

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. XII.—No. 124.

MARCH, 1898.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

PETER KROPOTKINE

ON

"THE DEVELOPMENT OF TRADE-UNIONISM."

A lecture delivered in the Memorial Hall, on Jan. 24.

A few months ago I was delivering a number of lectures on Socialism and Anarchism in the cities of the Eastern States of America. These were attended to a great extent by American workers belonging to the Trade unions, especially when delivered in the big industrial centres. That gave the idea to our New York comrades of convening a big meeting in the Cooper Union Hall, and to invite representatives of Trade unions and as many of members of Trade unions as possible. It was done and we had a splendid meeting on the eve of my departure. At this meeting, comrade McCraith read a short message from the Trade unionists of America to be transmitted to their English comrades. It was accepted unanimously and I was requested to convey it.

I was much prouder of carrying it than I would have been of carrying any political message of any importance, which, in fact, I would not have accepted at all.

It would be presumptuous of me, having stayed so short a time in America, to come here to tell you of the movement there. It would have required wider knowledge and more serious study, and moreover a journey to the Western States where Trade-unionism takes quite a different character to the "nibbling" Unionism of the Eastern States. I can only say that it is full of youth and of force, and that happily the differences between "Americans" and the Bohemians, Poles, Hungarians and other "strangers" are gradually fast disappearing. When in the strike at Hazelton such "strangers" were massacred recently it produced such an indignation in New York that the "American" Trade-unionists called a great meeting and told the police who were there present such things as to what would happen if they, the "Americans," were attacked as the poor Bohemians had been, that not one single paper of the middle class cared to report it.

My intention is to speak from a more general standpoint. I have not much to say which you may not know already, but perhaps some general views may not be out of place.

Everyone feels in this country that some change in the present organisation, aims and methods of the Trade unions is absolutely imposed by the union of international capitalism.

For many years in the mediæval towns the workers of all nationalities were united in unions and very often it is said that the guilds of old have given origin to the Trade unions of to-day. Perhaps it is true, but the modern Trade unions are absolutely different from the old guilds; they cover but a very small part of the field covered by the Unions of old. The workers of the guild considered themselves as the masters of the industry—not as men who were being hired to do the work without any interest in the management of the concern. They did not consider themselves as outsiders to industry: they considered rather the *others*, the capitalists, as the outside and useless element.

They used to buy all raw material and to sell the produce. They managed the industry entirely; and the cities were nothing but the unions of these unions, the *amitas* between these unions. When they had to export something, they did not leave it to someone going to find new markets in Africa, nor in China. It was the city which carried on the export, it was the city which was considered the first, the great consumer.

Moreover, the guild was supreme in its own concerns; it was autonomous. If any dispute arose between two workers of the same guild, it was to the arbiters (or judges, if you like), nominated by the guild, it had to be referred; if any dispute arose between two workers of different unions, it was referred to the persons elected by these two unions, who if they disagreed could call in the nominee of a third to decide. It had its own militia; it would join with the others in war if it *liked*, and such wars were, of course, wars of defence, not of conquest. It was a brotherly organisation of production, of distribution, of mutual support, and of the defence of the citizen. What is the modern Trade union in comparison with this?

What was the result? That in these mediæval cities of the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, such extraordinary progress was made as has never since been equalled.

You know how all this disappeared, how States and kings took possession of the funds of these guilds, how the king conquered the cities and imposed his judges on them and his laws, how the cities were crushed, and how for two centuries, the seventeenth and the eighteenth,

all industries in Europe went *backwards*, were destroyed where they had flourished.

One union however was not crushed, that of the men engaged in the pursuit of knowledge, the men who continued to work in their silent studies; who were adding new discoveries to the old ones. In the mediæval universities men had made experiments which led ultimately to the steam engine; chemistry and other new sciences sprang into being; man's force in the long run was increased a hundredfold. If we were to take some books on modern industry, we should be told that the nineteenth century is a beautiful illustration of what can be achieved under capitalist organisation. "Look what industry was a hundred years ago, look what it is now! And who has made it? The capitalist." The reality is that it is *science* which has made it. It was under the influence of the ideas circulating at the end of the last century that man has accomplished the prodigies we see now. Capitalism has not helped, but hindered it. What the capitalists did to promote it we know—helped with a legislation which pauperised the population, which expelled the peasant from the land which he and his ancestors had cultivated; sent their agents travelling all over England stealing children for the factories of Lancashire and Yorkshire. That was what the capitalist invented for the organisation of the large industry.

What was the worker to do under such circumstances—a legislation in the hands of the monopolising classes and these workers driven to the factories to compete their with their children. In their small secret societies they fought this Moloch but they could only try to prevent capitalism from crushing them altogether. They were hanged for strikes, they were deported to Australia. All they could imagine at that horrid time was a *policy of resistance*. Not a constructive policy, not a destructive, simply a policy of conserving only the little they could maintain. This policy has been continued too long. To this policy the Trade unions continue to adhere although the conditions have changed and it is time to come forwards with new demands of a destructive and constructive order.

Already in the commencement there were men who undertook a greater task, who understood that that would not be enough, that it would be necessary to carry on a policy of active reconstruction. Already in the beginning, Robert Owen, the man to whom we Socialists owe infinitely more than most of us think—a man who really foresaw the future development of Socialism better than many of his successors—had started an international society for discussing these questions, and had constituted "The Great Trades' Union"—the Union of all trades.

You know what the attitude of the government was towards these unionists. They were met with deportation and hard labour, crushed down by prosecution after prosecution, and for a while again they had to return to their little committees, their little councils in secret, to carry on merely a passive resistance.

Then came the great movement on the continent of 1848. But again the workers were crushed down, and again all hope disappeared from the hearts of the workers. In the sixties began a new movement. The International Workingmen's Association. This has now been forgotten, yet it succeeded in bringing together several millions of workmen all over Europe. It put all the great problems into discussion, and gave some solution for each which was not inspired by books but by a knowledge of life and work. In a few years this association seemed to become a tremendous power. The journalists of the capitalist world attended its congresses and hastened to wire from them that things were still quiet, the dreaded revolution was not coming off this time. The International Workingmen's Association growing constantly in power finally led the French government to begin that struggle which resulted, alas, again in the crushing of the workers movement.

The Commune of Paris was an attempt of the working class to try something new, something *constructive* in Socialism and Communism. It was crushed out in the blood of the thirty thousand workers killed in the streets. One hundred thousand were deported. Driven back again, all the workers could do was to fight step by step for the rights of combination and of striking—a fight which has still to be kept up. Men are still condemned for picketing in this country. Look at the money still spent in defending this, the soul of a strike.

Yet gradually an immense work has been done. Progress has been made since these years when almost everything seemed crushed, when the only light we saw gleaming was maintained by the Trade-unionists of this country. At the time of the dockers' strike an attempt was made to create an international union. An Eight hours day movement was begun in Chicago, when the five Anarchists were hanged. The May Day movement was started. A great meeting was held in Hyde Park

in 1891, and great hopes were awakened all over the world in regard to its success, which could be carried by the workers themselves in their unions. Unhappily it drifted into parliamentary channels, so much was talked about an eighthours bill and gradually it has faded away. It was a fact of the greatest importance when the engineers again began this movement. We have had several months of resistance, and you know how it has ended. The capitalists have united all over the world; they went to Germany, France and Austria to get help in crushing the English engineers.

This defeat—for if it is not a victory it is a defeat—what does it show? That it is time to come out of those conditions of forty years ago when the Trade-unionists could do no more than timidly offer a passive resistance, and to enter a new period of constructive activity.

When anything is brought up just now, something to be done for the workers, our ruling classes have but one answer to it. The housing of the poor, for instance—tons of matter have been written about this. When anything is proposed what do they say? "Wait. Wait a little. Wait a bit. Wait." You have your children educated in the schools. This may be pretty good, but your children go hungry. You are told to wait, wait, wait. You would be pauperised, remember, if they were fed! The problem of the unemployed? The Land going out of cultivation? In every direction there is a problem standing and when you ask for a solution of it, they have no answer for us but "Wait. Wait a little. Wait a bit. Wait. Let us see what the political economists say. Wait."

No; we must not wait. Are the workers of England now less intelligent than in the time of the guilds, that they could not manage industries as their forefathers did? They tell us you could not manage, you could not organise them. I must be very much mistaken if you could not manage them as well as your masters. The capitalists are continually complaining that they cannot manage industries well enough to be productive; they are too poor to pay you a living wage. Well, if they cannot manage industry without exploiting us so, let them go. We don't want them; we can manage better than they have done yet.

I advise everybody to read in this connection the book of Bellamy's, *Equality*. Here you will find a brilliant proof of the uneconomical organisation of the present day. He does not criticise it from the standpoint of morality, of Christianity, he shows simply that it is the most uneconomical you could imagine, the most wasteful. The idea is growing amongst the workers that it is not for them to be considered outsiders in industry. You are told that you have nothing to say in the management of these things; the present is a good time to begin saying you have, that it is the capitalist who is the outsider and that the organisation of industry must be taken into the hands of the workers. This is one movement, in which you have only to be logical; to come to the necessary conclusion imposed upon you by the managers of industry themselves.

Then you see the co-operative movement, since it has organised a market, moving on now towards production; Socialist ideas are penetrating it; many of the people in it are returning to its old conception, that they should combine not for laying aside a few shillings by the end of the year, but for the taking over of all the industries which are now in the hands of the capitalist.

And we see a third movement growing more and more, in the attempt of the cities to organise such things as the tramways, gas, the water supply and so on. It is a childish movement yet, and will remain so as long as it continues in the hands of governing bodies. But bring it to its logical conclusion, let it take its full development, and it will be that the people themselves must take possession of the territory, of the city, of its houses, of all the city contains for the satisfaction of all needs of the population.

Take these three different movements, and let them take their logical development. Imagine a Trade Union movement not only for increasing wages and reducing hours, but inspired by the grander idea of getting rid of the drones and taking possession of the works; imagine the Co-operative movement, inspired too by a grander idea, aiming not only at a small benefit to the members of the society, but at organising the distribution and production of all the the country; imagine the third movement emerging from its present childish phasis, growing to become a man—the people—and this man asserting his rights on the territory, the houses, all the necessities for satisfying the needs of the whole population. Who has made all that is valuable in a city?—The inhabitants themselves! And if it be the presence and labour of the people round about it, why should it be the property of a private individual? Why should not the city take into its possession everything that stands upon the ground of the city and the city itself, those values created by its inhabitants, not to-day or yesterday but by many centuries of work?; imagine that these three movements, instead of always seeking a governor or even a dictator, instead of stopping half-way, take their entire development, combine amongst themselves, with freedom not for the whole city or union only but for every separate part of it; imagine these things and we have, not yet the Social Revolution, but the beginning of the Social Revolution.

I appeal to you members of the Trades Unions now. Hitherto you have admitted the right of the employer to consider the factory, the mine, as something which belonged to him alone. You have treated with him, but you have always recognised his right, the right of giving you such or such wages, of producing as he liked, of opening or closing it. The great change in ideas which must be produced is that Trades Unions should no longer recognise that right, that they should recognise that which results from the labour of all cannot belong to any separate individual. What we have all worked for and pro-

duced, what everyone has contributed to, no one has a right to take into his own hands. For you, the Trade-unionists of England, it is time to recognise that these changes are not for the twenty-first century but for the immediate future. It is time to combine your efforts in these three directions, and joining hands across frontiers and oceans, to proclaim that at last is arriving the emancipation of the workers.

PAGES OF SOCIALIST HISTORY.

IX.

MATERIALISM AND SLAVERY.

Engels and his very scientific disciples have denounced the materialism of naturalists as *vulgar*, that is to say all inductive science itself. Does there then exist another kind of materialism for the use of the elect and privileged?—It seems there exists a dialectic materialism invented by them, and this materialism has nothing in common with that of naturalists.

Dialectic materialism! What a monstrosity, and what may we not expect from such a mixture? Dialectic is proper to metaphysics and has no connection with science; whereas materialism, in our times, is inductive science itself. It is the general basis of all *positive* knowledge, of all present evolutionist philosophy, and there exists no *science*, save the sophistic medley known by the name of Social-Democracy, that is not based on the *vulgar* materialism of naturalists. I shall remind the sophists of Engel's school what Marx said on this subject in 1845:

"Materialism is the child of England...¹ The true founder of the materialism and inductive science of modern times is Bacon. For him science consists solely of the natural sciences... science is experience... Induction, analysis, observation are the principal elements of the rational method. Movement is the inseparable property of matter... and the force that creates even animated beings... You cannot separate the idea of movement from matter which engenders it... Man is subject to the same laws as nature."

Speaking of the influence of materialist and sensationalist English philosophy in France, Marx says: "The need of a positive and anti-metaphysical system was felt in that country... Locke's work appeared at the right time."

How is it, I ask Engels's disciples again, that Bacon and Locke, the "founders of materialism, of inductive science and the antimetaphysical system," are called by Engels founders of metaphysics? And how do they dare to tell workers that they "created narrowness in the ideas of the last two centuries... metaphysical reasoning"? that there exists a materialism other than that of the natural sciences? And by what right do these pupils of Hegel's metaphysical and reactionary school attribute to themselves the invention of materialism, while combating the true materialism of naturalists? How can they tell workers that the economic explanation of history (see chap. VIII), elaborated by all science, was discovered by them and that just this discovery is true materialism?

In spite of their scientific pretensions, I believe that Engels and his disciples have chiefly acted out of ignorance. Let them therefore listen to what a great German naturalist says on the materialism of "vulgar" inductive sciences. Perhaps they will learn that Bacon's and Locke's ideas, adopted by Marx when neither he nor Engels aspired to an international dictatorship, that these ideas enriched and developed, constitute the basis of all contemporary science and philosophy.

"Our conception of Monism, or the unity-philosophy," says Haeckel², "on the contrary, is clear and unambiguous; for it an immaterial living spirit is just as unthinkable as a dead, spiritless material; the two are inseparably combined in every atom... for according to our monistic conception, energy and matter are inseparable, being only different inalienable manifestations of one single universal being—substance... These fixed groups of primitive atoms are the atoms of the elements—the well-known 'indivisible' atoms of chemistry... Thus, for example, the atom of carbon (the real 'maker' of the organic world) is in all probability a tetrahedron made up of four primitive atoms... After the glowing sphere of the earth had cooled down to a certain degree (according to Laplace's hypothesis), drops of fluid water precipitate themselves on the hardened crust of its surface—the first preliminary condition of organic life. Carbon atoms begin their organism-engendering activity, and unite with the other elements into plasma-combinations capable of growing... the history of descent now leads us on step by step from the oldest Metazoa, the simplest pluricellular animals, up to man... Our human body has been built up slowly and by degrees from a long series of vertebrate ancestors, and this is also true of our soul; as a function of our brain it has gradually been developed in reciprocal action and re-action with this its bodily organ. What we briefly designate as the "human soul," is only the sum of our feeling, willing, and thinking—the sum of those physiological functions whose elementary organs are constituted by the microscopic ganglion-cells of our brain... Comparative psychology teaches us how, hand in hand therewith, the soul itself, as function of the brain, has been developed. The last-named science teaches us also that a primitive form of soul-activity is already present even in the lowest animals, the single-celled primitive animals, Infusoria and Rhizopoda. Every scientific man who has long observed the life-activity of these single-celled Protista, is

(1) See his article on French materialism (1845) reproduced by *Die Neue Zeit*.

(2) *Monism*, an address delivered on Oct. 9th, 1892, at Altenburg. London, 1895, Black.

positively convinced that they also possess a soul; that this 'cell-soul' also consists of a sum of sensations, perceptions, and volitions; the feeling, thinking, and willing of our human soul differ from these only in degree... We now definitely know that the organic world on our earth has been as continuously developed, 'in accordance with eternal iron laws,' as Lyell had in 1830 shown to be the case for the inorganic frame of the earth itself; we know that the innumerable varieties of animals and plants which during the course of millions of years have peopled our planet are all simply branches of one single genealogical tree; we know that the human race itself forms only one of the newest, highest, and most perfect offshoots from the race of the Vertebrates."

Speaking of human morality, Haeckel says: "Do to others as you would they should do to you." This natural and highest command had been taught and followed thousands of years before Christ said: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' In the human family this maxim has always been accepted as self-evident; as ethical instinct it was an inheritance derived from our animal ancestors. It had already found a place among the herds of Apes and other social Mammals."

Animal-man, man produced by organic evolution from the moral and physiological point of view, is the basis of science nowadays. All men of science, even fervent Catholics, like Secchi and Moigno, have adopted the doctrine in about the same terms as Haeckel... In fact, nowadays, nobody talks of materialism as of a doctrine apart. I repeat, materialism has become synonymous with science. At the time of the Encyclopedists, when science was invaded by theology and metaphysics, or at the beginning of the century, when the doctrine of cataclysms dominated in Geology and Cuvier disowned the doctrine of Lamarck and Geoffroy-Saint-Hilaire, at that time the controversy about materialism was of great importance. But for fifty years, to call yourself materialist signifies simply not to be an ignoramus that denies science, not to be a theologian, a talmudist, a metaphysician, or a Social-Democrat. As for Engels, who was beginning to emancipate himself from the absurdity of metaphysics under the influence of Feuerbach, scientific doctrines must have appeared a kind of revelation to him. But he had no grounds for attributing to Marx and to himself the invention of these elementary truths of modern science.

And I have my doubts that Engels ever completely emancipated himself from metaphysics. He shows himself neither materialistic nor scientific in his polemics with Dühring, when he entirely denies the influence of force in history, or when he glorifies slavery as a boon to mankind.

"In general," we read in Engels, "private property was not the result of pillage or violence... it was brought about by economic causes. Violence plays no part in its creation... The whole history of the origin of private property is based exclusively on economic causes, and to explain it, it is not necessary to refer to violence, to pillage, to the State¹ or to any other political intervention... Property must be created by work before it can be appropriated by force... Before slavery became possible, production and inequality of distribution must have already existed."

No violence, no State or forcible intervention... It is production itself that engenders inequality, oppression, slavery... If it is so, what an abomination, a curse to humanity must be production and work, that are only sources of social iniquities!

But what may I ask was the theory primitive men depended on? What capital did they need when killing one another to regale themselves on human flesh?

Engels as a true Sophist, triumphantly teaches Dühring that Robinson Crusoe captured Friday because Robinson was a representative of high culture and was the better armed. "Producers supplied with the better weapons always triumphed over inferior producers," he adds. But Robinson saved Friday from the not very pleasant prospect of being eaten by his noble fellow-citizens. These latter had triumphed over Friday before Robinson. Had they triumphed by their superior education or by force? Did Menelik and the Abyssinians beat the Italians because they are more advanced in civilization and in methods of production, or because they were stronger? And did Barbarians destroy Greco-Roman civilization because they were more developed, more industrious and more civilized? No it was force, brutality, violence that triumphed.

Where did Engels find his pernicious doctrine that legalises oppression and slavery? He has many times said that he expressed Marx' ideas. But the latter never denied the part played by force and violence, neither in economical nor in political life. "...The unity of great nations has been created by violence, and in our times it has become a powerful factor of social production." (Marx, Civil war in France in 1870-71.)

Who is right, Marx admitting, according to history, the part played by violence, or Engels preaching to workers that they are exploited and oppressed according to their own slavish good will?

And on what does he base himself when he teaches that without slavery, ancient Greece and its arts and sciences could not have been developed: or that slavery at that time was a great step towards progress? If slavery was a progressive factor in history, why did the same Greece fall into a barbarous state under Turkish rule? Slavery flourished in those parts till the beginning of our century. How did it happen that during twenty centuries, the same nation with the same slavery, instead of continuing its incomparable civilisation, fell more and more into a savage state?

I know of no such example given in any literature except among the upholders of slavery. The apologists of despotism and slavery say, at

least, that they are the representatives of armed power and that the people, the rabble, must obey them. But here is the leader of scientific Socialism who tells workers that their fathers submitted voluntarily to the rich, that force was not necessary to bring them to sell themselves and their children, and that they pushed cowardice so far as to voluntarily cede to the rich the right of the first wedding night!

Nobody had ever outraged the proletariat in such a way. To put forward such an assertion, a man must be a confirmed sophist, but no scientist. Poor science, what stupidities and monstrosities Engels preached in your name!

And they try to impose all this mass of obscurities and brutishness as scientific Socialism on German workers. But the German workmen are too intelligent, too kind, too frank-hearted, to remain under the influence of such a doctrine for long. And we already feel the signs of approaching revolt.

AMERICAN NOTES.

There is little to report this month; the movement seems frozen along with the frost on the poor man's windows. Only, a frozen movement is not half so pretty to contemplate. The government steadily pursues its policy of restriction, conformably, it must be admitted, to the demands of the labour movement, though if the bourgeoisie were demanding something else the labor managers would soon see how little their clamours had to do with it. However it is policy to allow the latter to believe themselves heeded, so long as they are foolish enough to look to the same methods as have proved profitable to the masters. It makes them think they have a docile government, a government which does their sovereign will. It vindicates the great American superstition, the belief in the power of our political institutions to right all wrongs, and obey all voters. Well, if they continue there will be nobody left to shoot but Americans. Then we shall see how the labor leaders will like it.

The corporation of Philadelphia has forbidden the employment of aliens on her public works. A European might consider this from a moral standpoint; we do not; we consider that this will force foreigners to naturalize and the several dollars which the naturalization papers will cost will bring an income to the office. We are a practical people; our professions of equal liberty are maintained quite as the Church maintains its Christianity—that is to say we trade in them, they are a good label, they help us to sell our wares. The city of Toronto has responded to Philadelphia by enacting an exclusion clause forbidding employment of all aliens, "particularly subjects of the United States" on her public works. Fences, fences! More fences! Meanwhile the wise old mother country smiles and continues her time-proven policy of saving up restrictions for peoples too helpless to resist them. She has learned her lesson. If George the III could get up he might wonder what the mischief the Americans kicked about. But he might retire again with the comforting reflection that somebody else would have to "get it in the neck" the next time.

The *Firebrand* case drags, as everything which begins to go round the circles of the courts. The first court has convicted, and according to reports sentence would have been passed immediately had it not been for the fairness of judge Bellinger, who gave time for an appeal. The whole affair at this distance appears rather mixed. The issue of *Free Society* of January 23, contains an article which makes two counts in the indictment, one for "The Woman who waits for me," and a letter entitled: "It depends on a Woman"; the other for "Marriage v. Liberty," a contribution. We are not told upon which count the conviction was secured, but in the issue of January 16, it is stated by F. A. C. that "it appears to have been Whitman's 'Woman who waits for me.'"

It requires considerable credulity to believe this. The poem (?) has gone through the mails for years, and it would appear that the barest statement of that fact to a jury should have been sufficient. The letter is a much more likely subject for conviction. Yet to Government all things are possible.

The most tragic event is the approaching murder of Worden by the State of California. This man whom, we are told by every one concerned in the strike of the Railway men of 1894, that is in a position to know, is the victim of the great R. R. corporations. He is accused of complicity in the train wrecking which caused the death of several U. S. soldiers, and according to the evidence is as wrongfully charged as were our men in '86. Eugene V. Debs makes a stirring appeal in his behalf in the *Social-Democrat*, but there is no likelihood that it will be heeded. Ex-president Cleveland himself, the very man who ordered out the Federal Troops, declares his belief in Worden's innocence. But a re-election, though out of the question to Cleveland, is not so to the Governor of California. He will want the support of the great corporations at the next election; he will hang Worden to get it. Such are "republican politics."

VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE.

A CONCERT AND DANCE

will be held at Christ Church Hall, Hansbury Street, Spitalfield, E., on Saturday, March 26th, 1898, in aid of the funds for the publication of a weekly Anarchist paper. Commence at 8 p. m. Admission by ticket 6d.

(1) Why then wish to conquer the State?

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

Monthly, One Penny; post free, 1½d.; U.S.A., 3 Cents; France, 15 Centimes.

Annual Subscription, post free, 1s. 6d.; U.S.A., 36 Cents; France, 1fr. 80c.
Foreign subscriptions should be sent by International Money Order,
payable to C. M. Wilson.

Wholesale Price, 1s. 4d. per quire of 27, carriage free to all parts.

All communications, exchanges, &c., for "FREEDOM" to be addressed to

THE EDITOR, 7, LAMBS CONDUIT STREET, LONDON, W. C.

Business communications to THE MANAGER, 127 Ossulston Street, Euston Rd.

The Editors are not necessarily in agreement with signed articles.

NOTES.

"THE BALLAD OF READING GAOL."

One of the heaviest blows ever struck against our prison system is the publication of this "Ballad." C. 3. 3., the author, is an unhappy offender against and victim of the law, whose identity will be obvious to most readers.

Never before can we remember to have read of the effect in the prison itself of an execution. Terrible beyond description must be the tension of the nerves of the wretched inmates; but C. 3. 3. gives us a picture that weighs like a nightmare on the mind. And the irony of it all is that the *only one who slept was the condemned man*. Such is the moral of capital punishment.

In two verses which we will quote we are told in words which burn into our hearts, how this boastful century with its progress and refinement treats its "criminals."

The vilest deeds like poison weeds
Bloom well in prison air;
It is only what is good in Man
That wastes and withers there;
Pale Anguish keeps the heavy gate,
And the Warder is Despair.

For they starve the little frightened child
Till it weeps both night and day;
And they scourge the weak and flog the fool,
And gibe the old and gray,
And some grow mad, and all grow bad,
And none a word may say.

It would be well if those in high places who "dispense justice" could learn and repeat these two verses as a grace before meat.

THE BOURTSEV CASE.

In another column we put the facts of the Bourtsev case before our readers. The trial and sentence is to our mind one of the worst judicial scandals that has happened in England for many a year. We begin to wonder if England has any of her sturdy manhood left that such things can happen with scarcely a protest. Even the "great radical organ," the *Daily Chronicle*, tried to make it smooth for the law. Yet almost the next day it writes of the Revolution of '48: "Rarely was any great movement marked by higher qualities, rarely has any movement awakened more ardent hopes," knowing full well that the heroes of '48 were even more revolutionary than Bourtsev. If he had been here in '48 he would have found a home: to-day he finds a prison.

What Tennyson said of the partition of Poland is worth quoting against us now:

... "Lord how long shall these things be?
How long this icy-hearted Muscovite
Oppress the region? Us O Just and Good,
Forgive who smiled when she was torn in three;
Us who stand now when we should aid the right—
A matter to be wept with tears of blood!"

ANOTHER CASE.

Weak minded people imagine Lord William Neville's sentence vindicates the justness of the law. Cannot these people see that the sentence—which we protest against, as we do all sentences—is a mockery of justice. The law has caught a vulgar liar and a cheat, a disgusting specimen of his class—that is all. But what of those whom the law leaves untouched, what of Earl Dudley at Quarry Bank, of Lord Pearhlyn in Wales; the brutal mine owners; those employers who poison young girls with white lead; the Colonel Dyer gang and a host of others? All these people have caused untold misery and suffering for the basest of motives—the love of wealth and power. And the law supports them in crimes, in comparison with which Lord Neville's was a drop in the ocean.

Why did he not take to company promoting? He might then have kept within the law, and swindled with an easy conscience.

A CONDEMNATION FOR OPINION.

THE CASE OF VLADIMIR BOURTSEV.

Bourtsev, a political refugee, escaped from Siberia, since the age of seventeen a victim of atrocious persecutions by the police of the tsar, has just been sentenced to eighteen months hard labour... To no purpose he had broken out of the enormous gaol known as the Empire of the tsar: the agents of the latter had him arrested and sentenced here in London, in a so-called free country.

What was his crime? He published a Russian paper *Narodovolets* in which he exposed that his unfortunate country is oppressed and disgraced by the tsar and his government of gendarmes and police, that every honest Russian must fight against oppression and despotism, to introduce a constitution like that in force even in Bulgaria, Servia and other countries. He called upon his countrymen to revolt—and Englishmen of to-day, forgetting that they obtained their constitution by a series of revolts and one great revolution which decapitated a king,—sentenced him to eighteen months hard labour! To keep up appearances, the accusation said, with national hypocrisy: "he excited to homicide and conspired against the life of the tsar."

This is not true!

Before all, Bourtsev did not conspire because he published his ideas in a paper. Crowned heads, their ministers, their police conspire against humanity, but newspaper articles were never held to be conspiracies. Publicity excludes all idea of conspiracy. It is futile when the accusation tries to make us believe that his paper was a secret publication. Every number bore his address (Westcroft Square, Hammer-smith, W.) and the name of the editor. It were as well to call the *Times* a secret paper, a monstrous absurdity.

Furthermore, where did the prosecution find a direct incitement to murder Nicolas II, the present tsar? We defy anyone to indicate such a passage from Bourtsev's paper. It is neither given in the reports before us published in the *P. M. G.*, *W. G.*, *D. N.*, *D. Chr.*, *Standard* and other papers, nor in the quotations given in the accusation, for it does not exist. All which the accusation could quote for its support are the following remarks:

1. "We are revolutionists, not only to the extent of a direct rising of the people, but to the extent of military conspiracies, to the extent of nocturnal invasions of the palace, to the extent of bombs and dynamite."

But where is the name of the tsar? This is a definition of revolutionary action, but by no means an appeal to assassination, and Bourtsev is simply prosecuted as a revolutionist. Did Cromwell, Milton and others act otherwise? So they were assassins? Yes, in the eyes of the spies and the secret police who rule this country at the present time. But for history, for the nation, they are its greatest glories. To reactionists whom the police ever and always protect, every revolutionist is an assassin. Did not Disraeli cry that Mazzini conspired "with the assassins of Europe the men who point their daggers at the breasts of our allies"?

But what government dared to prosecute Mazzini? At that time England was not ruled by Scotland Yard.

The most revolting fact is that this quotation is taken from Stepniak's book *Nihilism as it is*, published in England for years. Was the author ever prosecuted? Never. But Bourtsev who quoted him, is sentenced to eighteen months hard labour...

2. The accusation affirmed that Bourtsev glorified the attempts made against the life of the tsars, that he glorified Sophia Perovskaia and other Russian revolutionists.

If one praises Cromwell or the Convention of the Great French Revolution—will that also bring on a sentence of eighteen months hard labour? Perhaps it may in our period of secret international police rule... But twelve or fifteen years ago, an author, praising Sophia Perovskaia, became famous. *Underground Russia*, by the same Stepniak (a book translated into most European languages), is an eloquent praise of Russian revolutionists and before all of this sublime woman admired by the whole world, of Sophia Perovskaia. Stepniak, for his admiration, became a world-known author, and English advanced societies received him with open arms—whilst Bourtsev is sent to hard labour in an English prison.

The prosecution and condemnation of a Russian sympathising with his revolutionary countrymen who organised attempts against tsars is the height of monstrosity. Did not one of these revolutionists, L. Hartman, who had blown up the imperial train at Moscow in 1879, live for years openly in London, received in society, and who is living now without hiding himself in full liberty in America? And Bourtsev who approves of him, is condemned to eighteen months hard labour!

Let honest people decide. Is this a crime or is it justice?

Celebration of the Commune.

A public meeting to celebrate the proclamation of the Commune of Paris 1871, will be held at the

HALL of the WORKINGMEN'S CLUB & INSTITUTE,

next to Holborn Town Hall, Clerkenwell Road, E. C., on FRIDAY, MARCH 18th.

Speakers: H. KELLY (of New York), J. C. KENWORTHY,

H. STOCKTON, P. CAMPBELL, P. CURRAN,

P. KROPOTKINE, LOUISE MICHEL, J. TURNER, F. KITZ and others.

Doors open at 7.30.

Commence at 8.

Extra Supplement to "Freedom."

VOL. XII.

MARCH, 1893.

No. 124

MONTJUICH, AND AFTER.

In the November supplement full details were given of the conditional liberty granted to the 113 men who were released in October last from Montjuich. This release following upon a visit made by some Spanish officials to Francisco Callis while at Penon de la Gomera, was not without its suspicions. We were even unwise enough to suspect it for the better, but, alas, our anticipations were too optimistic. When the news flashed throughout Europe that their release had taken place, nothing was said of the conditions, and generosity was attributed as the motive for such an act.

It is an ingenious mind that could so definitely unravel such a mystery and thus conclude. To assume generosity is to assume something above the law, but Senor Larroca's conduct was even a violation of the law!

The four days interrogation by him was nothing short of an insult to the two Courts Martial that acquitted these men and to the men themselves as innocent beings. What did Larroca do? He put them through a process that is only meted out to confirmed criminals and the vilest suspects. He treated them as if they had just been placed under arrest on suspicion of the very crime for which they were acquitted on two occasions, and as if their discharge counted for nothing, though delayed 17 months.

New governments like most new things are always generous, for we know them not.

Fools believed it of Sagasta's government and diplomacy prevailed. Senor Larroca knew of Callis's confession and the intended trial and so hoped by the one "generous" act to pave the way for the less "generous" one to follow.

The first row made the second easier. He is cruel enough to know that to try Callis while Montjuich still reeked of the blood shed by his predecessors, and its dungeons and torture chambers filled with men who were kept locked in by the keys of power hanging at his side, would but intensify the bitterness prevailing against Spain. Thus counselling to himself, these men were released rather than to openly expose the worn out broom with which they are to sweep the accumulated refuse. An exposure that would have courted the same fate that befel General Agzarraga.

There can surely be no other motive attributable to his "generosity."

For purposes of keeping the record of Spanish affairs in order we now produce below extracts from the letter addressed by Emanuel Enrique—Callis's accomplice—to the *Revue Blanche*, in which he gave an outline of the origin of the Fomento¹ explosion and their connection with same.

It was addressed from "The prison of Barcelona, Oct. 31st, 1897."

In the summer of 1885 there was a strike of masons in the town, and among their demands was the reduction of the working day to 8 hours. On Sept. 1st, the masters met, and after lengthy discussion refused to concede this demand. Immediately after a bomb was hurled in their midst, wounding some 5 in number.² Emanuel Enrique then proceeds: "I was arrested for the first time on June 11th 1896, released, then re-arrested on August 6th, same year." These arrests, it must be mentioned, were in connection with the Cambios Nuevos affair, and finally acquitted by both Court Martials. Continuing: "Thomas Ascheri having been put to the torture became the accuser of all those who were implicated in the affair of Cambios Nuevos; it is not to be wondered at, that, when they had made him say everything they wished him to say concerning the said trial, he answered by a shrug of the shoulders when they asked him what he knew about me. Seeing this, the military judge asked him: 'Do you remember that he is one of the accomplices of the author of the Fomento attempt in 1885?' To which he answered without looking at me: 'Yes'; and questioned again: 'Do not you know this through Callis?' he again said: 'Yes'; so that in drawing up the act of confrontation there appeared as author and informer Francisco Callis, who, terrorized by the tortures inflicted on him, signed everything he was told to sign—and it was on account of these declarations I was implicated in the new trial, without knowing it."³

"Now this is sufficient to fill with fear the most serene of souls. Ascheri pretended that the accusation against me was communicated to him by Callis, and Callis in his statements (folio 1234 of the Cambios examinations) denies having spoken to anyone about it—this is the first contradiction.

¹ In the November supplement the *Athenæum* was the place mentioned; the error was corrected but neglected by the compositor. The Fomento is a large hall where public, companies and employers in various industries assemble to discuss their affairs.

² There were none killed as previously reported; 5 injured was the actual result.

³ In our November issue there was reference to this trial in the letter of Callis originally published in *Revue Blanche*, Sept. 15th, 1897.

"I must remark that I was confronted with Ascheri, my accuser, but that they took care not to confront me with Callis, the involuntary author of the proceedings taken against me—and it is easily understood, for, had I been confronted with him, I could not have failed to see on the face of Callis the marks of the martyrdom he had been subjected to and of which the traces are still very visible.

According to Callis's second interrogation, without us ever having seen or known each other, I 'met him in a tavern where I proposed to him to commit the outrage; this he accepted and then we parted.' If this were true, in presenting myself at the Fomento I should have been bound to be recognised by one of the master builders who constituted the meeting and who knew me full well, the marble workers' and masons' trades being closely allied."

He then explains that when Francisco Callis was confronted by the judge of the district of Parc, he admitted the confession but explained it was made involuntarily, while under torture. When Ascheri was confronted by the same judge he made a similar declaration; on being asked the manner in which Callis confided to him, he failed to give any explanation.

In defence of himself (Eurique), he proceeds: "I must mention a fact of the greatest importance: President Senor Miro of the meeting which was held in the Fomento on the day of the explosion, was precisely the master builder of the construction of an edifice which was then being built in Gerone or del Bruch Street, and if Senor Miro had seen strangers in the hall, and seeing me among them he must have recognised me." Then in defence of the theory that the charge was fabricated, he declares that "in the official document, the commander of the Municipal Guard of Gracia, Don Antonio Fernandez, mentions a clue to the supposed author of the crime and yet nothing is done to follow up the scent.

One of the victims of the explosion who was maimed, Don Juan y Rovira, is reported to have given the names of strangers present at the Fomento, among whom Callis and Eurique are not mentioned, while the prosecution did not bother about those present.

The counsel for their defence was Puig de Asprer, a celebrated lawyer, who laid before the Court Martial an affidavit emanating from the civil government of Barcelona declaring that on August 18th, 1885, he embarked from Barcelona for Marseilles, and was not in Barcelona on Sept. 1st, date of the explosion. The tribunal, however, refused to add this affidavit to the evidence by arguing, "that the proofs placed before us, having no connection with the incriminating facts, are not admissible."

Continuing:

"My counsel also proposed to add to the evidence a demand addressed to his Excellency the Minister of War by Epifanio Caus and others, in order to prove that tortures had been inflicted at Montjuich. The demand was not admitted; neither were other proofs and documents asked of the Minister of War, such as the certificate of the sentence pronounced on April 28th last on Ascheri and others, the copies of statements made by Ascheri demanded of the Captain General of Catalonia, the confrontations to which Ascheri was subjected; the official report of the Court Martial's sittings, the sentence passed on Ascheri and the certificate proving that in all the said documents there is no mention of a confrontation of Ascheri and Callis.

"It is enough for me to say that my worthy counsel, who is also defending Callis, concludes by denying altogether and without comment the participation of the latter in the perpetration of the crime and asks for an acquittal. It must be made known that Senor Puig de Asprer has up till now not been able to obtain an interview with Callis, and consequently has not been able to present any proof in the name of his client, not knowing which proofs Callis would have given preference to. And although he has not been able to speak to Callis—who is in the Penon de la Gomera penitentiary, being sentenced to twenty years for the outrage of los Cambios Nuevos—always owing to Ascheri's accusations—and although he asked, without permission being granted, that his client should be transferred to Barcelona, the tribunal exacted of our counsel that he should give his evidence in two days; and as this order makes Callis defence impossible, our counsel has formally protested with the object of being able to appeal for non observance of established rules—the procedure during the trial having already been recognised as illegal.—The court received this protest and accepted it. All these proceedings took place in the month of July last under Canovas' government, which renders comment unnecessary."

This practically is the main of the communication. It must be observed that the whole evidence rested on Ascheri, who was shot.

The *Daily Chronicle* of Nov. 25th, 1897, in a long leader on this communications, concludes: "We do say that the long silence of the government" (and still continued) "under the accusation is in itself a strong presumption of guilt, that if the fact of the tortures is established it is an outrage against law and human conscience, even to consider evidence obtained by such means, and that the tortures themselves are an abomination amongst mankind, no matter of what character the tortured men may be."

Surely the *Daily Chronicle* have had sufficient evidence before them, both personal and documental, that should have put to rest the "conscience" of any human person as to the guilt or innocence of the Spanish government, instead of the indefiniteness that has marked its attitude practically all along the time.

November 1897.

THE TRIAL.

Great criminal or political trials seldom pass without a tinge of romance, a dark page of tragedy, and oft unlooked-for sensations.

The Spanish Anarchist trial was ever regarded with such interest by the revolutionaries of Europe as well as of Barcelona—and Spain itself. An incident—in one of the fiendish judicial crimes of the century, the Cambios Nuevos affair and the legal iniquities that accompanied it—were the proceedings against Francisco Callis. Enriques letter as summarised above explicitly sketches the facts, now I propose to record, as briefly as possible, the proceedings, which began on Nov. 25th. The court is crowded with journalists, lawyers and the public. The gallery is packed with policemen and civil guards. Callis and Enrique are defended by Jose Puig de Asprer. There were 98 witnesses in all, 89 for the defence and 9 for the prosecution. *El Diluvio* of Nov. 26th, gives a complete report of the trial and describes Callis as follows:

"His countenance is very energetic and expressive of great intelligence, he was clean shaved and bore cicatrices that were visible on the mouth where the iron casque had been applied, also under the right eye and on the forehead."

The interrogation of Callis immediately began on his arrival.

Attorney General.—You knew of the Fomento meeting? *Callis*.—No.

Q.—What were you doing that day?

A.—I was delegate of the Working Men's Federation to a strike meeting in Camda Street, where the men were assembled.

Q.—Do you know Emanuel Enrique?

A.—I met him yesterday for the first time at the national prison.

Q.—Do you admit having made a declaration of guilt?

A.—Yes; but everything I said was wrung from me by torture that continued 8 days and nights.

Q.—What interest had people to torture you for such a declaration?

A.—I don't know. What I do know is that they tortured me in a barbarous fashion.¹

Q.—You were sentenced as an accomplice in the Cambios Nuevos affair?

A.—I admit the sentence but declare it unjust. (The presiding judge here called upon Callis to avoid comments and to answer questions only.)

Q.—Did you make a voluntary declaration to anyone?

A.—No. Judge Marzo drew a paper from his pocket and quietly requested my signature, which I gave, being unaware of its contents.

Q.—But you made a different declaration to your advocate?

A.—Yes, I know; I was threatened with further torture if I did not sign the first declaration, therefore I said nothing then.

Q.—Did you know Tomas Ascheri?

A.—No, not until the Court Martial trial in Montjuich.

Counsel for the defence now questions Callis:

Q.—Why did Ascheri accuse you?

A.—I think it was due to the tortures he underwent. When he accused me he spoke very slow and inaudibly.

Q.—Did he accuse you face to face? *A*.—No.

Q.—This document containing your declaration, is it the same as previously produced?

A.—I cannot say whether it is the same. (Judge restless.)

Q.—After the first declaration did you see anybody?

A.—Yes, Sir; I saw Narcisso Portas and he told me that when I was asked about something, I must answer in the same fashion, and if not he menaced me with Zero.

Q.—What is Zero?

A.—It is a cell in the Castle of Montjuich, without ventilation and light, deathlike in appearance, in which tortures were applied, but I was not tortured there, I was tortured in the cell next to it. They flogged me 8 days; I was freed of the tortures when I spewed blood.

(After this question, counsel asked the presiding judge to examine the cicatrices on the prisoner's body. This he blankly refused to do.)

Evidence was then given in confirmation of Enrique's absence from Barcelona on the day of the explosion.

Thus ended the first day's sitting.

SECOND SITTING.—NOVEMBER 26th, 1897.

(From *El Diluvio*, Nov. 26th, 1896.)

It begins with witnesses for the prosecution. Though the greater number of them were victims to the explosion, many being maimed, with the exception of one each spoke favourably of the prisoners.

The exceptional one was José Deu, who, looking at Callis, said: "I think he was the man, but he had a beard then."

Next witness was Sebastian Sune, who was sentenced to 20 years penal servitude.

Counsel for the defence interrogates:

Q.—You know Callis?

A.—I met him first in Montjuich during our solitary confinement.

Q.—Did you know whether he was tortured for the purpose of eliciting declarations?

He replied by referring to the tortures that followed the Cambios Nuevos affair, when the presiding judge interrupted and demanded a specific answer to question put. He then replies: "I was taken to Zero and Callis was in the next compartment, and I heard his lamentable screams, through the torments inflicted on him. When he was taken out he was smothered in blood about the forehead. Callis then explained to me what was done to him."

Sune, then, in reply to further questions, could not say "for certainty" the number of days Callis was tortured, but describes the kind of tortures, so often made plain in these columns. Starving him, refusing drink, preventing sleep and beating him with sticks, also compressing his head in an iron casque.

Attorney General.—Do you know why Callis declared himself author of the Fomento explosion?

Sebastian Sune.—Callis told me he was ordered to declare himself accomplice to the act, just as I declared myself an accomplice in the Calle Cambios—(here the presidential bell was rung).

Next witness Juan Torrent Ros, also under sentence.

Counsel for defence examined him and he verified Sune's story, with the additional evidence of the mutilation of testicles and the application of hot irons to the body.

Then came Juan Bantista Oller whose evidence was similar, but added: "I heard so many screams that I could not distinguish one from another." The presiding judge then asked him to stand down. He declared he wished to explain something. The judge replied he could only speak to the case on trial. Having answered he would do so, he proceeded: "I have this to say: *For the self same reason that Callis was threatened, Ascheri was tortured, that is for refusing to confirm his first confession.*"

Next came a host of witnesses the whole of whose evidences we cannot give, involving too much space.

Lorenzo Sena Baines first met Callis in Montjuich and then learnt of the tortures.

Jaime Vilella Caristofel verified Baines' evidence, adding the names of the torturers.

Francisco Lis gave Callis as his informer of the tortures.

Juan Casanoxas Viladeprat endorses Sune's evidence and is heard while a deep silence reigns.

Jacinto Melich Alemany gave a verification of Sune's evidence. He knew Callis, and spoke with a resolute air. He declared the confessions were wrought by torture in the celebra Castille of Montjuich. "I know it because of the letters received from Ascheri, Nogues, Molas and others, in which they ask our pardon for denouncing us; the letters were written in pencil, and I saw their wounds when they were raw and sore."

His evidence creates a profound sensation.

A flash of humour was hereafter introduced by Antonio Ceperuelo Fernandez. He is under sentence of 20 years and was asked by the judge why he received such a term; he replied: "I don't know and don't remember."

Each of the above named witnesses are under various sentences owing to the statements made by Ascheri while under torture.

Then came the sensation of sensations, Don Enrique Marzo, Don Narcisso Portas, Don Antonio Tresols, doctor to Alfonso XII life-corps, (who was in garrison at Montjuich during last December) and the rest of the 8 torturers were called, in defence of Callis and Enrique.

Enrique Marzo was first called and cross-examined by Asprer.

He admits having been chief judge at the Calle de Cambios Court Martial, and that Callis declared his guilt of the Fomento outrage.

Counsel.—How many times?

Marzo.—Two, if I remember rightly; made in the presence of my secretary and myself.

Counsel.—Was not Lieutenant Portas present too?

Marzo.—No, Sir. I wish to add that Ascheri and Callis were not confronted because each replied in the affirmative.

Counsel.—Have you observed that Callis was subjected to tortures and bears cicatrices?

Marzo.—No, Sir.

Counsel.—When Callis confessed, was not the declaration written in advance?

Marzo.—Never!

Judge.—This interrogation is impertinent!

Counsel.—Was Portas instructed to take charge of the prisoners?

Marzo.—Yes, Sir.

Counsel.—Then it was he who interrogated Callis?

Marzo.—I do not know.

Counsel.—Has he not given you notes of the prisoners' declaration?

Marzo.—I don't remember.

Salvador Mas, secretary to Marzo, says he knew nothing of any declaration previous to the one made before himself and judge Marzo.

Narcisso Portas was next called. The audience here showed signs of curiosity and murmuring continued for some minutes.

Counsel.—You were ordered to take charge of Callis?

Portas.—My soldiers were so ordered.

Counsel.—What were the conditions imposed on Callis?

Portas.—He was never to be communicated with.

¹ *L'Publicidad* reports his reply as follow: "I don't know, but the tortures are a fact."

Counsel.—Have you interrogated him? *Portas.*—Never.

Counsel.—To what treatment was Callis submitted?

Judge.—That is an impertinent question. This trial is for the Fomento attempt, and questions must relate to that only. I ask you, Lieutenant Portas, in relation to the Fomento bomb affair, was Callis an object of bad treatment?

Portas.—I am ignorant of it.

Counsel.—Were the gendarmes ordered to formulate their impressions of the prisoner?

Portas.—They received impressions, it is true, and I sent them to the judge.

Counsel.—Was not a special casque helmet used in order to torture Callis?

Portas.—No, Sir.

Counsel.—Were you present when Callis was interrogated by the judge?

Portas.—I know my duties and therefore could not possibly be present.

Next came Toma Botas, sarjeant of the gendarmes who inflicted the tortures.

Counsel.—Were you in charge of Callis in Montjuich?

Botas.—Yes, Sir.

Counsel.—Was he carried to cell 0.

Botas.—I am ignorant of it.

Counsel.—Did you put a special helmet on the head of Callis?

Botas.—I! No, Sir.

Counsel.—Were hot irons put on the body of Callis?

Botas.—I don't know.

Counsel.—Was he kept in his cell many days?

Botas.—I don't know.

Counsel.—Was he tortured? *Botas.*—I don't know.

Counsel.—Have you interrogated Callis? *Botas.*—No, Sir.

Judge.—You do not know anything more? *Botas.*—No, Sir.

The Counsel then rose and demanded that Callis and Botas be confronted. The tribunal replied it was useless and refused.

Next came Cirilo Ruiz. The judge immediately addressed him and said: "You must reply to questions bearing on this actual trial and no other."

Counsel.—You and other gendarmes were charged with the case of Callis in Montjuich? *Ruiz.*—Yes, Sir.

Counsel.—Were you instructed by Portas to form impressions of the prisoner? *Ruiz.*—Yes, Sir.

Counsel.—What kind of impressions were you to form?

Ruiz.—To know what character of persons visited Callis and other prisoners.

Counsel.—Have you tortured Callis? *Ruiz.*—No, Sir.

Counsel.—Do you know if other gendarmes have tortured him?

Ruiz.—I don't know anything, and I protest against this question! (!!!).

The judge here intervenes: "The question is not impertinent." Ruiz then adds: "I don't know anything."

This concludes the most important evidence.

After the reading of several documents, the tribunal unanimously decided that there is no case against Emanuel Eurique.

THIRD SITTING.—NOVEMBER 27th, 1897.

This day is devoted entirely to the speeches of defence and prosecution, and the tribunal's judgment. The Court still retains its sensational atmosphere, and the proceedings are opened by Attorney-General. Below is a summarised translation of his address:

The Attorney-General, Don José Catala, having sketched a very black picture of Anarchist crimes, went on to say that after the last attempts, it was possible, by means of tortures to get to know what was true and what was not, and so discover the authors of these crimes. (The italicised words are an exact translation of the words used by the Attorney-General.) The result being that the police were able to arrest many of those guilty persons and among them Francisco Callis.

When Ascheri was interrogated in order to discover if Callis were guilty, he replied by the monosyllable: "Yes." Nor did he retract this up to the time he was shot.

The only item of importance in the first part of the speech for the prosecution was the declaration of a man who had attended the meeting of Fomento, José Deu, who said he thought a man resembling Callis was present at this meeting.

Speaking of the means used to obtain declarations, he said that Portas could reply to those who questioned his conduct: "Let justice be done, though the heavens fall."

The *Imparcial* of Nov. 28th says in its account of the trial that the Attorney-General said: "Portas can reply like the ancient Roman, 'I have saved my country.'"

Speaking of the inquisitors, he says later on: "What should we think of the men who have unearthed the crimes of the Liceo Theatre and the Calle de Cambios? Do they deserve reproaches or congratulations, these men who are accused of having used tortures? Furthermore, Gentlemen, after the discovery of the Liceo and Cambios criminals—what criminals!!!—the mystery of the Fomento affair would still be a mystery, were it not for these elements," i. e. the tortures.

In conclusion the sentence of imprisonment for life was demanded.

El Diluvio describes the speech as incoherent and very bad.

No sooner had the Fiscal sat down than counsel for the defence, Don José Puig de Asprer was on his feet.

The account below is also summarised.

There is no proof against Callis, and how had his trial been conducted? He, the advocate, had not been allowed to see Callis until the day before the first sitting of the Court. He had protested against this unusual and illegal proceeding. If the charge against the accused had contained any argument of value, he should not have been in a position to reply to it. Happily the speech for the prosecution was worthless, and a speech of that kind was better for the accused than a splendid one for the defence.

He then went on to analyse the speech and the evidence, which he declared valueless. What in it was of weight? Ascheri's statement? No. The statement of the accused (Callis)? No. It was omitted to be stated in the speech for the prosecution that Callis had denied himself to be the author when interrogated by the responsible judge of the Parque district, Sir Mariano Pascual Espanol. He had admitted himself to be the author only before the special and irresponsible military judge.

How had this admission been obtained? He, the accused, had been driven to the Military Commander's house and afterwards to Montjuich. There he was placed in a cell, where he was forced to walk day and night, without a word, by continual flogging. A helmet of peculiar construction was placed upon his head. (This was the torture casque of which the results are so well known from our former descriptions.) After this, hot irons were applied to various parts of his body, and he was further subjected to the torture of having his testicles twisted, besides being kept without food for long periods. After several days of such tortures, the man was ready for examination and he made his declaration.

The advocate then went on to say that these inquisitorial proceedings were prohibited by law. He also called attention to the contradictions in the evidence so obtained. Callis said one day that the explosion occurred in 1885. Ascheri in an interview with Euriquez (one of the torturers) said also it was in 1885. But in his second declaration, Callis said it was in 1887. Ascheri himself in several letters sent to his family and published in the papers, by *L'Intransigeant*, among others, says, too, that the accusations of himself and others were wrung from him by horrible tortures. What must be thought then of the declarations made by Marzo, Portas and Mas, to the effect that they had not seen a scar upon the body of Callis. But these scars exist, and a superficial examination is easily performed. When he (the advocate) saw Callis in prison he had seen scars on various parts of his body.

And then what denials on the part of the gaolers! One of them had even denied the existence of the cell Zero.

Eleven men have declared in this Court that the tortures were committed, two of them having endured them in person. (Sane and Oiler). The proofs of the tortures lay in the bodies of the unfortunate victims, proofs more powerful than any others.

He demanded the complete acquittal of Callis.

(From *El Diluvio*, Nov. 28th, 1897.)

This defence has been described by almost every newspaper in Spain as very long, documental and very good.

Finally Emanuel Eurique was acquitted and Francisco Callis was condemned to penal servitude for life.

The aged mother of Callis sat through the whole trial—three days. She witnessed the criminal proceedings against her son and heard the outrageous sentence. Francisco is the only living son of 17 children. She is reduced to mendicancy in order to send some pence to him at Penon de la Gomera.

In spite however of the hopelessness of the situation, she still cherishes the one hope that he will soon be free and with her. What a brave soul!

No king, I am sure, could purchase the happiness that such an event would bring her.

Callis was lodged at the National Prison on his arrival from Penon de la Gomera, and then marched in true barbarian style, heavily chained, like Ruiz the Cuban on his arrival from Cuba, some few weeks back, from prison to the tribunal, morning and night, to and fro, during the 3 days trial. Crowds of people assembled along the route, and though somewhat hidden by the soldiery, they persisted in giving outward vent to their sympathies, by shouting various kind expressions, a manner characteristic of the Spanish race.

It was during this period that the 5,000 francs held by the Belgian Committee were distributed among the prisoners and their families.

On December 3rd, the *Daily Chronicle* published a letter from Callis and his 8 companions who are under various long terms of penal servitude, up to life, of which we quote the final part, being the most important:

It is true that the Inquisitors, after some hesitation, denied the facts about the torture and the existence of Cell Zero, where these horrors were perpetrated. But it is also true that the Court in the end refused to admit the evidence which the accused and their counsel were ready to produce to prove the truth of their assertions.

Before the Court the military judge, Senor Marzo, declared that Callis never had a mark of torture on him, but in the trial in Montjuich the very same judge stated that Callis had a wound across his forehead. Callis and his counsel called for medical inspection to examine the wounds and scars with which Callis's face and whole body are marked. But even that request was refused by the Court.

The Court encouraged Callis to hope for justice, they urged him to be calm in his defence, they advised him not to dwell on the subject of the torture. And in the end they passed a sentence as unjust as could possibly have been feared.

As the matter stands, Lieutenant Portas may well consider himself justified in the phrase which he used to repeat over his victims during their torture: "If you die, it will only cost me a bit of paper." And Senor Marzo, too, will be justified in his assertion that "within a year there will be public autos de fé in Spain, and the Holy Tribunal of the Inquisition will be re-established."

We appeal to all who love freedom and progress. Let them remember that we suffer because we held liberal opinions, and for nothing else.

Signed by
FRANCISCO CALLIS.
JUAN BTA OLLE.
JUAN CASANOVAS.
LORENZO SEDDA.
ANTONIO CEPEVUELO.
FRANCISCO LIS.
JAIME VELELLA.
SEBASTIAN SUNE.
JUAN TORRENTS.

This same letter appeared in many continental papers in full.

On December 12th, 1897, *El Diluvio* reports the departure of the prisoners to various penal settlements. Outside the prison crowds awaited the sound of banging and rattle of keys, for with the ugly noise the faces of the victims will appear; there are two countenances among the populace more expressive of pain than the prisoners themselves—it is the wife and mother of Callis—one more agonized than the other.

During the trial and up to that moment neither have been permitted to speak with him; they now make an effort to do so by pushing through the soldiers but are repulsed.

On the crowd goes, growing in number and in appreciation of the martyrs, thus continuing shouting and gesticulating, when the railway station is neared; here the crowd closes in, while another column of soldiers join their comrades. The old mother of over 70 is seen to wring her hands in pain, it is perhaps the last time that she will ever see her only son, sent to a living death for being a man; then with a sharp run and a leap she gets to the side of him; the crowd has by this time grown menacing, and spurring on the mother and hurrahing the prisoners, they behold the soldiers wrench her from him; the crowd groans, then a volley of stones are directed against the soldiers and immediately after steel is flashing through the air, the soldiers fight, men and women lie bleeding on the ground and among them is the mother of Callis, with a great gash on the head, but still living. His wife was similarly treated. Of course, there have not been any tortures in Montjuich nor in Cuba. No, Spanish officials couldn't do such a thing, "they are honorable men"! O justice, what crimes are done in thy name!

No early Christian martyr suffered under crueler circumstances. Only those papers sympathetic to the prisoners reported this gruesome incident. Reuter's well informed agency didn't even know of it. (!!!)

The trial had no sooner finished than every daily paper of any worth in Spain acknowledged that Callis bore cicatrices that must have resulted from torture, many demanded an inquiry, but suppressed any further expression of their conscience.

However, the Republican press in one united voice demanded a new trial, led by such well known journals as *Nuevo Regimen*, *Los Dominicales*, *L'Publicidad*, *El Pais*, *El Diluvio* and *El Progreso*, the latter paper issued a special circular on behalf of the whole editorial staff, signed by the chief editor Frederico Urales, declaring their intention of agitating until each of the condemned receives a new trial and the torturers were punished. The first step taken by the united Republican parties was a deputation of its leaders to Sagasta. They recited the whole story of Montjuich and demanded a new trial. In reply Sagasta expressed knowledge of the tortures, explaining however that he could not act without written declarations obtained direct from the prisoners. Declarations were soon obtained, before the departure of Callis and his comrades from Barcelona, and handed to the Cabinet.

This was in the early part of December 1897. Governments act slowly. Quite so, it is the secret of diplomacy. It was about the end of September that Queen Regent dismissed General Azcarraga for not giving her a satisfactory answer respecting an inquiry, and now in February 1898, the victims are still eating out their hearts in noisome Spanish dungeons.

What after all can be expected from a new trial? When one beholds the farcical production of the one herein briefly described, assuredly there is little left to hope from such hands. No new trial could produce a satisfactory result without an absolutely impartial tribunal. And who is there that can conjure up such an illusion? The tortures are true, all the evidence that aided the conviction of Callis was a result therefrom, and to have acquitted him of this charge would have been a complete verdict against Marzo, Portas, etc., including even the late lamented Canovas. Who again could imagine official Spaniards casting evil reflection on a corpse? They revere such things far too much. Further, Callis had undoubtedly confessed, and to keep on record such a confession without proceeding against the confessor would be more injurious to the Spanish authorities than Callis's conviction. Once having tried him, arrangements were naturally made, that those living, accused of torturing, use the opportunity so as to give a clean denial to the whole charge. It is a universal practice in law that an official's word be taken in preference to a convict's, and hence Callis was condemned and the tribunal did not concern itself about the methods in which the confession was obtained.

Either Messrs Marzo, Portas and Co were to be convicted of torture (with Canovas as late instructor) or Callis to the galleys. The conviction of Callis was therefore inevitable. And any further trial will produce the same result, it will tend to strengthen the hands of the law; it would mean an open trial and a confirmation of the sentence. Ascheri and Mas are dead; their's would be the evidence on which the guilt of the condemned would depend, it is on record, and to place it aside as unwarrantable, would be a further condemnation of Canovas, implying as it would the murder of 5 innocent men, they having been executed on their own confession. This will never be done, and so another such farce would aid in cleaning the dirty mantle hiding the blood-stained sheaths of Marzo and Portas.

An independent inquiry of men from various parties, before whom each of the living tortured should attend—each and every time facing each and every one of their torturers—to give evidence, and then examined by independent medical men who shall report to such a jury. If the Spanish government be sincere, such a form of procedure would be economical and effective. Any other inquiry outside one of such independent character will in itself be criminal, for it will not be honest.

That Enrique was acquitted and Callis condemned is no more surprising than when Coraminas was acquitted by the supreme Court Martial at Madrid, though previously condemned to death by the Court Martial presided over by Marzo in Montjuich.

In both cases it gave the trials a bona fide character.

The evidence against Enrique was quite as strong as against Callis. Enrique's acquittal therefore was due to his fortune and his fortune to his non activity as a revolutionist. Callis was an active revolutionist and therefore tortured, whilst Enrique was not. Result: Enrique was not tortured, therefore acquitted. The self same spirit characterised the Montjuich trial.

Coraminas's fame as a barrister saved him from torture, and his release tended to suppress forces that would otherwise have grown stupendous in their protests, had he been shot.

This trial like the previous one was a formula of pretentiousness and its consequence should not have been surprising. One good result may ensue. The chief judge in summing up came to the point where Portas was accused of torture and

in reference thereto said: "Like the Roman, he himself can reply to those who attack him: I am a servant and have done my duty."

It will be remembered that after the Cambios Nuevos affair, Barcelona was ruled by Court Martial, which was only withdrawn, and the constitution revised, after the Fomento trial. Immediately many of the exiles returned to Spain. In France for instance the Spanish Consul presented two exiled Anarchists with free railway tickets to Spain—men whom she previously was so desirous of ridding herself, as if Barcelona was at a standstill without them! In any case, with their absence she was deficient of some good stuff.

Already there is news of an advanced magazine to be issued by the young cult of Barcelona, based on revolutionary principles.

The barrister who defended Ramon Sampeau—M. Sarre Clara—was given a banquet by the barristers of Barcelona in honour of the act and his excellent defence.

Ramon Petchor, who was mentioned in November, has been expelled from Perpignan to Marseilles. The Spanish authorities originally demanded his extradition from France; this was not granted but his expulsion followed. No reason was assigned.

Barcelona papers report its head policeman—Portas—as being accompanied by 5 detectives and 2 policemen whenever on promenade. What a pleasant existence—who would not prefer death?

This practically completes another chapter in this tragedy.

The internal affairs of Spain are disquieting. With Cuba still desperately staring her in the face, with the Phillippinos temporarily silent, with a strain of something like £3,000,000 monthly needed to keep Cuba as she is, is the magnificent legacy Canovas has left behind. "The evil that men do lives after them," and Spain to-day must thank her "patriots" for the striking picture she presents after emerging from barbarism. The proud Spaniard refused aid offered by Mr. Lee, the American Ambassador at Havana, some months ago, yet very recently he fulfilled his offer at the special request of Marchal Blanco. What a falling off was there.

One can hardly say that Spain will emerge clean-handed and safe from her ignoble position, but it is evident she is in the hands of wiser counsel than previously, influenced considerably by Senor Moret, minister of the colonies, a man whose diplomatic education is derived chiefly from the English. Finally whatever is done to draw discredit on the decrepid monarchy and so end it, must be done in Spain itself through her own people. An independent inquiry on lines mentioned above, must assuredly unearth the truth and incalculably add to the forces that are making for a republic.

December 1897.

The following came to hand on January 30th, 1898:

The undersigned will be grateful to you for publishing the following letter which is a copy of the one sent to Senor Sagasta.

Exmo Senor,

We prisoners, sentenced by Court Martial at the Anarchist trial of Montjuich, having read with astonishment that the authorities of Barcelona deny the infliction of torture on several of the accused in the said fortress, desire for the sake of human honor and dignity to contradict this official information. With all due respect to your Excellency we make these statements:

1. That Tomas Ascheri, who was shot as author of the Calle de Cambios outrage was the first to succumb to his tortures: hunger, thirst, gag, whip, twisting of the genital parts and trotting day and night without rest. Being unable to withstand torture after four days, and seeing that denying was of no use, he confessed himself to be the author of the crime. Then, by the same means, he was forced to accuse Juan Bantista Ollé and Francisco Gana of being his accomplices.

2. That when J. B. Ollé and F. Gana denied participation in the crime they were accused of, an accusation wrung from Ascheri by the persistence of his torturer Parillas, Ascheri answered: *When they say they are not guilty it is a sign that they are right!* For this retraction Ascheri was tortured again in the same way. Ollé and Gana who were in cell no 2 saw him carried by his torturers from the artillery hall to cell no 3.

3. That when Ascheri, well prepared by torments and by brandy given to him instead of water, had resolved to avoid a repetition of the cruel lesson meted out to him for retracting, he was forced to accuse José Molas and Antonia Nogués of the same thing they had tried to make him accuse Ollé and Gana of. And to compel Nogués to accept the role of accomplice that had been destined to him, they had to apply all the above mentioned tortures as well as burning his flesh with hot irons. They also deceived him into signing blank sheets by a promise of liberty if he acted his part well. When Molas who had suffered nine days and nights of terrible torture in cell no 5 was presented with a written paper which he was to sign and maintain he protested saying: *It is infamous!* Portas, pointing to Mayans and Estorqui who were present, answered: "Sign it, or I will deliver you to these men." It was impossible for him to resist any longer and he was compelled to obey the commands given him. Thus, like Nogués and Ascheri he acted the dual part of author and accuser. The same thing happened to Louis Mas whose mental faculties gave way under torture. By means of such martyrdom the officials succeeded in turning the prisoners into automata who served as accusers in an imaginary conspiracy that forms the basis of our trial.

4. That Sebastian Suné and Francisco Callis also suffered this terrible martyrdom which has left on their bodies its indelible marks that your Excellency can see and touch.

5. That several gendarmes under Lieutenant Portas' orders inflicted the tortures and that those who most distinguished themselves for their cruelty were José Mayans, Manuel Carreras, Leandro Lopez Parillas and corporal Tom s Botas who twisted the genital parts. Iturcio Estorqui only did it when ordered to by Lieutenant Portas.

6. That in spite of lieutenant Portas' threats to his victims forbidding them to say a word about their sufferings, and causing them to be accompanied by two gendarmes—torturers who heard what they said to their counsel, the prisoners affirmed the tortures before the Court Martial sitting at Montjuich to try this case. The revelations of these tortures, especially those of Nogués, compelled the Court to call in the Figueras battalion's doctor, who, after examining the condition of the prisoners, corroborated their statements.

7. That considering that the five men who were shot, as well as the twenty men now undergoing penal servitude are innocent of the crime for which they were sentenced, and that the survivors can give convincing and indubitable proof of this before all the world, we pray your Excellency to the end that you may make a revision of the trial referred to and bring the necessary light to bear on this affair. It is an act of justice we hope from your Excellency as President of a liberal ministry.

May you live for many years.

Prison of Madrid, 20th Dec., 1897.

JACINTO MELICH.	JUAN TORRENTS.
JAIME VILELLA.	JUAN BAUTISTA OLLE.
ANTONIO CEPEVUELO.	JUAN CASANOVAS.
FRANCISCO CALLIS.	SEBASTIAN SUNE.

The phrase "May you live for many years" represents in no way great reverence for Sagasta, but is a mannerism of the Spanish, generally applied in all leading communications of that kind.

Continued on page 14.

THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

VII.

The victory of the State over the communes and the federalist institutions of the Middle Ages did not take place straightway. At one time the State was so threatened that its victory seemed doubtful.

A great popular movement—religious in form and expression, but eminently communistic in its aspirations and striving at equality—originated in the towns and rural parts of central Europe.

Already in the fourteenth century (in 1358 in France and in 1381 in England), two great similar movements had taken place. Two powerful revolts, that of the Jacquerie and that of Wat Tyler had shaken society to its foundations. Both, however, had been principally directed against feudal lords. Both were defeated; but the peasant revolt in England completely put an end to serfdom, and the Jacquerie in France so checked it in its development that henceforth the institution of serfdom could only vegetate, without ever attaining the development it subsequently attained in Germany and in Eastern Europe.

Now, in the sixteenth century, a similar movement took place in central Europe. Under the name of "Hussite" in Bohemia, "Anabaptist" in Germany, in Switzerland and in the Netherlands, and of "Troubled Times" in Russia (at the beginning of the next century), it was over and above a struggle against feudal lords—a complete revolt against Church and State, against Canonic and Roman law, in the name of primitive Christianity.

This movement which is hardly just beginning to be understood, was for many years travestied by State and ecclesiastical historians.

The absolute liberty of the individual—who must only obey the commandments of his conscience—and Communism, were the watchwords of this revolt. And it was only later, when Church and State succeeded in exterminating its most ardent defenders, and juggled with it to their own profit, that this movement, diminished and deprived of its revolutionary character, became Luther's Reformation.

It began by Communist Anarchism preached, and in some places, practised. And if we set aside the religious formulæ, which are a tribute to that epoch, we find in it the very essence of the current of ideas which we represent to-day: the negation of all law, both State or divine; the conscience of each individual thus being his one and only law; the commune—absolute master of its destinies, retaking its lands from feudal lords, and refusing all personal or monetary service to the State. In fact, Communism and equality put into practice. Moreover when Denck, one of the philosophers of the Anabaptist movement, was asked if he did not at least recognise the authority of the Bible, he answered that the only obligatory rule of conduct is the one that each individual finds, *for himself*, in the Bible. And yet these very formulæ, so vague, borrowed from ecclesiastical slang,—this authority "of the book" from which it is so easy to borrow arguments for and against Communism, for and against authority, and so uncertain when it comes to clearly define what liberty is,—these very religious tendencies of the revolt, did they not already contain the germ of an unavoidable defeat?

Originating in towns, the movement soon spread to the country. The peasants refused to obey anybody, and planting an old shoe on a pike by way of a flag, they took back the lands which the lords had seized from the village communities; they broke their bonds of serfdom, drove away priest and judge, and constituted themselves into free communes. And it was only by the stake, the wheel, the gibbet—it was only by massacring more than a hundred thousand peasants in a few years, that royal or imperial power, allied to the papal or reformed church,—Luther inciting to massacre peasants more violently even than the Pope,—put an end to these risings that had for a moment threatened the constitution of nascent States.

Born of popular Anabaptism, the Lutheran Reformation, leaning on the State, massacred the people and crushed the movement from which it originally had derived its strength. The survivors of this immense wave of thought took refuge in the communities of the "Moravian Brothers," who, in their turn, were destroyed by Church and State. Those among them who were not exterminated, sought shelter, some in the South-East of Russia, others in Greenland, where to this day they have been able to live in communities and to refuse all service to the State.

Henceforth, the State's existence was secure. The lawyer, the priest and the soldier-lord, having constituted a solidary alliance around the thrones, they could carry on their work of annihilation.

How many lies have been accumulated by State-paid historians, concerning that period!

In fact, have we not all learned at school that the State rendered great service in constituting national unions on the ruins of feudal society; unions made impracticable in earlier times by the rivalry of cities? We have all learned it in school and we have all believed it in manhood.

And nevertheless, to-day we learn that in spite of all rivalries, medieval cities had already worked during four centuries to constitute these unions by federation, freely consented to, and that they had fully succeeded in that work of consolidation.

The Lombard union, for example, included the cities of Upper Italy and had its federal treasury in safe keeping in Genoa and Venice. Other federations, such as the Tuscan Union, the Rhenan Union (comprising sixty towns), the federations of Westphalia, of Bohemia, of

Servia, of Poland, and of Russian towns covered Europe. At the same time, the commercial union of the Hansa included Scandinavian, German, Polish, and Russian towns throughout the basin of the Baltic.

All the elements were there already, as well as the fact itself, of large human agglomerations, freely constituted.

Do you wish for a living proof of these groups?—You have it in Switzerland! There the union asserted itself first between village communes (the old Cantons), in the same way as it was constituted in France in the Laonnais. And as in Switzerland the separation between town and village was never so great as it was for towns carrying on an extensive and distant commerce, the Swiss towns lent a hand to the peasant insurrections of the sixteenth century, and the union encompassed both towns and villages, and constituted a federation that still exists to-day.

But the State, by its very essence, cannot tolerate free federation; because the latter represents this nightmare of the legislator: "The State within the State." The State does not recognize a freely adopted union working within itself. It only deals with *subjects*. The State alone and its prop, the Church, arrogate to themselves the right of being the connecting link between men.

Consequently the State must perforce annihilate cities based on direct union between citizens. It *must* abolish all union in the city, abolish the city itself, abolish all direct union between cities. To the federative principle it must substitute the principle of submission and discipline. Submission is its substance. Without this principle it leaves off being *the State*: it becomes a federation.

And the sixteenth century—century of carnage and wars—is entirely summed up in this war waged by the growing States against the cities and their federations. The towns are besieged, taken by assault, pillaged; their inhabitants are decimated or transported. The State is victorious all along the line. And the consequences are these.

In the fifteenth century, Europe was covered by rich cities, whose artisans, masons, weavers and carvers, produced marvels of art, whose universities laid the foundations of science, whose caravans travelled over continents, and whose vessels ploughed rivers and seas.

What was left of them two centuries later?—Towns that had numbered fifty and a hundred thousand inhabitants and that had possessed (it was so in Florence) more schools, and, in the communal hospitals, more beds per inhabitant than are possessed to-day by the towns best endowed in this respect, had become rotten boroughs. Their inhabitants having been massacred or transported, the State and Church were seizing their riches. Industry was fading under the minute tutelage of State officials. Commerce was dead. The very roads that formerly united the cities, had become absolutely impracticable in the seventeenth century.

The State spelt warfare, and wars were devastating Europe and completing the ruin of those towns, which the State had not yet ruined direct. But—had not the villages, at least, gained by State centralisation?—Certainly not!—Read what historians tell us about the style of living in the rural districts of Scotland, Tuscany, and Germany in the fourteenth century, and compare their descriptions of that time with the misery in England at the beginning of 1648, in France under the "sun-king" Louis XIV, in Germany, in Italy, everywhere after hundred years of State domination.

Misery everywhere. All unanimously recognize it and point it out. Wherever serfdom had been abolished, it was reconstituted in a hundred different forms; wherever it had not yet been destroyed, it was shaped, under State protection, into a ferocious institution, bearing all the characteristics of antique slavery, or even worse.

And could anything else evolve out of this State-produced misery, as the State's chief anxiety was to annihilate the village community after the town, to destroy all bonds existing between peasants, to give up their lands to be pillaged by the rich, and to subject them, each individually, to the functionary, the priest and the lord?

ETIÉVANT.

The following are extracts published by *Le Libérateur* from a letter of Etiévant's, at present in Mazas prison. No one will be surprised at the calmness with which our valiant friend waits his fate at the hands of those who have him fast again.

My dear friends,

Paris, 29th January, 1898.

You are right; it is unnecessary to say to me: courage! I have some left still. Besides is so much of it needed to come out of the theatre of life? It is rather for me to say *courage* to those who stay in the arena.

Even expectation does not weary me in my solitude, for I am of those who are never wearied with themselves. I think, I read, I write, I distract myself by working out some problem of geometry or algebra or by some controversies with myself. With that the little troubles of the cell's life go by hardly noticed, and besides I have the prospect of seeing them cease soon.—It does not require much courage for all that, a little cool reason is sufficient....

I have received the book *La raison passionnée*, by Joseph Caraguel. He is a funny philosopher... not at all one of us, it is hardly necessary to say, as his book went through the sanitary net set out by the administration round the prisoner's mentality; but the reading of the book has been pleasant to me as it has excited the combativity of my mind. I love contradiction, as I love all struggle that makes one live faster....

G. ETIÉVANT.

The Tortures True.

The preceding notes were no sooner completed than Reuter's telegraphed from Madrid as follows:

Madrid, Jan. 22.

"A semi-official Note has been issued stating that at the last Cabinet Council the Minister of Justice submitted to his colleagues a report regarding the inquiry instituted into the complaints relative to the maltreatment and torturing of Anarchist prisoners in the prison of Montjuich at Barcelona. Medical experts have examined some of the released prisoners now in Madrid, and, although great reserve is shown concerning the results of this examination, traces of maltreatment have been found. The inquiry continues for the purpose of ascertaining who is responsible."

The *Daily Chronicle* of Jan. 25th, 1898, when it published the above without comments proved its want of good faith in espousing the cause of the oppressed. In Gana's affidavit of July 27th, the editor suppressed the name of he who Gana accused of having ordered the infliction of torture. Perhaps they would have no objection in aiding the Spanish government by publishing that person's name now, seeing that "the inquiry continues for the purpose of ascertaining who is responsible"!

Even the *Evening Standard* wrote a leader on the subject on Jan. 31st, 1898, which is quoted from, below:

"Then it is true that the persons charged with bomb-throwing in Barcelona were tortured. Medical experts have examined some of them who are now in Madrid, and they found traces of the ordeal. There is no doubt about it for the Government has issued a semi-official Note stating that the Minister of Justice reported these facts at the last Cabinet Council. It is to be noted that the persons examined at Madrid were innocent, or at least, were not found guilty; otherwise they would be under the hands of the tormentor still. English people who heard those stories might well refuse to believe them. The refugees, welcomed and paraded by international rascality, offered their mutilated limbs for inspection in vain. It was monstrous to suppose that in Western Europe, at the end of the nineteenth century, human beings could be subjected to the *peine forte et dure* just as in the Middle Ages. The Spaniard was noted for cruelty as soon as he began to play a part outside his own realm. So early as the Fourteenth Century, Cornelius Agrippa makes that his leading characteristic. The Middle Ages still linger in Spain. At present the Government is inquiring who was responsible for this outrage. We do not hope that anyone will be punished."

We know quite well how glad the *Evening Standard* would have been if it could have denied the whole thing. But that was impossible, and so it gives its final word on the matter by mingling deliberate lies with prejudices. Firstly the refugees were not "welcomed and paraded by international rascality," unless all sections disagreeing with the *Evening Standard* (thank heavens, there are some) come within that category; for they were "welcomed and paraded" by English societies and some English journalists, whom even the *E. S.* would not accuse of rascality. The truth does not seem to agree with the temperament of the *E. S.* Then again the offering of "their mutilated limbs for inspection was in vain" is contradicted by its acknowledgment of the existence of torture in Spain. The unearthing of this fact has not arisen through the agitation in Spain itself, but from the European movement that has brought Spain to its senses through the costly price its silence has involved.

Then in a unique appeal for justice they passionately exclaim: "We do not hope that anyone will be punished." Whether "anyone" means "no one" or the "right one" it is difficult to realise; if the latter case, then we welcome the stage of discrimination, a faculty so deficient on the staff of that journal, for where Anarchists have ever been in question, condemnation has followed the name and not the act. If the former, then we understand it; these reverent humanitarians should be acclaimed for their code of ethics. If they but broadened this theory one might behold a little less intemperance in their leading articles.

As to the "inquiry for the purpose of ascertaining who is responsible," what can be said? The government knows and we all know that Enrique Marzo conducted the Court Martial in the subterranean passages of Montjuich and that Lieutenant Narciso Portas with his hirelings were in charge of the prisoners, and it is they who have been definitely charged with the work of torture. Marzo must have been in league with Portas or otherwise Marzo would not have suppressed the evidence of the tortured and the withdrawal of confessions made at the trial.

The guilty are known, but the prosecutors in this case do not ask for the law's revenge. No, we do not ask that they should be punished, but we do ask that their victims be "pardoned."

We fear that the counsel of the judge and attorney-general will eventually assert itself; then Portas and Marzo shall have ample opportunities of replying to those who attack them.

Canovas has already paid the penalty of his criminal folly, for which as Prime Minister he was chiefly responsible. Angiollilo was no common murderer, he slew the modern Torquemada.

This inquiry calls to mind the shooting of two Matabele envoys, without cause, resulting as it did in an inquiry which decided that "the responsibility for the unfortunate occurrence cannot justly be fixed on any individual, and was merely the result of necessary orders issued in accordance with the exigencies of the military situation."

Assuredly then we should not have anticipated a different issue for the above was penned by Englishmen; why should we expect better from cruel Spanish Jesuits? More especially since Barcelona was ruled by Martial law during the torture period, which was in accordance with the "exigencies of the military situation." Ever since General Weyler, the modern Don Pedro, has returned to Spain he has been the personification of sedition, and eventually the public prosecutor demands a sentence of two months imprisonment on him. With this the "Supreme Court of war will comply," but "the government will immediately grant him a free pardon," so Reuter's wire on Jan. 29. Two decisions one more farcical than the other. So much "for the purpose of ascertaining who is responsible."

Again we say we do not wish the government to punish the torturers, but we demand common justice for their victims.

Ascheri, Mas, Nogues, Molas and Alsina have been most cruelly tortured and shot. But there are some twenty under various sentences still living and suffering. These men were no less victims to the accusations of the tortured than the tortured themselves were victims to their own confessions.

If the tortures are true we are justified in asserting the confessions are false. Made as they were in secret, tried as these men were in secret, no independent evidence permitted, every declaration relating to the tortures and the falsity of the confessions suppressed, surely now that the tortures have been declared true, the injustice done is graver a millionfold more than ever the Dreyfus case is likely to be. Yet—yet the press are silent, silent because workmen are in question. Let the guilty go unpunished, let not their pardon however be an excuse for the continuance of punishment on the innocent.

JOSEPH PERRY,

Hon. Sec. of the Spanish Atrocities Committee.

PRISON REFLECTIONS.

The following letter, which will interest some of our readers, has been received from Fred Charles:—

I write you again to-day on Henderson's suggestion. I find by recent letters that his speculative thinking had evidently drifted quite away from the old materialist position, as he says, "into a conception of the universe where every blade of grass has roots that grope about eternity" and is deeply impressed by reflecting on the "inscrutable mysteries with which the world enfolds its creatures." I notice Browning has largely replaced Shelley in his esteem. His ideas seem pantheistic, or rather approach the transcendental philosophy, both of which my crude notions have sometimes attributed to the same current of thought as those labelled Mysticism—persistently reappearing views of the world within and without us which I sadly want to know more about. This change of attitude, and signs that a deeply rooted tendency exists in this direction to-day interest me, as I feel in the ultimate analysis Thought rules the world, and all important practical changes originate in the intellectual regions. Specially interesting to me since the ordinary theological creeds have become incredible, and return to them for ever more impossible; (including all the dogmatic forms in which the religious spirit has hitherto been embodied by the great religions of the world, and not alone when decked out in "Hebrew old clothes") and I am waiting for more light, for wider conceptions that shall embrace whatever is true in all these, be consistent with all known truths, and adapted to the state of culture men have now arrived at.

Naturally I look to the higher branches of Literature (to Art in its widest sense) to ennoble our existence, and teach and guide us in this much entangled many-sided struggle that human life presents. But fancy too that the historic epochs during which an earnest belief of some sort or other going beyond our five senses has prevailed have been the distinctly heroic, and great, and fruitful ones, and I wonder if the present is a blindly groping reaction from the shabbiness and unburied falsehoods of a transition period, or something more hopeful; if modern science will after all lead us to metaphysics and philosophy; and whether the wrathful attacks on "conventional lies" and all that it involves may not be a necessary preliminary to a vision of the true, and to a more comprehensive credo than "a lie is unbelievable."

I do feel that the present condition of our industrial system is in many ways intolerable, and to alter that the most pressing work of to-day; but I do not therefore picture the destiny of our race as unlimited "cake, ale and skittles." In no way ashamed of the animal basis of our nature, one is not inclined to deify it by proposing the mere pursuit of pleasurable sensations (in the usual sense) as men's highest aim, whether for a life-time or an eternity. Rather one's deeper feelings are touched by a view of the tremendous possibilities (beyond the abolition of poverty and physical hardship) that a true society based on mutual aid and worthy of human beings, instead of tigers and pigs, would bring with it possibilities seen no longer as vague utopian hopes, but as strict scientific deductions from ascertained facts; and one begins to realize that not alone the collective life of men, but even that of the weakest and the poorest may possess in a far other than theological sense an infinite significance and germs at least of nobleness and worth. The wondrous faculties and capabilities that must have been latent, say in the prehistoric savage, irresistibly suggest that other elements of our nature may still lie under a deep sleep, and that our race may be destined to attain far higher levels of existence than have yet been anywhere reached. For which reason the Anarchist side of Socialist thought always strongly attracts me as offering the best practicable condition for continued development, for enabling a man to cultivate and use all that is available in him, for securing in various senses "the tools to him who can handle them," and especially as forming an emphatic protest against mere external mechanism, and recognition of a trust in nature rather than belief in the omnipotence of organisation and artificial systems practically certain to become in time cumbrous and cramping. I do hope that the "new spirit" will not harden into fresh mental chains, but realize that our mental life is vital and grows; and that the whole truth on most matters lies for ever beyond us. And however knowledge and insight into things may increase as ages roll on, our general conceptions can only be at best continually nearer approximations to the reality. If sitting lonely in a cold cell about the size of a large packing-case it comes into my mind that silent and still narrower graves will ere long swallow up all now living, my memory also tells me that a starry sky exists above, myriad centres of light and warmth, and life, and a universe of infinite beauty and wonder all around; that thoughts are not busier in the mind of man than the mute forces at work on every square yard of earth's surface; and there steals over me the conviction that however things may appear on the surface at any moment, at bottom "All's Well." Therefore give my earnest greetings to all comrades, and as a prisoner's message for the New Year bid them strive as Goethe phrases it: "Im Ganzen Guten Wahren resolut zu leben" (to live resolutely in the Whole, the Good and the True), with no half-hearted compromises between what they feel is false and true, but "faithful, fearless and loyal to all things manly"; to work on if without haste, also without rest, preparing the world for better days that yet shall be. Is not the whole history of men a virtual promise of success? Take for instance the period from the protestant reformation with its widespread strife for mental freedom, or the French revolution and the struggle for political freedom which followed in most European countries; and then to the immense movement now growing up throughout the civilised world for economic freedom. How many pages might one not fill with familiar names of persons and events each one of which was in effect a restatement of the fact that lies and injustice are contrary to the essential constitution of things, and man's nature a fresh prophecy they shall in no wise endure for ever, let their ending cost what it may, and though all the powers on Earth joined to bolster them up? Do not their lives too practically say in such matters, "the prize lies in the race and a man's true wages is delight in doing his work"? My health and spirits continue about as usual (lately excused heavy lifting by the doctor). Have not yet been able to give your thought-resting suggestion a fair trial. How have "Love's Coming of Age" and the collection of essays on labour questions gone off? Please tell sister date of this letter which is in lieu of a visit. A right merry Christmastide and a very happy and prosperous New Year to you all. (Jim, the Binghamms, May, Ballas, Hukin, Adams, Martin, Max Flint, if still with you, etc.) Remember me to all other enquirers you may come across, such as Core, Watson, Sharland, Salt, etc. etc.

Affectionate regards to yourself.

Excuse this kind of letter by remembering the conditions and limits I write under.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

Capitalists and governments could give no more significant object lesson of the blessing they bring to the people under their sway than by their recent attempt at wholesale starvation in the grain market. The American farmers produce enormous quantities of wheat which, instead of reaching the large centres of industrial workers in the most expedient way, simply become the prey of numerous sets of thieves. One set, residing at New York or Chicago, corners it in immense quantities, and we have all read the admiring articles in the daily press, telling us how one plucky speculator, Mr. George Curzon's brother-in-law, Mr. Leiter of Chicago, actually controls the wheat market of the world, and, having stored away as large a quantity of wheat as was never before accumulated in one place, will in all probability be able to dictate prices for some months to come. What is sent over, of this wheat, to the European continent, has to pay the duties imposed by the other set of public benefactors, the various governments; and in Italy nearly 30 out of a total of 64 millions pounds annual revenue come from duties and taxes levied on the bread and food of the people. Then wheat passes into the hands of the local speculators; the municipal authorities often impose an octroi duty before it can pass their doors and last of all, the people's friend, the baker, gets his share. So in a town like Vercelli a kilo of bread costs 49 centimes, which means 9d. per quarter loaf; it now costs 45c. (about 8d. per loaf) and, as I read in the *Secolo* of Jan. 30, "a new form of bread is studied now" in this town, which would be still cheaper!

No wonder that the people, seeing how they are robbed, also begin to combine and to use the only means at their disposal. That bread must become cheaper or more serious events will happen is plain from the demonstrations now taking place all over Italy. Whilst we regret that the movement stopped there and dwindled away after a number of small concessions had been obtained, we welcome it as a proof of the fact that in every serious matter after all the people has learned—or rather never forgotten—to act directly and to take matters in its own hands. It takes very little to make them forget the roundabout ways of a political machinery which so many politicians, from Conservative to Social-democrat, continually strive to hammer into their heads. The Italians gave another splendid example two years ago, after the defeat in Abyssinia, when instead of listening to the provocations of militarism to find another pretext for increased armaments and fresh national hatred, the people in so many towns prevented the sending of another army to Africa, and thus secured peace.

Small "bread riots" at Siculiana and other places in Sicily were followed on Jan. 16 and 17 by large popular demonstrations at Ancona where grain-stores were stormed, streets barricaded and the military defied until the price of bread was reduced to 35 centimes per kilo (6d. per quarter loaf). *L'Agitazione*, the local Anarchist paper, was of course the first victim of the government. Malatesta, Smorti and Bersaglia being arrested on January 17 and are still kept in prison together with a great number of comrades and workmen. A special edition of a new paper was seized also, but after a week's interruption *L'Agitazione* reappeared and has since regularly come to hand.

Similar demonstrations occurred at Forlì, Macerata (Jan. 19 where women carried away the grain from a store), Sinigaglia (Jan. 19 where stores and railway vans were equally sacked by women), at Gallipoli (Jan. 23), Florence (Jan. 23), Milan, Naples, Perugia, Caserta, Piacenza, Messina and many other towns. The government is arming and calling reserves out all over the country; the chamber of deputies defied the people by conceding but an insignificant reduction of the duty on grain. The people ceased to demonstrate for the moment, probably until the insufficiency of the small concessions obtained will be universally felt. They go but they can come again at any moment, in this lays their strength; an organisation may be dissolved, any number of distinct acts may be repressed but the people itself cannot be got out of the way. Many times more they may be induced to return to their old misery and slavery but an occasion will arise when they will come and mean to stay and then this system will be at its wits ends. No oppression, no exploitation is so bad as voluntary submission and mental servility, and from these the Italian people seems in a good way to emancipate itself.

These events are little noticed whilst all attention is concentrated on the trial of Emile Zola which ended by his condemnation to one year imprisonment, under the frantic applause of the well-dressed mob who are now as eager to lick the boots of the army chiefs as they were in May 1871, when they insulted and ill-treated the Parisian workmen, the prisoners of the Commune, led through the streets of Versailles by the brave army to summary execution or transportation. The position of the French Anarchists on this matter can be seen from a series of articles (to be published as a pamphlet) by Sébastien Faure in the *Libertaire* (*Les Anarchistes et l'affaire Dreyfus*), an article by Charles Albert in the *Temps Nouveaux* of Jan. 29, a letter by Jean Grave to Zola in the *Aurore* of Feb. 17, and E. Pouget's *Père Peinard*. Excepting the latter, I find that the significance of the trial is now more clearly grasped when all have seen that Zola and his counsel really strike hard at the rotten superstition of military superiority and the rule of the *sabre* above all. What a number of comrades on one side (the *Ligue des Anti-patriotes*) and many young authors, Lucien Descaves (*Sous-Offs*), George Darien (*Biribi*), etc., on the other side, tried to effect for years, to expose the military fetish in its dull, brutal, spiritless hideousness,—is powerfully supported by the immense publicity given to this trial which became, in a wider sense than perhaps Zola himself at first thought, a revolutionary act par excellence. Enormous efforts are made by governmentalists and clericals to hinder all this from having its full effect and the infamous roll of the majority of the daily press—to be a regular barrier controlled by the vilest reactionary interests between the people and the truth—never became more evident; anti-Jewish riots disgraced Algiers and even French towns, and a new St. Bartholemew for Jews is under discussion. Still we do not see that the *working people* anywhere listen to these appeals of the army and the clergy, and if this proves true to the end, it will be another hopeful sign that, after all, the days of authority and exploitation may be numbered.

Of new literature I will mention the publication or preparation of translations of Kropotkin's volumes in many less-known languages, so that English editions should be hurried up in order not to be the very last. The *Conquest of Bread* exists now also in Portuguese and Norwegian (at Bergen) editions and, besides a Bohemian translation (in parts, at New York), an Italian edition is prepared at Mantova. Of the *Words of a Rebel* a Bohemian

translation appears at New York (in parts, edited by Volne Listy). The *State* appeared in Dutch and will be translated in *Freedom* of Norway.

Law and Authority, first translated in 1886 (London) was reprinted in *Free Society* of San Francisco and is the first pamphlet of the "Free Society Library" (5 cents).

Jean Grave printed two pamphlets: *La Panacée-Révolution* and *Le Machinisme*, extracts from his larger books (Paris, *Temps Nouveaux*). Most's *Deistic Pestilence* reached its 26th edition at Buffalo, N. Y. Ten years ago an English translation of this pamphlet existed; since then the particular pestilence alluded to has not so much decreased, unfortunately, as to make a reprint useless.

In Italy comrades of local groups often combine to bring out single numbers of papers; such numbers appeared at Naples (*Il Turbine* and *L'Affamato*), at Lucca (*Agitiamoci*), at Bologna (*La Libertà*), etc. *Il Nuovo Verbo* at Parma and *L'Aurora* at Torino are new papers about to be published.

M. Angiolillo's portrait is issued separately by the *Questione Sociale* of Paterson, N. J. (10 cents; this address is sufficient).

Another libertarian play, *La Cage*, by Lucien Descaves, was acted at the Theatre Antoine in Paris; it deals with the narrowness and misery so often detected if a corner of the curtain of sacred family life is lifted. After two representations at this private theatre, the censor prohibited its being acted in public. So public conscience which was so much upset by O. Mirbeau's *Mauvais Bergers* has been saved from this new shock by the paternal care of the government. The author will read the piece before the group *L'Idée Nouvelle* and it has just been published in bookform (P.-V. Stock, 1 fr. 50 c.)

COMRADESHIP.

This question of human solidarity unfortunately does not interest many people, and it is deplorable to find that in many the love of self strongly predominates. We mean here of course that selfishness which is anti-social in spirit and not the "enlightened selfishness" of the Egoists. To-day we see many amongst us who in satisfying their own greed are quite careless as to the sufferings of their fellow creatures. At this fact we need express no surprise, since it is the direct result of cruel and unjust social conditions, founded as they are upon greed, avarice and tyranny. Man, like all animals, is the product of the environment in which he exists, and his morality and his social feelings are the direct outcome of these conditions. Mutual affection between human beings seldom much farther than their own circle of relations or friends. Our social and economical condition causes us to view each other with mistrust, prejudice and often bitter hatred. Bad social conditions have in a large measure crushed this spirit of love and true comradeship between men, and have divided the great human family into countless factions, creating antagonisms which have cast a shadow of despair and misery over the history of mankind. The love we have for our parents, or our brothers or sisters is a natural instinct, but is it not often of a very shallow description? We have yet to learn that our love for others has not only to exist within our own circle of friends, but that we have to recognise every human being irrespective of nationality, colour, or creed, as a brother whose life is part of our own, whose well-being and development is as important to us as our own. It is this spirit of love and unselfishness which will ennoble men, and which will raise him to a higher plane of development. And we see that this fraternal spirit has existed in many communities, and does even at the present time where there exists a strong feeling of brotherhood, and where all the members of the tribe or clan share each others joys and misfortunes, where the loss of a member casts a gloom over the rest of the community.

This may seem somewhat strange to many who boast of their civilisation, but among Redskins, for instance, it is not at all uncommon: "In their clans, in their tribes, each leans upon and counts upon his neighbour. The loss of a single warrior seems to them a subject of infinite regret, because it weakens the association. It is inculcated upon the Redskin chiefs to look after their men; a victory dearly bought dishonours him who has achieved it."¹ These people whom many look upon with disdain, and who have not advanced so far in subduing nature as the white man has, possess a spirit of fraternity and altruism which is the outcome of their simple communal life."² Indeed all observers ancient and modern have recognised and often admired the generous qualities existing amongst the Redskin some of this testimony I will quote. Charlevoix, speaking of the great mutual considerations shown by the Indians to one another, says: "This doubtless arises partly from the fact that mine and thine, those icy worlds as Saint Chrysostom calls them, are not yet known among these savages. The care that they take of orphans, widows and infirm, the hospitality they exercise so admirably, are merely a consequence of their persuasion that all ought to be held in common amongst men."

As regards altruism and mutual aid the white man might learn many good lessons from these noble people. We know how much he needs it. And yet we find that commercialism has not succeeded in entirely obliterating all that is noble in humanity. There are plenty of cases in European societies occurring daily in which human beings make sacrifices for each other. How often do we hear of a person seeing another in danger hasten to the rescue. Their is a house in flames, the inmates appear at the windows crying for aid. But they do not cry in vain, there are numerous hands ready to assist in the rescue. Or a person may be struggling in the water, you see a plucky fellow hasten to save his unfortunate fellow creature. This Altruistic feeling is spontaneous, it is a part of the noble character of man, which bad institutions have failed to crush, and in many this fellow feeling comes naturally, it is not prompted by the desire of gain, neither is there any need of a law to enforce it. (*To be Concluded.*) R. C. M.

¹ *Property, its origin*, by C. Letourneau, pp. 51 and 57.

THE PROPAGANDA.

LONDON.

On Friday evening, Feb. 11th, a farewell meeting was held in Christchurch Hall, to say good bye to our comrade Weinberg of Philadelphia, who intended to leave London for Liverpool the same evening on his return to New York. Like all the meetings he has addressed during his ten weeks here, the place was crowded to suffocation; in fact it is years since our Jewish comrades have had here a propagandist who has drawn such crowds and who has united them as he has done. The result was that after comrades Baron, Lyshitch, Turner and Caban had spoken, Michailom and Bonhoff respectively sung and recited—when comrade Weinberg came to speak and say good bye, the audience would not hear of it, and after detaining till too late for the train, made him promise to stay a while longer. During his stay he has delivered twenty-one lectures in London and the provinces. In Leeds several times over 2,000 people crowded to hear him. Glasgow and Liverpool were almost as successful. His simple yet eloquent speaking secured him invitations from several of the Jewish Trade-Unions, among others the Tailors. Kropotkin wrote regretting he could not attend the farewell meeting but perhaps he will when he really does go. This only shows what a sound sensible comrade can accomplish. We wish him continued success. J. T.

GLASGOW.

We started the winter's work with a series of addresses delivered at the Group meetings, by the more intelligent members. They comprised papers on "Colonisation," "Fundamentals," "Mutual Aid," "True Co-operation" and "Non-resistance." These meetings offered a splendid opportunity for the older comrades of the Group to be useful in making our principles plain to the younger members; this opportunity was taken full advantage of.

Several of the comrades were invited down to Muirkirk (a small mining village about 40 miles from Glasgow) to lecture; this was the first occasion that Anarchist lectures had ever been held there, but our comrades' efforts were highly appreciated by the audience that assembled to hear the truth of Anarchism expounded. We are largely indebted to the Italian and German comrades resident in the village for the success of these meetings.

At Bridgeton a course of six lectures were delivered and were as successful as the comrades anticipated. The Eclectic Socialist Union and the Group started a series of monthly week-night meetings. First lecturer V. de Cleyre, on "Philosophy of Anarchism"; after this very successful meeting, the I. L. P., S. D. F., C. S. L., E. S. W., and Solidarity Anarchist Group all joined in running these monthly meetings. The second meeting was the Chicago Commemoration, with a good vocal and musical programme; it was splendid, but the speaking was the least attractive part of the evening's proceedings when it should have been the strongest. Next meetings: Councilor Ferguson on "Land values"; Enid Stacy on "Socialism and Trade-Unionism"; J. C. Kenworthy on "Socialism, Communism and Anarchism, What they are." This lecture was masterly delivered and our comrade has the gift of arousing the sympathy of the most apathetic audience; the impression was a *lasting* one. These lectures have not been a financial success, and this seems to be the criterion by which some Socialists and even Anarchists gauge success. The pity of it! Although not a successful capitalistic venture, they have caused the more intelligent members of all Socialist schools of thought to come more in touch with one another, and this has tended to soften the asperities which we had towards each other. The more we see the other side and understand it, the less need we see for this everlasting bickering and quarreling about names and classifications and the more one realizes the necessity of ever keeping the end in view (methods are only for politicians and other such unclean cattle), the end we are all striving for: An era of love, based on Voluntary Co-operation, i. e. Anarchism.

The Jewish comrades had a visit from comrade Weinberg, America, and they held a number of largely attended meetings, and the good seed sown by him will be sure to bring forth fruit after its kind.

A number of the comrades have been lecturing to Co-operative and Ethical societies, Trade-Unions and I. L. P. branches, and at most of these meetings we have been successful in raising lively discussions and leaving behind a good impression. General impression: "Oh! I yer a recht, but it's gie far awa!" Taking us all through we have carried on a very successful winter propaganda, and we are now looking forward to the spring, tra-la-la, when we once more will mount the stool and address the stolid audience of lamposts until our more stolid audience comes along—i. e. the Schotchmen, that can't see a joke in *Freedom*. W. DUFF.

LIVERPOOL.

We have had practically no propaganda here for several months, as we have only one English Anarchist speaker, and his time has been given to the Cabinet makers' strike. However our door meetings were started again last Sunday and we hope to continue the meetings through the summer.

As to your London Conference, we should be glad to see a bright little weekly paper, a wee bit witty to catch the eye of the passer by, if the comrades think they could support it. It would not affect *Freedom* which has special work of its own to do, and we feel sure the *Freedom* Group would help it. MAGGIE SINNETT.

CANNING TOWN.

During February we have held group meetings every Thursday, followed by discussion, also meetings on Sunday mornings at which Leggatt has spoken, and Perry and Kelly of New York have been down, but weather prevented a meeting. In the summer we hope to be as regular as of old.

We are beginning to see some of the results of the last strike in the tactics the employers are using towards the men. We enclose a form that you may see what the men are expected to sign. For next *Freedom* we will send up a detailed account of what is happening here between the men and the masters.

The Anarchist Literature Bureau.—Manchester.

A Voluntary Association of Workers, formed for the purpose of propagating the principles of Anarchist-Communism by means of the distribution of pamphlets, leaflets, etc., also for the sale of Socialist, Revolutionary, and advanced literature.

French and American Anarchist journals, books, and pamphlets sold: *Le Libertaire*, *L'Humanité Nouvelle*, *Les Temps Nouveaux*, *Free Society*, *Lucifer*, *The Age of Thought*, *Armstrong's Autonomist*, etc. Terms cash. Apply to John Bacon, Brick Row, Marple.

FREEDOM PAMPHLETS.

- No. 1. THE WAGE SYSTEM. By PETER KROPOTKINE. 1d.
- No. 2. THE COMMUNE OF PARIS. By PETER KROPOTKINE. 1d.
- No. 3. A TALK ABOUT ANARCHIST-COMMUNISM BETWEEN TWO WORKERS. By E. MALATESTA. 1d.
- No. 4. ANARCHIST-COMMUNISM: ITS BASIS AND PRINCIPLES. By PETER KROPOTKINE. 1d.
- No. 5. ANARCHY. By E. MALATESTA. 1d.
- No. 6. ANARCHIST MORALITY. By PETER KROPOTKINE. 1d.
- No. 7. EXPROPRIATION. By PETER KROPOTKINE. 1d.
- No. 8. ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. By C. M. WILSON. ½d.
- No. 9. ANARCHY ON TRIAL—George Etiévant, Jean Grave and Caserio Santo. 32 pages; 1d.
- No. 10. ANARCHISM: ITS PHILOSOPHY AND IDEAL. 1d.

Other Pamphlets.

- LAW AND AUTHORITY. By PETER KROPOTKINE. 2d.
- EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. By ELYSEE RECLUS. 1d.
- AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. By PETER KROPOTKINE. 1d.
- THE CHICAGO MARTYRS. Their speeches in Court and the record of their trial, with the reasons given by Governor Altgeld for pardoning Fielden, Schwab, and Neebe; price sixpence. Spies speech in pamphlet form, 1d.
- GOD AND THE STATE. By MICHAEL BAKOUNINE. Price fourpence.
- AN ANARCHIST ON ANARCHY. By ELYSEE RECLUS. 1d.
- THE TABLES TURNED; OR, NUPKINS AWAKENED. A Socialist interlude. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1s. each.
(Only a few of these original copies left.)
- THE COMMUNE OF PARIS. By WILLIAM MORRIS, E. BELFORT BAX and VICTOR DAVE. 2d.
- THE IDEAL AND YOUTH. By ELYSEE RECLUS. 1d.
- REVOLUTIONARY STUDIES. By PETER KROPOTKINE. 1d.
- REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT. By PETER KROPOTKINE. 1d.
- SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN GERMANY. By GUSTAV LANDAUER. ½d.
- MONOPOLY; OR, HOW LABOR IS ROBBED. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
- CHANTS FOR SOCIALISTS. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
- USEFUL WORK VERSUS USELESS TOIL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. 1d.
- BIBLIOGRAPHIE DE L'ANARCHIE par M. NETTLAU. Preface d' ELYSEE RECLUS; Brussels, 51 rue des Eperonniers, 1897; 294 pp. 5 francs; post free for 4 shillings prepaid.
- THE OLD IDEAL AND THE NEW, By EMIL F. RUEDEBUSCH, best pamphlet out on the sex question, 2s. 6d. post free.

SPECIAL NOTICE.

In future we must request that all orders for pamphlets be accompanied with cash. We are compelled to adhere to this as we need funds for reprinting.

MONTHLY ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

- Donations Publication Fund.—Delorme 6d., Lear 2s., Lagsdon 3s., N. F. D. 2s. N. 2s. 4.
- Annual Subscriptions.—C. K. Elly 2/6, Hartehorn 1/6.
- FREEDOM Guarantee Fund.—J. Perry 2s., Muller 1s., A. M. 5s., A. M. L. 1s., C. M. W. £1, Henry W. Nevinson 2s.
- Sales of FREEDOM.—Delorme 3/8, Rean 3d., Swenson 1/4, Edwards 1/6, Wess 1/4, Emery 2/6, Reeves 1/3, Notkin 16/5, Duff 12s., Canning Town 1/6, Robertson 6s., Taylor 3s., Maggie Sinnett 2/8, Manchester Group 7/4, Newsagents 1/6, Office 4d.
- Sales of FREEDOM Pamphlets.—Wilkes 1/3, B. Pierre 3s., Delorme 1/9½.

[Will comrades in the London and provincial Groups make a point of furnishing us with reports of their meetings and progress by not later than the 20th of each month.—ED.]



Cosmopolitan

F. HENNEGHEN

127, Ossulston Street, (Euston Road)
LONDON, N. W.

ALL KIND OF PRINTING
IN ALL LANGUAGES
AT MOST MODERATE PRICES

Printery

SHEFFIELD.

Freedom and pamphlets can be obtained from E. Delorme, 54 Daniel Hill Upperthorpe.

Printed and published by J. TURNER at 7 Lambs Conduit Street, London, W. C.