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THE COMMUNE OF PARIS.

By LOUISE MICHELE.

PART II.

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

CHAPTER II. (Continued.)

THE GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE.

As an attempt had been made by the Government to rotate the guns of the Place des Vosges, the artillery-men sent there did not choose to undertake the responsibility of bloodshed; and the National Guards, not wishing to be disarmed, sent detachments of the 66th, 68th, 94th, 125th, and 180th battalions, who conveyed the guns to the Buttes Chaumont. They were fifty-six in number. Those journals which the Government accused of inciting to insurrection ceased to appear after March 12th. They were as follows: “Le Vengeur” (The Avenger) conducted by Felix Fust; “Le Cri du Peuple” (The Voice of the People) by Vallet; “Le Mot d’Ordre” (The Word of Command) by Rochefort—this paper was started on May following the armistice; “Le Pure Duchesse” by Vermersch, Humbert, Vaillant, Larrieux and Martin; “La Bouche de Fer, (The Mouth of Iron) by Vernor Joel; “Le Caricature” by Pilotele. Thus in the great silence—the platforms mute, the journals suppressed—insurrection swelled to revolution.

At daybreak, on March 18th, on all the walls of Paris was displayed the famous proclamation:

"Inhabitants of Paris! Once more we address ourselves to your reason and your patriotism, and we hope that we shall be heard. Your great city, which cannot subsist without order, is in certain districts profoundly disturbed, and the disturbance in these quarters even will spread to the others if we do not, in defense of the honor of the country, hinder the return of industry and comfort. For some time past, ill-disposed persons, under the pretext of resisting the Prussians who are now no longer within your walls, have constituted themselves masters of a part of the town, houses of destructions and have mounted guard upon them, forcing you to mount guard with them by the command of an emergency committee which pretends the sole regulation of a portion of the National Guard; which committee thus ignores the authority of General D’Au-ralls and all your duty to your position at your head; wishing to form a government in opposition to that of the legitimate institutions of our country.

These men who have already done you so much harm, whom you yourselves dispersed on Oct. 31st, make pretense of defending you against the Prussians who have done no more than appear within your walls, and whose final departure is retarded by this disorder. They point cannon which, should they be discharged, would merely shatter your houses, and lay low your children and yourselves. In a word, they compromise the Republic instead of defending it; for since they have no pretense, and are in open opposition throughout France that a Republic is necessarily a field of disorder, the Republic may be lost. Do not believe these men, but listen to the truth which we tell in all sincerity. The Government instituted by the whole nation would already have been before the guns, as so often, of the State, and which at this moment are a menace only to yourselves; also to remove the obstacles which serve no purpose but to impede traffic, and to bring into the hands of justice the criminals who are thus not afraid of bribes, who are not afraid of civil war after the war with the foreigner. But the Government desired to give those men who are merely deceived, time to separate themselves from those who deceive them. Nevertheless the time that has been granted to men of good faith to draw away from a government which has been dispersed from your well-being, and the well-being of France at large; therefore it must not be indefinitely prolonged. So long as the present state of things continues business is at a standstill, your shops are deserted, orders coming in from all directions are suspended, your banks are idle, credit cannot be renewed. The capital of which the Government is in need to return to its territory; the possession of the enemy is not forthcoming. In your own interest, and in that of your city as in that of France the Government has resolved to institute a government of its own and to resume control of the Government in its own interests. Let the good citizens separate themselves from the bad, let a public force instead of resisting it; they will thus hasten the return of order in the city and will render the Republic itself a service, which Republic indeed possesses the immense estimation of France. Parisians! we thus address you because we suspect you, your sagacity, your patriotism. But this warning once given, you will approve, after having recourse to force, for it is needful at any price and without one day’s delay that order (the condition of your welfare) should be restored, completely, immediately, and unconditionally.”

March 17th, 1871. (Signed) Thiers, Chief of the Executive, (whose signature was followed by those of the other members of the Government.)

CHURCH AND STATE.

"For always in these times of Liberty! Rulers that high light whereby the State is saved."

—John Hay.

When a number of individuals assemble by and majority vote decide that all the other members of the community shall act in a particular way, or suffer fine, imprisonment or assault, that assembly of individuals is called the Government. When a number of individuals assemble together and by majority vote decide that all the other members of the community shall in certain doctrines or suffer external punishment, that assembly of individuals is called the Church. Once the Church possessed a very effective method of slinging liberty. The "secular arm" with its hand of steel and fingers of fire was at its disposal, but its secular power is now reduced to the employment of billiards and police for the protection of thieves, rapine, murder and interest; and, as I have said, its chief power now lies in the threat of a hypothetical hell in the next world, and social ostracism in this.

But there are no real, tangible things corresponding to the words Church and State. Neither Church nor State has identity, or locality, or dimensions—length, breadth, or thickness; they are not things that you can see, hear, smell, taste or touch; you cannot talk to them, feed them, put them in prison or cut off their heads; you cannot say of either: "See, there it goes; it is green, it is white, it is black, it is long, it is short." The Church is not a thing; it is an idea. The State is not a thing; it is an idea. Both exist only in the imagination. It would be well if everyone could understand this, for it would then be quite plain that Church and State are mere convenient expressions used for the purpose of shifting responsibility from persons to an alleged something that does not exist.

For example: A vaccination officer examines my child and either poisons it or compels me to go to school or pay a fine to prevent my child from being poisoned. The vaccination officer is really nothing less than a common poisoner, but he satisfies his conscience by the reflection that he is an officer of the Government, and you clearly understand that there is no such thing as the Government when you clearly understand that the vaccination officer is simply an individual employed by other individuals to poison babies, then you can understand that the vaccination officer is a rapine, murder, and interest. Now apply the same reasoning to a Custom House officer and you will see that he is just a common everyday thief employed by other thieves to rob travellers.

In Italy there are bandits. They have their captains, lieutenants and privates. In England we have bandits also, with their captains, lieutenants and privates; but we call our bandits Aristocrats i.e., pupils of government by physical force; we call their captains members of Parliament, their lieutenants Government officials, and their privates policemen, bailiffs, hangmen, club-wielders, and custom officers. We appeal to the superstition of the people by throwing over our bandits the sacred name of the Government, their attacks and robberies are termed "legal" and the collection of revenue, so that what is crime in Italy becomes legal in England. But to the clear thinker the only difference between the two systems is that in Italy the bankits are weak, while in England they are many and strong.

What is true of the State is true of the Church. Just as a policeman, who, in his own proper person and acting on his own responsibility, would not hurt a fly, will, in the name of the State break open his neighbor’s head; just as a hangman or soldier, who if left to himself would not kill a spider, if he acts in the name of the State murder his neighbor—so a person who, as an individual, would not lie or treat anyone unkindly, will in the name of the Church subscribe to statements that he does not believe and cruelly cut the acquaintance of his best friend. Where there is one victory of the Church over the individual opinions of the men who made it or subscribe to it? There is none; and this means that a hundred or a thousand clergymen will get together and, in the sacred name of the Church, declare that they believe what no single one of them believes.

All organized churches and political parties are the enemies of progress because they try to paralyze the brain. The Church forbids her children to question her dogma. The political party thinking person believes the creed in its absolute integrity. The moment a clergymen or politician begins to honestly proclaim his doubts that moment he begins to be treated like a criminal. Progress is impossible to a left off all organizations. He begins to receive the cold shoulder. He begins to feel that he is unwelcome whenever the church or the party, comes together. He is
ANARCHY NOT SECRECY.

Those who have read Anarchist literature attentively and who have attended lectures by Anarchists, who have conversed and argued with Anarchists of all shades and opinions and of many nationalities, must be surprised to find any of them are members of a secret society. The writer of this article holds Anarchist opinions, but he belongs to no society of Anarchists, nor is he aware of any Anarchist who does. It is quite true that there may be found a group of Anarchists, as there may be a group of friends, or a pack of politicians as there may be a pack of wolves, or a flock of voters as there may be a flock of geese, or a swarm of office-seekers as there may be a swarm of locusts. But, because a few Anarchists, for local reasons form themselves into a group, it by no means follows, they are a society, or even a secret society. To belong to a society—such an organization as the word implies—and especially a secret society, would necessitate that which we Anarchists are averse to, namely, to commit ourselves to a number of rules and regulations drawn up by a committee. It is likely that a majority of Anarchists, who deny the right of any set of men to make laws for others, who are non-invasive, to obey, would commit themselves to such rules and regulations under any conditions. No, certainly not. Such a thing would be impossible among Anarchists. In the first place, Anarchists would not be such fools as to set about manufacturing a number of laws with penalties, and in the second place, no Anarchist would consent to obey them, or, even to commit himself to them. I am an Anarchist, thou art an Anarchist, he is an Anarchist, and so on, but I, thou, and he, is committed to no rules and regulations. Leave such things to simpleton voters, and reasoning wolves. Anarchists will have none of them. We have seen quite enough of law and its offsprings. It is such order that we want to get rid of.

We quite admit that there are secretive Anarchists as there are sure to be men of Anarchist opinions who are non-secretive, and to whom it would be folly to confide anything, which for a time, was to be kept a profound secret. But because there are Anarchists who keep their own counsel, and act in the dark, by no means follows that Anarchists are in any way pledged to secrecy. Anarchists are not so convivial, and not because they have signed their names in a book, taken an oath, etc. Anarchy means an absence of all government—liberty pure and simple. Anarchists by belonging to a secret society would be placing themselves at the mercy of their non-secretive confederates. The babbling friend, however, honest and good intentioned he may be, is more dangerous to his comrades than the government spies and detectives, who can obtain access to almost any secret society.

The southern Irish, who as a race, are incogent and
non-secretive, have ever been ready to join secret societies in their struggles for liberty as they conceive it. And what have been the ending of all their rebellions and revolutions? Betrayal, both by friend and foe. Under the soothing syrup of sycophantic Irish patriots have marched to imprisonment and death. Governments have been able to undermine and destroy nearly every society the existence of which was objectionable to them.

Why are governments unable to suppress Anarchy? Because it has a scientific basis, being the result of a close study of human society and an accurate perception of those principles which if applied to society would be conducive of human happiness, those principles being believed in by men who have, as a body, no secrets to betray, no oaths to break, or documents to sign. In dealing with Anarchists, governments have to deal with a number of independent thinkers, who object to the methods the state employs to be destroyed by an external will imposed upon them, to be interfered with when not interfering with others, who will resent this interference with the exercise of that equal liberty which they are justly entitled to by passive and active means according to the mental capacity of each individual Anarchist.

As Anarchist opinions spread the difficulties of government will increase.

IRELAND.

THE CHICAGO MARTYRS—COMMEMORATION MEETINGS.

In commemoration of the event in Chicago, on November 11th, 1887, which is handing the name of that city down to posterity in a way its more intelligent inhabitants dread the mention of, the usual meetings in remembrance thereof are being arranged as we go to press.

A meeting will be held on Monday, the 11th inst., at the Lecture Hall, Tidal Basin, opposite the Station, commencing at 8 p.m. The speakers will be Leggett, Peddie, Turner, Tochatti, Ford, and others.

A meeting will be held at South Place Institute, Ealing, but the particulars of the arrangements have not come to hand.

A few copies of "The Chicago Anarchists," the remarkably fine drawing by Walter Crane, are left, and may be obtained by sending to our office. Fine copies, post free, 6d.; other copies, 2d.

SBOYER von TURCER, the celebrated French orator and Anarchist, Communist is announced to deliver two lectures in St. Andrew's Hall, Newman St., Oxford St., W., on Saturday Nov. 2nd and Monday Nov. 4th. The subjects dealt with will be "The Society of Today" and "The Society of Tomorrow." Tickets (6d.) may be obtained in advance at Lapie’s Library, 30 Goodge St., Tottenham Court Road.

ANARCHIST-COMMUNISM.—The Deptford Working Men's Educational Association announce a Free Course of Sunday Evening Lectures, the first of which will be given on Nov. 3rd, at Smith's Cocoa Rooms, Deptford Bridge. The lecturers include Olivia Rossetti, J. Turner, and others.

"SOCIALISM IN DANGER," by F. Donela Nieuwhuis, (Part I) is one of the "Liberty" pamphlets we should like to see very largely circulated. The work, which at the present moment cannot be otherwise than highly interesting to Socialists generally, has not hitherto been printed in English. To our thinking it is one of the clearest presentations of the Socialist position in Germany ever penned, and may be read to advantage alongside a report of the proceedings at the recent Congress at Brussels. Nieuwhuis is himself a painstaking writer, he verifies as far as possible every statement he makes, and supports every opinion he advances by the weight and appropriateness of his quotations. The work has been admirably translated by R. Grierson, though the style being less effectually preserved. We confidently ask our friends to give this little pamphlet all the publicity they can. We are pushing forward the printing of Part II as quickly as possible.

"COMMON-SENSE COUNTRY" is the title of a pamphlet just issued from our office, and written by L. M. Barington. Speaking of it a contemporary says it is one of the brightest of the London press, and is a very cogent exposure of some of the wrought shams of today.

The sad death of Comrade Christopher Boddy, which took place on the 18th of September, owing to an accidental fall from the roof of a house in Tottenham Court Road, has taken from our ranks a young man of considerable promise, who added to his natural kindness and earnest desire to acquire knowledge, and to aid his fellows in all true efforts to obtain more equitable social conditions.

BENEFIT APPEAL FUND.—R. Gundersen writes: I have received for the Beneficent Fund: Lewison, Glasgow, 12/6; Price, Chester, 3/6; Subscription List No. 18 (R.G.) 15/-; No. 19 (Stark's) 2/6. As there are much needed I urge upon friends to do their best, and those who have subscription lists to send them to me as soon as possible. R. Gundersen, 26 Wardour St., Soho, W.

"LIBERTY" is a journal of Anarchist-Communism; but articles on all phases of the Revolutionary movement will be freely admitted, provided they are written 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 is all matters reserves to himself the fullest right to reject any article.

We would ask our contributors, to write plainly and on one side of the paper only.

All Communications should be addressed to: The Editor, Liberty, 57 Beeton Road, Hammer smith, W. Subscriptions, 12/6 per year, post free. Per quire of 20 copies, 12/6 post free. The trade supplied by W. Reeves, 155 Fleet Street, E.C.

-The following notice notices of our Exchanges is crowded out of this issue, as is Joa Clayton's "To the Army of Revolutions."

LIBERTY.

LONDON, NOVEMBER, 1895.

BETWEEN OURSELVES.

Snow and severe frost predict the rapid approach of winter. It needs no prophet to foresee that winter will bring again to the front the question of "What is to be done for or with the unemployed?" Indeed the Radicals, including London's representative of mammon—the Lord Mayor, and the political quacks have already intimated their readiness to resume business—the old lines, of course. The rich must be appealed to, their sympathy must be roused, and their hearts must be touched. The poor must be taught to think themselves lucky in being allowed to beg—the law stands in the way of their doing so generally; they must eat with due thankfulness for the crumbs thrown to them by Dives, and under no circumstances must they look "the gift-horse in the mouth." If this nice little arrangement should—just for once—not happen to work as smoothly as usual: suppose—only suppose—that such a thing as a general rising of Anarchism should suddenly take place in London and one or two other big cities; What would happen next? Will someone come along with an answer?

One of "Ourseles" says Anarchists are not such fools as to admit that the dispensing of so-called Christian charity is the only method of solving the "unemployed" difficulty. The solution, to his thinking, is to be found in a much simpler but more drastic mode of procedure. It is only necessary to give the unemployed the opportunity to exist for themselves, by ruthlessly brushing away all impediments in their way—such atrocities as monopoly, usury, unjust laws, worn out customs, and effete creeds, and then, the ground being cleared, the work to be done would give ample employment to everyone.

Simple enough! So simple that one is astonished so few should be found as yet who have determined to do what they can to put the principle into practice. But the idea has been set rolling, and widespread feeling of discontent is nearing the borders of revolution, and this next winter will probably not pass away without existing social arrangements receiving a shaking to their very foundations.

So far as the lockdown at Carmaux and the action of the French Government in relation thereto are concerned, the result has been exactly what was to be expected. Governments can do no wrong when they oppress and coerce their subjects. In a contest between "might" and "right," the former is as strong as ever, and the latter by a neatly contrived illusory trick is suddenly transformed into "wrong." God, or right, is always on the side of the big battalions. Of course, in the opinion of French deputies—at any rate in the belief of such of them as hope some day or other to be office-holders—what the government has done is perfectly in accord with political justice. If a most tyrannical capitalist and employer has been upheld in his base and cruel acts, the support has been "lawfully" given; even if the law has been strained by allowing
the police to endeavour to provoke half-starved workers to commit acts of violence, such straining has been at once condemned, because, in the opinion of all except the oppressors, it was necessary that a state of affairs dangerous to the continuance of "order" according to law should be ended.

As it is today in France, so it would be tomorrow in this country, if a large body of strikers or the lockedout were threatening the citadel of capitalism and monopoly. Whether the Government were Tory or Radical, policemen and soldiers would guard the banner of "law and order," and the former would be told to use their bludgeons vigorously, and the latter ordered to "fire live." What has been will continue to be, given the same incentives and the same conditions. Republicanism in France or in America, Monarchy in Britain, Germany, or Russia—so long as these are the governing forces of social and political life, hold in hand and used in the main for the benefit of the moneyed and the landlord, must continue to be the biggest barriers to freedom. The cutest politician has no scheme for rendering such obnoxious forces altogether harmless, and no true social reformer can work to advantage in the deadly shadow of their presence. Has not the time arrived for more vigorous attacks on such inhuman monstrosities? In the words of M. Gassey, we should like to clearly "that the reason for the existence of all these classes is not to touch, or be taught; they exist to divide." The sooner these pretentious bagues of windy rhetoric are picked the better, and a wider structure obtained of the fact that every improvement will be exploited by the landlord. Mr. Scrivener says the first thing to do is to take the land out of the control of "private persons"; and to this we add, "public persons." Nothing, in the opinion of the Anarchist-Communist, but the Community can make the land free possible. The stories of the cultivators would sound like fairy tales in the ears of the farm laborer to whom the possibilities of the so-called cultivation are as dream impossible of realization. That "man with no leisure cannot do his work properly, and, what is perhaps worst, he cannot be taught," necessitates a complete overthrow of the present system.

The strike of the workmen in Lyons and Co. forms a lurid light on the sham civilization of today which compels young girls to go a fortnight without dinners, and finds them on some days in the exhausted condition of pocket after long hours of labor, while they have a few shillings for a week's work. To add to their difficulties, when they propose to appeal to their employers for more humane treatment, the depredation they appoint is refused a limition to their masters' indulgence. The Palliatore Act of Parliament that don't palliate Sundays, and intellectual feasts on the ethics of factory legislation, are most inefficient remedies for such rank and outrageous evils.

The joy of the angels over the one "sinner" who repented can scarcely have exceeded our gratification as we read the reports of the proceedings at the various congresses which have been held during the past week. The secularists do, of course, "love one another"; they are constantly doing as much, if not more, in some quarters and parts than the "believe," however when they attempt to show their love by actions that we find occasion to rejoice greatly, and then because of the show up they give of the miserable superstition they persist in calling Christian principles. If the attempt being made to be about a society of Churches" is to our thinking very little more than an allusion admission that the said churches find the ground they have so long encumbered trembling beneath them. The spiritual pilots have become desolate in a sinking ship, and are seeking to huddle together in order to meet destruction rather than accept their fate singly.

These latest congresses have proved once more how utterly incompetent the clerical mind is when it tries to deal with social affairs. Parsons, of the christening or of the baptising schools, have alike but one remedy for the icer of poverty—and that is charity-alve. For years they have been saying that the landowners and medicine and their efforts have been profitable to themselves. Not one word of approval have they for such a drastic and honest curative as freedom—liberty to think, to do, and to live on pure and simple and unobstructed lines. We are not going to say that these false pilots in their death agony, because we believe their removal will tend to a purification of the moral and social atmosphere. If there be any men amongst them let them come over to us and live as becomes men.

One of the speakers at the Conference of Women Workers made a few very sensible remarks about the absurd proposal to grant old age pensions to women. The argument however was topical and it was asfollows talk about thrift and self denial is out of place. It is rank absurdity to suggest that men and women should "lay up for rainy day" when they do not get enough to enjoy the very few sunny days they may have. The system of insurance through the gigantic fraud, and it is not by bringing the producing classes within its demoralizing and debasing influence that its fraudulent character will be destroyed or even lessened. Look at the pensions given to "officers of State" and high or low breed "flunkeys" generally. What are they but monies dishonestly obtained from the producing classes? Women workers, and those who assume to speak for them, had better cease talking about pensions and charity. Workers of both sexes want the full result of their labors. Having obtained this, the proverbial "rainy day" will have lost its terrors.

The relatives of Miss Lancaster (a woman whose name has suddenly become a "household word") and the doctor assisting them, who successfully conspired to temporarily confine a sane woman in a lunatic asylum, deserve the sincere thanks of all Anarchists. They have proved an object lesson which promises good results should do no more than indicate the demoralizing character of every Act of Parliament recorded in our Book of Statutes. The laws relating to lunacy arose out of a desire to acquire property, or in other words to steal it. They are not the only case of the same object. Private asylums—dolls of cruelty and extortion—have sprung up in all directions owing to the existence of these laws. "One of our dailies, the editor of which is fearless lest he may be involved and insinuous in consequence of his insincerity, has been dangerous enough in any case," but when administered by bigots and amateur scientists, well—this is too much—even for an editor of the "rest and be thankful" school. If the gentlemen in question go for the entire abolition of the degrading character, we should be glad to assist him. But he won't. So long as Property rules the roost the lunacy laws will remain, what they are widely acknowledged to be today—a standing disgrace to their framers and an insult to the intelligence of every honest man and woman in the land. The fight all round between the oppressed worker and the oppressing capitalist is approaching a crisis in the United States, and the writing in the Firebrand thus summarises the situation: "Let the unemployed, the American born, once come to the conclusion that it is either fight or die, and they will fight without much reluctance." "Men, tired of looking for work and angry at being repulsed on every hand when asking for food, have been arming themselves, and there are, now, it is estimated, over 1000 men in this (Fargo, N.D.) vicinity who are carrying revolvers or guns." "The farmer is gradually being enslaved by the money power." "All that we lack of a revolution tomorrow is the opportunity." Surely the ancient "handwriting on the wall" was not plainer or more significant than this.

The deplorable facts coming to light day by day with regard to impoverished farmers, starving farm labourers, and land going out of cultivation are positively appalling. And the suggestions for tinkering made by men in the position of Salisbury, Devonshire, and others of their class, together with the twaddle written by men unable to see clearly the whole bearings of the question at issue, would justly every honest man in turning revolutionist. Twenty farms will shortly be added to those already unoccupied in Kent—the "garden" of England. Those journals which, like the Estates Gazette, record and deplore these facts, do so from the landowners' point of view. They express no sympathy with the men and women who are deprived of work and food when land is left to produce weeds only. Farmers who once farmed hundreds of acres are finding refuge in" the" three, their sons and daughters are drifting into our overcrowded cities. While the farmers and market gardeners who manage to keep their heads above water find the railway companies and the salesmen so rapacious that rather than put their produce on distant markets they feed their pigs and fowls with it.

Scrivener C. Scrivener, who writes a remarkably good letter to the Weekly Times and Echo on the agricultural situation, shows the utter absurdity of the suggestion that one hundred members of Parliament should form themselves into a pioneer gang, and after making themselves acquainted with thorough cultivation, show the farmers how to cultivate the land properly. No doubt Mr. Scrivener gauges the mental aptitude of the average "member" correctly when he states that "there are not one hundred members of Parliament capable of being trained to teach the science of agriculture. He also recognizes
GOVERNMENT AND ORGANISATION.

In the last issue of LIBERTY mention was made of certain misrepresentations with regard to Anarchists and Anarchism (made by "Tattler" in Justice) and the action of the former in connection with the proposed Workers' Congress in 1896. "Tattler" reproaches the charge of misrepresentation: he says a congress is a representative body, and that it is its representative character which gives it any importance; and then goes on to ask, with "sweet illogical unreasonableness", why Anarchists, who do not believe in representation, desire to be admitted to a (not "the") congress. Having asked this somewhat misleading question, "Tattler" proceeds to answer it in his sweetly illogical way by accusing Anarchists of a desire "to break up all organisations of workers and to destroy all conferences and congresses." "Tattler" is disingenuous. How can a workers' congress be representative of workers when a worker who is also an Anarchist is not permitted to be present? Surely "Tattler" does not contend that none but Social Democratic subjects are to be discussed at a congress, or that all topics discussed at such a gathering must be dealt with from a social democratic point of view only? If this is what he means, we protest most strongly against such exclusiveness, and—proceed to a more important point.

"Tattler" says "We are called upon to believe that at one and the same time the Anarchist does and does not believe in representation and delegation. The Anarchist is always assuring us that he can represent no one but himself, and no one can represent him. Now we are told he can represent others, and others can represent him, only not in Parliament. Surely the principle of representation is not altered in any case, whether the body in which representation is claimed be a Parliament or a Congress." "Tattler" also says "If one dares to suggest that the Anarchist believed in organisation and all that it involves—voting, agreement, majority rule, delegated authority, and the like, your Anarchist would almost choke with the wrath of his ignominious repudiation of such gross misrepresentation. But if one should dare to assert the contrary it appears to be equally gross misrepresentation."

The above statements prove that "Tattler" knows very little about Anarchism, and even less about organisation, and he displays lamentable confusion of thought by using the words organisation, representation, and delegation with but one meaning, and he may be advised to get a correct knowledge of these terms before he again essays to write as a Socialist or rather as a Social Democrat, and in the meantime his attention may be called to the fact that the principle of representation is not the same in a parliament as it is in a congress or conference. Parliamentary representation is achieved by action in accord with orders made in parliament—orders which must be observed before representation, in part or in whole, can exist. Even then it is in no sense free to act, its authority being delegated to an administration which is so constructed as to favour initiative by the capitalist. On the other hand, voluntary organisation is free, and the interests of all concerned are inalienable. Neither law nor police are needed to give effect to the conclusions arrived at by common agreement, and such an organisation observes the rules it makes simply because it is to the interest of its members to do so: but Parliament compels compliance with its laws by brute force. If "Tattler" will refer to the writings of such well known Anarchists as Kropotkin and Malatesta he will find full confirmation of these assertions. The last named says: "Scientific societies and congresses, international, lifeboat, and red cross associations, etc., labourers' unions, peace societies, volunteers who hasten to the rescue at times of great public calamity, are all examples among thousands—of that power of the spirit of association which always shows itself when the need arises, or an enthusiasm takes hold, and the means do not fail. That voluntary associations do not control the world, and do not embrace every branch of material and moral activity, is the fault of the obstacles placed in the way by governments, of the antagonisms created by the possession of private property, and of the impotence and degradation to which the monopolising of wealth on the part of the few reduces the majority of mankind." Kropotkin writes: "Emancipation from governmental yoke, free development of individuals in groups and federations, free organisation ascending from the simple to the complex, according to mutual needs and tendencies."

These views are endorsed by English, American, and continental Anarchists. Can "Tattler" show them to be illogical, unreasonable, or in the slightest degree funny or silly. If he cannot, then his criticism is beside the mark.

Voluntary association means neither majority rule or delegated authority, and agreement and majority rule are contradictory terms. If "Tattler" were to do a little more reading of Anarchist literature and study a little more closely the arguments used and the facts stated therein, it is possible he might considerably enlarge his sphere of usefulness.

IN MEMORIAM.

Mad, as the world calls mad,
See Anarchy's few;
Fighting the false and the Bad
In all that they do;
Forcing a way for the Glad,
The Pure, and the True.

Bolder and clearer it grows—
The Anarchist task;
Liberty's plausible foes
To assail and unmask;—
Handing the torch as it glows
To all who may ask.

Great! oh, exceedingly great,
The Anarchists' claim.
Fusing the falsehood of State
In unquenchable flame;
Breaking the letters of fate—
In Humanity's name.

Breathing with fiery breath
On the marmionite crew;
Fearless, in splendor of faith,
Of the worst they can do;
Blessed, in life and in death,
O beneficent few!

From "Liberty Lyrics," by L. S. Bremington.

REVOLUTIONS are fretsests intended to equalize the ideals of the people and the actual conditions of life. They are never arbitrary, but obey certain physical laws, like the cyclone, which re-establishes the equilibrium of the air, disturbed by violent changes in the temperature, or like the waters, which is constantly striving to bring the two bodies of water to the same level. As often as there is found to be a great difference between the wishes of the people and the actual reality of things, in obedience to the laws of nature a revolution takes place; it may be dammed up artificially by the organized powers for a while but not for long. Revolutions are consequently the only witnesses of history which allow us to draw conclusions from their extent and aims as to the degree and the causes of the preceding popular discontent.—Dr. Max Nordau.

A Query.—About what date was the word "Anarchists" first used in the sense of indicating or pointing to a number of men holding and publicly avowing the principles of Anarchy?

"For a picture of pure Communism, showing its necessarily anarchic character, I recommend 'News from Nowhere' by William Morris."

—Henry Addis, (Firebrand).

Truth and Freedom are the pillars of society.—HERMEN ELM.

Anarchism is the natural right of self-preservation; Communism, the concession of that right to others.—Dr. Paden Macdonald.
WHY I AM A SINGLE' TAXER.
By Arthur Withy.

I can best explain why I am a single taxer by stating as briefly as possible what the single tax is, and by announcing as clearly as I can its economical and ethical basis.

The single tax is a tax only in form. Economically speaking it is rent, for we single taxers propose to abolish all rates and taxes on labour or labour products, and to derive all public revenues from a single tax levied on the rental value of the land, irrespective of improvements. Rent must be paid in any case. If it be paid to private individuals it will be a monopolistic and speculative rent, which is much higher than an economic rent; and in addition the state and the municipality must meet the expenses of government by levying rates and taxes on trade and industry. If, however, it be paid to the state it will be an economic rent, because the barriers of land monopoly would be broken down and all unused land would be open to labour and capital; and all the rates and taxes that now hamper trade and industry could be abolished.

In this country the first step towards the single tax would be to impose upon the present value of all land the existing tax of 4s. in the £, now levied on the values of 1692, and bringing in a paltry £1,020,000 only. The rental value of the land of the United Kingdom is estimated at £160,000,000 to £200,000,000, so that a tax of 4s. in the £ levied on present values would net from £32,000,000 to £40,000,000, and the existing rates and taxes might to that extent be remitted. We would then proceed by annual increments of 1s. in the £. In nine or ten years the whole of the present rates and taxes, amounting to £128,000,000 per annum, could be abolished; and in 10 years the whole of the rent would flow into the public coffer.

This, however, is only the fiscal aspect of the reform. Its industrial and social aspects are much more important. A substantial tax on land values would inevitably break down the barriers of land monopoly, and give labour and capital freedom of access to all land not actually in use, because the tax would be levied upon the full annual value of the land whether the land were put to use or not, and no landowner could long afford to pay out the tax while receiving no return from the land. This freedom of access to the land would at once solve the unemployed problem and make the workers economically independent; for no man would work for another longer hours, for lower wages, or under worse conditions than he need work for himself on the land. Each man would, therefore, be his own factory inspector, and each would fix for himself his hours of labour.

I do not regard the single tax as a panacea, or cure-all; but I consider that it is the first thing needful, because, so long as land monopoly continues, no matter what political, social, or industrial reforms may be introduced, the landlords controlling, as they do, the only raw material of industry can compel the workers to hand over to them the whole of the produce of their labour above and beyond a bare subsistence.

I am a single taxer because I believe in freedom—in the equal rights of all men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

If all men have equal rights to life, then, since the use of the earth is essential to the life of all men, all must have equal rights to use the earth. It is therefore unjust that the land should, as is the case to-day, be monopolized by the few. Of the 72,000,000 acres of this country 50,000,000 are owned by 15,000 persons, and of those 50,000,000 acres 30,000,000 are owned by 1,000 only! But all men have, also, equal rights to liberty. Therefore whatever each man makes by the application of his labour to the soil is his as against the world, for to force him to hand over to another individual, or to the state, a portion of his product would be to make him to that extent a slave to that individual, or to the state.

This is precisely the result of our present systems of taxation and land tenure.

The rental value of the land is created by and therefore belongs to the whole community... Without population land has no value. It can have no value until at least two people want the same piece. As population increases land values rise; as population decreases land values fall; and were population to disappear land values would also disappear. Land values, therefore, form the natural source of public revenue, but at present do not. They would remit them to be appropriated by private individuals, and as a consequence the state is obliged to levy rates and taxes upon land and capital.

What, I ask, could be more in accord with the principles of justice than the single tax, which would appropriate to public purposes the values created by the public, while leaving to individuals undiminished by rate or tax the values created and that therefore belong to individuals?

“But is not the single tax unjust to the landlords?” someone may ask. Assuredly not. As I have shown, the rental value of the land is created by and therefore belongs to the whole community. It is obvious that it is not created by the landowners simply considered as landowners, for if the whole earth were merely “owned” till doomsday no wealth would be produced. And since it is one of the fundamental truths of political economy that no wealth is created except by the application of labour and capital to the land, it is equally obvious that to whatever extent the landlords receive what they have not earned, the workers must, directly or indirectly, to that extent go short of what they have earned.

CRIME: AND HAMON'S DEFINITION.

As the word “crime,” though familiar to every land and every class, belongs to that category of words which seem so easy to understand as not to need any precise definition, all the world uses it according to their individual enlightenment or ignorance, without seeing any necessity to define its exact meaning. Scientists, however, are bound to state clearly what they mean by the things they treat of, and each criminologist, or school of criminologists, has found it hitherto necessary to give a new definition for the word crime.

A. Hamon (whose article, “Definition of Crime,” appeared recently in this journal) is not a mere criminologist—he is a student of social phenomena over a much wider field, and when he treats of crime he does not limit his search for, or his recognition of it, to those who act illegally. He finds it, for instance, to a large extent among the military profession. Consequently his definition is much broader and at the same time more radical than all the others. He says “Crime is an act which injures an individual liberty. This is the man who, at some time of his life or in some way, has not injured the individual liberty of another? In fact there is no one existing who at this rate has not committed a crime. Possibly this is also Hamon’s opinion. At the same time he reminds us that everyone is that which his inherited tendencies and his environment during life have made him. Consequently in the words so ably put by Herzen, “the individual is not free to will that he wills but he is free to do what he wills, if no obstacle impedes the execution of his volition.” Therefore, even though a man’s acts may be deplorable, he cannot be held responsible for them. That brings me to the conclusion that it is unjust to condemn a man for any act.
This in my opinion is true, but it is in perfect contradiction with the usual opinion. With the exception of a few philosophers and more thoughtful Anarchists there is hardly anyone who does not believe that individuals are responsible for their actions, and that therefore, justly approved or condemned for them. The whole fabric of governmental institutions, such as the judicature and magistrature, is based upon this idea of moral responsibility. To my thinking the idea of crime has arisen out of this notion of responsibility.

And by the time people come to accept the definition that crime means an act that injures individual liberty, and to recognise that all mortal beings— not being angels—all mortal beings are criminals, crime will no longer be in their eyes what it now is. It will be equivalent to the inevitable—however regrettable—acts of imperfect beings in an imperfect society. Then it will be impossible to classify men as criminal or non-criminal, and the time of the possibility of the perfect and less perfect human beings. This brings me to my conclusion that crime is a word which no longer fits in with enlightened comprehension of social phenomena. It is a word which, as society grows more moral will fall into disuse, as being associated with ideas based on an inferior and no longer admissible moral theory.

A. Hamon's definition of crime is as far removed from that which the general public, including learned criminologists, mean by crime as an Anarchist's conception of Anarchy is from the old and less enlightened use of the term.

What would I suggest (it may be asked) in place of this definition? Nothing. I would suggest to give up talking about crime and criminals, and, taking the larger view of human nature, urge the inevitability of anti-social acts under inhuman, unnatural conditions, which themselves again are mainly owing to ignorance.

A. H.

Can Roman Catholics be Anarchists?

To the Editor,—Sir—Anarchists have not much difficulty in stating their opinion of the Church of England and its doings. That church is simply a spiritual manifestation of "state" authority; even its own members admit that it would be nowhere in the race to save souls if it were not "established". Nor can Anarchists have sympathy with the actions of the non-conforming bodies, for most of these organisations would willingly be "established" if they had the chance. The Church of Rome has however on more than one occasion refused the offer of recognition and succour, and in fact declined to be bribed by a very successful manoeuvre, and has to this extent been an Anarchist in spirit, although not openly avowing herself possessed of any such noble but much malignited principle. May it not therefore be assumed that the Romish Church stands in a somewhat different position towards the Anarchist movement than the churches above mentioned? The Catholic clergy have, not only in Ireland but in many other countries, stood manfully against the tyranny of government when the personal liberty of any member of their church has been in jeopardy, whilst maintaining strict observance within the bounds of their own churches, they have often dared the political oppressor—and the government for the time being—to do his worst. It would be interesting to ascertain how far this holding for and support of the principles of personal liberty can be relied on in the coming contest for freedom—in the struggle for the abolition of all known forms of "government" whatsoever. Would the Romish church's love of liberty remain intact if she became as dominant spiritually as she appears to be becoming? Is the principle of individual liberty so fully comprehended by her devotees as to cause them to be favourably disposed towards the only movement (Anarchism) which seeks to give life and a fellow liberty of thought and freedom of action to all? The appearance of the present French Revolution does not lend much sanction to this assumption. He cannot apparently forget that in Rome he is a temporal prince as well as a spiritual pope. But English Catholics do not talk in that spirit. Unrestricted liberty of thought and practice is an integral part of their spiritual belief and all they ask for. Under these circumstances they should give hearty support to the Anarchist propaganda. Are they prepared to do so?

D. B.

In re Emma Goldman's Lectures.—Collection at Lecture 1/3/8, Collected by Emma Goldman 5/0, Emma Goldman (donation) 10/0, J. Tochatti (donation) 10/0, total receipts 3/10/0. Hire of Hall 3/3/0, Printing 2000 handbills 6/0, Postage 1/0, total payments 3/10/0.

Liberty Pamphlets.

Price One Penny Each.

Socialism in Danger. Part II. By E. DÖMELA NieUWEHUIS. Translated by R. Garner.

Parliamentary Politics in the Socialist Movement. By E. BRIEL MALATESTA.

The Why I Am: (Third Series): Why I am an Advocate of Physical Force, by G. Lawrence; Why I am a Socialist, by (the late) E. J. Craig; Why I am an Anarchist, by Louise Michel.

Socialism in Danger. Part III. By E. Domela Nieuwenhuis. Translated by R. Grierson.

Jones' Boy: Dialogues on Social Questions Between an "Enfant Terrible" and his Father. By "Spokesman."

Liberty Lyrics. By L.S. BEVINGTON.

The Ideal and Youth. By ELL. E. RECS.

An Anarchist on Anarchy, by ELIÉSÉ RECS.

In Defence of Emma Goldman and the Right of Expropriation. By VOLTÁRNE DE CLEYRE.

First Series.


Second Series.


AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. By P. KROPOTKIN. Translated from the French. 1d.

ANARCHIST MORALITY. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.

THE COMMUNE OF PARIS. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.

THE PLACE OF ANARCHISM IN SOCIALISTIC EVOLUTION. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.

REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT. Price 1d.

REVOLUTIONARY STUDIES. 32 pp. Price 2d.

A TALK ABOUT ANARCHIST COMMUNISM Between Two Workers. By Enrico Malatesta. Price ½.

ANARCHY. By Enrico Malatesta. Price 1d.

ANARCHY AT THE BAR. By D. NICOLL. 1d.

THE WALSSALL ANARCHISTS. By D. NICOLL. 1d.

CHICAGO MARTYRS. Their Speeches in Court. With an Appendix by J. P. Altgeld, Governor of Illinois. 6d.

ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. Price One Halfpenny.

USEFUL WORK V. USELESS TOIL. By W. Morris. 1d.

THE TABLES TURNED, OR NUPKINS AWAKENED. By W. Morris. 1d.

TRUE AND FALSE SOCIETY. By W. Morris. 1d.

MONOPOLY OR HOW LABOUR IS ROBBED. By W. Morris. 1d.
CONTENTS
Between Ourselves.
Why I am a Member of the
I. L. P.
By GRIFFITH DELL.
Drawing the Line.
The Rev. T. Smugly on Anarchy
By J. BLAIR SMITH.
A Glasgow Man with the Swiss
Police.
By H. WEINBERG.
A Criticism of, "The Single Tax"
By J. M.
[114] The Monomaniacs:
A Fable in Finance.
By HENRY SEYMOUR.
To the Army of Revolt.
By JOE CLAYTON.

A JOURNAL OF
• ANARCHIST COMMUNISM •

WILLIAM REEVES, 185, FLEET STREET, E.C.
WHY I AM A MEMBER OF THE I. L. P.
BY GRIFFITH DELL.

I think, for the sake of clearness, I had better begin by defining Socialism as I understand it. I do not regard Socialism as merely the "nationalization of the means of production, distribution, and exchange." That is only the scaffolding, so to speak, for the building of the beautiful fabric which will be true Socialism, which is a universally prevalent spirit of altruism and love. It is consequently impossible for Socialism in its fullest and truest sense to become an accomplished fact at the present time.

The social system of any country is the outcome of the national spirit, and, pessimistic though it may seem at first sight, I can come to no other conclusion than that, bad as it is now, our present organization is the reflection of the moral altitude of the mass of the people.

The hand of every man is against his neighbour in the fierce struggle for life, and it is only the exceptional man or woman who sees the hideousness of it all. Our national spirit is "each for himself." When it is "each for all" Socialism will be possible. And this I feel to be the most important part of our work, as true revolutionists—to educate, to enlighten, and to liberate, rather than to demonstrate scientifically: to appeal to that loving right and good which lies latent within the soul of every human being, rather than to the intellectual faculties: for, at the risk of being accused of a sentimentalism, I must confess to being more of a moralist than an economist. To make English men and women brothers and sisters seems to me a shorter road to Socialism than to convince them of the impregnability of its economic basis. But here I would say that I do not expect nor desire every revolutionist to share any of my opinions, any more than I should expect or desire everyone to have red hair; for of all things let us have in the revolutionary ranks forbearance and charity one to another as comrades in very deed and not in word only.

I have not an exaggerated idea of the importance of the Independent Labour Party's position in the evolution of the perfected social state out of the present chaos. It is not a small power straining toward light—one that will have the liberty and fulfill its mission, and eventually vanish to make room for a mightier one than itself: it is but a body of men hammering together a little of that scaffolding whereby may arise Socialism that infinitely lovely fabric built of noble souls of men and women, whose spire touches heaven indeed. And although I should take off my coat for scaffolding, and work with my whole heart to get a Socialist majority returned to Parliament, yet, none the less, I have the firm conviction that true Socialism will never be attained by mere legislation, but only through that spirit of love and fraternity that I have spoken of. But let us have Socialists everywhere, in Parliament as well as out.

Wherever you find a true Socialist you find a man willing to cheerfully do his share of the labour nature exacts from every child of her; one who will recognize an equal in every human being he meets, neither regarding his capacities nor weighing his virtues, but by reason of the divine spark which dwells within the human soul; one who hates wrong and all injustice and who loves right and freedom. I think that a man who holds principles like these, and pledges his honour to uphold them in that modern harbour of misrule and injustice, which we call Parliament, is worthy of support; if he be a liar, then we will seek for an honest man. To me it seems that, for the present, laws and government must be, and that Anarchism will be the final social condition for an uplifted people.

We have lost our Paradise through the oppression of tyrants and through laws made by evildoers. By the laws framed by lovers of men must we be made worthy that Eden where alone no government will be necessary. That such a time will come is certain. There is no ideal that the human soul is capable of conceiving that is impossible of realization.

But not yet. We must work and have patience, holding fast to the faith, with eyes steadfastly fixed on the light at the end of our path. We are but poor men and women; we cannot take one great step and be at our journey's end; it is a long, long way yet.

The first step seems to me to be—making people happier and better, by creating better and healthier and more beautiful surroundings, and—a majority of honest Socialists in Parliament would do this.

That is why I belong to the Independent Labour Party.

DRAWING THE LINE.

The uses of organisation are much insisted on by Parliamentary Socialists, and from their point of view these uses are of great importance. To get a multitude of men to act in unity for a common end seems at first mention an admirable thing, but cooperation is not in itself a novelty, nor is it always a blessing. We call nothing of the kind good until we know its end. If the object of organisation be merely to elect a particular man or set of men to office, it is evident we should know something of the men, and something of the office they propose to fill, before we can get any enthusiasm for the preliminary organisation. Is the man good? Is the office necessary? Are questions needing to be answered before we can work the ganglia of capture. Men are so variable, and many of them so unreliable, that we prefer to save up our enthusiasm for the more impersonal and less changeable devotion to principles. Fling up your caps if you like for Tom, Dick, or Harry; we hold up our hands for certain principles to which we desire to have these men's assent. We will organise to advance our theories, but not to promote any set of men to office. Nor will we be bound on any consideration to vote for candidates we personally disapprove. It matters not how they label themselves, if they seem unfit—brought our principles into creditable action we claim liberty to stand aloof from them. Here we draw the line between the political parties and ourselves. We decline to be organised for voting purposes; for educational ends we may or may not cooperate, but in all else we demand freedom. We do not wish to compel others to behave like ourselves. When the merits of a candidate are pressed on our attention we simply ask, Is he worth voting for? Can he do any good? At present nearly the whole energies of Parliamentary Socialists are devoted to getting certain men into office, and we cannot pull ourselves together for such a paltry object. The common use of organisation is to enable certain men to conveniently use certain other men for ignoble and personal ends. For that reason we are not having any. Nearly all cooperative effort of a worthy kind will command the united strength of the people, and if any difference of opinion exist the people should be left to sift and settle the matter.

R. G.

In COMMON-SENSE COUNTRY, "as there was no mammon there were none of those dismal things which are eternal essentials where mammon reigns. There were no arsenals, no armies, no police, no spies; no banks, no prisons, no poisons; no judges, no dangers, no courts, no munitions, no confessions; no "rings," no strikes, no infernal machines, no galloways. Common-sense found no sort of use in all these queer things. Common-sense knew by hearing that mammon could not reign without them; but then common-sense found no reason whatever for putting up with mammon, or paying its expenses."—L. S. Bavintron.
CHRISTIAN ANARCHISM.

BY J. C. KENWORTHY.

In reply to Tonzeau Parris, in October Liberty, it may be worth while to say a few words further on this matter of Christian Anarchism.

The reason why I do not call myself a Christian Anarchist is, that to do so would do more harm than good with the mass of people, who do not understand the term, and I have not the slightest ambition to those who understand the legitimate significance of the words so calling me. But I am not going out of my way to court misapprehension. I am content to be known as one who seeks to follow the Jesus of the Gospels: this seems to me, least open to misapprehension.

Why is our comrade Parris amused about the orthodox preachers of the gospel who “read black where you should read white”? It is a serious matter; rather more serious than if a body of commentators who should call—only call—themselves Socialists, were to construct a careful and deliberate “comment” on the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels, and show the document to be Ultra-Conservative, and an authorization to burn at the stake those who believe in common property in land and capital! It could be done! The Pope did just this with the will of Francis of Assissi. Surely, surely, much is gained by proving, as is quite simply done, that Jesus was in the very forefront of the revolution.

Comrade Parris “defines” me to prove that “men are the creation of an all-powerful, all-wise, and all-loving being.” Well, I cannot prove to a man blind all his life, that red is red, or any colour at all. Nor would I attempt to prove anything to one like the Spectreman who said “I am always open to conviction—but I’d like to see the man who’d convince me.” But I am quite prepared, when asked, to give my reasons for the above statement; which I find to be just as valid for the building of my life as though it were part of an architect’s true plan for the building of a house. I merely mentioned it as the first great fact of life to the Christian—the first article in the spiritual belief which differentiates the Christian Anarchist from other Anarchists.

The “life hereafter” is the second such great fact and article of belief. Here again, I hold to this on grounds of fact, demonstrable fact, and of reason—pure reason. And how can I, comrades, not read the story (legend, he would call it) of the death and resurrection of Jesus, that he should say “there is not a single passage there declaring that the human spirit or soul enters the other life upon the death of the body?” See how the commentators have deluded even our clear-sighted comrades!

He speaks of “a radical error that blinds” me; namely, “an implied belief in the supernatural.” Now, I do not understand his use of the word “supernatural.” If, however, he means it to cover the spirit world, and all the associations and intercourse of humanity with that other order of being, then I must say, this is essential to the Christian conception of life. But these things are not “supernatural”; they are entirely “natural”, so natural that the Christian knows them and acts in them in the supreme part of his environment. Because the things do not appear real to, are not consciously apprehended by, Touzeau-Parris and many others, it is not to be supposed that they are unreal to, unapprehended by, others who know of them, and believe in them. Competent observers who have seen ghosts know that there are ghosts, notwithstanding the doubts of those who have not seen them, and even of some who have.

Then our friend raises the question, as to whether Christianity, “Christian civilisation,” has not failed.

I ask, Has civilisation ever tried Christianity? The answer is plainly, No. When it does, it will become something quite other than what it now is, and just what we reformers (I understand) want it to be. That will be when the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of God and his Christ. And this, Parris and others are, after all, little as they suspect it, doing something to bring about.

I repeat that, the better Anarchist, Communist, Reformer one is, the more surely this miserable society of ours will become to us a wilderness; and—for myself, and I suppose I am human, like other men—I need the conviction that this life is not all, that it shall “be well with the righteous”, to give me the hope, courage, power, which shall enable me to use my life most effectively in the cause of the right.

SINGLE TAX STUPIDITY.

To the Editor of Liberty.

In order to make out a case for the single tax, in your November issue, Mr. Arthur Withy has to assume that all men have equal rights to use the earth. In order to shatter such pretensions as are made by single taxers I must show that “equal rights” is a figment of the imagination. In a state of nature the rights of men are measured by their might, and whatever men have the might to do they have the right to do. The only alternative to the right of might is the right of contract. When men are sufficiently intelligent to perceive their self-interest they will abandon the right of might for the right of contract, or equal liberty. Then will the sunburst of Anarchy illuminate the universe. The state of nature, in which might and right are synonymous, has not vanished with the appearance of government; for, as I have said, the only alternative to the right of might is the right of contract, or voluntary agreement. No government has ever yet entered into a contract with the people, and in the absence of a contract there is no obligation. No person is by any principle of justice bound to respect the laws made by a band of individuals calling themselves a government. And, in so far as, the government invades the life, liberty, and labour products of individuals who have made no contract with it, these individuals are bound by no principle of justice to respect the government in any way. Even in the most civilized government of to-day there is no contract between the people and the government, and the right of might is just as valid as it ever was. This is subtly recognised by Christians and Hebrews, who bow in fear and trembling to God because he is Almighty.

When government is dead and the right of might gives place to the right of contract it will be in order to talk of “equal rights”. Till then the single taxers have no basis for their theory. If I, as a member of the community have a right to a share of the economic rent of every piece of land, I have also the right to dispose of such share in any way I may think fit. I may take my share or leave it, but even if I do the latter, the state has no right to touch a fraction of it unless I personally consent: and I shall not consent! But the state will take no notice of my protest. Why then talk of “equal rights”? The whole trouble with the land is that people have no right to it. Landlords will accept rent so long as the people consent to pay it. The only real solution of the land question lies in the refusal by the people to pay rent. As Proudhon said: “Products are bought only with product,” and taxes can be paid only with products; therefore the taxation of land values leads logically to the taxation of labor values. There is no necessity to deal further with the single tax. I have shown that it has no basis in fact or logic.

WILLIAM J. ROBINS.

DECEMBER, 1895.

LIBERTY.
DEATH OF L. S. BEVINGTON.

It is with deep sorrow we record the death of our dear comrade, Louisa Sarah Bevington, which took place on Thursday, the 28th ult., at her residence at Willesden, in the 50th year of her age.

L. S. Bevington was one of the most remarkable women of her time. Born and reared in the lap of luxury, but of better stuff than most of those thus delicately nurtured, she gave early indication of that great ability as a thinker and writer which she afterwards displayed, and which led to an introduction to the leading writers on science and philosophy, and secured for her the life-long friendship of Herbert Spencer.

Her early writings, which were chiefly of a poetical nature, gained recognition at once, and stamped her as a poet of uncommon power. Her later writings marked her out as one of the keenest and brightest thinkers of the day on social topics.

As an advocate of free thought she won renown in her brilliant reply to Mallock's article on "Modern Atheism," in the Nineteenth Century. This reply necessitated a second edition of the magazine. It was in this reply-article our friend enunciated her firm conviction—arrived at after years of thought and investigation—that "Conscience has taken millions to develope, and it has developed in obedience to a need, not to a creed—springing out of the fundamental demands of progressive existence rather than from the comparatively recent demands of theological aspiration."

Of late it has been one of L. S. B.'s greatest regrets that she was prevented by ill health from earning money by her pen which would have enabled her to support and advance the cause with which her feelings were in most active accord. Only those who were fortunate in having her friendship could adequately appreciate her natural purity of character, and the great bravery which characterised her whole life.

It might truly be said that she rose superior to circumstances. Her private trials were of that description which would have utterly broken down a less resolute nature, but so keenly alive was she to social injustice, that—ignoring her own sufferings—she strove with all her might to make the world better, and the advanced thought of today is enriched by her efforts, and her name will be revered, and handed down with those of Francis Galton, Herbert Spencer, Peter Kropotkin, and Louise Michel. Her friends were to be found in all ranks of life, and her readiness to aid all with the hand of a friend was not limited to her own circle, but everything she did in this direction was characterized by the grace and unobtrusive charm which so highly distinguished her.

As our readers are aware, it was during the latter part of the summer that our comrade's illness assumed a serious aspect, and necessitated all the care and attention her family could give her. Nothing however could save her life. Only a few hours before her death she was in excellent spirits—had been in fact dictating a contribution for the columns of Liberty, in answer to the letter of D. B. in our last number, which she made with all the quietness and coolness which her opinion was both "quaint and foolish," her contention being that any person recognizing authority of a spiritual nature could not possibly be a true Anarchist. With this conviction she passed peacefully away early on the morning of the date above mentioned.

"Key-Notes," a small volume of poems—which the title of which was probably suggested by Emerson's reference to the "Key-Note of Nature and Spirit"—was the first of Miss Bevington's works. It was published in 1879. Four of the songs, entitled respectively "Morning," "Afternoon," "Twilight," and "Midnight," were reproduced in a well known American periodical, the Popular Science Monthly, at the special request of Herbert Spencer, under the title of "Teachings of a Day." One of the teachings was that:

"In the drift of things and forces
Comes the better from the worse."

The mind of Miss Bevington had not as yet acquired its full vigour, for we find her asking "When breath has ceased for ever, are men all the same?" Indeed the whole work is not inaptly described in a few lines which we quote from the dedication:

... The sum of them together cast
Makes just one questioning discourse, such chord
As symbolises best unified life.

At this time Miss Bevington had scarcely begun the good work she was eventually to carry on.

Between 1879 and 1882 (the latter being the date of issue of her second book) L. S. B. had been very busy contributing articles to various magazines and newspapers—Modern Thought, Mind, The Anglo-Continental Review, etc.

"Poems, Lyrics, and Sonnets" displayed most unmistakably an advance on all previous efforts. There was a breadth, a fire, a power to:

... Hold aloft a meaning steadfastly
Amid the ruin-crash of falling creeds which occasioned The Cambridge Review to say
This little book shows beyond doubt that a poetess has risen among us stronger in her peculiar style than any of her predecessors."

The Athenaeum wrote:

"That Miss Bevington is a poet there can be no doubt; her poetic gift is that of an uncommon order to be met with in Blake's drawings and in the best of Dr. Garth Wilkinson's poems. There is in all three that sure power of inner vision which can clothe spiritual truth with visible form."

In well nigh every page of these "Poems, Lyrics, and Sonnets" there is an ever growing desire for freedom—the purest, the strongest, the best that men or women may win. It is in connection with this incessant longing and craving for liberty that one of the most important events in the life of L. S. B. occurred. She was married to an artist, a German. After a few years of wedded life they found themselves not altogether at variance, but out of tune with each other. In the light of this fact the last verse of the last sonnet ("For Freedom's Sake") in the volume has now a touching interest:

"But we have chosen Freedom: so I make
Here—as in part for weeks, for years, for life—
My promise: I will whet my steel keen knife
And one by one all memory's fetters break.
Ahh! go, forget, forgive love's lingering strife!
One Kiss—our last, Goodbye—for Freedom's sake."
straight, and her work thorough. She took her stand with
— "Anarchy's few; Fighting the False and the Bad
In all that they do;
Forcing a way for the Glad;
The Pure and the True."

Her articles in the Commonwale, Freedom, and Echo,
and more recently in Liberty and Torch are ample evidence of our assertion. Our readers will remember "Liberty Lyrics," containing the latest of L. S. B.'s poetical works. We must not omit mention of the fact that the translation of Louise Michel's "Commune of Paris" (which has been running through the last twelves numbers of L'Usine) was done by Miss Bevington, between whom and the author there has long existed a sincere and sympathetic friendship.
The last work published by L. S. B. was "Common-Sense Country." Our Comrade has left some unfinished and some unfinished MS. The publication of all or any of these will be eagerly anticipated by those who have already become acquainted with her writings.
The interment took place on Tuesday, the 3rd inst., at Finchley Cemetery. Amongst those attending were the brother, a sister, and several cousins of the deceased, Mr. and Mrs. Peter Kropotkin, Dr. and Mrs. Donkin, Mr. and Mrs. James Tochatti, the Misses Rossetti, Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence, and others.
The coffin was taken from the hearse to the grave, and at once lowered to its resting place amidst the utmost silence and without any formal ceremony whatever. A gentleman, a stranger, stepped forward and placed a very handsome wreath upon the coffin, and then quietly withdrew. To the wreaths contributed by the relatives of our comrade was added a large one from the London Anarchists," the ground work of which was red flowers, the letters being formed in white flowers.

TO OUR READERS.
The next No. of Liberty—the first of Vol. III.—will consist of Twelve Pages. The size of the page will be rather smaller than this, but with additional pages, and using a larger quantity of small type, we shall be enabled considerably to increase the amount of reading matter. Our present contributors most generously promise to continue their invaluable assistance, and several other friends have offered to write on subjects of great interest to Anarchists and to revolutionary Socialists. In the direction here indicated, and in other and similar methods, we hope to largely increase the numbers of readers of Liberty, and at the same time prove to our present readers that we do not forget their help in the past and that we intend doing our level best to deserve their continued confidence.

Can Roman Catholics be Anarchists?
To the Editor of Liberty.

Before an answer can properly be given to the above question we (Catholics) must know what Anarchism is. We can agree with much of "D. B." wrote when he asked the question in your last issue. Certainly it is true that the Church has refused State control, and must always do so, because—the Church is above the State, although always desiring to allow the State perfect freedom in its own sphere, which should never be contrary to God's laws, natural laws, or human reason. The Church does therefore stand in a different position towards Anarchism, or any other movement—that be occupied by other churches. The reason is about the clearest and in other countries having stood up manfully for the people are true—and a matter of history I presume no one will doubt or question. I cannot understand the point where historians are accused of practising spiritual oppression within the State or their own churches. The Church from the earliest times has been in almost continual conflict with state governments, kings, or rulers, for it has often been the oppressor to do his work and her children have suffered martyrdom in consequence, and would do the same again; but mark, it has always been a passive resistance, which has in the end triumphed, for the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church. D. B. says it would be interesting to ascertain how far it is the task of the Church to support the principle of individual liberty can possible be in the coming fight for freedom. The principles of the Church do not change. What they were in the past they will be in the future. Of course, Socialist writers of the revolutionary type are the least likely to be unduly prejudiced in their views, just as the Church has done for the people, and yet in their writings one finds a full acknowledgment of the good work accomplished for civilisation by the Church as a body but by those very monks and nuns who are the special bugbears of anti-catholic writers. I see in the very wealth of the medieval church a factor of civilisation and national prosperity, and in the so-called Reformation they know not what took place a wholesale robbery of the poor, and of the machinations through confiscation of their trade guilds, the effects of which we are suffering from to this day.
The Church's love of liberty is the same today as ever, and will ever remain the same. The Church's meaning of liberty is well understood by her children. When I know the Anarchists, as the two can be compared. The utterances of the holy Father will be accepted by his children with that obedience which his exalted position demands. "The Church, he forgets, is the position which it is by her every known right—a position which is an example of that which has by the sacred law. He orders the Church to the Anarchist propaganda," this is a false conclusion. Because Catholicism agrees that hunger, misery, robbery, and injustices are wrong and are going against us, and because we resist the oppressor in consequence of our love for justice and liberty, it is true that we must therefore become anything other than Catholics. Our history for the past 1800 years proves it. We can assist any society or group that aims to right wrong or improve mankind. We can take the good out of the teaching of any society, but there is no need to join it, nor any reason why we should not, provided the object is good and true. In her efforts for the abolition of slavery, in her moral orders, in her councils, and in her edicts which run without regard to political boundaries, in the low born hands of those before whom the poorest kneel, in her bishops who by consecration become the peers of the greatest nobles, in her servant of servants (so his title) who by virtue of the ring of the bishop claimed to arbitrate between nations, the Church in spite of everything, has shown dignity of association, and witness for the natural equality of men. One has only to study the history of the Church to know that it is unnecessary to become anything but a good Catholic, although others play a powerful part in the Church must remain a potent factor in social evolution.

Oscar Bamber

"Can Roman Catholics be Anarchists?" From the very nature of their faith they cannot. They believe in a god who is the sole creator, redeemer, and absolute disposer of all things. This god being truth, justice, beauty, life, and power, it necessarily follows that man is "conceived in sin and shaped in iniquity" and consequently unable to find truth, justice, etc., without a divine revelation. Roman Catholics teach that their church, with the "one pope as its head", has been made the custodian of that revelation by a supernatural agent or instrument", and that it is the only inspired expounder of the law of the universe to man. Thus the Church is essentially authoritarian in spirit, in that it is the law to which it is the duty of everyone to obey without question, and to claim to be above human reason. Inherently cannot be confined to theology, but must include the scientific, social, and political affairs of the world. Anarchists recognize rebellion to the authority of another as the most important factor making for anarchy, and who rebel against the authority of the Pope are to be considered as heretics. The Church "has refused to be bossed by any temporal authority" is because it wants to possess the temporal authority itself, (that is not "Anarchist in spirit") and as such it does its duty. It is true that "the law of God and the law of the Pope are one and the same", but the all other powers being its "subjects". In Catholic countries the State is consecrated by the Church, and it, according to the teachings of Socialism, is essentially the state. Anarchism as the synonym of individual liberty is the logical outcome of the Reformism and therefore the enemy of Roman Catholicism.
THE REV. TOBIAS MUGGLY ON ANARCHY.

His sermon was not altogether on Anarchy. By no means. It was simply before his last "in conclusion," which preceded the usual peroration, that he did not know it worth while to come from the pulpit. This he explained was a defect in his eloquence which was corrected in the next sermon. "This, my brethren," he said, "is one of those everlasting questions which perplex and move us, the dark and ineradicable riddle which must be read if we would have our minds prepared to read and understand the other side of the past." He went on in this strain for some time, and, after quoting half the Bible, succeeded in proving completely to his own satisfaction that the rod was neither bee nor pine but birch. Whether he thought the sermon was between the two or the other I cannot tell. He there or there to be known, I don't know, but at any rate he proceeded to give the congregation of little Bethesda his opinions and ideas on these men and their propaganda thus:

"It goes to my mind, brethren, to make known unto you that I have receiv'd information which compels me to accept the alarming conclusion that there are, in the neighborhood of our church, a body of men engaged in the devil's work, not only turning the hearts and minds of our youth away from God, but also from their masters. If they succeed in imbuing the minds of the people with their pernicious doctrines, their abominable wickedness should triumph and their abhorrent principles reign supreme, what, I ask, oh what will the consequences be? How shall we be able to live in those lodges—those wretched, unchristian, bankrupt, benevolent men, who so generously relieve them from all care and anxiety regarding superfluous money, who heretically accept the burden of riches with a maniacal eagerness? And I wonder, most piteously losing people in number that the great bulk of humanity may be certain of receiving it. Ah, my brethren, this is heresy, this is courage but seldom seen in the history of the world. What could the people do without the capitalist, who so generously provides them with employment, so that they may get through the day without time hanging about their hands, so that they may be kept out of mischief, for you know Satan always finds mischief for idle hands to do—this truly philanthropic capitalist, not only empowers them, but out of the largeness of his heart, provides the sympathetic loan of money which actually comes from his hands. What is the amount of loaned money? What is the amount of interest paid on these funds? What is the amount of taxes that pay them wages? What, I ask you, would become of our beautiful factories, whose majestic chimneys reach almost to the sky, belching forth their smoke, grandly colouring the air and carrying with it new breath of life? It might have been the most miserable of the suffering piles of brick and mortar we would have only green fields, blue skies, and a clear atmosphere. Oh, my brethren, is it not almost too horrible to contemplate—this outrageous abortion of the landholder and the manufacturer be the benevolence of the capitalist? Truly the great, Christian, for the young ladies of this congregation, if those abandoned stretches triumph, and the sages, as they threaten? What will become of the society for providing bounties? What will become of the jugged oxen in the fields then in full bloom? These Anarchists—denied, irreligious men—suggest that we should like the beasts and blankets for our own people at home; but they forget our own people have the strongest privileges, which is denied them by blanketing and blanketeting at the windows. And now I come to the last and most terrible calamity. What, my brethren, oh! what would become of me?"

And here the Rev. Tobias was so overcome with emotion that he sunk back on the cushions, and the service was declared over.

J. BLAIR SMITH.

A GLASSBLOWER MAN WITH THE SWISS POLICE.

Some months ago I went, on the advice of my doctor, to Switzerland. On arriving at Rothens, the capital of Obre, I found a brother in the hotel for whom I had reserved a room. I was, in fact, fast asleep by half-past twelve, at which time I was rudely awakened by someone leaning over me and mumbling something which I could not understand. The room being dark and the window now shut, I knew not what to do and was paralyzed upon being awakened. The intruder sharply asked me "Did you write a letter today?"

I said "Who are you?" The reply was "A policeman." By this time I was thoroughly awake, and instantly answered "No." I had not written a letter. I then passed into the door of the room, and then I saw that the adjoining apartment was lighted up, and that my landlady and her children were all there and apparently in great alarm. The officer, as I afterward told the woman in writing, "he, see, denies having written any letter." Being an American, I thought I was suspected, and I immediately asked him to show me the letter. I could not contain my laughter when I caught sight of a small sheet of paper I had written a few years ago. I then asked him what it was, but it was not a letter. He then informed me that I was his prisoner, and ordered me to come with him to the police office. I had no desire to increase the alarm of the family. I was so pressed, so my pulse fell on the floor and, having some copper cups in it, created considerable noise. I stooped to pick it up, when my wrist was caught in the iron grip of the officer, and on looking at the man's face I saw it was pale with fear. More amused than angry I asked him if he was frightened, and if he thought it was a six-shooter that had fallen from my pocket.

When he saw that I was laughing at him he let go his hold and went to the door, where he stood shaking like an aspen leaf. I again asked him if he was afraid, when he replied "No, I am not afraid, but my wife is dead, and I am thinking of my poor children." I assured him that I was in no danger, and that I could not understand from the drawer of the officer's coat. I was soon prepared to accompany him, and we marched along the deserted streets to the office. I was led up to a counter, on the outer side of which the chief constable (or whoever he was) was seated. "This is the man; he does not deny," said the policeman, who then took up a position behind me. The chief jumped from his seat, and withdrew a few paces, eying me with rather an unsteady look. "Are you a foreigner?" "Yes." "Have you written this?" "Yes." "Why did you write it?" "I don't know." "Are you an Anarchist?" "Yes." "Are you not ashamed to be an Anarchist?" "No, I am proud that I have intelligence enough to understand Anarchism." "Do you believe in God Almighty?" "No, I do not believe there is a God. I believe in the law, and I believe in the present state of society to continue: how could he see some of his poor children starving for bread, and forced to suicide, while others live in the greatest of luxury?" "Don't you believe in eternal punishment?" "Well, I don't know anything about it, I am not afraid of any world than this." "But you are not going to be arrested here." "Just as you like: I am not afraid of prison." "Well, you are honest, you don't deny your creed you may go." I asked that the policeman should accompany me back to the hotel and lodgings, to assure my landlady that she was perfectly safe in allowing me to remain there, or I might be compelled to walk the streets, or go to an hotel and charge him (the chief) with the cost.

The policeman was ordered to go with me. As we walked he began to talk in praise of Anarchism, said he was half Anarchist, and would like to ask me some questions if I would go to his office where he was going on duty, as he did not like to talk much in the streets.

After making matters all right with the landlady, I complied with his request, and as soon as we were alone he commenced to put a lot of questions about Anarchists and the movement generally, interpersing his questions with remarks to the effect that he was sick of the present system, and would like to blow up the rich people and break up the country in that manner. I managed to get out of him how it could be done. He then produced a bottle of whisky, and asked me to have some, but I declined. I answered such of his questions as I thought proper, and intimated that I was not to be caught by means of a little whisky. He was very liberal with me, as they will enable me to recall my acquaintance with the Swiss police.

I duly returned to Glasgow but very little the worse for my midnight adventure, excepting a slight cold. Had I been foolish enough to fall into the trap, I should have been caught against me, and wear to, and I might have been sent to prison. Perhaps this short account of my experience may be of service to anyone contemplating visiting Switzerland.

H. W.

Greetings.

Courage and speed you well.

The warfare is not for political freedom alone:

Nor yet for industrial freedom alone:

But for one who is strugling to establish the long established canons of obedience, against legalized ties to inability to marriage, against claims unduly pressed of family tradition:

Courage and speed you well I bid you.

If no account past or present arise of rebellion be heed:

Greater far the breaking of bonds, the step nearer Freedom

Than all the terrors of Heaven and Hell:

The great thing is the step nearer Freedom:

May ye be in conflict with public opinion:

You are against popular taste in art and literature:

Fight fiercely on.

Public opinion and popular taste are acceptable en masse, but never authoritative and coercive.

The blast of social displeasure will not kill so fatally as the gainskimsocialism of compulsion.

Whatever the warfare against all decrees of convention, rules of polite society, etiquette and the demands as to God or the soul, current morality, servile compliances.

If you, personal and immortal, stand for Freedom

I am with you, irrespective of causes and disputes.

And stand for the fight for Freedom you but pass from one master to another, and find the chains still fetter,

Be not discouraged.

For in the time last link shall be broken—if you desire it.

And only the solitude of the struggle, and the coldness of that isolation that blows o'er Freedom's frontier deprresses you,

Be not discouraged.

You are not really alone:

They come, and by you—close.

And unobserved are many around you, whom an outstretched hand—

Always the fight is for Freedom.

JOE CLAYTON.
THE MONOMANIACS: A FABLE IN FINANCE.

By HENRY SEYMOUR.

Once upon a time there lived in the moon a couple of people who sub- 
sisted principally by eating one another. In course of time their 
numbers became so diminished that they viewed with alarm the ap- 
proaching extinction of their species. But the first law of nature, 
which required the extermination of the weaker sex, and the re- 
pling of the earth with a new species, could not be neglected. This, 
and the universal belief that cannibals were a luxury, and by degrees they went to fasting, to pasture their 
husbandry, ultimately developing a rude system of commodity 
production. But the ground they found hand-to-labor to be excessively tiring, 
and although they worked from morning till night they had very great 
difficulty to produce enough to support themselves. Step by step, 
their devices better tools, and contrived some ingenious inventions by 
which they produced other things than corn, or for was at it 
not said of old that man cannot live by his own labor alone? If they 
ought a pair of boots, for instance, the shoemaker, preferring flesh, did 
ot want the fish. So after tarrying until the fish stank, he would 
mature a pair of boots, and go barefooted. In fine, they were in a 
state of hopeless fix for the want of something to exchange. 

Now there happened to be amongst them one, known by the name of 
Old Roth, who understood a little of the exchange. He knew the import 
ance of exchange, and that in the community exchange was more 
advantageous than the exchange of raw materials. He was, therefore, 
the only political economist practised by these people. He had suffered the 
wrath of the people, and was a confirmed invalid. He knew what 
the sum of all the goods of which there was abundance to produce. 
His opportunity had at last arrived. His inventive genius had made 
his fortune. He discovered a rule of exchange which could be made 
profitable to all, and which even furthered the interests of 
the community. He had brought to you bounties of money, and to make 
you a present of the idea, you will just grant me one and three. 

Name it, shouted all.

Continuing, he said, "the concession I refer to is that I have permi- 
sed the community to make use of any article of value, and I have 
set up a system of commodity production in which every person can 
make use of any article he chooses. But I have not forgotten the 
people, and I have arranged for them a system of commodity 
production, which I believe is the best for the whole community. 
This was so peculiar a request that the people fell to looking at each 
others' faces in bewilderment, wondering if the old man had taken 
a leave of his senses.

Certainly was agree," said they, after recovering from their aston 
ishment, knowing that the dirt could be of no possible value, and 
remembering that he was entitled to it, seeing that he had not used it 
together with his own hands.

"This is very fair for Old Roth," he said, "and I will unfold my scheme. 
It must have occurred to you hundreds of times that the system of 
barter which you have so long prised is a most wasteful and ineffi- 
cient one.

"Now hear," shouted the multitude.

"Such being the case," he went on, "it must be equally plain that if 
some scheme were devised to supersede it and to make the exchange 
of your products perfect and complete,—no matter whether one of the 
parties would greatly benefit it, and the other would suffer,—then 
that scheme must be worth a thousand times what you have been 
done or, not,—it would be the greatest boon ever bestowed upon 
the inhabitants of Lunarnia."
er (since they could not refund the principal) and he was therefore able to command all he desired. He had a large mansion built, magnificent in its appointments; the decorations were sumptuous; the most delicate satin and tapestry adorned the magnificent entrance. The best studs of horses was his, the most costly carriages that the art of mechanical ingenuity of mortal could devise, and the daintiest delicacies that ever graced the table of a prince. All these things he could enjoy, and could perpetuate these enjoyments because his debts never diminished—and year by year the interest returned on the unpaid principal being more than enough to command its payment in time to furnish him with such luxuriance and splendor. And in the same degree that he increased his riches, did they who ministered to him become poorer. So potent was the power of yellow dirt,—it is a true maxim that he who can procure happiness, that the people became possessed of an irresistible mania to get it at all costs. All other considerations were excluded from their thoughts; but those who were the shrewdest amongst them suggested that money was made by a most material thing, and that there was not an idea in the air that yellow dirt, as a token of exchange, had had its day. Seeing this, Old Roth went to great pains to ridicule all innovations; and as he controlled the newspapers he made them circulate all sorts of sophistries about the nature of the mud. The mud being comparatively unpopular with these things, became more and more bewildered, and abandoned, in despair, all hopes of improvement.

It occurred to Old Roth that it would be more expedient to offer the people small loans on easier terms. He foresaw that unless some yellow dirt was put into circulation, all industry would collapse, and then he would not be able to procure the things that he desired, in spite of his vast possessions.

The people were literally seized with a wild impulse to get and to keep it; those who failed to secure it in the usual way of producing something of value to exchange for it, connected all manner of devices by which the soil of Old Roth and those who had been more fortunate in their quest. The arts of commerce were shaped to the mad pursuit of dirt-collecting. Once in their possession, they hoarded it in strong iron boxes and vats of valour. They quite forgot its original utility, which was that of purchasing food and luxuries, and simply secured it for the purpose of worshipping it.

Old Roth had his clowns tightly riveted on the yellow dirt he had put into circulation, notwithstanding all their strong boxes. He laughed at the cost of their financial blindness. He always had the opportunity to dictate terms to his debtors, and made them favorable to him, so arranging the conditions of payment at such specified times that it was a physical impossibility for all of his debtors to discharge their obligations. He could foreclose on their mortgages, or on their slaves, or on their gold and silver银行s, and so on. The value of yellow dirt in circulation, he could thus degrees raise the value of all other things to his own advantage when he wanted to buy or sell. In a word, Old Roth, in controlling the circulating medium, pulled the strings of the entire industrial and commercial world.

The manipulation of the value of the currency soon got to be a fine art with Old Roth. He forced the wages of those who worked for him down and down until the women replaced the men because they needed the money less. He raised the price of labor, and by this means he could force the prices of the securities of the de-1quities, which were always double the value of the loan, and so get even more than his dues, and could thereby underwrite other dealers and monopolize markets. Thus the yellow dirt would come straight from his mine, and he would be the only one extracting or exchanging it. As the value of yellow dirt in circulation increased, he could thus degrees raise the value of all other things to his own advantage when he wanted to buy or sell. In a word, Old Roth, in controlling the circulating medium, pulled the strings of the entire industrial and commercial world.
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