CONTENTS

Between Ourselves.
The London Congresses:
Anti-Anarchist and Anarchist.
Special Articles by Louise Michel,
Andre Girard, and others.
The Anarchists in Spain.
Kropotkin on Agriculture,
(Continued.)
Is there an English Anarchist
Movement?
Notes on Passing Events.

Vol. III., No. 37
August, 1896
ONE PENNY.
BETWEEN OURSELVES.

When Mr. Cowey opened the so-styled International Socialist Workers' and Trade Unionists' Congress, on Monday, July 27, he asserted that the delegates had for their motto "Many ways, but only one object"—the object being "the uplifting of the workers of the world". Opinions differ as to whether Mr. Cowey put the case accurately, while the work accomplished by the Congress has been received with most conflicting criticisms. It is possible the opinion of the impartial observer might be summarised in one short sentence—"After much talk, a little work".

From our point of view the Congress—although not an unmixed blessing—has given greater impetus to the development of the principle of Anarchy than we expected or believed possible. Its merits as an object lesson will live when many of those who took part in its proceedings have passed into the silent land. In the first place, the ground for future action has to a considerable extent been cleared. The various sections of the great "onward" army consequently see with greater clearness the various routes they have to travel. In the second place, their strength and their weakness have been manifest alike to friend and foe.

It is something that the prime movers of the Congress—those who manipulated the preliminary arrangements in such an autocratic manner—have seen and admitted the error of their ways: for this we take to be the real meaning of the following, which appeared in "Justice" before the Congress had concluded: "Had the present Congress been, as the S. D. F. desired, an International Social Democratic Congress, there would have been a common ground of agreement, and the disorder of the present Congress would have been avoided." If the accuracy is admitted of that portion of the foregoing which refers to the "desire" of the S. D. F., we are compelled also to admit our regret as well as our utter astonishment at the said "desire" not having been consummated.

In spite of the effects (wise and unwise) of its promoters, the Congress had a very inharmonious beginning, and this was not altogether owing, as alleged, to the earnest but indiscreet actions of some of the occupants of the gallery. On the floor of the hall there were many of the elements of discord, and it needed only a vacillating chairman to lead up to a crisis. An endeavour to proceed with the first business—the adoption of the Standing Orders—brought about a collapse, and the first day's proceedings closed with a sudden adjournment and no real business done. Not very much can be placed to the credit of the sittings of the next two days. Indeed it is questionable whether time should be given to any serious criticism of the paltry work accomplished by the Congress. It is rather in what was attempted, but not achieved, that food for thought may be found.

An amusing feature was the endeavour made by members of the S. D. F., and more especially by their leader, to show that they had been, and were anxious to continue being, tolerant to all sections of the Socialist party. There was something audacious as well as funny in this plea, and that it should have been received with mocking laughter is not to be wondered at. Had there been a real "desire" to be tolerant, nothing could have been easier: they could have arranged for a free platform, and have taken the votes of their opponents for what they were worth—according to their (S. D. F.) estimate. Apparently they were afraid to take such a straightforward and common-sense course. As they declined so to act, it will perhaps be as well if in the future they say little about their courage, and still less about their desire for tolerance.

But, candidly, we have no wish to devote either time or space to more than the briefest of notes to the shortcomings of the Social Democrats, either English or continental. They appear—one and all—to be thoroughly imbued with the idea that the only way to attain freedom is by substituting one authority by some other authority—one monopoly by some other monopoly. Here we part company with them, but not in anger. We are optimistic enough to think we shall meet them again, when they have well-nigh exhausted their strength in a useless struggle, and when in all probability they will be ready to admit that the principles of Anarchy are not so completely chimerical as they now think them to be.

"Powder and Shot"—a series of world-be smart paragraphs in the "Weekly Times and Echo"—contained, on the 2nd inst., more than the usual quantity of slipshod superfluous comment. The correspondent of "P. and S." writes of "the inevitable Anarchist shriek duly uttered at the International Congress" as being a "little inconsequent," and as tending "greatly to assure Mrs. Grundy"; and further on says he "has great hopes of the usefulness of the Anarchist in the near future," because
(note the reason) “the wasp is really and amiable insect, and stings mankind into beneficial action.”

This sort of literary rubbish is accepted in some quarters as up-to-date journalism. More’s the pity. To our thinking it degrades journalism, almost as much as the badly drawn and wretchedly printed “portraits” so continuously thrust upon the newspaper reader.

"IRELAND" ON VENERATION.

There are certain faculties peculiar to man, which gives him a moral nature. He has a series of Faculties whose several and joint office is to lift him above his mere animal self—to make him a human animal. These faculties have each an independent functional existence. But such independence is like that of the separate bodily functions and organs—each doing its own work in its own right, but depending nevertheless on the harmonious co-operation of all the other functions for the consumption of the ultimate result for which each was set in motion. Each instrument in an orchestra has its independent structure and function but it is only a part of an independent collection whose joint result is harmony. There can be no such concert without a leader. Veneration is that leader, inasmuch as it is the leading organ of what was once called the Religious group of Faculties—viz., Hope, Faith, and Veneration. The early investigators into the phrenological system of mind study found this faculty always largely developed in persons who were excessively venerative, who devoted much of their time to the adoration of all things connected with worship—for instance, churches, shrines, and all things symbolic of a Deity. This is no doubt the reason why Gall and Spurzheim called the faculty Veneration, and why many of the later phrenologists were too apt to associate this faculty only with Religion. Without entering on the so-called religious offices of veneration, it may be well, to consider its temporal effects in a moral view. It is this faculty chiefly which leads men to pay deference to others, to blindly submit to law and authority. It has been somewhere observed that if half a dozen men were thrown on an uninhabited island, one of the first things they would do would be to elect a leader, a head, a chief whom the rest should venerate. It is very certain that if these men should soon repent of their choice and quarrel, or were to pay sufficient deference towards another, they would require no chief or head. It is this mistrust of one’s immediate associates which induces men to elect someone, entirely unknown to them, to be in authority over them. Not one of them all wants to be governed, but each thinks his neighbour dees. Carlyle seemed to lay great stress upon the innate desire of men to bow down to authority.

This sort of veneration is carried to great excesses, as witness the amount of deference paid to the Royal Families of Europe. Looked at with a phrenological eye, many of these are of the most commonplace type, devoid of all talent and with no claim to real physical or facial beauty. Many of them have been on the verge of idiocy. Yet they are received everywhere with the greatest respect.

Veneration has moreover led astray republicans, and not only republicans but democrats and socialists! Let a man possess the powers of oratory, he is at once singled out for public estimation, yet his ability arises merely from the happy combination of a few mental faculties well developed, and their strength is in no way indicative of executive ability. The same may be said of literary gifts, which in no way qualify a man for other purposes.

In times of Revolution and public turmoil this blind veneration for titles, ancestry, mere oratorical and literary ability has led to untold trouble and disappointment, not to speak of failure and defeat. During the efforts of the working classes of Paris to establish the Commune they fell into this error. Any man who could speak well from a public platform, or write a good newspaper article was placed in authority and deemed worthy of governing thousands. History informs us of the result. And as it was with the Commune of Paris so it will be with other attempts of a like nature, if the same mistake is repeated. The essential Faculty of the human mind, for it would be impossible without it to lead a social life, but carry it to excess. Do not go down on your knees to a plaster of Paris image or a wax candle, especially if the places in which these things are damp and cold. Do not bow down and worship a man merely because he has passed certain examinations in Greek and Latin. Do not raise your hat or cheer at the sight of a diminutive half-witted sensualist merely because he is the son of a mother who was the daughter of a father who wore a crown and was called a king. Do not worship a man simply because he can speak upon a public platform with all the charms of oratory. Do not worship a man because of his literary gifts. Venerate such men of course—but not more than your neighbours. Venerate one another. Use your faculty of veneration in all the little affairs of every day life. Venerate your wife, your mother, your father; treat all old people with deference and respect. When a man speaks to you, let him see by your answers that you are listening to him; don’t show him any disrespect or indifference if you don’t agree with him. There will then be no need of governors and leaders.

The French are more fitted for a commune than we at present are, simply because they have more veneration, which they use not towards persons of royal birth but to each other. They are ever ready to raise the hat, to pay deference, to be polite to one another. If we could make our everyday conduct to our next door neighbour our constant study, we should soon begin to understand the idea of priming the governing powers of governors, not to speak of the Church spire, and the host of parasites who swarm and fatten on the misapplication of veneration.

THE ANARCHIST CONGRESS.

The Anarchists and others excommunicated from the Social Democratic assembly at Queen’s Hall, immediately made arrangements for a Congress, and engaged St Martin’s Hall for a meeting place. The Congress took place on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday (July 30, 31, and Aug. 1). This gathering, owing to the tolerance and general good feeling displayed was a complete refutation of the prevalent idea that Anarchists cannot listen patiently to anything said by their opponents. On the first day, when the affair was under discussion, Hunter Watts spoke for some time without interruption: notwithstanding the fact that a great number of delegates of all nationalities were strongly opposed to him and were anxious to speak.

On Thursday, several items on the Agenda were discussed under one head “General Strike, Trade Unionism, and General Tactics,” thus preventing any waste of time. All the difficulties were met in good spirit and quickly overcome. Why did the fact that Social Democrats, Independent Socialists or Opportunist took part in the discussion cause any hitch; the most diverse views were argued in the most forcible manner and were discussed on their merits without undue feeling or friction. At this Congress were men and women whose names have been unparalleled devotion and suffering for their principle—Louise Michel, Domela Nieuwenhuis, Gustav Landauer, Errico Malatesta, Christ Cornelissen, Dr. Netter, Tschidny, Miss Reche, A. Humov, Pouget, W. Wesz, Steinzeit, Slowak, Tochatti, Quinn, Bankham, O’Malley, Paul, etc., besides Hunter Watts and another Social Democrat (who spoke from among the visitors at the back of the hall.)

The Congress ended in a most satisfactory manner on Saturday morning.

The Anarchists gave a public reception to the delegates from the Continent at the Holborn Town Hall, on Tuesday, July 29th, which proved one of the most successful demonstrations of the sort ever held in London. The hall would not contain all who wished to be present, and an overflow meeting was consequently held in the hall of the Club and Institute Union.
LOUISE MICHEL ON THE CONGRESS.

Where I not an Anarchist of long standing, the Parliamentary Congress in London would have made me one; many feel others likewise, not to mention those who were actually won over by it. The opening of the Congress, more exclusive than the Chambers of Badingue and little William, has precipitated events; the presidential bell has rung the knell of the dogma, the credo of which had to be recited before entering.

Having reached power, the Religion, the State, the new Papacy shut itself up in a fortress, happily too small to enclose the earth teeming with justice, liberty, and happiness. The new papacy had walled itself up. It was conclusively proved at the Congress that the best, the most intelligent, the most devoted of men will be worse than those they seek to replace. No one will return to such a Congress. Parliamentarians will have only themselves to blame for it. Therefore it was not worth while to call their next senate in a German town in 1899. Where will Parliamentarians be then? Perhaps carried away in the general break up. But the idea will be grander, clearer than today; the idea they wished to nail to the stones of their fortress will have progressed.

The assassination of Anarchists and anti-parliamentarians by the Queen's Hall Infallibles will follow the fate of all excommunications. The idea of Liberty glittered like flames round the world; they stirred it up till it irradiates like an aurora.

It was perfectly logical to exclude, from a council in which they believe articles of creed without examination, associations for social studies, the members of which strive to obtain a clear conception of human tendencies at the end of our epoch. This incident must however be lamented—that the Anarchists delegated by trade unions could not be excluded. And a grotesque thing might have happened. Felix Faure—who is a tanner, Constans—who is a nightman, Tirard—who is a clockmaker, and many others so situated, could easily have obtained mandates from their trades, and, as they profess in the Congress, the Congress gates—decked with the flag of trade unionism—would have been open to them.

Another comical thing is, that the police on this occasion were worse than the police of kings and emperors. As I had to wait at the door of the Congress for my entrance card, that I had omitted to change the day before, in order to reach the anti-parliamentarian meeting in time, the policeman who guarded the entrance began to push me from my place. With my accustomed obstinacy I returned each time he pushed me away. Had I not a perfect right to be present at my own assembly conducted by being sufficiently rough for me to have to remind him in my very bad, excitable English that it was not customary to act thus: I said "You are not in Paris for to be insolent like English police; you are in London." After this very correct observation he grew a little polite during the half hour I was made to wait for my card, which was difficult to obtain, although Mrs. Aveley herself asked for it, because the "formality" of changing had been forgotten on the previous evening.

But the satisfaction of assisting at the sentence pronounced on us by Parliamentarians, and I should have been much amused but it not been painful to see old friends in their ranks, waked up by a stupid dogma, while the horizon is so vast.

Dame Nienwenbui was right when he said, "It is curious how history repeats itself—sometimes like a farce, sometimes like a tragedy. What sort of play will they act this time we wonder? The old Christians had the same struggle with heresy, and we can see how the horror of today is the dogma of tomorrow."

But Anarchy will never become a dogma, it would then no longer be Anarchy: it must follow freely, without god or master, the eternal call of progress.

ANDRE CIRARD ON THE CONGRESS.

The Congress is finished. The comedy which the authorities were proposing to play, to change opinion and get the credit for being the sole representatives of international socialism, is turned to their confusion and ended just as we predicted it would. Their intolerance, their narrow sectarianism, as well as their Jesuitical manoeuvres have been revealed in the most glaring manner. In virtue of an illusory interpretation of the decisions of the Zurich Congress, they have aimed at excluding from the last Congress every delegate not accepting in its integrity the Gospel according to Saint Marx. They have fortunately found whom they are talking to. In spite of all the agitation kept up during the months before the opening of the Congress they have not been able, in France, Holland and England at any rate, to return a majority favourable to their aims. Their attempts at exclusion have failed in these countries, and one has even seen three French Deputies arrive there, confiding in the prestige of their personal reputation, deprived of mandates and on the point of being, in their turn, excluded from an assembly of which they have every claim to be the members. But those whom they were thinking to excommunicate have given them a fine example of tolerance from which they ought to profit and also learn, if they can, some sort of modesty or shame. On the contrary, these delegates without mandates, dismissing all attempt at recognition—this has doubtless nothing in common with political action—have made an unblushing show of anarchy against the independents provided with regular mandates. They were even going to contest the genuine mandates of their comrades, who had been elected by fraud! And to such a degree that one of their co-religionists, the delegate Varchelveld, of Belgium, could not help recalling them to a sense of their false position. This loyal protest caused him to be saluted with the polite epithets of "traitor" and "Jesuit"—by the very people who were applauding him some minutes previously. Thus are frankness and sincerity considered by these tricksters treachery and hypocrisy.

One has also seen these scrupulous independants of the decisions of the Congress throw their former scrupuloseness to the winds when it is the obtaining of one vote the more that is in question. The French delegation being opposed to the exclusion of the anti-parliamentarians, those parliamentarians who extolled before everything respect for the majority, but on condition that it should be favourable to them, have demanded for their minority the right of voting apart, contrary to all the usages, all the traditions of parliamentarianism which they enjoinced with so much energy. This demand called up indignant protests from all the independents present at the Congress and would have been rejected if the president, a Marxist, in order to protect the interests of his otor, had not suspended the sitting. During the interval, they came to the decision that the English should abstain from entering the Congress, and the motion was accepted.

In short, certain people went so far as to propose that an executive council should be made up of the personal opinion of each of the delegates of the syndicates, in order to know whether they were yes or no, believers in political action. This abuse of authority found not a single echo.

All these odious discussions, these contemptible struggles lasted for three days; meanwhile, several of the questions on which the delegates were desirous of voting had been disposed of by the Congress.

The Congresses of the whole world, whose interests were the main concern of this assembly have now been able to see how dear, how very dear they and their interests were to these syntagmas who filled the Congress with their personal squabbles to the detriment of the important questions concerning the working classes. They have been able to appreciate the devotion to their cause, the sincerity of the electoral propositions of these candidates for sovereign power. The shock of this_MEMBERSHIPS REPRESENTATIVES OF THE INTELLECTUAL PROLETARIAT, will make clear to them, let us hope, the fate which awaits them should they one day run the risk of putting the direction of their interests into the hands of those pseudo-socialists.

They will conclude; we sincerely hope, that they have nothing to expect from these false friends, no more than from the moneyed classes, and that the best thing for them to do is to manage their affairs themselves in order to free themselves and to guard their interests.
PLANTATION.

By Peter Kropotkin.

(Continued from the July number.)

III.

We have seen how the three million and a half inhabitants of two departments would find ample bread by cultivating only a third of this territory. Let us now pass on to cattle.
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The Englishmen, who eat much meat, consume on an average a little less than 22 lbs. a year per adult. Supposing all meats consumed were oxen, that makes a little less than the third of an ox. An ox a year for 5 individuals (including children) is already a sufficient ration. For three and a half million inhabitants this would make an annual consumption of 700,000 head of cattle.

But today, with the pasture system, you need at least 5 million acres to nourish 660,000 head of cattle.

Nevertheless, with prairies pretty well watered by spring water (as recently done on thousands of acres in the South-West of France) and a quarter million acres already sufficient. But if intensive culture is practised, and beetroot is grown for food, you only need a quarter of an oxen for each one of the 10,000,000 acres. And when we have recourse to maize and prasise silage (the compression of fodder while green) like Arabs, we obtain sufficient fodder on an area of 217,500 acres.

In the environs of Milan, where sewer water is used to irrigate the fields, fodder for 4 to 6 horned cattle per two and a half acres is obtained on an area of 217,500 acres; and on a few favoured fields up to 44 and a quarter tons of hay to the two and a half acres have been cropped, the yearly provider of nine milk cows. Seven and a half acres per head of cattle are needed under the pasture system and two and a half acres for ninety oxen or cows under the new system. These are the opposite extremes in modern agriculture.

In Guernsey on a total of 9,984 acres utilised, nearly half (4,996 acres) are covered with cereals and kitchen gardens; only 511 acres remain as meadows. On these 511 acres, 1,450 horses, 7,290 head of cattle, 900 sheep and 4,300 pigs are fed, which makes more than three heads of cattle per two and a half acres, without reckoning horses, sheep or pigs. It is needless to add that the fertility of the soil is made by seaweed and chemical manures. Returning to our three and a half million inhabitants belonging to Paris and its environs, we see that the land necessary for the rearing of cattle comes down from five million acres to 197,000. Well, then, let us not stop at the lowest figures; let us take those of ordinary intensive culture; let us liberally add to the land necessary for smaller cattle that must replace some of the large beasts and allow 3,350,000 acres for the rearing of cattle,—464,000 acres if you like, on the 1,013,000 acres remaining after bread has been provided for the people.

Let us be generous and give five million work-days to put this land into a productive state.

After having therefore employed in the course of a year twenty million work-days, half of which are for permanent improvements, we shall have bread and meat assured to us, and besides an extreme abundance of milk, fowls, pigs, rabbits, etc.; without taking into consideration that a population provided with excellent vegetables and fruit, consumes less meat than Englishmen, who supplement this poor supply of vegetables by animal food.

Now how much do twenty million work-days of five hours make per inhabitant? Very little indeed. A population of three and a half million must have at least 1,500,000 adult men, and as many women capable of work. To give bread and meat to all it would need only 17 days of work a year per head. Add three million work-days, and double that number if you like, in order to obtain milk. That will make: twenty-five work-days of five hours in all—nothing more than a little pleasure country exercise—to obtain the three principal products: bread, meat, and milk. Those three products which, after housing, cause daily anxiety to nine tenths of mankind.

And what is the result of repeating—those are not fancy dreams. We have only told what is, what has been obtained by experience on a large scale. Agriculture could be reorganised in this way tomorrow, if property laws and general ignorance did not offer any opposition.

The day Paris has understood that to know what you eat and how it is produced, is of the highest interest to the day when everybody will have understood that this question is infinitely more important than parliamentary debates or municipal councils,—on that day the Revolution will be an accomplished fact. Paris will take possession of the two departments and cultivate them. And then the Parisian worker after having laboured a third of his existence in order to buy bad and insufficient food, will produce it himself, under his walls, within the enclosure of his fort, if they still exist, in a few hours of healthy and attractive work.

And now we pass on to fruit and vegetables. Let us go outside Paris and visit the establishment of a market-gardener who accomplishes wonders (ignored by learned economists) at a few miles from the academies.

Let us visit M. Ponce, author of a book on market-gardening, who makes no secret of what the earth yields him and who has published it all along.

M. Ponce, an especially his workmen, work like niggers. It takes eight men to cultivate a plot a little less than three acres (two acres and seven tenths) They work twelve, and even fifteen hours a day, that is to say, three times more than is needed. Twenty-four of them would not be too many. To which M. Ponce will probably answer that as he pays the terrible sum of £100 rent a year for his two acres and seven-tenths of land, and £100 for manure bought in the barns, he is obliged to exploit. He would no doubt answer, "Being exploit, I exploit in turn." His installation has also cost him £1,210, of which £800, mainly mortgage, must be ascribed to the idle barons of industry. In short, this establishment represents at most 3,000 work-days,—probably much less.

But let us examine his crops: nearly 10 tons of carrots, nearly 10 tons of onions, radishes, and little vegetables, 600 heads of cabbage, 500 heads of cauliflower, 500 bunches of tomatoes, 1,500 dozen of asparagus, 150,000 salads, in short, 123 tons of vegetables and fruit to two acres and seven-tenths—120 yards long by 109 yards broad, which makes more than 44 tons of vegetables to the acre.

But a man does not eat more than 660 lbs. of vegetables and fruit a year, and two and a half acres of a market-garden yield enough vegetables and fruit to richly supply the table of 350 adults during the year. Thus 24 persons employed a whole year in cultivating two and a half acres of land, and only working five hours a day, would produce sufficient vegetables and fruit for 350 adults, which is equivalent at least to 500 individuals.

To put it in another way—in cultivating like M. Ponce—and his results have already been surmounted—350 adults should each give a little more than 100 hours a year (103) to produce vegetables and fruit necessary for 500 people.

Let us mention that such a production is not the exception. It takes place under the walls of Paris; on an area of 2,224 acres, by 5,900 market-gardeners. Only those market-gardeners confined to a state of beasts of burden to pay an average of £22 per acre.

But do not these facts, that can be verified by everyone, prove that 17,300 acres (on the 519,000 remaining to us) would suffice to give all necessary vegetables, as well as a liberal amount of fruit to the three million and a half inhabitants of our two departments.

As to the quantity of work necessary to produce these fruits and vegetables, it would amount to 50 million work-days of five hours (50 days per adult male), if we measure by market-gardeners' standard of work. But we shall soon reduce this quantity if we have recourse to the process in vogue in Jersey and Guernsey. We must also remember that the market-gardener alone forced to work so hard because he must produce early season fruits, the high prices of which have to pay for fabulous rents, and that this system of culture entails more work than it is really necessary. The Jersey and Guernsey culture, instead of having the most time to take care of their gardens, and being obliged to pay heavily for glass, wood, iron, and coal, have got their artificial heat out of manure that can be had at less cost than coal and hothouses.
counting a second crop, a very good one, in certain hothouses, nor an immense greenhouse for fancy plants, nor all sorts of little growths in the open, between the hothouses. We have ourselves visited this establishment.

A hundred and forty one tons of fruit in the early season! Enough to feed 1,500 people abundantly during a whole year. And to do this only needs 21,000 half workdays,—210 hours a year for half the adults only.

Add to this the extraction of about 985 tons of coal, (that is, with the yearly burn in the hothouses, to heat ten acres,) and the average extraction being, in England three tons per miner working a ten hours' day, that would make a supplementary work of six to seven hours a year for each of the three hundred adults.

Taking all in all, if only half the adults gave 50 half work days a year to the culture of early season fruit and vegetables, everyone could eat delicacies tosatify all the year round, even if no vegetables only be obtained. And on the same principle they would have as second crop in the same hothouses the most ordinary vegetables that, in establishments like that of M. Ponce, require fifty workdays.

We have just discussed the culture of articles of luxury, but as already stated, the present tendency is to turn a hothouse into an ordinary kitchen garden under glass. And when it is applied to this use, with extremely simple glass shelters, warmed slightly during three months, we obtain the most delicious and valuable vegetables. For example, 395 bushels of tomatoes in the acre, as first crop at the end of April. After which, having improved the soil, we grow fresh crops from May to the end of October, in an almost tropical temperature due to glass shelters.

To obtain 395 bushels of potatoes today you must till a surface of 20 acres or more every year; you must plant and earth up the plants again later on, uproot weeds with a hoe; and so on. We know how much trouble that takes. With a glass shelter, it will take perhaps nearly a half day's work per square yard to begin with. But once this initial work done, we shall economise half, if not three quarters of the work to come.

These are facts; these are results already obtained, verified, well known, of which each one can persuade himself by visiting these cultivated areas. And are not these facts sufficient to give an idea of what man can obtain from the soil if he works it with intelligence?

V

In all our arguments we have depended on precedents already admitted, and partly put into practice, such as intensive culture of fields, plains irrigated by sewer water, market-gardening culture and kitchen gardens under glass. As Leonce de Laverne foresaw thirty years ago, the tendency of modern agriculture is to reduce the area to be cultivated as much as possible, to create both soil and climate, to concentrate work, and to combine all necessary conditions to the life of plants.

This tendency is born of the desire to realize large sums of money on the sale of early season fruit. But since the processes of intensive culture have been discovered, they have become common property and are used for the most ordinary vegetables because they allow of obtaining more produce with less work and with more certainty.

In fact, after having studied the most simple glass shelters of Guernsey, we affirm that, taking all in all, far less work is expended for obtaining potatoes under glass in April, than in cropping three months later in the open air, by digging a space five times as large, by watering it, weeding it, etc. Work is likewise economised in employing a perfected tool or machine even when an initial expense has to be incurred to buy the tool.

Complete figures concerning the culture of common vegetables under glass are still wanting. This culture is of recent origin and is only carried out on small areas. But we have figures about thirty years old concerning the culture of early season grapes; and these figures are conclusive.

In the North of England on the Scotch frontier, where coal only costs 3s. 3d. a ton at the pit-mouth, they have long since taken to growing hot-house grapes. Thirty years ago, these grapes, ripe in January, were sold by the grower at 20s. per lb and resold at 40s per lb, for Napoleon III's table. Today the same grower sells them at only 2s. 6d per lb. He tells us so himself in a recent article in a horticultural journal. It is caused by tons and tons of grapes arriving in London and Paris in January.
THE ANARCHISTS IN SPAIN.

The bombs of Barcelona are pretexts for the Spanish government to take up new arms against the anarchists. The other day, at Cortes, M. Canovas lectured on a project of the law of which the end is—he hopes so at least—a prompt and energetic repression of crimes and provocations to crime. He gives also very extensive power to the government to prevent political crime. Courts martial for judging crimes of violence, the punishment of death for the authors; penal servitude for the instigator when the crime has been followed by an effect; banishment, perpetual or temporal, for the conspirators; the power of suppressing newspapers, of dissolving societies, and of banishing from the territorypersons professing anarchist opinions—such is the economy of the project of the law.

Spain is following in the footsteps of Russia. Soon a new Kennan will visit the Spanish gaols. Then he will bring back a book—that which is about to appear—"Political Prisoners in Russia"—sad reflections on the terrible sort of men who dream of a social transformation that shall create a more fortunate and a happier humanity.

In truth, one is stupified at the absurdity of the proposed law, for it defeats its own end. It wishes to prevent and put down crime—it is producing and increasing it.

Anarchists are revolutionists, and beings inspired with a profound faith in human nature. This being their mental attitude, a little observation easily shows that persecution, far from diminishing their proselytizing zeal, increases it. Those who were spreading propaganda by word of mouth, who were writing in the papers, in the reviews, who were publishing books, who were speaking in the conferences—are suddenly confronted with the impossibility of writing or speaking. The law suppresses the papers, seizes the books, shuts the theatres, prevents the conferences. Those who were spending, in propaganda by word of mouth or in writing, their revolutionary energies and faith in humanity, will be obliged to concentrate it on themselves. Their energy will accumulate and increase so much the more.

The ground is prepared for the seed, and develops by itself the idea of employing violence—bomb, revolver, sword. They will remain self-centred, untroublingly examining their complaints against society, their hopes of a better society. A simple incident, insignificant in any other mental state, unsettles the soul, and plunges it into violent crimes. Such a crystalline dust determines the crystallization of a startling solution. These persons who were merely spreading propaganda by word of mouth will spread it by the bomb, and men of culture, scholars even, will bring to perfection outrageous attempts at crime. Such will be the fatal result of new laws proposed and quickly voted.

It is not necessary to be a great scholar to know this. The least observant person who applies himself to the study of psychology could instruct M. Canovas and those like him. It would be more useful for these to make themselves acquainted with this subject than to continue to put in practice that horrible vitriol of Alphonse Karr—"Let the assassins begin!"

To clothe individuals in power tends necessarily to the abuse of it, and therefore the Spanish government tends to increase the number of anarchists.

All those who are inconvenienced by it will be transformed into anarchists. Societies are to be dissolved, papers to be suppressed, individuals to be imprisoned. The discontent is about to increase, and with it the number of malcontents. Confronted with the impossibility of carrying on propaganda by word of mouth, these malcontents will carry it on by violence. This law is the real manufacturer of criminals.

It would seem that certain political crimes excite the brain to such a degree that the measures taken are precisely the opposite of what they ought to be. The alarm is such that we have seen this inconceivable thing—a government, that of Portugal, prohibiting the use of the word "anarchy". It imagines that the suppression of the word involves the suppression of the idea it expresses. This is an absurdity for which no name can be found. The ignorance and foolishness of some people are really immeasurable.

"Quos vult perdere Jupiter dementat."

Would Jupiter have wished to lose the leaders? In any case, it is quite certain that there are some criminal acts which deprive them of all reason.

Repressive measures never attain their end. It is a grave error to believe, like the "Journal des Debats", that in France laws of repression have attained their end. Since July, 1894, no outrage has broken out among us—true, but this is just because the law has not been applied. They wished to suppress propaganda by word of mouth; it is more active than ever.

Those who are using it have not been obliged to fall back on violence. As to the outrages, they are always the work of isolated individuals, who over-excite themselves in examining their own sufferings, those of others, and their helplessness. A repressive measure has no effect whatever on them unless it be to increase their number and modify the form of their crime following the difficulties which it creates in its execution.

In Spain the police pursue and imprison. Newspapers and reviews are dead or dying. Even the "Theatre Libre", established at Barcelona to represent the works of Ibsen and Hauptmann, is in its last agony. The propaganda by word of mouth has been stopped for several months, perhaps for several years.

There are in circulation only placards, brochures and pamphlets sent in secrecy from South America. There is unfortunately no doubt that violence will allow itself a wide course. Such is the absurd result arrived at by the bomb-throwers of Barcelona: Pitiabible creatures of impulse, distracted by the
miseries they have suffered or will suffer, convinced that terror is a powerful modifying social influence, they have been violent, criminals. They have not known and could not know that social transformations are of slow growth, the more so that they necessitate the transformation of human minds: in wishing to go too quickly, they probably retard the movement of ideas. Their criminal act has been more mischievous than useful to the cause of which they believe themselves champions.

But there is no hope for them. Thwarted beings, prepared by the social miseries they were undergoing, and seeing undergone, they have been conquered in the throes of those cosmic influences determining an unsettling of their mental organism and conducting them inevitably to crime.

A. Hamon.

IS THERE AN ENGLISH ANARCHIST MOVEMENT?

To the Editor of Liberty.

It may be somewhat audacious to ask the above question. I do however, and in all seriousness, put it both to you and your readers, and shall be glad to have a reply. My reasons for thus acting are the result of a fairly extensive perusal of periodicals and publications printed in English and circulated as Anarchist or Anarchist-Communist literature. I have with considerable interest watched the issue of this literature from the time of Morris’s “Commonweal” to the present day Rossetti’s “Torch” and Tochatti’s “Liberty.” I have looked somewhat anxiously for evidence that there was growing and developing a movement closely in touch with the everyday life of the English people. I have sought amongst the contributors to this literature for a writer whose work showed at once that he or she understood their subject and knew how to deal with it so as to be understood by the ordinary English reader. My reading has made me acquainted with a large amount of French, German, Italian, and Russian thought as to the desirability of abolishing all tyrannous forms of Government. Any English scheme, idea or theory of a state of society based on complete liberty I have not succeeded in discovering. Does such a thing exist, has it been described in print, and have I unfortunately overlooked it?

Please do not assume that I am seeking to disparage the teaching of Kropotkin, Grave, Malatesta, Reclus, Michel, and other continental men and women of note. I would not do so if I could, and I could not if I would. My contention is, that good, sound and powerful as their teaching is, it is to a large extent, and from its very character is bound to be, unsuited to an Englishman, and in most cases beyond his powers of comprehension. Apropos of this point, I will venture the assertion that Kropotkin—long as he has resided in this country—has not yet acquired the power to deal with English subjects, including perhaps his favourite “Agriculture,” from an English standpoint.

To return to my object, however. Where is the English worker who has dealt with and explained the true principle of Anarchism and its applicability to English everyday life? I am not forgetting those individuals who possess enough of a certain sort of courage to be constantly thrusting their borrowed ideas of what Anarchy is on an open-mouthed and little thinking audience. But really, with all due respect for these puny demigods, I fail to see their ability as teachers and expounders of a great principle.

Possibly these few lines may bring to the front some modest genius who is now hiding, as it were, his light under a bushel. So mote it be.

D. B.

Dare then: dare to talk against the State. Since we know that in her past existence she has served faithfully only our oppressors. Dare to oppose the priest, and his lieutenant—the patriot, since all these are but parasites upon the social body. Patriotism! What a satire it is! Love for your nation! when there is no such thing as a nation. What is a nation? Where is a nation? Only in the minds of superstitious people. It is but a weapon that has been used by despots to retain their despotism. Not one of those who have tried to argue the existence of nations (and consequently patriotism) ever gave a single proof of it. Dare to oppose everything which impartial analysis proves to be wrong; and if nothing is left of our so-called society when the analysis is complete, dare to proclaim it. True to the theory of negation, we shall not think of systems in the future; we are saved from creating dictatorships, from allowing power to others to rule over us; saved from the curse of past revolutions which have perpetually established systems, and to maintain the systems, governments, to maintain the governments, public prosecutors, prisons, hangmen. The work of the modern revolutionist is not to enforce laws, but to inculcate ideas; and ideas can never be inculcated by the use of legal terror, nor by any kind of terror. For whether it be the dictatorship of the proletariat, as Marx would have, or whether it be that of the bourgeois, it must lead to bad results—it must lead to the mistake of our predecessors, who took power from one class to give it to another. The motto of the modern revolutionist is, “Power to no class: down with privilege!” And privilege being destroyed, individual power over self is established. I must not be understood as saying that revolutions can, or will, be made. They grow, they come; but they cannot be made. All that the revolutionist can do is to bring them a little sooner. The more extensive and thorough the revolutionary propaganda now, the less sacrifice will be necessary on the day of doom.—Samuel H. Gordon’s “Revolution.”
THE FRENCH SECTION OF THE CONGRESS.

The separation of the French section into two distinct parties, anxious to have the power to vote in different directions, was a feature of the Congress, and, as a matter of course, has led to attempts at explanation. The greater (by the number of one) section has issued a "declaration", of which the following are the closing sentences:

"The time of the Congress has been wasted by a discussion commenced in fraud and continued in wounded pride, or through interested motives. We declare—(1) That the French delegation has never wanted anything but this: 'The absolute maintenance of the right of Trade Union organisations against all political coercion.' (2) That when the cards were handed out, the secretary of the delegation, Citizen Lavau, declared that no card would be given to any delegate of the Anarchist group. They (the minority) wish to establish the opinion that the majority of the French delegation is composed of Anarchists or of allies of Anarchists. This is absolutely false. This majority is composed of delegates of Political Socialist groups and of Trade Union groups, and the delegates of both these groups have declared that they would strictly conform to the terms of the mandate with which they have been invested by their organisation."

NOTES ON PASSING EVENTS.

The pertinacity with which Comrade Seymour and the Maybrick Committee keep the Maybrick case before the authorities and the public is highly commendable: their conduct deserves, and in all probability will obtain, the hearty approval of Comrade Bernard Shaw. Still the object aimed at is not attained—Mrs. Maybrick remains in prison. The Home Secretary only varies the form and not the purport of his answer to every question put to him. Sometimes he says he "cannot", and at other times he "will not" interfere with the sentence on Mrs Maybrick. After all, there does not appear to be much difference between English, French, Russian and German "Jacks in office". Mrs Maybrick may have a few wealthy friends, but clearly she has not so many as the Transvaal rioters. Comrade Seymour has not a Barney Burnato at his back. If he had, well—we should see what we should see.

If, as stated, it has cost £30,000 to prosecute Dr. Jameson and his confederates, somebody has been very much overpaid.

An American named Pennington, having his headquarters at the Hotel Metropole, London, is engaged in making aerial torpedoes. A few of these things floating in the air, and automatically discharging their cargoes of dynamite, would destroy the whole of London, including its inhabitants, in a very short time. The inventor expects a keen competition presently amongst "Governments" for the purchase of his torpedoes. If governments do not give him sufficient patronage, he will probably not object to customers from other quarters. An aerial torpedo might be a useful tool to have in one's possession in the acute stage of struggling for mere existence which is rapidly approaching.

Socialists are not the only people who, when they assemble in any number, fail to agree. The members of that very genteel profession—the Medical—have been holding their annual congress, and one of the discussions thereabout grew very "personal" that the speakers were "shouted down" and the subject had to be "dropped".

Apropos of the Jameson verdicts, a man who has recently undergone "15 months' imprisonment" says: "Nor do I think that any offender against the law, whatever his category, whether his lapse was light or heinous, can be greatly benefited by 15 months' segregation from his fellows" under prison conditions. In spite of any amount of evidence of this sort, we go on filling up our goals, and making laws the chief results of which are the production of more so-called criminals.

There is a water famine in the East of London. Consequently disease has spread and the death-rate has increased. The said famine is caused—not by the real scarcity of water, for there is a sufficiency of that article within reach, but by a certain company, whose duty it is to supply the water, refusing to make the necessary expenditure. These facts are so incontestable that a most "constitutional" journal—one that has nothing but abuse and ridicule for the foes of monopoly—is compelled to admit "that the London Water Companies are run too much in the interests of private gain to adequately subserve the public needs."

BOOKS, PERIODICALS, ETC.

Morison J. Swift, of San Francisco, California, forwards two pamphlets of which he is author and publisher. One is entitled "The Quality of Education under Millionaires", and the other "What a Tramp Learns in California". The tramp, after his weary journey from town to town and from ranch to ranch, comes to the conclusion, with regard to the land question, that "the danger line has been reached"—that "Americans can and will endure no more." The capitalist, under a variety of names, has such a hold on the soul of the States that profitable cultivation is well-nigh impossible. That legislation in any form whatever will ever notice him to quit his monopolist's position is highly improbable. The author of these pamphlets emphasizes this debatable position by reference to actual circumstances with which his peripatetics amongst the Californian ranches brought him in contact: and although he believes the tenants of the ranches are in reality "strongly socialistic", yet he has to point out that they are "afraid of the word Socialism," and in their ignorance associate Socialists with dynamite-throwing Anarchists. But after all, these farmers "are considerably more anarchistic than the city wage-earners"; they believe more in actual fighting (war) than in political contests, and one of them is said to have expressed his attitude in a manner amounting to tragedy: "No, his to use ballotting for, it will not stay: but what you do with the gun will stay." The two pamphlets are worth reading, for they help to explain the peculiar difficulties under which Americans are today labouring. These difficulties are nearing a climax in the present election. For the capitalists—the money monopolists—are gripping each other by the throat. May their fate be similar to that of the Irish workers. Their utter prostration would help forward the solution of the land problem—the problem to be settled both in America and this country before much real progress towards liberty can be made. The earth must be the people's, and the fulness thereof.

"A Plea for Communism," (No. I of "New Moral World" Series), by Arthur Baker, M.A., consists of a brief review of past and present communistic efforts, and after much of the following assertion:—Not without prostration would help forward the solution of the land problem—the problem to be settled both in America and this country before much real progress towards liberty can be made. The earth must be the people's, and the fulness thereof.

"A Plea for Communism," (No. I of "New Moral World" Series), by Arthur Baker, M.A., consists of a brief review of past and present communistic efforts, and after much of the following assertion:—Not without prostration would help forward the solution of the land problem—the problem to be settled both in America and this country before much real progress towards liberty can be made. The earth must be the people's, and the fulness thereof.
ON POLICY.

The well known picture of a mischievous boy attired in judge's gown, wig and spectacles, who means business, and claims nothing short of obedience from dependents on his lordship's dignity, reminds one of Parliamentary Socialism, which prefers to clad itself in somebody else's political garments borrowed from the masquerading shop of the end of the nineteenth century rather than in its own natural clothes. And no wonder that the half naked street boy of Anarchism is making fun of his brother in spite of his pretence to be very busy and terribly offended by his sneers. The younger of Socialism is daily growing up and the question at issue hitherto was which of the two costumes, all circumstances considered, is preferable—the mocking masquerade of parliamentarians or the Anarchist nakedness of the denial of any policy except destruction.

Speaking plainly, Anarchists have to acknowledge that, according to the accusations of their adversaries so often thrown at them, they have no definite policy to pursue. There is much more truth than we can comfortably ignore, preaching as we do, war to capital and destruction to the State. Is it not better to acknowledge openly that we have no policy of our own towards the State, without seeking the excuse, even in the past, that parliamentarians themselves have none, because what they choose to call their policy is not a definite "socialist" plan of campaign but merely an old, very old, trick of mechanical parliamentary majority, i.e. misuse of the corrupted machinery of the State in the interest of one class instead of its being used in the interests of all the population. Corruption is always corruption and a rotten hook does not become a new and sound tool because a great cause—the emancipation of the labouring masses—is hung upon it. Woe to the cause so dangerously situated!

And moreover, what means the united coalition of capitalism, landlordism and church can still invent in order to upset the would-be Socialist Parliamentary majority? No one can be sure that they will not try all sorts of bribery and corruption and even the brute force of the Pinkertons, merely to scatter the Socialist legislators or to shoot down thousands of organised electors if they are not trained for revolutionary struggle beforehand. All this is quite right, but are we Anarchists better prepared for the fight? Not in the least!

And the sooner we acknowledge this the better for the cause.

We have nothing to do with politics! We have to fight on purely economical grounds! We do not want any governments, we must destroy the State! are exclamations common enough with all Anarchists.

But what about paying rent and taxes, direct as well as indirect, in the price of the commonest goods—such as tobacco, tea, beer, etc. What about obligatory military service in all countries on the continent? How do we propose to deal with the State which forces these duties upon us? Are we to pay and serve weekly or are we not? And if not, by what means are we to insist on making good our decision? Are we to follow the example of the Russian sectarians who prefer to be tortured to death in correctional military prisons, singing psalms and meekly but resolutely declining to take up arms? Of course this is impotency, however strong their individual spirit may be. But what other force are we to use except this? Have we any at present?

No, friends; the renunciation of all politics and individual hatred towards the State do not as yet constitute any definite policy; individual protests, quarrels, fights and even bomb-throwing are far from constituting a plan of campaign of a party, especially if you remember the indignity of being colarded by a stout bobby seconded by the shouts and laughter of an ignorant crowd. If this is a policy, what is impotency?

Yes, we are impotent and shall be impotent until we hit upon our true plan of campaign, until we have a definite and practical purpose for which to agitate, to organise and to act as a united body, as a social force, true to its principles but always steadily moving towards its own goal, sure of final victory.

Organisation, like any other mechanism for utilising natural forces, comes into existence only when we understand our position thoroughly, and derive from this understanding an organising idea, without which no social body can either live or prosper.

What is the State? Is it not an organisation which has been from time immemorial kept up by the masses themselves? And if they mean to withdraw their support from it may they not do so? Its power has ever been derived from the natural political function and right of every adult citizen to have his or her voice in the management of their common social body.

But of course there was a time when no-one, not even kings and emperors, knew that this right is part of human nature, but believed that political power—as we believe everything of whose origin we are ignorant—originated with the gods, who commissioned kings to govern mankind.

The times changed; a mysterious being, "nation", came into existence, and the origin of political power was placed in its will. Different sets of privileged individuals (called political parties) disputed the king's privilege to represent the will of that complicated being, some basing their right upon the antiquity of their clans, others on their personal merits and skill in serving the nation. In the meanwhile, economic evolution created circumstances under which the whole machinery of the State fell into the hands of one capitalist class, and the masses began to distrust Parliament, and to doubt its political authority. Anarchy is the outcome of this tendency. That the true source of political power lies in the individuals inhabiting
the country being conscious of their rights as human and social beings, is becoming clearer and clearer. The fraud of "true representation" and parliamentary rule becomes evident to all, and a new policy is sought by all true socialists whose minds are not prejudiced by the played-out game of parliamentary majority although this time in favour of the working classes.

Frightened by the growth of Socialism amongst the masses, classes of capitalists, landlords and churchmen join hands in all countries in the anticipated struggle against the labouring masses, the issue of which will depend on the readiness of the latter to substitute their own new rule in place of the parliamentary one.

Now is the time for Anarchists to say their word. If the anarchist doctrine has any historical meaning at all, it ought to produce some practical solution of the problem—how the natural political functions of individuals conscious of their interests, rights and dignity could be organised, and what is the right issue from the pretent situation?

The modern constitutional State—as everybody knows—consists mainly of an executive and a legislative power, the latter’s duty being not only to enact laws but also to control the working of the former in the interest of the whole population. Now that both these parts of the State organisation are in the hands of a class, the natural tendency of the population must be, not to increase the number of their representatives in Parliament, for that would mean merely invigorating the rotten mechanism, but rather to withhold their right of direct control and veto over the working of the State and especially in its economic functions. There are three ways of insisting upon these rights:

(1.) The most vital points of State Existence being budget and army, the population may decline to supply them with money and men unless they have a chance of approving or disproving both—that is to say, to declare a political Strike against the Government.

(2.) They may agitate for yearly budgets, extraordinary war credits and taxes being subjected to the final approval of local or communal mass meetings including all adult men and women of the country.

(3.) They may impress upon those amongst them who possess the privilege of electors the necessity of limiting their self-denying mandates to their representatives in Parliament withholding the right of final veto on those points for themselves.

In short, the right policy of the population must be to get hold of the neck of the monopolised State and to give it as much breath as they find convenient for the common interests.

Full and direct control over the machinery of the State must be the aim, and the weapon an organised political strike against the State side by side with the general economic strike against capital.

We know the objections: (1.) Political Strike is an impossibility. Yes, say we—until it is properly organised.

(2.) Referendum has been tried in Switzerland, and failed. Yes, it failed on such questions as capital punishment, rights of Jews, etc., but not on questions of bread and butter, on which the mass of the workers are certainly more competent to decide than any politicians, especially if the whole adult population (including women), and not the electors only, is appealed to.

(3.) To exercise our political rights, voting, etc., is contrary to our Anarchist principles.

This is a misunderstanding. "Political rights" does not mean "right of electing members of Parliament" only, which we certainly do not profess, and which ought rather to be called a privilege of the few than a right of all, and has nothing to do with the natural right of each human being to live in society, and to be master of its organisation as far as it affects him.

N. TOCHKOWSKY.

THE "CLARION" AND THE CONGRESS.

To the Chairman of the Anarchist Congress,—Will you allow me, on behalf of myself and the other Clarion men, to say that we consider the treatment of the Anarchists at the Conference ungenerous and unfair. We think they were not given a fair hearing, and that the Conference in expelling them has sent away many of the best Socialists in Europe. If I could have spoken French, I would have expressed my sympathy with the French and Dutch friends verbally. As I could not speak to them at the Conference, will you please read to them this protest against the narrowness and intolerance so unfortunately manifested at the Conference.—K. BLYTHFORD.

We get a glimpse at the spirit which animates the officials of H. M.'s. Prisons by perusing a letter by Edward Carpenter to the "Daily Chronicle", dated August 4th, wherein he states that he has received a letter from the Governor of the prison in which Comrade Charles is confined, informing him that "The prisoner is not allowed to correspond with you." It appears that Edward Carpenter reprinted some passages of the prisoner's last letter to him (in a public journal called "Humanity"). Hence the "official" condemnation.

The Walsall Amnesty Meeting at Trafalgar Square was in every way a marked success. Mr. J. H. Glueck made a very good chairman, and the speeches in behalf of the Walsall prisoners were far above the average and made a strong impression. The resolution adopted called the attention of the Home Secretary to the different treatment granted to Mr. Jameson and his friends. The Walsall and Irish political prisoners were treated of by Pete Curran, his knowledge of Irish affairs enabling him to make a very able speech; while A. Gibson, Dan Irvine, and D. Nicoll did justice to the subject from the English point of view. Louis Michel made a speech of remarkable power and beauty, which was fortunately translated by Domela Nieuwenhuis who also spoke. The meeting gave new life to the agitation. A collection was made which was concluded by a shower of pence thrown by the audience up to the pedestal £2. 9s. 6d was the sum collected and we trust all comrades will assist in this good work.
Liberty Pamphlets.
PRICE ONE PENNY EACH.

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

Definition of Crime. By A. HAMON.

Common-Sense Country. By L. S. BEVINGTON.

Socialism in Danger. Part I. By E. DOMELA NIEUWENHUIS. Translated by R. Grierson.

Socialism in Danger. Part II. By E. DOMELA NIEUWENHUIS. Translated by R. Grierson.

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

Liberty Lyrics. By L. S. BEVINGTON.

The Ideal and Youth. By ELISÉE RECLUS.

An Anarchist on Anarchy. By ELISÉE RECLUS.

In Defence or Emma Goldmann and the Right of Expropriation. By VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE.

A Plea for Anarchist-Communism. By H. H. DUNCAN, of Aberdeen. This Essay contains simply the thoughts of a working man on the all-important subject of the poverty and degradation endured by the working classes, and the remedy for that poverty and degradation.


In the Press.

Anarchy. By ELISÉE RECLUS.

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

Parliamentary Politics in the Socialist Movement. By ERRICO MALATESTA.

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

CABINET PORTRAITS of LOUISE MICHEL, ELISÉE RECLUS, L. S. BEVINGTON, BAKOUNINE, and others. Produced in the very best style of the Art Photographic, Free by Post, One Shilling each. May be obtained on written application to Editor, Carmagnole House, Hammersmith, W.

Liberty Bookshelf.

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

---

By P. KROPOTKIN.

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

ANARCHIST MORALITY. 1d.

THE COMMUNE OF PARIS. 1d.

THE PLACE OF ANARCHISM IN SOCIALISTIC EVOLUTION. 1d.

REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT. 1d.

REVOLUTIONARY STUDIES. 2d.

---

By ERRICO MALATESTA.

A TALK ABOUT ANARCHIST COMMUNISM BETWEEN TWO WORKERS. Price 1d.

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

ANARCHY. 1d.

---

By WILLIAM MORRIS.

USEFUL WORK V. USELESS TOIL. 1d.

THE TABLES TURNED, or NUPKIN'S AWAKENED. 1d.

TRUE AND FALSE SOCIETY. 1d.

MONOPOLY: or, HOW LABOUR IS ROBBED. Price 1d.

---

By D. NICOLL.

ANARCHY AT THE BAR. 1d.

THE WALSSALL ANARCHISTS. 1d.

---

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

ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. 1d.


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