

Freedom

VOL XXXIX.—No. 428.

JULY-AUGUST, 1925.

MONTHLY: TWO PENCE.

NOTES.

Threatened General Strike.

It is quite evident that if the mineowners lock out the miners many other Unions will be drawn into the struggle. The General Council of the Trades Union Congress have decided to give the miners "complete support" and "whole-hearted co-operation," and the Transport Workers' Federation have promised similar assistance. The General Council say they "are confident they will have the backing of the whole organised Trades Union movement in placing themselves without qualification, and unreservedly, at the disposal of the Miners' Federation." Mr. Cook, the secretary of the Federation, warns the owners and the Government that if there is a conflict "this time it will be one such as has never been witnessed before in this country." While another Labour leader says the Government is "in peril of its existence should a universal strike take place." The Government has succeeded in getting the owners' and miners' representatives together again, but as the latter say they will not even consider a reduction of wages or an increase of hours it is very difficult to see what good a meeting can do. Hints have been thrown out that a Government subsidy to the industry would save the situation, and the Government may adopt this as a temporary expedient. Otherwise, how are the miners to get what they term "a living wage" out of the industry if it keeps the price of coal so high that it cannot compete with the coal from other countries in the world-market? Under Capitalism profits must be made; if not, the owners will close down the mines as they have done already in hundreds of cases. Even if all the workers in Great Britain ceased work in support of the miners they could not compel the owners to work the mines at a loss. The General Council have not given any sign as to how they intend to deal with this situation, and there seems to be no solution under Capitalism. We think the miners would do better if they looked round for an alternative occupation. There are millions of acres of uncultivated land waiting for willing workers, and if there is to be a great struggle it would be more sensible to fight for access to the land now held idle by the monopolists. Its cultivation is far more likely to provide a living wage to-day than are the mines.

The Demand for Nationalisation.

Now that industry is in a depressed state and unable to sustain a suitable "standard of living," whatever that may mean, the demand for nationalisation is increasing in strength. The miners have advocated it for years, in the hope that their conditions would thereby be improved. Now the railwaymen are proposing nationalisation of railways. Speaking at their annual general meeting on July 6, Mr. Dobbie, the president of the National Union of Railwaymen, said: "The statements of the railway companies are a confession of their failure to run the industry efficiently, and the time has arrived when the industry should be taken over by the State." In ancient times people used to pray to their god or gods when they were in trouble; later on they petitioned their kings to help them out of difficulties; but now the State is looked up to as the all-wise and all-powerful deity who can cure all the ills, social and economic, of its subjects. It is a wonderful faith. To these simple believers State officials are a class of supermen, concerned only with devising ways and means of solving the problems which afflict humanity. Unfortunately for them, it is untrue. Like Mr. Dobbie and other Trade Union leaders, our State officials, with very few exceptions, are mainly concerned about keeping their well-paid jobs and maintaining the privileges of the class to which they belong. Government departments are notoriously conservative, and hate the introduction of any new ideas likely to disturb the placid routine of their work. Everything they do is ruled by precedent, and few dare to take the responsibility for initiating new methods. Red-tape is the symbol of bureaucracy, and Charles Dickens' skit on the Circumlocution Office

might be written to-day. How on earth these officials can be expected to improve on the methods of the capitalists, who have profit as an incentive, we fail to see. But devotees always clothe their gods with omnipotence despite every disappointment, and worshippers of the State are just as credulous. "The State giveth and the State taketh away; blessed be the name of the State."

Evolution and Creation.

The trial at Dayton, Tennessee, of Professor John T. Scopes for teaching the doctrine of evolution, contrary to the laws of the State, has ended in a verdict of guilty and a fine of \$100. An appeal will be lodged before the State Supreme Court. Whatever the verdict there may be, there is certain to be a final appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. Most of the press reports have treated the trial as a huge joke, the judge and Mr. Bryan providing much material for the humorists. The serious side of the trial, however, must not be ignored. It is one more incident in the age-long struggle between science and the forces of superstition. Untold generations of investigators have worked methodically and unceasingly to lift the veil from the secrets of man's origin, and at every step they had to fight the hierarchy of the churches, who feared to lose their hold on their credulous flocks. The churches in their death-pangs may deal some hard blows at their deadly enemies, but the conquests of science are founded on rock and cannot be overthrown. The defence in the Dayton trial were not able to call their scientific witnesses, but Mr. Darrow said they were ready to prove that there was no conflict between the theory of evolution and the Bible story of Creation. Mr. Darrow may have thought it expedient to say this to disarm the jury; but if he meant it seriously, he has no claim to be considered a scientist. Scientists have produced overwhelming evidence of the unbroken descent of all living things from the simplest organisms. Genesis says that they were all planted on the earth at the Creation. Astronomy teaches us that daylight comes from the sun, and night comes as the earth revolves and turns a part of its surface away from the sun. Genesis says that light was made on the first day of Creation. "And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the evening and the morning were the first day." Yet the sun, "the greater light," was not made until the fourth day! Mr. Darrow's cross-examination of Mr. Bryan proved conclusively the conflict between evolution and the Bible story of Creation, and we must presume that the scientists who were ready to give evidence to the contrary belong to that servile crowd who are willing to distort science in order to please the religious people who control educational institutions. Science has not gained its victories by such cowardly tactics but by audaciously challenging the myths and legends of an ignorant past which are the stock-in-trade of the priestly caste that held mankind in mental bondage for centuries.

More Battleships.

The papers have been telling us that, side by side with the industrial crisis, there was a Cabinet crisis over the Admiralty's demand for more cruisers than the nation's financial position would stand. We do not know how many cruisers the naval chiefs asked for, but they were credited with having presented an ultimatum to the Government, who had promised the electors economy in every department. The Cabinet held long and stormy meetings, and just when everyone was saying the crisis was at its height it was all over. Then we were solemnly informed that a compromise had been arranged—the Admiralty had got all they wanted! Probably the Government thought it best to settle this affair before the industrial crisis came to a head. The Labour Party, of course, will oppose the vote for these new warships; but as soon as the vote is passed they will scheme and intrigue to get them built in places they represent so as to be able to claim the credit for relieving local unemployment. If organised Labour is sincerely opposed to war, as its leaders tell us, why does it build warships and manufacture munitions?

Women of the Russian Revolution.

By EMMA GOLDMAN.

(Reprinted from *Time and Tide*, by permission of the Editor.)

Pre-revolutionary Russia stood unique in the world's history for the host of remarkable and heroic women she contributed to the movement for liberation.

In his vivid and powerful poem, "Russian Women," the poet Nekrassov paid a high tribute to the fortitude and valour of the women who had sacrificed wealth, social station, and culture, to wend their weary way across the frozen Northern plain for their ideals. Later it was Ivan Turgenev who with fine feeling and sympathetic appreciation painted the picture of the Russian women revolutionists of his time. In his superb prose poem "On the Threshold" he immortalised the exalted idealism of the Sophie Perovskaia type of Russian women whose passionate faith and selfless devotion to liberty beacon-like illuminated the dark horizon of Russia in the early eighties.

The February Revolution of 1917 opened the prison doors to the survivors of the torture, the dungeon, and Siberian exile meted out by Tsarism to its political opponents. In triumph they were brought back to Moscow and Petrograd, scores of the revolutionists of the younger generation, representing various political tendencies, but all inspired by a common ideal.

Olga Taratuta, the daughter of intellectual parents, though of slight physique, possessed a powerful mentality and was in a certain sense a pioneer. When barely twenty she organised, together with several friends, the first Anarchist group in Southern Russia. Arrested at the beginning of the revolution of 1905, Olga was doomed to twenty years' *katorga* (hard labour prison) in Odessa. Ingenious and daring, she succeeded in escaping, again taking up her former work, this time under an assumed name. For a considerable time all the efforts of the gendarmerie to find her were fruitless, but in 1908 her disguise was discovered, she was re-arrested, and sentenced once more to twenty years' prison. On her return to freedom, in 1917, Olga devoted herself to the political Red Cross work, aiding the victims of the Hetman Skoropadsky regime in the Ukraine, and subsequently giving relief and cheer to the new groups of political prisoners created by the Communist State.

In the latter part of 1920 an All-Russian Conference of Anarchists was to take place at Kharkov. All the delegates were placed under arrest. Among the several hundred prisoners was also Olga Taratuta. She was sent to the Butyrki Prison, in Moscow, the very place where so many of her comrades had suffered and died in the days of the Romanov regime. There Olga underwent the most harrowing experience of her eventful life. On the night of April 25th the political wing of the prison was raided by the Tcheka, the prisoners were attacked in their sleep and badly maltreated, and then rushed to the railroad station and transferred to other prisons.

Olga found herself in the dreaded Orlov prison, which served as a central point of "distribution" under Nikolas II. The character of the administration and of the regimen of that prison was such as to drive the politicals quickly to a hunger strike in protest against their treatment. Olga was again removed to another prison, thence being sent to exile in the dismal region of the Veliky Ustiug, and finally ordered to Kiev, where she had formerly ministered so devotedly to the Communist prisoners of the Hetman reaction.

Leah Gotman and **Fanya Baron** left Russia for America in their teens, where they were employed in factories and took active part in the Labour movement. I knew the girls well, splendid specimens of independent womanhood, of attractive appearance, fine feeling, and strong mentality. At the first call of the February Revolution these two girls, together with scores of other Russian refugees, hurried to their native land. They at once threw themselves into educational work among the masses of Petrograd and Moscow. Later the two women drifted into the peasant ranks of the famous peasant rebel, Bat'ka (Little Father) Makhno, where they took up cultural activities.

The hand of Kremlin, lifted against Makhno, fell heavily also upon Leah Gotman and Fanya Baron. Both were arrested on the eve of the Kharkov Conference, referred to above, and were sent to Butyrki Prison, where they fell victims to the Tcheka raid, on the night of April 25, 1920. Torn out of her bed in the dead of night, Leah was dragged by her hair down a flight of stairs, and forced to

remain for hours, half-dressed as she was, in the prison-yard together with the other politicals, waiting to be transferred to some unknown destination. She has remained in prison ever since, being now one of the hapless inmates of the terrible Solovetsky Monastery, situated in the Arctic zone.

Fanya Baron, who always impressed me with her unbounded courage and exceptionally generous spirit, belongs to the rare type of women who can perform the most difficult tasks of revolutionary ardour with calm grace and utter selflessness. Following the Butyrki raid she was transferred to Riazan Prison, whence she soon escaped, making her unaided way back to Moscow on foot. Arriving penniless and almost without clothes, her desperate condition compelled her to seek refuge with her husband's brother, at whose home she was discovered by the Tcheka. This big-hearted woman who had served the cause of the Revolution all her life was done to death (shot) by the party that pretends to be the advance guard of the Revolution.

Evgenia Ratner, a young woman of keen mind and forceful character, joined the Social-Revolutionist Party soon after completing her medical studies in Switzerland. Her activities, on her return to Russia, repeatedly involved her in difficulties with the authorities, who finally condemned her to a long prison term. Freed by the February Revolution of 1917, her exceptional ability and energy caused her to be elected as a member of the Central Committee of her party, while she at the same time was chosen by the peasantry as one of their representatives in the Moscow Soviet. Her party having been outlawed by the Bolsheviki, Evgenia was arrested in 1919, and placed on trial in 1922 together with eleven of her comrades, all of whom were condemned to death.

The intercession of the Western world, which aroused an emphatic international protest against the execution of the sentence—signed by such men as Anatole France, Romain Rolland, and others—saved the lives of the twelve Social-Revolutionists, Evgenia Ratner among them. She was exiled for three years. Recently her term has expired, yet she has not been liberated. She is now threatened with renewed exile to some remote part of Siberia.

Of the Left Social-Revolutionists, **Irena Kakhovskaia**, **Alexandra Izmailovitch**, and **Maria Spiridonova** have suffered the greatest martyrdom. Kakhovskaia, grand-daughter of General Kakhovsky, the famous "Decembrist" rebel against Nikolas I, is a woman of recognised literary ability and revolutionary idealism. She began her work in the liberation movement of Russia when a very young girl, in 1904. Subsequently she was arrested and sentenced to twenty years' *katorga*; later she was transferred to Akatuy, one of the most feared places of Tsarist exile. In 1914 she was permitted to settle in the Trans-Baikal territory, whence she was freed by the February, 1917, Revolution.

Upon her return from exile Irena Kakhovskaia worked in the Left Social-Revolutionary Party. After the Brest-Litovsk peace and the German occupation of the Ukraine the German authorities arrested Irena as a participant in the conspiracy against the life of General Eichorn, the Prussian Field-Marshal in the Ukraine, who was killed by the Left Social-Revolutionist, A. Donskoy. Kakhovskaia was subjected to torture and sentenced to death, but the outbreak of the revolution in Germany prevented her execution.

Irena continued in the work of her political convictions and in 1921 she was arrested again, this time by the Bolsheviki, by whom she was exiled to Kaluga, in Siberia.

While in prison Irena Kakhovskaia wrote her most interesting memoirs. Romain Rolland, after perusing the work, said: "I am opposed to the ideas of Kakhovskaia, but her narrative has a captivating human, or rather superhuman, quality. It is a psychological document of the highest value. The absolute simplicity of the narrator, her truly Russian ability of objective vision, her incredible energy devoted entirely to the cause she has at heart—all this arouses admiration in the reader, no matter what his attitude may be towards the value of the action accomplished or contemplated. What heroism, patience, utter self-abnegation, what treasures of the soul does not humanity waste on terrible and shameless purposes."

Alexandra Izmailovitch, the daughter of a Russian Army General, is another instance of Russia's young womanhood driven to acts of violence as the sole form of protest possible under a despotic regime. In 1906 she attempted the life of Governor Kurlov, of Minsk Province, who was responsible for most fiendish pogroms against the Jews. Sentenced to Siberia for life, she was released with the other politicals in 1917. As a member of the Left Social-Revolutionary

Party, she became a leading figure in the All-Russian Soviet of Peasant Deputies. When the Bolsheviks decided to "liquidate" her party "for good," in 1919, she was arrested together with a number of her comrades, remaining almost continuously in prison ever since.

The most characteristic feature of this exceedingly able and energetic woman is her lifelong devotion to her friend and comrade, Maria Spiridonova. They spent together eleven years in Siberia, together they returned to Russia to join their efforts in behalf of the people, and together they were arrested by the Bolshevik Government and are sharing their imprisonment these many years.

Maria Spiridonova is undoubtedly one of the most remarkable and heroic figures in the Russian revolutionary movement. Of aristocratic family, beautiful and cultured, young Maria left luxury and social position to devote herself to the cause of the oppressed. At the age of 18 she committed an *attentat* on General Lukhanovsky, the Governor of Tambov Province, who was execrated for his savagery toward the peasantry.

In the case of Maria Spiridonova the henchmen of Nikolas II surpassed even the methods of Ivan the Terrible. Upon her arrest Maria was beaten into insensibility, her clothes literally torn from her body, and the young girl then turned over to the drunken guard, who amused themselves with burning her naked flesh with lighted cigarettes. After weeks on the verge of death Maria was finally condemned to death.

The torture of Spiridonova aroused the Western world, whose protests saved her from the scaffold. She was "pardoned" to Siberia for life. The effects of her ghastly experience left her with injured lungs, a crippled hand, and the loss of the sight of one eye. But though physically marred and broken, her spirit remained aflame.

Few of the returned politicals received such popular ovations all the way from Siberia to Petrograd and Moscow as Maria Spiridonova upon her release from prison in 1917. She became the adored leader of the great agrarian millions of Russia, the soul of all their age-long aspirations, and the spokesman of their needs and hopes.

Already in 1918 Maria Spiridonova became aware that the Revolution was in greater danger from some of its alleged friends than from its enemies. She saw the growing autocracy of the Communist State and set herself sternly against it. The final break between her party and the Bolsheviks came over the Brest-Litovsk peace, which Spiridonova condemned for reasons of principle as well as on practical grounds. Shortly after that she was arrested together with the 500 delegates to the Peasant Congress.

When I came to Russia I was told by the Bolsheviks that Maria Spiridonova had suffered a nervous breakdown and that she was therefore placed in a sanatorium where she was receiving the best of care. But soon I discovered that Maria had escaped from "the best of care" and was living in Moscow disguised as a peasant, as she used to do in the days of the Tsar. Fortune presently favoured me with the opportunity of spending several days with this extraordinary woman. I found not a trace of hysteria in her—in fact, her poise and mental balance and the objectivity of her recital of events since her return to Russia were extraordinary.

A few months later, in the autumn of 1920, the Tcheka again became busy discovering conspiracies. During the numerous raids throughout Moscow they came upon Maria Spiridonova, who lay ill with typhus. She was arrested and removed to the *Ossoby Otdel*—the Secret Section of the Tcheka. In 1921, when Maria was almost on the verge of death, the efforts of her friends succeeded in procuring her temporary release on condition of her returning to prison as soon as her health should improve. The only alternative was to let Maria die in prison of neglect, or give her back—improved in health—to the "best of care." In fact, no sooner did she begin to recuperate when the Tcheka took charge of her again. Guards with bloodhounds were placed at the house where Spiridonova was being ministered to by her devoted friend, Alexandra Izmailovitch. Their every step was watched and existence made so unbearable that the tortured Maria demanded to be taken back to prison. Together with the inseparable Izmailovitch she was then ordered to a furthestmost corner of the Moscow Province, and from reliable sources I have the information that both Izmailovitch and Spiridonova have been exiled to the wilds of Turkestan.

The martyrdom of the heroic women of Russia has become more poignant and intense under Bolshevik dictatorship than in the days of Tsarism. Then their suffering was merely physical, for nothing

could affect their spirit. They knew that while they were hated by the autocracy, they enjoyed the respect and love of the vast masses of the Russian people. Indeed, the "simple folk" looked upon them as "holy ones" suffering in their cause, and the moral influence exerted by the politicals in prison, *katorga*, and exile was very great.

All that is changed now. The new autocrats of Russia have discredited the ideals of Socialism and have besmirched the fair name of its exponents. There is no public voice in Russia save that of the ruling party, and the martyrs—men and women—of revolutionary Russia have become pariahs in the fullest sense. They have no redress and no appeal to the conscience of their country, for the latter has been politically paralysed.

ITALIAN SYNDICALISTS' APPEAL.

The vicissitudes the Italian proletariat has undergone during the last four years, as the result of Fascist terrorism, are notorious. Well, of all the proletarian organisations, political and economic, the Italian Syndicalist Union, which stands for revolutionary Syndicalism and is affiliated to the International Working Men's Association, has been the hardest hit.

After all its Syndicates and Chambers of Labour had been destroyed, one by one; after its locals had been laid in ruins and burned down; after thousands of its militant members had been beaten, killed, or condemned to ten, twenty, or thirty years' imprisonment, all the others were put under the ban and either hunted out of their own country or forced, by terror and hunger, to flee from it. Tens of thousands of these comrades have taken refuge abroad. Those who have remained are being continually persecuted, arrested, beaten, etc. Moreover, they are compelled to submit to all sorts of reprisals at the hands of their employers. Much land has been abandoned by its owners and gone out of cultivation through lack of the peasants' labour. Where the peasants are working a few days a week their pay is five or six lire a day, which is equivalent to 1s. 1d. or 1s. 3d.

Every defensive act on the part of the workers is punished terribly. All those who in their travels happen to run across squadrons of the Black Shirts are clubbed, or if as individuals they have the audacity to defend themselves they are tortured or killed.

Papers, reviews, books are being confiscated nearly all the time. Those belonging to the Syndicalist Union were all suppressed, either with personal violence or by order of the Government. When they are not suppressed or confiscated they are often burned, and those who have any copies of them are beaten, if they are not arrested.

"One lives dangerously," as the head of the Government and leader of the Fascisti himself has said.

But, as if all this were not enough, they have chosen to dissolve the Italian Syndicalist Union itself, after having prohibited its meetings, strikes, and all its activities in defence of the workers' rights. The Syndicalist Union is the only central organisation of workers that has been dissolved in Italy. Hence it comes about that our task of keeping alive somehow the Revolutionary Syndicalist movement in Italy is more difficult and arduous than ever.

Nevertheless we are trying to resist and to maintain in existence Syndicalist nuclei, and to bring new activity into our national industrial Syndicates, especially among the metal-workers, the agricultural labourers, and the miners. Conventions have been held, and there have been secret local and district meetings. The efforts being made are superhuman, and they call for no light sacrifices. At the May Day celebrations our Italian comrades were at the very front, and hundreds of them suffered in consequence imprisonment and other forms of persecution by police and employers.

The situation is still a grave one, and solidarity on the part of comrades is, therefore, more necessary than ever, to overcome the ever-hardening reactionary resistance and deceitful manoeuvres of a Social Democracy which had no scruples about offering, as soon as the opportunity presented itself, to collaborate with the Fascist Government. To-day, as always, this same Social Democracy sabotages our revolutionary Syndicalist movement.

To you, comrades, we turn with this appeal for fraternal solidarity, that the Italian Syndicalist Union may be able to pursue intrepidly its own proper road and surmount the many obstacles presented by the tragic situation now existing.

With fraternal greetings,

THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

FREEDOM.

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF ANARCHISM.

Price, Twopence; post-free, 2½d. Annual Subscription, 2s. 6d. post-free.
U.S.A. and Canada, \$1.00. France and the Continent, 2s. 6d.
Wholesale price, 1s. 6d. per dozen (13) post-free in the United Kingdom.

All communications, exchanges, etc., to be addressed to

Freedom Press, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W.1.

The Editors are not necessarily in agreement with signed articles.

Notice to Subscribers.—If there is a blue mark against this notice, your subscription is due, and must be sent before next month to ensure receipt of paper.

Money and Postal Orders to be made payable to FREEDOM PRESS.

The Miners' Coming Struggle.

All the signs at the time of writing point to a lock-out of the miners on August 1, the mineowners having given notice to terminate their agreement with the Miners' Federation. In that case we may see an industrial upheaval which will exceed anything of its kind in recent years. The mineowners have put forward new proposals for regulating wages which in some districts will mean a reduction of 30 per cent. To soften the blow, they have suggested that if the men will agree to an eight-hour day these cuts in wages would not be so drastic, as they could earn more in the longer day. The miners have refused to discuss these proposals, and they decline to meet the mineowners in conference until they have withdrawn them. The General Council of the Trades Union Congress have called on the whole of the Trade Union movement to support the miners, so it looks as though organised Labour is in for a big struggle.

There is much talk of an alliance between the miners, the railwaymen, the engineers, and the shipbuilders; but this is at present only at the discussion stage, and it could hardly function in this dispute. Some of the railwaymen's leaders are opposed to the idea of an alliance, but they are afraid that if the miners are locked out their members may refuse to move coal from the pits and thus be drawn into the fight. Besides, as the railway companies also want to cut wages, the railwaymen may think it an opportune moment to strike on their own account.

In the meantime the Government are doing all they can to get miners and mineowners into conference again, and have themselves set up an inquiry, at which only the mineowners are giving evidence. The Government recognise that a lock-out would be fatal to all hopes of improving trade, and as there are 1,300,000 unemployed registered at the labour exchanges, an increase of 250,000 in the past twelve months, they are anxious to prevent a stoppage if possible. The miners' leaders also want to avoid a lock-out, as the Unions are bankrupt and have no money for strike pay. In these circumstances a way out may yet be found, but it rests more with the owners than with the men. If, however, the mineowners think the lack of strike pay is a good opportunity to drive a hard bargain, they will make a mistake, as the men say they may as well starve out of work as starve in work.

We cannot feel any great enthusiasm for the coming struggle on the question of wages and hours of labour. It would be different if the workers were fighting to abolish the wage system. But here we are threatened with a gigantic industrial upheaval which will leave untouched the power of the masters to exploit the workers. Even if the miners' demand for the abolition of mining royalties were conceded it would not improve their position, as it is impossible to imagine that the Government would do it without compensating the royalty owners, which would mean that the royalties would be paid by the taxpayers instead of by the mining industry. Neither would they gain by nationalisation of the mines. If the mineowners cannot sell their coal at a profit, is there any likelihood of a Government department doing so? Business people are continually denouncing the unbusinesslike methods of these bureaucrats, more especially those of the Post Office, which a writer in a recent issue of the Labour Party's *Press Service* described as "one of the biggest pieces of Socialistic effort the world has ever seen." (1) Besides all this, we may be sure that under nationalisation the Government of the day would act far more drastically against miners on strike than they dare do whilst the mines are private property.

There can be no solution of the problem until the wage system and the monopoly of natural resources are abolished. We know that an increasing number of Labour leaders recognise this, but lack the

courage to say so. The truth is, that the War so undermined the position of this country as "the workshop of the world" that we must think out new methods of production and distribution. The capitalist system can no longer feed, clothe, and house the inhabitants of these islands, so now we must tackle the problem ourselves. The very first step must be to secure free access to the land, the source of all the necessities of life. The fences which shut out the people from the soil must be broken down. Then we shall be free to provide for ourselves on a basis of equality, calling no man master. We may or may not work eight hours a day, but we shall be working for ourselves as free men and women, exchanging freely the products of our labour with other producers, in this manner eliminating the overgrown army of parasites who now rob us of the fruits of our toil, spending it in lives of aimless pleasure and riotous luxury. These are the ideals for which Anarchists are working, and we put them before the workers as a substitute for the present system, which gives untold wealth to the few and misery, starvation, and constant anxiety to the many.

FIGHTING THE FUTURE.

In the June issue of *The Road to Freedom* (Stelton, N.J.) there is an article by Max Nettlau,* in which he states that he is struck by the contrast between the largeness of Anarchism's aims and "the narrowness"—let me personally emphasise that word—"so to speak, of the economic programme of Anarchism, be it Individualist or Communist." He deplores the existing division into "little chapels," which he attributes to the fact that each chapel is convinced that it possesses a correct economic solution of the social problem; and he concludes by saying that, "to fight authority in the capitalist system, and in the coming system of State Socialism, or Syndicalism, or both or all the three combined, an immense wave of real Anarchist feeling is wanted, before ever the question of economic remedies comes in."

Nettlau points out further that Individualist theories for about a century, and Collectivist and Communist theories for about fifty years, have "acquired a degree of settledness, certitude, and apparent permanency which they never ought to have assumed; for stagnation—this is the word—is the death of progress." He instances particularly the French Communist Anarchist Congress held in Paris, in which "Individualism was regularly stigmatised and placed outside the pale of Anarchism by a formal resolution." Yes, it is true. They actually did that. They solemnly excommunicated, with bell, book, and candle, everyone who had the courage and intelligence to do some thinking for himself. From the profound depths of their own inner consciousness they issued, with more than Papal insolence, the decree that whoever believed that the society of the future would use money as a medium of exchange was not entitled to call himself an Anarchist. Necessarily that let me out, the very sheet-anchor of my belief in Anarchism being that some day all men will be free to produce and free to make their own arrangements for the exchanging of their products. Incidentally I may add that my admiration for Proudhon rests on the fact of his having demonstrated, by what seems to me a correct analysis, that this is the goal toward which Humanity is steering in its struggle to abolish Militarism and assume a civilised, industrial form.

The basis of Anarchism is surely that men, at present helpless in the bonds of slavery, will find in Freedom the road by which individually they can escape from helplessness and become completely masters of themselves. If Anarchism does not stand for that, it need not count me among its adherents. If, under the guise of Socialism, Communism, Trade Unionism, Syndicalism, Dictatorship of the Proletariat, the Class Struggle, Majority Rule, or other of the catchwords now in fashion, it seeks to cripple the Individual, I have not the slightest use for it. I am not interested in anything that tends to weaken people. My one ambition is to make them strong; to induce them by all the means at their command to climb out of the position of inferiority which invites invasion and into that position of power from which, being armed with equal opportunity of self-defence, they can defy invasion. I dislike the invader, but I hate the senseless servility which makes him what he is.

This, as I conceive it, is the very soul of Anarchism; and until

* Nettlau's article—"Anarchism: Communist or Individualist?—Both"—was originally published in *FREEDOM* some years ago, but that does not affect the value of the comments by our present contributor.

that soul is fully aroused and full of fight we shall not have a movement. Until a great awakening takes place we cannot have that "immense wave of real Anarchist feeling" which, as Nettlau properly points out, is the first thing needed. We shall not get, for example, free and equal access to Nature's inexhaustible storehouse, the land, until the great bulk of people "feel" in the very marrow of their bones that to deprive them of that right is to condemn them to a slavery no longer bearable. We shall not get free speech until it becomes generally recognised that the right to the expression of one's personality is at once the most precious thing in individual life and the first essential to collective progress.

What Nettlau is really telling us, in his own words, is that "the letter killeth and the spirit giveth life." He is reminding us of an immortal truth, and one that too many Anarchists forget. Ten years ago I was living on the outskirts of a so-called Anarchist colony, and many of its members were feverishly speculating in land. Apparently they did not understand that they had no equitable right to the values the colony had created; had no conception of the fact that, inasmuch as no man made the land, none is justified in roping off a portion and saying, "This henceforth belongs to me alone"; had no comprehension of the vital difference between land, which is limited in quantity and imperishable, and goods which can be produced to almost any extent to-day and are consumed to-morrow; in short, on this all-important question were ignorant barbarians. Do you maintain that, despite all this, they were good Anarchists at heart? I cannot think it.

It may seem as if in this particular example I had plunged into economics; but the question raised has no such narrow limits. I did not expect to find these people economic specialists, but I did expect to find in them that respect for honesty and equal rights which is supposed to be the very corner-stone of our belief. What became self-evident to me immediately was that they were quite willing to reap where they had not sown, and, by establishing a monopoly, to trade on the helplessness of others. That sort of thing is fatal. It kills the movement's soul. It is as if William Lloyd Garrison, while rousing all the United States to the overthrow of chattel slavery, had added to his income by doing a thriving trade in slaves. On this broad basis, as I see it, Individualist and Communist Anarchists can well unite. They are not required to agree on any nice points of disputed scholarship. All that is asked of them is that they should recognise fundamental principles they are supposed to hold in common, and be sincere.

Turn to the question of free speech. I have a taste for study, and the examination of economic problems has been to me a genuine pleasure. I think, for example, that the system of mutual banking, explained so clearly by Benjamin R. Tucker, who made himself the interpreter of Proudhon, is the system toward which society is tending, and which ultimately it may adopt. On the other hand, I think the Henry George plan of killing Land Monopoly by appropriating all the land values and handing them over to the community is more correct scientifically and more practicable than are Tucker's proposals, which seem to me to ignore the law of economic rent (*i.e.*, the difference in value of different pieces of land), though he himself declares it cannot be ignored. These opinions, which are to me mere probabilities, I have reached quite honestly; but I have often discovered that Anarchists who attacked them virulently knew nothing of the arguments for or against them. As regards Henry George, they assumed almost invariably that he advocated State ownership. He devoted a chapter of "Progress and Poverty" to its specific condemnation!

What folly it all is! Why should we attempt to cross bridges at present hardly in sight? Why should we seek to settle the world for future generations when the present generation has still no idea that it is necessary to make a change? As things are, the man in the street does not realise that the land monopolist has disinherited him; thinks that without a rich employer he would starve to death; or believes, if he is a Socialist, that the sole remedy for admitted evils is to make the State the universal capitalist. Upon such simple points as these a great propaganda of enlightenment is needed sorely. On the other hand, hair-splitting over disputed, and highly disputable, theories makes not so much as a dint on this great barrier of ignorant indifference, and I may add that shouting names or shaking fists at it has even less effect. What is needed is a wide and persistent rub-a-dub agitation, centred on the simplest possible explanation of simple principles and facts that all can understand. On this we could all unite. From the elaboration of programmes for the future comes most of the trouble.

W. C. O.

THE TASKS OF ANARCHISM.

La Revue Internationale Anarchiste is conducting what it styles "a world-discussion on the immediate and future tasks of Anarchism." An enormous subject. Thought changes all the time; but what are the factors that work most powerfully to that end? What is the comparative influence, let us say, of economic developments, political institutions, and propaganda? Is organisation a paramount necessity, and, if so, is Syndicalism its ideal form? Who uses his time and energy most wisely, the man who confines himself to the teaching of basic truths, or the man who merges himself in the hand-to-mouth struggles of the masses, that he may shape them to larger ends? These are complicated questions, and they will be answered very differently by different Anarchists. As it is, the discussion is producing a number of excellent articles; and, so far as it is possible to analyse at present, the main division of opinion is as to whether the teaching of Anarchist principles can be combined with that active participation in working-class strategy which often compels the participant to violate his principles.

In a recent number of *Le Reveil* Malatesta considers this problem under the heading "Syndicalism and Anarchism." He says, in part:—"Many comrades aspire to fuse into one the working-man's and the Anarchist movements; and where they are able to do this, as, for example, in Spain and the Argentine, and to a small extent in Italy, France, and Germany, they seek to give the workers a programme that is purely Anarchistic. There are those who call themselves 'Syndicalist-Anarchists,' or, uniting with those who in reality are not Anarchists, take the name of 'Syndicalist-Revolutionaries.'" He then points out that the business of the Syndicate is to defend the present interests of the workers, and that it must try to get into its ranks all the workers, whatever may be their theoretical beliefs. He maintains that Syndicalism is, by its very nature, reformist; and that "every fusion or confusion between the Anarchist and Revolutionary movement and that of Syndicalism ends either in rendering the Syndicate powerless to attain its specific aim, or in attenuating, falsifying, and extinguishing the Anarchist spirit."

The every-day work of the Syndicate is necessarily in conflict with Anarchist ideas. "One cannot," says Malatesta, "be acting as an Anarchist when one is compelled to bargain with employers and the authorities. One cannot make the masses act on their own initiative when they themselves refuse to do so and demand leaders. But why confuse Anarchism with that which it is not, and why assume as Anarchists responsibility for transactions and compromises rendered necessary by the fact that the mass is not Anarchist, even if it has written into its constitution an Anarchist programme?" In his view, Anarchists should join their trade Syndicates and work for the organisation's ends, and "if, for the sake of the organisation's life and needs, and in conformity with the wishes of the organised, they find it truly necessary to come to terms, give way, and compromise with employers and the authorities—well, that must be as it will." What they ought not to do is to pretend that the organisations in so doing are acting as Anarchist organisations, for our role is "to demonstrate the insufficiency and precarious character of all ameliorations obtainable under the capitalist regime, and to steer the struggle toward ever more radical solutions."

It will be seen that this branch alone of the general question bristles with difficulties, and it cannot be too unflinchingly thrashed out. Malatesta complains that he and Fabbri have been accused of wishing to organise the Anarchists in "unions purely cultural." The present reviewer, on the other hand, regrets profoundly that they are not bending all their energies to the development of propagandists who, holding themselves aloof from Trade Union entanglements, can devote themselves whole-heartedly to setting forth the vital truths that are the very lifeblood of our movement. Divided allegiance is never worth while. However, this is only, in another form, the old dispute as to whether the Church is best attacked by assault from without or permeation from within. It is here submitted that the scientists, who followed boldly the former tactic, are the ones who have reduced it to what it is to-day—a dried-up gourd, with all the life gone out of it.

TOWER HILL OPEN-AIR CAMPAIGN.

Wm. C. Owen and J. W. Graham Peace are holding a mid-day meeting every Tuesday during the summer. Readers who can attend and help in any way to make the meetings a success are cordially invited to do so any time between 12.30 and 2.30.

REBELLIOUS MEXICO.

There comes to us from the United States a well-known paper, the *Emporia Gazette*, edited by a noted writer, Mr. W. A. White. Its leading article begins:—"If you are under 30 you probably will see and maybe take part in the second war with Mexico. For it is impossible that the two civilisations known as Mexico and the United States shall live together on one continent in peace much longer." This central theme the writer proceeds to amplify, declaring that "the northern civilisation which the United States embraces has for its basic idea the belief, deeply grounded in every citizen, that capital—the savings of yesterday for the use of to-morrow—is a sacred institution." With this he contrasts the Mexican philosophy of life which he describes as "essentially Latin, plus an Indian hang-over," and as one that "cares little for capital." Out of this conflict of philosophies, as he considers, the clash is sure to come, and he adds:—"Americans are in an imperial mood. They believe in fighting for the rights of capital. They will not brook insult. The Mexican will not refrain from insulting what we think is sacred. Bloodshed is sure to follow, and war will follow insult and bloodshed."

So men whose only capital is their labour-power must die by thousands because North of a river boundary the Almighty Dollar is worshipped, while South of that boundary it is held in comparatively light esteem by a people which has a different view of life. On the one side those who wish to live their fleeting lives as freely as they may. On the other side those whose ambition is to get and get. This is the real struggle of the age—the struggle of the aggressive few against the unaggressive many. For this China, India, and all the vast areas we speak of loosely as the Orient, are in revolt against the White Man; and because of this there is little love lost between easy-going Mexico and her restless, money-making Northern neighbour.

Economically the United States, more powerful and vigorous, has triumphed at almost every point; first by seizure of such great Mexican States as Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California, which she acquired by war; secondly, by pouring money into the country and buying up for a mere song its natural resources; all which took place under the powerful Dictatorship of Porfirio Diaz, himself originally a revolutionist and rebel. Then came the revolt, led in the first instance by Ricardo and Enrique Magón, which drove him into exile. There followed in the Presidency, Madero, who was assassinated; Huerta, who was banished; Carranza, also assassinated; Obregon, whose term expired recently; and now Calles is in power. And year after year the struggle has gone on, always with the one end in view—the recapture by the masses of their natural resources, that they may live the life that suits them. They are a Latin people, with Latin habits, accentuated by the tropical and semi-tropical climate of the country; and they have in them all the Latin impetuosity and fire. But they are also largely of an ancient Indian stock, noted for its tenacity.

These people never give up. Ricardo Magón battled to the last, and died as he was stepping out of gaol. His brother Enrique is, if possible, more active than ever, despite increasing age, ill-health, and penury. It is to be remembered, however, they have all the weight of the United States against them, for the financiers of that and other countries have no idea of releasing the fat territory they have got into their clutches. They work through politics. They hold over Mexico's rulers a rod of terror—the prospect of another invasion. And Mexico's rulers are probably neither better nor worse than other politicians. They can be cajoled and bribed. They can be bullied. They steer a double course. On the one hand, they try to placate Wall Street, the oil combines, and other great economic powers whose support they need, and whose enmity they dread. On the other hand, they seek to control, as best they can, a rebellious and discontented people which has set its heart on just one thing—the Land. Every Mexican politician promises the masses that he will give them that, and of late certain of these promises have had to be redeemed. Concessions have been made by the restoration of ancient communal rights, and even Mr. William Randolph Hearst, the American newspaper proprietor, at one time a

powerful advocate of American intervention, has thought fit to turn over to the peasants a portion of his million-acre ranch.

These concessions are not made willingly. They cannot be; for the politicians in granting them come immediately into conflict with the foreign monopolists, whose vested interests are thereby attacked. They play, therefore, for time, and they work largely through the more conservative element in the Labour organisations, many of which they have themselves created. As we understand it, the Mexican Regional Confederation of Workers plays much the same rôle in Mexico as the American Federation of Labour has played in the United States. It is honeycombed with politicians, and is all for non-essential political reforms. These do not satisfy the masses, and least of all such radical organisations as are the General Confederation of Workers (Anarchist-Syndicalist), the Confederation of Railroadmen's Unions, and the Bakers' Syndicate. Labour organisation, practically non-existent under Porfirio Diaz, has had an enormous development since he was overthrown. But in Mexico, as everywhere, Labour is still split into warring factions. There, as elsewhere, the majority, having no clear conception of the road in front of it, is easily misled; but to us the important thing is that it is on the march and eager to forge ahead. Under Diaz it appeared to have sunk into the torpidity of death. Unquestionably in the last fifteen years there has been extraordinary mental growth.

Perhaps President Calles also has grown, but on that we are sceptical. Pressure from below forces him to figure as the people's champion; but we remember that, under Diaz, he was Governor of the wealthy State of Sonora, and that he crushed the Cananea strike by shooting down the miners' leaders. However, the Mexicans are essentially a revolutionary people; they have no liking for Dictatorship, and their treatment of leaders who become distrusted is apt to be extremely drastic.

SOLOVETSKY PRISON ABOLISHED.

According to the latest news received from Russia, Solovetsky, the dreaded concentration camp for political prisoners in the frozen North, has been abolished, thanks to the unceasing agitation of the Committees for the defence of the political prisoners which has been carried on in Europe, America, and in Great Britain. In spite of the lies about the ideal conditions of this hell-hole which have been published in the Communist press all over the world, the Bolsheviks have had to give way to this agitation and all the political prisoners have been removed. But this does not mean that the agitation for their release should slacken. These prisoners have been distributed in other concentration camps where the conditions are little better than in Solovetsky. Now that the Bolsheviks have shown that they can be influenced by public opinion, the agitation must be intensified until all the political prisoners are released.

SONNET.

Out of the large, calm, starry night it ran,
Reaching the wine-drugged monarch's inward ear;
Close round his neck, snake-wise, a white arm dear,
Blue-veined, gold-circled—his warm courtesan!
"I, too, have known the couch of last year's gold;
I, too, the splendours of a prison-house,
Wherein all chained and padded men carouse,
And sell their freedoms for the shadows cold.
Now it is Spring and beggars may go blessed
When there are crowns of May on every bough,
And to each mothering bird the cock makes cry."
"Hist!" cried the king, upstarting and distressed,
"What minstrel of my court is singing now?"
The beggar at his gate went laughing by!

ETHEL CARNIE HOLDSWORTH.

Liberty is contagious, and liberty alone—not the governments—created liberty.—*Bakunin*.

CHINESE ACCOUNT OF SHANGHAI MASSACRE. ANOTHER VIEW OF "POLITICAL ANARCHISM."

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

In the name of all the people of Shanghai, in the name of the Chinese people, and in the name of all members of the human race, we protest against the cruelties perpetrated in the foreign quarter of the town of Shanghai by the bloodthirsty police who, without being under the necessity of self-defence, for three days made savage war on and butchered more than 20 students, working men, and civilians who had been guilty of no offence, and were unarmed.

Because it is a terribly black spot on human history and on this divine globe's record, and because it is to the common shame of all its present population, it has become our imperative duty to report truthfully to all the world what has taken place, without national bias or any desire to stir up trouble. Inasmuch as what is just and true can never be made otherwise by arms or the use of force, we know that all lovers of truth and justice will read our appeal and pass on it a conscientious judgment. We hope that there is still sufficient sense of justice left in the world of to-day to enable our readers to form a fair decision, and with that we shall be content. Of course, the English police and their fellow-countrymen who are friendly towards them—they know only nationality and not humanity—tried to cover up their misdeeds, and, to exculpate themselves, poured out in their own journals a flood of misinformation. We beg readers to believe our report.

Here are the facts. Last month (May) there was a strike in a Japanese cotton mill. The strikers won, the mill-owners granting all their demands. Nevertheless, after the workers had gone back again, the Japanese refused to keep their promises. While their employees were making a peaceful protest the mill-owners opened fire on them, killing two and wounding seven. After this bloody business the local police, acting under orders from the English Consul, arrested a number of the workers, and refused to allow news of the cruelties that had taken place to be published in the local Chinese paper. On May 24th six students from various universities were arrested for speaking on the streets. In order to lend assistance to the students and workers who had been put under arrest, on May 30th a number of students of both sexes, from nearly all the Shanghai seats of learning, went to the foreign quarter and made speeches and distributed pamphlets on all the streets. In the afternoon a large crowd assembled in Nanking Road, which is the main street. Again the police arrested a number of men, but the crowd did not disperse. The English Chief of Police then gave the order to fire on the crowd. His men fired, more than 40 discharges being aimed directly at a body of innocent and unarmed persons. This firing lasted several minutes, six persons fell to the ground dead and ten were severely wounded. Blood flowed in the street like water. Among those who have been killed are three young students, and workers, commercial men, and passers-by. None of them knew up to the last minute why or for what he had to die. Is it not a terrible tragedy?

As a result there followed a great strike, more killing, and riots in every corner of Shanghai. But do not ask who was at fault during most of this rioting, for all indignantly blame all. But in this drama the Chinese were unarmed and, as a consequence, numbers of them were killed daily.

Readers ought to know: (1) Whether the first day's firing by the police was necessary, as being in self-defence; (2) whether unarmed students could have attacked armed men; (3) whether there is any evidence of the police having been in danger prior to the firing, and how they were attacked; (4) whether an attack at a distance of six feet is possible; (5) how it is that the bullets found on the dead men had entered from the back.

Publication in Esperanto and other journals is solicited. Correspondence should be addressed to Shanghai Esperanto Association, K7, Boone Road, Shanghai, China.

The above statement, in Esperanto, is issued in the name of the following Chinese Esperantist organisations:—Shanhaja Esperanto-Asocio, Orienta Esperanto-Propaganda Instituto, China Telegrafista Esperanto-Asocio, U.E.A. Anaro en Shanghai, Redakta Komitato de "La Verda Lumo," Esperanto-Kurso de Granda China Instituto.

DEAR SIR,—I receive FREEDOM regularly and like it very much. It is by far the best paper of our kind that I have found anywhere.

Using the words of Marjorie Peacock in a recent issue of your paper, whose definition of Anarchism I accept, or which I have held for years, I am a "political Anarchist," of the Individualistic variety, but not a pro-capitalistic Anarchist in the sense that word is now used.

Like Jo Labadie, my associate editor, I am Communistic in some things—in those things where privateism takes us further from economic justice or equity. Common highways or roads of locomotion are of this class, for instance.

Capitalism and property in the conventional or legal sense mean privileged capitalism and legal property—and in this sense I am averse to them. Now call "capital" or "property" products—i.e., products in use to further production ("capital") and products of consumption, and we have a very different thing from what those terms legally and conventionally mean.

In my view neither Communism, "privateism," mutual banking, free banking, etc., are any part of Anarchism, but economic expedients or means or pursuits that could be freely worked in Anarchism, or the absence of government of the imperial, coercive, or force-backed variety.

Anarchism, or the doctrine of untrammelled individual liberty, as I see it, is broad enough to cover all things, or rather permit all things—economic errors as well as economic virtues—and then men would naturally, for selfish reasons, adopt or practise the better and withdraw from the worse, and then all our problems that divide us or confuse us now would soon vanish from among us. As we now, under Archism, cannot possibly give our economic theories a real, fair, practical test, that we could *learn* and *know*, we are kept fussing like children in the dark—for theories, schemes, plans, inventions are of little or no use if the thing cannot be given a fair try-out.

The private or State or so-called "public" ownership of land, or property in land, is not the same as private ownership of one's products from land. Bona-fide *use-right* of land by the user is not *property* in land, as we know it, where a man can live in "London town" or a castle and levy upon the products of the user of certain acres.

Land ownership, unlike product ownership (by the producer), is a denial of Anarchism, and all Anarchists, whether of Individualistic or private inclination or Communistic inclination, are at one on this: "Absolute (or non-occupancy, non-use) land ownership must be abolished." Until it is abolished, authority, the State, mastery, and slavery must remain the fate of the world. And those things are Archism in its fullest sense. Freedom of land—that is freedom of an individual or group of individuals in the *use* of land—freedom of trade or exchange, freedom of locomotion (highways or roads), freedom in the means of exchange, or credit transfer, among those who desire it, are all necessary to the freedom of man—to Anarchism; and all denials of those things by man or men, communities or States, are part and parcel of the thing called Archism, authority, government, or State.

All Anarchists (Individualistic and Communistic in economic views) should unite on a programme of this nature, and keep aloof from the petty squabbles between Union men and "scabs," "closed shop" and "open shop" contentions, as they are evils necessarily resulting from master-and-man relationship.

When the great incubus of Authority or State no longer exists, in friendly emulation or competition, men or voluntary groups of men may solve all economic problems, not by mere argument, as now, but by practical demonstration.—Yours fraternally,

EDWARD H. FULTON.

The Egoist, Clinton, Iowa, U.S.A.

ANARCHISM VERSUS SOCIALISM.

By WM. C. OWEN.

32 pages, with Wrapper. Price, Threepence.

A VISIT FROM PIERRE RAMUS.

In the early days of July Pierre Ramus—editor of *Erkenntnis und Befreiung* (Vienna)—came to London as a delegate to the No More War Conference. After the conference was finished he addressed two public meetings, one on July 7, when he spoke, in German, at the Circle House, Great Alie Street, Aldgate, under the auspices of the "Workers' Friend" Group; and the other on June 8, at the Minerva Café, High Holborn, when he spoke in English. The latter meeting was arranged by the Freedom Group. The subject on both occasions was "Lessons of the Lost Revolutions in Germany and Austria." His address at the Minerva Café was a comprehensive survey of the situation in Germany and Austria when the two great Imperialisms came crashing to the ground. He said that the bourgeois class in both countries were absolutely helpless, and the Social Democrats had the power in their hands to make a real workers' social revolution; but instead of doing so they linked themselves with the defeated reactionaries for the purpose of "saving the Republic." The result we all know. The reactionaries gradually forced the Social Democrats out of power and are now in the saddle in both countries. It is impossible to report his speech in detail, but his eloquence and his grasp of the situation carried conviction to a crowded and enthusiastic audience. Many questions were put and ably answered. A Communist challenged him to debate. He was perfectly willing, but never heard any more of the matter.

At a social gathering two days later speeches of welcome were made in English and Jewish by several comrades, and in reply Pierre Ramus reviewed the revolutionary position from the Anarchist standpoint. He said that it was just twenty-five years since he joined the Anarchist movement, thanks to his acquaintance with John Most in America. He thought Anarchists should be optimistic rather than pessimistic. Twenty-five years ago we could only combat State Socialism in a theoretical way. But in the past few years we had seen the Social Democrats in power in Russia, Germany, and Austria, and in each case their failure to emancipate the workers from wage-slavery had been complete. With these object-lessons before us, we Anarchists were now in a splendid position to drive home the principles of Anarchism to the workers. It was an eloquent and inspiring address, for which he was heartily thanked by all the comrades present. It is a great pity that we do not have more frequent opportunities of exchanging opinions with comrades from abroad.

Kropotkin's "Ethics" in English.

We are pleased to announce that an English edition of Peter Kropotkin's "Ethics" has been published by Messrs. George G. Harrap and Co. We hope to publish a review in our next issue. Copies can now be obtained from FREEDOM Office. Price, 12s. 6d.; postage 6d.

"Freedom" Guarantee Fund.

Our readers will readily guess why we dropped an issue of FREEDOM. June was a very black month, so we felt we were not justified in running further into debt. July has been better, and we hope it is a good omen for the future. You are sorry when FREEDOM does not appear regularly, and so are we; but it rests with you to provide us with the necessary cash.

The following donations have been received to date (July 25) since our last issue:—A. D. Moore 4s., T. S. (3 months) 15s., G. W. Tindale 2s. 6d., C. Sewell 2s. 6d., W. R. Pearson 2s. 6d., G. P. 5s., E. M. 5s., W. C. Owen 5s., Joseph 5s., Michael A. Cohn £4 2s. 1d., G. Davison £3, S. Llewellyn 1s., J. Dimitroff 4s., L. G. Wolfe £2.

CASH RECEIVED (not otherwise acknowledged). (June 6 to July 25.)

"FREEDOM" SUBSCRIPTIONS.—F. Boyd, J. H. Grigsby, C. J. Protheroe, J. S., S. Mainwaring, E. Bairstow, S. S. Lee, S. Fabijanovic, R. Rhies, L. Kisluik, J. B. Barnhill, B. Phelps, V. Mantovano, J. W. Maskell, W. H. Harrison, H. Hiscox, E. E. Williams, W. Fraser.

The Road to Freedom.

A Periodical of Anarchist Thought, Work, and Literature.

Subscription, \$1.00 (4s.) a year.

Address all communications and make all money orders payable to
ROAD TO FREEDOM, STELTON, N.J., U.S.A.

GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

By P.-J. PROUDHON.

Translated from the French by JOHN BEVERLEY ROBINSON.

Paper covers, 2s. 6d.; Cloth (printed on superior paper), 5s.;
Postage (paper and cloth), 3d.

Prices in U.S.A.—Paper, \$1.00; Cloth, \$2.00; post free.

FREEDOM PRESS, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W. 1

Books by Emma Goldman.

My Disillusionment in Russia. 242 pages. **My Further Disillusionment in Russia.** 178 pages. 12s. the two volumes.
postage 9d.

Anarchism and Other Essays. 6s. 6d.; postage 4d.

Russia and the British Labour Delegation's Report: A Reply.

Published by the British Committee for the Defence of Political
Prisoners in Russia.

Price 4d., postage 1d.; 13 copies for 3s., post-free.

From FREEDOM Press, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W. 1.

Publications on the Russian Revolution.

Anarchism and the World Revolution. By FRED S. GRAHAM.
1s., post-free.

The Crushing of the Russian Revolution. By EMMA GOLDMAN.
2d.; postage, 1d.

The Kronstadt Rebellion. By ALEXANDER BERKMAN. 6d.,
post-free.

PAMPHLET AND BOOK LIST.

ANARCHIST COMMUNISM: ITS BASIS AND PRINCIPLES. By PETER
KROPOTKIN. 3d.

THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 4d.

THE WAGE SYSTEM. By P. KROPOTKIN. 2d.

ANARCHY. By E. MALATESTA. 3d.

THE PLACE OF ANARCHISM IN SOCIALISTIC EVOLUTION. By
PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.

REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT. By Peter Kropotkin. 2d.

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. By ELISEE RECLUS. 2d.

LAW AND AUTHORITY. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3d.

OBJECTIONS TO ANARCHISM. By George Barrett. 4d.

THE ANARCHIST REVOLUTION. By George Barrett. 2d.

ANARCHISM VERSUS SOCIALISM. By WM. C. OWEN. 3d.

ENGLAND MONOPOLISED OR ENGLAND FREE? By WM. C. OWEN. 1d.

ANARCHISM AND DEMOCRACY. By John Wakeman. 1d.

THE CONCENTRATION OF CAPITAL: A MARXIAN FALLACY By
W. TCHERKESOFF. 2d.

AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d

THE CHICAGO MARTYRS. With Portraits. 2d.

ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. 1d.

FOR LIBERTY: An Anthology of Revolt. 6d.

Postage extra—1d. for each 3 pamphlets.

MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM. By PETER KROPOTKIN.
Paper Covers, 1s.; postage 2d.

FIELDS, FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS. By PETER KROPOTKIN.
Cloth, 2s.; postage 4d.

GOD AND THE STATE. By Michael Bakunin. (American Edition.)
Cloth, 4s.; paper, 2s. 6d.; postage, 2d.

MUTUAL AID. By P. Kropotkin. Paper, 2s. net; postage 3d.

WHAT IS PROPERTY? By P. J. Proudhon. Cloth (1 vol.), 4s. 6d.;
paper covers (in two vols.), 3s.; postage, 5d.

PRISON MEMOIRS OF AN ANARCHIST. By ALEXANDER BERKMAN.
11s. 6d., postage 8d.

ECONOMICS OF LIBERTY. A statement of Proudhon's system of social
organisation. By JOHN BEVERLEY ROBINSON. Cloth, 2s.; postage 3d.

MAN VERSUS THE STATE. By Herbert Spencer. Paper, 6d.; post. 2d.

THE EGO AND ITS OWN. By Max Stirner. 6s.; postage 4d.

NEWS FROM NOWHERE. By William Morris. Cloth, 3s. 6d.; paper,
1s. 6d.; postage, 3d.

FREEDOM AND ITS FUNDAMENTALS. By CHARLES T. SPRADING.
Cloth, 6s. 6d.; postage, 4d.

SYNDICALISM AND THE CO-OPERATIVE COMMONWEALTH.
By E. Pataud and E. Pouget. Paper covers, 2s. 6d.; postage, 3d.

A DREAM OF JOHN BALL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. Cloth, 3s. 6d.;
postage 3d.

THE ORIGIN AND IDEALS OF THE MODERN SCHOOL. By
FRANCISCO FERRER. Cloth, 1s.; paper, 6d.; postage 2d.

POLITICAL JUSTICE: Essay on Property. By William Godwin. Cloth,
3s. 6d.; postage, 3d.

ANARCHISM AND OTHER ESSAYS. By Emma Goldman. 6s. 6d.;
postage 4d.

REFLECTIONS ON POLITICAL JUSTICE. (Selections from the
Writings of William Godwin.) 4d.

A VINDICATION OF NATURAL SOCIETY. By EDMUND BURKE.
8d., postage 1d.

Orders, with cash, to be sent to

FREEDOM PRESS, 127 OSSULSTON STREET, LONDON, N.W. 1.

Printed & Published by the Freedom Press, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W. 1.