THE COMMUNE OF PARIS.
By LOUISE MICHEL.

PART II.

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

CHAPTER II.—(Continued).

THE GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE.

There were acts of great courage that day. Derene wearing his scarf of office remained a long time alone in the doorway of the Hotel de Ville, opening the way. The aged Maizieux upright on the barricade had his over-coat perforated with bullets not one of which wounded him. He was to die all the same. He killed himself because he was afraid to work on account of his age, although he felt as strong as ever and his heart so young. Madame Lemel, Andre Leo, Madame Ponier, Blin Dangnet, Esecon et others were equally courageous.

At the end of half an hour the Place was deserted and marked with great patches of blood.

On the following day Jules Ferry caused the following proclamation to be placarded. It is a tissue of falsehoods from beginning to end:

"Paris, Jan. 22nd, 1871, 4.52 p.m.

The Mayor of Paris(to the Commandants of the Nine Sections.

Certain seditious National Guards belonging to the 10th demarcation have attempted to take the Hotel de Ville. They shot at the officers on duty, grievously wounded an Adjutant Major of the Mobile Guard. The troop replied. The Hotel de Ville fired upon from the windows of the houses on the opposite side of the Place, which had been occupied in advance. Bombs were thrown at us and explosive shells. The agglomeration was of the most cowardly and odious nature from beginning to end, since more than a hundred rifle shots were aimed at the colonel and his officers at the moment when they were diminishing a deputation which had been admitted just before into the Hotel de Ville. Not less cowardly was it afterwards, when, after our first discharge, the Place being cleared and the firing having ceased on our side, we were shot at from the opposite windows. Make these facts known to the National Guards, and send me word as to whether order is once more restored. The Republican Guard, and the National Guard are in occupation of the Place and its approaches.—Jules Ferry.

It is a work in written sympathy rather with the men in power, than with the revolutionists, that we find the following frank statement: "We had to content ourselves by denouncing to death for contingency, Gustave Flourac, Blanqui, and Felix Piat."

The Government protested more loudly than ever that Paris should never be surrendered. Possibly a few of them may have so desired. On Jan. 28th, however, an announcement from Jules Favre proclaimed the armistice, for Paris, and for the provinces. Thus the surrender became a matter of certainty. The only thing that remained uncertain was the date on which William would enter Paris.

Jules Favre knew well enough that to deprive betrayed Paris of her arms would mean immediate revolution; or can it be that he felt a scruple about it? Be it as it may, the National Guard retained its arms. In spite of the silence on all these points, the truth as to the Government's intentions leaked out everywhere. Those who had so long and so firmly maintained that the Government of the Defence would never surrender, hang their heads. Many of them joined our ranks.

Of the immense number of warrants for arrest that were issued on Jan. 22nd, hardly any were carried out after those few taken at the first moment. Insurrection, may, revolution would have taken place at once if the arrests had continued; even the municipalities refused to do it. Of the hundred or so taken prisoners on the arrival of the troops before the Hotel de Ville, some were arrested at random in the neighbouring streets, and were mere lookers-on, or passers by. Read now G. Lefrancois, an account of the mass in which they were treated, as also the men arrested on the previous occasion. Oct. 31st, who having been transferred to Vincennes before the 21st of January, had now no chance of liberation.

These unfortunate people were first thrown into Vincennes prison with those arrested on Oct. 31st; and remained there crowded together, eight days without fire. It snowed through the windows into the turret room where they were confined, and they had to sleep pell-mell as they could, on a surface of about 150 square yards, and in the midst of the most abominable filth.

One of them, citizen Tibaldi, who was imprisoned because of Oct. 31st, and who had endured all kinds of mental and physical tortures at Cayenne where the Empire had kept him for 18 years, declared to us that he had never seen the present evil conditions equalled.

After being removed from Vincennes to la Sante, in which prison they remained a fortnight in unwarmed cells, where the damp was such that water ran down everywhere, impossible to keep either clothing or bedding dry, they were taken to St. Pelaye, where they had another two months to wait pending the judgment of the Court-martial to which they had been committed.

Among those imprisoned on Jan. 22nd, we met the citizen Delescluze, who had been arrested and thrown into this hole merely for being the principal editor of Le Reveil, which had been suppressed. Delescluze, who was sixty-five years of age and very feeble, took acute cholera, and left Paris dying on the 10th of Feb, just after the elections of Feb. 14th which sent him to the Assembly at Bordeaux. Lastly a workman, citizen Mague, arrested at the moment of entering his dwelling, on returning from the workshop. He was already ailing, and died a month later at St. Pelaye, a victim to the treatment he had endured.

From January 23rd, the clubs were closed, the following decree having been issued on the evening of the 22nd:—


The Government, that in consequence of criminal incitements of which certain clubs have been centres, a few agitators known to the entire population, have engaged in civil war, it is time to put an end to these detestable machinations, which under present circumstances are a danger to the country, and the recurrence of which would tarnish the hitherto irreproachable honour of the Government of the Defence of Paris, it is decreed:

The Clubs in question are suppressed until the end of the siege; the various halls in which they have held their meetings will be immediately closed. Disobedience will be punished according to law.

As the Prefect is charged with the execution of the above decree.

(Signed) General Trochu. Jules Favre.

Emmanuel Arago. Jules Ferry.

From the day the clubs were closed, all Paris became club; the streets with the bee-like murmer of agitated crowds. Such numbers already dead from privations, the numbers fallen on French and German lines, within whose mothers had only reared to feed the crowds or fatten the fusiliers, so many wounded and disabled from earning a livelihood & so many aged people and children, dead or abandoned and to think that the long train of desolations and miseries should only have availed to prolong under another name the still unrelenting chain of the penal system! Truly it seemed incredible.

The bombardment which up to Jan. 28th had continued throughout the dark nights (for Paris was no longer lighted) found nothing but indifference among the population. But the news of the armistice caused a great tumult; the bombardment was suspended. The Committee of Vigilance of the Faubourgs silently took note of everything. The Central Committee of the National Guards, with which were joined some members of the Parisian Federal Council of the Commune, the Blanquists, and the Committee of Vigilance of Belleville, Le Villette and Montmartre, awaited events, resolved upon revolutionary action.

Meanwhile the nominations for the Assembly continued; it being certain that the conditions of the peace is charged that should be completed by Feb. 8th, so that the National Assembly might be held at Bordeaux, and forthwith decide either as to the conclusion of peace, or else to continue the war, which in case the conditions of peace should be rejected, would re-commence on Feb. 17th.

Jules Favre, Jules Simon, and Garnier Page ranged the country. Gambetta had just stifled the Commanos of Lyons and Marseilles, thus showing none of those men could crowd expect anything but repression; certainly no act equal to the occasion could be looked for.

A second delay was accorded, however, till Feb. 28th; and the entry of German troops into Paris was fixed for the 1st of March.

After the events of Jan. 22nd, Trochu had resigned his nomination. But this concession to public opinion could scarcely count as such, since Trochu was replaced by Vincy, one of the men of the Coup d'Etat in '51. William had now wasted its time in drawing up lists of candidates, ranging from simple Republicans to the Internationalists. The inspection of the ballot boxes yielded the customary surprises, which had recurred so often since the occasion when Thiers, on the eve of the official proclamation had scored only 61,000, yet was able to boast of 103,000 on the following day.

When Garibaldi, elected by three departments, presented himself at the Assembly at Bordeaux, he was greeted with laughter, even before he had spoken in order to receive the honorary dignity and to offer himself and his sons to the service of the Republic.

After the election of Grey as President, the resignation of the members of the Provisional Government, and the nomination of Thiers as Chief of the Executive, peace was voted on March 2nd, by 546 votes against 107.

(To be continued.)
ON THE DEFINITION OF CRIME.

Br A. HAMON.

[Continued from No. 13.]

Calumni, bad faith, lies, hypocrisy, injustice, deceit, abuse of power, etc., are acts that suppress or restrict individual liberty. In consequence these acts injure liberty and according to definition they are crimes.

Without prejudging the author, this definition allows us to classify as crimes: murder, wounds, mutilations of oneself, that is to say suicide etc. For the criminalization of these acts, we need not take social conventions, nosiness to society, infractions of natural laws into account, it is sufficient that they injure individual liberty to classify them as crimes. There seems to be no universal act that cannot be comprised in the class of acts so defined as crimes.

The definition: an act that injures individual liberty is a crime, is therefore precise, clear, sufficient, and general. It has been decided upon, setting aside all conception of good or evil, all idea of breach of feelings, customs, laws. It clearly defines crime itself, for it gets rid of all side issues; causes, aim, author, social conventions, reprehension, approbation, indifference, it is well suited to all times, to all places.

Some will object, by the fact of its generality, that this definition allows of classifying as crimes nearly all actions committed daily. This is true, but there is in that no hindrance to its adoption. In fact this objection is raised by the ordinary notion that all crime implies censure or approval of the act and its author. The definition I propose, I cannot repeat too often, does not imply any other element than the act itself. Approval disapproval, responsibility, and irresponsibility are special elements not connected with the act itself, but with crime considered with its cause, aim, author, its physical and social surroundings. These are variable elements that cause the same act to be approved or disapproved, according to determinative circumstances, according to the collective mind. Some typical facts will throw a light upon the subject.

Man kills man: crime. In looking for the causes and the aim, we learn that the mass was a prey to famine, in shipwreck for instance, and that they killed to sustain their own existence. It is evident that the crime cannot be reproached.

A man steals: crime. In searching for the causes and the aim, we establish that this man has stolen food, and clothes, because being without bread, without clothing he was about to die of hunger, and cold. It is evident that this crime cannot be censured, I should even add that its author should be praised.

A man tames a wild beast: crime, because he injures the individual liberty of the animal. We verify that this domestication adds to the well-being of man, that is, to say to individuals of the same species as the author of the crime. It is evident that all men will find the crime useful, and will praise the action and its author.

A man kills animals, mutilates them: crime. Analyzing the causes and the aim, we verify that the man hopes by his murderous experiments to make discoveries that will benefit the lives of other men or animals. It is evident that the crime is praiseworthy, that the crime will be approved of. The same crime is perpetrated with the identical aim in the country where society has defied or consecrated the animal, victim to the crime. The action is censured, the criminal is punished.

The same crime has been perpetrated, but when making an etiological analysis we see that the criminal has acted for his own amusement and recreation. It is evident that the action and the author will be disapproved of by men of refined feelings, whereas the act will be indifferent to less refined natures. This is so true that the generality of civilized men who have legislated for the protection of animals, have only included certain ones in these laws, and do not think it deserving of punishment, and not even blameworthy to torture or kill flies, ants, etc.

War does not occur without individuals being killed, wounded, mutilated, without things being destroyed, or stolen: crime. Nevertheless, a great number of people do not consider it worthy of reprobation, nor to glorify it and applaud the actors, other look upon it with contempt and despise those who take part in it.

A man steals: crime. On examination we find that he has stolen to increase his riches that are already in excess of the average possessed by others. The generality of men will censure both crime and criminal.

A man adulterates food or other products: crime. He has done it so adroitly that his acts are legal. Crime and criminal will be approved of by many, will be censured by a minority.

A man appropriates more landed, real, personal, or tangible property than is necessary for his existence: crime; in fact all he has in excess he takes away from other men: in consequence he injures the liberty of putting into action the desire of other men to enjoy these riches. This is accepted by the present society. The crime is conformable to custom, the criminal is respected, saved by a minority. A man possesses other men as he would slaves, a crime. But yesterday, it was considered moral, and wounded no feeling, and in consequence entailed no censure whereas nowadays the majority of civilized men reprove these acts.

A man abuses the power that society has freely conceded him for a fixed purpose; a man keeps that power in spite of society: a man takes possession of power against the will of society: crimes. It is the rule in present societies. The majority of men find these acts just, as they are conformable to custom—their authors are always honoured, sometimes glorified.

A man revolts against society: crime. By an etiological analysis we find that the author’s liberty was injured by society acting criminally towards him; we verify that the aim, of his crime was to bring about a change in the social contract, so as to increase the well-being of each member. Some will censure the action, will punish the criminal; the others will praise the act and glorify or deify the criminal.

These few examples show the impossibility of defining crime, if we entertain the notion of reprobation or approbation, because according to time and place crime and criminals would vary. There would be no means of studying criminality in all times and places, in utilizing the comparative method so successfully used by anthropologists.

By its breadth, the definition I have given, allows of the comparison of criminal forms in all times, among all peoples, and even among animals. The breadth of this definition encompassing, not any longer exceptional individuals, but individual masses, gives a greater interest to criminology, not only from a speculative point of view, but also from a practical standpoint. From these criminological studies will result conclusions, no longer respecting exceptions or abnormal individuals, but the mass of individuals. Moreover, although crime does not depend on the estimation of the act, criminologists will be able to judge of the criminality of a collectivity at a given time, by the appreciation of criminal acts by that collectivity, at that time.

In fact, the man who applauds an act, in so doing shows the possibility of his committing that act.
Between Ourselves

Our Comrade Emma Goldman who is now in England, not on pleasure but for propaganda will be very pleased if any comrade will oblige her with No. 1 of Liberty.

Comrade Leggatt was arrested on Thursday last for non-payment of fine inflicted on him for taking a seat in a second-class carriage instead of standing in a third, or to use his own words, “Not because I wished to mix with the respectable classes, but because I prefer stuffed cushions to deal boards.” He will be out on Wednesday Sept. 11th. All comrades are asked to forward subscriptions to maintain his wife and family to R. Peddie, 56 Ford Park Road, Tidal Basin, London E.

Our next number will contain a reply to J. C. Kenworthy’s article by Touzene Parris.

If our friend Clayton, whose letter appears in another column, had read Liberty regularly he would have known that the Anarchists have no “patronies” either against Parliament or anything else. A series of articles has appeared showing the futility of political methods as far as enabling the wealth-producers to get the results of their labor is concerned. We are not “dogmatics” because we reason, argue, and invite discussion, and are open to conviction; but Parliament is essentially an instrument of aggression and therefore we cannot take part in politics, or help the State Socialists to become Legislators—Governors. We want to “manage our own affairs,” but that is rather an argument against sending men to Westminster, than in favor of it.

The Bakers’ Record says that never since the battle of Waterloo have we grown sufficient wheat to feed the inhabitants of these islands and calls attention to the fact that in 1854 our population was about 27 millions, and now it is nearly 40 and asserts it is absurd to talk of supplying the nation with bread without using foreign flour, and finds fault with the Agricultural Guild when it says, “We have it upon the most capable and reliable authority for guiding the destinies of British agriculture that the land of the United Kingdom is capable of supplying daily bread of the highest quality for the people of these islands.” And contends that members of the Agricultural Guild have not troubled to arm themselves

with facts, our contemporary seems oblivious to the fact that methods of agriculture are different to-day to what they were in 1854 and to our mind British food for British people is neither foolish nor parochial, and it may enlighten the Editor in question who is either willfully blind or lamentably ignorant, to refer him to “The Coming Reign of Plenty” in the Nineteenth Century as to what might be done.

If the soil of the United Kingdom were cultivated only as it was thirty years ago, 24,000,000 people, instead of 17,000,000, could have been grown food, and what railroads could carry, if the occupation at least 750,000 men, would give nearly 3,000,000 wealthy homes to the working class, and of course our railway lines are not going to be crowded while any more of the United Kingdom would grow food for 27,000,000 inhabitants out of 35,000,000. If the now cultivated area of the United Kingdom (82,000 square miles) were cultivated on the average in Belgium the United Kingdom would produce food to carry seven million inhabitants; and it might export produce, without craving to produce, so as freely to supply all the needs of a wealthy population. And if the population of this country came to be doubled, all that would be required for producing the food for several million inhabitants would be to cultivate the soil as it is cultivated in the best farms in this country, in Lombardy, and in Flanders, and to cultivate the meadows when at present are almost unproductive around the big cities in the same way as the neighbourhoods of Paris are cultivated.

It is time for these Rip Van Winkle’s Editors to open their eyes as to what is going on around them, when such a serious charge as that made by one of the speakers at the conference called by this Guild. Namely, that saw-dust was now largely being made into flour and alleged his ability to prove it; several medical men followed him and unreservedly denounced the way English bread was made, assuring that it was answerable for many of the diseases to which London children are especially subject.

Owing to pressure on our space, “Priest and Prophet” and a number of other articles, as well as notices of pamphlets and periodicals are held over for our next issue.

THE PREJUDICE AGAINST PARLIAMENT.

To the Editor of Liberty.

Of that idea that because a man goes to Westminster to speak for the people, he is necessarily “reactionary,” “disregarding the masses,” or “wanting to get power for himself.” I don’t see why Anarchists should think those things, and as some do, grow quite dogmatic on the subject. Why not say, “Can Parliament do anything useful for us”? Instead of starting with the dogma (for that is what it is) in the mouths of some Anarchists “Parliament is no good.”

Parliament shouldn’t be a bogey to any of us; if Socialists think their service is of no use, they may help to bring down Socialism the sooner than if they remained outside, well, we can’t help them about it. They may be wrong in thinking so, but then we may be equally wrong in thinking the reverse. The Individualist Anarchist may say, “No, that he don’t care. Parliament is at any price, and object, to be brought any nearer, neither through any other means whatever. But Communists cannot be in this position, or take up such a logically attitude. They (many of them like our old Socialist League) have all the love for Socialism, apart from a dominating State Control, and are far from being indifferent to its forward march.

Well, then, if Parliament is only to be used as a help towards aiding the growth of Socialism, (as it was for instance by Mr. Keir Hardie) and the Socialist members do not steadily maintain the real objects of their cause, though they may besides aid and indeed try to press forward some useful legislation in defence of the workers; why should there be any prejudice against this kind of action?

It is surely true that to Socialist believers Parliament can be any thing more than a help towards realizing Socialism.

We hear every day from Socialists and others the need of education in Socialist Economics and Ethics, and of ways in which we can practically carry on in the absence of outside force to compel us to do so. And after all, Parliament can do certain kinds of work for us, work which we haven’t all of us for ourselves, just as the shoemaker may make shoes for those who cannot do it for themselves, if the work is unsatisfactory, well, we have our remedy in each case.

Let us try and be reasonable on this question of Parliamentary action by Socialists, and though it may not personally suit our dispositions to take part in it, nevertheless do not let us be petty others who may be deemed by our comrades fit and useful for that work.

T. CLAYTON.
WHY I AM CALLED "A CHRISTIAN ANARCHIST."

By J. C. KENWORTHY.

I say "called," because, to most people, no title could be more misleading than this of "Christian Anarchist," with which I therefore do not label myself others so label me, however.

That I am an anarchist," in so far as I believe that men ought to live together without using force upon one another—that is, without "governing" one another,—I must confess, is true. Yet no one could possibly be more opposed to the methods of some Anarchists (the violent faction) than I am: for I believe violence to be the most reactionary of practices; one which simply and always plays into the hands of the oppressors.

And in objecting to "government" I find it necessary, in these days, to always make a clear distinction. Our present government is really a compound of functions, one administrative, one coercive. The former is proper and necessary; being the organised activity of the nation operating in useful ways for the carrying on of the national business; the post office, road making, corporate gas and water supply, are examples of the administrative side of our government. The coercive function is improper and oppressive; being merely the means whereby the privileged propertied class enforce their wills upon the body of the workers, and keep them in virtual slavery. As for instance, the power of law and police which keeps up the railings round the landowners' yards and fields while millions cooped up in slums are perishing for want of space; or the military force which shoots down the wage-slaves at Featherstone because they appear a threatener danger to mine owners' brick-mallet.

This Coercion, we must abolish. But Administration, we must develop out of its present corruption and fearful inefficiency, into the wholesome ordering of the affairs of a free people.

So that my ideal, if realised, would be not unlike that pictured by William Morris in "News from Nowhere." One may say that there is to-day a really great mass of opinion in the so-called "civilised world," which is describable as "Socialist," and has for its ideal such a New Society as I have spoken of. But the mass of Socialism is differentiated into sections on the question of methods; the State Socialist wishes to bring his Socialism about by means of Government, that is, by using the existing forms of Coercion in the interests of the New Order; the Anarchist wishes to destroy all existing forms of Government, and leave Society to reform in the strength of its recovered freedom. And many Anarchists believe that democracy, or rebellion, may put an end to Government.

This is as I have said, seems to me a delusion; and it is where the Christian Anarchist parts company with his fellow-believers who goeth the way of violence.

Many people think that the "Christian" Anarchist or "Christian" Socialist, is a feeble creature who dare not leave the old orthodoxies and trust to his own inspiration. That may be true in some cases, but it is not always true. For my own part, I am a Christian, because I know not any other doctrine which is as true to life and fact, and therefore so capable of supplying the sublime and simple motives, guideances and powers which the social reformer needs. Of course, to discover that this is so, you must not read the New Testament as its orthodoxy—not interpreters, but verifiers—do. Where they read black, you will most commonly need to read white, if you really desire to get at "the mind of Christ."

Now the doctrine of Jesus, summed up, is something like this:

Men are the creation of an all-powerful, all-wise, all-loving Being.

Men are sent into this world, to develop them, and to prepare them for another life which follows this life, the human spirit, or soul, entering that other life on the death of the present body.

The lesson men have to learn in this life is that of intelligent love to one another; those who fail to learn this lesson having to suffer "purgatory" until they shall learn it.

Present social conditions—those called "civilization"—are based, not on intelligence and love, but on stupidity and hate; therefore every person who is wise and loving must contend against social conditions, to the death if need be.

Property—the possession of riches—is a denial of the "love" principle; no man has a right to "own" that which a fellow man needs more than he does. This is, in fact, Communism.

Men must rise superior to the idea that their lives are bound up with their bodies. Not the body, but the soul, is the seat of life; and the life of the soul consists in surrendering it to the powers of truth and love. Better, infinitely, for our bodies to die for these principles, than for us to live on, violating them.

In this conviction men must take their lives in their hands; giving up everything which does not come to them freely from the love of others; and they must afford to the world, here and now, an example of life lived on ideal principles.

Well, that is a Christianity which I think commends itself to clergymen, and ministers, and the congregations committed to their charge, even less than bomb-throwing Anarchism does, for this time, the enemy is in their own camp. But that this is what Jesus taught, and why he died, seems to me perfectly clear. It is a teaching, to follow which needs a courage equal, if not superior, to the most desperate Anarchists of the violent method. And just because he seems to me the clearest headed, surest, most matter-of-fact, and most effective, of the world's teachers—just because of that, I call myself by his name, and think it a grand thing if I may, ever so little (though the more the better), walk in his steps. And practical experience in the effort to influence the lives of others more and more convinces me that I do wisely in building on the foundation which another, (one so great and as good) worthy of our boundless love, has laid for us.

The Crispian Dictatorship.

The government of Francesco Crispi has sent the country back sixty years. By him and through him all the old instruments of torture are in use. Spies fill the cities, detectives scour the fields, informers listen to speech, public and private; literary clubs and co-operative societies are arbitrarily dissolved; packed juries condemn, venal judges sentence; military courts imprison civilians; civil courts judge homicidal officers; time-serving prefects deny the franchise to all independent thinkers and manipulate the electoral lists to secure their governments; ladys as they come singing through the country lanes are arrested if the song is of liberty; little children writing in chalk on town walls are imprisoned for forty eight days. There is terror from Alps to Alps, the police, armed to the teeth, swarm everywhere, and the prisons are crowded with innocent citizens.

The country has gone back to the darkest and worst days of Austrian and Papal tyranny, and the name of the tyrant is ostensibly Humbert of Savoy, in reality Francesco Crispi.—Outida.

Though through the press and by private conversation, men are perpetually reminded that when it has ceased to wield the new broom, any governing power tends to become either a king kong that does mischief, or a king log that does nothing; yet more deputy governing powers are asked for with unwavering faith. While the wisdom of officialism is daily illustrated, the argument for each proposed new department is made with the postulate that officials will act wisely. After endless comments on the confusion and apathy and delay of Government offices, other Government offices are advocated. After ceaseless ridicule of red-tape, the petition is for more red-tape. Daily we castigate the political ideal with a hundred pens, and daily pray to it with a thousand tongues.—HANSARD STANHOPE.
TORTURING ANARCHISTS IN SPAIN.

In May, 1894, six Anarchists were shot, or rather “done to death” at Barcelona. There were rumors at the time that the prisoners had acknowledged the seizure guilty of the crimes with which they were charged, but nothing positive or definite was known. Now however the facts are being published, and we learn how the so-called confessions were obtained by torture which may take their place alongside the diabolical deeds of an earlier age.

A small Spanish pamphlet, La Montenza, “El Proceso de un Grande Crimen” (the trial of a great crime), La Coruña, 1895, 599p., contains a number of letters from our imprisoned or dead comrades, from which we glean the following extracts and particulars.

Francisco Villarrias (a carpenter, 45 years of age) tells the tale of the sufferings, and his letter is confirmed by the signatures of nine other comrades; he was himself sentenced to penal servitude for life and may now be, if he survived the new sufferings in the transport ships—(a picture in La Idee Libre, of June 15, shows how our comrades are treated on these ships)—like so many others transported on the Philippine Islands in the extreme Orient. From this long letter we take the following:

Alberto Saldani, arrested in the Liceo Theatre, is not acquainted with our ideas, a sculptor in marble, an Italian, 50 years of age. He was a victim of the grossest indignities, and never-ending blows, until he was left for dead. Brought to the Governor’s Palace (the office of the Governor General of Barcelona, it wastgl of the enemy who hides and takes back to the prison apparently dead. The Governor’s secretary gave him three violent blows in the face, and he was not even an Anarchist. Needless to say, that he knows nothing of the crime for which he was arrested.

Juan Arago, a baker, and a native of France and an Anarchist; blows every day were his lot, his head was torn off and one of his teeth was knocked out by a violent blow in the face.

Alfredo Bucchetti, an Italian, 29 years of age, was beaten, gagged, and allowed to sit down for five days. During all this time he was given dried codfish and not a drop of water. Feverish and utterly prostrated he had to be removed to the hospital—and all for not saying what he did not know; being as innocent as the others.

Alfredo Buggiero Binaldi, an Italian, age 29, knew nothing of Anarchism, was extradited by the generous French Republic! He had to walk for a long time, was beaten, and in the night of December, in the primary of the vicinities of Montnell (where they were all kept prisoners) and threatened to be drowned if he did name the accomplice of the Liceo Theatre outrage. He was twice submerged in the water and taken back to his cell where, in the midst of winter, his clothes had to dry on him.

Emilio Navarro, a shoemaker, age 39, an Anarchist; blows; and the gag, dried codfish without water for a number of days, and was not allowed to rest. On the way to the Governor’s House he was told he would not be confounded and they pointed their rifles at him, and as he gave no reply negative to all questions he was terribly beaten with the butt-ends of their rifles.

Don Alonzo Aranda, a Spanish wool weaver, had to eat dried codfish for five years, without water; during his extremest times of suffering, he was forced to drink his own urine which, with most of the other victims, consisted of blood. He was not allowed to rest, and then, to intensify his sufferings they tied his testicles and inserted a stick which they knocked in and out. Finally, they poured oil on his body; the flesh was torn in a most brutal manner, iron was heated and they threatened to place them on the wounds if he did not make such declarations as suited their purpose.

We pause here to reflect whether the beasts who inflicted those tortures were simply madmen; yet we have no doubt that they only acted according to international police practice. Thus at the time of Ravan it became known that the executioner pinned him in such a way as to make every one of the most extreme pains in the genital parts, this was done to make him look frightened and faltering in his last moments, in which, however, they did not succeed. And in the Nineteenth Century, March 1884, p. 481, we find a quotation from a Russian book, relating to the torturing of a girl of eleven years—in order to extort a declaration concerning some crime committed by her father. The girl, who was a prisoner in the cell, “was placed in the same cell before the executioner flung her from the head to the soles of her feet. She had already several lashes with the cat’s-tail-tails; when she asked for something to drink, a salted herring was presented to her. The torture would have gone on had not the executioner refused to do his work. We hear of no such scruples on the part of the Spanish torturers.

Shortly after the Spanish events the torture of codfish was removed in the Belgian Anarchist, Liege. Thus we have not only single acts by maddened brutes, but systematic acts by the international police. Is it to be wondered at that the instigator of all this, the infamous Larocco was shot at by Ramon Mural, shortly after this; he escaped and had Murull tortured to make him denounce his accomplice though his was a purely individual act. Still some unfortunate friends of his were arrested, among whom was Ramon Felip; they put chips of wood under his finger-nails and resorted to other acts as barbarous as those above mentioned until he lost consciousness.

And Larocco goes on to tell of Jose Beraza, an Anarchist, who was executed in May, 1894. There was a letter of Beraza’s printed on April 3, 1894, in which he says that after eight days detention, when he expected to be liberated, he was brutally flogged and brought before Larocco, who for two and a half hours tried to make him confess. Then Larocco (he says) my martyrdom began. They began by beating me for nothing. They threw food in my face, tormented by thirst. Night came and having eaten nothing all the day, I asked for food. This I was refused. They brought in a large slice of dried codfish which I ate with avidity. I asked again for water when he told me that it was prohibited. I passed the night in walking up and down the cell, and when I stepped the miserable carva rang. I was ordered to make a document and to make a confession. I was殴打 at the same time I was again led before the Governor. Our interview ended with the same result as the day before; having gone back I received more blows, but nothing to drink and was not allowed to sleep. Finally the day was out, and I was able to get to the cell, but the cell until I dropped from sheer exhaustion. The next thing I was conscious of was that a cup of broth was being given me. The Governor began to interrogate me again; my sufferings were so severe that I could not resist my memory of my friends and comrades; but they were not satisfied because I did not denounce others. They then struck me with their fists, they kicked and pinched me, spat on me, and treated me as only the police can do. Imagine what my declarations were! We are not worth the trouble of saying in so many words. Codina being silent was ordered to kneel to be shot, but his comrades would do him no such kindness; he was put on the fish diet for seven days instead, without water, sleep, or even a seat; drinking his urine. Nor shall he remember to declare himself the author of the Liceo explosion (the real author of that explosion was prescribed to himself the author of everything they asked of him in order to die.

Codina, even when torture forced him to speak, defeated the full purposes of the police, and made his declarations of no value to them except for his own destruction. Not all however possessed this courage; for Zerecuelas (who was also executed in May, 1894) imitated several comrades. In a letter (which was not published) to the bourgeois Barcelona paper El Pais he tells how the “confessions” were wrung from him.

He was threatened to be shot by the police, continuing to die; he was stripped and the grossest cruelties practised on him to induce him to make declarations. This was done on the seashore; Zerecuelas threw himself into the sea to save himself. Then followed the fish diet for five days without water, and without rest. During this time they often inflicted personal injuries by which he was both crippled and maimed. He was beaten with sticks and sometimes hung on the door to keep him up for more than an hour. Finally, in a moment of despair he made a declaration, which they quickly wrote upon paper and forced him to sign.

And on the strength of this and similar declarations, six men were shot and many others imprisoned and transported, when they did not commit suicide, or die by some other means, in prison.

We will not conclude this article amidst these scenes of utter human degradation, which might make even despair of the future of humanity, but will close by translating in full, the letter of farewell of one of the Anarchists who was shot at Barcelona. As long as we have among us men who, after all their sufferings, in the face of their martyrdom, give utterance to such sentiments, we have no reason to despair and the future is with us.

My Dear Son, Read with attention these badly penned lines of your father. I shall soon be nothing more than dust. The accounts that I have had pending with the prison since the 28th of March, will soon be settled. It will not be nature who takes the life from me, but the prejudiced inhumanities of men; the callousness and cruelty of those men was bourgeois, who, without having experienced by physical force have tried once to put me to death. More than once the bourgeois of Barcelona tried to settle with me, but as the character of your father cannot be broken or bent, they invented an infamous plot against me, using the tortures of the inquisition to
make unfortunate working men declare what suit their purpose. My
son, they resorted to practices so absurd that they dared not give
use to them. There was no end to the gentle treatment. I shall be murdered,
may God, I do not know, however, that your father will die content, convinced
that during his life he has used his faculties to defend a great and just
idea; and that his death and that of his comrades will show how the
authorities are afraid of the people, and not of the law. Perhaps tomorrow
your summons will tell you that your father was a criminal or a madman.
Tell them and tell it aloud that I was innocent of the crime I was
charged with; that I was murdered because I was an Anarchist and
proclaimed my ideas; that I thought to be noble and just, and without
anybody having been able to prove the contrary to me, though I have
ever invited discussion. To those who tell you that I was a madman,
reply that all the pioneers of modern ideas and scientific theories have
been called madmen, who are useful to humanity and who are now adapted
and adopted to be in human life. I implore you to study the Anarchist
ideas as soon as you are old enough; compare them with others and
I believe you will see that they are capable of emancipating the
world. The Anarchist ideas are based upon freedom and equality,
and every individual shall be able to enjoy the offerings of
nature and the products of human intelligence. When our doctrines
are understood by the people they will hasten to put them in practice,
and they will then reap the reward after many centuries of suffer-
ings. I hope that the end of your father will not frighten you, but
serve as an incentive to spread everywhere the principles for which I
lay down my life. Die as your father dies, if necessary, but be useful
to your fellow-men, and do your utmost to help on the emancipation
of the proletariat. I charge you also to watch continually over your
sister, giving her the instruction that you can, and before all keep-
her away from religious fanaticism, because this is the greatest
obstacle to progress. With the help of your dear mother make of
your sister a man; she will be useful to mankind; to-day a good
daughter and sister, to-morrow, a good wife and mother. I die
convinced that you will do this, as I die convinced that I always did
my duty. Long live free humanity! Long live progress! Hurrah for
Anarchy! Your Father. Castillo de Montemich, May 17th, 1894.
When men die with words like these on their lips, the cause they
die for, is, indeed, and, in spite of torture, and murder, the cause
of freedom and happiness for all, the time of freedom and Anarchy will come.

THE WORKERS' CONGRESS OF 1886.

The comrades of the London Freedom group, reinforced by a few friends, met to discuss the ad-
visability of taking part in the worker's congress which is to be held in London in August 1886. The fact is
that in England as elsewhere, there are Anarchist com-
rades who belong to workers' associations and who may be sent by their trade union to discuss all points of
the programme from an Anarchist point of view. The
groups in question cannot look on with folded arms at
the juggling, by politicians, of the working-class move-
ment. Moreover they cannot look, without trying to
rear, at the egotistical relations often existing between
workers whose salaries are unequal or who have none
at all through want of work; and they desire to come
to an understanding with Anarchists of other countries
as to what should be done to permeate trade unions with
Anarchist ideas and to aid them in getting out of the
beaten track.
The progress recently accomplished on these lines in
certain unions, especially in America where the impulse
of all the strikes and revolts comes from those outside
organized trades, and impels those along, (as we saw
during the last railway strike) is most encouraging.
This new spirit of revolt that breathes among the work-
ers makes it imperative for those, who do not believe
themselves superior to the "ignorant masses," because
they are Anarchists and the masses are not yet so, to
do all in their power to propagate the Anarchist idea
among the masses. And then we must know where we
stand as regards the general strike that politicians are
trying to juggle away between now and the next
congress.

We know that the congress is manipulated, precisely
by these politicians. The German Social Democrats
who dominate on the organizing committee, have
taken their precautions that no one shall hinder them
during their petty debates on parliamentary questions,
and the decree hurled forth by these gentlemen
announces that all will be excluded from the congress
who do not admit parliamentary politics. The question
was therefore: what should be done?

The unanimous opinion of the meeting was that we
should go to the congress and go in numbers. So it
was also at a subsequent meeting of all London
groups. Had the Congress been announced as a
Social Democratic Congress, Anarchists would evidently
not have gone. Why should we disturb Social Demo-
crats when they discuss their affairs, or confirm them-
thselves mutually in the belief that the task has discover-
the whole of Socialism, and the philosophy of history.
But the Congress is announced as a Universal Workers' Congress, and therefore—either trade unions only are admitted, or all Socialist and Revolutionary groups that care to come must be admitted. In fact there is no reason why workmen's groups plus Social Democrats should be admitted, and not admit trade unions plus Social Democrats plus Anarchists and plus Socialists of all schools. It is prejudging that the groups of workers must be Social Democrats and nothing else.

That is precisely what these gentlemen have done. If you are an Anarchist, sent by a trade union, having
given in its name to the London committee eight
months in advance, you are admitted: if you are a
Social Democratic belonging to no trade union you are
admitted; your Social Democratic opinions open wide
the portals: if you are an Anarchist not belonging to
a trade union, but presenting by a group of Anarchists,
you are not received. Your Anarchist opinions bar the
way. If all workmen's parties and groups of workers
accepted this resolution, we should have to bow to
human stupidity. But it is precisely the contrary. The Dutch
worker's party, for instance, won't hear of it. It
says as we do: Either an exclusive worker's con-
gress or a Social Democratic congress; or a worker's
congress that opens its doors to Anarchist and Social
Democrat alike. But do not make the workers believe
that the majority of workers are enlisted on the side of
the parliamentary tactics of Democrats who call themselves
Socialists. The Americans probably will have a more
of it, for instance, and it has lately decided that in future it
will take no part in political tinkering. Spaniards will
probably not agree with Marxist exclusiveness, and
the same can be said of Italians. So that as they vote
by nationalities, Liebknecht must parade anew as
delegate of the workers of Brazil and perhaps of the
Sandwich Islands, in order to enforce his opinions.

It will therefore be proposed, at a meeting of Anar-
chists to be held on September the 5th at the Grafton Hall
in London, to issue two manifestoes: one addressed
to all European Anarchists, American and Australian,
to ask them to discuss the congress, and the other
addressed to English trade unions to open their eyes,
and baffle the scheme of the organizers of the comedy
to be played at the expense of the workers.

At the same time Anarchist papers are asked to
invite discussion on this question.

P. K.

The time is racked with birth-pangs; every hour
Brings forth some gasping truth, and truth new-born.
Looks a misshapen and untimely growth,
The terror of the house with its sham,$
A monster coiling in its nurse's lap,
That some would strangle, some would starve;
But still it breathes, and passes from hand to hand,
And sucked at a hundred human breasts.
Comes slowly to its stature and its form,
Calms the rough ridges of its dragon scales,
Changes to shining locks its shaggy hair,
And moves transfigured into an Angel's face,
Welcomed by all that cursed its hour of birth,
And folded in the same encircling arms
That cast it like a serpent from their hold!

OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES.
ANARCHISM.

1.-Do Anarchist-Communists believe in the common ownership of land and capital?

I myself do not; that is to say, I certainly do not believe in making such ownership compulsory. Whether common, or private ownership, shall prevail under Anarchism, is merely a question of detail. The principle is individual freedom; equality to every man, woman, and child, to develop all that is in him or her, and to have access to the life-opportunities necessary for such development; i.e., freedom of movement, and of distribution or exchange, which is, of course, only the final process of production.

This—freedom to the non-invasive individual to do everything except invade—is, to my thought the vital principle, because on its observance depends all the development of life, in all that is immeasurable diversity which alone makes progress possible.

Freedom for the individual—free access to the means of sustenance and developing his life—this is the basic principle. He must be free to use these means in solitude, or in co-operation with others, just as he may seem to him desirable.

Were this liberty granted sociology would evolve just as all other sciences have evolved, by constant and varied experiment all along the line. Men would group themselves naturally; some would flock in a corner by themselves, and go it alone a la Thoreau; others would go for political communism; others would set up a State Socialism of their own, and so forth. Certain experiments would succeed, others would fail; what proved workable would gradually gain universal adoption; what proved unworkable would gradually pass into inconceivable desuetude; the fittest would survive, and progress would advance with leaps and bounds, because we should be working with natural law, instead of obstinately bucking against it.

Who are the reformers that they should lay down laws for others—inevitable laws compelling the non-invasive, harmless individual to cut his coat according to his particular pattern? Do they not know that what is one man’s meat is another man’s poison? Communism, save when forced on the unwilling, is neither good nor bad. For some it would be doubtless good, because suited to their tastes, characters, and to the particular stage in evolution that they have reached; for some it would be bad, because unsuited to them. The mistake is in laying down positive rules of conduct. Conduct must always be relative—conditioned by circumstances. What is good to-day may be anything but the right thing tomorrow.

Militarism still saturates all our thought, we are still slaves to the old barbaric idea that men cannot be trusted to work out their own destiny, but that they must be governed, and forced, and driven hither and thither. What is wanted is confidence in human worth and ability; confidence in freedom all round—in freedom of production and exchange; in freedom of sexual association and disassociation; in freedom to worship or not to worship; in the freedom, in a word, that allows and actively encourages, a man to be himself.

2.—If the answer is “yes,” how are they to become common property? Obviously, from my point of view, the individual’s labor and capital can only be merged into the common fund with his full and free consent.

3.—Can a worker who owns a number of machines, the product of his labor, keep them under Anarchist-Communism?

Under my philosophy he certainly can, and will if he wants to. He probably will want to.

4.—If he can, and if he uses them for productive purposes, can he keep the product?

Of course.

5.—Suppose a man has a plot of land which he is occupying and using, will he be permitted to continue to do so?

Tenure by occupancy should, in my judgment, never be disturbed, save when it becomes manifest that the welfare of the community is being retarded by such occupancy; as where a man, for example, insists on keeping possession of a piece of land greatly needed for some public purpose. The verdict of a jury, deciding that his removal was necessary to the public good and assessing the compensation to be paid to him, would settle the case, I think, both easily and justly. By the time that the people have risen to the elevation of thought necessary to just conditions of life can be adopted, they will by that time be more capable of understanding that hoggish philosophy in which they now exist, and, comparatively speaking, stupid. My apologies to the four-footed hogs for the comparison, which does them great injustice. They are monopolists only when food runs short, and they themselves are starving.

In fine: The masses are everywhere in want, because they do not understand that the poet uttered a hard economic truth when he said “Bread is freedom, freedom bread.”

W. C. OWEN.
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PART II.

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

CHAPTER II.—(Continued).

THE GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE.

The new Government was composed as follows:—Thiers, (Chief of the Executive) Jules Favre, (Foreign Affairs) Ernest Picard, (Minister of the Interior) De Pauw, (Justice) Le Flo, (War) Poujouquet, (Finance) Jules Simon, (Public Instruction) Pothion, (Marines) Lambert, (Commerce) De Larrey, (Public works) Jules Ferry, (Mayor of Paris) Vinoy, (Governor of Paris), Victor Hugo, Rochefoucault, Molon, and others. They signed their oaths as deputes, from the outset.

The conditions of peace were the cessation of Alsace and a part of Lorraine, with Metz; the payment within three years of 5,000,000,000 under the title of war indemnity; the occupation of territory until this payment should be completed. The evacuation of territory was to take place by degrees, and in proportion to the sums paid off.

On the 27th of February a report having spread of the entry of the German army into Paris, a call to arms was bested in the night; the Champs Elysées and Passe Au Relais were occupied by the National Guards. They knew that the place Wagram a park of artillery had not yet been removed in view of the approaching entry of the Prussians. They were the guns that had been purchased by the subscriptions of the National Guards of Belleville, La Villette, Montmartre, and La Chapelle, and which consequently belonged to these districts. At the Place des Vosges were the field pieces purchased by the battalions du Marais. Men, women, and children yelled themselves to the guns; those of Montmartre were wheeled to the boulevard Ornano, and manned there on the highest point. Those of Belleville, and La Villette were mounted on the Charmont steeps. Those of the battalions du Marais were left in the Place des Vosges.

At a meeting of two thousand delegates, the Central Committee of the National Guards had on Feb. 24th drawn up and published the following resolution:

"The National Guard protests by the organ of its Central Committee against every attempt at disarmament; and declares that in case of need it will resist by force of arms."

On Feb. 28th, the Central Committee published a manifesto which ran thus:—

"General feeling appears to be against opposing the entry of the Prussians into Paris. The Central Committee of the National Guards which had given expression to a contrary opinion hereby declares itself to have formed the following resolution:

"Around all those quarters to be occupied by the enemy, a series of barricades is being erected, so as to isolate this part of the city completely. The inhabitants of the districts, so circumcised should immediately move away. The National Guard in concert with the army forming a cordon around the district, will take care that the enemy thus isolated on ground which will no longer be that of our city, shall be cut off from all means of communication with the intrenched part of Paris."

"The Central Committee then engages the whole of the National Guard to lend its concurrence in the execution of measures necessary to this end; and to avoid all aggression, which could only lead to the immediate overthrow of the Republic."

"(Signed) The Central Committee of the National Guard."

The army retired to the left bank of the Seine, and the National Guard carried out its program alone.

That night was a deeply impressive one for everybody. It was cold. One seemed to see further into time, as if standing at a point whose course could look across an abyss. In the great silence the tocsin sounded. The moment had come when the Reaction was about to attempt its work.

The Federal Republican Committee of the battalions of Montmartre acted in conjunction with the Central Committee. It was felt that we were in danger of a monarchic restoration, there was scarcely time to take much heed of the regulations that they made under the name of Federal Republican Federation of the National Guards, but their propagandists were those whom it would not do to let slumber before escaping from the snare.

The Assembly at Bordeaux entered on a series of reactionary measures. Not only did it desire to place beyond all power of opposition the courageous men whom it designated as the infamous drags of the fanatiques. But it attacked the small tradesmen already undermined by the law relating to overdue bills. Two hundred and seventy five protests were made from the 14th to the 16th of March.

Although the so-called National Assembly had no intention of attacking Paris, it was preparing a coup de force for the recovery of the power of the fanatiques. The government of the arable, the "citadel of revolution," the "acropolies of insulation," which we on our side called the "sacred mount," the "citadel of freedom." Thiers could not have made a better selection in view of conflict with the "vile multitude." But first of all it was needed to disarm that multitude.

The groups for their part amalgamated to meet the common danger. Even those who only desired the municipal elections were under no mistake as to the situation. Revolutionists hoped that out of the struggle would come deliverance—the republic; social, equal, international, antisemitic, anti-Bourbon, anti-Blanqui, and simple patriots formed a single army. Perhaps in some such way will all revolutionary Europe one day unite, as events increase in magnitude.

"At holding at his disposal his colleagues of the "National Defence," inspired the lamentable journeys of Jules Favre to Ferrières. The latter hesitated for some time, but came round to viewing as an heroic action the shameful cowardice he was about to perpetrate. The absence of freedom was also in the air. The press of the day was all the more laborious, so that the whole of France should not rise in rebellion, and perhaps, as in 1792, now revolution broadcast over the world.

"For everywhere that breeze of liberty was stirring. In 1870 there chased this dungeon of the men, the barricades of the National Guards. They tried by means of an active propaganda to arouse from their torpor the moonjits (Russian peasants) bowed for loads over the hard summits by the last imagery—simple words such as would appeal to simple people—the propaganda was carried forward. "Le Peuple" was written by Bakounin in the kind of language that suited them. Said Bakounin, "The Russian people are at present under conditions precisely similar to those which forced the revolution under the Tsar Alexis. For a long time. At that time it was Stenka Razin, the Cossack leader of the rebels, who placed himself at their head, and pointed out to them the road to emancipation. In order to rise to-day, the people only await a new Stenka Razin. But this single leader will be the legion of un-classed young men who now live in the life of the people.

"It is, as if Stenka Razin stood behind those collective heroes, and the same irresistible power will inspire all this magnificent young blood over whom his spirit will hover."

In a poem by Oppenrod (the friend of Bakounin) entitled "The Student," young students of ardent spirit and who were enthusiastic for a life of struggle, read of one of their own student class, living in poverty, and the name of a man by whom they were inspired to action. An object of the Ter's and the nobles' vengeance, compelled to a nomadic life because of persecution, going about from sundown to sunrise urging the peasants to assemble and to revolt, and finally taken by the Imperial police, finishing his life amid the snows of Siberia, and with his dying breath, appealing to men to die for the world, and for freedom.

"At the moment when they were trying the Commune, the trials of the Internationalists in Russia had just terminated in the gallows and Siberia. Algeria, in 1870, quivered under the weight of military conquest.

"Our administration," said Jules Favre, "thus wreaked the sad fruits of the policy to which for long years the interests of colonial subjects had been sacrificed.

"Towards the end of February, the Arabs, who knew enough about military despoticism, but who were ignorant of civil despoticism, preferred a known to an unknown evil, preferred to have their own compatriots in the Arab bourgeois rather than the Frenchmen by whom they had been conquered. Doubtless the idea that the new administration would reach even into the Arab family, aided those who dreamt of freedom to prepare the insurrection. The old shiek, Haddad, who for thirty years had been the shiek of thirty years in the Kabylie, Mohammed and Ben Azziez, the sheiks El Mokrani, Ben Ali Cherif, and others stirred up La Kahlya. Their army amounted to about 30,000 men. In the middle of March the Baggars of La Medjiana sent a declaration of war to the Governor of Algeria, and the Arabs beseeched Bord- jon-Arridj. The siege had lasted a week; when Colonel Bouvrat arrived with a column of several thousand men. Felled by the shafts then fired all the horse, and seeing the dispersion of his own men, slowly and with head erect, climbed the steep escarpment of a ravine which was being swept by the bullets. He received the death which, (according to those who witnessed the terrible scene) he sought, with the proud dignity of a man who had triumphed."

"The Government, which in the name of patriotism, shed tears before its conquerors, simultaneously shot down the Arabs who rose in the nation, in the same part that the revolutionists were condemned by court-martial to two years imprisonment. But in the night of Feb. 26th—27th, they were released by the revolutionists, who were backed by the crowd."

To be continued.
A REPLY TO J. C. KENWORTHY.

BY TOUEAU PARRIS.

Comrade Kenworthy says the title "Christian Anarchist" is most misleading; he does not label himself but others do. We have the idea that the "others" hit the mark more nearly than our comrade. He is an Anarchist, a moral suasionist, therefore opposed to the use of physical force. With this position we do not quarrel. But when he defines where the Christian Anarchist parts company with his fellow Anarchist—who theoretically advocates violence, and practically uses it, at any and every opportunity,—Kenworthy distinctly labels himself Christian Anarchist.

The Anarchist who repudiates the discredited coercive means, common to all class governments, is not we admit necessarily a "feeble creature," but may be a thoughtful person, who intuitions the wisdom of all-inclusive, one who can weigh the causes, producing in some opponents of government that hatred of oppression, which, when they themselves are subject to its tyranny, sweeps away all reasonable control, and fear, of personal action, culminating in some terrible but usually futile attempt to destroy the tyrants.

The widespread belief in physical force, as the only and best means to improve human nature, cannot be eradicated by constant appeals to it by those who preach Liberty, which means free life, without State coercion.

As there are Anarchists who quite as strongly deny the wisdom of violence in the form of reprisals for the tyrannies of the Governments or their officials, and who repudiate the name Christian, we deem it most misleading, as well as unfair, for Christians to take the credit of these views and to fancy they are the peculiar property of Christianity, and its professors. Comrade Kenworthy affirms he is a Christian—and without doubt he is an Anarchist of a different kind, he should repudiate being a Christian Anarchist seems to us strange.

Let us briefly consider the character of the reasons he gives for being a Christian. The prime reason alleged by him is, "that he knows no other doctrine true to life and fact, capable of supplying the motives, guidance, powers, which we need." By doctrine of course Teaching is meant. And this teaching we are told is to be found in the New Testament. But we are warned against orthodox perverters, "who read books where he should read white," if you want to get at the mind of Christ. This is very amusing, and the result would be probably more amusing still. Our Comrade, however, does not leave us to work out the problem in this wonderful way. He sums up the doctrine of Jesus as something like this: "Men are the creation of an all-powerful, all-wise and all-loving Being. Our comrades have no doubts believe this, but we deny him to prove any one of these statements. We do not believe one of them.

Again, he says, "The life is a preparation for another life, the human spirit or soul entering that other life on the death of the body."—"This may be his belief and hope, but here again we want proof. Nay, as he has appealed to the New Testament, as the source of his belief we make bold to say that, though the Christian writings teach a future life, there is not a single passage in them declaring that the human spirit or soul enters the other life upon the death of the body.

With regard to the lesson of intelligent love, we doubt whether that is in New Testament language, or that it is the peculiar property of Christianity. The reference to Purgatory is very loose. If it means suffering in this life, we should agree with the statement: if, as is usual, it refers to a period of spiritual training, and failing that, some reliable information about the unseen world that should carry conviction to any reasonable mind.

With respect to social conditions and property, we probably agree. But how comes it that with the motives guidance, and powers of Christ's teaching Civilization, Christian Civilization, as it is called—should be based upon stupidity and hate, and a practical denial of the love principle which Comrade Kenworthy no doubt looks upon as the central idea of Christianity.

The radical error that blinds our friend to the true position of the Christian Religion is made manifest in his implied belief in the supernatural in the phrase "motives, guidance, and powers." The Christian religion is simply the natural product of limited human aspiration. Its motives, etc., are either natural or supernatural, but in both cases, history for two thousand years shows their complete failure—as stated by our friend. Nay if men want to improve this life, they must do the very reverse of that which our comrade desires them to do. Instead of rising above the idea that their lives are bound with the bodies, the more they realize that this life is all they know anything about, the more likely are they to strive to make the best of it. To whom make little of this life, and much of a life to come—who use the former as a preparation only for the latter—have always deemed it a wilderness, and themselves only strangers and foreigners, quickly passing through (and the quicker the better) and as not worth the attention necessary to make it habitable, much less enjoyable. Indeed the tendency has been to condemn all earthly and physical enjoyment as wicked and therefore reprehensible.

The Autocracy of God is the pattern of all Autocratic Governments, and the Theocracy of the Old Testament will be repeated in the fulfilment of New Testament prophecy—when the kingdoms of this world become the Kingdom of God and his Christ.

Not, however, if we Anarchists can prevent it.

WHAT I UNDERSTAND BY SOCIALISM.

BY J. SKETCHLEY.

I am asked to explain further some points in my brief sketch in the August No. of Liberty. I am asked why Socialism is incompatible with government by representation. The question is a very simple one, and the answer equally so. Either the people are sovereign or they are not. If they are sovereign they are supreme, and their sovereignty is the negation of every form of government. Sovereignty, a free, and fresh air are all one and the same thing.

But, as it is asked, the people, by virtue of their sovereignty, in the full exercise of their sovereign right, elect men to govern them. Or in other words, cannot the people elect their representatives to govern them, so that it is, can the people guard their own sovereignty and thus become voluntary slaves? Can a man transfer to another his right to think, his right to the freedom of speech, his liberty of consciences, his right to life? Yet this is what is meant by Government. Government is a power external from and above the people. Logically it claims, in virtue of its very existence, the right to direct and control the people; to tax them and to coerce them. Without these attributes, it would not be a Government. Nor does it matter whether the government be that of Rome, the despotism of Russia, of Austria, of Italy, or of Germany, or the governments of France, America, England, or elsewhere. All governments have the same essential attribute, claim the same powers, and rest on the same principle. Take the right or control.

If the people of any district want a branch railway, however short or however essential, they must get permission from the government; if they want to make any great improvements, or take over the government, they must lay out a water company, they must buy the government. The very fact of having to go to government, to a power external to and above themselves, humbly praying and promising ever to pay shows the degree of abasement, the depth of degradation of a people under government. But going to the government is a real and capital affair, to say nothing of the waste of time. On the deposit of the Petition or Bill, fee £5; for each day the bill is being examined to see if it agrees with the Standing Orders the fee is £5; on presenting the petition to the House of the Bill for the Bill £5; on the second reading of the Bill £5; if the committee report on the Bill £5; on the third reading of the Bill £5. Again if the money to be expended under the Bill be £100,000 and under £500,000 all the above fees are added. If £500,000 and under £1,000,000 the fees are three times the above. And if £2,000,000 or more, the fees are four times the above. And this is one of the essentials of government, the right to plunder for a favor granted. On this, anything about the hated condition? Then it is asked, is it not right for the people to try and capture the parliamentary machinery? When will they
BETWEEN OURSELVES.

For wilful misrepresentation few could excel "Tattler" in his notes (in Justice) on the Anarchist-Communists and the Congress to be held in 1896. He states that we do not believe in representation or delegation. This however is not true with regard to trade unions and other organisations, but we do not believe in Parliamentary representation—which is quite another question. We appeal for fair play because it is announced as a Universal Workers' Congress. Had it been a Social Democratic Congress, an Anarchist sitting and voting therein would certainly be out of place. An appeal for fair play may to "Tattler" be synonymous with howling and whining; but most people who are tolerant and in earnest will (we venture to say) think otherwise.

F. S. Paul, who has already displayed much zeal in his efforts to instigate an Anarchist movement against Social Democrats, is exceedingly desirous of winning the support of comrades generally by his actions. That such support is not forthcoming is evident. This result may perhaps be owing to the fact that Paul is as yet new to the movement, and, we think, lacking in the qualifications necessary for the position he aims at.

The action taken by him, together with that of a few comrades, in issuing a manifesto relating to the proposed Universal Workers' Congress, has led to the events described in the next paragraph.

On the evening of the 26th ult., there was an International meeting of comrades held at Grafton Hall, for the purpose of electing a committee to consist of delegates representing the nationalities of Germany, Italy, Spain, France, and England (two for each), to consider the desirability of holding next year an International Anarchist Congress. The business at the first meeting of the committee, to be held at an early date, will be the appointment of a secretary, who shall have the confidence of the whole of the comrades. One of the principal points to be considered by the committee will be its attitude towards the forthcoming Universal Workers' Congress, which has been suggested and is being organised by the Social Democratic Federation. Whether the Committee will endorse the manifesto recently issued in our contemporary The Torch remains to be seen.

The incessant labor devolving on the more active Anarchists has told heavily on some well-known comrades. Blair Smith of Glasgow, Tom Bell of Edinburgh, and H. Duncan of Aberdeen, are all more or less incapacitated by ill health. The cause in the north must suffer when such active spirits are thus driven from work, unless the other comrades stick closer than ever to the extra duties thrust on them. Our comrades have one consolation in their illness—they have the knowledge that Anarchist principles are everywhere becoming more widely known and thoroughly appreciated throughout the land of Burns.

By the-by, the necessity for more workers in the cause suggests the question "What is our old friend Joe Bu..."
EMMA GOLDMAN IN LONDON.

PUBLIC MEETING AT SOUTH PLACE INSTITUTE, FINSBURY.

Emma Goldman, the woman who voiced the sufferings of the unemployed in New York in 1892, and who consequently suffered imprisonment for this so-called breach of the laws of the U. S. A., arrived in England on the 22nd of August. Her first appearance in public was at lectures in London, where she spoke to a large audience. Later periods she addressed meetings at Hyde Park, Whitechapel, Cannongate Town, Barking, and Stratford, her speeches being received in every case with marked approval. And on Friday evening the 18th ultimo she delivered an interesting address in the South Place Institute, Finsbury.

The meeting was called to consider the subject "Political Justice in England and America." The chair was occupied by E. Piddington. The platform and amongst the audience were Louise Michel, Tou- seau Parris, E. Leggett, Henry Seymour, Amy Morant, C. Morton, G. Lawrence, and James Tochatti.

Goldman having briefly stated the object for which the meeting had been called, Comrade Leggett spoke on his imprisonment and said that a magistrate was always more severe on a man if he happened to be an Anarchist than upon an ordinary man, and that he as a working man would continue to assert his rights to right to right to right to.

J. Tochatti said the question of Political Justice in England no one could afford to ignore, whatever their political views may be, nor could we allow the Continental system of "agents provocateurs" to be introduced without strenuous opposition. Justice was not in accord with equity but used by the classes to suppress all advanced thought which threatened their interests. Acts of Parliament passed in panic had been strained in order to brutally punish men who had been tried and admitted to the political rights. The case where the Wallis Anarchists were victims of a police plot, was difficult to believe that in England men like Charles Batters and Batters were suffering through the infamy of men like Coulson and the police detectives of Scotland Yard, but such was the case of the Oregon. The case of the Chicago Anarchists did not affect American law, that 7 years' imprisonment was a sufficient punishment for an attempt to kill 15 years' imprisonment.

The meeting adjourned.

Friends and comrades in America are about to appeal for a commutation of the sentence on Berkman, and a fund is being subscribed for paying the expenses which must be incurred. The injustice and illegality of the sentence passed on Berkman is described in the address given by Emma Goldman, on the 18th ult., and reported in this issue. It is earnestly hoped that English Anarchists will render all the assistance they can. Contributions will be received and thankfully acknowledged by Comrade Gunderson, 98, Wardour Street, Soho, Square.

In answer to numerous enquirers we state with very much regret that the health of our Comrade and earnest co-worker L. S. Bevington remains in a very precarious state. Every reader of Liberty will join with us in sincerely hoping that rest, quiet, and bracing sea air may tend to ultimate renewal of vigorous life.

The labour war is being carried on at Carmaux by the strikers there with great pluck and determination, in defence of the right of organization, which in theory is allowed by law. Any attempt, however, to put the law into practice is immediately met by that brutal form of suppression so characteristic of the bourgeoisie. The most marked feature in connection with this strike, that not one of the men will sign a frame from the strike fund and if so has anything to sell or pawn. The fund in existence will require augmentation as the battle goes on, and if English comrades can assist and will send on their contributions to the office of Liberty, we will acknowledge and forward to the proper quarter.
July these armed assassins charged upon a crowd of men and women, killing eleven and wounding many more. The strikers fought a brave battle, determinedly defended themselves and drove back the hired blood-hounds; Frick called upon the government to send the militia, Roebling the men. Of course, the war of nerves, the war of books, the war of budgets, was the war in America for? what was an army kept for in England, or on the continent, if not to protect private property? But the militia would never have been permitted by the strikers to enter within their territory. Revolution is the solution to them, the solution which would have had the bodies of the workers. The authorities saw the people in earnest, they understood that to use force would mean a war, so they decided to use a trick. The strikers were promised full protection against violence and murder, and the police were permitted to put work in the mines; the poor deluded and confusing strikers, did not see this trap and the militia were allowed to march into the town cheered and applauded by the people; those people afterwards shot down the workers. It was a trick, in uniform, they seemed all those things, and who gave the order to drive the sick wives and starving children of the strikers from their homes, who caused the death of the eleven victims on the 16th of July, who expressed their companionship for the workers, even raised their wages, that is to say, won the strike, was not in the least molested. It was then that Berkmann appeared; though not a striker himself and not suffering from the brutality of Frick, he keenly felt the wrongs inflicted upon his brethren. He demanded a hearing with the strikers, and this they gave him. Such a trial was illegal and without precedent in the history of American jurisprudence. It was an open secret that America was ruled by a band of thieves who monopolized the land, machinery, railroads, mines, etc., in fact all the means of production of the country, and were made and enforced by the few. The rights of free speech, assembly and the press, were things of the past, so far as the interests of the workers were concerned, and the constitution which provided equal justice, had never been observed in the U. S. A. Who were in power and had the almighty dollar could command everything, seduction, theft, etc. and remain unpunished. Every official from the policeman to the President could be bribed; and those possessing nothing were hopeless. Frick and Carnegie used their stolen money freely in order to obtain the desired sentence for the strikers and they succeeded. Twenty two years imprisonment! Did it not make one's blood run cold to think of it? Could they imagine what it would be like to go from the world, to be hanged alive for such a long term of prison walls? The people, according to his own master, and days had not been in prison could understand it. Such however was the lot of the hundreds of men and women in Siberia—in modern bastilles all over the world. Berkmann was one of the great army of free thinkers, revolutionists who have lost liberty for the advancement and welfare of mankind. Frick to-day was in perfect health, was enjoying his ill-gotten wealth. The brutality of the 18th Century was languishing in one of prisons of America, but was delivering to the public, of a day, the revelations of the Act of Liberty for the advancement and welfare of mankind. Frick to-day was in perfect health, was enjoying his ill-gotten wealth.


The plucky little Firebrand, which by-the-by, has hitherto prided itself on having been the only Anarchist-Communist periodical published in the English language in the U. S. A., is doing excellent work. Despite its small circulation, the fact that one of its contributors has been put "run in" and fined for defaming the person of an address such, and not deterred from continuing its "burning" propaganda. The article that appeared in our last number, over the signature of W. Owen, was "The Firebrand." The Alboran, however, has been put out of business also, and their energies have been directed into the Firebrand.

The list given above testifies to the fact that the United States are not only the most vigorous Anarchist-Communist periodicals published in the English language. This latest addition to the list is "Voile Lesty," the number of which is unknown, and, a small piece by an admirable writer. Fouger's "La Sociale," adds it at the little striking cartoon a popular song, "Pere Peinard's Almanac for 1898," and "The Poodle" are published.
PRIEST AND PROPHET.

Have ye noticed it—Lazarus?—Dives?—
Tis certain to-day as of yore,
The priest is the friend of the rich man,
The prophet is friend of the poor.
The priests are conservative—orthodox;
Prophets face Truth as a whole;
Prophets seek for power and preference;
Prophets, Free Life for the soul.—L. S. B.

The General Election has revealed to us once more the Priesthood, with but few exceptions, fighting on the side of privilege, and showing in an unmistakable manner that now as so often heretofore, they consider their own class interests before those of the Common-wealth. And even in the Socialist movement those who were at one time prophets, now vacate the priestly and re-entertain the prophetic. It was while thinking of this on August 4th we wended our way down to Kelmscott House, Upper Mill, to hear Grant Allen on "The Man of Letters as Prophet." "The prophet," he said, "was the man who had something to say that no one wanted to hear, who uttered the truths that society kicked against, and which were unpleasant only because they happened to be true. Much of the finest literature of the world, was literature in revolt." As evidence of this fact, he adduced Ibsen with his prophetic messages; Byron, Shelley, Voltaire, Rousseau, Whitman, P6lman, and others. The practical proposal, however, that the lecture contained, was a recommendation that some "good" capitalist should create an endowment for young men with a prophetic message. He was to be taken whilst young and fresh, and saved from all the hardships and struggles of life. Passing to the literature of to-day, the lecturer sarcastically remarked, that the one thing utterly unforgivable in a man of letters now was that he should have an idea which ran counter to generally received opinion; hence common sense, this much vaunted "common sense" of the English people being really a stagnant incapacity for seeing your principles.

Society to-day did not attempt to stifle those who had great truths to utter, but won them over to their side in a different way, which reminded him of something he had heard or invented, he thought invented, which was as follows: There came to London one John Baptist Jones, who was clothed in Dr. Jager's wool clothing and whose food was Hovis and wild honey. He went from Tottenham Court Road to Westminster and from the Strand to Cheapside preaching "Simplicity of Life." And it came to pass that the aldermen and Lord Mayor of the city of London went out to hear him; and having heard his words, behold! they invited him to a banquet at the Mansion House. And arriving there he sat down to the feast; and besides being fed on ox-tail soup and many good things he was afterwards presented with a golden goblet set with precious stones and which bore this inscription, "Presented by the Mayor and Corporation of London to the prophet John Baptist Jones in grateful acknowledgment of his efforts to bring about Simplicity of Life."

At the close of his lecture, Grant Allen was asked whether he considered Kropotkin and Reclus were prophets and whether they were not killed at by Socialists? He replied that "really didn't know much about them, but from what he had heard about them he would answer in the affirmative."

He was ironically questioned as to whether it would not be more Socialist to get the Vestries and County Councils to create the proposed endowment.

Nor as regards the proposal of Grant Allen, we think that the imbecility of it will be apparent to those who know anything of literary men and of society. Were it adopted we should create a new parasitic class, for we believe that the prophet when endowed would become a priest and oppose new truths, and would use his abilities to mislead the people in the interests of the class that nurtured them. There is reason to-day to be glad that there are prophets who will not "sit down to the feast."

With what bitterness do we realise that literary men have persistently misrepresented our principles, and to-day are to be found in great numbers in the ranks of the enemy. When the interests of the Man of Letters is not the same as the workers, he at once became a parasite. What most concerns us, however, is that the great truths uttered to-day by the prophets, shall be recognised, and that religious and political superstitions shall receive their death-blow; then the priest, like Othello, will find his occupation gone.

Intelligence in the heads of the workers is now more necessary than the oracular literary man; until the workers are free, Art and Literature can and must remain in the background.

Mr. Grant Allen's proposal is based upon the fallacy that the prophet cannot proclaim new truths, and at the same time earn his daily bread. But a very superficial knowledge of biography and history proves on the contrary that no prophet evolves new truths from his own consciousness alone, it is his conflict with nature that enables him to discover new scientific facts; he preaches his new gospel regardless of all difficulties. His struggle for existence results in his proclaiming a higher morality in spite of, and in face of governmental and priestly opposition.

JAMES TOCHATTI.

SUPERSTITION.

A superstition is a belief in something that is not true—such as the existence of an arbitrary, man-like God, the necessity for a Government by brute force, the idea that one man has a right to control as much as seven hundred others, that money must be made of gold and silver or based on them, that the number 13 prevents small-pox, that the possession of a child's caul is a sure preventive against drowning. All these are beliefs which rest upon nothing that is demonstrated by facts. But the conduct of the vast majority of the human race is determined not by the demonstration of facts, but by believing fictions. This involves for them mental slavery, and mental slavery carries with it physical slavery.

The age of steam and electricity: a small amount of labor is required to produce everything—food, shelter, clothing, etc.—that we require; and yet the bodies and minds of nine-tenths of the people are broken down by excessive, grinding toil, in order to procure a bare subsistence. This results from their religious beliefs. Just as they were taught to believe in a divine right to rule over them and be supported in idle luxury out of their labor, so now they believe that politicians who can beg, buy, or steal a majority of votes have a right to rule over them and be supported, not exactly in idle luxury but in harmful and luxurious activity also that if a man owns some bits of parchment or paper, (titles to land, government bonds, railway or brewery shares, etc.) other men must purchase his consent before they can go to work and so support him in idle luxury.

If you go into certain churches you will see a priest hold a glittering bangle up before the people, who cringe and bow down before it in abject awe. These people have been taught from their earliest childhood that there is an eternal life to come after this present life, and that the best way to be spent in torment or bliss after death is according to what the priest tells them, and accept blindly his interpretation of a certain book called the Bible, the said book having been entirely in the hands of the priests for many hundreds of years and properly interpolated in their interests. Because of this foolish superstition the priest can make the people support him. They will drink bad beer and buy him the best wine; they smoke clay pipes and buy him choice cigars; they live in tenements and mud cabins and polish his large mansion and let him have all the pleasures, money, and power. He does not have to force these foolish people to give him anything. They give him a large part of their hard-earned wages willingly, because they are hypnotised by superstition.

It is just the same in secular life. The sight of a seal of office, a title deed, a bond, or a certificate of stock-producers the same effect upon the ordinary man as the elevation of the host, or the family Bible, does on a devout Roman Catholic or Protestant. The people have all the good things which were the right of childhood that is quite impossible for them to live togetherness in harmony without a host of insolent and blustering officials mingling everybody's business except their own, that they can only go to work by buying access to the land from some landlord, and by buying the use of capital from some gold-owner.
"You see," say the politicians, landlords, and money-lords, "here are our seals of office, our paper titles, bonds and stocks. You laborers can only go to work now by first providing us with the things we want—horses and carriages, yachts and opera boxes, wine, women and cigars. Whatever you want you must get, or starve." They do have the force to make the foolish laborers get all these things for them; indeed, the only force they have is drawn from the laborers themselves. They simply appeal to their superstitions. The laborers believe that they have no right to use land without paying rent, and no right to use any kind of money on the landlords' income so that if you plant a sovereign in the right place it will have twelve little pence growing to it at the end of a year. Because they believe these foolish things they bow and scrape to a monopolist, and vote and yell till he is at his election times.

If you walk up Fifth Avenue in New York you will see a white marble palace on one side of the way, and a brown stone mansion on the other. The man who lives in the marble palace holds up before the people across the street, and they forthwith drop on their knees before him, and take the bread out of their children's mouths that he may have game and salmon and wine. The man who lives in the brown stone mansion holds up before the people a bundle of government bonds and railroad stocks, and the same effect is produced upon the people by them. They will go without proper clothing in order to buy his orichs. And they laugh and think him great when he bear say in that lofty way that millionaires have: The people be damned!
The priest and the politician; the landlord and the gold bug; brothers in hypocrisy and prosperity—all supported in princely luxury by laboring people who are enslaved by ignorance and superstition. It is a great scheme, this, to hold up a cross, or an office seal, or a bond in one hand and pick a poor man's pocket with the other; to keep him mind in order to ensnare a body; to fill a brain with falsehood in order to empty a pocket of cash; to stock a priest's, or a politician's, or a monopolist's cellar with wine distilled from fruit that should be on a table in a house, to polisher their furniture with cream and velvet and satin that should be made into shoes and clothing for the wives and children of workmen. And the worst of it all is that the priest and the politician and the monopolist think they do right in taking, as the laborer thinks he does right in giving. The priest and the politician tell the laborer that they love him; the monopolist tells him that he gives him employment; and the laborer loves them all, works for them all, and dies in the belief that because he impoverished himself and his family to enrich his masters he will receive enjoy everlasting heaven that does not exist. It is all wrong, so palpably wrong, that a child eight years of age should be able to see the wickedness of it. And yet at the end of this nineteenth century, the few men who understand and expose it are jeered at and branded as runaways. The man who has mastered the science of production is excoriated as the man who has mastered the art of destruction. And yet the wrong cannot go on for ever destroying. Real thoughts once formed, right words once spoken, do not perish; the blood of the martyrs has not been spilled in vain; Chicago and Siberia have awoken the souls of the prophets of liberty, but before they died they spoke, and hundreds of thousands of hearers are now moved by their eloquence.

Nothing can bind the dears of superstition. The Pope is powerful but he cannot kill the worm of doubt that gnaws away the churchman's faith. The politicians and monopolists are mighty, but the advance of thought undermines them and is too subtle for them to control. The sun of truth is rising and shedding light upon the causes of poverty, and as men come out of the dark and hold their freedom they will be removed, little by little, one after another, and by and by the millionaire will have to sell his horses and yachts, and the trump will buy a coat; the "society" woman will wear fewer diamonds, and the workman a comfort dress. The priest coming down the palace stairs and the pauper rising from the gutter, and some day there will be neither prince nor pauper, but two classes, and they will hang hands and look each in the other's face and call each other brother.

G. O. W.

"Was Jesus Christ a Socialist, Communist, or Wise Teacher?" is the question put and answered by Conrad Naeiger in a two-column pamphlet published by Forder, (Stonecutters St. Church). For the man who has freed himself from the teachings of the mystical and theological schools the subject has very little interest; for he has not been determined to equate the god of existence—who are not yet free from the bandages of creeds, Naeiger's pamphlet, by showing that the alleged teachings of Jesus were, for the most part, contradictory and impracticable, should appeal to the moral, spiritual, and intellectual minds of all men.

All provincial comrades should help Naeiger's "Anarchist" as it is well worthy of their support.

"The Torch," generally good, is somewhat marred in the current number by a weak attempt to satirize the Social Democrats.