

# LIBERTY

## • CONTENTS •

Workers' Congress of 1896  
By J. KROPOTKIN.

Priest and Prophet.  
By THE EDITOR.

Why I am called a Christian  
Anarchist.  
By J. C. KENWORTHY.

Torturing Anarchists in Spain  
By X.

The Commune of Paris.  
By LOUISE MICHEL.

Anarchism. By W. C. OWEN.

On the Definition of Crime.  
By A. HAMON.

Between Ourselves.

W. M. ROSE

## • A JOURNAL OF •

## • ANARCHIST • COMMUNISM •

# THE COMMUNE OF PARIS.

## By LOUISE MICHEL.

### PART II.

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

#### CHAPTER II—(Continued).

#### THE GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE.

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

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

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

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

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

Certain seditious National Guards belonging to the 101th *démarche* have attempted to take the Hotel de Ville. They shot at the officers on duty, and grievously wounded an Adjutant Major of the Mobile Guard. The troop replied. The Hotel de Ville fired upon from the windows of the houses on the opposite side of the Place, which had been occupied in advance. Bombs were thrown at us and explosive shells. The aggression was of the most cowardly and odious nature from beginning to end, since more than a hundred rifle shots were aimed at the colonel and his officers at the moment when they were dismissing a deputation which had been admitted just before into the Hotel de Ville. Not less cowardly was it afterwards, when, after our first discharge, the Place being cleared and the firing having ceased on our side, we were shot at from the opposite windows. Make these facts known to the National Guards, and send me word as to whether order is once more restored. The Republican Guard, and the National Guard are in occupation of the Place and its approaches.—Jules Ferry.

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

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

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

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

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

One of them, citizen Tibaldi, who was imprisoned because of Oct.

31st, and who had endured all kinds of mental and physical tortures at Cayenne where the Empire had kept him for 13 years, declared to us that he had never seen the present evil conditions equalled.

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

Among those imprisoned on Jan. 22nd, we met the citizen Delescluze, who had been arrested and thrown into this hole merely for being the principal editor of *Le Reveil*, which had been suppressed. Delescluze, who was sixty-five years of age and very feeble, took acute bronchitis, and left prison in a dying state for the elections of Feb. 8th, which sent him to the Assembly at Bordeaux.

Lastly a workman, citizen Magne, arrested at the moment of entering his dwelling, on returning from the workshop. He was already ailing, and died a month later at St. Pelagie, a victim to the treatment he had endured.

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

The Government of National Defence.

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

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

Art. 2.—The Prefect of Police is charged with the execution of the above decree. (Signed) General Trochu. Jules Favre.

Emmanuel Arago. Jules Ferry.

From the day the clubs were closed, all Paris became club; the streets with the beelike murmur of agitated crowds. Such numbers already dead from privations, the numbers fallen on French and German battle-fields whom their mothers had only reared to feed the crows or fatten the furrows, so many wounded and disabled from earning a livelihood, so many aged people and children, dead or abandoned! and to think that the long train of desolations and miseries should only have availed to prolong under another name the still unbroken chain of the people's abasement! Truly it seemed incredible. The bombardment which up to Jan. 28th had continued throughout the dark nights (for Paris was no longer lighted) found nothing but indifference among the population. But the news of the armistice caused a great tremor; the bombardment was preferable to that.

The Committees of Vigilance of the Faubourgs silently took note of everything. The Central Committee of the National Guards, with which were joined some members of the Parisian Federal Council of the Internationale, the Blanquists, and the Committees of Vigilance of Belleville, La Villette and Montmartre, awaited events, resolved upon revolutionary action.

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

Jules Favre, Jules Simon, and Garnier Pages ranged the country. Gambetta had just stifled the Communes of Lyons and Marseilles, thus showing himself no more capable of revolutionary energy than the rest of them. From none of these men could the crowd expect anything but repression; certainly no act equal to the occasion could be looked for.

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

After the events of Jan. 22nd, Trochu had tendered his resignation. But this concession to public opinion could scarcely count as such, since Trochu was replaced by Vinoy, one of the men of the Coup d'Etat in '51.

Paris now wasted its time in drawing up lists of candidates, ranging from simple Republicans to the Internationalists. The inspection of the ballot boxes yielded the customary surprises, which had recurred so often since the occasion when Thiers, on the eve of the official proclamation had scored only 61,000, yet was able to boast of 108,000 on the following day.

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

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

(To be continued.)



## ON THE DEFINITION OF CRIME.

By A. HAMON.

[Continued from No. 13.]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The same crime has been perpetrated, but when making an etiological analysis we see that the criminal

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

War does not occur without individuals being killed, wounded, mutilated, without things being destroyed, or stolen: crime. Nevertheless, a great number of people do not consider it worthy of reprobation: some glorify it and applaud the actors, other look upon it with contempt and despise those who take part in it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(To be continued.)





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

We would ask our contributors, to write plainly and on one side of the paper only.

All Communications should be addressed.—The Editor, Liberty, 7 Beadon Road, Hammer-smith, W.

Subscription, 1s. 6d. per year, post free. Per quire of 27 copies, 1s. 7d. post free. The trade supplied by W. Reeves, 185, Fleet Street, E.C.

LIBERTY,  
LONDON, SEPTEMBER, 1895.

## Between Ourselves

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the soil of the United Kingdom were cultivated only as it was thirty years ago, 24,000,000 people, instead of 17,000,000, could live on home-grown food; and that culture, while giving occupation to at least 750,000 men, would give nearly 3,000,000 wealthy home customers to the British manufacturers. If the 1,590,000 acres on which wheat was grown thirty years ago—only these, and not more—were cultivated as the fields are now cultivated in England under the allotment system, which gives on the average forty bushels per acre, the United Kingdom would grow food for 27,000,000 inhabitants out of 35,000,000. If the now cultivated area of the United Kingdom (80,000 square miles) were cultivated as the soil is cultivated on the average in Belgium, the United Kingdom would have food for thirty seven million inhabitants; and it might export produce, without ceasing to produce, so as freely to supply all the needs of a wealthy population. And if the population of this country came to be doubled, all that would be required for producing the food for seventy million inhabitants would be to cultivate the soil as it is cultivated in the best farms in this country, in Lombardy, and in Flanders, and to cultivate the meadows which at present lie almost unproductive around the big cities in the same way as the neighbourhoods of Paris are cultivated.

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

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

## THE PREJUDICE AGAINST PARLIAMENT.

To the Editor of LIBERTY.

Of that idea that because a man goes to Westminster to speak for the people, he is necessarily "reactionary," "betraying the cause," or "wanting to get power for himself." I don't see why Anarchists should think these things, and as some do, grow quite dogmatic on the subject. Why not say, "Can Parliament do anything useful for us"? instead of starting with the dogma (for that the words become in the mouths of some Anarchists) "Parliament is no good."

Parliament shouldn't be a bogey to any of us: if Socialists think that some of their men at Westminster may help to bring Socialism the sooner than if they remained outside, well, why get angry about it? They may be wrong in thinking so, but then we may be equally wrong in thinking the reverse. The Individualist Anarchist may of course say, that he does not desire Socialism at any price, and object to it being brought any nearer, either through Parliament or by any other means whatever. But Communists cannot be in this position, or take up such a logical attitude. They (many of them like our Editor, once members of the old Socialist League) have still a genuine love for Socialism, apart from a dominating State Control, and are far from being indifferent to its forward march.

Well, then, if Parliament is only to be used as a help towards aiding the growth of Socialism, (as it was for instance by Mr. Keir Hardie) and the Socialist members do but steadily maintain the real objects of their cause, though they may besides aid and indeed try to press forward some useful legislation in defence of the workers; why should there be any prejudice against this kind of action?

It is surely true that no Socialist believes Parliament can be anything more than a help towards realizing Socialism.

We hear every day from Socialists and others the need of education in Socialist Economics and Ethics, and of ways in which we can practically manage our own affairs without any particular need of outside force to compel us to do so. And after all, Parliament can only do certain kinds of work for us, work which we haven't all of us time to do for ourselves, just as the shoemaker may make shoes for those who cannot do that kind of work. And if the work is unsatisfactory, well, we have our remedy in each case.

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

T. CLAYTON.

## WHY I AM CALLED "A CHRISTIAN ANARCHIST."

By J. C. KENWORTHY.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### The Crispian Dictatorship.

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

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



## TORTURING ANARCHISTS IN SPAIN.

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

A small Spanish pamphlet by Juan Montseny, "El Proceso de un Gran Crimen" (The trial of a great crime), La Coruna, 1895, 50pp. contains a number of letters from our imprisoned or dead comrades, from which we glean the following extracts and particulars.

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

Alberto Saldani, arrested in the Liceo Theatre, is not acquainted with our ideas, a sculptor in marble, an Italian, 50 years of age. He was a victim of the grossest indignities, and never-ending blows, until he was left for dead. Brought to the Governor's Palace (the offices of the Civil Governor of Barcelona, Larocca) he was flogged with ox-hides and taken back to the prison apparently dead. The Governor's secretary gave him three violent blows in the face. And he was not even an Anarchist. Needless to say, that he knows nothing of the crime that caused his arrest.

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

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

Alfredo Ruggiero Rinaldi, an Italian, age 29, knew nothing of Anarchism, was extradited by the generous French Republic! He had to walk quick for a long time, was beaten, and in the night of December 25th, 1893, was led to the seashore in the vicinity of the fortress of Montynich (where they were all kept prisoners) and threatened to be drowned if he did name the accomplices of the Liceo Theatre outrage. He was twice submerged in the water and taken back to his cell where, in the midst of winter, his clothes had to dry on him.

Emilio Navarro, a shoemaker, age 36, an Anarchist; blows and the gag, dried codfish without water for a number of days, and was not allowed to rest. On the way to the Governor's House he was told he would be shot if he did not confess; the police pointed their rifles at him, and as he gave only negative replies to all questions he was terribly beaten with the butt-ends of their rifles.

Domingo Frutos, a Spanish wool-weaver, had to eat dried codfish for several days without water, until the extreme thirst drove him to drink his own urine which, as with most of the other victims, consisted of blood. He was not allowed to rest, and then to intensify his sufferings they tied his testicles and inserted a stick which they twisted, inflicting such agony that he fell senseless to the ground; the flesh was torn in a most brutal manner, irons were heated and they threatened to place them on the wounds if he did not make such declarations as suited their purpose.

We pause here to reflect whether the beasts who inflicted those tortures were simply madmen; yet we have no doubt that they only acted according to international police practice. Thus at the time of Ravachol's execution it became known that the executioner pinioned him in such a way as to make every step he had to walk cause the most extreme pains in the genital parts, this was done to make him look frightened and faltering in his last moments, in which, however, they did not succeed. And in the *Nineteenth Century*, March 1884, p. 481, we find a quotation from a Russian book, relating to the torturing of a girl of eleven years—in order to extort a declaration concerning some crime committed by her father. The girl, who was a prisoner in Siberia, "was suspended in the air and the executioner flogged her from the head to the soles of her feet. She had already received several lashes with the cat-o-nine-tails; when she asked for something to drink, a salted herring was presented to her. The torture would have gone on had not the executioner refused to do his work. We hear of no such scruples on the part of the Spanish torturers. Shortly after the Spanish events the torture of codfish was renewed with the Belgian Anarchists at Liege. Thus we have not only single acts by maddened brutes, but systematic acts by the international police. Is it to be wondered at that the instigator of all this, the infamous Larocca was shot at by Ramon Murull, shortly after this;

he escaped and had Murull tortured to make him denounce his accomplices though his was a purely individual act. Still some unfortunate friends of his were arrested, among whom was Ramon Felips: they put chips of wood under his finger-nails and resorted to other acts as barbarous as those above mentioned until he lost consciousness.

Villarnbias goes on to tell of Jose Bernat, age 22, an Anarchist, who was executed in May, 1894. There was a letter of Bernat's printed on April 3, 1894, in which he says that after eight days' detention, when he expected to be liberated, he was brutally fettered and brought before Larocca, who for two and a half hours tried to make him confess. Then he was led into a cell on the second floor. "Here (he says) my martyrdom began. They began by beating me for more than an hour; tiring of this they forced me to walk, which I did under constraint. Night came and having eaten nothing all the day, I asked for food. I was feverish and had a burning thirst. After some hours, I do not know how many, the warder brought me a bit of bread and a large slice of dried codfish which I ate with avidity. I asked again for water when he told me that it was prohibited. I passed the night in walking up and down the cell, and when I stopped the miserable cur at the door ordered me to continue to march. Morning came and at the same hour I was again led before the Governor. Our interview ended with the same result as the day before; having gone back I received more blows, but nothing to drink and was not allowed to sleep. All that day and through the night that followed I walked about the cell until I dropped from sheer exhaustion. The next thing I was conscious of was that a cup of broth was being given me. The Governor began to interrogate me again; my sufferings were so fresh in my memory that I replied affirmatively to his questions; but they were not satisfied because I did not denounce others. Then they struck me with their fists, they kicked and pinched me, spat on me, and treated me as only the police can do. Imagine what my declarations were worth! In vain I asked for the Public Prosecutor and judges. .... I have since learnt that I was among those who suffered least.

Villarnbias tells of the sufferings of Jose Codina, a young Spaniard, one of the six executed Anarchists; when arrested he was struck in the face before the eyes of his wife while the police had their revolvers pointed at him. Then bribery was tried, but all in vain. He was thrice thrown into the sea in the end of December and left with the wet clothes on him. He was further tortured in a way that will not admit of description. This torture was conducted by three police officers, one of whom was the inhuman Pena. The prisoner was nearly dead, but he was brought round and addressed in this manner: "Your life is in our hands; we have to account for it to no one; we have been ordered to obtain your confession by any means." Codina being silent was ordered to kneel to be shot, but his tormentors would do him no such kindness; he was put on the fish diet for seven days instead, without water, sleep, or even a seat; drinking his urine. No wonder that he resolved to declare himself the author of the Liceo explosion (the real author being Salvador Franch). He declared himself the author of everything they asked of him in order to die.

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

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

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

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

My Dear Son, Read with attention these badly penned lines of your father. I shall soon be nothing more than dust. The account, that I have had pending with nature since the day of my birth, will soon be settled. It will not be nature who takes the life from me, but the prejudiced inhumanities of men; the callousness and cruelty of the infamous bourgeois who, not content with having exploited my physical forces have tried more than once to ruin me morally. More than once the bourgeois of Barcelona tried to settle with me, but as the character of your father cannot be broken or bent, they invented an infamous plot against me, using the tortures of the Inquisition to



make unfortunate working men declare what suit their purpose. My son, they resorted to practices so absurd that they dared not give us a public trial. There was not even a jury! We shall be murdered. You must know, however, that your father will die content, convinced that during his life he has used his faculties to defend a great and just idea; and that his death and that of his comrades will show how the authorities commit crimes in utter disregard of the law. Perhaps tomorrow someone will tell you that your father was a criminal or a madman. Tell them and tell it aloud that I was innocent of the crime I was charged with; that I was murdered because I was an Anarchist and promulgated an idea which I thought to be noble and just, without anybody having been able to prove the contrary to me, though I always invited discussion. To those who tell you that I was a madman, reply that all the pioneers of modern ideas and scientific theories have been called madmen; but their ideas and theories are now adopted and admitted to have been true. I implore you to study the Anarchist ideas as soon as you are old enough; compare them with others and I believe that you will see that they are capable of emancipating the world. The Anarchist ideas are based upon freedom and equity; that every individual shall be able to enjoy the offerings of nature and the products of human intelligence. When our doctrines are understood by the people they will haste to put them in practice, and they will then reap the reward after so many centuries of sufferings. I hope that the end of your father will not frighten you, but serve as an incentive to spread everywhere the principles for which I lay down my life. Die as your father dies, if necessary, but be useful to your fellow-men, and do your utmost to help on the emancipation of the proletariat. I charge you also to watch continuously over your sister, giving her all the instruction that you can, and before all keeping her away from religious fanaticism, because this is the greatest obstacle to progress. With the help of your dear mother make of your sister a woman who will be useful to mankind; to-day a good daughter and sister, to-morrow, a good wife and mother. I die convinced that you will do this, as I die convinced that I always did my duty. Long live free humanity! Long live progress! Hurrah for Anarchy! Your Father. Castillo de Montynich, May 17th, 1894.

When men die with words like these on their lips, the cause they die for is invincible, and, in spite of tortures and judicial murders, the time of freedom and happiness for all, the time of Anarchy will come.

X.

## THE WORKERS' CONGRESS OF 1896.

The comrades of the London *Freedom* group, reinforced by a few friends, met to discuss the advisability of taking part in the worker's congress which is to be held in London in August 1896. The fact is that in England as elsewhere, there are Anarchist comrades who belong to workmen's associations and who may be sent by their trade union to discuss all points of the programme from an Anarchist point of view. The groups in question cannot look on with folded arms at the juggling, by politicians, of the working-class movement. Moreover they cannot look, without trying to re-act, at the egotistical relations often existing between workmen whose salaries are unequal or who have none at all through want of work; and they desire to come to an understanding with Anarchists of other countries as to what should be done to permeate trade unions with Anarchist ideas and to aid them in getting out of the beaten track.

The progress recently accomplished on these lines in certain unions, especially in America where the impulse of all working-class revolts comes from those outside organized trades, and impels these along, (as we saw during the last railway strike) is most encouraging. This new spirit of revolt that breathes among the workers makes it imperative for those, who do not believe themselves superior to the "ignorant masses," because they are Anarchists and the masses are not yet so, to do all in their power to propagate the Anarchist idea among the masses. And then we must know where we stand as regards the general strike that politicians are trying to juggle away between now and the next congress.

We know that the congress is manipulated, precisely by these politicians. The German Social Democrats who dominate on the organizing committee, have taken their precautions that no one shall hinder them during their petty debates on parliamentary questions,

and the decree hurled forth by these gentlemen announces that all will be excluded from the congress who do not admit parliamentary politics. The question was therefore: what should be done?

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

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

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

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

P. K.

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

OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES.



## ANARCHISM.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.—If the answer is "yes," how are they to become common property?

Obviously, from my point of view, the individual's land and capital can only be merged into the common fund with his full and free consent.

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

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

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

Of course.

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

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

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

W. C. OWEN.



The following can be obtained from the Editor, or will be forwarded on receipt of stamps.

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

ANARCHIST MORALITY. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.

THE COMMUNE OF PARIS. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.

THE PLACE OF ANARCHISM IN SOCIALISTIC EVOLUTION. By P. KROPOTKIN. 1d.

REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT. Price 1d.

REVOLUTIONARY STUDIES. 32 pp. Price 2d.

AN ANARCHIST ON ANARCHY. By ELISEE RECLUS. 1d.

"It is a pity that such men as Elisee Reclus cannot be promptly shot."—Providence Press. This criticism is sufficient to show that the pamphlet is a strong indictment of the present iniquitous system of private property and government.

THE IDEAL AND YOUTH. By ELISEE RECLUS. Price 1d.

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. By ELISEE RECLUS. Price 1d.

A TALK ABOUT ANARCHIST COMMUNISM Between Two Workers. By ERICCO MALATESTA. Price 1d.

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

ANARCHY. By ERICCO MALATESTA. Price 1d.

IN DEFENCE OF EMMA GOLDMANN AND THE RIGHT OF EXPROPRIATION. By VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE. 1d.

THE WHY I AMS: Why I am a Socialist and an Atheist, by Conrad Naeffiger; Why I am a Social Democrat, by G. B. Shaw; Why I am an Individualist Anarchist, by J. Armistead. 1d.

THE WHY I AMS: Why I am a Communist, by William Morris; Why I am an Expropriationist, by L. S. Bevington. 1d.

JONES' BOY: Dialogues on Social Questions between an 'Enfant-Terrible' and his Father. By "Spokeshave." 1d.

LIBERTY LYRICS. By L. S. BEVINGTON. 1d.

ANARCHY AT THE BAR. By D. NICOLL. 1d.

THE WALSALL ANARCHISTS. By D. NICOLL. Price 1d.

CHICAGO MARTYRS: Their Speeches in Court. With an appendix by J. P. ALTGELD, Governor of Illinois. 6d.

ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. Price One Halfpenny.

THE CHICAGO ANARCHISTS. A Beautiful Design. On toned paper. By WALTER CRANE. Price 1d.

USEFUL WORK V. USELESS TOIL. By W. MORRIS. Price 1d.

THE TABLES TURNED, OR NUPKINS AWAKENED. By W. MORRIS. 4d.

TRUE AND FALSE SOCIETY. By W. MORRIS. 1d.

MONOPOLY OR HOW LABOUR IS ROBBED. By W. MORRIS. Price 1d.

MICHEL BAKOUNIN. ŒUVRES. Federalisme, Socialisme et Antithéologisme, Lettres sur le Patriotisme, Dieu et l'Etat. Prix 3 fr. 50.

LA SOCIÉTÉ MOURANTE ET L'ANARCHIE. By JEAN GRAVE. Price 1s., post free 1s. 3d. A. Lapie, 30 Goodge Street, Tottenham Court Road, W.

FREEDOM. Journal of Anarchist-Communism. 1d.

THE TORCH. Anarchist-Communist. 1d.

THE ANARCHIST. Communist & Revolutionary. 1d.

Printed and Published by J. Tochart, at 60 Grove Park Terrace, Chiswick. All communications should be addressed—The Editor, Liberty, Carmagnole House, Hammer Smith, London, W.