

LIBERTY



• CONTENTS •

Between Ourselves.

Why I am an Anarchist: by Louise Michel.

Common Misconceptions of Anarchism.

*An Interview with Merlino.
Kenworthian Logic Criticised.*

*The Laudation of Force.
Will you join in the Fight?
The Anarchist Committee.*

*Correspondence.
The Forthcoming Congress.*

Vol. III., No. 3.

March, 1896

ONE PENNY.

LONDON

W.M. ROSE

WHY I AM AN ANARCHIST.

I am an Anarchist because Anarchy alone, by means of liberty and justice based on equal rights, will make humanity happy, and because Anarchy is the sublimest idea conceivable by man. It is, today, the summit of human wisdom, awaiting discoveries of undreamt of progress on new horizons, as ages roll on and succeed each other in an ever widening circle.

Man will only be conscious when he is free. Anarchy will therefore be the complete separation between the human flocks, composed of slaves and tyrants, as they exist to day, and the free humanity of tomorrow. As soon as man, whoever he may be, comes to power, he suffers its fatal influence and is corrupted; he uses force to defend his person. He is the State, and he considers it a property to be used for his benefit, as a dog considers the bone he knows. If power renders a man egotistical and cruel, servitude degrades him. A slave is often worse than his master; nobody knows how tyrannous he would be as a master, or base as a slave, if his own fortune or life were at stake.

To end the horrible misery in which humanity has always dragged a bloody and painful existence incites brave hearts more and more to battle for justice and truth. The hour is at hand: hastened by the crimes of governors, the law's severity, the impossibility of living in such circumstances, thousands of unfortunates without hope of an end to their tortures, the illusory amelioration of gangrened institutions, the change of power which is but a change of suffering, and man's natural love of life: every man, like every race, looks around to see from which side deliverance will come.

Anarchy will not begin the eternal miseries anew. Humanity in its flight of despair will cling to it in order to emerge from the abyss. It is the rugged ascent of the rock that will lead to the summit; humanity will no longer clutch at rolling stones and tufts of grass, to fall without end.

Anarchy is the new ideal, the progress of which nothing can hinder. Our epoch is as dead as the age of stone. Whether death took place yesterday or a thousand years ago, its vestiges of life are utterly lost. The end of the epoch through which we are passing is only a necropolis full of ashes and bones.

Power, authority, privileges—no longer exist for thinkers, for artists, or for any who rebel against the common evil. Science discovers unknown forces that study will yet simplify. The disappearance of the order of things we see at present is near at hand. The world, up till now divided among a few privileged beings, will be taken back by all. And the ignorant alone will be astonished at the conquest of humanity over antique beastiality.

I became definitely an Anarchist when sent to New Caledonia, on a state ship, in order to bring me to repentance for having fought for liberty. I and my companions were kept in cages like lions

or tigers during four months. We saw nothing but sky and water, with now and then the white sail of a vessel on the horizon, like a bird's wing in the sky. This impression and the expanse were overwhelming. We had much time to think on board, and by constantly comparing things, events, and men; by having seen my friends of the Commune, who were honest, at work, and who only knew how to throw their lives into the struggle, so much they feared to act ill; I came rapidly to the conclusion that honest men in power are incapable, and that dishonest ones are monsters; that it is impossible to ally liberty with power, and that a revolution whose aim is any form of government would be but a delusion if only a few institutions fell, because everything is bound by indestructible chains in the old world, and everything must be uprooted by the foundations for the new world to grow happy and be at liberty under a free sky.

Anarchism is today the end which progress seeks to attain, and when it has attained it will look forward from there to the edge of a new horizon, which again as soon as it has been reached will disclose another, and so on always, since progress is eternal.

We must fight not only with courage but with logic; that the disinherited masses, who sprinkle every step of progress with their blood, may benefit at last by the supreme struggle soon to be entered upon by human reason together with despair. It is necessary that the true ideal be revealed, grander and more beautiful than all the preceding fictions. And should this ideal be still far off it is worth dying for.

That is why I am an Anarchist.

LOUISE MICHEL.

"ANARCHISM AND SOCIALISM."—Comrade A. Hamon is contributing articles on this subject to the *Free Review* to which we call the particular attention of our readers, in the hope that they will take the necessary steps for becoming acquainted with them. The purport of the articles is to show, by reference to the best authorities, that Anarchism is a part of Socialism, and that there is no contradiction in the terms. Comrade Hamon piles up quotations, and indicates minutely his sources of information, with the desire that as far as possible his readers should form their own conclusions. Work thus honestly and earnestly done deserves hearty recognition, and Anarchists will only be doing the right and proper thing in giving it thorough consideration.

A REQUEST.—Will the authors and editors of all publications relating to Socialism in any of its many phases, send one copy at least to me at 132, Avenue de Clichy, Paris. Such books, booklets, papers, placards, pamphlets, songs, designs, whether relating to Collectivism, Communism, Social-Democracy, Anarchism, or the working-class movement generally, no matter in what language, will be used for "Sociological Studies."—A. HAMON.

NEW PUBLICATION.—E. H. Fulford, of Columbus Junction, Iowa, U.S., has commenced to issue monthly a series of works, under the general title of "Liberty Library," which promise to be of good service to the cause in the States and elsewhere. The books are in handy form, admirably printed, and sold at the uniform price of 5 cents each. "The Historical, Philosophical, and Economical Basis of Anarchy," by William Holmes, and "God and the State," by Bakounine—the latter having a preface by the editors and translators, Carlo Caffero and Elisee Reclus, are the first published.

Common Misconceptions of Anarchism.

That a false conception of the objects and methods of Anarchism should exist in the mind of the average man or woman is hardly to be wondered at when we consider the source from which they mostly derive their information: I refer to the lying capitalist press, the function of whose writers seems to be, as "Cynicus" once naively put it, "to make something out of nothing, and more out of less." An accident occurs on a ship laden with dynamite, resulting in its destruction, and the press, the truthful press, immediately places it all to our credit. A slight diversion is caused in a post-office by the explosion of a penny squib, and, lo! it is the result of a gigantic international conspiracy on the part of wicked Anarchists to destroy life and property wholesale. There are, at the present time, no greater enemies to the promulgation and dissemination of truth than the modern writers for the press—mercenaries, who prostitute their intellect and talent for gain, compared with whom the poor unfortunate who prostitutes her body on the streets for a living, is purity itself. Cobbett once expressed a wish that all newspaper writers could be paraded in Hyde Park, so that the public might be able to see what a contemptible set of curs are the "we's" of the press.

A staunch believer in the infallibility of the press, devouring its every word as gospel, is the average unthinking British workman, and too slow or totally unable to grasp the fact that there are two sides to every question, or to conclude that a plain unbiassed statement of any given principle is hardly to be expected from its enemies. Intellectually nourished from this source, no wonder that many of the unreasoning class should regard us as a band of mad-brained criminals forever plotting outrage. Once again let us briefly explain our position with regard to the question of violence. That a comparatively insignificant few Anarchists, driven to desperation by poverty and oppression, should sometimes resort to the use of violence seems, to some people, proof conclusive that anarchism and outrage are necessarily connected. This is not so. It is true we have no word of blame for those unfortunate victims of society who have been driven to a policy of revenge, but still at the same time we do not counsel violence. We point out incessantly that, so long as society is organised on its present basis of inequality, resulting in extreme luxury on the one hand, and starvation and misery on the other, so long will society reap the fruits of its own unwise, tyrannous, and monopolistic actions.

Anarchy, we are told, means disorder and confusion, and this false interpretation of the word is mainly the reason for the belief that violence is part and parcel of Anarchism. The word Anarchy means simply "without government." Government means constraint, compulsion; Anarchy means without constraint, without compulsion—FREEDOM, the removal of all restrictions to the liberty of the individual. The common belief that disorder must necessarily ensue on the cessation of government, is based on the erroneous assumption that order reigns in our existing society. Where is the "order" in a society where thousands die annually from starvation, overwork, and preventible disease? Is it "order" which forces our sisters to accept a life of prostitution to supplement their terribly insufficient wages? Ninety per cent. of workmen, the actual producers of all wealth (according to Frederic Harrison), have no home that they can call their own beyond the end of a week, have no bit of soil, or so much as a room that belongs to them; have nothing of value except a little furniture—scarcely enough to fill a costers' handbarrow; have the precarious chance of a weekly wage, which does not suffice to get food to keep them in good health; are housed for the most part in places inferior to the rich man's stable; are separated by so narrow a margin from destitution that a month of bad trade, sickness, or unexpected loss brings them face to face with hunger and pauperism. Is this order? Then chaos and confusion are preferable.

Yes, Anarchy is Order! This sounds like a paradox to unthinking people. They cannot conceive of order existing in society, apart from the policeman's baton and the soldier's bayonet. First of all, let us ask ourselves why have we these organised forces of police and soldiery in our midst? "To keep order," is the instantaneous reply. Ah, but is that the real reason? Is it not because society is founded on a basis of inequality, ensuring to the non-workers (the rich) the best of everything, and leaving the workers (the producers of all) with just sufficient to keep body and soul together. Yes, the ruling classes produce nothing, their only function is to rob the worker after he has produced; and the duty of the policeman is to see that the worker does not recover what has been stolen from him.

But, says the unthinking opponent of Anarchism, would not the abolition of law mean an increase in criminality? No. Because, as history shows, in proportion as education has increased, and the punishments of law been relaxed, so, in exact ratio, has crime diminished. In olden times the penalty for a paltry theft was death. This absurd injustice has been removed, but has crime increased in consequence? No. Has murder increased in those countries which have so far advanced in humanitarianism as to abolish altogether the death penalty? On the contrary, it has diminished. So, with the spread of education, and when the people are prepared for Anarchism—and we are not so foolish as to expect its realisation until they are prepared for it—then will the necessity for laws and prisons, judges and policeman, and the rest, cease, for then there will be no use for them.

One of the commonest misconceptions is the idea that Anarchists, in common with all Socialists, propose to divide all property. Such a notion is indeed too idiotic to need refutation here. What we do say is that, under a system of perfect freedom—such as we propose, working men will naturally and voluntarily associate for the production and distribution of commodities, the members of these associations deciding among themselves the manner in which the wealth they have created shall be distributed.

Some people think that without the whip of authority men would not work—that society would be eaten up with idleness. A strange idea, indeed! For how could society exist without the production of the necessities of life? If a number refused to work they would be forced by hunger to resort to it in order to live. It is the burdensome and degrading conditions under which men toil today that make them dislike and shun it as much as possible; but under freedom all would be equal, sharing alike the burdens of life, and work would then be a pleasurable exercise from which no one would think of shrinking.

Another misconception is, that we propose reducing every body to one dead level. The State Socialists may favour such an ideal, but most assuredly it is not ours. It is precisely because we know that all men are different in their tastes and dispositions that we say it is impossible to make laws to regulate every action of every individual. If no two men are alike, as our opponents say, then it is an impossibility for anyone to represent them in Parliament. The so-called "representative of the people" merely represents himself. If all men are imperfect, then the lawmakers are imperfect, and the more reason there is why all law should be abolished. All men differ; therefore we say, give absolute freedom to all to act according to their own desires and wishes, and this can only be done by Anarchism, which proposes the abolition of all forms of compulsion and subjection.

Some Socialists so far misunderstand the question as to say that in order to realise our aims we have no choice between the ballot and the bullet. Repudiating, as we do, the ballot-humbug, we say there are other means than a resort to physical violence. The labour question is an economic question, and consequently can only be settled by economic means—not political; that is to say, by means of a general strike, which can be carried out with very little violence, or in fact without any violence whatever.

I must say that in some instances our comrades themselves are to blame for creating a wrong idea of Anarchism in the minds of enquirers. Anarchy means simply the absence of authorised compulsion—the application of the principle of voluntarism to all the affairs of life. We often hear it said

that Anarchism can only exist with Communism,—that we must have the latter or the former cannot exist. This is a false position. There is no “must have” in Anarchism. We preach freedom, and freedom alone, leaving each to do as he wishes, convinced that each in his way will act for the good of all. We do not propose to force our Communism on an unwilling people; we should by so acting be false to our principles. Neither do we think that the mere abolition of the State will do everything desired. But what we do say is, that by abolishing the State—the instrument of compulsion—we shall open up the way for the full and unrestricted liberty of the individual to act in whatsoever way he chooses. Thus, when government is removed from our path, those of the same ideas will co-operate together voluntarily to put them into practice. We shall then see a number of systems in operation—here Communism, there Individualism, and so on; for it is only by actual experience that the worth of any system can be proved, and practicability and usefulness will decide the fittest to survive. It may be that we think Communism, when seen in operation by the side of other systems, will prove the most economical and practical, and will therefore be copied by others who probably have witnessed the failure of their own ideas in practice, and Communism therefore in the end will prevail. This, I say, may be our belief, but only experience can prove the worth of it.

“What would you do with the outragers of women?” asks an opponent. Never fear, means will most assuredly be devised to deal with such persons, without the expensive machinery of law and government and the horde of officials which they necessarily engender.

“But you would destroy the sacred institution of marriage,” shrieks the pious moralist, in tones of holy horror. Poor fellow! To his mind there is no alternative to marriage but universal prostitution. But is there really any difference between marriage and prostitution? Only this: that the prostitute sells herself for a night and the majority of married women for a lifetime. Both do it for a living. If it is immoral in the one case, it is infinitely more so in the other. We preach free love, not free license, as we preach freedom in all other matters. If a couple really love each other, what need of the law to force them to cohabitation? The marriage laws are an absurdity.

In conclusion, we appeal to all seekers after truth, to all classes, men and women alike, to study the subject of Anarchism before condemning it. Let them not be misled by abuse and misrepresentation, let them cast aside all prejudices and ask themselves honestly what it is that makes Anarchists persevere in promulgating their ideas, in spite of persecution, calumny, the prison, and the gallows. It will then probably cross their minds that there must be something worth working for in Anarchism.

WALTER C. HART.

FRED CHARLES.

A few years ago there would have been no need to write the life of Fred Charles, for there was no one better known and loved in our movement.

But change is constant in a revolutionary movement, and now there are many in our ranks who do not remember the stormy days of '87, or those stirring meetings in memory of the Chicago Anarchists, in November '88, when Morris, Kropotkin, Mrs. Parsons, Cunninghame Graham, and John Burns addressed crowded audiences full of revolutionary enthusiasm, and Socialists and Anarchists forgot disputes about petty points of principle in the general hope that the revolution that all desired was at hand. It was in those days that Fred Charles was active in the movement, and there were few Socialists in London who did not know the careless, gay, kindly, young man, who was the secretary of the Socialist League. He was the life

and soul of the movement, and a general favourite everywhere. Parties were not so rigidly defined as nowadays, and Charles—though looked upon as an extremist—was a favourite with Anarchists and Social Democrats alike. Though a convinced Anarchist, he was not fond of petty cavilling, nor did he display the airs and graces of the superior person over people who were not so advanced. Perhaps this was the reason that, though he was not an orator, he made more converts to his ideas than any other Anarchist. Charles was “a good fellow,” everyone liked him, and thus it was in towns like Norwich and Sheffield—the very centres of reaction—a large group gathered around him.



He was born in Norwich. His parents belonged to the sect of Dissenters who were descendants of the Anabaptists—the Christian Anarchists of the days of the Reformation. Charles was a Communist, and he showed in every action of his life that he believed in his theories. In Norwich he spent a small fortune, left him by his father, in propagating Socialism, though it is probable he spent still more in helping those who were in trouble and distress.

Those were lively days in '87, and a riot of the unemployed in January of that year resulted in our Comrade Mowbray receiving nine months' hard labour at the hands of Justice Grantham.

Afterwards, when Charles came to London in '88, he threw the same energy and enthusiasm into the movement, and still more apparent was his kindness of disposition. I have often seen him take unemployed men, who were starving and spiritless, and give them a good dinner at the place where he had his meals. If Charles gave, it was not “charity” but the kindly help extended from one comrade to another. “I have known him,” said Edward Carpenter, “to have his week's wages in his pocket at midday on Saturday, and before night to be without a penny—he had given every farthing away to those who were in need.”

And it is this man, who was so ready to help

others, who now needs help. He is alone and friendless in a great criminal prison, exposed to all the brutality which law and authority has always shown to the true lovers of the people. Will his old comrades forget him, will they let him lie in prison until the last moment of his sentence has expired? No, surely not, when those who do not hold our ideas are ready with their help and sympathy. Let us make up our minds that if Charles and his companions still remain in a living tomb, it shall not be our fault, but that we will work our hardest to unlock the prison gates and let the oppressed go free.

DAVID NICOLL.

AN INTERVIEW WITH MERLINO.

In an interview with a representative of the *Pungolo Parlamentare* (of Naples) F. S. Merlino—lately released from his confinement at Montesarduo—says that he is in a neutral position, being neither in agreement with the Individualists, nor in sympathy with the Authoritarian Socialists. Being in this neutral position, he is able to examine impartially the burning questions that surround the Socialist movement, and to sound them thoroughly—as far, he adds, as his own intelligence allows. He is glad to find, by penetrating further into the question, a rational conciliation of many dissensions and the solution of many apparent difficulties.

Asked to define the principal divergences between Anarchists and Socialists, he said that the idea of Anarchism is opposition to government, authority, and centralisation in the Socialist schemes, and in short is a corrective to Authoritarian or Utopian Socialism.

When (he continued) all conservative writers, from Mazzini downwards, denounced the French Communist sects, those among Socialists who did not wish to incur such a reproach founded Anarchist Communism, or Socialism. Now-a-days, however, no Socialist dreamed of a State as possessor of all wealth, and as organiser of industries and distributor of work and rewards. The aim of Anarchist propaganda might therefore in a great degree be said to have been reached.

Today (says Merlino) the great difference lies between Individualist-Anarchists and Socialist-Anarchists. Between the last and the so-called Marxists the principle difference is one of method, the first being revolutionists and the latter parliamentarians: moreover the difference is not so deep nor so constant as is often thought: it is partly a question of temperament, too, and of opportunity.

In answer to a further question, Merlino said he thought a union between the two sections was quite impossible. They had never really come to terms, and, in his opinion, never would. There was a practical incompatibility between revolutionary tactics and parliamentary or legalist tactics. Anarchist outrages, attempts at revolt, and the

display of a revolutionary spirit did harm to an electoral movement, and that movement in its turn enticed away members from the party of action. Thus arose dissensions, accusations, and reciprocal recriminations; and they would never grow less, but would rather increase, unless a crisis occurred of a nature so acute as to compel legalists to become revolutionists.

Merlino gives his views on the Socialist movement in England, Germany, France, Belgium, etc. In England (he says) the movement is a working-class movement—a class struggle. The S. D. F. made its name in the unemployed agitation of '85, and reached the height of its power in the Dock strike. In Germany the movement is, above all, intellectual. "I shall never forget (he adds) the impression made on me when I took part in the meetings at Monaco and at Berlin in '91." All sorts of philosophical questions were discussed at the working-class meetings. "And people say that the working-class are incapable! I believe there is no philosophical or economic question, however difficult, that they cannot succeed in understanding." The Anarchist idea has (Merlino considers) an important future in England and Germany. "The Independents—the 'young' party, have gained ground in Germany, England, France, and Holland. I know that they propose to fight the Marxists at the coming London Congress." Merlino thinks these Labour congresses a bad imitation of Parliamentary assemblies, with their intrigues and backstairs plots; and he comments on the action of the Socialist deputies in Germany, who have, he thinks, exercised a dictatorship over the party, converting it into a vast electoral agency.

Continuing to reply to his interviewer's questions Merlino said: I should prefer a continual exchange of ideas, not only among individuals but also among groups and associations, to congresses, which rarely leave a trace of their passage in the history of an idea or of a party. I believe that we must fight illusions that many have as to parliamentarianism, and furthermore it is necessary to fight the tendency that looks upon means as an end. I think it would be a mistake of Socialists and Anarchists to consent to the abolition of parliaments. It is necessary, according to my thinking, to fight step by step every action that leads to absolutism. But the struggle must take place in the country and with the country: certainly not in parliament.

With regard to Anarchist outrages, Merlino said that to give his opinion fully he would have to discuss each fact by itself, but, speaking generally, he considered such outrages as reactions arising from the blind and ferocious persecutions of governments.

Of the most important men in the Socialist and Anarchist movement Merlino said: I have known many, but notable men who militate in the ranks of Socialism are now so numerous that it would be impossible for me to name them. Besides, today, we are no longer at the beginning of the movement, when every talented man who appeared on the

scene gave a new direction and personal stamp to the movement. Now the bulk of the system is formed, and Socialism has become a popular movement; and the greatest thinkers can bring but slight modifications to ideas, and instead of leading they are influenced by the impulses of the masses.

Merlino, it is understood, has just begun a work in which he intends to make his present position in the Social movement known, and to give ample justification for it.

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

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

Subscription, 1s. 6d. per year, post free. Per quire of 27 copies, 1s. 7d. post free.

The trade supplied by W. Reeves, 185, Fleet Street, E.C.

LIBERTY,
LONDON, MARCH, 1896.

BETWEEN OURSELVES.

One thing is very certain: when Herbert Spencer some years ago described Socialism as the coming slavery he spoke as a true prophet. Even in its inception, the antics of the wire-pullers—hungry for office—in suppressing all opinion but their own in the so-called representative congresses, amply justify Spencer's deduction. The richest joke of all is to behold the Hyndmans, the Avelings, and the rest of the happy family, trying to keep a straight face when they are disavowing the Socialism of Bismarck. Why Bismarck is not in it with them!

Of course the Socialists have a perfect right to have a congress of their own, and to exclude, in good old parliamentary fashion, all those who happen to disagree with their proposals. But when they get up a bogus congress, falsely claiming to represent the working class; and when, furthermore, they act upon this arrogant presumption, and seek to mould the political machine to their antediluvian projects—which consists in nothing else than the replacing of economic competition by political competition, it is nearly time the working class uttered a protest.

Whether economic competition under free conditions is a good thing or not, there can be no two opinions about the badness of political competition. The former certainly acts without individual preference; it is no respecter of persons. But in political competition (which is nothing else than the scramble for office in order to exploit the work-

ing class) all the vilest qualities of that vilest of men, the politician, is brought into play, and merit has no chance. Only trickery, corruption, double-dealing, survive.

We hasten to congratulate Keir Hardie on having arrived at the conclusion that it is "a wise decision" that excludes Anarchists from the forthcoming Workers Congress. If we hurry up also with the assumption that Hardie had the best of reasons for coming to his conclusion, but did not from excessive modesty like to thrust them upon his readers, the step is taken with just a little caution. Perhaps Hardie has looked the subject all round before making up his mind, (and we use that "perhaps" with the utmost courtesy), but if so why should he desire to have the subject discussed in his paper, and why, in particular, should he ask (in terms which are little short of an insult) for a two-column article from the pen of Kropotkin? Has friend Hardie arrived at that stage of mental development which some sophists describe as being in possession of "an open mind", but which most men designate as a position wherein the holders thereof become as weather-cocks, and shift their position in obedience to every passing breeze? Is he thinking that Kropotkin may possibly show up the ridiculous position in which the Social Democrats are placing themselves over this Congress? Or that the time is not so very far off when it may be "a wise decision" on the part of Socialists to accept without demur the principles of Anarchism?

Keir Hardie's request for gratuitous copy is a fair sample of the journalistic cuteness that travelling in the United States tends to develope. He not only solicits for an article by Kropotkin, but also asks other Anarchists to assist him in filling the columns of his journal. We are almost inclined to respond to our friend's beseeching appeal and send him along a batch of copy—and good copy, too—for which we cannot find room in our columns. Of course we do not forget that once upon a time—not so very long ago—letters from Anarchists were treated with, shall we say contempt? by Keir Hardie. But no matter: generosity is part and parcel of our nature, also of our principles. The flowing tide is with "us", and who knows but that, in less time than we reckon, Keir Hardie may be merrily swimming with the stream instead of grimly battling against it.

It is interesting to learn that Miss Emma Brooke, author of the Socialist romance, "Transition," was in 1884 a member of the Hampstead Historic Club, a group of Socialists who met at Mrs. Wilson's (who was then editing *Freedom*) to study the works of Karl Marx, and in this way became acquainted with G. B. Shaw, Sidney Ollivier, Graham Wallace, and Sidney Webb, the latter of whom is said to have been the counterpart of the hero in the novel above mentioned. That such a group

powerfully influenced and moulded Miss Brooke's future life is not to be wondered at: that she has been able to invest Sidney Webb—if only in fiction—with any of the qualities of a hero, stamps her at once as a woman of imagination and genius.

Our memory cannot recollect the time when political frauds were so big or so rampant as in this year '96. In every direction the old game of "Heads I win, tails you lose" is being played with an audacity that is astounding. And the players are the classes and the masses. The latter are apathetic or asleep, and the former are as wide awake, as active, and as ferocious as mosquitoes.

The Britishers are being bamboozled with the idea that it is necessary to spend some millions on warships, guns, bayonets, etc. The "dailies"—Tory and Radical—tell their readers the expenditure must be incurred in order to protect trade and commerce, and the lie is accepted as gospel truth. Some Britishers believe everything their daily papers tell them. Ask any one of these people to give a reason for the faith they profess, and they cannot. Take the first dozen men from any public thoroughfare, and ask each one separately if he has any objection to paying increased rates, and he will answer quickly "Certainly I have: I pay more now than I can afford." But there the protest ends. Get Britishers together, if only the scriptural "two or three", and they become patriots—an easy prey for the politicians.

That Stock Exchange gamblers, office and pension seekers, and the like, who act as catspaws to the governing classes, should become obtrusively patriotic at every opportunity requires no explanation; but why, oh why should the working and small trading classes play the fool and the idiot—get all the kicks and none of the ha'pence?

It is true the so-called leaders of public opinion are doing their level best to mislead everyone who listens to them. There is that political trickster, Lord Rosebery, talking about the British Empire as "a commonwealth of nations united by the Crown," and the necessity for "a predominant navy," and also asserting that "there never was an occasion when faith in the empire was so great or so general as now." Cardinal Vaughan goes a little further, and speaks of "the great position assigned by Providence to the British Empire."

Unfortunately not many of the very persons who are able to estimate such balderdash at its proper value have the courage to act up to their opinions, and they excuse themselves with the plea that as individuals they are powerless. Where is the "commonwealth of nations" so glibly mentioned by Rosebery? Why not even Secretary Chamberlain, with all his newly acquired knowledge of geography, would be able to give to such an "airy nothing a local habitation." Lord Selborne con-

tradicts his brother peer, by saying that political philosophers have been "trying"—only trying—to cement the empire by a constitutional bond.

And of evils much the greatest
Is the lying politician—
He, who speaking to the people,
Doth but lure them to disaster.

Next the parson—slimy driveller,
Bosom friend of God Almighty;
He, with sanctimonious word-spells,
Slavers rich men, gulls the poor.

Is it wonder that Buchanan,
Straight, outspoken Bob Buchanan,
Seeing these and other evils
Proclaims Beelzebub "a kindly monarch."

And what are the legalists on the other side of the Atlantic doing? Playing the same game of bamboozle and bounce? Oh, yes, and successfully too. A short time since "the elected" at Washington were shouting defiance to all and everyone who should dare to encroach on American soil, and were borrowing money from the usurers to prevent the national cash-box from becoming empty. Today they are plotting uncalled interference in the affairs of Cuba, and are following the wretched example set them by the "old country" of heaping up indebtedness by the wholesale purchase of weapons for the murder of their fellow creatures. And for "governors" and "rulers" of this diabolical description the masses are told they should be grateful. Should they?

The French police sought to make the recent journey of President Faure into the provinces sufficiently noticeable to attract for the moment the attention of Europe. As nothing less (to their thinking) than a plot to assassinate Mons. Faure would produce the desired effect, they imagined the plot and then announced their discovery of it, following up this wonderful course of procedure by arresting a few citizens, and calling them Anarchists. They afterwards reproduced another of their old tricks—they intruded on the privacy of a large number of families on the plea of searching for documents. The whole thing, however, was a complete failure: there was no excitement, no one frightened, not even a toy revolver discharged. President Faure made his tour in peace. But what a farce the whole affair was! Peregrinating president, plotting policemen, petty prefects, and mind-polluting priests—what a mixture, what a procession?

A copy of the "Manifesto of the Associated Anarchists" has been forwarded to us, and our opinion of the document has been asked for. A somewhat unpleasant duty has consequently to be discharged. The authors of the publication in question are evidently unaware of the first principles of Anarchism; hence they have no claim to be considered as exponents of Anarchism. The principle of freedom, which we believe to be the root of all sound development, is outraged by sub-

mission—be the act voluntary, or otherwise: for he who voluntarily submits becomes not less a slave, a brute, and in his turn a tyrant; he abdicates his position as an intellectual being by submitting beforehand to majority decisions; and as all parts of a living organism which are not used degenerate, the result is mental and moral idiocy. The principles of Anarchism must not be adulterated, or, to use an Americanism, "whittled down", not even to meet the urgent exigencies of propaganda.

Of course we do not for one moment question the right of the few comrades who have issued this manifesto to act as they have done. Possibly their object was to benefit the movement. If so, they would have acted more wisely had they been more careful in the drawing up of their printed statement. It is, to put it very mildly, somewhat misleading to announce this manifesto as having been unanimously accepted at more than one meeting of London Anarchists, without at the same time honestly and explicitly stating that the meetings in question were of the smallest possible dimensions. More however on this subject need scarcely be said, as, in all probability, the authors of the manifesto have by this time seen the folly of their unwise and ill-considered tactics, and that such things must discredit the cause.

Our readers will be pleased to hear that Comrade William Morris, who has been very ill, is decidedly better, and that his doctor is hopeful as to his complete recovery.

Comrade Kropotkin has experienced a little more of the "kindly consideration" so often given by the authorities—including Republicans—to men of his calibre. He started on a visit to Paris, but got no farther than Dieppe, at which place he was informed that a decree of expulsion had been issued against him, that he must at once re-embark for England, and that if he refused he would be taken into custody. He failed to obtain permission to remain for a night in an hotel without being under police surveillance, and was in other ways treated so discourteously that he decided on returning at once. He quitted France without accomplishing the object for which he had left home, namely, to deliver two lectures for the benefit of Jean Grave's journal, but his visit thoroughly frightened the French authorities.

Rolf Clayton writes suggesting the desirability of providing free meals for the children attending Board Schools. He says a committee has been formed for the Chelsea Division for the purpose of pressing forward a consideration of this subject. We should support heartily a movement for feeding the London children who are now foodless, but it would have to be a movement on very different lines to those indicated in Comrade Clayton's letter. The School Board is doing the work it has in hand in a manner most unsatisfactorily: indeed the system they work on is more adapted for producing cads and prigs than for assisting children to develop into intellectually independent men and women. We would rather see the School Board abolished than see its powers increased in any direction whatever. If by independent and voluntary action we can today feed a few hungry children—and acting individually, and not either in groups or through committees, something may be done—let us do so, rather than associate in action with the very people who are the main cause of the poverty and misery. We want the children fed, and this would come about if their parents were in the position a natural state of society would enable them to occupy.

From the Roxburghe Press will shortly be issued a work

entitled "Carinã Songs," by Amy Morant, which we hope will justify a favourable review.

Henry Labouchere, alias Truthful Tommy, says "As things are a considerable number of the members of the House of Commons cannot be independent. They have not the means to pay for their election, and their ability to sit in the next Parliament depends on their subserviency in the present Parliament." This is very rough on some of Tommy's brother legislators.

The 1st of May Celebration.

The second Delegate Meeting of the First of May Celebration Committee was held on Sunday, the 1st inst., at the S. D. F. Hall, Strand, London, more than 100 delegates being present. G. Lansbury occupied the chair. A permanent—in place of the provisional—committee was appointed, and a manifesto for circulation was adopted. It was further unanimously agreed that the following should be the first resolution moved at the celebration: "That this mass meeting of workers send fraternal greetings to their fellow workers in other lands, and assert with them their determination to overthrow wagedom and capitalism, and establish by their united efforts that international cooperative commonwealth in which all the instruments of industry will be owned and controlled by the organised communities, and equality of opportunity given to all to lead healthy, happy, human lives."

Comrade Quinn, writing with regard to the above meeting, reports: Among the Anarchists put forward for a seat on the executive were Turner, Quinn, Banham, and Caplan. Turner withdrew; Caplan got for 40 votes, Banham 34, and Quinn 43, but as it required about 53 votes to gain a place they were not appointed; their nominations were however well supported by the members of the I. L. P. There were two resolutions put forward to be spoken to on Mayday. The first was couched in general terms, and sufficiently wide to admit of Anarchists speaking to it. But the second was narrow and parliamentary. A suggestion I made for altering it, although strongly supported by Amy Morant and R. Peddie, was not accepted.

The Great Socialistic Humbug.

The following correspondence has passed between Henry Seymour, as hon. sec. of the Free Currency Propaganda, and Will Thorne, as sec. of the Committee organising the forthcoming International Congress. Comment is needless.

Free Currency Propaganda,

18th Feb., 1896.

Dear Sir,—I am requested by my Committee to apply for permission to be represented by delegate at the forthcoming International Labour Congress.—Fraternally yours,

Mr. W. Thorne.

HENRY SEYMOUR.

International Socialist Workers and

Trade Union Congress,

Feb. 20, 1896.

Dear Sir,—I may say in reply to your letter that only Trade Unions and Socialist organisations can be represented at the International.—Fraternally yours,

H. Seymour.

W. THORNE, Sec.

Free Currency Propaganda,

March 4, 1896.

Dear Sir,—I am requested by my Committee to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 20th ult., and to say that in making application to be represented by delegate at your Congress, they did so under an entire misapprehension, for which their apologies are due. They were under the impression, destitution of foundation as it appears, that it was to be a "Labour" Congress—not a mere political caucus masquerading in the name of labour—at which those labour organisations which have outgrown the antiquated policy of the strike, and rejected the creed of Karl Marx, might have an opportunity to present their views.—Respectfully yours,

Mr. W. Thorne.

HENRY SEYMOUR.

KENWORTHIAN LOGIC CRITICISED.

Comrade Kenworthy marvels at my being amused at his assertion about orthodox perverters of the gospel reading "black where they should read white." I certainly was amused, as the thought crossed my mind, that the orthodox might just as readily charge him with "heterodox perversion" and with equally good reason from their point of view, and believe as honestly in their assertion as our friend undoubtedly does in his. And I confess I might be even more amused if it were not "so serious" a matter, when he—instead of attempting to prove his assertion that "men are the creation of an all-powerful, all wise, and all-loving being"—evades his incumbent duty as an affirmer, of giving me proofs of his assertion, and in place thereof suggests that I am mentally deficient—suggests that my condition is analagous to that of a blind man, with whom it is useless to discuss a question of colour, or similar to that of the proverbial Scotchman who needs a surgical operation before he can appreciate a joke, or be convinced of a truth that runs counter to his prejudiced convictions. I earnestly ask if this is a manly way, or one likely to help an opponent to appreciate and thus give fullest consideration to the matter under discussion. All must answer, It is not manly—it will and must terminate free and earnest discussion.

In place of argument our comrade only reasserts dogmatically what he calls "the first great fact of life". I am willing to admit it to be a fundamental "belief" of Christians, but deny it to be an incontrovertible fact. It is not my place to give at this stage my reasons for denying his affirmation: it is for him, he being the affirmer, to give his reasons and the evidence he has for his beliefs, and not to think that to "merely mention" them is sufficient.

Then again when he reasserts his second great fact, "the life hereafter," he adds "and article of belief." One sees at once how confused his concepts of knowledge and belief are. Matters of knowledge can be demonstrated; matters of belief are not demonstrable, but are accepted or rejected according as the evidence affects each individual mind. I admit a life hereafter is a Christian belief, and some think they have evidence that compels their belief, but I deny it to be a fact, or a matter of knowledge, i.e. demonstrable, as it would be if it were knowledge.

Our comrade, instead of attempting anything like a scientific, logical, and therefore a reasonable line of argument, or producing his proofs, simply asks "Has our Comrade Parris never read the story of the death and resurrection of Jesus?" I answer "Yes, over and over again," and I freely admit that in my earlier and uncritical years I believed it; but why? Because my parents, my loved and trusted teachers, told me my salvation depended on my believing it. When, however, my critical faculties became developed, I necessarily subjected my belief to a critical investigation, and I then found there was not sufficient evidence of the truth of the story to compel my belief. This led me further to investigate the origin of Christianity, and my studies compelled me to reject the whole thing as utterly without historic evidence. Of course if any fresh evidence is forthcoming, I, wishing to be strictly honest, shall always be open to consider such evidence.

I must, however, disabuse our friend's mind of an assumption that is purely gratuitous, viz., that "the commentators have deluded" me. I can assure him that for once he has made a most egregious mistake. Anyone knowing me at all, or who has heard me lecture, would simply say, "You don't know Touzeau Parris."

With regard to the word "supernatural", I do not see why Comrade Kenworthy should doubt if he understands my use of it. I used it most certainly in contradistinction to "natural".

But I have good reason to doubt our friend's meaning when he refers me to the story of Jesus' death and resurrection, and then implies by his after remarks that this story of the resurrection is purely natural, and not in any sense supernatural. His reference to ghosts being natural phenomena will not help him to naturalise the gospel story, for Jesus is represented as saying, "a ghost has not flesh and bones as ye see me have."

Then, lastly, the statement with regard to Christian civilisation never having been tried, is not true. It may not have been tried in that peculiar form, which I might denominate Kenworthian, but it has been in the past ages, whether Catholic or Puritan, what the then Christian Church according to its lights thought pure and true Christianity. But in each case it was a miserable failure. And we have no indication that any conceivable form of Christianity, not even the Kenworthian sort, would do what we Anarchist-Socialists hope and work for.

TOUZEAU PARRIS.

The International Workers' Congress.

ANARCHIST COMMITTEE.

The growing agitation against the exclusion of the non-political delegates from the International Congress has now reached such a pitch as to provoke comment even in the columns of the collectivist press. Even W. M. Thompson, in the *Clarion*, refers to the Organising Committee's interpretation of the Zurich resolution as "causing grave dissatisfaction amongst our French comrades." The *Labour Leader* also supports the claims of Anarchists and non-political Socialists to take part in the coming congress, and seemingly reflects the opinion of the I. L. P. at large. All this makes for good. With the cooperation of fair-minded Parliamentary Socialists, and Anarchistic Trade Unionists, the notorious resolution is sure to be rescinded, and a heavy blow will be struck at the crafty crew who endeavour to be the popes of the labour movements, for reasons best known to themselves, but which are doomed to ignoble failure. This congress will undoubtedly be the inauguration of a period of splendid opportunities from the Anarchist standpoint. It will make clear two important facts. Firstly, the undeniable and rapid growth of the Anarchist principle of non-participation in the working of that most gigantic and brutal instrument of the workers' oppression and degradation—government: and, secondly, the spread of the Anarchist policy of greater tolerance.

The public arrangements made by the London Anarchist Committee have been carried out very successfully during the past month.

The Variety Concert at the Grafton Rooms, on Feb. 19th, was a thoroughly enjoyable event. Songs—revolutionary, sentimental, humorous, and eccentric, solos on the violin, mandoline, and cornet, step-dancing, and, last but not least, recitations by D. J. Nicoll and J. Turner—all tended towards this desirable end.

A Public Meeting of East-end Jewish workers was held at the Labour Hall, Cannon-Street Road, on Feb. 22nd, when speeches in English and Yiddish against the action of the Organising Committee were made and the whole question thoroughly considered.

On Monday, 2nd inst., a good sized audience occupied the Imperial Assembly Rooms, and a series of speeches were delivered by Comrades Tochatti, Caplan, Quinn, Wess, Banham, Leggatt, and Presbury.

Preparations are now being made for the big West-end meeting, full particulars of which will appear in the next number of *LIBERTY*.

The following is the statement of receipts and expenditure to March 2nd: Receipts—Per L. Baron 5s., Stanley 6d., Collier 1s., Sundry donations 5s., Sale of tickets 32s. 6d., Imperial Assembly Rooms collection 9s. 7d., Loans 8s., Total £3 1s. 7d. Expenditure—Printing 12s 10d., Rent 16s. 7d., advertisements 6s., Postages 6s. 6d., Concert expenses 16s. 1d., Sundries 1s. 6d., Total £2 19s. 8d. Balance in hand 1s. 11d.

The lists which have been sent to different provincial centres have not returned yet. When they do we hope to have enough money to issue the manifesto. THOS. REEVE, Assist. Sec.

THE LAUDATION OF FORCE.

Events do sometimes cast their shadows before them: the smallest straw will indicate the direction in which the stream is running. Mere truisms these; but they will serve as an introduction. The event of the past month has been the arrival in this country of the leader, if not the instigator, of the recent invasion of the territory of the South African Republic—Dr. Jameson. The British Poet Laureate's unpoetical effort to make a hero of the medical-political-commercial fillibuster, has been succeeded by the drivel of certain musichall rhymsters, and by the speeches and writings of Jingoists generally; to all these outward and visible signs has been appropriately added the applause of a considerable number of people whose chief characteristic is their power to shout "hurrah" and throw up their hats.

And the reasons for all this commotion? What are they, and on what grounds are they based?

Dr. Jameson was the duly appointed executive officer of certain powers granted by the British Government to a company of capitalists formed for developing the resources of a clearly defined territory in the south of Africa. Stepping outside these powers he got together an armed force, and deliberately, secretly, and without warning, invaded the country of the Boers, and went as far as he could towards destroying the authority of a government with which the British Government is on friendly terms. His invasive action—his appeal to force, was frustrated. He and his brother fillibusters were apprehended, and today they are prisoners (on bail) waiting to be tried for a breach of the Foreign Enlistment Act—than which (in the words of Sir John Bridge) "there cannot be a graver offence charged against men; it is a crime of the highest possible gravity."

It has been pleaded that Dr. Jameson simply responded to an appeal by certain British residents in Johannesburg, who said that their lives and property were in imminent danger. It has on the other hand been said that if such an appeal was made there were no legitimate grounds for making it. In no quarter has any attempt been made to prove that Dr. Jameson had justice or reason on his side when taking his invasive step—his deliberate attempt to encroach on the liberties of his neighbours.

Whence and wherefore, then, this outburst of approval of an appeal to force—to violence? The military authorities have not been able to prevent common soldiers from displaying it, and the highest of the stipendiary magistrates found himself unable to suppress it. Dr. Jameson and his officers are evidently heroes in the eyes of many people, and may possibly retain that ambiguous position for some little time to come.

Are there any justifiable grounds for assuming that at least a portion of the inhabitants of this country have so far lost their common sense as to become indiscriminate worshippers of "force" in

any form whatsoever—even that of a fillibuster? And if so, should the "authorities" be the first to blame them? Have not these said authorities been doing their level best for some time past to drag "force" to the front—to place it on the highest of pedestals, and to ask the multitude to fall down and worship the idol they have moulded and graven? Why should they complain; and why should Sir John Bridge be "pained and troubled", and accuse the approvers of force (according to Jameson) of wishing to "bring the name of England into contempt"? What was Lord Wolseley doing when, on receiving the troops who have just returned from Kumasi, he used these words: "They had had no bloodshed and no fighting, and he dared to say that a great number of them were very sorry for it." We may remark parenthetically that Wolseley gets some £5000 a year for his laudation of force. The British ratepayer finds the money, but is not permitted to cry "hurrah" without running the risk of being accused of desiring to bring the name of his country into contempt.

But we are in no mood for sympathising with the authorities—from the great Chamberlain to the little Bridge. We are much more disposed to laugh at them and the highly ludicrous position in which they find themselves. It is really amusing to observe their contortions as they hang figuratively on a gallows of their own erection. Our sympathy, which is somewhat akin to pity, is rather with those who are led to think they see real bravery and real manliness in the actions of men who, inspired only by their lust for gold, seek to invade the liberties of their fellows—who act only at the bidding of moneylords and landlords, and who tomorrow if it suited their fillibustering purposes would shoot down, rob, and in other ways maltreat the very foolish people who today forget their manhood when obtrusively lauding force in its most inhuman form.

Without attempting to prejudice in any way the charge against Dr. Jameson and his officers, and merely calling attention to the fact that, for killing some fifty Boers and seriously injuring one hundred others, they may possibly be let off with the payment of a fine, or at the utmost get two years' imprisonment without hard labour, we cannot but call attention to another anomaly of the law—the two-faced pliable law with which humanity is burdened. Today there are several men suffering the tortures of penal servitude, whose only offence was committed at the instigation of the police authorities, and which did not amount to either killing or wounding. The authorities have no time to consider the case of the Walsall Anarchists: they are too busy in straining the laws they profess to administer justly and mercifully. Just now they are particularly engaged in trying, on the one hand to elevate the worship of force into a virtue of the first degree, and on the other hand to suppress it when its expression is to their thinking untimely. On the horns of this dilemma they are indeed ridiculous and contemptible. B.

A Reply to S. D. Shallard's "Why I am not an Anarchist."

There is little to reply to in Comrade Shallard's article. On many points his views and ours are absolutely identical. In his first statement, "I would rather be making more Socialists than be criticising any section of those already existing," he has my hearty sympathy. Some Anarchists seem to be under the impression that to abuse Social Democrats, who in many cases, like Shallard's, are not very far off from the truth, is the best way to preach Anarchy, and that the explanation of our principles in a clear and logical manner is a matter of much less importance. I do not believe in trying to convert a man by calling him names, and I prefer to reserve my hard words for the common enemy.

And here I have a word to say to Shallard. Is it quite fair to talk as if Anarchist Socialists were Individualists of the Tucker-Spencer school? In reality Anarchist-Socialists are as wide apart from the Individualists and Mutualists as E. S. Shallard is from Herbert Spencer. To Anarchists, Socialists, and Individualists alike, the State is the abomination of desolation. But Herbert Spencer and E. S. Shallard believe in the State, but their notions as to its functions, and their ideas as to property, are wide as the poles asunder. The Individualist-Anarchist believes in private property, which the Anarchist-Socialist would make the property of the community. So please, Comrade Shallard, don't argue as if we want all men to become Robinson Crusoes. This is an admirable argument against the Individualist, but it won't do against us. We agree with you, that man is better off when working in association with his fellows, but, unlike some Social Democrats, we would not force him into association with others by the bludgeon of the policeman and the bayonet of the soldier. Association must be voluntary, and the individual allowed perfect freedom will soon find out for himself that he is better off working in association with his fellows, than on his own little piece of land or in his own little workshop. But should he not be Robinson Crusoe if he likes? Why should not any individual, or group of individuals, try any experiments in living and working that they please, so long as they do not seek to trample upon the liberty of others to do likewise. Shallard speaks of the "arbitrary power" of the committee of a club to expel a defaulting member. But has that committee any arbitrary power? Cannot the defaulting member appeal to a general meeting of the members of the club, if he thinks he has suffered any injustice? What then becomes of the "arbitrary power" of the committee? And would not the members of an Anarchist community have power to expel a man who trampled upon the liberty of others, who endeavoured to become a capitalist by seizing more than his fair share of the wealth produced by the labour of all, and refusing to do any work in return? Anarchism gives alike to the community and the individual the right of rebellion against the tyranny of an individual or number of individuals. But still we should as Anarchists use argument and kindly persuasion before resorting to these extreme methods.

As for committees of clubs and municipal councils always working for the "good of the club" and the "comfort of the city", I know some remarkable instances to the contrary. In the main, governing bodies of all kinds work for their own advantage, and it would certainly be dangerous to give municipal councils, or the executive government in a Social-Democratic State, arbitrary power to expel any individual. That "the individual has no rights" might receive some startling illustrations.

"In my ideal society (says Comrade Shallard) each will give of his best, recognising this as the very condition of his being.

The first thought will have to be, not how much to get, but how much to give. 'He that would be chief among you, let him be the servant of all.' Ah, but you say, is not this our ideal? From each his capacity, to each his necessities."

This is a beautiful description of an Anarchist society, but will you produce this harmonious whole by the brute force of the State, or by the "arbitrary power" of rulers and governors? And why should we not exalt the individual, if the individual be strong, vigorous, and healthy—developed to the fullest extent of his physical and intellectual powers? Then, a society composed of many of these individuals, who have also attained the same pitch of exaltation, will partake of their character, and we shall see the City Beautiful—the dream of poets and idealists.

DAVID NICOLL

Will you join in the Fight?

[Tune—"One day nearer home."]

O'er the hills the sun is rising,
Flooding earth with beauteous light;
Birds wake up with songs of gladness,
Nature seems so pure and bright.
But in towns reigns murky darkness,
Heads bowed down with grief and care,
For the toiler knows that morning
Brings its load of black despair.
Sorrow and grief are the worker's share,
Homes so wretched and comforts rare;
Oh, how sad to think that the breaking day
Brings no joy to the toiling slave.
How sunless his life, how cruel his fate,
From dewy morn till night so late;
Oh, how sad to think that morning
Has no joys for the toiling slave.

See King Poverty's grim presence
Hovering round us day by day,
Snatching up some falling toiler
As he starves on life's highway;
Help for him is not forthcoming,
Hope for him is not yet nigh.
Oh, that he should starve 'midst plenty,
Often in the gutter die;
Oh, that he should want 'midst plenty,
Often in the workhouse die.
Who then is willing to join in the fray?
Who then is willing to drive away
Poverty, who, in the toiler's home,
With his power has long held sway?
On every hand our brothers despair,
Sisters are weeping everywhere;
Who among you then is willing
This cruel monster to drive away?

In the west the sun is sinking,
Nature speaks of peaceful rest;
Birds have ceased their peaceful rapture,
Darkness spreads o'er earth's green breast.
But our slaves in lanes and alleys,
Find no rest in night or day,
For their heavy burdens pressing
Drive refreshing sleep away;
Yes, their heavy burdens pressing,
Drive refreshing sleep away.
Gird on your swords so sharp and bright,
Soldier, be willing for the fight!
For the din of distant trumpet tones
On each listening ear doth fall!
Soldier! be daring, fearless and true,
For there is plenty of fighting to do;
Oh, be ready on that morning—
Ready when the trumpets call!

G. E. CONRAD NAEVIGER

GETTING ON.—"The Firebrand" (Portland, Oregon) has increased its size. Well done, Addis and group!



THE ANARCHISTS OF LONDON

WILL HOLD A

Public Meeting

AT THE

CLUB AND INSTITUTE UNION HALL,
CLERKENWELL ROAD, (next to Holborn Town Hall),

On Thursday, 19th March, 1896,

To Commemorate the Declaration of the Commune of Paris,
and to reiterate the International Protest against the
brutalities used in its suppression.

SPEAKERS:

Peter Kropotkin, Tom Pearson, James Tochatti,
Alice Krane, Will Banham, W. Wess, C. E. Ford,
J. Presbury, C. T. Quinn, Chas. Morton, J. Caplan,
R. Rocker, E. Malatesta, and Louise Michel.

Doors open at 7.45; commence at 8.30.

Collection.

Liberty Pamphlets.

PRICE ONE PENNY EACH.

IN THE PRESS.

Parliamentary Politics in the Socialist Movement.

By ERRICO MALATESTA.

The Why I Ams: (Third Series):

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

Socialism in Danger. Part II.

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

Common-Sense Country.

By L. S. BEVINGTON.

Socialism in Danger. Part I.

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

Jones' Boy:

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

Liberty Lyrics.

By L. S. BEVINGTON.

The Ideal and Youth.

By ELISÉE RECLUS.

An Anarchist on Anarchy.

By ELISÉE RECLUS.

**In Defence of Emma Goldmann and the Right
of Expropriation.**

By VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE.

The Why I Ams: FIRST SERIES.

Why I Am a Socialist and an Atheist, by Conrad
Naewiger; Why I Am a Social Democrat, by G. Bernard
Shaw; Why I Am an Individualist Anarchist, by J.
Armsden.

The Why I Ams: SECOND SERIES.

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

Liberty Bookshelf.

Any of the following Publications may be obtained by sending
the amount in stamps, or by postal order, to the Editor, Carmagnole
House, Beadon Road, 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 SOCIAL-
ISTIC EVOLUTION.** 1d.

REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT. 1d.

REVOLUTIONARY STUDIES. 2d.

By ERRICO MALATESTA.

**A TALK ABOUT ANARCHIST COM-
MUNISM BETWEEN TWO WORKERS.**

Price 1d.

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

ANARCHY. 1d.

By WILLIAM MORRIS.

USEFUL WORK V. USELESS TOIL. 1d.

**THE TABLES TURNED: or NUPKINS
AWAKENED.** 4d.

TRUE AND FALSE SOCIETY. 1d.

MONOPOLY: or, HOW LABOUR IS ROBBED

Price 1d.

By D. NICOLL.

ANARCHY AT THE BAR. 1d.

THE WALSALL ANARCHISTS. 1d.

**THE CHICAGO MARTYRS: Their Speeches
in Court.**

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

ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. 1d.