

Freedom

A JOURNAL OF ANARCHIST COMMUNISM.

VOL. VIII.—No. 88.

JUNE, 1894.

MONTHLY; ONE PENNY.

THE RIGHT OF ASYLUM.

It is an open secret in our ruling circles that the French Government, backed by its ally, the Russian Tsar, as well as by its enemy, the German Government, is exerting diplomatic pressure on the English Government, in order to obtain an extradition treaty against Anarchists. Of course, Anarchists are only the scapegoats in this business. The Russian Tsar knows well that if extradition becomes customary from this country, he will have no difficulty in fishing out of England anyone of his subjects—bearing no matter what party label—whom he may accuse of preparing acts of violence against his own sacred personality, or the not less sacred personalities of his functionaries. In the case of Right of Asylum, the right, once violated, very soon becomes a mere fiction: it simply ceases to exist.

And as to the German, French, Italian, Spanish, and all other governments, they know perfectly well that every day they may expect in their countries great labor riots; and that, under present conditions, any labor riot may assume the proportions of an insurrection, during which the usual massacre of the workers will be resisted by violence. Against such insurrections they are preparing their new "strike cartridges"; they are teaching "the small war" in the barracks; and they are also forging extradition treaties.

Not longer than a few weeks ago, Moravian miners were shot down by gendarmes in the interest of the exploiters. Twelve men shot and thirty-three wounded, were the items of that bloody encounter between armed assassins and unarmed producers of wealth. And if to-morrow the relatives or the friends of the massacred miners answer that shooting by acts of violence, which would only be too natural, we may be sure that workmen of all shades of politics—Socialists, Anarchists, or simply strikers—will be prosecuted by the score, and condemned to life imprisonment, if they do not succeed in finding refuge in this country.

Now, the question which every English worker—nay, every Radical—ought to ponder well is this:

Suppose that to-morrow one of those Moravian miners comes to these islands to seek refuge. If he is more or less known in his own country for his energy, the Austrian Government will not fail to ask his extradition. Shall it be granted or not?

Under the old conditions, it certainly would have been refused. But—can it be refused now?

We candidly believe that, if the extradition of Meunier is granted, it will be no longer possible for Great Britain to refuse the extradition of anyone involved in labor riots on the continent—unless she be prepared to break diplomatic relations with continental powers, which, everyone understands, is a big affair, and will not be lightly undertaken by the middle classes, for what they will describe as a "mere workman," if they do not add "an assassin."

The Social Democrats, as a rule, are too much blinded by their hatred towards Anarchists to see clearly in such matters. Their hatred has led them to side with the governments in the persecution of Anarchists. But, by this time, even Social Democratic workers must begin to realise that they have gone in the wrong direction. All persecution begins with the numerically weakest party, and reaches the next party only after the former has been persecuted for some time with the approval of the "more reasonable" fractions of the opposition. Already the reaction on the continent has reached the Social Democrats. In France they prosecute the Deputy Toussaint, who spoke at a strike; in Germany, they condemn both the Independent and the Dependent Socialists for mere trifles; in Italy, they pronounce atrocious sentences against scores of modest Socialists, and even Republicans; and in Switzerland, sixty-one workers, implicated in the labor riots at Bern, were condemned the other day, regardless of parties, to months and years of imprisonment. And this is only the beginning of the general reaction which is setting in all over Europe, in all directions—political, economical, literary and social.

After the Anarchists, the Social Democrats and the labor organisers; this is unavoidable. And so Great Britain will soon see addressed to her demands of extradition for labor riots, just as she has them now for explosions of barrack walls.

When François' case was at Bow Street, we warned our countrymen that his case would be quoted as a precedent. So it is. In Meunier's case the magistrate and even several lawyers, hostile to extradition in principle, invoke or acknowledge François' case as a precedent.

But in Meunier's case a new, or rather two new precedents are being created; and any unprejudiced person who will take the trouble to look at the wording of the decision of the Bow Street magistrate, will be

struck by the immense importance of the precedents thus created, without noise and discussion, but with all the force which precedents have in the administration of English justice.

The manner in which the Bow-street magistrate treated Meunier's case was certainly most extraordinary. When it was proposed to bring over from France some witnesses who would testify that Meunier could not have been at the Café Véry at the time of the explosion, the magistrate answered that, the witnesses being simply "evidence against evidence," he would not go into the analysis of their testimonies. He pronounced his sentence of extradition first, and permitted the defence to produce these witnesses next week—no one in the world could say what for, since he already had pronounced the sentence of extradition. He thus established the theory, which will not fail to be quoted as a precedent, that *any* accusation brought forward by the Government which asks the extradition, even such testimony as cannot be sworn, is sufficient for granting the extradition; while any evidence brought in defence, even if it annihilates the former, is of no value, because it is "evidence against evidence."

The magistrate's theory is, in fact, that in extradition cases the function of the court is simply to see whether there is *any* evidence in favor of the accusation, and that the value of such evidence must be discussed before a tribunal of the country which asks the extradition.

Now, theoretically and legally, this view may be true. But in practice it never has been applied before in cases which had the slightest political tint; and, if it were applied in the future, it would simply mean the total abolition of the right of asylum.

In these cases the magistrate is, on the contrary, expected to go into the discussion of the evidence; so much so that in countries which are jealous of maintaining asylum rights extradition cases are entrusted to the courts and not to the governmental administration, which might be satisfied with *any* evidence brought forward by the accusers. They wish the evidence to be discussed, and very seriously, and therefore leave the matter with a magistrate and not with an official of the executive.

More than that. When a rebel leaves his own country and seeks refuge elsewhere, he does so because he knows that, for temporary or permanent reasons, he cannot expect in his own country anything like the current sort of justice which is accorded to every thief or assassin, but is *not* accorded to one who stands in rebellion against the laws or the misapplication of laws in his own land. And he expects to find at least as fair a hearing as an ordinary thief in the country of refuge.

When a Russian, German, or French refugee comes to Britain, it is not because what he is accused of in Russia, Germany, or France, is not punishable by the laws of this country; but because he believes that he will not be given back to his government under an accusation of massacre, or murder, or the like, without the accusation being thoroughly tested; while in his own country the simple testimony of a spy, or of a wicked comrade, would be sufficient to hang him. Such, as everyone knows, are the normal conditions in Russia for political offences; and such are, at the present moment, as all English correspondents in Paris could testify, the conditions which now prevail in France.

Is therefore the Bow-street magistrate right in advancing the theory that *any* accusation brought forward by the French Government is sufficient ground for granting the extradition, even if it be shown to be false by contradictory evidence?

If such a view had prevailed in this country and in Switzerland after the Commune, all the hundreds of Communards who found refuge in the two countries ought to have been delivered to be massacred in France. Each one of them (and especially Razoua, whose extradition was asked by France, and refused by Switzerland, thus putting an end to all similar demands) was under an accusation of murder, incendiarism, theft and so on, supported by evidence as reliable—or rather unreliable—as the evidence, exacted under the menace of capital punishment, from that disreputable woman Madame Bricou—a personal enemy of Meunier.

The second precedent established the other day by the Bow-street magistrate is equally, if not even more, important.

Meunier is accused of two things: the explosion at the Café Véry, and the explosion against the walls of the Lobau barracks. The second is, on the face of it, a political act. Militarism is a nuisance all over the world; but nowhere is it such a nuisance as in France. Nowhere have soldiers been so freely used, by both the Empire and the Republic, to massacre the people; nowhere is the country so much the prey of military adventurers, and in real danger, at this moment as well as two years ago, of military dictatorship; nowhere is any attempt at revealing the incredible atrocities committed in the barracks punished so terribly as it is in France; the military man must not be touched, even

when he commits the simply mediæval horrors which are in every-day use in the battalions of discipline in Algeria. (Everyone who wishes to understand France ought to read that terrible book, "Biribi," by Darien, which is an account of what the author himself has suffered in a discipline battalion). Under the permanent menace of a military dictatorship, the hatred against militarism is therefore as much a French growth as the hatred against Tsarism is a Russian growth. And, while there are Anarchists everywhere, it is in France alone that the Anarchists have started an Anti-Patriotic League; that over and over again they have been condemned for anti-patriotic and anti-militarism manifestos; that a numerous series of petty acts of violence have been directed against recruiting boards; and that explosives have been used against the walls of both barracks and recruiting boards.

Meunier may have hated all governments as much as Tolstoi and Auberon Herbert do; but if he has used explosives against the walls of the Lobau barracks (which still remains to be proved), the final impulse must have been given by the rapidly growing hatred of militarism in France. The act is *French* in its essence. It is political.

The English magistrate, absolutely ignorant, of course, of French conditions, has refused to recognise the political character of this act. But why? Because, he says, "Meunier, being an enemy of all government, an act against his own government cannot be treated as a political act."

Never, until now, has an English magistrate taken so much upon his own responsibility. The act, being an act "against Meunier's own government" (in the magistrate's own words), is a political act according to the magistrate's own qualification and to all precedents (see the decision in François' case). But he refused to consider it as political because Meunier is an enemy of all government—i.e., an Anarchist.

Opinion, not the character of the act itself, is henceforward to be considered decisive in extradition matters. The accused's theoretical conceptions—not the direct, final motives which have led him to commit an act of revenge—will settle the matter as to whether he shall find refuge or not in this country. And, while the public opinion of the country, and even its government, refuses to enter into an arrangement with the continental powers in which the fact of a man being an Anarchist would be sufficient to place him beyond the common law, a magistrate grants this extradition treaty by his own authority, without consulting his countrymen, under cover of the fact that, Meunier not being well known, his fate will not attract much attention.

Two precedents, both of the highest importance for the future position of asylum rights, have thus been created. And the question is—Will the public opinion of Great Britain allow these two precedents to be surreptitiously introduced, without being roused to consider their importance?

Will the right of asylum be left to be abolished, or made a matter of opinion, without the public, and especially the workers, forcing upon the lawyers of this country the necessity of raising a protest against the abolition? Will a new extradition treaty be granted *de facto*, while it would be sure to be refused *de jure*, if the country were consulted about it?

There are plenty of people who will not fail to say: "They are only Anarchists." But every intelligent person in the land must understand that the Anarchist Meunier is simply used as a precedent for abolishing *de facto* the right of asylum; and that the consequences of that abolition will soon be felt, after the very first serious labor riot on the continent has compelled revolted workers to seek refuge in what once was the traditional country of refuge for all persecuted men.

OVER THE WATER.

"YESTERDAY morning, 21st May," writes the Barcelona correspondent of *Il Secolo* (May 25), a leading Italian capitalist paper, Spain. "six Anarchists, accomplices in the attempt on Campos: Sogas, Codina, Cerezuola, Arche, Bernat and Sabat, after refusing all religious consolation and loudly proclaiming their Anarchist principles, were shot, at 4 30 a.m., in the fortress of Montjuich. The weather was very bad. The execution was something horrible, and must have shaken the partisans of the death penalty in their conviction. All the 6 were placed in a row and at the first volley all fell. But when the doctor examined them to certify to death, he saw that Codina was still alive. He was lifted up; a second platoon of soldiers fired at him, but did not kill him. Then the *coup de grace* at close quarters (a blow on the head) was given him; the soldier's hand was unsteady, and he had to be shot again. It was such a frightful spectacle that the few lookers on (about 300) were horrified, and several fainted.—The sensation in the city is very great, no less on account of the atrocity and barbarity of the sentence than because of the very way in which the trial was conducted. There is but too good reason for this. Whilst with firm step these unhappy men went to their death, Sabat called out to his military judges: 'Assassins!' and Bernat exclaimed: 'Death to the Inquisition!' This trial was conducted more unjustly than in the days of the Inquisition itself. The proceedings were conducted with closed doors, no communications were made to the papers, no one was allowed to see or speak to the condemned men during the last twenty-four hours. Only a short interview of five minutes' duration was permitted to the relatives, all conversation to be carried on aloud, in the presence of an official, and when Arche complained of the treatment he had received, he was told the visit would be terminated if he did not change the subject.—This

was the last severity, but when we revert to all that has been said about the tortures they have been subjected to in prison—it is something too horrible. It is common talk * that they were kept for four days without food, and then given raw salt cod without water. They were tortured by thirst and stripes, and all the other infamous methods which dishonored the judicial proceedings of the 16th century were resorted to.—The petitions for pardon to the Government were most numerous; the most noteworthy being that of the Republican members of the Cortes, which urged the secrecy of the trial and also the *ill-treatment inflicted upon the prisoners*, so that their depositions could not be regarded as either sincere or accurate. In fact, clemency was asked for in the just cause of humanity.—But all to no effect. He who alone could have done something, and who in Spain governs all, was Marshal Campos. But he would do nothing. Perhaps he wished to add to his triumphs (!!) at Millila these victims to his pride.—Barcelona, however, is certainly not thankful to him, and recollecting his flight from the lines on the day of the attempt on him, it will blame him for the sad state of affairs brought about by his want of generosity, for it is the current opinion that the Anarchists will revenge themselves. Meantime, the procession of the Corpus Domini, which goes through the city with great pomp, has been suspended."

Another account of this execution in *L'Italia del Popolo* (a Milan capitalist paper) 28th May, relates that, "when the terrible tragedy was over, from among the couple of hundred spectators who had, despite the precautions taken, broken through the cordon of soldiery, one advanced to the heap of corpses. When asked, 'Where are you going?' he replied, 'I will see my brother whom you have massacred.' Arche's brother assisted in laying the dead upon the litters. The aged father of Bernat followed the cortege with pitiful moans. Below stands the Navarra Marine prison, in which are more than 400 Anarchists awaiting condemnation. It is said that they rose in tumult when they heard the rattle of the executioners' rifles."

The victims of these barbarities were six of the men picked out from amongst the crowd of arrested Anarchists, and handed over to martial law, last January, on the plea that they had in some way, direct or indirect, a hand in Pallas' attempt. Since then they have been kept and tried in secret, and the public are entirely ignorant of the evidence upon which they were condemned to death.

According to a Madrid correspondent of the *Daily Graphic*, May 29, "Codina was a workman very well known in Barcelona. He was president of a workmen's society called 'Three Kinds of Steam,' to which thousands of artisans belong. Born twenty-six years ago at Gerona, he devoted himself to the Anarchist agitation at an early age. During a short residence in France, he was arrested for taking part in illegal propaganda, but acquitted for want of sufficient evidence. Soon after his return to Spain the Barcelona outrage was committed, and Codina was at once arrested on suspicion. It is said that he confessed to being the maker of the infernal machine used by Franch. Mariano Cerezuola was born at Barbastro, in the province of Huesca. He was a carpenter by profession, and 32 years of age. Besides being charged with having been concerned in the Liceo outrage, he was also accused of complicity in Pallas' attempt on Marshal Campos. Jaime Sogas, also executed on account of the explosion in the Liceo Theatre, was born at Argenton. He gave shelter to Franch for a time in his house. José Bernat, alias Siveval, constructed the model which Codina employed in making the bombs. He is described as a man of literary tastes. Manuel Arche, a well-known agitator and orator, had long been one of the firebrands of Barcelona Anarchism. Sabat was a friend and ally of Codina, and an active member of the Revolutonary party. At the execution he behaved with great coolness, refusing to kneel, and shouting out, 'Long live Anarchy,' even when the bullets were showering on his body."

On May 17th, the daily papers published a telegram from Liège, stating Belgium. that "the German named Muller who was arrested by the police yesterday, on the charge of being concerned in the recent dynamite attempts in this city, has made a full and circumstantial confession. He declared that he was the author of the outrages both at the church of St. Jacques and in the Rue de la Paix, and mentioned the names of several of his accomplices. The police expect to make numerous arrests." A lurid light is cast upon this information by the following letter, which we quote from the Ghent Free Communist paper, *De Fakkel*, for May 27th:—

"Liège, May 19, 1894.
"You might assert that if the anarchist Muller has made statements, the same 'trick' has been used which the Spanish magistrates used against the anarchists: Thirst."

"You might assert, without running the risk of contradiction, that Muller, after eating very salted food, was left to die of thirst. Before the enquiring magistrate stood, as if by chance, a jug of water; and for the sake of one glass of water Muller did make statements."

"That this manner of acting be used against anarchists—let it be so; but is it lawful?"

"And why are we always told about the inquisition?"

"X."

To which *De Fakkel* adds:—

"This letter is reproduced verbatim; we shall for the present add not one word, but, it being true, we should like to know immediately the names of these monstrous beasts."

In Vienna enormous crowds of workmen demonstrated, on May 1st Austria. passing resolutions in favor of extended franchise and an eight-hours' day. There was also a great strike of masons and bricklayers, in the course of which a conflict occurred with the police, who fired on the people, mortally wounding one. What a howl would have been raised if the victim had been on the side of law and order.—An instance of the value set on human life by capitalist society is afforded by the recent mining strikes in Moravia. The men struck for an eight-hours' day and increase of their wages. On Wednesday, 9th May, the men were going to visit the mine and to see if any were at work there, when they were stopped by the gendarmes, who tried to

* Statements to this effect appeared several times, uncontradicted, in the Spanish capitalist press; and the *Journal des Debats* (in February) published a correspondence from Barcelona on the same subject, the details given in which coincided with those in the Spanish newspapers.

prevent them going. But the men insisted, and the order was given to fire, with the result of 10 killed and 33 wounded. The only English paper which had a leader on the subject was the *Evening Standard* of May 10, and the point of view it takes is the excellent occasion afforded by the riot for testing the capabilities of the Mannlicher rifles, which they say worked wonders, the bullets passing through one body to strike another. They also can state with satisfaction that the wounds inflicted are "most terrible," bones being splintered and flesh torn to rags; not one word of indignation is used about this brutal murder. Like all murderers, the Austrian governors are cowards, and, afraid of the consequences of their brutality, buried their victims on the sly, at 3 in the morning, allowing no friends to be present, and surrounding the cemetery with soldiers. When a question was raised on the point in Parliament, the Minister of the Interior merely said that the gendarmes had performed their duty and would have the support of the Government. Count Wilisek, the mine owner, received a deputation of four miners on the subject of this murder, pledged his word that no harm should come to them, and then calmly gave them up to his manager to be punished.

On the first of May well-attended and enthusiastic meetings and processions were organised by our Anarchist comrades at Berlin, Germany. Maintz, Frankfurt-on-the-Main, Leipsig, Stuttgart and elsewhere. The police of course were present in strong numbers, and tried to interfere, provoke or disturb, but failed ignominiously. Where no meetings or processions were possible, Anarchists turned up at the Social Democratic "entertainments," held in the evening, and did not fail to reap good results for our cause there. The citizens of Frankfurt-on-the-Main awoke to a pleasant surprise on May Day. A red flag was hanging triumphantly from the telegraph wires, in centre of the city, with the inscription of "Hurrah for the Social Revolution!" on it. It was first discovered by a policeman, who alarmed the firemen. A vast crowd soon assembled to witness the performance, whilst one fire-escape not being long enough, another was fetched, and after two hours' gallant work, the emblem was removed. Whereupon our comrades proceeded to hold their meeting.—Comrade Ellendt, who as late responsible editor of the *Sozialist* was sentenced on February 9th to a term of imprisonment for an offence against the press law (see *Freedom* for March last), was taken out of his bed, on April 28, at 5 o'clock in the morning, in order to undergo his punishment. It is a noteworthy fact that no notice whatever was previously given to him.—Three more of the most energetic Berlin Anarchists are the victims of arbitrary sentences. On Friday, May 12th, the printer and publisher of the *Sozialist*, Grunau, was sentenced to 18 months; the late editor of the *Sozialist*, Neft, to 8 months; and the latest editor, Reinhardt to 9 months' imprisonment. The charge made against all of them is the printing of the 18 of March issue of the *Sozialist* on red paper; as well as the special issue after the confiscation. All sorts of ridiculous charges are included in the accusation—e.g., having sent away some parcels before the due copy for censorship was sent. The Public Prosecutor tried to make out that forbidden matter was republished in the special issue after the first had been confiscated, whereas, as a matter of fact, the articles confiscated in the previous paper were not reproduced.—On Monday, May 21, a charge was brought up against Dr. Ladislaus Gumpowicz, the mechanic Wiesenthal, and also the Social Democratic editor Theodor von Wächter, for "inciting" speeches at a meeting of unemployed painters. Dr. Gumpowicz, who is now serving 18 months, (see *Freedom* for March) has been sentenced to an additional 9 months; Comrade Wiesenthal, who is also now undergoing his 16 months' imprisonment, has got an additional 3 months; and T. von Wächter, who denied any intention to incite, was acquitted.

It is known that after the shameful behavior of the Italian Government towards the rebels of Massa Carrara and Sicily, a demonstration was held in Zürich (see *Freedom* for March 1894) outside the Italian consulate, which, through the unwarrantable interference of the police, degenerated into a scuffle, the which was followed by the expulsion of the organisers and speakers. But the Government did not restrict itself to expelling the demonstrators; they seized this good opportunity for expelling, on the demand of the Federal Council, the author, Otto Wichers von Gogh, who had raised his voice in a meeting against the shameful regimen in Italy. He was imprisoned, photographed—for the international album of criminals—and finally taken, by administrative order, to the Prussian frontier. No charge was brought against him, no examination made and no defence allowed. He was disliked and this was sufficient reason to sacrifice him. The names of those who were expelled, so far as the Government has allowed them to be known, are: Arthur Cahane, student, from Vienna; Robert Simmerling, cabinet maker, from Germany; Fritz Liess, tailor, from Germany; William Nonnemann, shoemaker, from Germany; Otto Wichers von Gogh, author, from Hamburg; F. Rossi, house painter, from Milan; Giovanni Ottina, workman, from Como. It is noteworthy that these expulsions were no less than direct extraditions. The first batch were received by the French police on the very frontier, and were sent back by the next train; they were then marched to the German frontier and delivered up to the gendarmerie. The author Otto Wichers von Gogh only escaped this fate by his presence of mind. He crossed the French frontier to Belgium, although the station was guarded by police, who twice sought for him. Switzerland is quietly advancing on the downward path. Just lately three other men have been expelled for carrying a black flag. Switzerland already fears the devil, which is the first step towards hell.—So writes a well informed correspondent.

The trial of our Comrade Merlino has been postponed till the next assizes, as the prosecution discover that they have lost one of their most important papers. His advocate, our Comrade Gori, has visited Merlino in prison. He says, he found him confined in a miserable little cell violating all principles of hygiene. He is not allowed books or writing materials. Gori says, the authorities told him that they had orders to treat the prisoner "with courtesy but with great severity."—The Palermo trials are still dragging on. The Public Prosecutor has demanded twenty-three years' imprisonment for de Felice and similar terms for the other accused, and, though the defence has to be got through, it seems by no means improbable that this monstrous sentence will be pronounced.

The events in America during the past two months show a most important development in the labor movement there, and exemplify that at the present moment almost any demonstration, however peaceable its origin, may assume suddenly the proportions of rebellion. Futile as the immediate result of the Coxeyite march has been, it is perhaps a fact of even more significance than the great miners' strike still going on in Pennsylvania. The unemployed army organised by "General" Coxey and his followers was started with the idea of marching an imposing number of out-of-works into Washington, to demand legislation from Congress. At first the idea was treated as a huge joke by the capitalists and their press, but their tone soon altered when they found that from every quarter large reinforcements were starting to swell the army. It began to flurry the rich robbers a little to see their starving slaves emerge from their hovels and unite in one imposing mass. Then the workers found that they required trains to convey them, and, as the companies would not lend trains, they boldly took them; thus accomplishing, as far as it went, a really Anarchist deed of expropriation. The people everywhere have shown themselves sympathetic, and the governing bodies proportionately alarmed. It was hardly to be expected that the first attempt at such a movement should be quite successful. Of course, large numbers of men have been arrested for train stealing, and now they will have time to reflect on their own actions and on the true functions of government and private property. To justify their own acts, they will be led to the idea of expropriation—not of stealing for private ends, but of seizing in the name of the community the means of life. The movement will also have given the workers some little foretaste of their tremendous power, and of how helpless the government might be when brought face to face with determined men. Perhaps, too, the unemployed may take the hint not to waste their time in future marching backwards and forwards from one relieving officer to another, as has hitherto been the case here in London, as well as elsewhere, but to make better use of their time and strength. Our Comrade Addis writes to us from America that the people listen willingly and with much interest wherever Anarchy is spoken of, to the great annoyance of the State Socialists and other pettifogging politicians. Speaking of the Coxeyites, he says that he considers the general condition of affairs in America shows that they are much nearer the Revolution than we are. Comrade Own writes:—

"I have always found the ordinary Socialist in England, and those who come from time to time over here, looking at things from this point of view—if there are nice, orderly meetings, and the reformers are genial and harmonious, everything is lovely; whereas, when there are hubbubs and bitterness all round, they think that there is no 'movement.' I think all this a great mistake, since the frightful chaos and the exceeding bitterness on all sides (and among the reformers themselves as evidenced in their papers) are really the outward and visible signs of the inward and spiritual break-up. After all, the great guarantee of revolution is, as McEwen says, 'a belief that this should be a poor man's country and not a rich man's country.' This seems to me a much surer guarantee of change than any amount of beautifully disciplined organisations."

PUNISHMENT AND CIVILISATION.

A flogging machine has been invented in Berlin which has been called an "aid to civilisation." Well, to such a civilisation as that under which we are living perhaps it is an aid. At any rate, it has been tried and the effects, we are told, were so terrible that numbers of the spectators fainted—these same spectators being, mind you, as the phrase goes, "hardened criminals," who were specially trotted out to view this refined example of doing as you would be done by. The official features, however, were no doubt radiant with smiles, since the report says, "the officials present were highly pleased, and pronounced it perfection." For the spectacle of a man completely reduced to a brute you cannot equal the "official."

LAW AND PUBLIC OPINION.

Miss Ida Wells, who has come to England to rouse public opinion against the barbarous exhibitions of race hatred which have lately taken place in the Southern States of America, says that, so far as the question of brutal injustice to negroes is concerned, there are plenty of laws which could be used for their protection; but these laws are a dead letter, "because there is no public opinion to back them up." "Why, certainly," as the Americans say; that is what we are always urging. If you have got the public opinion you don't want the laws, and if you have not got the public opinion the laws are worse than useless.

IT IS PROPOSED shortly to have A SOCIAL EVENING and "RUMMAGE SALE" for the FREEDOM Publication Fund. All articles, old and new, clothing, books, ornaments, &c., which are clean and in good condition enough to be useful to any one, will be gratefully received for the sale by Mrs. Marsh, 3, Alpha Villas, Archway-rd., London N.

* Articles have already been received from B. Fraser, C. R., T. Primmer, O. R., L. Bevington, C. W., L. Hyde, A. Marsh, J. Tochatti, N. F. Dryhurst.

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, 61, ST. AUGUSTINE'S ROAD, CAMDEN-TOWN, LONDON, N.W.

Notice to Subscribers.—If there is a blue mark against this notice your subscription is due, and must be sent before next month if you wish to go on receiving the paper.

Back Numbers.—Vol. I., October 1886 to September 1887 (No. 2 sold out), price 2s. Vol. II., October 1887 to September 1888 (Nos. 16, 17, 18, 19 sold out), price 1s. 6d. Vol. III., October 1888 to December 1889, price 1s. 6d. Vol. IV., January to December 1890, price 1s. Vol. V., January to December 1891, price 1s. Carriage: single volumes, 2d., five volumes, 6d., throughout the United Kingdom.

NOTES.

THE MODERN INQUISITION.

Our Spanish comrades have not only been executed with the most barbarous cruelty, upon accusations so unfair and evidence so flimsy that the prosecution did not dare to make them public, but it seems no longer possible to doubt that, before trial, they have been *deliberately tortured* to induce them to make revelations. According to *Il Secolo*, several Spanish papers and a Barcelona correspondent of *Le Journal des Debats*, the Anarchist prisoners were starved for four days, then fed on raw, salt cod, but denied any drink. Afterwards, maddened by thirst, they were taken before the examining officer, upon whose table stood a bottle of water, and whose confessed drank. These and other horrors have circulated *uncontradicted* in the Spanish, Italian, and French press, though the English papers, generally so eager for sensational details, have ignored them, together with the ghastly accounts, which we quote elsewhere, of the execution. A most suggestive exception is the *Daily Graphic*, for Jan. 22nd, which published a picture, professing to be taken from a photograph, of Franch, *chained by the leg in his bed* in the Saragossa prison, together with the following remarks:—

"Although unable to move in consequence of the severity of the wounds he inflicted upon himself when arrested, Franch is secured by a chain, which attaches his leg to the ceiling of his cell. Otherwise every arrangement is made for his comfort."

Finally, the Republican Members of Cortes presented a petition for the pardon of the Barcelona Anarchists, on the ground that their *confessions had been extorted from them by ill-treatment*, as well as on that of the secrecy of the trial. The petition was refused, but its grounds do not seem to have been disputed. After this, doubt seems impossible. Worse still, the horror tends to spread. If the information we reprint from *De Fakkel* be confirmed, the Belgian police are beginning to copy their ancient Spanish foes and apply to Anarchist prisoners a torture as agonising as any inflicted by the rack or thumbscrew of the Inquisition. As in the case of the victims of the Inquisition also, the torment is inflicted for holding obnoxious opinions. Spain and Belgium do not torture their common-law prisoners, however atrocious the crime of which they are suspected.

TORTURE AND EXTRADITION.

The theory of English refusal of extradition of political offenders is that they cannot expect fair treatment from governments of which they are avowed enemies. Again, in the case of the one so-called civilised Government which professes to torture suspected persons—Buenos Ayres—England refuses the extradition of any criminals, hence the difficulty about Jabez Balfour. Even to secure so notorious a rogue, England refuses an exchange of suspected criminals with a government which cannot be trusted not to use unfair means to obtain confessions. But what about the extradition of Anarchists on the pretext that they have committed some crime? If the thin edge of the wedge introduced in the François case be widened by the extradition of Meunier, the next demand for an Anarchist rebel may come from Belgium, or even Spain; and will that extradition be granted too without examination of evidence as to innocence or guilt, on the plea that the prisoner may expect a fair trial in his own Country? We appeal not merely to comrades, but to every honest man and woman in England, to protest against this shameful, sneaking persecution of opinion; against the vexatious arrests, the secret interrogations, the prison tortures, the military tribunals, the trials with closed doors, to which men and women, merely suspected of holding Anarchist principles, are being subjected abroad; and, above all, to protest against any attempt to hand over Anarchists taking refuge in England to governments which subject them to such treatment, and from which they have no justice or mercy to expect, however innocent they may be.

MEUNIER.

The French Government and the English "Third Section" have not found the extradition of Meunier quite so easy as they expected. After fighting the question inch by inch before the Bow-street magistrate, the Defence Committee have carried it to the Court of Queen's Bench, Meunier has never been legally identified, and the only evidence against him is the unsworn statement of a dubious character, one Mrs. Bricou,

who with her husband was arrested for complicity in the Café Vêry explosion. Her husband was transported, but she was liberated after denouncing Meunier, whom she hated, as her accomplice. This informer's unsworn statement Sir J. Bridge determined to accept, and refused to pay any attention to four witnesses who came over from Paris to swear an alibi. "It seems," says *La Petite République*, "that Sir John Bridge acted thus in compliance with a communication sent to him by the Prefecture of the police at Paris, begging him to consider the evidence brought by the persons called as witnesses for Meunier as of no value, as they were, according to the Prefect, friends of the Anarchist, and determined to save him at all costs." (Quoted by *L'Eclair*, May 28.) The objects of the Defence committee are, 1st, to prevent a man whom they believe innocent, but who during the dynamite scare was condemned to death by default, from being delivered up to his enemies, the French Government; 2nd, to insure publicity for the important extradition questions raised by this case, and prevent this dangerous precedent escaping the notice of English public opinion; 3rd, to make foreign governments realise that, in any case, it is impossible to obtain the extradition of "social criminals" without heavy expenses and many difficulties.

THE WALTHAM EXPLOSION.

The good people of Waltham must surely by this time be of opinion that government, besides being an expensive luxury, is a bit of a nuisance at times. Fancy having all the windows in one's house smashed, on an average rather more often than once a quarter. As to the sacrifice of human life (a rather strong point with governments), of what avail is it to upbraid this monster without a conscience? As well preach to the stones. And these explosives, why are they made? For the maintaining by force of all the injustices which to-day are crushing humanity. Is this not becoming clear to a daily-increasing number of people?

GOVERNMENT INSPECTION.

There is another view of this Waltham explosion which bears its own moral. The genius of an Asquith has just been engaged in the production of another Factory Act. The other, which we have been told did so much good, don't seem to have succeeded after all. If Mrs. Webb is to be relied upon, this latest one is going to fail grievously. We are inclined to think she is right. But why in the name of common sense ask the workers to put their affairs in the hands of a body which cannot manage its own business? This is what we read about the state of affairs at the Government factory at Waltham: "The storehouses and incorporating houses seem to have been constructed without a thought for the safety of the workers. They are packed up closely together within fifty yards of the great magazine that was blown up, where they have not even the elementary protection of earthworks, and yet there, in constant and acknowledged peril, a hundred men and boys are kept working. This has not been done without knowledge and warning." There have been five explosions in five months and 13 men have been killed besides many injured. If it were not for the absurdity of the thing we should be inclined to say, *Government, inspect thyself!*

ENGLISH MINERS AT BERLIN.

The English miners would do well to look carefully after their "labor representatives." At the International Miners' Congress their attitude certainly was much more as if they were representatives of the mine-owners than of the miners. When the continental miners insisted upon proclaiming the principle that the owners are responsible for all accidents which may happen in a mine, even when traced in the first instance to a neglect of the miner, the English delegates bitterly opposed this view. Nevertheless, the foreigners were right.

"ACCIDENTS."

It is known that no amount of inspection has succeeded in compelling the owners to properly ventilate the mines, and that for one well ventilated mine there are, at least, ten explosion traps. The miners know perfectly well that no amount of precaution, no safety lamps, can entirely prevent an explosion when the mine is not cleared of fire damp. Again, as to the use of explosives for blasting the coal. No amount of danger can prevent the miner from using them, even at great risk to his life; but why? Because the low wages he is paid, especially in working bad seams of coal, *compel* him to risk his life in order to earn a living. Accidents from such causes are like railway collisions caused by the signalman falling asleep after sixteen hours' work. Are such "accidents" the men's fault or the masters'?

NOT EVEN THE MINIMUM WAGE!

In the wages question, again, the English delegates behaved exactly as if they were the delegates of the mine owners. They seemed to wish the miners never to ask an increase of wages unless they agreed to leave a lion's share of profit to the employers. The continental proposal of the State establishing a minimum wage was certainly bad; very bad indeed. But it contained the principle, badly expressed, that what the miner has for his work need not depend upon the amount of the employer's profits. State regulated wages are rubbish; but the "living wage" is not rubbish at all, but a most elementary step toward justice, and the consideration of the employers' profits ought to have nothing to do with the demands for it. If the mine owners can't pay a "living wage" and live in luxury, let them give up some of their luxuries. And they don't care to own mines under such conditions, let them clear out and give the miners a chance to see how they can run the business for themselves. It seems as if the legal reforms so zealously advocated

by Fabians and other Social Democrats were quenching all Socialistic aspirations in working class organisations already.

The London Cab Strike.

At last the London cab-drivers are awakening. Wednesday, 16th May, saw the beginning of one of the most remarkable strikes that, I should think, ever took place. Four weeks ago anybody who had said that 7,000 cab-drivers would strike work and stick together would have been laughed at.

Now, what is it that these men require and are undergoing so much privation to obtain? In winter time the masters ask for a cab and 2 horses 11s. to 13s. a-day, rising, in proportion, to 19s. in the first week in June, or even in some cases to a guinea a-day. This is in the big yards, like Patsy Hearn, for example. This many of the men say it is impossible to obtain and to keep a wife and family. If a man is paying say 15s. and the yard money, 1s. 9d.—that is say, 16s. 9d.—that means, with men on ranks to look after the horse, that it costs him 17s. 6d. a-day before he has got anything for himself. This means that a man must work, as a rule, 14 to 16 hours a-day, and that he is lucky if he can do it in less. It often means that a man walks home in the early hours of the morning, after working 16 hours, with 2s. or 3s. wages, and sometimes none at all; and if he has not taken the master's money, it means he has got to go to the pawnshop towards getting it, for fear of losing his job.

Now, what the men offer is 13s. a-day to the end of May, and 15s. in June—that to be the highest price in summer—and 11s. a-day in the winter. This the masters refused; and the consequence was the great strike, when in one morning 7,000 men came out, north, south, east and west, with practically no organisation behind them, but with one idea—the general strike.

At first there were rumours of there being a large number of black-legs, but, as a matter of fact, on the first morning of the strike there were not more than 30 all over London; and these men, knowing how cabmen like blacklegs, most of them took themselves home again. On the twelfth day of the strike the men are as determined as ever.

Whether the men are beaten or not, the strike has been the means of making a large number, whose average ideas are the points of a horse, study the social problem. To see the way these men listen to you and argue on Anarchist Communism in their different Shelters, it is really wonderful; a class of men who have been given up by the Trade Unionists as useless. These men, who see the competitive system of society in its worst character, can readily understand the Anarchist-Communist position, when it is put before them. There are a few comrades, cab-drivers, who are doing propaganda work which must eventually teach these men that they must not fight only to wring a paltry few shillings from the masters, but unite with us for the abolition of mastership and tyranny altogether; that a system of voluntary co-operation shall take the place of this cursed system of misery, and—

"That man to man, the world o'er,
Shall brothers be for a' that!"

Hurrah for Anarchy!

WILLIAM WRIGHT,
Cab-driver.

* * We have opened a subscription list for the Cab drivers on strike, and appeal to all comrades and sympathisers to send us what they can spare. All contributions will be acknowledged in *Freedom*.

The following amounts have been already received:—A. W., £1; W. W., 6d.; L. H., 6d.; A. H., 6d.

A Bloody Vengeance.

"SOCIETY has been vindicated," indignantly writes an Anarchist Correspondent; "justice has been done. In Paris Emile Henry has died on the guillotine. In Barcelona 6 Anarchists after having been put to horrible tortures have been shot. What delightful reading for the bourgeoisie. But what cannot be quite so pleasant to them is that these men have all met death like heroes, with a smile on their lips and 'Long live Anarchy' for their last words. Lie as it will, the bourgeois press cannot deny this fact, and it is easy to see that it makes them uncomfortable. There must be some tremendous power in an idea which can make men face death with such calm, nay triumphant courage, which is quite incomprehensible to the ordinary capitalist mind, which can only take interest in swindling and money making. So they try to make out that this courage is simply the result of a defective moral sense, but they know themselves it is a lie. They know that the intense hatred shown them by these comrades of ours is a proof of their intense love of freedom and sympathy with the oppressed. You cannot love the right without hating the wrong. Well, let them go on shooting and guillotining they will be paid back in kind. As the *Echo* (May 22nd) says in an article on the subject, you must reap as you sow, and if government sows violence and vengeance it must not be surprised at reaping violence and vengeance in return. Let our masters also remember Walt Whitman's words—

'Not a grave of the murder'd for freedom but grows seed for freedom, in its turn to bear seed.

Which the winds carry afar and re-sow, and the rains and snows nourish.

Not a disembodied spirit can the weapons of tyrants let loose,

But it stalks invisibly over the earth, whispering, counseling, cautioning.'

Yes, the bloody minded hypocritical Society of to-day will be taught before long that 'there is a wit not for the conquered alone.'

Another comrade, writing in a more reflective strain, after dwelling on the grotesque extravagances of the London season and the degrading dependence of many workers for their livelihood, under the present system, upon the riotous extravagances of the idler of the rich, goes on to observe: "It is facts like these, coupled with the tyranny of governments and middle-class rule, that drives some natures to desperation! Especially if by the study of social problems their imaginations have been quickened into a vivid conception of what life might be.

Emile Henry, who has just been guillotined is a case in point. Here we have an intelligent and capable human being deliberately choosing a line of conduct which brings him inevitably to the scaffold. He meets his death with the same consistency that characterizes all his acts. Despite what the stupid editors of stupid papers may say, he was perhaps as far removed from what is understood by the word criminal as could possibly be. Impatient of control, impatient at the revolting sight of injustice which constantly met his eyes, spurred on also, no doubt, by the life-long remembrance of the cruelly unjust punishment inflicted on his parents—to strike back became the dominant and all-absorbing idea of his life. He struck back; indiscriminately, foolishly, barbarously if you will. But who has the right to condemn him? You? or I? or his Judge? To condemn him? Certainly we have no such right. But society? Ah! society. Society has always the right to 'protect' itself, has it not, no matter who the blood it may shed. But then a voice will be heard to say—it is heard faintly even now—"Society, why that is precisely the guilty thing—the logical and inevitable cause of Emile Henry's acts of retaliation. For has not Madame de Staël pointed out that 'the fury of revolts give us the measure of the vices of institutions.'"

It is not by any means only amongst Anarchists that such thoughts and feelings have been awakened by the bloody vengeance of middle-class society upon its French and Spanish assailants. The howl of triumphant execration which welcomed the death of Ravachol, was perceptibly less hearty after that of Vaillant. On the present occasion it is not merely weaker, but confused by other cries and mutterings in a widely different strain. The more radical press betrays a sort of horror and sympathy, of which it is half afraid and ashamed. Of the *Echo* and especially of its weekly edition still more may be said. It has been distinctly humanitarian in tone—and has spoken some straight words to the ruling classes. And the attitude of the press accurately reflects that of a large portion of the more thoughtful in all classes. They are becoming sick of all this bloodshed. For, after all, what is society? Not a fiend, or even a heartless and mindless monster; but a mass of human beings, with hearts to be touched and minds to be convinced. And it is our work as Anarchists to appeal to those hearts and minds, pressing upon them a 'larger conception' of the claims of human personality and of human fellowship, till it becomes insufferable to society to sit down quietly in the presence of such oppression and misery as provoke the deeds of a Henry or a Pallas, or to take a cruel revenge upon those who are goaded to violent rebellion by agony and wrong.

The Trial of Jean Grave.

On February 24th, Jean Grave was condemned by the Parisian Assize Court to two years' imprisonment and £40 fine, as author of the book "Anarchism and Moribund Society." (See *Freedom* for July, 1893, and for March last.) We are now able to give our readers full particulars of this most interesting trial of the right of a citizen of the French republic to express revolutionary Anarchist ideas, together with a brilliant defence of Anarchist modes of thought in the speech of M. de St. Aubin, Grave's counsel.

PART I.

EVIDENCE FOR THE DEFENCE—THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR'S ACCUSATIONS.

After the reading of the indictment, the witnesses were sent out of court and the Presiding Judge, M. Comoy, interrogated the accused, Jean Grave. "I say 'interrogated,'" writes the reporter of *La Libre Parole*, "but in truth the President had all the talking to himself and made an address that was really a brief for the prosecution."

"This address lasted exactly thirty minutes. During the whole time Jean Grave never uttered a word. A short man, with the unaffected and resigned manner of one who believes in the Idea, he listened and disdained to reply.

"At the conclusion, when asked if he admitted himself to be the author of the incriminated work, he merely said, without any arrogance: 'I accept all responsibilities!'

"The examination of the witnesses was at once proceeded with.

ELYSÉE RECLUS.

"The first, M. Elysée Reclus appeared, causing some sensation. Every one leaned forward to see the fine head with its silvered hair and soft yet penetrating eyes.

"For twenty-five years," said he, "I have known Jean Grave. I have a deep affection for him. He has educated himself in a manner worthy to be admired. He has pursued his studies with a very praiseworthy persistence. His intelligence is of the highest order. Jean Grave is chiefly interested in anthropology. Knowing Jean Grave's character and way of life, I can say that he has never encouraged or advised any criminal act."

M. le President: "In one of the passages of the book he has manifestly appealed to violence. He says to the soldiers, speaking of their officers: 'That won't cost you any the more: rip* them up.'"

Witness: "I do not know the context of the passage, so can neither explain

* The whole passage is in Chapter XIII., p. 167-70, and with the context runs as follows:—"What matter to us your country, your frontiers, your arbitrary national limitations! Your country exploits us, your frontiers stifle us, your nationalities are foreign to us. We are men, citizens of the world; all men are our brothers; our only enemies are our masters, are those who exploit us, who hinder us from evolving freely, from developing to our utmost. We no longer wish to act as defenders of your privileges, we no longer wish to be forced to wear the degrading livery of your militarism, to bear the yoke of your brutalising discipline. We will bow no more before you, we will be free. And you, poor devils, destined to fall into the clutches of the military law, and who read in your papers accounts of the injustices committed every day in the name of discipline, who have heard tales of the infamous treatment to which are subjected those who are fools enough to allow themselves to be enrolled, will not you reflect on the life which is awaiting you in the barracks? And all you who hitherto have only seen military life with the eyes of the poets who have glorified it, can you not see through the cheating of these bourgeois writers, who sing in every key the military virtues, military honor and warlike dignity? Go, poor devils, awed by the magic of the word Country, or who fear the court martial, go and waste the best years of your youth in those schools of corruption called barracks. Go, knowing the fate in store for you.

"If you wish to serve your time without mishap, lay aside with your civilian clothes all feeling of personal dignity, seal up in your heart of hearts all manly independence: military virtue and honor require that you should be but a killing

nor defend it."

President: "Jean Grave has been in your service?"

Witness: "Never!"

President: "At least in the service of your ideas? For instance, was he not the manager of your paper, *Le Révolté*, which came out in Geneva? You asked Grave to go there and see you. You edit the paper."

Witness: "There was neither editor nor manager on our paper. There were only collaborators; for each number one of the collaborators catered for the paper; he was editor and manager at the same time. It would be my turn today, Grave's the next, and then another's."

The Attorney-General: "Are you not the Mr. Reclus who was condemned at Lyons in 1882?"

Witness: "I am not aware of it. I have not been condemned at all, and I did not appear before any court at Lyons or elsewhere in 1882."

President: "You have collaborated on *Le Révolté* and afterwards on *La Révolte*?"

Witness: "That is correct."

President: "Very well; at the time of the Ravachol affair *La Révolte* condemned the Anarchist's act. In the following number the paper retracted those sentiments and approved of Ravachol. Can you tell us why?"

Witness: "Each is the master of his opinion, and I have not to answer for the collaborators who signed those two articles."

President: "That will do, sir. You can sit down."

OCTAVE MIRBEAU.

Now enters M. Octave Mirbeau, a serious and well-known Parisian man of letters, who wrote the preface to Jean Grave's book.

M. Saint-Auban [counsel for the defence]: "Will the witness tell us in what esteem he holds Jean Grave?"

Witness: "I have never seen Jean Grave. I know him only by his writings, which I have read with the greatest interest."

President: "It was you who wrote the preface to the book?"

Witness: "That is true. I was carried away by the dignity of the ideas that I met with in this volume, by the lofty and noble mental attitude of Jean Grave, and I am come here to testify to my esteem for him, esteem which is shared by many other writers, who might come and say the same."

M. Saint-Auban: "But what do you think of Jean Grave as the author of the treatise?"

Witness: "Jean Grave? I consider him as an apostle, as a superior logician. He carries his reasoning to its logical conclusions, and so reaches a certain violence; but to really understand his thought his book must be read in its entirety."

Attorney-General: "That is your personal opinion, Mr. Mirbeau?"

Witness: "Precisely."

President: "Will you tell us what is thought of Jean Grave in the literary world?"

Witness: "It depends on what you consider the literary world, that would include from the Academy to the *Chat Noir*." (Laughter.)

President: "In your literary world?"

Witness: "Very well, sir; in that world Grave is considered an honest man, and one of fine intellect. I may add that he is a great authority."

President: "Is his book original?"

Witness: "All Mr. Grave's ideas may be traced in all philosophers. He possesses the ideas familiar to men of his temperament."

Attorney-General: "In your preface, and notoriously in this passage where you suppose a conversation with one of your friends, who says to you: 'Anarchy is very well; but what disquiets me is the propaganda by deed, terrorism,' you reply: 'What matters it that the storm throws down the voracious oaks in the forest, provided that the beneficent rain revives the parched grass.' Will you clearly explain your thought?"

Witness: "You take an isolated phrase. The whole preface ought to be read. Besides, the voracious oaks overturned. . . . It is somewhat so that all revolutions are effected; 1793, for example. The Revolution of 1793 slew too, despite the great love for humanity which it proclaimed. It is the history of all governments. All who put themselves in power got there through death. I have an ardent love of life. No revolution takes place without violence; but I reject and regret the violence, and have always done so."

PAUL ADAM.

M. Paul Adam was the third witness heard. This is how he replied to the President's questions:—

"I do not know Jean Grave personally, though I have had some literary relations with him by correspondence. I see him for the first time here. But I can say that I should be very proud to have written his book."

BERNARD LAZARE.

M. Bernard Lazare, another well-known writer, the last witness, is no less brief nor less haughty.

"I have known Jean Grave," said he, "for four years. He is one of the men whose friendship I most prize. His uprightness and probity are beyond dispute. He is a writer of very great talent. His book is one of the finest that I know, and, like many others, I should wish to have written it myself."

THE PROSECUTION.

M. Bulot, Attorney-General, next held forth. His speech for the prosecution lasted two hours and ten minutes exactly. "It was made up," says *La Libre Parole*, "of a great many quotations from M. Grave's work: the quotations gave the audience the impression of an erudite

machine, a passive brute; for if by ill-luck you have harbored under the uniform they have clothed you in the least scrap of pride it may be fatal to you.

"If a drunken brute insults you and he happens to wear epaulettes, take care to hide all the natural indignation which will overcome you, in spite of yourself, and give the military salute with the hand which you have raised to strike your insulter. If you have opened your mouth to answer an insult or threat, shut it with the words 'Corporal, you are right.' But indeed you should make no sign by word or gesture, for the least sign of emotion may be considered satirical and bring down on you punishment for want of respect to your superiors. Whatever the insult, whatever the outrage, you must stiffen yourself against the anger which would lead you to retaliate, you must continue immovable, calm, inert, your hand to your side, your feet in position. Come, that's right! You are unmoved by insult, you do not wince? No! That's good; now you're a good soldier. Such are the demands of the Country on its defenders.

"But," say you, "if we find it impossible to be calm; if, in spite of ourselves, the blood rushes to our heads, making us 'see red'?"

"Then there is but one way: do not enter this prison house, which you can only leave when degraded, brutalised and corrupted. If you wish to be men don't be soldiers; if you don't know how to swallow insults don't wear the uniform. But if you have committed the imprudence of wearing it, and if one day you are placed in the position of no longer being able to swallow your indignation . . . do not insult nor strike your superiors! . . .

"Rip them up, it will cost you no more."

book, always vigorous, often bold even to the extreme, but savoring, in spite of all, of a powerful logic and an unusual sincerity."

The *Times* for February 26 summarises and comments on the accusation as follows:—

"Although the book as a whole was prosecuted, certain passages were specified, e.g.,

"In the first place, Anarchists should renounce the war of army with army, battles fought regularly in the open, combats of great strategists, who lead out their battalions as the chessplayer does his men. The struggle should principally be directed to the destruction of institutions, to the burning of title deeds and lawyers' papers and surveys, to the overturning of boundary posts, &c.—in a word, to the expropriation of capitalists." [Page 221.]

"This was what, according to the prosecution, constituted incitement to murder, pillage, and arson. This passage, however, was torn from a context in which various refinements of reservation gave it a decidedly different bearing. Thus, on the very next page, carrying out and limiting his thought, M. Grave says:—

"From hatred of property certain Anarchists have even justified theft. We do not pretend to bring the robber to the bar; this task we leave to the middle-class society, of which he is the product. But in fighting for the destruction of individual property, what we mainly have in view to be destroyed is the appropriation by some to the detriment of all of the means of existence." [Page 223.]

"And going on, he says of *la propagande par le fait*, that while this is nothing else than thought in action, yet 'this action should have an end, be conscious of what it is about, arrive at some meditated result, and not turn against that result.' Illustrating these generalities in a purely scientific spirit of casuistry, he points out that the burning of a workshop, 'without rhyme or reason,' where the employer is 'passably good,' would simply result in calling down the wrath of the workmen upon the incendiaries and upon the ideas which placed the torch in their hands. But if, on the contrary, during a protracted general strike, in which some exacting or intriguing employer, who prevented his colleagues from yielding to the workmen's requests, were killed as an 'exploiter,' or his workshop burned, 'the cause of such acts could not be misunderstood, and they would certainly be applauded by the whole labor world.' [Page 225.]

"This second case was cited by the Public Prosecutor as ground for the charge of provoking to murder, pillage, &c., but the limiting clauses were not mentioned, nor such a passage as this, which immediately follows:—

"As for the question whether there are some acts and theories from which we should sever ourselves, it is very evident that there is a kind of propaganda, certainly subsidised, which has slipped in among us, and which the exaggeration of temperament of certain well-meaning comrades has helped to further, but against which we must defend ourselves with all our strength. Certainly, for those who are impatient to see our dream of happiness and harmony realised, what is taking place at present in our ranks may be discouraging, and may make them despair of ever seeing a settlement issue from the chaos of ideas, which, under the name of Anarchy, are making war more or less against the middle class. But let us leave the impatient to vociferate, while we define ideas, and while the theories formed with more reflection gradually become more and more harmonious—so much the more as no obstacle will thus have been opposed to the free evolution of thought." [Page 234-35.]

"And one other cited as a basis for the charge of 'inciting soldiers to disobedience.' This was as follows:—

"When once the soldiers have been obliged to study the institution closely, when they have had to bow under the brutalising discipline, when they have had to support the rebuffs and insults of the epauletted class, respect has disappeared. They have begun to tear the mask from the accursed thing. They have snapped their fingers at the virtues with which their predecessors had been pleased to deck it, and the soldier—the officer as well—has begun to appear before the public in his real light, that is, as an alcoholic brute, an unthinking machine. Ah! it is necessary to have dwelt in this hell to understand all that an honest man can suffer there. One must have worn the uniform to know all that it covers of baseness and idiocy." [Page 160.]

The Advocate-General concluded by regretting that the law was not more severe, and he asked for the *maximum* penalty—five years' imprisonment—for "this professor of Anarchy, the inspirer of the Vaillants and the Leauthiers."

(To be concluded.)

THE CONQUEST OF BREAD.

By PETER KROPOTKINE.

CHAPTER V.—FOOD.

v.

WE have now to consider by what means a city in a state of revolution could supply itself with food. Before answering this question it should be pointed out that obviously the means resorted to will depend on the character of the revolution in the provinces, and in neighboring countries. If the entire nation, or, better still, if all Europe should accomplish the Social Revolution simultaneously, and start with thoroughgoing Communism, our procedure would be simplified; but if only a few communities in Europe make the attempt, other means will have to be chosen. The circumstances will dictate the measures.

We are thus led, before proceeding further, to glance at the state of Europe, and, without pretending to prophesy, we ought to be able to foresee what course the Revolution will take, or at least what will be its essential features.

Certainly it would be very desirable that all Europe should rise at once, that expropriation should be general, and that Communistic principles should inspire all and sundry. Such a universal rising would do much to simplify the task of our century.

But all the signs lead us to believe that it will not take place. That the Revolution will embrace Europe, we do not doubt. If one of the four great continental capitals—Paris, Vienna, Brussels or Berlin—rises in revolution and overturns its government, it is almost certain that the three others will follow its example within a few weeks' time. It is, moreover, highly probable that the Peninsulas and even London and St. Petersburg would not be long in following suit. But whether the revolution would have everywhere the same character is quite another question.

Though it is more than probable that expropriation will be everywhere carried into effect on a larger or smaller scale, and that this policy carried out by anyone of the great nations of Europe will influence all the rest, yet the beginnings of the Revolution will exhibit great local differences, and its course will vary in different countries. In 1789-1793, the French peasantry took four years to finally rid themselves of the redemption of feudal rights, and the bourgeois to overthrow royalty. Let us keep that in mind, therefore, and be prepared to see the Revolution develop itself somewhat gradually. Let us not be disheartened if here and there its steps should move less rapidly. Whether it would take an avowedly Socialist character in all European nations, at any rate at the beginning, is doubtful. Germany, be it remembered, is still realising its dream of a United Empire. Its advanced parties see visions of a Jacobin Republic like that of 1848, and of the organisation of labor according to Louis Blanc; while the French people, on the other hand, want above all things a free Commune, whether it be a Commune or not.

That, when the coming Revolution takes place, Germany will go further than France, there is every reason to believe. The middle-class Revolution in France in the eighteenth century was an advance on the English Revolution of the seventeenth, abolishing as it did at once the power of the throne and of the landed aristocracy, whose influence still survives in England. But, if Germany goes further and does greater things than the France of 1848, there can be no doubt that the ideas which will foster the birth of the Revolution will be those of 1848, as the ideas which will inspire the Revolution in Russia will be those of 1789, modified somewhat by the intellectual movements of our own century.

Without, however, attaching to these forecasts a greater importance than they merit, we may safely conclude this much: the Revolution will take a different character in each of the different European nations; the point attained in the socialisation of wealth will not be everywhere the same.

Will it therefore be necessary, as is sometimes suggested, that the nations in the vanguard of the movement should adapt their pace to those who lag behind? Must we wait till the Communist Revolution is ripe in all civilised countries? Clearly not! Even if it were a thing to be desired it is not possible. History does not wait for the laggards.

Besides, we do not believe that in any one country the Revolution will be accomplished at a stroke, in the twinkling of an eye, as some Socialists dream. It is highly probable that if one of the five or six large towns of France—Paris, Lyons, Marseilles, Lille, Saint Etienne, Bordeaux—were to proclaim the Commune, the others would follow its example, and that many smaller towns would do the same. Probably also various mining districts and industrial centres would hasten to rid themselves of "owners" and "masters," and form themselves into free groups.

But many country places have not advanced to that point. Side by side with the revolutionised communes such places would remain in an expectant attitude and would go on living on the Individualist system. Undisturbed by visits of the bailiff or the tax-collector, the peasants would not be hostile to the revolutionaries, and thus, while profiting by the new state of affairs, they would defer the settlement of accounts with the local exploiters. But with that practical enthusiasm which always characterises agrarian uprisings (witness the passionate toil of 1792) they would throw themselves into the task of cultivating the land, which, freed from taxes and mortgages, would become so much dearer to them.

As to foreign countries, there would be Revolution everywhere, but Revolution under various aspects; here State Socialism, there Federation; everywhere more or less of Socialism, but uniformity nowhere.

VI.
LET us now return to our city in revolt and consider how its folk are to be fed. How are the necessary provisions to be obtained if the nation as a whole has not accepted Communism? That is the question to be solved. Take for example one of the large French towns—take the capital itself, for that matter. Paris consumes every year thousands of tons of grain, 350,000 head of oxen, 200,000 calves, 300,000 swine, and more than two millions of sheep, besides great quantities of game. This huge city devours, besides, eighteen million pounds of butter, 172 million eggs, and other produce in like proportion.

It imports flour and grain from the United States and from Russia, Hungary, Italy, Egypt and the Indies; live stock from Germany, Italy, Spain—even Roumania and Russia; and, as for groceries, there is not a country in the world that it does not lay under contribution. Now, let us see how Paris or any other great town could be revictualled by home-grown produce, supplies of which would be readily and willingly sent in from the provinces.

To those who put their trust in "authority" the question will appear quite simple. They would begin by establishing a strongly centralised government, furnished with all the machinery of coercion: the police, the army, the guillotine. This government would draw up a statement of all the produce contained in France. It would divide the

country into districts of supply, and then *command* that a prescribed quantity of some particular food stuff be sent to such a place on such a day, and delivered at such a station, to be there received on a given day by a specified official and stored in particular warehouses.

Now, we declare with the fullest conviction, not merely that such a solution is undesirable, but that it never could by any possibility be put into practice. It is wildly utopian!

Pen in hand, one may dream such a dream in the study, but in contact with reality it comes to nothing; for, like all such theories, it leaves out of account the spirit of independence that is in man. The attempt would lead to a universal uprising, three or four *vendées* in one, the villages warring against the towns, all France up in arms defying the city for its arrogance in attempting to impose such a system upon the country.

But enough of Jacobin utopias! Let us see if some other form of organisation will fit the case.

In 1793 the provinces starved the large towns, and killed out the Revolution. And yet it is a known fact that the production of grain in France during 1792-93 had not diminished, indeed the evidence goes to show that it had increased. But after having taken possession of the manorial lands, after having reaped a harvest from them, the peasants would not part with their grain for paper-money. They withheld their produce, waiting for a rise in the price, or the introduction of gold. The most rigorous measures of the National Convention were without avail, and even the fear of death failed to break up the ring or force its members to sell their corn. For it is matter of history that the district commissaries did not scruple to guillotine those who withheld their grain from the market, and the populace of Paris strung them up to the lamp-posts at the street corners. All the same the corn was not forthcoming and the towns-folk suffered from famine.

But what was offered to the husbandman in exchange for the fruit of his toil? *Assignats*, scraps of paper decreasing in value every day, nominal £20 notes of no real worth! A £40 note would not purchase a pair of boots, and the peasant, very naturally, was not anxious to barter a year's toil for a piece of paper with which he could not even buy a blouse.

As long as worthless paper-money—whether called assignats or labor notes—is offered to the peasant-producer it will always be the same. The country will withhold its produce, and the towns will suffer want, even if the recalcitrant peasants are drowned and guillotined as before.

We must offer to the peasant in exchange for his toil not worthless paper-money, but the manufactured articles of which he stands in immediate need. He lacks the proper implements to till the land, clothes to protect him properly from the inclemencies of the weather, lamps and oil to replace his miserable rushlight or tallow dip, spades, rakes, ploughs. All these things, under present conditions, the peasant is forced to do without, not because he does not feel the need of them, but because, in his life of struggle and privation, a thousand useful things are beyond his reach; because he has no money to buy them.

Let the town apply itself, without loss of time, to manufacturing all that the peasant needs, instead of fashioning gewgaws for the wives of rich citizens. Let the sewing machines of Paris be set to work on clothes for the country folk: work-a-day clothes and clothes for Sunday too, instead of making wedding outfits; let the factories and foundries turn out agricultural implements, spades, rakes, and such like, instead of waiting till the English send them in exchange for French wines!

Let the towns send no more inspectors to the villages with red, blue, or rainbow-colored scarves, to convey to the peasant orders to take his produce to this place or that, but let them send friendly embassies to the country folk and bid them in brotherly fashion: "Bring us your produce, and take from our stores and shops all the manufactured articles you please." Then provisions would pour in on every side. The peasant would only withhold what he needed for his own use, and would send the rest into the cities, feeling for the first time in the course of history, that these toiling town-folk were his comrades—his brethren, and not his exploiters.

We shall be told, perhaps, that this would necessitate a complete transformation of industry. Well, yes, that is true of certain departments; but there are other branches which could be rapidly modified in such a way as to furnish the peasant with clothes, watches, furniture, and the simple implements for which the towns make him pay such exorbitant prices at the present time. Weavers, tailors, shoemakers, tinsmiths, cabinet-makers, and many other trades and crafts could easily direct their energies to the manufacture of useful and necessary articles, and abstain from producing mere luxuries. All that is needed is that the public mind should be thoroughly convinced of the necessity of this transformation, and should come to look upon it as an act of justice and of progress, and that it should no longer allow itself to be cheated by that dream so dear to the theorists—the dream of a revolution confining itself to taking possession of the profits of industry, and leaving production and commerce just as they are now.

This, then, is our view of the whole question. Cheat the peasant no longer with scraps of paper—be the sums inscribed upon them ever so large; but offer him in exchange for his produce the very things of which he, the tiller of the soil, stands in need. Then the fruits of the land will be poured into the towns. If this is not done there will be famine in our cities, and reaction and despair will follow in its train.

THE PROPAGANDA.

REPORTS.

LONDON.

Last month has been most successful for propaganda. It opened with the May Day meeting in Hyde Park, which has already been reported. A very large and successful meeting, on Sunday, May 6th, was held right in the midst of the legal eight-hours' demonstration in Hyde Park. In fact, we were so completely surrounded by legalist platforms that for some time the numerous detectives present could not find us. When they did, they again attempted to create a disturbance, but their efforts on this occasion were an absolute failure, because the whole of the audience were in sympathy with us. After vigorous speeches from Comrades Cantwell, Mowbray, Henry, Presberg, Samuels, Quinn, Lawrence, and a comrade from Peckham, the meeting closed with cheers for the Social Revolution and Anarchy, which were well responded to. Moreover, comrades were very active in distributing leaflets and selling literature.

The open-air propaganda has been going well; regular meetings have been held in Victoria, Hyde, and Regent's Parks, and at Hoxton Church, also a start has been made at Willesden and Tottenham. Among the speakers have been, Fauset Macdonald, Samuels, Quinn, Lawrence, Turner, Presberg, Tochatti, Cantwell, Mowbray, Leggett, and on Sunday, May 20th, Comrade Barton from Manchester paid us a visit, and delivered a good speech in Regent's Park. It would be interesting to see the face of a provincial comrade occasionally, as it would tend to closer knowledge of each other, which is the lacking feature in the movement. On Sunday, May 13th, Comrade Tochatti and Hunter Watts, S.D.F., debated in Hyde Park, on Anarchism. Watts stated he was going to point out where Anarchism was philosophically wrong, but it was rather surprising to find that in doing so his philosophic indulgence was expressed in the phrase, "the howl of Anarchists against law was all bosh, and that law was an expression of public sentiment." He also remarked that three-fourths of the matter in *Freedom* might have been written by any Social Democrat; the other fourth was bosh. He further pointed out that all the late dynamite explosions were the logical outcome of Anarchist Communism, and the teachings of Kropotkin! Lively isn't it for Watts, how Social Democrats will keep on pandering to their audiences by always speaking on dynamite? By the way, Watts mentioned several times that we were pessimistic; this is good, if you; like we are pessimists now, but, according to Herbert Burrows, we have "too great a faith in human nature, are too hopeful and all idealists." Comrades have been attending lectures at various places with splendid success. Toynbee Hall has been swarmed with Anarchists, and good speeches have been made continually by Mowbray, Morton, Quinn, and Leggett. A leaflet, entitled "To Hell with Trade Unionism," has been printed by Comrade Cantwell as a commercial speculation with the *Week's* address upon it. The Social Democrats were very active in telling the public that the Anarchists had issued this leaflet, but they have suddenly ceased upon discovering that it was written by one of their own body, one Grierson, of the Chelsea branch of the S.D.F. The whole Canning Town branch of the S.D.F. have embraced Communist Anarchist principles, and have formed a most energetic group; and we hear that a C.A. Group is in formation at Woolwich and also at Hoxton. The Wimbledon S.D.F. branch have been so disgusted by the reactionary policy of the Central Council in sending a circular to all their branches, calling upon all Anarchists in the S.D.F. to resign, that all the branch but two, who are still Social Democrats, sent a resolution to the Council, condemning their action; these comrades express their disgust at the narrow spirit in the S.D.F., truly "sectarian," as Ernest Williams says, and have also decided to carry on an Anarchist Communist propaganda in future. Comrades would do well to mention these facts about the narrowness of the position of the English Social Democratic Party; while they accuse us of being reactionary and only mere destructionists, they themselves are open to the report that they are only politicians and mere vote hunters.—J. P.

Deptford.—On Sunday, April 29th, Goldsmith, Banham, and Carter lectured in the morning, and Comrade Tochatti in the evening. A number of questions were put to our Comrade Tochatti, who answered them thoroughly to the satisfaction of the audience. Mrs. Tochatti wound up a very successful meeting by singing the "Marseillaise," the chorus of which was taken up well by the audience. In reply to an encore, she sang "No Master."—Tuesday, May 1st, we held a good meeting in the Broadway.—Sundays, May 6 and 13, two meetings as usual, addressed by Seacombe, Alford, Carter, Banham, and Goldsmith; audiences very attentive and sympathetic.—May 20th, in the morning Comrade Mowbray gave a good address to a large audience; opposition from a trade-union leader effectively disposed of. In the evening, speakers: Banham, Forrester, and Seacombe.—We have made several converts since we started here, and a host of sympathisers, who attend our meetings regularly. In fact, we have so far succeeded in our propaganda that we have hopes of starting an Anarchist club shortly. In the meantime we have tried to get a room temporarily for our Group meetings, but are boycotted on every hand. An application was made to the Social Democrats for the use of their room, once a week, and although they had already decided to let it to outside societies 2 or 3 nights a week, they refused our application, after an exhibition of their usual bigotry towards Anarchy and Anarchists. And to smooth matters over and make it appear that their action was not bigotry towards Anarchists, they decided not to let the room to any society! And yet they cant so much of "freedom." Yes, some of us have had personal experience of their so-called "freedom"; it means in practice, freedom for Social Democrats and let everybody else be damned! These exhibitions of bigotry and hatred towards opponents seem but to foreshadow the tyranny of the Social Democratic State, which must logically lead to the suppression of all opinions not in accord with its grandmotherly influence. We must not, as Anarchists, foster the absurdity that Social Democrats are our friends. They are not, and we have to fight them. Of all governments save us from the Socialist one!—W. H.

Woolwich.—Good meetings have been held here every Sunday during the last month, outside the National Bomb Factory. Audiences very attentive and good discussions; also good sale of literature. The speakers have been Comrades Seacombe, Banham, Carter and Goldsmith. We have hopes of forming a strong group here shortly.—J. G.

PROVINCES.

Sunderland.—We hold meetings regularly, at Wheat Sheaf, on Sunday evenings. Our audiences are larger and appear more interested at each subsequent meeting. April 22nd, Comrade Lebonef opened the meeting with the Marseillaise, in French, which quickly attracted a large crowd, the most of whom stayed to listen. He electrified them, at the close, with the Carmagnole.—May 6th, Comrade McCabe addressed a meeting at Silksworth colliery.—J. J. B.

Brighton.—During the last few months Anarchism has been very much discussed here, not only at Anarchist meetings, but at Secularist and Christian meetings also. On May 1st, our local Comrade Ford addressed a large and attentive crowd for about an hour; at the close we had some interruption from two drunkards.—Sunday, 13th May, Leggett and Lawrence from London spoke in the morning on the Front for two hours, and in the afternoon on the Level for three

hours, to great and sympathetic audiences. Good sale of literature. People in general like our principles very much, but they hate the bomb business; we hope that they will also learn to hate the governmental bomb-and-killing-innocent-people business, and will abolish every sort of violence and oppression and will establish Anarchist Communism.—J. H.

Leicester.—All comrades have been very active here during this "merrie-month of May," with the result that Anarchist Communism is spreading on all sides. By a very small majority the Trades Council carried a resolution that only Trade Unions should be invited to take part in the demonstration on Labor Sunday. A few of the Union "bosses" evidently thought that this would prevent the dreadful Anarchists from having anything whatever to do with the celebration of Labor Day; but they were very much mistaken, for, although they hired four bands, the gathering around our platform was the largest, and the people listened to our speakers with very close attention all the time. We had Comrades Leggatt and Turner from London, who gave splendid addresses on the work of the Labor Movement. Cores and Warner were also in very "good form" and gave vigorous speeches, bearing more particularly on local labor affairs, refuting the lies that have recently been spread about as to Anarchists being opposed to Trade Unionism &c. Our demonstration was in every way a great success, and this was largely due to the great amount of good work that has been carried on in the Boot and Shoe and Hosiery Unions by Comrades Cores and Warner, who are also on the Trades Council.—A new union of the girls in the box-making trade has recently been formed by Comrades Clara Warner and Emma Lewin, and has been well supported. This sort of work is well worth doing, for it brings our fellow-workers into closer sympathy with us, and also gives us a wider range of opportunities for spreading our ideas amongst them.—To sum up, Anarchist Communism is making great headway in Leicester and elsewhere, and the day is drawing near when the New Gospel of "Work, Wealth and Freedom for All" shall extend to every town and village and inspire the hearts of all workers with hope. May the time soon come when they will dare to put it into practice, and sweep away monopoly, poverty, and government for ever!—A. W.

Edinburgh.—Going ahead here; our local speakers, John Smith and Tom Bell, having been reinforced by Anthony Smith from Dundee, who has given them valuable assistance.—On the 22nd April, after holding our usual meeting in the Meadows, we turned up in the evening at the Secular Society's hall where Bell, having taken part in the discussion the previous Sunday, had been invited to lecture on "Anarchism, what is it?" The hall was crowded, and the interest of the audience and the lively discussion made the meeting break up a full hour after the usual closing time. Opposition, of course, beautifully squelched; literature sold 7s. 6d. On the 29th, usual meeting, large and attentive crowd. Literature sold 6s. 1d., Angus Doris giving us a bit of useful help in the spouting of it. On the 5th May Saturday, Eight Hours' Demonstration, John Smith, Bell, and Jack Robb from Glasgow held two meetings in the Park, to which the legalist procession marched; the rain, however, interfered greatly. Campbell, Fraser, and Robertson, nevertheless, managed to sell 15s. 8d. worth of Anarchist literature to the procession on the march. On the 6th, usual Meadows meeting in the afternoon; Robb keeping a good crowd despite the weather. In the evening we turned up again, somewhat to the surprise of the local Social Democrats (Scottish Socialist Federation they still call themselves, though nowadays there are none but Social Democrats in it). We had offered to make arrangements, so that the two Socialist bodies should not be on the Meadows at the same time. They couldn't or wouldn't have anything to do with this, so this Sunday evening we put up Comrade Henry on the stool to give us "The Red Flag" in his own splendid style. He gathered the Meadows crowd for us at once, and Bell and Robb kept them too. The Leith Ropedie girls on strike (they won) had sent up a deputation to get the collection promised them at the Social Democratic meeting. The Social Democrats not having a crowd to collect from, the girls came over to us; our help resulted in a collection of over a pound. Robb's good speeches, and indomitable pluck helped us greatly these two days. Bell took care at the evening meeting to challenge all and sundry Social Democrats, or Labor party men to debate. We are not afraid of discussion. Literature sold 10s. On the 13th and 20th, the celestial authorities had evidently determined to suppress us, our enthusiasm was nearly drowned out of us. We secured the crowd again on the evening of the 20th, only to find that the authorities in question had been on the watch, and our speakers, being perishable, were forced to give in, and leave to the Social Democrats the Meadows and the rain.—The amount of sympathy and interest shown has greatly encouraged us.—T. H. B.

NOTICES.

LONDON.

Open-air meetings, addressed by Anarchist speakers, are held on Sundays, at Hyde Park, Regent's Park, Victoria Park, and Hoxton Church, at 11 a.m.; Hyde Park at 3.30 p.m.; Hyde Park and corner of Wood Green-road, Tottenham at 7 p.m.

Deptford.—Open-air meetings are held on Deptford Broadway: Sundays, at 11.30 a.m. and at 8 p.m.; Thursdays, at 8 p.m.

Woolwich.—Meetings in Beresford-square every Sunday afternoon, at 3.30.

PROVINCES.

Glasgow.—Dr. Macdonald will lecture on "Evolution and Anarchism," on Sunday, June 3, at 6.30 p.m., in the Large Albion Hall.

Leicester. Open-air propaganda.—Sundays, Russell-square, at 10.45 a.m.; Market-place, at 6.15 p.m.; Humberston-gate, at 8 p.m.

Manchester. Anarchist Group.—Lectures and discussion every Wednesday evening, Stevenson Square (open air) every Sunday at 3 p.m. Financial Secretary, P. J. Kelly; Cor. Sec., Alpheus Round, 203, Oldham-road, Newton Heath.

AN APPEAL.

Comrade C. C. Davis, who is serving his sentence for having smashed a jeweller's window in Birmingham last year, to draw public attention to his misery as one of the unemployed, will be coming out of prison, July 13. We invite comrades to help in raising a fund to give Com. Davis a fresh start. Contributions may be sent to Mrs. Hyde, 61, St. Augustine's-road, Camden-town, N.W., and will be acknowledged in *Freedom*.

Subscriptions received: F. N., 2s.; N. Dryhurst, 5s.; F. Hyde, 6d.; A. Henry, 1s.; H. Samuels, 2s. 6d.; C. W., 2s. 6d.—L. HYDE, Hon. Treasurer.

LONDON: Printed and published by C. M. Wilson, at 84, St. John-street, West Smithfield, E.C. All communications should be addressed to The Editor, 61, Saint Augustine's-road, Camden Town, N.W.