it is not urged on by a superior idea, has penetrated into the brains of privileged persons! They are no longer certain of the legitimacy of their privileges; they are no longer sure of the necessity of the necessity of their power; exploitation, which they cause to weigh so heavily on the masses, seems no longer so just to them—there are only economists and those who think themselves "intellectual", to assert, nowadays, the necessity of the servitude of menials for the profit of a superior class.—And from the moment they have lost faith in their mission, our masters have lost the power of defending themselves. Fear, egoism, avidity will no doubt induce them by fits and starts to massacre as in 71, and to pass idiotic laws like those they made during these last years, but without energy to continue the defence of caste, without daring to continue openly and with continuity their work of reaction. Like all weak people, they go from excessive violence to the most complete flabbiness. They no longer believe in their social past.

They no longer dare to affirm their pretended rights with the same assurance, some have even consented to recognise "that there may be some truth" in the ideal, only discussing its more or less remote possibility. What they search before all, is to save the present hour, while leaving the future to take care of itself! When you come to doubt the justice of your own cause, you are no longer capable of defending it or of recruiting defenders. Therefore, at present, the social order is stabbed to death; it can still stand, from the effect of acquired velocity, by the power and multiplicity of institutions and interests it has known how to create around it. On the other hand, in consequence of that fear of the unknown called misoneism, or horror of anything new but the expression is not

true, for it is not what is new that is abominated, but simply the uncertainty of what it will bring, which makes multitudes cling to customs and ideas of the past, abandoning them only progressively, by the influence of circumstances, longer than individual will. The days of the present social condition are therefore numbered. The idea of complete autonomy of the individual, his free expansion, detaches itself imperceptibly from the vague aspirations that befogged it; it becomes precise, formulates itself, becomes more and more ulminous. The time approaches when it will become the initial motor of the active minority that incites multitudes, tearing them away, in spite of themselves, from the grip of the past; dealing roughly with them at times, so as to force them to progress.

The idea is launched; it will carry the world with it.

JEAN GRAVE.

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST WORKERS and Trade Union Congress.

Anarchist and Anti-Parliamentary Committee

BALANCE SHEET.

INCOME.			EXPENDITURE.		
	£	s. d.		£	s. d.
By loan, A Comrade	5	0 0	Holborn Town Hall	5	5 0
" " A. S. J.		15 0	Club and Institute hall	1	10 0
Croydon Group	1	0 0	75 large posters, Co-		
Canning Town Group	1	0 0	operative Printing		
Workers' Friend Group	13	3	Society	1	10 0
Leeds Group		5 6	Partingtons, posting	2	10 0
Sheffield Group		5 6	30 small posters		5 6
Hoxton Group		3 9½	Peace Demonstration		
Newcastle "	2	0 9	Committee		5 6
Dundee "		2 0	St Martins' Town Hall	2	0 0
Deptford "		2 9	Use of electric light at		
Stratford "		2 0	St Martins' Town Hall	2	11 9
German "	2	0 0	Adverts. in CLARION		12 0
Italian and French			" LABOR LEADER		12 0
Groups	2	1 6	" JUSTICE		9 0
Collections;			Federation Printery, cards	4	6
Delegate meetings	4	0	Cardboard, etc., for poster	4	0
Ossulton Street	1	4	A. C.		5 7 11
Regents Park	2	0	Co-op. Printing Soc.		
Hoxton Church	2		for 2,500 Conference		
Holborn Town Hall	10	9 0½	notices and 600 agen-		
Club and Institute hall	19	6	das 3 languages	3	7 6
St Martins' Hall	2	8 6	Postage, telegrams,		
List 12 and 13, N	1	0 0	stationery, fares, loans,		
List 36, Kampfmeier, I	1	0 0	gratuities and		
List 50, Galbraith,		5 0	sundries		8 1 4
Subscriptions;			Loans paid, A Comrade	5	0 0
A comrade	5	2 0	" " A. S. J.		15 0
A Social Democrat		5 0			
C. Cecinski		6			
W. Percy		1 0			
Returned from Peace					
Demonstration					
Committee		5 0			
Returned from Loan		2 0			
" " A. C.	4	19 0	Balance in hand		9 0½
	£40	19 6½		£40	19 6½

Superstition is a religion out of fashion and Religion is a superstition in fashion.—HOBBS.

When Science cannot control superstition, superstition chokes science.—Renan.

THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS.

By OUR SPECIAL MISREPRESENTATIVE.

The International Socialist Congress met on Monday, very appropriately in the Queen's hall with the object of upsetting the Queen's government if possible, or if not, of enlightening it on its duties.

The first sitting unhappily broke up in disorder. That was the fault of those obstreperous intruders the Communist Anarchists, who as come-raids, vociferously claimed the right to be represented at the congress. They should, it was explained to us, be carefully distinguished from the Anarchist-Communists the Social-Anarchist and the Anarchist-Socialists, but all these groups were here united against the common enemy, the Socialist pure and simple, as the French say, and a tremendous rumpus was the consequence.

The leaders of the party attacked behaved splendidly. Prominent amongst these was Liebknecht who, as his name implies, is the well beloved servant of Democracy; in the midst of raging storm he looked as cool, but not as green, as the proverbial cucumber. Herr Bebel too remained unmoved and seemed quite at home in the Babel of noises. Bernard Shaw who sat in the body of the Hall, smiled his well known golden-fringed smile and looked undisguisedly clever.

There is so much to be gained by free discussion that we should be sorry to see any groups of investigators excluded on future occasions, but we would like to make some suggestions that might be adopted for the benefit of all concerned.

The President and speakers should be provided with powerful speaking-trumpets, such as are used at sea in a storm. Fog-horns too should be at their disposal to dispel misunderstandings and to prevent collisions.

Life-boats should be lowered to save the speakers, when their speeches are drowned in a sea of voices.

No dynamiters should be admitted except on business closely connected with the destruction of Sovereigns with whom we are on friendly terms.

A special Committee composed of artists phrenologists and directors of Zoological Gardens should decide which of the lower types of the species "Man" should be excluded, or at least carefully watched.

A sanitary commission should be empowered to administer copious ablutions to those manifestly needing them, and to judge in which cases the Muzzling Order should be appended to the Order of the Bath.

If these and other precautions of a similar nature are taken by the able and energetic leaders of the movement, the universal brotherhood will, we have no doubt, be introduced in the course of the week, and the Editor of *Justice* will naturally be entrusted once for all with the guardianship and the exclusive management of the collective wealth and wisdom of the world.

THE TURKISH ATROCITIES.

The recent events in Constantinople are an ominous sign of the times. The unspeakable barbarities perpetrated by the order of the Sultan, but we shall be blind indeed if we take in a mere surface view of the situation, and fail to perceive the obscured causes which have occasioned such an outburst of national ferocity. The superficial observer will very naturally imagine that it is a religious question at bottom, but this is a great mistake. The religious rivalry between the Christians and Mahomedans is but an incident of the economic revolution which is convulsing Eastern Europe today.

The same cause which operated to bring down the Roman Empire has brought about the deplorable crisis in Turkey. That cause is Usury. Everywhere the confiscation of Armenian property has followed the ruthless slaughter of the Armenians.

is not one of the least of the secondary causes which have precipitated this mad outburst of revolt. But while we are bound, by all the laws of common humanity to deeply sympathise with the victims of the unspeakable Turk, we must nevertheless refuse to be carried away by the hysterics of the average newspaper which, in the interests of the usurers, make a miserable pretence that all this havoc is the natural manifestation of race hatred, pure and simple. The Mahomedans are by law, custom and religion, prevented from practising usury. The Christian Armenian is the chief trafficker in money. Hear what so notable an authority as Mr. R. A. Arnold said a quarter of a century ago: "The Armenian scale varies from 24 to 60 per cent, sometimes by express contract, sometimes as a disguised loan, frequently by compound interest. All classes are victims, but the chief sufferers are naturally the poor, and more especially the peasants." No Turkish, no Arab landlord would ever dream of selling out or evicting a tenant, but our "Eastern Christian" usurer will; and when, as is frequently the case, the usurer can call to his help the strong arm of Government, eviction with all its results of misery, crime, and violence is carried on over wide tracts. Entire villages have been thus unroofed, and cultivated lands left to pasture or to downright desolation.

The European traveller, — primed with staple ideas about Turkish oppressions, the Sultan's horse-hoofs, barbarian rule, and the like, — sees the ruin along the wayside, and notes, for subsequent publication, his observations on the decadence of the Turkish Empire, and the fatal results of Ottoman or Mahometan rule — observations which his Greek dragoman will sedulously confirm; and these will, perhaps, be repeated and believed in Parliament. But, could he know the real, the active cause of all this desolation, his visionary Pasha tyrant would fade away, and would transform himself into no other than some wealthy money-lender, the usurer whose cent. per cent. has taken away "the upper garment and the very millstone, not for pledge, but sale."

Of course, the vicarious vengeance of the Turks upon the Armenians is a result of the popular ignorance on the subject of money which confounds the evil of usury with the persons who practise it. It is the same jingo spirit which animates the Christian antipathy to the Jews, as manifested in the Anti-Semitic riots. Precisely in the same manner the Socialists attack Capitalists, charging the exploitation of labor to the monopoly of Capital, ignoring the monopoly of money. As M. Leroy Beaulieu says, it is not the Jews who make the power of money, but it is money that makes the power of the Jew.

The Powers know well enough what is at the bottom of the whole business, and that is why they are pretending to be divided so long, in order to make it appear that it is impossible to blot out Turkey from the European map. This is not their game. Turkey is a good market for the usurers, and the Powers are not going to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. The United States are beginning to wake up to the importance of the money question, and a great electoral fight is about to take place on this issue. The more forward countries will gradually follow in America's trail, and so will the usurer be compelled to trade exclusively with less civilized peoples. Hence it would never do for the gang of usurers who control the Powers themselves, to destroy a backward nation like the Turkish, no matter how many thousands of lives may be sacrificed in the meantime.

Lord Salisbury's recent description of the Turkish Empire as a gangrenous limb of the European body politic was the diagnosis of a quack. He mistook the symptom for the seat of the disorder. And if I mistake not the condition of Turkey today, it is only a prelude of what is to take place all over the world; sooner or later.

HENRY SEYMOUR.

IS THERE AN ENGLISH ANARCHIST MOVEMENT?

To the Editor of *LIBERTY*.

The superficial communication from "D. B." under the above heading in the August "Liberty" is an illustration of the scarcity of minds that are devoted to a calm and philosophical investigation of the problem of society: the problem of how individ-

British Massacres Contrasted with Turkish.

PROBLEM — FIND THE ASSASSIN.

The scheming Capitalist Politician, as represented by those who inspire the "Daily Chronicle", says that the Great Assassin is the Sultan of Turkey, and we find this view also well put forward in "Punch"—who always ably supports that class which possesses no principles or politics except to gather for the idlers what the toilers produce. *Punch* sketches us a statuesque group in which churchyard horrors surround a central figure labelled "Abdul Hamid, Assassin." *Punch* might as reasonably, or unreasonably, have made his central figure resemble our Queen and labelled it "Victoria, Assassin", for the recent murders of Ethiopians by British soldiers, and by Egyptians under their control, at least equal in atrocity and number the murders of Armenians by Turkish soldiers. To make the Monarch a figure-head for praise or blame is now the prime trick of those real assassins who are concealed among us. Kingship is now dead as a real social factor, but is used as a foil by those who kill wholesale and unmercilessly by appropriating to themselves the means of living; and who stir up wars in order not only to facilitate their operations, but also to divert attention from themselves.

I go almost always to the railway system for an illustration of modern capitalism, because it is not only the centre of monopoly and secret plunder, but is also so organised as to have but "one neck". This neck is nearly ripe for that single stroke which shall put the workers of England into the possession of these iron highroads they have made.

How many hundreds of thousands of deaths result indirectly from the plunder of forty millions sterling annually which the railway shareholders take from the toilers cannot well be estimated but some of the deaths caused by the plunderous action of railway owners come under a very different and more direct category—the English law of murder. That the law is not put into force against the *assassins*, affords one supremely good argument for *Anarchism* as I comprehend it—the breaking down of law, and replacing law by public opinion based on equity. About *fifty* persons are killed every year at level crossings simply because the shareholders chose to appropriate that which should serve to guard those points where railways have been made across public roads. They would thus be held guilty of murder if the common-law view of murder—"any act known to be dangerous to life & liberty in itself to cause death, done for the purpose of committing a felony"—were put into effect. In fact, a verdict of manslaughter against a railway company has been found in a case of this kind, but the offenders were not even arrested and put on trial. Take one case out of the fifty or so which occur every year. In December of last year STEPNIAK was killed at an unguarded level cross-

ing on a short railway worked by & for the profit of the shareholders of the *Midland, London and North Western, & North London Companies*. Here surely is murder, & murder for money, & a fine field for punishing assassins nearer home than Turkey. Be very sure, however, of one thing—our *Government*, whose chief work is to shield such cliques, will not move in the matter. Even the *Fabian Society* is equally torpid, though one sleek member of its Executive helped, morally, to kill STEPNIAK.

T. BOLAS.

IN MEMORIAM.

Death has again visited the advanced guard and dealt a terrible blow in striking down our comrade Mordhorst who for thirty years worked untiringly with all shades of socialists. In days gone by he was found side with Bebel and Liebknecht when they were more uncompromising than they are now. He was known to all actual socialists during the last fifteen years for his keen mental grip of the social problem, and his strong, deep, sincere nature endeared him to all.

Born Feb. 4 1840, died Aug. 21, 1896, at his funeral were friends from all sections of the Socialist movement & other societies. Beautiful wreaths were sent from the *Hammersmith Liberal and Radical Club*, Mrs MANN of the *Freethought Party*, & others of the *Hammersmith Socialist Society*, for one of which Morris wrote the following:

"Forsooth, brothers, fellowship is heaven and lack of fellowship is hell; fellowship is life, and lack of fellowship is death."

As we go to press, the news has reached us of the death of our comrade, William Morris. It is difficult to realise that the great figure in the movement of the people towards freedom is no more. There is no Socialist in the world to-day but will be rendered full of grief by the terrible loss, & supremely so, we who knew him best.

"And what wealth shall then be left us when none shall gather gold
To buy his friend in the market, and pinch and pine the sold?
Nay what save the lovely city, and the little house on the hill,
And the wastes and the woodland beauty, and the happy fields we till;
And the homes of ancient stories, the tombs of the mighty dead;
And the wise men seeking out marvels, and the poet's teeming head;
And the painter's hand of wonder; and the marvellous fiddle bow,
And the banded choirs of music;—all those that do and know,
For all these shall be ours and all men's, nor shall any lack a share
Of the toil and gain of living in the days when the world grows fair."

London Anarchist Socialist Groups

CHICAGO MARTYRS COMMEMORATION

A MASS MEETING will be held at the Holborn Town Hall, on Wednesday November 11th.

LET US BE JUST.

(Open Letter to Liebknecht)

SIR.

Your two articles ("Justice", Aug. 15. and 29., 1896) upon the Socialist Congress of London, dwell a good deal upon anarchists. Of all that you, in your capacity of connoisseur of our party, affirm, I understand that the anarchists "have no more right to sit in a Socialist Congress than the Czar or Rothschild", that "there is nothing in common between anarchism and socialism", that "in all countries the anarchists are petted by the bourgeoisie", that they are your enemies and calumniate you,—"throw mud at your head"—and for this reason you make an energetic appeal to your friends, saying, "We have to fight the enemy! We cannot allow the enemies to enter our army."

You are indignant!...With reason, if the anarchists are such monsters. Only I cannot quite understand to whom you are applying your epithets. In your articles, you speak of Stirner and his pupil, your colleague, Eugene Richter. I assure you, sir, that these persons and their works are strangers to our party. You who know the anarchists "in the Old World and in the New World", can you inform the public what fraction of anarchy is represented by your colleague Richter in Parliament? Since when have anarchists adopted the stingy tactic of parliamentary legislation? And, then, could you inform me for what anarchist paper your "colleague" wrote? At what international congress he presented himself as an anarchist delegate? Above all, sir, I should be much obliged to you if you would inform me of the names of some of the works of Stirner and his pupil, your colleague Richter in which they developed communism autonomous and revolutionary, that is to say, anarchy?

You indicate nothing thus. "Stirner—Individualist," and Richter, 'chief of the Socialist-killers', are mentioned by you solely for the purpose of demonstrating to your friends that the anarchists are not socialists. Perhaps, for your friends, this seems clear, but I am afraid, sir, that men of sense will find your arguments slightly illogical. Following your method of argument, I should have the right to say:

"Liebknecht, and the Social-Democrats are always at war with the anarchists; from another quarter, these latter are persecuted by Crispi and other governments—'ergo' Liebknecht and Crispi, the government oppressors, and social-democracy are the same party."—This is monstrous! you say.

Yes, monstrous, but not more so than your own course of reasoning. I do but imitate it.

You wish to show that the anarchists are not socialists? There exists a very simple method, that of demonstration; it is enough to compare formulas, the professions of faith of the true socialists, and of the anarchists. Do you wish to do so? Let us take the communists of the great Revolution,

the socialists of 1848, the international Association, and compare them with the anarchists' professions of faith—not forgetting your own programme.

You know, sir, that the Convention against which Babeuf, Buonarrotti, and the "Egaux" conspired, proclaimed all sorts of "libertes politiques", and that national edifices bore the device, "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." But the people remained in the same state of misery. What was the cause of it? asked honest men. "The cause" said Buonarrotti, "is to be found in the inequality of fortunes...in individual proprietorship"...It was to obtain economic equality that the "Egaux" conspired against the Convention.

"There is no liberty"—let us read the proclamation of Blanqui, in 1848—"for him who is in want of bread!

"There is no equality when opulence parades itself side by side with misery!

"There is no fraternity when the starving woman of the people drags herself along with her children to the doors of the rich!

"The tyranny of capital is more merciless than that of the sword, and the censor; it must be crushed.

"Let us have no more empty formulas!

"The economic emancipation of the working classes is the principal aim to which all political action should be subordinated"—adopted by the first International Congress, in 1866.

You see, sir, that economic equality, economic emancipation, the "crushing" of the tyranny of capitalism, are the base of socialist claims; that political rights without economic equality are "empty formulas" for revolutionary socialists. And you, as supreme head of "scientific" socialism, how did you formulate your claims?

In your article: "The Programme of German Socialism" ("Forum Library, New York, April, 1895, page 28) you say:

What do we ask for?

Absolute liberty of the press, absolute liberty of religion, universal suffrage for all representative bodies and in the Commune; national education, all schools open to all, the same opportunities of learning and education for all, abolition of standing armies and creation of national militia, so that every citizen is a soldier and every soldier a citizen; an international court of arbitration between different States, equal rights for men women, measures for the protection of the working classes (limitation of hours of work, sanitary regulations, etc.)

These are reforms already brought about, or in course of being realized in advanced countries; and they are in complete accordance with democracy.

All these freedoms, or abolitions, are magnificent, and it is not we, the anarchists, who are against them. It is precisely in order to guarantee to humanity all the joys of liberty that we wish to destroy what is so dear to you—the State. But in your claims one does not find a word about "economic equality" and "economic emancipation" proclaimed by the Socialists. So that your formula repeats that of the Convention qualified by the Socialists of "empty formulas".

What about the Anarchists?

While your extremely loyal friends, Will Thorne and Dr. Aveling, were applying themselves to the task of thrusting the anarchists from the doors of the Congress with the help of the agents of the police, the anarchists were holding their conferences and drew up, among others, the following declaration:

"The Anti-parliamentarian and Anarchist Conference, considering that the subjection of the working classes to the ruling classes is based on the exploitation and economic submission of the workers, and that this economic exploitation is the source of all evil, and of political, moral, and intellectual oppression, declares that the principal aim of the working class movement should be economic and social emancipation, and that all political action should be subordinated to it.

Considering that legal and parliamentary tactics are not the only forms of political action, the Conference declares itself against all attempts at reduction of the socialist movement into a merely electoral and legal movement which can only create division among the workers.

Considering, moreover, that it was by revolutionary struggle that the people have in all times, gained any amelioration of their social and economic conditions, the Conference declares for revolutionary political action against the State, which is the incarnation of all injustice, economic, political, and social.

As an honest man, you will admit that, in this resolution, anarchists repeated the claims of Babeuf, Blanqui, and the "International". They have but extended the claims of these brave predecessors. That being so, why do you, who know them so well, declare that the anarchists are enemies of socialism? I am very desirous to know your reasons.

I am no less desirous to learn from you, who, among the well-known anarchists, calumniated your party, your friends, or yourself?

Was it Bakounine, with whom you had an affair of honour? In your articles, you merely name E. Richter, who is just as much of an Anarchist as Crispien is of a social-democrat. Let us look into your affair with Bakounine. Perhaps it was he who calumniated you.

In the 'Memoire', presented by the 'Federation Jurassienne' of the International Association of Workers, we read:

"We cannot pass over in silence, apropos of the Congress of Bale (1869), a personal incident of great importance. Bakounine had learnt that Liebknecht, while speaking of him, had represented him as a spy of the Russian Government.... The jury was composed of ten members.... Paepe, Palix, Sentinon, Fritz Robert, Moritz Hess, Eccarius, and others. The jury declared unanimously that Liebknecht had acted ill in repeating infamous "calumnies". Liebknecht, taking Bakounine by the hand, declared that he looked on him as an honest man, and a good revolutionist. "I have

been deceived myself with regard to you" said he, "I have helped to spread calumniating accusations and I owe you reparation." (P.84) As reparation, Liebknecht engaged himself to publish in his paper an article of rectification. "Bakounine," continues the Memoire, "gave him the article with his own hands. What did Liebknecht do? He never published it."

You say, that the anarchists calumniate the social-democrats, "throwing mud at their heads," then one must suppose that in 1869, Liebknecht, the anarchist, calumniated Bakounine, the social-democrat! You are an honest and impartial man: do then, explain to me this flagrant contradiction.

A last question, sir. What does this phrase of yours mean? "In all countries the anarchists are petted by the bourgeois." Are we, as individuals, "petted" by isolated members of the bourgeois or are we "petted" as a party by the capitalistic organization of the State that defender of the bourgeoisie? It is evident that you speak of us as a party "petted" by the entire bourgeoisie and by the State. And you could write those lines, you a journalist, a politician?

What! don't you know that the prisons and convict settlements of Italy, France, Spain, Portugal are full of anarchists? That even in England, and in the United States there are anarchists condemned to hard labor. And in Germany, where a stupid reaction pursues you and your friends, was it not there that the anarchists, Landauer, Dr. Gumplovicz, Grunau and others submitted to 18 months' imprisonment? Take no matter whom among my anarchist friends, and you will see that they have, everyone, been "petted" in prisons, during transportation and exile—Cipriani 16 years, Louise Michel 14 years, Borda 5 years, Kropotkin 5 years, Martin 5 years, Merliro, Malato, Faure, Grave, Pouget, Reclus, Malatesta, Nicoll,—all, absolutely all of them, have been submitted to long years of imprisonment, transportation, exile.... And that is what you call being "petted!"

Perhaps you were not aware of this? Let us assume so. But you knew perfectly well that, during the last twenty years, capital punishment for political offences in civilised countries, has been applied only to anarchists.

You knew of the execution of Reinsdorf and Caserio, for, whether at your personal instigation or not, your paper excited against them the hatred of the government and of the bourgeoisie.

You were perfectly well aware of the executions of Parson, Spies, and other Chicago anarchists, of Vaillant, Pallas, Henry....

You know perfectly well that it is the anarchist party which is persecuted, martyred....

And you could set it down in black and white that the anarchists are "petted" by the bourgeoisie?—Let all honest men, let the brave German workmen in whose name you love to speak, now judge of these literary proceedings of yours.

W. TOLSTOY.

"LIBERTY" is a journal of Free-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.

All Communications—including orders for Papers or Pamphlets—should be addressed to The Editor, Carmagnole House, Hammersmith, London, 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, SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER, 1896.

BETWEEN OURSELVES.

What a satire on prison "discipline" that convicts are made insane. The release of Whitehead and Gallagher, on grounds of ill-health, will do something to shew up the infamous life within English prison walls. How many others, without influential friends outside, are driven mad and perhaps murdered out of the way by the wretches who are responsible for the maintenance of the public peace?

Of course nobody believes that these men were let out for the reasons assigned by the Home Secretary. Their release was the Judas-price to the Irish party to secure the passage of the recent Land Bill for Ireland which is rotten to the core. This is the sort of thing that is got out of politics. Our Social Democratic friends ought to be sanguine.

Meanwhile, the *Sun* has interviewed an ex-detective who helped to bring about the conviction of these men. It was all a plot from beginning to end. The dynamite scare was got up to punish innocent men, and to get a Crimes Act passed to arrest the agitation for Home Rule, and then, in order to carry another no less infamous Act, some of these victims of governmental conspiracy are let out. How beautiful and how indispensable is Government!

There exists some little discontent among certain parties who may figure at a discount on account of the release of these men. No doubt the "detectives" think that they will be convicted of "conspiracy" by implication now that some of their victims are free. It may be that they think, now that the men are out, the *secret* will be out as well. Which may account for the recent "bomb" scares in London, which turned out to be "hoaxes". Hoaxes, forsooth! But these gentry need not be alarmed, *madmen* will not say much.

How is it that Mrs. Maybrick is not let out when it is known that she is, and has been for some time, within measurable distance of death? Fears are entertained that she too is losing her reason, owing

to the stringent regulations. Comrade Seymour tells us she is quite frustrated, and cannot live through the winter, if she survives so long. This is more the pity just at this time, for after long and patient plodding Comrade Seymour has at last got almost to the bottom of the so-called Maybrick mystery, and he believes that in a week or two he will be able to produce absolute proof that Mrs. Maybrick's arrest and conviction were maliciously brought about by certain persons who were witnesses for the Prosecution. One witness has already confessed that his evidence was put into his mouth by the police who got up the case. This opens up the question as to how far the police are implicated.

Whether Mrs. Maybrick dies or not, the Home Secretary has got to answer for the part he has played. When it became known that the Lord Chief Justice as Head of the Criminal Judiciary of England sent an instruction to the Home Office that Mrs. Maybrick "ought to be immediately released", a press whip was sent out that the matter must not be commented on. Comrade Seymour then immediately prevailed on Dr. Clark, M. P. to raise the point in the House, and in reply the Home Secretary stated that the communication was only sent to him in a private capacity. Since then, Mr. A. W. MacDougall has published in the *Manchester Courier* that he has been privileged to see the said instruction, and that it stated in plain English that it was framed by its author as the Head of the Criminal Judiciary.

Henry Matthews and H. H. Asquith became very much discredited through their shameful treatment of this case, and Sir M. W. Ridley's tactics are likely to secure for that gentleman the contempt if not the execration of posterity.

The daily paper have expressed surprise at Mr. Lushington's decision in the case of the cabman who drove without a license, at the instigation of his employers, the owners of the *London and North Western* railway. The offence was acknowledged, but magistrate Lushington regarded the offence as too trivial to warrant him in convicting. But what else could have been expected, considering that Mr Lushington himself is one of the owners of that very railway—and moreover so large an owner as to be qualified to act as a director. He was at any rate recently such an owner—one can never speak absolutely in the present tense as an owner may sell out his "right" at any time.

Probably every London stipendiary magistrate is a part owner of one railway or another, but the shareholders' lists are secret documents to which access can only be had by shareholders, or through the unwariness or carelessness of a shareholder.

all can best live together, since living together has, through the exigencies of augmented needs and consequently the more thorough exploitation of external nature, become necessary—in some cases almost a necessary evil. Far from recognizing the necessity for any particularly English Anarchistic movement I have generally considered Anarchy to be peculiarly international in its character, and for that reason there seems to be no more necessity for an English Anarchistic movement than there is for an English North Polar movement. If Equal Liberty, the principle of Anarchism is sound, it is applicable to any race of people possessing the intelligence to grasp it in all its bearings. And it also seems to me that the principle of Equal Liberty, which is none other than that of allowing every person to mind his own business in the fullest sense of the word, is far too broad in its sphere of application to need what is generally understood by the word "movement," which seems to be associated with bands, banners, demonstrations, demagogues, (I had almost said demigods,) and much else that is vulgar.

The proposition of Anarchism: that when individuals become intelligent enough to recognize that a peaceful and harmonious society can only be realized when every person is allowed full and complete sovereignty over himself and affairs, all forms of government of man by man will disappear, is as true as mathematics; and does not need a movement, English or otherwise. And there are many English Anarchists who are really capable students and exponents of Anarchism yet look upon it as a science which, being on a firm basis of logic, is perfectly able to withstand the blatant brass trumpeting of the apostles of love, altruism, and physical force paternalism. Besides, "D. B." 's question is strangely misplaced, for, probably of all countries in the world, England is the most Anarchistic—which however is not saying very much. Still the power of the prince, priest, and policeman is less than in other countries, and especially democratic America. This, as Herbert Spencer has shown, is inevitable in countries where the regime of militarism give way to the regime of industrialism, thus permitting the assimilation of the principle of freedom with greater facility. So it is that in Germany with its intensely militant organization the authoritarian doctrine of Social Democracy finds a firm footing.

And so far indeed is Anarchism from being "unsuited to an Englishman, and in most cases beyond his power of comprehension", I contend that its basic principle of Equal Liberty is a logical plumb-line, capable, by application to all the social and economic affairs of life, of indicating the course of conduct most conducive to universal prosperity and peace. For instance: Compulsory taxation is a forcible dispossession of the products of labour. Equal Liberty implies the secure possession by every individual of self and the results of self-exertion. Therefore: Compulsory taxation is robbery. Nothing could be plainer. The compulsory organisation of labour as proposed by State Socialists is an infringement of individual freedom. Equal Liberty implies that every individual may work when, where, and how he may choose (within the limits of possibility.) Therefore: State Socialism is a system of slavery.

"D. B.'s" statement that: "Any English scheme, idea or theory of a state of society based on complete liberty I have not succeeded in discovering," is rather vague. What does he mean by "English scheme"? Is it a scheme originating in the English language, or is it restricted to a scheme or theory expounded by one who can produce his genealogical tree and say, with W. S. Gilbert: "I am an Englishman?" If the latter I am afraid that to investigate it fully; he will soon be involved in a complicated study of the origin of tribes and nations, extending possibly even to that of species. But if by "an English theory of a state of society based on complete liberty" he means a theory originating in the English language, I can refer him to piles upon piles of books, pamphlets, and periodicals. Has he never heard of Josiah Warren, Stephen Pearl Andrews, Lysander Spooner, Edmund Burke, Godwin, and a host of lesser luminaries superfluous to specify? And their works, whose name is legion: "The Science of Society", "Natural Law", "Vindication of Natural Society", "Political Justice", etc., etc.?

I am not overlooking the fact that at the outset of his remarks "D.B." stated that: "My reasons for thus acting are the result of a fairly extensive perusal of periodicals...circulated as Anarchist or Anarchist Communist literature. Possibly "D. B.'s criterion of an Anarchist is one who is forever proclaiming himself an Anarchist; and that, to him, a theory of society based upon complete liberty is not Anarchistic unless its author labels

it as such. But on the other hand there are many pseudo Anarchists, of whom, however I will not upon this occasion treat. Surely "D. B." has heard of the proceeding which our misguided religious friends call: "donning the livery of heaven to serve the devil in."

Is it not superfluous then to ask for an English Anarchistic movement? First, because Anarchism is a philosophy, and philosophy knows no nationality; secondly, because England, through its industrial regime has a natural tendency towards liberty, in spite of the efforts of politicians to trample it down; and thirdly because movements in the common acceptance of the term are not necessary to the application of so comprehensive a principle as Equal Liberty. The realization of a society which we call Anarchy can only result from the recognition (by a sufficient number of persons to hold their own against aggressors) of the fact that individuals can best live together where every person's sovereignty over himself and his affairs is fully respected and defended.

If there be anything in the above "unsuited to an Englishman and in most cases beyond his comprehension," I must conclude with the remark that it only proves what I have long held to be true, namely: that compulsory instruction, misnamed Free Education, is the greatest promoter of ignorance.

WILLIAM J. ROBINS.

With regard to the above question, by "D. B.", in the August Number of "Liberty",—I fail to see the point of his letter, having myself watched the movement for the last ten years. Morris' "Commonweal" first made me realise the insane conditions under which the workers exist and toil. Since then I have read almost all the pamphlets written from a State Socialist standpoint, as well as all those mentioned by "D. B.", and I believe that there are more plain and easily understood pamphlets written on Anarchist than on State Socialist ideals. Any man or woman could understand if they would the pamphlet by the Scotch Anarchist orator, our comrade Duncan. We can find plenty of food for thought in it, and are not biassed by superstitious belief in law and authority. Why, then, need we wait for an English scheme for the overthrow of monopoly?

Considering the Socialist movement in England as a whole, if Anarchy means disorder, then they are suffering from it badly. The Congress itself only showed how far these leading lights of intellect would drag the people through the mire to gain their own ends: men and women supposed to be well read in the history of Governments use the same dirty weapons as do all political frauds in order to put themselves into power over the people they look down upon, yet want to rule. Looking back on the work done by Socialists, I feel assured that they will never gain the confidence of the enslaved and discouraged workers who stand in danger of losing their means of existence should they dare to speak their mind. Much might be done for the workers of England by working on the lines of fraternal cooperation—such as our comrades Bruce Wallace, Kenworthy, and others are trying to carry out in a practical way. The time is ripe for an organization on an equality basis, for the uprooting, by any and every means, of all monopolies that stand in our way, an organisation that will take the place of the I. L. P., or Trade Unions, who recognise no class, Government, law, or authority—an Association of all classes of workers combined together for the complete overthrow of the Profit System. For the State Socialist will never emancipate the workers from the slavery of capitalism, nor will the Trade Union with its blind leaders of the blind leading the worker through the mire of Arbitration and Conciliation. Had, indeed, these intellectual lights of Socialism used their intelligence to direct the workers in a common sense way for Industrial Emancipation only—and had the money that has been wasted on strikes and political action been used for building up a Cooperative Commonweal in the midst of our rotten so-called civilisation, we should have had millions of the workers with us today who are still outside the ranks of Trade Unions or Socialism. It has been truly said that organisation of any kind is only possible where individuals will forget their differences in general agreement, and it is now time to close up our ranks and start fighting all ranks of enemies with their own weapons. There is, however, a limit to the Usury and Profit system, and a limit also to a Fourteen Hours' Shop Slaves' time and strength. Or to writing when time and opportunity expire against it.

H. TAYLOR.

AGRICULTURE.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

(Continued from the July number.)

VI

We can easily perceive new horizons opening up to the Social Revolution.

Each time we speak of Revolution, the worker who has seen children wanting food, lowers his brow and repeats, obstinately—"What of bread"?—Will there be sufficient if each eats according to his appetite? What if peasants, ignorant tools of re-action, starve our towns as the black bands did in 1793—what shall we do?"

Let the peasant do his worst! The large towns will have to do without him then.

At what then should the hundreds of thousands of workers who are asphyxiated in small workshops and factories today be employed on the day they regain their liberty? Will they continue locking themselves up in factories after the Revolution? Will they continue to make luxurious toys for export when they see their stock of corn getting exhausted, meat becoming scarce and vegetables disappearing without being replaced?

Evidently not! They will leave the town and go into the fields! Aided by machinery that will help the weakest of us to put a shoulder to the wheel, they will carry revolution into previously enslaved culture as they will have carried it into institutions and ideas.

Hundreds of acres will be covered by glass, and men, and women with delicate fingers, will foster the growth of young plants. Hundreds of other acres will be ploughed by steam improved by manures or enriched by artificial soil obtained by the pulverization of rocks. Happy legions of occasional labourers will cover these acres with crops, guided in their work and experiments, partly by those who know agriculture, but especially by the great and practical spirit of a people roused from long slumber and illumined by that bright beacon: the happiness of all.

And in two or three months, the early crops will relieve the most pressing wants, and provide food for a people who, after so many centuries of expectation, will at least be able to appease their hunger and eat according to their appetite.

In the meanwhile, popular genius, the genius of a nation that revolts and knows its wants, will work at experimenting with new processes of culture that we already catch a glimpse of, and that only need the baptism of experience to become universal. Light will be experimented with—that unknown agent of culture that makes barley ripen in 45 days under the latitude of Yakoutsk:—light, concentrated or artificial, will rival heat in hastening the growth of plants. A Mouchot of the future will invent a machine to guide the rays of the sun and make them work, so that we shall no longer seek sun heat stored in coal in the depths of the earth. They will experiment irrigation of the soil with the culture of micro-organisms—a rational idea, conceived but yesterday, that will permit us to give to the soil those little living beings necessary to feed the rootlets, to decompose and assimilate the component parts of the soil.

We shall experiment—but let us go no further or we shall enter into the realm of fancy. Let us remain in the reality of acquired facts. With the processes of culture in use, applied on a large scale, and already victorious in the struggle against industrial competition, we can give ourselves ease and luxury in return for agreeable work. The near future will show what is practical in the processes that recent scientific discoveries

give us a glimpse of. Let us limit ourselves at present to opening up the new path that consists in the study of the needs of man, and the means of satisfying them.

The only thing that may be wanting to the Revolution is the boldness of initiative.

Stupefied by our institutions in our youth, enslaved by the past in our mature age and till the grave, we hardly dare to think. If a new idea is mentioned, before venturing on an opinion of our own, we consult musty books a hundred years old to know what ancient masters thought on the subject.

It is not food that will fail, if boldness of thought and initiative are not wanting to the Revolution.

Of all the great days of the Revolution, the most beautiful, the greatest, was the one on which the federals came from all parts to till the soil of the Champ de Mars, to prepare it for the fetes.

That day France was united: animated by the new spirit, he foresaw the future in the working in common of the soil.

And it will again be by the working in common of the soil that enfranchised societies will find their unity and will obliterate hatred and oppression that had divided them.

Henceforth able to conceive solidarity,—that immense power that increases man's energy and creative forces a hundredfold—the new society will march to the conquest of the future with all the vigour of youth.

Leaving off producing for unknown buyers, and looking in its midst for needs and tastes to be satisfied, society will liberally assure the life and ease of each of its members, as well as the moral satisfaction that work gives when freely chosen and freely accomplished, and the joy of living without encroaching on the life of others.

Inspired by a new daring—thanks to the sentiment of solidarity—all will march together to the conquest of the high joys of knowledge and artistic creation.

A society thus inspired will fear neither dissensions within, nor enemies without. To the coalitions of the past it will oppose new harmony, the initiative of each and all, the daring which springs from the awakening of its genius.

Before such an irresistible force "conspiring kings" will be powerless. Nothing will remain for them but to bow before it, to harness themselves to the chariot of humanity, rolling towards new horizons, opened up by the Social Revolution.

Thanks to the cheapness of coal and an intelligent culture grapes from the North travel southwards, in a contrary direction to ordinary fruit. In May, English grapes and those of Jersey are sold at 1s. 8d. per lb. by gardeners, and yet this price, like that of 40s. thirty years ago, is only kept up by slack production.

In March, Belgium grapes are sold at from 6d. to 8d., while in October, grapes cultivated in immense quantities,—under glass, and with a little artificial heating in the environs of London—are sold at the same price as grapes bought by the pound in the vineyards of Switzerland and the Rhine, that is to say, for a few halfpence. They still cost two-thirds too much, by reason of the excessive rent of the soil, the cost of installation and heating, on which the gardener pays a formidable tribute to the manufacturer and middle-man. This being understood, we may say that it costs "next to nothing" to have delicious grapes under the latitude and misty London climate in autumn. In one of the suburbs, for instance, a wretched glass and plaster shelter nine feet ten inches long by six and a half feet wide, resting against our cottage, gives us about fifty pounds of grapes of an exquisite taste in October, for the past three years. The crop comes from a Hamburg vine-stalk, six years old. And the shelter is so bad that the rain comes through. At night the temperature is always that of outside. It is

evidently not heated, for that would be as useless as to heat the street! And the cares to be given are: pruning the vine half an hour a year, and bringing a wheelbarrowful of manure which is thrown over the stalk of the vine, planted in red clay outside the shelter.

On the other hand, if we estimate the particular care given to the vine on the borders of the Rhine or Lake Lemman, the terraces constructed stone upon stone on the slopes of the hills the transport of manure and also of earth to a height of two or three hundred feet, we come to the conclusion, that on the whole, the expenditure of work necessary to cultivate vines is more considerable in Switzerland or on the banks of the Rhine than it is under glass in London suburbs.

This may seem paradoxical, because it is generally believed that vines grow of themselves in the South of Europe, and that the vinegrower's work costs nothing. But gardeners and horticulturists, far from contradicting us, confirm our assertions. "The most advantageous culture in England is vine culture," says a practical gardener, editor of the English journal of horticulture. Prices speak eloquently for themselves, as we know.

Translating these facts into Communist language, we may assert that the man or woman who takes twenty hours a year from his leisure time to give some little care—very pleasant in the main—to two or three vine stalks, sheltered by simple glass under any European climate, will gather as many grapes as their family and friends can eat. And that applies not only to vines but to all fruit trees.

The commune that will put the processes of intensive culture into practice on a large scale, will have all possible vegetables indigenous or exotic, and all desirable fruits, without employing more than about ten hours a year per inhabitant.

In basing the maintenance of these 370 acres on the Jersey average, requiring the work of seven to eight men per two and a half acres under glass—which makes less than 24,000 hours of work a year—would need about 3,600,000 hours of work, year. A hundred competent gardeners could give five hours a day to this work, and the rest would be simply done by people who, without being gardeners by profession, would know how to use a spade, a watering-engine or a stove. This work would yield at least—we have seen it in a preceding chapter—all necessities and articles of luxury in the way of fruit and vegetables, for at least 75,000 or 100,000 people. Let us admit that among this number there are 36,000 adults, willing to work at the kitchen-garden. Each one would have to give a hundred hours a year distributed over the whole year. These hours of work would become hours of recreation spent among friends and children in beautiful gardens, more beautiful probably than those of the legendary Semiramis.(1)

This is the balance-sheet of the labour to be spent in order to be able to eat to satiety fruit which we are deprived of today and to have vegetables in abundance, now so scrupulously rationed out by the housewife when she has to reckon each half-penny which must go to enrich capitalists and vampire landowners.

Ah! If only humanity had the consciousness of what it can and if that consciousness only gave it the power to WILL!

If it only knew that cowardice of the spirit is the rock on which all revolutions have stranded until now.

Let us mention that when our assertions were published in England they did not meet with the slightest contradiction. They were confirmed and even exceeded by a practical cultivator editor of the "Journal of Horticulture". We are persuaded that French market-gardeners will also agree with us.

Consult la "Repartition metrique des impots," par A. Toubeau, 2 vols, published by Guillaumin, in 1880. (We do not in the least agree with Toubeau's conclusions; but it is a

real encyclopedia, indicating the sources, which prove what M. Ponce. Paris, 1869.—"Le Potager Gressé", Paris, 1885, can be obtained from the soil.)—"La Culture maraichère", by an excellent practical work.—"Physiologie et culture du ble" by Risler. Paris, 1881.—"Le ble, sa culture intensive et extensive," by Lecouteur, Paris, 1883—"La Cite Chinoise", by Eugene Simon.—"Le dictionnaire d'agriculture," de Barral (Hachette, editor).—"The Rothamstead experiments" by Wm. Fream, London 1888 (culture without manure,) etc. (The "Field" Office editor)—"Nineteenth Century", June, 1888, and Forum August, 1890.

In summing up the figures given on agriculture, figures proving that the inhabitants of the two departments of Seine and Seine et Oise can perfectly well live on their own territory by employing very little time annually to obtain food, we have:

Departments of Seine and Seine-et Oise:

Number of inhabitants in 1889.....	3,900,000.
Area in acres.....	1,507,800.
Average number of inhabitants per acre.....	2.6
Areas to be cultivated to feed the inhabitants (in acres).....	
Corn and cereals.....	494,200.
Natural and artificial meadows.....	493,900.
Vegetables and fruit from, 17,300 to.....	25,000.
Leaving a balance for houses, roads, parks, forests.....	494,200.
Quantity of annual work necessary to improve and cultivate the above surfaces (in five hour work-days).	
Corn (culture and crop).....	15,000,000.
Meadows, milk, rearing of cattle.....	10,000,000.
Market-gardening culture, high class fruit.....	33,000,000.
Extras.....	12,000,000.
Total	70,000,000.

If we suppose that half only of the able-bodied adults (men and women) are willing to work at agriculture, we see that 70 million work-days must be divided among 1,200,000 individuals, Which gives us fifty eight work days of five hours for each of these workers. With that the population of the two departments would have all necessary bread, meat, milk, vegetables and fruit, and articles of luxury besides. Today a workman spends for the necessary food of his family (generally less than what is necessary) at least a third of his three hundred work days a year, about 1000 hours be it, instead of 290. That is, he thus gives about 700 hours too much to fatten the idle and the would be administrators, because he does not produce his own food, but buys it of middlemen, who in their turn buy it of peasants who exhaust themselves by working with bad tools, because robbed by the landowners and the state, they cannot procure better ones.

War is the harvest to governments, however ruinous it may be to a nation. It serves to keep up deceitful expectations which prevent people from looking into the abuses and defects of governments. It is that which amuses and cheats the multitude.—THOMAS PAINE.

If poverty is the mother of crime want of sense is the father.—BRUGER.

Whoever talks to me of God, has designs upon my liberty or my purse.—PROUDHON.

The proper study of a wise man is not how to die, but how to live.—SPINOZA.

Philosophy, wisdom, and liberty, support each other: he who will not reason is a bigot, he who dares not reason is a slave, and he who cannot is a fool.—THE FIREBRAND.

What Egyptian bondage, do you suppose, was ever so cruel as a modern English iron forge, with its steam hammers? What Egyptian worship of garlic or crocodile ever so damnable as modern English worship of money?—JOHN RUSKIN.

Liberty Pamphlets.

PRICE ONE PENNY EACH.

Anarchist Communism in its Relation to State Socialism. By AGNES HENRY.

Definition of Crime. By A. HAMON.

Common-Sense Country.

By L. S. BEVINGTON.

Socialism in Danger. Part I.

By E. DOMELA NIEUWENHUIS. Translated by R. Grierson.

Socialism in Danger. Part II.

By E. DOMELA NIEUWENHUIS. Translated by R. Grierson.

Jones' Boy:

Dialogues on Social Questions between an "Enfant Terrible" and his Father. By "SPOKESHAVE."

Liberty Lyrics.

By L. S. BEVINGTON.

The Ideal and Youth.

By ELISÉE RECLUS.

An Anarchist on Anarchy.

By ELISÉE RECLUS.

In Defence of Emma Goldman and the Right of Expropriation.

By VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE.

A Plea for Anarchist-Communism. By H. H. DUNCAN, of Aberdeen.

This Essay contains simply the thoughts of a working man on the all-important subject of the poverty and degradation endured by the working class, and the remedy for that poverty and degradation.

The Why I Ams: FIRST SERIES.

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.

The Why I Ams: SECOND SERIES.

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

IN THE PRESS.

Anarchy. By ELISÉE RECLUS.

Agriculture. By PETER KROPOTKIN. Translated from the French by Miss ROCHE.

Parliamentary Politics in the Socialist Movement. By ERICO MALATESTA.

The Why I Ams: (Third Series):

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

CABINET PORTRAITS

LOUISE MICHEL, ELISE RECLUS,
L. S. BEVINGTON, BAKOUNINE,

AND OTHERS,

Produced in the very best style of the Art Photographic,
Free by Post, One Shilling each,

May be obtained on written application to Editor,
Carnagnot House, Hammersmith, W.

Liberty Bookshelf.

Any of the following Publications may be obtained by sending the amount in stamps, or by postal order, to the Editor, Carnagnot House, Hammersmith, W.

By P. KROPOTKIN.

AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG,

Translated from the French. 1d.

ANARCHIST MORALITY. 1d.

THE COMMUNE OF PARIS. 1d.

THE PLACE OF ANARCHISM IN SOCIALISTIC EVOLUTION. 1d.

REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT. 1d.

REVOLUTIONARY STUDIES. 2d.

By ERICO MALATESTA.

A TALK ABOUT ANARCHIST COMMUNISM BETWEEN TWO WORKERS.

Price 1d.

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

ANARCHY. 1d.

By WILLIAM MORRIS.

USEFUL WORK V. USELESS TOIL. 1d.

THE TABLES TURNED: or NUPKINS AWAKENED. 4d.

TRUE AND FALSE SOCIETY. 1d.

MONOPOLY: or, HOW LABOUR IS ROBBED

Price 1d.

By D. NICOLL.

ANARCHY AT THE BAR. 1d.

THE WALSALL ANARCHISTS. 1d.

THE CHICAGO MARTYRS: Their Speeches in Court.

With an Appendix by J. P. Altgeld, Governor of Illinois.
Price 6d.

ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. 1d.

Revolution: its Necessity and its Justification.

By SAMUEL H. GORDON. 3d., free by post.

Comrades desiring to have a small book, or pamphlet, printed and published, and wishing to know the cost, should write to the Editor of "Liberty."