

LIBERTY



• CONTENTS •

Between Ourselves.
The True Direction of Moral Progress.
Paris Commune Commemorations
Patriotism and War.
Communes: Past and Future.
Anarchist Prisoners in France and Italy.
One Socialist Party.
The Walsall Anarchists: Amnesty Agitation.

Vol. III., No. 4.

April, 1896

ONE PENNY.

W. M. ROWE

THE TRUE DIRECTION OF MORAL PROGRESS.

Broadly stated, the functional basis of morals appears to be the perpetuation of human development. This development presents itself under two aspects: (1) The evolution of society as a whole; (2) The evolution of the social or super-personal impulses, emotions, and tendencies in individuals. "Virtue", functionally considered, amounts to the maintenance of humanity's fitness for survival, so far as this maintenance may be secured by the socialisation of individuals through the medium of their own conduct. That character is "moral" which (whatever the formulated principle recognised by its owner) issues in conduct conducive to the well-being, not necessarily of the personal agent, but of his kind: which keeps man at the head of things, and elevates his headship. That motive is "moral" which implies a desire to exhibit such conduct, so far as the owner knows how. Just in proportion as the desires and purposes of the individual lead him to conform to social requirements and to merge self, the person, in self the social unit, can he obtain a virtual mastery over his conditions. Happiness consists in such mastery; rectitude in the conformity which leads to it.

If the function of morals be thus to subserve the interests of the community, those motives and principles must be most moral which concern themselves most closely with the welfare of the community, and which have least regard to considerations indifferent to that welfare. The most moral belief, again, must be that which tends to the institution of such social motives and principles; and which, in its indirect effect on the emotions of its followers, brings his will increasingly under their power.

A high degree of enlightenment and prosperity, or swift progress towards it, commonly accompanies the high estimation of such principles as self-government, sympathy, and equity. The latter especially is the crowning virtue of civilisation. From first to last moral advance appears to have consisted under varying guises in the slow surmounting, not of individual distinctions, but of personal considerations; in the gradual lessening of the weight of special interests; whether egoistic or altruistic, in the balance of morally accredited motives, and in increasing the preponderance of what are virtually race-instincts as a compelling agency in the conscious lives of individuals. In states preeminently civilised we find teachers, governments, and even public opinion busy, more or less consciously and more or less successfully, with the inculcation of ends and the institution of restrictions bearing directly on the products of individual character and conduct, as affecting the vital resources, not of the agent *per se*, but of the community; the interests of the agent being included only in proportion to his capability of development in social conditions.

Society is no impersonal structure; neither as regards the requirements of its development is it a merely magnified person; but it is a great super-personal organism, into which the self-hood of every one of its units enters, not merely as a modifying influence or a supplementary end, but as an essential ingredient. The requirements of society include, while transcending, the requirements of the individual, and, when supplied, yield what is felt as an improved quality of happiness to each individual who lives in practical recognition of his share in a larger life than his own.

Men are slow to learn that even their own glory must play second fiddle to the wants of a solidifying community, although it is a happy thing for themselves and for the community when at last they do learn it. Life is at last simplified and beautified, and many faults of character with their attendant miseries vanish spontaneously when the individual learns to (find himself, and) content himself in what Emerson calls "his social and delegated quality"—when he sees that whatever "respects the individual is temporary and prospective, like the individual, who is ascending out of his limits into a catholic existence."

L. S. BEVINGTON.

[The above article was the last received from our Comrade, and was sent us shortly before her death.]

ANARCHIST PRISONERS IN FRANCE AND ITALY.

The use of sending Socialists into parliament is illustrated by the present political situation of France, where the Socialist deputies uphold the so-called Radical ministry of M. Bourgeois, who, of course, whilst on other occasions reeking with Socialist phraseology, has just now paid a visit of homage to the brother of the Russian autocrat, and handed in his credentials of political "respectability" in the form of the expulsion of our Comrade Kropotkin from France. He may be quite sure that this will not shake the support he is getting from the so-called Socialist deputies, and he could also easily have shown to the representative of the Tsar that France is rivalling in her treatment of political prisoners in Cayenne with the finest exploits of Russian despotism in the fortress prisons of Russia and Poland and the mines in Siberia.

Documents which prove this again, are published in Pouget's "La Sociale", of March 8. A Cyvoet, in 1883, the editor of an Anarchist paper of Lyons, was tried there in 1884 for having written an article, published a short time before a bomb explosion, and was—although no connection between his article and his person and the explosion could be proved—sentenced to death, graced to transportation for life, and is still at New Caledonia, whilst every ministry, including the present semi-Socialist cabinet, refuse to have his case re-examined!

Another example. A comrade at Cayenne was, ten months ago, condemned to death, but no ministry has up to now decided on the day for his execution. French convicts are executed without previous notice being given them—they are taken from their rooms in the early morning and hurried to the guillotine. Our Comrade has been waiting for, and expecting, that early call every morning for the past ten months. His name is Lorion: and since his fate is typical of the hardships of an Anarchist propagandist we will tell shortly the chief incidents of his life.

When still a boy, he used to address Anarchist meetings, and the police then put him away in a reformatory for several years. Having thus experienced what the fraternal care of the State does for the people, chiefly for those who dare to think, he became at last free, and began the life of a "trimardeur," an Anarchist on the tramp, who spreads our ideas here and there, wherever he goes. He was a fine speaker, and unmasked the political selfseekers in the ranks of electioneering Socialists, chiefly at Lille, where Marxism had some adherents. When he was obliged to leave the town—being prosecuted for a speech he had made, these Marxian Socialists, knowing that he could not show himself in the town, published that he was a spy. Upon this, however, he returned from Havre where he had taken refuge, called a public meeting to expose his calumniators, and when the police arrested him he fired at them; for this he was sentenced to ten years' transportation. This happened in 1890, and is recorded, together with his speech when on trial, in the "Revolte" of Nov. 15, '90, and Jan. 3, '91.

When, in 1894, the Anarchist convicts at Cayenne were goaded into revolt, in order to decimate or if possible murder them wholesale (see *LIBERTY* of April 1895), Lorion was picked out as one who should pay with his life for being undaunted in mind and speech by four years of suffering in a French prison hell.

What happens in France, it is said, is still to some degree under the control of public opinion (though we see precious little of it!); but once a political convict enters the ship that transports him to Cayenne, he is at the mercy of the guards—human beasts, who are practically free to shoot whom they dislike, their pretext always being an alleged act of rebellion or resistance. Thus, for instance, a convict who is dying is brought by his comrades to the hospital, where a guard tells them to place him upon the bare floor. On one of the dying man's friends remarking that he ought at any rate to be placed on a bed, the guard discharged his revolver at the speaker, killing him on the spot, saying "There, you beast, that will teach you to hold your tongue." This guard was rewarded in the same way in which the German Emperor rewards his soldiers (sentries) who manage to kill men or children in public—he was promoted.

Of Lorion his defender wrote (in a letter to Lorion's father, which is published in full in "La Sociale"): "Your son is innocent, a hundred times innocent; the judges themselves, who found him guilty by a simply majority of their votes, know it, but they wanted to repress the doctrines which he formerly ardently defended," etc. Well, the same men who in 1890 provoked his impulsive act by their calumnies, in 1896 uphold the ministry who deal out a ten months' daily expectation of death to one who dared to tell the truth to the people. To this degree of infamy political action of the electioneering type necessarily reduces its upholders; they become solidly with a government, labelled Progressive, or Radical, or Socialist—this government like every other government can only act by crimes or blunders; hence these only can be the outcome of governmental Socialism in any case.

Another example is just to hand from Italy. There was a time when Mr. Gladstone described the Neapolitan prisons. Since then Italy is supposed to have been liberated. Yet today hundreds upon hundreds of our comrades are put away on islands, or in out-of-the-way places, because no shred of evidence exists against them which could enable the government to have them sentenced to prison. You are an Anarchist, but have done nothing against the law; hence—not, you are free—but, you will be transported to some barren island, away from your family, where you have to live on sixpence a day, under the thumb of guards and gendarmes. This is the way the Italian government argues and acts, until some slight attempt at rebellion gives them the welcome opportunity to shoot innocent and brave men down like dogs.

This was done at St. Nicolo de Tremiti, on March 1st. A number of comrades walked about singing, their only pastime, when the gendarmes interfered with them, provoked them by

arbitrary orders, and then fired volleys of shot among them. One comrade, Arganti, was killed; ten others were grievously injured. (See "Les Temps Nouveaux" of March 14.)

When one set of ministers becomes too disreputable, another set is placed in office and the gulling of the public goes on as before. This has just happened in Italy; after Crispi comes Rudini. He has proclaimed an amnesty for a part of those imprisoned, for the events of Massa-Carrara and Sicily, but nothing is heard of alleviating the horrors of the "domicilio coatto" just described, or of setting free the imprisoned Anarchists who, like Schicchi, Galleani, and many others, linger away their lives in prison year after year.

All of which should induce us to double our efforts to spread our ideas.

Y. Z.

One Socialist Party.

To the Editor.

That there is a wish and cry arising from many parts of England and Scotland for "one Socialist party" no one can deny; therefore I think all comrades should consider carefully all proposals having that object in view.

I should like to offer a suggestion. Would it not be possible for Socialists of all kinds in the various districts to meet together, say at the meeting place of the local Socialist organisation. If they were really desirous of doing something for the cause, they would probably bear in mind that the blessed word "methods" is not the only thing in the minds of ordinary people when they are considering Socialism. Failing to get union in this way, could not the dissentients form themselves into a society, simply giving a pledge to work for Socialism. Then when the indoor and open air propaganda was started, the different comrades could display their powers of persuasion on the same platform, and such actions might prove the unity of Socialists in a way most convincing, and ultimately tend to promote a juster and happier England.

This would be forming another Socialist party, some will say, and a wild and impracticable one. Perhaps so: only in this case, I should have hopes that comrades would be less inclined to endeavour to instruct each other in a dogmatic manner. In the end there might be a union of Socialists, the individual members of which would not be continually condemning each other and disagreeing about elections, local matters, etc.

The great object to be kept in view is the destruction of capitalism, and all its hideous surroundings—its dire robbery of the workers. What we want to achieve is the triumph of an equal and socialistic communism.

Of course the need for what I have suggested would be removed if the existing Socialist and Anarchist bodies should, by delegates sent to a conference on the subject, decide to form themselves into a broadly based and all embracing organisation under the title of, say the Socialist Union. This, by the way, is I believe the name under which our Dutch friends are carrying on their warfare, which is largely non-political in its aims.

A last word. We of the Independent Labour Party can do something towards this object at once. We can offer our platforms freely to our Anarchist comrades, and they might return the compliment.

ROLF CLAYTON.

"THE LABOUR ANNUAL FOR 1896," has for some time been waiting at our hands the commendation it so well deserves. Had opportunity offered, we should some two months ago have congratulated Mr. Edwards on his second volume—one of the most useful compilations ever placed within the reach of the workers. We do not say the Annual contains everything we should like to see in it. Mr. Edwards does not claim that the work is as complete as he desired to make it. That he has gone so far in this direction, and has on the whole done his work so well, deserves to be recognised heartily and universally. The Annual should find a place in the reading-room of every club and institution in the kingdom, and also on the bookshelves of every workman whose desire is to be the owner of first-class tools—literary and otherwise. It appears there are a few copies of the first issue still in the hands of the publisher. This is a hint for those who wish to pick up a good thing.

THE WALSALL ANARCHISTS.

THE AMNESTY AGITATION.

The Home Secretary (Sir William White Ridley) having rejected petitions, on behalf of the Walsall Anarchists, from many towns in England, (including one from Walsall, signed by stipendiary magistrates and J.P.'s), the Committee have resolved upon carrying on a vigorous agitation. It will be seen by an announcement on the last page of this issue that a meeting will be held at South Place Institute, Finsbury, on the 22nd inst., at which a number of well known speakers have promised to be present. We take this opportunity of expressing the hope that all London Anarchists will attend, and take with them as many as possible of their friends who are not Anarchists.

The agitation has—owing to the activity of the Walsall Committee, and its hon. sec. Comrade Nicoll—been carried on energetically in the provinces, large meetings having during the past two months been held at Bradford, Rochdale, Burnley, Todmorden, Padiham, Nelson, and Derby. Everywhere there has been a genuine display of enthusiasm in support of the amnesty movement, and much sympathy expressed on behalf of the prisoners.

At a meeting held in Sheffield, on the 13th ult., under the auspices of the Trades Council, (Councillor Charles Hobson presiding), the following resolution was moved by Comrade Moorhouse: "That in the opinion of this Council the time has arrived when a fresh and careful inquiry should be made by the Home Secretary into the case of the three men—Charles, Caines, and Battola—convicted at Stafford Assizes on the 4th of April, 1892, under the Explosive Substances Act, and sentenced by Justice Hawkins to ten years' penal servitude for being in possession of explosive substances for an unlawful object, with a view to the remission or mitigation of the sentence." Comrade Moorhouse pointed out the cruelty of the sentences, which even "The Times" admitted were severe. The men had been led into conspiracy by an agent of the police under a pretext that the castings were for Russia. They had suffered four years of a sentence that the judge described as "exemplary", and Michael Davitt as "barbarous".—The resolution was duly seconded Mr. Howard (Silversmiths), supported by Councillor Hobson, J.P., Mr. Meason (Bookbinders), and Mr. Davidson, Vice-President of the Council, and was carried unanimously.

Michael Davitt, when consenting to sign a petition, wrote to Comrade Nicoll as follows: "I willingly sign the petition, and do so on the ground of the barbarous sentences inflicted on men who would have been adequately punished by six months' imprisonment."

THE PARIS COMMUNE.

LONDON ANARCHISTS' COMMEMORATION MEETING

A Public Meeting, arranged by London Anarchists, in commemoration of the Paris Commune, was held on the 19th ult. The hall of the Working Men's Club and Union, Clerkenwell Road, was filled with an enthusiastic audience, and the proceedings from beginning to end were of an exceedingly satisfactory and encouraging nature—from the Anarchist as well as from some other points of view.

The proceedings were commenced by

Comrade Quinn, who, in the the course of an effective speech, asked the question, What led to the declaration of the Commune? History (he said) answered by asserting that it was a refusal to permit State interference, it was an Anarchistic revolt against the powers of government. For five months Paris had moaned through famine, had seen her powers for defence turned aside, and her welfare sacrificed by the treachery of the wretches and the mercenary scoundrels she had been put in subjection to. Paris capitulated to the Prussians, who entered the city on February 28, 1871. Paris, however, re-

mained armed. It was recognised that this was a danger to governmentalism. Thiers, the head of the French Government, resolved to disarm the inhabitants of the cannon which they had themselves bought or made, and for which they were by no means indebted to the State. Thiers called upon them to give up this property to the State—he desired to nationalise it. But the Parisians refused to surrender their cannon. That led to the declaration, the formation of the Commune. That was a point in the history of the Commune which was often conveniently lost sight of by the authoritarian Socialist, who could always be relied on to show an utter want of logic and consistency in word and action. The nationalists year after year spoke highly of the Communards who fought and died in opposition to State interference with their cannon; as legal Socialists they actually went out of their way to commemorate an "illegal" Commune; although worshippers of constitutionalism they glorified an unconstitutional event; professing to be respectable props of the State they extolled to the skies—and rightly—a seditious insurrection of the so-called ragtag and bobtail of Paris! To Anarchists, the fact that the Commune was illegal was its brightest crown of glory—that it was unconstitutional was its diadem of immortality. The history of the Commune was a short one, and as sad as it was short. It was however enriched by bright and shining examples of self-sacrifice and martyrdom for principle. It was but natural that Anarchists should regret the failure of the Commune, but on the other hand they had much to remember with gladness in the nobility of the men and women of the Commune, whom no amount of mere military reverses could ever possibly disgrace. It was but natural that Anarchists should mourn a time of so much death and agony, but they had much also to rejoice over in the sublimity of purpose manifested by the Paris Communists, those pioneers of freedom, whose actions exalted them far above the mere whirl and storm of the revolutionary period in which they lived. People who made half revolutions dug their own graves, and left behind them only a memory of regret; but in the case of the Paris Communists the regret was tempered with a feeling of intense satisfaction in their luminous enthusiasm, which still lights the way to progress, and in their glorious attempt to realise the loftier aspirations of an oppressed people. There were many lessons to be learnt from the Commune. The Communards, when they knew they would fail, were still prepared to remain steadfast to their principles, and to die for them if necessary. Hard necessity called upon them to lay down their lives, and they answered the call with courage and cheerfulness. They were men who might well be imitated. They were not filled with an unsteady rage, but with a marvellous resolution; they were not men of uncalculating rashness, but men of cool and collected courage. They had the qualities necessary to ensure success in a revolutionary struggle. They were not men to be led by the ballot, but men of bold thought and bolder action. He (the speaker) hoped that remembrance of the Commune would encourage Anarchists to deeds as great and as undying, and lead them to be prepared for the time which might be coming more quickly than many anticipated, and which might call upon "some to live and some to die."

Comrade Kitz spoke in roughly sarcastic but thoroughly deserved censorious terms of the "jingoism" applauded at the music halls. He said England's wars were now of a most petty character, and instigated by the wretched commercialism that thought more of finding a market for its shoddy goods than of paying its workhands a proper wage. Soldiers became patriots at a bob a-day, and were rewarded with sawdust glory. That was the sort of thing the politicians and the officials were deducing the public with, and all they showed as a result was the occasional cruel massacre of men, women, and children, the destruction of their homes, and the annexation of their lands.

Comrade Presbery read a letter from Peter Kropotkin, excusing his non-attendance at the meeting on the ground of ill health, but trusting that the proceeding would be a marked success. Comrade Presbery said the fall of the Commune might be described as a slaughter through a slaughter. The German army had inflicted a terrible massacre upon the French, and, the lust for blood not having run its course, the French workers had been slaughtered. The defeat of the French had resulted in the entry into Paris of the German troops. To a high-spirited people like the French such

humiliation was insufferable. The defeat of their brothers in battle, the taking possession of their city—together with other similar events, had given birth to desperation, to disgust with the ruling powers, and—to the Commune. The Commune had not been defeated—it had been crushed. It had sought only to live; it had not been aggressive; its very lack of the spirit of revenge had constituted one of its features of greatness. It had displayed the Anarchistic spirit of resistance, as against the revenge exercised by governments. Anarchists preached rebellion, resistance, but not revenge. Revolutions were not accomplished by pitched battles of violence; they came about slowly with the change of opinions, and with the growth of knowledge. The next Commune would not be confined to one city—it would be a world-wide Commune. The only real security for its permanent existence would be the fact that it was necessary to the realisation of the best social theories. Firstly there would have to be a desire—in other words, sincerity; secondly, understanding; and thirdly, determination, from which action would become inevitable. That was the lesson all peoples were learning, consciously or unconsciously, and from which would spring the realisation of that life for which the French Communists fought and fell, and on behalf of which Anarchists and others were now striving.

Mrs. Kranc (of Canning Town) appeared next, and made a most effective speech, emphasizing the value of the actions of the Communards from a woman's point of view, and urging her hearers to give the principles of Anarchism careful study.

William Banham said that Anarchists defended the men and women of 1871 because they fully understood and fully sympathised with their aims and aspirations. The average man, who did not know how the Communists fought, struggled, and died for economic freedom, could not be expected to have much sympathy with them in their heroic revolt against the system which had produced such inhuman creatures as Thiers and his supporters. The Commune had failed only because the people—after relying on their own initiative and their own spontaneous actions in inaugurating the Commune—created a government, which acted, as all governments do and from their very nature must do, against the popular initiative. Like other governments, it began by protecting property, and for that reason alone it might be claimed that the operation of the principle of authority was the most direct cause of the failure of the Commune. The government of the Commune had been formed on a really democratic basis—as much so as it was possible for any government to be; all the popular leaders were elected; but it was only too well known now how they wasted their time in personal decorations. Such facts ought to form a good lesson for State Socialists, who put so much faith in political action and governmental regulation. Although Anarchists pointed out the mistakes of the Paris Communists, they did not—they could not blame them. What Anarchists could and would do would be to recognise those mistakes, and do their best to avoid a repetition of them; and thus help on the coming Social Revolution, and inaugurate the successful Commune—the Anarchist Commune. He (the speaker) asked each and of those present to take an active part in Anarchistic propaganda. The present state of public affairs offered many excellent opportunities to the revolutionary party. If governments continued their insane and cruel war policy a chance would be afforded for striking a blow at the capitalist system, which if properly aimed—with the necessary audacity and determination, would have good results, and show to the world that Anarchists could work for as well as earnestly desire the speedy deposition of the grossest form of monopoly.

John Turner having spoken,

James Tochatti said, that night the principle of the right to rebel had been dwelt upon and emphasized, and the oft repeated accusation that the Communards were monsters of iniquity, or madmen with Utopian ideas incapable of realisation, had been disproved. The perfect order that had existed during the Commune had been proved, and also the ability of working men to manage their own affairs. Their selection of the comrade to fill the office of postmaster-general was a case in point, for he had performed the duties in such a way as to compel admiration even from his enemies. That blood was

spilt was no fault of the Communards; they were justified in fighting for the right to order their own life. As Parisians they were fighting for the right to manage Paris—much as the County Council might manage London; and they fought with a heroism, which even men like Archibald Forbes had to admit. The accusation of brutality and wanton slaughter might with more truth be hurled at the Versailles troops, for history recorded them as driving the Communards step by step with inhuman slaughter to the Pere la Chaise, where the wounded, the dying, and the dead were thrown into a large hole, and hours afterwards the earth with which they were covered could be seen moving. Well might it be said that Paris had ever been the battle ground of sentiment, and that her sons had fought and died for liberty. In France the cry was "Vive la Commune," and in the hearts of Englishmen that cry would be re-echoed, for they must all know full well that the time was coming when they also might have to fight for the realisation of their ideas.

Louise Michel, whose appearance was greeted with most hearty cheers, said they were on that occasion commemorating the twenty sixth anniversary of March 18, '71. Those who ignored the date might, however, still fancy themselves under the Empire, with its guillotine, its murders in Cayenne and in Madagascar, and its capitalism, which latter was more crushing than ever. The only difference between the present and the past was, that one tyrant had been replaced by many. Nevertheless the work of spreading ideas had progressed. The governments of Europe could no longer slaughter in their own immediate territories—they had been driven to carry on their butcheries in Africa and in Asia. The most down-trodden and most miserably governed of all peoples—the Latin race, would be the first to rise in rebellion, or if they failed to do so they would be crushed out of existence. She therefore hailed the social revolutions now in progress in France, Italy, and Spain. The deeds of tyrants sowed the seeds of revolt. In 1871 Bonaparte plunged his country into war in order to strengthen his tottering authority by victory, or, in case of defeat, hoping that his throne would be propped up by the victors. France, indignant, rose in her shame, and the Commune was originated. At that time Internationalists had dreamed of universal peace. Now they were dreaming, not only of peace but of liberty—of men being both conscious and free, acting justly towards one another, without fear of punishment or hope of reward. Did they think that science, discoveries, everything that makes humanity powerful and intelligent, were for the few only? Certainly not. The only true anniversary of the Commune would be when all nations would be free, and would reap the benefits of science. Nevertheless, they could celebrate March the 18th as the rising sun of liberty; they could celebrate those bloody days in May, for the victims on that occasion died gladly for liberty's sake. In conclusion, she would say, Long live the time when men should be free, and the day when all would be happy, intelligent, and good.

R. Rucker made (in German) a few remarks, and E. Leggatt added some terse comments. The proceedings were then closed.

HENRY SKYMOOR will deliver an address at the Brotherhood Church, Tamworth Road, Croydon, on Sunday, the 19th inst., at 3 p.m., on "Free Currency." Discussion invited.

GLASGOW.—On the 10th of May, a debate between H. H. Duncan, of Aberdeen, and G. Bruce Glasier, on "Will representative government be necessary under Socialism", will take place in the Albion Hall. Kier Hardie will preside. This should be an intellectual treat for Glasgow comrades.

FREE SPEECH IN DANGER.—London comrades, and lovers of fairplay generally, are asked to rally in strong force at Deptford Broadway every Sunday, at 7 p.m. sharp, to help maintain order at the meetings, and assist the local comrades in upholding the liberty of speech, now endangered by a gang of christian rowdies, who, unable to reason, resort to such cowardly tricks as kicking, blackguardism, insult, and disturbance. Now then, comrades, rally in large numbers, and form a strong guard round the platform.

"LIBERTY" is a journal of Anarchist-Communism; but articles on all phases of the Revolutionary movement will be freely admitted, provided they are worded in suitable language. No contributions should exceed one column in length. The writer over whose signature the article appears is alone responsible for the opinions expressed, and the Editor in all matters reserves to himself the fullest right to reject any article.

All Communications—including orders for Papers or Pamphlets—should be addressed to The Editor, Carmagnole House, Beadon Road, Hammersmith, 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, APRIL, 1896.

BETWEEN OURSELVES.

During a lecture on "Women and Socialism," recently given by Herbert Burrows, he claimed that if women had equal voting power with men they would be in a position to say who should be the father of their children, and also that they would not then be compelled—as they are today—to submit to the embraces of husbands whom they despise. The lecturer went on to state that, as in his opinion pure Communistic-Anarchism was not likely to come into existence for many centuries, it would be as well if, in the immediate future, it were permissible for men and women to enter into marriage agreements which should simply require recognition by the authority for the time being, and which should include provisions for the maintenance of the children that could be strictly enforced. In all this, as will be noticed, Burrows scarcely got within sight of real liberty: his mind, and consequently his expressions, were environed with authoritarianism and the necessity for acknowledging the existence of "property, property." He was oblivious of the fact that today all good intentions are wrecked by legislation, and his support of the principle of continually relying on written law was as pernicious as could well be. Why not trust to the fullest liberty of action, and rely on the natural instincts of men and women as regards their children? But, no: Comrade Burrows is still hampered with the idea that human nature can be made "good" only by Acts of Parliament.

In commenting on a poem, entitled "The Factory Girl's Last Day," our contemporary *Justice* says "it will serve to remind them (Lancashire comrades) of what unrestricted capitalism is capable, and of the condition of things the respectable Anarchists of the Liberty and Property Defence League type would like to see re-established." Has our contemporary made a discovery by which those of Lontgen and Nansen are put completely in the shade? An "Anarchist of the L. and P. D. L. type"! We cannot even imagine the existence of such an abortion. Of course our Social Democratic friend, owing to nervous depression caused by the rapid spread of Anarchist ideas, may be suffering from "illusions," or he may be in the society of innumerable "spooks," but that he has

any knowledge of an Anarchist of the type he mentions is not possible.

At a recent lecture at Fulham, given under the auspices of the I. L. P. it was gratifying to observe—during the discussion that followed—that the belief in coercion as a necessary factor in Socialism was losing strength even amongst Democratic Socialists. The belief dies hard, as do all such antiquated superstitions. Under free Socialism it is however bound to disappear. And so also must that somewhat amusing but pertinacious and ubiquitous opponent of Anarchism, who fails to see in Anarchist-Communism anything but a contradiction and an impossibility. This individual never gets beyond a parrot-like reiteration of statements which in his ignorance he thinks are arguments. His patient listeners are becoming fewer day by day.

Let all comrades turn up in good force at South Place Institute, on Wednesday, April 22nd., to enter a protest against the continual imprisonment of the Walsall victims of Scotland Yard machinations. The recent decision of the Home Secretary upon the case only strengthens the Anarchist contention that all officials are necessarily corrupt, however they may try to disguise the fact by their plausible pretences. If the police get up an Anarchist plot, as they did in this case, at the rate-payers' expense, a Home Secretary is bound to whitewash the scoundrels; and perpetuate their dastardly work. Government could not hold together for very long unless this were so. All government officials are hand in glove by the necessities of their existence; like maggots on a dust-heap, they only thrive on corruption.

From the ordinary political point of view, it is preposterous that a person like Sir Matthew White Ridley should occupy the position of Home Secretary. We are not in love with lawyers, but if there is one office more than another which is pre-eminently a legal one, it is that of Home Secretary. The present Home Secretary is only an amateur lawyer, but he draws the pay—extorted from the taxpayers—of a man who understands his business.

His recent decision in the Maybrick case—a case similar to the Walsall one, in that the verdict was only secured by evidence manufactured by the police—will make his name stink in the nostrils of a growing section of the public, who know that this unfortunate woman is only detained in order to cover up the corruption of the police, which would surely be exposed the moment she became free. The Home Secretary must feel pretty small in the face of the Lord Chief Justice's recent public expression that "the prisoner ought to be released."

It is high time that some one started a Committee of Public Safety, to protect innocent people

against the outrages of the police, and their fatherly protector the Home Secretary. Up to the commencement of the present reign, the Privy Council was the only court of criminal appeal, and, except for political offences, was really one of the best arrangements known in the administration of justice in criminal cases; we mean, of course, taking the present anomalous system as we find it. The Sovereign was the president of this court; but in consequence of the disgusting cases which occasionally came before the court for consideration, it was considered that an Act should be passed exempting the Queen from attending the Council in person, and delegating her authority to the person of the Home Secretary. Such an Act was passed; since which time there has been a continual encroachment of irresponsible authority by successive Home Secretaries, and now we have the fact staring us in the face, in spite of all the twaddle about our free institutions, that the liberties and lives of every one of us are virtually in the hands of one man, and that man such an one as the Home Secretary.

A so-called "Liberal" campaign has been commenced in the Home counties, and at one of the meetings a leading speaker said, "Property had rights, and those rights must be preserved; but the rights of humanity ought to receive due consideration." Please mark the nice distinction as to the treatment of humanity's rights and the rights of property! The latter "must" be preserved; the former "ought" to be considered. The old idea, the old principle—Property first, Humanity anywhere. This is the Liberalism which is held up as the panacea for humanity's sufferings and wrongs, as the only weapon the "advanced politicians" of this age of christianity and civilisation can forge for the destruction of humanity's fetters.

Another speaker said "Liberalism was not an abstract gospel: it was a spirit that recognised that there were many things to do—that men had rights and that they had duties." If this is a sample of Liberal gospel, it is like some other gospels—of a very "mixed" character. "At present (further said the same speaker) the power of the purse was successfully contending against the power of the people." Just so: truth to the very letters! But who helps most actively to make the power of the purse "successful"? Why, the mealy-mouthed politician, who not only preaches but acts up to the principle of "Property has rights which must be preserved." Anarchism says, Property has no rights, and that its claims in this respect must be trampled under foot and abolished. Is not this "handwriting on the wall" plain enough for even the dullest of Liberal politicians to read, or must it be written in "blood red" characters?

The more information obtained as to the real state of affairs in the Transvaal, the more reason there appears to be for utterly repudiating and con-

demning the actions of those "pioneers of civilisation"—the capitalists. A Mr. Leonard (Chairman of the National Union of the Transvaal) is very busy just now giving his version of affairs, and he claims to speak as "one having authority"; and if we may use a slang phrase he certainly appears to be "in the know". His contention is that, but for English capitalists, gold to the amount of eight millions a year would never have been got out of the Transvaal mines. The Boers (he says) are pastoral men, and "know not the wants of civilisation". These ignoramuses however have the audacity to claim some three millions of this plunder, and they not only claim it—they get it.

Hence the rumpus! Hence the Outlanders', the capitalists', cry for justice, for political rights, for civic equality, and so forth. The capitalists consider they are "oppressed", and "defrauded of the results of their labours". We smile. For really the capitalist, and especially the "oppressed" capitalist, can shout when his corns are trodden on. We smile again, but somewhat bitterly, because we remember the callous expression of the capitalist when he treads on and crushes those beneath him. The capitalist tells the "oppressed" workman to take what is doled out to him as the result of his labour, or to "go and starve". But when the Boer says much the same thing in Dutch to the capitalist the latter whines and cries like a whipped cur.

And again we laugh—this time heartily, because the British capitalists, who have squatted in the Transvaal with the intention of plundering the land of its hidden store (which for all the real good it will bring had better remain buried), object to be dominated by "a group of financiers situated partly in Amsterdam and partly in Germany," who "control the public works in the Transvaal and take a share in the profits"—so says Mr. Leonard. Could anything be more atrocious—more unjustifiable? A mere "group of financiers" miles and miles away from the mines, clutching a portion of the results of the efforts of the "oppressed" capitalists, and without so much as saying "By your leave, gentlemen"! Is it possible that anything so cruel, so outrageous can exist anywhere else under the sun? In the face of facts like these, who can wonder at the cry of "Jameson to the rescue"? Who can be surprised at Soudan expeditions, at the hurried equipment of war vessels, at the encouragement given to "Jingoism"? Property, even if stolen, "must" be preserved—for the thieves.

The leading performers on the political stage—Salisbury and Co.—have produced a cunningly arranged show in the new "Education Bill." This measure, if it becomes law, will create a new authority—a local representative of the Education Department, which is "to hold the purse strings;

and in the long run the holder of the purse strings is bound to get a good deal of control". So says a preliminary puff of the new Bill. We do not, however, in a copy of the Bill itself find anything to warrant this puff. It is true there is a proposal to give County Councils some authority for assisting in the management and control of schools, but that authority will be limited and always exercised under the supervision of the central Education Department. The present deadly influence of the priest and the bigot will not be lessened or weakened in any way. In short the bill does not really advance matters one single step towards freedom and unsectarianism in education, and if it becomes an Act of Parliament it will simply become one more obstacle on the road to freedom.

Thus saith *Free Life*:

Before the late disturbances, the English at Johannesburg had prepared and adopted a voluntary scheme of education for their children. They were to have raised £30,000 for first expenses, and to contribute £3,000 a year. They were wise enough not to wait for State assistance, but to put their own shoulders to the wheel. But of course you know what is possible at Johannesburg is not possible in Great Britain. We could not undertake this bit of good and righteous work in our own fashion and at our own cost. We must be nursed by a central department, and compelled by law and punishments to do the very thing that we want to do. It is odd it should be so: but perhaps it is the little penalty we pay for having so many unemployed politicians about.

Capitalists have discovered, if not exactly a new field yet a very tempting locality, in which to display their thieving propensities. Burglaries, forgeries, and other "illegal" operations are found to produce good dividends. It appears to be the opinion of the Scotland Yard authorities that but for the fact of capitalists being at the back of the burgling and forging fraternity these gentlemen could not possibly carry on their extensive business with so much success. This may be true: the S. Y. people ought to know whether it is or not. If however they possess the knowledge they do not put it to a proper use, for the burglars are able to carry on their depredations with but very little molestation. Does the capitalists' influence reach the police? Is Money king in Scotland Yard, as elsewhere? Who knows?

It is not only at Carmeaux that the workers are endeavouring to do their work in their own way, and without the control of a "master". The New York Brotherhood of Tailors are moving in the same direction, having decided to use a portion of their funds for the purpose of establishing their own workshops. When will the English trade unionists follow so excellent an example? The time to move is when trade is flourishing, and when strikes are not draining their resources. But the unionists do not seem to care for taking this view of things. Only when oppressed by slack trade, and their employers turn on the screw and lower wages, do they begin to talk of the advisability of doing anything for and by themselves. And then they are too weak to act.

Walter Crane—fittest of men for the occasion—has been opening an exhibition of pictures in the Eastend of London. His remarks were to the point. Art (hé said) should not be regarded, as it too often was, as a luxury—as something outside our lives, but as something which should enter into the education of the people. True, most true, Comrade Crane. But how can this come to pass so long as the homes of the masses of the people remain what they are? Against art exhibitions, picture galleries, and museums we have nothing to say. Let us have more of them, and let them be more easy of access. But they can only remove in the smallest degree the burdens under which the people exist today. If a picture gallery were opened in each of the principal streets in Whitechapel, the "cribbed, cabined, and confined" homes of the poor in that locality would not be improved in the least.

Lord Herschell—a successful lawyer, who likes to pose as a "progressive" politician—has also opened an art exhibition in the Eastend. In doing so he had the effrontery to claim that he and his class should be designated "workers". Never (said this audacious peer) was there a time when workers more required the spiritual refreshment which Art could bring: in order to love a thing there must be the opportunity of seeing it. Profound! Prodigious! With talk of this kind, men like Lord Herschell flatter themselves they reach the sympathies of the working classes.

THE FORTHCOMING CONGRESS.—It has been arranged to hold a meeting of London Anarchists, on the 29th inst., at the Club Union Hall, (next door to the Holborn Town Hall), at 8 p.m., to protest against the exclusion of Anarchists and non-parliamentary Socialists from the coming International Socialist Workers Congress. Don't forget: 8 p.m., Wednesday, 29th.

THE MAY-DAY DEMONSTRATION will be accomplished by the time of our next issue, and comrades are reminded that their presence will be needed in Hyde Park, in order that the special Anarchist platforms may be well surrounded.

The Anarchist, for April, (published by Comrade Nicoll, at Sheffield) is a very interesting number. It contains a short but admirably written history of "The Luddites"—"heroes who fought and died so boldly, that the tyranny that bred wild revenge is not possible to-day."

"**BEFORE SUNRISE**, and other Pieces," is the title of a little volume just issued by the Labour Press Society Ltd., of Manchester. The author is Joseph Clayton, an active member of the Leeds branch of the I.L.P., whose sympathy however is not limited to that or any other mere section of the party of progress. Comrade Clayton has occasionally contributed to the columns of *LIBERTY*. He is one of the great "Army of Revolt". He says the pieces printed in this volume were "written in the storm and stress of political agitation, in close contact with the sordid horrors of present industrial conditions—not in the Fullness of Light, but in the dim, grey dawn of the Coming Day." The pieces amply justify these few words of introduction. So much that is worth reading is not often found in such a limited number of small pages. When "Freedom's frontier" has been passed, Comrade Clayton will have a theme worthy of his pen, and one he will revel in. We hope he may live to see that day. Meanwhile his "Pieces"—daring in spirit and ruggedly truthful in form—will do something towards cheering those who are, midst many "pains and penalties", doing their best "for Freedom's sake".

KROPOTKIN ON PAST AND FUTURE COMMUNES.

Comrade Peter Kropotkin was not able to be present at the Anarchist Commemoration of the Paris Commune, held in London on Thursday, the 19th ult., and his absence was much regretted. His presence alone would have added weight to the demonstration. His opinions on the subject, however, have already been made known, but they will bear a still wider circulation; no apology therefore is necessary for printing the following from "The Commune of Paris"—one of the *Freedom* pamphlets:

The Commune was defeated, and too well we know how the middle-class avenged itself for the scare given it by the people when they shook their rulers' yoke loose upon their necks. It proved that there are really two classes in our modern society: on one side, the man who works and yields up to the monopolists of property more than half of what he produces, and yet lightly passes over the wrong done him by his masters; on the other hand, the idler, the spoiler, hating his slave, ready to kill him like game, animated by the most savage instincts as soon as he is menaced in his possessions.

After having shut in the people of Paris and closed all means of exit, the Versailles government let loose soldiers upon them—soldiers brutalized by drink and barrack life, who had been told to make short work of the "wolves and their cubs." To the people it was said: "You shall perish, whatever you do! If you are taken with arms in your hands—death! If you use them—death! If you beg for mercy—death! Whichever way you turn, right, left, back, forward, up, down—death! You are not merely outside the law, you are outside humanity. Neither age nor sex shall save you and yours. You shall die. Death! Death! Death!"

And after this mad orgie, these piles of corpses, this wholesale extermination, came the petty revenge, the cat-o-nine-tails, the irons in the ship's hold, the blows and insults of the warders, the semi-starvation, all the refinements of cruelty. Can the people forget these doughty deeds?

The Commune of Paris, the child of a period of transition, born beneath the Prussian guns, was doomed to perish. But by its eminently popular character it began a new series of revolutions: by its ideas it was the forerunner of the social revolution. Its lesson has been learnt, and when France once more bristles with communes in revolt, the peoples are not likely to give themselves a government and expect that government to initiate revolutionary measures. When they have rid themselves of the parasites who devour them, they will take possession of all social wealth to put it in common, according to the principles of anarchist-communism. And when they have entirely abolished property claims, government, and the State, they will form themselves afresh and freely, according to the necessities indicated by life itself. Breaking its chains, overthrowing its idols, humanity will march onward to a better future, knowing neither masters nor slaves, keeping its veneration for the noble martyrs who bought with their blood and suffering those first attempts at emancipation which have enlightened our march toward the conquest of liberty.

Judging by what is said at Commune Commemoration meetings in France and elsewhere, the workers have made up their minds that the coming revolution will introduce anarchist-communism and the free reorganisation of production. These two points seem so far settled, and in these respects the communes of the next revolution will not repeat the errors of the forerunners, who so generously shed their blood to clear the path for future progress.

There is however a third and no less important point upon which the same agreement has not been reached, though it is not so very far off. This is the question of government.

As is well known, there are two sections of the Socialist party completely divided upon this point. "On the very day of the revolution," says the one, "we must constitute a government to take possession of the supreme power. A strong, powerful, resolute government will make the revolution by decreeing this and that, and forcing all to obey its commands."

"A miserable delusion!" says the other. "Any central go-

vernment, taking upon itself to rule a nation, must certainly be a mere hinderance to the revolution. It cannot fail to be made up of the most incongruous elements, and its very essence as a government is conservatism. It will do nothing but hold back the revolution in communes ready to go ahead, without being able to inspire backward communes with the breath of revolution. The same with a commune in revolt. Either the communal government will merely sanction accomplished facts—and then it will be a useless and dangerous bit of machinery, or else it will wish to take the lead to make rules for what has yet to be freely worked out by the people themselves if it is to be really practicable; it will apply theories where all society ought to work out fresh forms of common life with that creative force which springs up in the social organism when it breaks its chains and sees new and larger horizons opening before it. The men in power will obstruct this outburst without doing any of the things they might themselves have done if they had remained among the people, working with them at the new organisation, instead of shutting themselves up in ministerial offices and wearing themselves out in idle debates. The revolutionary government will be a hindrance and a danger; powerless for good, formidable for ill; therefore, what is the use of having it?"

However natural and just, this argument still runs counter to a great many prejudices, stored up and accredited by those who have had an interest in maintaining the religion of government, side by side with the religions of property and theology.

This prejudice, the last of the three, still exists and is a danger to the coming revolution, though it already shows signs of decay. "We will manage our business ourselves without waiting for the orders of a government; we will trample under foot those who try to force us to accept them as priests, property owners, or rulers," so begin already to say the workers. We must hope that the Anarchist party will continue to vigorously combat government worship, and never allow itself to be dragged or enticed into a struggle for power; we must hope that in the years which remain to us before the revolution, the prejudice in favour of government may be so shaken that it will not be strong enough to draw off the people upon a false track.

The communes of the next revolution will not only break down the state and substitute free federation for parliamentary rule, they will part with parliamentary rule within the commune itself. They will trust the free organisation of food supply and production to free groups of workers—which will federate with like groups in other cities and villages—not through the medium of a communal parliament, but directly, to accomplish their aim.

They will be Anarchists within the commune as they will be Anarchists outside it, and only thus will they avoid the horrors of defeat, the furies of reaction:

"ANARCHY ON TRIAL" is the title of No. 9 of the *Freedom* Pamphlets. In it are given the speeches made at their respective trials of George Etievant (sentenced to five years' imprisonment on a charge of stealing dynamite cartridges), Jean Grave (sentenced to two and a half years for publishing his famous book "Société Mourant et l'Anarchie"), and Caserio (who killed President Carnot, in 1894).

"THE NON-PARTISAN," a weekly paper printed and published at Los Angeles, California, is one of the smartest, liveliest, and most pugnacious journals we have come across lately. We thank the editor and proprietor, Capt. James, for having sent us copies. It is not surprising to learn (by the later issues) that the Capt. has got into trouble by his bold outspoken denunciation of political and capitalist thieves and tricksters. He could hardly expect any other reward for his truthfulness. But unless we are mistaken in the man he is not likely to cry "Pecavi." The temperature of Los Angeles is generally warm enough, but if "The Non-Partisan" continues its career (which we sincerely hope) some of the residents—the "gambling, dog fighting, bull baiting, pimping, stool pigeoning fraternity"—will find the place many degrees too hot for them. "Justice (says Capt. James) is dead, and money is king. Long live Money! it rules this country. But the day is drawing near when another cry will be heard—Long live Anarchy!"

TOLSTOY ON PATRIOTISM AND WAR.

From a long letter written by Count Tolstoy, and which has appeared in the "Daily Chronicle," we take the following paragraphs:

If two armed men live side by side, who have from childhood been taught power, wealth, and glory are the highest distinctions, and that therefore to gain these by arms at the expense of their neighbours is most praiseworthy; and if, further, these people acknowledge no moral, religious, or political limitation—then is it not evident that such people will consistently wage war; that their normal inter-relations will be war; and that if, having flown at each other's throats, they have separated for a time, it is only, as the French proverb has it, "pour mieux sauter,"—that is, they draw back to take a better leap, to rush upon each other with the greater ferocity?

Open the newspapers at any time you choose, and you will see always some black spot, a possible cause of war. At one time it is the Korea, at another the Pamirs, Africa, Abyssinia, Armenia, Turkey, Venezuela, or the Transvaal. The work of brigandage does not cease for a moment; now here, now there, some small war is always waging, like skirmishing in the front lines. A real great war may begin at any moment: must begin.

Obviously, to prevent war, it is not necessary to preach sermons and pray God for peace, nor to adjure the English-speaking nations to keep the peace with each other in order that they may domineer over other nations, nor to make double and triple alliances of nations against each other, nor to intermarry princes and princesses of different nations; but it is necessary to destroy the cause of war. The cause is the desire for the exclusive welfare of one's own people; it is called patriotism. Therefore to destroy war, patriotism must be destroyed. But to destroy patriotism the conviction that it is an evil must first be established, and this is difficult to do. Tell people that war is evil and they will laugh at you, for who does not know this? Tell them that patriotism is evil, and the majority will agree, but with some reserve. "Yes, there is an evil patriotism which is undesirable, but there is another and good patriotism—that which we hold." But what this good patriotism is no one explains. If its character is unaggressiveness, as many say, nevertheless all patriotism, even if "unaggressive", must remain "retentive". That is, people must wish to keep their former conquests. Now that nation does not exist which was established without conquest; and conquests can only be held by the means which effected them—namely, violence, murder. But if patriotism cease to be even retentive, then it can only be "rehabilitative" patriotism of conquered, oppressed nations—of the Armenians, Poles, Irish, Czechs, and so on. And this kind of patriotism is perhaps the very worst, because most embittered and most calling for violence.

It will be said: "Patriotism has united men into States, and is the bond of States." But men have by now formed themselves into States, the process is accomplished: why then should we still maintain the exclusive devotion to one's own State, when this produces terrible evils for all States and peoples? The same patriotism which produced States is now destroying them. If there were but one patriotism, say that of the English only, it would be possible to deem it unifying and beneficent; but when, as now, there is American patriotism, English, German, French, Russian, all opposed to each other, patriotism no longer unites, but disunites.

Whether mankind wish it or not, this question stands early in front of them—How can this patriotism, from which proceed human sufferings incalculable, both physical and moral, be needful and a virtue? This question must perforce be answered.

Either it must be shown that patriotism is so great a blessing as to recompense all the sufferings it inflicts on mankind, or it must be acknowledged that patriotism is evil—not to be grafted into them, drilled into them, but, instead, to be struggled against for deliverance with all our powers. If patriotism is good, then Christianity is an empty dream, and the sooner we root out the Christian doctrine the better. But if Christianity really has peace in gift, and we desire peace, then patriotism appears as a survival of barbarism, which must not be excited and cultivated as now, but exterminated in every way, by preaching, persuasion, contempt, ridicule.

The Single Tax Settled.

To the *Editor of LIBERTY.*

I do not wish to occupy much space upon the above subject, the economic fallacies of which Henry Seymour has so admirably criticised (in the January *LIBERTY*)—his article being an excellent supplement to my previous criticism of its philosophical fallacies; but W. E. Brokaw's extraordinary effusion in your issue for February seems to call from me—not so much a refutation (for he refutes himself) as an explanation.

I have seldom come across such a labyrinth of contradictory statements as he has given us in his own particular theory of the single tax, wherein he sets at naught the gospel according to St. "George", and preached by the prominent disciples thereof. After saying that "all single taxers do not assume that all men have equal rights to use the earth," and that, in fact, such assumption "weakens the single tax position"; yet, in attempting to decide the terms of land occupancy upon the basis of "equal freedom" (a most illogical proceeding for a believer in compulsory taxation and majority rule), he asserts "that there is but one way: that way is for one to pay the other a certain amount of the results of his labour"—not mere economic rent, or unearned increment, mark—"for the privilege of excluding the other." If the latter quotation is not an assumption of equal rights of all men to use the earth what is it? Here Mr. Brokaw has directly contradicted himself in saying, firstly, that the assumption of equal rights of all men to use the earth "weakens the single tax position," and, secondly, that there is but one way to settle the land question, namely, "for one to pay the other for the privilege of excluding him."

Another illogical conclusion is that when admitting the correctness of my contention, that whatever men have the right to do they have the right to do, he says, "What then? Why

this. . . I deny that any person has, has had, or ever can have any right—other than that of might—to exclude any person from any portion of the earth at any time." Quite true! I agree, absolutely. But then he goes on, "Then no one has any right to occupy and use, to the exclusion of any other, any portion of the earth at any time." Here again Mr. Brokaw has contradicted himself in saying that any person has the right of might "to exclude any person from any portion of the earth," and, a few words later, that no one has any right to occupy and use," etc. Oh, Dominie Tucker, send a copy of "Instead of a Book" to Alabama! The appearance of a third person desiring "to occupy that same portion of the earth at the same time" causes Mr. Brokaw to ask "Does not the law of equal freedom apply equally to him?" Well, firstly I deny any such thing as a "law" of equal freedom. If this third person is not an Anarchist I am under no obligation whatever to respect his freedom. I shall do so if it suits my purpose, and if not—not. Providing I am stronger, or can call more strength to my aid than he, I shall make him limit his "desire" to my own convenience. And if he is an Anarchist he will admit that my priority of occupancy is a valid title to the land, and will either tempt me to sell out, or himself to quit. There the matter would end. But Mr. Brokaw does not believe in priority of occupancy as a title to land. Let us see where his disbelief leads him. If I cut a twig from a tree and fashion it into a walking stick, which, when finished, some single taxer claims an equal right to, as far as the twig is concerned, and demands compensation for my exclusion of him from possession of the twig, everyone with more sense than it takes to make a single taxer would exclaim, "Why, you fool, if you wanted the twig you should have got there first!"

The argumentative stock-in-trade of the ordinary single taxer is an extra special coal mine, or an unusually fertile plot of land. These he carries around in his inside pocket, or up his sleeve, in order to spring them upon the opponents of his theory. He is so solicitous that every man shall have an exactly equal share of the good things of the earth that he would force them upon him with the aid of a strong government—providing, of course, that the government left anything to be shared. Fancy, too, Mr. Brokaw's naïve idea of the majority delegating to the government "the power to enforce the conditions of equal freedom"! Would compulsory taxation be a condition to the enjoyment of such "equal freedom"? Or would the majority voluntarily contribute to the expenses of the government in forcing rent and taxes from the minority? Where is your "equal freedom" any way?

Here is another gem from the collection with which Mr. Brokaw's communication is studded: "Is not this the place where, without such exercise of might, freedom to contract is impossible?" In other words, we are to use the right of might to overpower the opponent of the single tax, and, after having subjected him, to tell him that he has the freedom to contract in the use of the earth.

Mr. Brokaw asks, "Can Mr. Robins show any other way whereby the principle of equal freedom to contract can be held inviolate and yet exclusive possession of any portion of the earth can be maintained?" Well, as an Anarchist, I cannot lay down any cast iron system of land tenure—equal freedom forbids it, and that is why I reiterate that the single taxer has no logical claim to be considered a believer in equal freedom. He is forever wasting his time in speculating as to how we shall parcel out the land when the power of the landlord is broken. He never thinks of how we are to break that power. In fact he does not intend to break the power of the landlord, but only to transfer it. His landlord is the State—the original thief. Personally I should prefer occupation and use as the title to land. I would much rather forego the enjoyment of the extra fertility of another man's land than submit to the countless robberies practised by government with the excuse of giving me a share of the extra fertility of every piece of land.

But experiment alone can decide the most equitable system of land tenure, and as the single tax does not admit of experiment I again hold that the single tax has no basis in fact or logic. When people refuse to pay rent to anybody, there will be no land question. In fact that is the only solution. Rent, interest, profit, and taxes are the four great means of getting something for nothing. Anarchism disposes of them all.

WILLIAM J. ROBINS.

LIBERTY!

"Liberty, liberty, liberty!"

A clear, sweet voice called unto me,
Called, and sent through the trembling air
A clarion message everywhere.
Sweet was the strange voice, sweet to me
The one strange, sweet word—liberty!
Sweet, for it sang of the world's new birth,
Of an earthlier heaven, diviner earth:
All Time's secrets it told to me—
Did Liberty, liberty, liberty!

"Liberty, liberty, liberty!"

Strong was the voice as it called to me;
Strong as custom and strong as fate,
Strong as love, and strong as hate;
Stronger than England, even she,
England, who brooks not tyranny!
Than France more strong, and stronger too
Than all the journalists, old and new;
So strong was the clear voice, lone and free,
Of Liberty, liberty, liberty!

"Liberty, liberty, liberty!"

Great was the voice as it called to me;
Great, for a conquering voice, it cried,
Demanded, and would not be denied:
Great, for it would not bend the knee
To prejudice, force, or policy;
But in spite of all and each hindrance cried—
God-like in vigour and joy and pride—
Cried and asserted the dignity
Of Liberty, liberty, liberty!

"Liberty, liberty, liberty!"

Kind was the voice as it called to me,
Kind as only the sweet and strong
And great can be, to a world gone wrong,
Was the tremulous voice that called to me,
No child of a bloodless fantasy,
But trembling with love, throbbing with love,
Heavily laden with love, pure love,
Was that voice, that cry, that passionate plea
For Liberty, liberty, liberty!

"Liberty, liberty, liberty?"

Now what precisely may this thing be?
If not hollow and vain, as some men say,
Won't it sacrifice all to the grim To-day?
Now what, say others, may this thing be,
That smacks so strongly of Anarchy?
Won't it crush the gifted, the good, the great,
Instead of goodwill raise up fiendish hate?
Is not this the vaunted divinity
Of Liberty, liberty, liberty!

"Liberty, liberty, liberty!"

Nay, not thus shall its triumph be!
Not to soothe or to slay in vain,
Not to revive your bootless pain,
Italy, France, and Germany!
O not for ill shall its triumph be;
Though long obscured, set at naught, despised,
Yet, as Justice, shall it be prized;
By its fruits ye shall know the glorious tree
Of Liberty, liberty, liberty!

"Liberty, liberty, liberty!"

Oh, sons of men, is it naught to ye?
Ye who hear in the trembling air
That clarion message everywhere?
Oh, fools and blind, is it naught to ye,
That ye mutter of fraud and Anarchy?
Awake! arise! rub your sleep-dimmed eyes!
Prepare for Truth's latest and best surprise!
Prepare to welcome the great To-Be—
The new and the true Democracy!
Or 'twill leave you behind it, even ye,
Will Liberty, liberty, liberty!

JOHN FULFORD.

THE IMPRISONED ANARCHISTS

AGITATION FOR THEIR RELEASE.

PROPOSED PUBLIC DEMONSTRATION.

A Public Meeting

WILL BE HELD AT

THE SOUTH PLACE INSTITUTE

SOUTH PLACE, FINSBURY,

(Near Moorgate Street Railway Station)

On Wednesday, 22nd April, 1896,

For the purpose of adopting a Petition to the Home Secretary in favour of a remission of the sentence passed on the Walsall Anarchists—Charles, Cailes, and Bartola.

SPEAKERS:

Robert Blatchford (Editor of *The Clarion*), Tom Man, Alderman Ben Tillet, Touzeau Parris, Miss Lanchester, James Tochatti, D. J. Nicoll, and others.

Doors open at 7.45; commence at 8.30.

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."

Liberty Pamphlets.

PRICE ONE PENNY EACH.

IN THE PRESS.

Parliamentary Politics in the Socialist Movement. By ERRICO 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.

Definition of Crime. By A. HAMON.

Socialism in Danger. Part II.

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

Common-Sense Country.

By L. S. BEVINGTON.

Socialism in Danger. Part I.

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

Jones' Boy:

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

Liberty Lyrics.

By L. S. BEVINGTON.

The Ideal and Youth.

By ELISÉE RECLUS.

An Anarchist on Anarchy.

By ELISÉE RECLUS.

In Defence of Emma Goldmann and the Right of Expropriation.

By VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE.

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.

Liberty Bookshelf.

Any of the following Publications may be obtained by sending the amount in stamps, or by postal order, to the Editor. Carmagnole 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 ERRICO 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.