

Freedom

VOL. XLI.—No. 445.

SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER, 1927.

MONTHLY: TWO PENCE.

NOTES.

The Execution of Sacco and Vanzetti.

After seven years of suspense our comrades Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti have been executed. The world-wide protest failed and on the morning of August 23 they were electrocuted at Charlestown Prison in Boston, Mass. Thus ends a long-drawn-out tragedy. It is now quite evident that the Commission appointed by Governor Fuller was simply a fake to give an air of justice to his decision. The prejudice of Judge Webster Thayer has already been exposed to the world, but his reported remark to an acquaintance, "Did you see what I did to those Anarchist bastards?" is a striking commentary on the impartiality of the man who tried and sentenced Sacco and Vanzetti, and afterwards heard their appeal against his own decision. Governor Alvan T. Fuller has just as bad a record. When he was a member of Congress in 1919, on the occasion of the expulsion of Victor Berger, the Socialist who was elected to Congress from Wisconsin, Fuller made a violent speech in which he called for the execution of "the whole red scum brood of Anarchists, Bolsheviks, I.W.W.'s, and revolutionaries." This was the man to whom the world appealed for the release of our two comrades. And this was the man with whom Ramsay MacDonald dined on his last visit to America, when he said the case was one entirely for Americans to deal with. We do not mourn the death of Sacco and Vanzetti, who have exhibited a marvellous dignity throughout the whole of their trying ordeal. These two men, in dying, have exposed the hollowness of the much-vaunted impartiality of capitalist courts of justice, and they scorned the idea of begging for "pardon" when their lives were in the balance. Let us show our appreciation of them, not by shedding useless tears, but by throwing renewed energy into our task of destroying this brutal and callous system.

Darwin's Theory Irrefutable.

Sir Arthur Keith's presidential address at Leeds to the British Association on August 31 was such a thorough vindication of Darwin's theory of man's descent that his opponents have no longer got a leg to stand on. "All the evidence now at our disposal," he said, "supports the conclusion that man has arisen, as Lamarck and Darwin suspected, from an anthropoid ape not higher in the zoological scale than a chimpanzee, and that the date at which human and anthropoid lines of descent began to diverge lies near the beginning of the Miocene period." On a modest scale of reckoning, Sir Arthur explained, that gave man the "respectable antiquity" of about 1,000,000 years. He said the evidence, obtained from a study of fossil remains, is "definite and irrefutable." He recalled the fact that it was in Leeds, in 1858, that "was fired the first verbal shot of that long and bitter strife which ended in the overthrow of those who defended the Biblical account of man's creation, and in a victory for Darwin." The principal opponents of this theory were the clergy, because it upset all those old legends in Genesis about Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden, and the wicked serpent who tempted Eve, and how Eve took the apple from the "tree to be desired to make one wise" and eat it, and then gave one to Adam, "and he did eat"—in short, the story of the Fall. Many of Darwin's opponents in this country, however, were members of our old aristocratic families, who claimed descent from the Norman Conqueror or some other ancient robber. To say that their original ancestors were ape-like beings was rank treason. For our part, we think it is much better to know that we have risen in the scale than fallen, although our antics from 1914 to 1918 did not show that we had made much good use of our rise. Since Sir Arthur's declaration some of the clergy have been thinking deeply, and the Bishop of Birmingham has startled the Christian world by a sermon in Westminster Abbey on September 25, in which he said that "Darwin's triumph has destroyed the whole theological scheme."

Rebellion a Crime.

Sir William Joynson-Hicks, the Home Secretary, is evidently getting in a funk, if we are to judge by a speech he made at Dunrobin on September 20. After tilting at the Trades Union Congress for their vote of censure on the Government for breaking off relations with Russia when they themselves had broken with the Russian Trade Unions, he said: "I am trying to help them in their warfare against Russian Communism," and hoped they would join with him and the loyal portion of the community in putting an end to this "miserable Communism." The Government would welcome the co-operation of the Labour Party in the House of Commons. "I have always held," he said, "and so has English law, that political opinion is free in this country, but rebellion is not. Rebellion is to-day a crime, as it always has been, and the time has in my view come to say that preparation, even if only mental preparation, for rebellion is or should be made a crime in this country." This seems to foreshadow an attack on the revolutionary press in the near future. We know the sort of legislation these people aim at: an Act which will be drafted so vaguely that any expression of discontent could be construed to mean incitement to rebellion. Last July Sir William told a Mansion House audience that "Signor Mussolini has set an example to the statesmen of the world," and he evidently wishes to follow that example. But as Mussolini smashed up all the political parties opposed to him and put the Trade Unions under the control of his black-shirted followers, we hardly see how "Jix" can hope for the support of the Labour Party. Perhaps he meant it as a threat. Help us or be smashed. Of course, Sir William wishes us to forget his violent speeches during the Ulster Rebellion, when he and his friends openly defied the Government and armed and drilled men to resist the working of the Home Rule Act. His friends threatened to hang Cabinet Ministers on lamp-posts in Whitehall, and said they would sooner be subjects of the German Emperor than submit to Home Rule. We are quite willing to see the Government pass an Act against "mental preparation" for rebellion. Revolutions are not made by articles in papers or by pamphlets but are created by unjust economic and social conditions. And the unjust and inequitable conditions which Joynson-Hicks wishes to perpetuate will breed the revolution he wishes to prevent.

Hypocrisy of the Communists.

It was certainly surprising to find Communists joining in the agitation for the release of Sacco and Vanzetti, who all know were Anarchists. For years the Anarchist press of the world has been calling attention to the threatened execution of these two men on the faked-up charge of murder. And for years the Communist press was silent on the question. But when the volume of protests could no longer be ignored, the Communists came in, to get what credit they could out of it. They carefully concealed the fact that Sacco and Vanzetti were Anarchists as long as was possible. They spoke of them as radicals or Labour agitators or Socialists, and only at the last said they were Anarchists. We wish that their new-found zeal on behalf of persecuted Anarchists could be diverted to demanding the release of the many Anarchists, Socialists, and even Communists now wasting their lives in jail or in exile in Russia. The agitation in favour of the release of these victims of the Communist Government of Russia has been ignored by those who so recently have been loud in their denunciation of "capitalist" justice. Let them show that "Communist" justice is any better. Thousands of political prisoners are eating their hearts out in the jails of Russia waiting for the day when their "comrade" warders will open the doors and let them have one breath of air in freedom ere they die. But their warders are too busy now to hear them. They are preparing to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the great Revolution which was fought to break the power of tyranny in Russia and set men and women free. What a mockery it will be to the men and women in prison or in exile to see the flags waving and hear the bands playing to celebrate that great event.

Tucker or Henry George?

The quarrel over the land question between those who agree with Herbert Spencer, Tolstoy, and Henry George, and the Mutualists, who follow Proudhon and Benjamin R. Tucker, is essentially a quarrel as to facts. It should be, therefore, as capable of being determined definitely as is an ordinary problem in chemistry or any other branch of exact science. Apart from the folly of war between two sets of people who are entirely at one in their condemnation of land monopoly, it is always of the first importance that error be killed and truth established. If it be true, as many think, that a correct settlement of the land question would lead automatically to the abolition of poverty and the overthrow of human slavery, it is imperative that we get at the facts in the case, in order that we may reach a right conclusion as to methods.

This can be best done, I think, by setting out as simply as possible the position on either side. Those whom, for convenience, we may call the followers of Henry George, assert that their object is to secure for every human being equality of opportunity. They consider that the first step is to establish on a correct basis Man's relation to the natural resources of this planet, by and on which he has to live. They maintain that every child of man has an inalienable right to the free use of natural opportunities, on equal terms with every other child of man. This, they believe, can be secured only by recognising that different pieces of land differ enormously in value, and by understanding that he who occupies a superior site enjoys a special privilege for which, in all justice, he ought to compensate those who occupy sites of inferior value. They declare most positively that there is a fundamental distinction between land, which no one has created, and the products of human labour; that all have a right to use on equal terms the former, but that the latter should be the personal property of him whose labour has brought it into existence. It is clear to them, for example, that the enormous prices well-located city property commands are due to the presence of the people concentrated at that particular spot, and that the values they have created should go to them. Thus and thus alone, in their view, can the social structure, at present balanced precariously on its apex, be planted firmly on the basis of the free enjoyment by all of equal rights, it being no infringement of the law of equal freedom to require that the grantee of a special privilege shall pay to the grantor its equitable value. Inasmuch as two persons cannot occupy at the same moment the same point in space, it follows that under any conceivable system of land distribution some will have to occupy superior and some inferior territory, from which fact arises what political economists call the law of economic rent. Tucker himself has said that he would no more think of disputing the validity of that law than he would think of disputing the law of gravitation.

The question, therefore, is whether this rent shall go into the private pocket of the fortunate individual who has cornered territory of superior value, or into the pockets of those whose presence and labour have created that value. That this is quite an important question becomes evident when one reflects that ownership of a well-situated strip of land in London brings the Duke of Westminster an income of, as it is calculated roughly, fully £1,000,000 a year, while a similar state of things in New York City pours annually into the Astors' lap something like seven times that amount. It cannot be pretended that these people have earned those incomes. Why then should they be allowed to extract them from the earnings of others? We have to recognise as facts: (1) That justice alone brings peace; (2) that he who owns a certain piece of land owns those compelled to live on it; and (3) that justice should be done even though the heavens fall. If, therefore, the system of land tenure advocated by the followers of Henry George is just, Tucker's fear that it will increase the power of the State should have no weight, for justice must be done at any cost. I myself believe, with Herbert Spencer, that Tucker's fears are groundless. I see no reason why the inhabitants of Sleepy Hollow should not collect on their own account, and distribute equitably among themselves, the values created by them but now flowing into the coffers of the local magnate.

Let me now set out the Mutualist position. I shall quote, or summarise faithfully, from the chapter entitled "Land and Rent" in "What is Mutualism?" which I reviewed in the last issue of FREEDOM, and comment very briefly, for space is limited. The Mutualists, speaking through the mouth of C. L. Swartz, who reproduces Tucker, begin by saying, with Herbert Spencer, that to allow certain men to *own* land is to empower them to put up signs "Trespassers not allowed," and thereby compel the landless, who perhaps number at present ninety-nine out of every hundred, to emigrate to another

planet. Agreed. They say (p. 126): "What Mutualists do advocate and are working to bring about is equality of *opportunity*." Again we are entirely at one. They say on the same page that if "the owner complies with those sole conditions of *occupying* and *using* the land of which he claims the ownership . . . there can be no monopoly of land, and no one who desires land for occupancy and use may go landless." To me, at least, most unsatisfactory, for who is to say which person is to have the superior piece of land and which the inferior? In the next sentence we read that "each person may, in the order of the priority of his selection and according to his requirements and occupation, have equality of opportunity in the selection of land." I cannot see how this differs from the stampedes to stake out and occupy the best sections whenever the Government of the United States opens to settlement a reservation. At best the race goes to the swiftest, and in practice, as I have understood, such events are usually orgies of corruption.

On the same page the remark is made that "the high prices of real estate (and the consequent enormous rentals) in the congested areas of the large cities invite the attack of the various other land reformers," but that "Mutualists realise that these comparatively small parcels of land which are *occupied and used* by such large numbers of people are not so much objects of their immediate concern as are those vast tracts held out of use by land speculators." To my mind, the enormous rentals pocketed by those who have cornered city real estate constitute, if not the greatest, a most gigantic robbery, and are no small matter.

"The general development of modern civilisation tends to equalise, rather than to accentuate, economic rent," is the statement on page 131; and this is followed by a lengthy argument to the effect that increase in transportation facilities, the use of aeroplanes, and other recent inventions, all tend to scatter population and equalise land values. My own belief is that the whole of that argument is erroneous; that the tendency to concentrate in cities is becoming, if anything, more marked; and that the rise in city land values and rents has been greater than ever during the last few years.

Apparently, however, the main thesis is that Henry George men propose to sacrifice Liberty to their passion for Equality, and to inaugurate a system of Communism enforced by State authority. I am of exactly the contrary opinion, for I consider that the State derives its power from the helplessness of the plundered masses, and that with the removal of that helplessness its power will wither. However, the Mutualists maintain that we have to choose between liberty and equality, and that they are on the side of liberty. "Therefore," we are told on page 130, "having so chosen, they recognise that, like human differences, land differences must always exist. To accept the situation and make the best of it is their policy. And, unlike those who ignore the other economic factors, Mutualists are not dismayed, or even disturbed, by the inequalities that result from the advantages enjoyed by the holder of a superior piece of land." On this the only comment I feel able to make is that, if this position is correct, I cannot see what sense there is in complaining because one man rolls in money through having been permitted to occupy—"by priority of selection," if you please—an acre in the heart of London, while another must content himself with some outlying acre out of which no one could make a living. To resign ourselves fatalistically to such inequities would be to give up the whole battle, and I, for my part, should despair of the future.

This chapter abounds in statements that seem to me extraordinary. I do not believe that (p. 128) "the very rise in ground valuation is mainly subject to manipulation of money," or that "the whole question of rent in modern cities largely reduces itself to the question of the monopoly of money." On the contrary, I hold that it rests on this: "You have to live here. I own the land on which you have to live. Pay me such price as I choose to ask or you shall not live here at all." I consider that, doubtless through ignorance, a grave injustice is done the Henry George men when (p. 125) it is stated that they propose to confiscate a part of the land's product. Indeed, on p. 134 the same thought is repeated in the statement that "Mutualists oppose any scheme to equalise economic rent by forcibly taking from the occupier and user any part of the product of his land." The argument made is that "the pure economic rent could never be accurately differentiated from the other elements"; yet even now our assessors estimate separately the value of the site and the improvements on it, and find no difficulty in doing so. Lastly, I stand amazed at the statement on page 139, that "in primitive society land was everything," the contention being that "the capital needed to work the land and to transform the raw materials by means of all those machines and contrivances soon became more important than the land itself." Our

landed aristocracy is the richest and most powerful in existence. Never, or at least not until quite recent times, has it devoted itself to making money; because, owning those natural resources without which no industry can be conducted, it has been always able to extract from the producer, would-be or actual, the money necessary to maintain an almost regal state.

Anarchists say to me in private conversation; "Why, of course, the land question is the whole thing." But they do not put themselves to the trouble of studying the question. They are content to say loosely that they believe in "use and occupation," and to let it go at that. Nevertheless I am convinced that the most important thing in life is to get your thought straight; that therein lies strength; and that what applies to the individual applies to the movement as a whole.

W. C. O.

Revolutionary Opposites.

The French Revolution institutionalised, successively or simultaneously, the despotism of the majority, the law as an expression of the general will, the Republic one and indivisible, Jacobinism, the Terror, the guillotine as a permanent factor, the Committee of Public Safety, the Tenth of August, the September Days, the drownings at Nantes, the machine-gun massacres at Lyons, etc., etc.—things that had not even the attraction of novelty, having all been practised previously under one form or another. The French Revolution, therefore, led directly to Napoleon the Great and Napoleon the Little, to Lenin, Mussolini, and the others. When our one-time crony Mussolini tells us his course of action is a reversal of the spirit and principles that actuated those who directed the French Revolution he lies—for he is not an imbecile. On the contrary, Lenin, Mussolini, their rivals or those who are continuing their policies, are entirely within the spirit and tradition of the French Revolution's leaders, even when they do not perceive it, or pretend they do not. Their brain has been too long shaped by their revolutionary cult to be able to erase the impression it has received.

What does the Fourth of July actually symbolise? The confiscation of power for the profit of a class, party, or faction, other than the class, party, or faction then in possession of the governing power. To maintain themselves in power the Revolutionists have used all kinds of means—the sovereignty of the people, dictatorship, the quashing of elections unfavourable to them. Sometimes they have got the people to intervene, and sometimes they have resorted to the army; sometimes to those who are only military men on occasion, and sometimes to those with whom militarism is a trade. All the governmental methods employed by revolutionists from 1789 to 1900 have been resorted to by Sovietism and Fascism, in their different incarnations. The French Revolution has evolved within a framework of patriotism, one-sided social contract, exclusivism, preponderance of class, imperialism, and the silencing of rebellious minorities. To deny this is to ignore its history.

The French Revolution having plunged Humanity more deeply than ever into the abyss of Authority, what will come out of it? I hope—I say nothing further—it will be the *Anarchist Revolution*. What is the "Anarchist Revolution"? It is a revolution that does not look to establishing the supremacy, hegemony, or superiority of the law or nation, any more than that of any one doctrine, class, élite, practice, system, or method which shall be one and the same for all human beings. On the contrary, it wishes all human beings to understand that liberty can function positively only through emulative competition; that is to say, when all individuals and all associations are able to live in their own way, according to their particular understanding of happiness, whether from the ethical, the economic, or any other point of view.

E. ARMAND, in *L'en Dehors*.

ELISÉE AND ELIE RECLUS: IN MEMORIAM.

Including Tributes, Appreciations, and Essays by Elie Faure, Prof. Albert Heim, Jean Grave, Havelock Ellis, Dr. Max Nettlau, Bernard Lazare, Peter Kropotkin, Patrick Geddes, Jacques Mesnil, Anne Cobden-Sanderson, and other important Contributors.

Fragments, Letters, and Sixty Woodcuts by

LOUIS MOREAU.

Compiled, Edited, and Printed by

JOSEPH ISHILL.

Price \$10.00, post free.

THE ORIOLE PRESS, Berkeley Heights, N.J., U.S.A.

Can be obtained from FREEDOM PRESS. Price £2 0s. 0d.

THE GREAT FRENCH REVOLUTION.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

Cloth, 2 vols., 5s.; postage 6d.

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

AN APPEAL TO THE LIGHT.

"Anarchists declare that the bourgeoisie would resort to the formidable armed force it has at its command—a force established for the crushing of the masses. Then we shall have either to conquer by the same kind of arms as are turned against us, or resign ourselves to being the eternally-vanquished."—(*Le Réveil*, quoted in FREEDOM.)

Out of the masses surges the revolution-impetus, and none sees this more clearly than the counter-revolutionary. Hence his special objective—the clouding of all vital class and social issues. He senses the fact that revolution is a constant element in human society, that social evolution and social revolution make one and the same process. He does not wait until "a little before the nuts work loose." Day and night, at the cost of the energies of multitudes of men, drawn from the masses themselves, there is poured into the ears of the masses a constant flow of lulling antidotes to all daring dreams and rebellious aspirations—peculiar to those of the oppressed. On all fields—and on none more than on the field of workers' education—is counter-revolution at work. It is there by reason of the presence of its antithesis—revolution.

It is out of present tendencies that the future evolves. It is out of present social revolutionary tendencies, whatever might have been the initial impetus, that the social revolution will develop and a free society evolve. The masses themselves are the social groundwork, and who loses contact with them builds in the air.

Anarchists do not need reminding of this, but the same cannot be said of all sections of the Labour Movement, the larger and milder sort of which, when they do attack, are so very, very careful not to stimulate the inherent revolutionary tendencies of the masses (thus functioning as counter-revolution) that they deprive themselves of the one sure means of attaining their objective.

When the masses say, what they do say goes. *Vox populi, vox Dei*. So what do they say of war—any war, civil war, armed insurrection? They would have to be dragged, or deluded, as usual, whatever kind of war it might be, or driven by desperation—too trembling and unreliable a midwife to safeguard the birth of a new society.

But even if they could be induced to take up arms, whence would the arms come in quantity and quality sufficient to down the forces of capitalist State or capitalist stalwart? Secret preparation would be impossible, and open preparation would be met by counter-preparation of a more terribly destructive order, and, furthermore, would stimulate to a greater counter-revolutionary activity that reptile of confusion, the Press, with its sting of "fears and sorrows that infest the soul" of the masses unbearably enough already.

But, above all, the possibility of organising armed insurrection is negated by the power the reactionaries have of precipitating counter-revolutionary crisis at any time to suit their own convenience. They hold the forts. That time may be tomorrow—any to-morrow, and the shifting chaos into which the masses could be flung would be enough to jeopardise every advance made since men became slaves of men.

Massacre is certain. But that is not the real menace. Chaos is the menace to be offset, and can be, in spite of massacre. Steady solidarity on the part of the masses is the key, and the banding together of all rebels active against the existing order is the prime need of the hour. They are the dynamics—the masses *in parvo*. And though the masses were helpless against massacre (and as slaves, can they be ever otherwise in a slave-society?) such rebel-leadership would be the naturally evolved instrument wherewith to stem chaos and render constructive the inevitable revulsion against the bourgeois shedders of blood.

If the masses were as actively revolutionary as they are inherently so, counter-revolution would not dare to lift a hand with a weapon in it. And so long as Socialists, or any other "ists," persist in dodging or decrying revolutionary issues and activities, so long are they exposing the masses to utter chaos and imperilling the New before it has rid itself of the Old.

So—not arms but men—men and women, comrades, a league of Light, of no doctrine but the doctrine of rebellion, dynamics, natural leaders, they whom the hour of crisis ever calls forth. They are here, here now—for the breath of crisis is hot about us. Men and women who are ready to live dangerously that they may live free, and die having *lived*!

Where are they?—let them answer. For the masses have great need of them, greater than any know.

ALFRED HOLDSWORTH.

KROPOTKIN'S REVOLUTIONARY PAMPHLETS.

A Collection of Writings by PETER KROPOTKIN.
Edited with Introduction, Biographical Sketch,
and Notes by ROGER N. BALDWIN.

Cloth, 2s. 6d.; postage 3d.

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

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 Editor is not necessarily in agreement with signed articles.

Notice to Subscribers.—A blue mark against this notice signifies 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.**

Industrial Peace!

Permit us! In your infinite graciousness permit us, if only on account of our longing for industrial peace, to meet you at the Council Board and shake hands across the table!! Surely you can grant us that much, for what is there we have not done for you? That you may devote yourselves to pleasure we toil incessantly. That you may travel far and wide in search of climate and excitement we remain imprisoned in those fetid slums for which we pay you princely rents. Early and late we labour in your fields that the manor house may feast. We burrow in your mines that you, who own the earth, may live as rulers have a right to live. In thousands of factories we and our wives and children faithfully perform whatever tasks you choose to set us, and when there are no tasks we starve resignedly. And you cannot have forgotten that when you told us your possessions were in danger of being invaded by a foreign foe we rallied, to the last man of us, to their defence. These things should count for something, and all that we ask in return is that you permit us to assist you in the conquest of markets and—oh, irony of ironies—industrial peace.

The editor of **FREEDOM** has invited me to comment on the recent Trades Union Congress at Edinburgh; and, after wading through floods of eloquence and floundering in bogs of slimy resolutions, the foregoing paragraph is the best that I can do. It attempts to reproduce whatever there was of actual meaning in that love-festival; to sift out of a mass of rhetorical rubbish the one nugget of important fact that seems worthy of attention. As I judged them, the proceedings were from first to last one ignominious crawl, varnished over with a lot of sophisticated philosophising for the sake of "saving face." The leaders had made up their minds that the surrender of May last year had not been sufficiently complete, and they were determined on this occasion to make a clean job of it. They intended to brand the strike weapon as hopelessly out of date, and did so. They intended to convince the employing class that they had no sympathy with revolutionary ideals or methods, and with that end in view they disassociated themselves from whatever might appear to have the taint of Russian propaganda—a step for which the abuse in which Communists indulged had smoothed the way. After which they solemnly reproved the Government for having severed relations with Russia! However, for that apparent blindness to the ridiculous it is perhaps unjust to censure them. They had to do it. Having thrown away the strike bludgeon they had to take up the political stiletto, and the gist of all the proceedings was precisely this—"Let us put all our eggs in the one basket of a prospective Labour Party victory at the forthcoming General Election."

If our modern Socialists had still left in them a spark of loyalty to the principles they have been thundering from thousands of platforms for now nearly a century, they could not have been otherwise than intensely dissatisfied with the results of this Congress. Had they not become utterly demoralised by years of political shilly-shallying they would have said bluntly to their Trade Union allies in the Labour Party: "All this talk of peace between the disinherited, who have nothing, and their disinheritors, who have everything, is balderdash." They would have told the miners that by no possibility can they reap the just harvest of their toil so long as a swarm of Do-Nothings are allowed to bleed the industry by way of rents, royalties, and other devices for making money without working for it. Similarly would they have spoken to the representatives of the shipbuilding, the engineering, the textile, and other staple industries in which millions of our fellow-countrymen are employed, or are hoping against hope that they again will find employment. But this, under the programme to which the Socialists are now committed, they

dare not do. They need every vote they can get, and for this they must conciliate with cold impartiality both the workers and that huge middle class that lives by profiteering on them. None of these must they offend, and all these conflicting interests they must strive to gratify. In such conditions plain speaking is impossible, and plain speaking is the very thing the Labour Movement needs.

Moreover, there is the question of funds; and this, you may be sure, Labour leaders, who do not live by any means on air, never forget. Political campaigns are frightfully expensive affairs, and that very fact makes the ordinary workers' vote a practically worthless asset, for they put him at the mercy of those who contribute to, collect, and control the huge funds that have to be amassed. In the case of the Labour Party the Trade Unions are the paymasters, and necessarily they call the tune to which their financial satellites, the Socialists, must dance. The Socialists may be permitted to carry on a safely-worded propaganda, and to put through at the various congresses certain of those general resolutions in favour of collective ownership which commit no one to anything in particular, but when it comes to definite action the big Trade Union bosses, who hold the purse-strings, mark out the line the Socialists must toe. Rarely, if ever, have those bosses a spark of revolutionary feeling in their mentality, and they are about the last persons in the world who are likely to squander the resources of the organisations by which they get their living, and to which they owe their privileged position, on what they consider Utopian campaigns. Invariably their motto, which coincides with their own personal interest, is "Safety First."

Nevertheless we had our serious doubts as to whether the Socialists would be able to stomach the Edinburgh cave-in, but on that we were quickly disillusioned. The editorial staff of the *New Leader*, which is the official organ of the Independent Labour Party, naturally needed a little time in which to think things over, but in their issue of September 16 much space is devoted to the Congress, and nowhere is there a single note of indignation. Mr. Lansbury assures the Russians that they have our goodwill, but explains to them that we have created our own democratic machinery and intend to use it; while a page is given to an article headed "The Issues at Edinburgh—A Forward Policy," which concludes as follows: "This year's Congress has, in a positive sense, achieved nothing; but, if it has done no more than liquidate old troubles, it has helped to clear the road for a new forward policy on the lines which George Hicks suggested in his presidential address. The task for the coming year—in which the I.L.P. has a great part to play—is that of giving this new policy form and precision, and of framing an industrial plan of action comparable with that which the I.L.P. has been helping to hammer out in the political field."

It is conceivable that there may be among the unemployed, or among the miners and others of our sorely belaboured workers, some who may find comfort in that sort of promise, but I doubt it. Facts are facts, and our workers can hardly fail to understand that all talk of industrial peace between disinheritors and disinherited is not merely blatant buncombe but a cowardly betrayal of that great emancipation movement in which, whether we are Socialists, Communists, Anarchists, or Labour men, we are all supposed to be endeavouring to play, to the best of our abilities, our individual parts. However, there is nothing in all this that should discourage any one of ordinary intelligence and courage. Parties that flinch great truths fall quickly to pieces through their own corruption. Mr. Either-Side may cause some momentary confusion but he will not be able to hinder seriously the onward march.

W. C. O.

VANZETTI ON JUDGE THAYER.

In "The Story of a Proletarian Life," published in 1924, Vanzetti tells of his first trial, when he was sentenced to fifteen years' imprisonment for an attempted robbery. He writes:—

"Judge Webster Thayer, the same man who later presided at the murder trial, imposed the sentence. There was not a vibration of sympathy in his tone when he did so. I wondered as I listened to him, why he hated me so. Is not a judge supposed to be impartial? But now I think I know—I must have looked like a strange animal to him, being a plain worker, an alien, and a radical to boot. And why was it that all my witnesses, simple people who were anxious to tell the simple truth, were laughed at and disregarded? No credence was given their words, because they, too, were merely aliens. . . . The testimony of human beings is acceptable, but aliens—pooh!"

And as aliens and radicals they were electrocuted as an example to other aliens who dare to be radicals.

Sacco and Vanzetti As I Knew Them.

In view of the fact that Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti are being assailed—even since their deaths—as “obvious rogues” and “fake Anarchists,” it behoves those of us who had personal contacts with these men to make public what we know, and to help keep the record of their tragedy as clear and as accurate as possible.

I met Sacco and Vanzetti for the first time during the summer of 1926. They were confined in different prisons—Sacco in the Dedham Jail in a beautiful suburb of Boston, Vanzetti in the bleak and forbidding State Prison at Charlestown, near the Bunker Hill monument.

Vanzetti impressed me immediately with his powerful physique, his firm hand-clasp, his magnetism, his overflowing energies, and his cheerful spirit in a desperate situation. He was truly inspired, and he inspired all who met him. Sacco, a slighter figure, was just as remarkable in his own way. He was quiet and less articulate, but just as courageous and even more uncompromising.

Both men were intelligent, charming, and, as it seemed to me, tremendously sincere. They would have stood out anywhere, and they stood out all the more prominently because they were in prison. Vanzetti, especially, was a kind of prodigy. All his life he had slaved for a mere pittance at the hardest sort of manual labour, and yet somehow through it all he had managed to keep his mind bright and clear.

At the time I saw him he was working every day in the prison making automobile plates. In his spare hours and in the evenings he was translating a long and closely reasoned book on “War and Peace,” by Pierre Joseph Proudhon, French Anarchist philosopher who flourished three-quarters of a century ago. I would describe Vanzetti as a born speaker and writer. He was constantly writing, and his letters glowed, like his own personality. He generally signed them, “With great heart, Bartolo,” and the title, “Great-Heart,” fitted him exactly. His autobiographical pamphlet, “The Story of a Proletarian Life,” is in its way a classic. It reveals not only an exceptionally fine and interesting character, but also an authentic literary instinct. In this record, which traces the details of his physical and spiritual development, he declares plainly: “I am and shall be until the last (unless I shall discover that I am in error) an Anarchist-Communist, because I believe that communism is the most humane form of social contract, because I know that only with liberty can man rise, become noble and complete.”

Sacco revealed himself to me as an omnivorous reader; as an admirer of the Russian novelist Dostoevsky; as something of an Anarchist theoretician; and as a critic of the Bolshevik régime in Russia. His affection for his devoted wife Rosina and for his two children Dante and Inez goes without saying. There was in him a mental and spiritual refinement more easily felt than described. He was disheartened by his long imprisonment, but would never surrender.

My object in visiting Sacco and Vanzetti was to get first-hand impressions for an article I was writing on their case.

This article appeared in a radical monthly magazine, the *Square Deal*, and met with their approval, for they wrote me pleasantly about it. Vanzetti sent me a handsomely-carved ivory pen-holder as a token of friendship.

Following my visits to the prisoners I received five letters from Sacco and ten from Vanzetti. All breathed a spirit of sincere comradeship, and offered unconscious revelations of the men's characters. I sent Dostoevsky's novel, “The Idiot,” to Sacco, and the poems of Walt Whitman to Vanzetti. When a friend gave me money which she wished expended on small gifts for the prisoners, and I asked them what I should buy, Vanzetti suggested for himself a copy of Gustavus Myers' “History of the Supreme Court.” Sacco said, “Give the money to some one who needs it more,” but finally acquiesced in a plan to give it to the *Road to Freedom*. Both Sacco and Vanzetti liked to read the *London Freedom* and the *Road to Freedom*, but these papers were proscribed by the prison authorities and seldom reached them. Sacco spoke to me with pleasure of a visit that he had received from Hippolyte Havel, editor of the *Road to Freedom*, a few months before my own visit.

Sacco and Vanzetti were both great admirers of Eugene Debs. When I told Vanzetti that I would write Debs of my visit, he replied: “Tell him that I salute him!” When Debs died, Sacco wrote to me: “Yes, the great noble soul of Eugene Debs has gone for ever! And with him disappears one of the most faithful and sincere leaders of the American Socialist movement. But the example of his faith remains to spur us on to the conquest of joy and liberty and happiness for all.”

It is untrue to say that Sacco and Vanzetti were not genuine Anarchists. They had minds capable of weighing and understanding the fine points in Anarchist theory, and they had the enthusiasm which made them want to devote their lives to the spreading of Anarchist ideas. They seemed, both, to be in a special sense admirers of Proudhon, but Vanzetti had studied closely the writings of Peter Kropotkin and Elisée Reclus, and Sacco was reading Max Stirner's “Ego and His Own” at the time when I talked with him.

I believe that Vanzetti was innocent of the charge of attempted robbery at Bridgewater, Mass., on December 24, 1920.

I believe that Sacco and Vanzetti were innocent of the charge of murder and robbery at South Braintree, Mass., on April 15, 1921.

And I believe that the execution of these men at Charlestown State Prison on August 23, 1927, was one of the blackest crimes of the twentieth century.

LEONARD D. ABBOTT.

New York, September 1, 1927.

Letters by Bartolomeo Vanzetti.

We give here an extract from a letter written in prison by Vanzetti which gives us some idea of his mental outlook on life. No date is on the letter, but it was evidently written in 1921. It is taken from “Outstanding Features of the Sacco-Vanzetti Case,” by Elizabeth Glendower Evans, which was published by the New England Civil Liberties Committee (Boston, Mass.) in January, 1924. We reproduce it exactly as it was printed:—

“Man call moral everything that is favourable to conservation of life, to happiness of the individual, as well of the race, and these things are virtues and justice. For this reason, I cannot believe in those philosophers, who speaking of morals, tell me about a categoric order, a revelation, an abstract principle, and so on.

“For me, the moral sense come from the strongest instinct of every living being. I mean the instinct of conservation and happiness, which as soon as the intelligence come, generates a third instinct, the love of the race. As soon as any intelligent creatures begin a social life they are compelled to social duties: hence the notion of what is just and what is unjust, of what is good and what is evil. So, we can say that morals, as well as everything else made by man, has the purpose of conservation and happiness. That is why he who said that the fundamental nature of morals do not change, was right, and that is the reason why men breaks a moral relation to anything or person as soon he stops believing in their goodness and justice. And this is why every new idea that mark a progress has in itself a superior moral.

“I recollected what Kropotkin said in his Anarchist Moral: ‘Do to others what you would wish that the others should do to you, in the same circumstances,’ can be the basis of the morals. Of course, many comrades had criticised him, but my little I, believe him very near to the reason. Nothing new in this, save a little modification which not only command to not do unjust things, but command also to do good. And this is progress. Every normal persons can be in accord.

“The trouble and the differences begin when the moral values of our present institutions, of our social contract, of our costumes (customs) are put in discussion. And more complications arise when we treat of details of the life, of the relativeness and absoluteness of it, because we all are individual, and, what is more important, determined creatures leaded in life by an influence of our personal life, amid a perpetual conflict between the mind and the heart.

“But we have instincts that lead us, and intelligence that serves them, and after all, a nature fundamentally equal. Those things would be enough if man would not be susceptible of degeneration, as soon as he left his natural way of life. Here we face a gigantic problem; not a letter but a book will be necessary to resolve, or better to prospect it.

“Before concluding, I put to myself a question, and answer to it. What is the good, and what is the evil? Till now from the greatest luminaries to the last dagoes wandering over the land, the idea is ‘All what help me is the good, all the rest is the evil.’ It is as Gorki said about the moral of the savage, and it run as follows: ‘If I steal the wife of my neighbour that is the good; if my neighbour steals my wife that is the evil.’ To be exact there are many and enough of moral principles abstractly true, but they are viziati (vitiati) by their application.

“The anarchist go ahead and says: All what is help to me without hurt the others is good; all what help the others

without hurting me is good also, all the rest is evil. He look for his liberty in the liberty of all, for his happiness in the happiness of all, for his welfare in the universal welfare. I am with him.

"Well, I perceive I have been very incomplete and inexact in my words, but, there are no pretention in them. They arise out of the intention of reveal my thought and exercising in English language. I begun to read the bible!

Your grateful, Bartolomeo V."

Vanzetti was well aware of his shortcomings in the English language, so one day he wrote the following humorous letter as a criticism of himself (November 23, 1923):—

"Dear Friend Mrs. Evans: A few years ago, a good divvol of comrade, felt to have something to say and wrote it down in an article that he sent to the weekly for publication. In the enclosed letter he said to the edictor: 'I have put down the words: please put down for me the commas and the periods.' To make that written presentable, the poor edictor almost lost his reason and he wrote to the writer: 'Next time, if you wish your article to be pubbiced, just put down the commas and the periods that I will put down the words for you.'"
"B. V."

This is the man who, with his comrade, Nicola Sacco, has been executed as a murderer and robber.

Chicago, 1887—Boston, 1927.

We all know that Sacco and Vanzetti were innocent. They never committed the murder or robbery! They declared themselves: "We had nothing whatever to do with the South Braintree crime. Our instincts made us abhor and our principles condemn such a crime." And yet they were condemned to death for murder, and in spite of protests from all over the world, in spite of public opinion, in spite of the efforts of the Defence Committee, in spite of the manifestations of the workers in America and Europe, they were executed after more than six years.

In the last issue of FREEDOM I read: "Even now, at the last moment, we cannot believe that they will dare to kill Sacco and Vanzetti." And Vanzetti, in a letter dated June 9, 1927, also wrote me: "It seems to me that they are not going to burn us."

Why, there is no reason to burn these two innocents; the authorities of Massachusetts cannot do such a thing! You said: "Demands for their release should be poured into Governor Fuller's letter-box until they are free again!" Yes, the demands are indeed poured into the Governor's letter-box uninterruptedly; and yet the innocents are killed under the eyes of their friends and comrades. Is there a possibility that the authorities, the bloodthirsty beasts, would know what is meant by Justice and Humanity? No, it is no use to demand justice. Justice can only be gained through fight. The authorities can do everything except justice! "They like everything except the pure, naked truth," Vanzetti thus assured us.

We are wrong when we believe that justice can be gained through demands. Perhaps there are still many old comrades who remember the execution of the Chicago Anarchists. Forty years ago Parsons, one of the Chicago martyrs, surrendered himself, and asked the court to grant him a fair trial that he might prove his innocence. Yet he was never granted the shadow of a fair and impartial trial and was put to death with the rest of his comrades on November 11, 1887. Sacco and Vanzetti also asked a fair trial for more than six years, yet they were never granted the shadow of a fair and impartial trial, and were put to death on August 23.

"The long agony is over. Law has triumphed. Anarchy is defeated." We never forget these words written by the editor of the *Chicago Tribune* forty years ago. The capitalists will cry these words again! Yes, your law has triumphed, the dollar has triumphed! But Anarchy will never be defeated!

Vanzetti and Sacco, in a letter to all their friends and comrades, assured us: "The enemy can imprison, torture, kill some or many of us, destroy our homes, our poor few books and our institutions, but the enemy cannot destroy ideas, rights, truths, or causes." And even before his death Sacco cried: "Long live Anarchy!" and Vanzetti still protested that he was innocent! The dollar has triumphed, it has killed two innocent persons, but it cannot make the world believe that these two persons were murderers! The dollar can buy everything, but it cannot buy the universal conscience; it cannot buy pardon! Anarchists never fear death; on the contrary, they will meet death with a smile. Only murderers fear death, and Governor Fuller and Judge Thayer are among them.

Now, Sacco and Vanzetti are dead! They die; they die bravely, nobly in the electric chair; they die calmly, smilingly; they die as great martyrs; they die for our beautiful ideal and also for the young generation, children born and unborn!

But what shall we do after the execution of our two brave comrades? Fight for justice! Fight for Anarchy—our beautiful ideal.

Adieu, my dear friends and comrades, Sacco and Vanzetti! We shall never hear from you again! But what you have said and what you have done are still vividly in our remembrance! Your names will live long after people will ask: "Who are Fuller and Thayer?" If Anarchy and Justice never die, then you will never die! We all know that you are innocent, and your only crime is that you lived in advance of your time! Adieu, dear comrades!

LI PEIKAN.

And here I publish one of the letters Vanzetti wrote me:—

"... Do you know why I mentioned the 'silent ones' in my letter to all our comrades and friends? Just because I know that there are many little ones like you and many grand old men and women that silently share our passion, defend our life, struggle for our freedom, revindicate our innocence and our faith—this is why I am carrying them all in my heart, till death.

"It is supremely great and sweet to us that you all, in spite of the dark and cruel time of ours, have done and are doing for us two poor workers, what once would have only been done for saints and kings.

"This proofs that, after all, the principle of equality of the mankind—the right based on the nature and individuality of Man, and therefore alien to castes and classes and social stations, and equal to all—has been greatly acquired and quietly applied by millions of persons. This is one of the few bright sides of our case.

"It does not mean that our Cause is fatally pre-destined to victory. No! Let me tell you something *à propos*: Human history has two principal factors; namely, mankind grossly divided into two files: that of tyranny and that of freedom; the individual, being himself tyrant or libertarian, and the cosmos from which we come and in which we live. Now, apart from the cosmic factor, which at least to the date is superior to our will and force, history will become what we will force it become. As every phenomenon, history is the result of qualities and of quantities, as Pythagoras so truthfully thought. So that if we Anarchists will know to have on our side the quantities and the qualities necessary for the victory of freedom, we will be victorious and free. If not—not. Mankind and history, it seems to me, could be but are not pre-destinated. Nature has given us unfathomable treasures for the security and elevation; it breaths in our heart an unquenchable long of freedom, and it gifts us of such faculties which, if free and cultivated, would make a wonder of us. But there is another side of this, it is told and proved by all the dead nations and decayed or decadent civilisations; by the fact that while mechanic and cultured progress furnishes us of a greater capacity of production, want and pauperism remain among the workers always more subjected to intensive and unhealthy works; by the fact that while general and popular progress in learning and higher standards of physical condition take place, morality, character, and even physical strength perish; and, finally, by the actually universal conditions of mankind: either innovate ourselves and live, or perish. This negative side of history is difficult to be understood and even more to be explained. But we know that it is what induced great minds as Balzac, Shakespeare, and many others to proclaim that mankind travels in a close circle, always returning upon its former steps. And you have already met and will ever meet more rascals, cynics, and fools—when not the three in one—who tell you: 'What is the use of it all... the world has always been so and...' and send them to their place. Young comrade, and you, keep on. After all, to struggle for Anarchy, even if it were a folly, is the most beautiful way to spend a life—if its owner is worthy of it.

"The real essence of Anarchy is the understanding and the will to eliminate the causes of this negative result of history by freeing the life and the individual from every oppression and exploitation of the man by the man. Anarchy is, therefore, the only way and means of life of which we can dispose. But it must be wished, it must be actuated, realised by men; it will not come by itself—not even if the victory of its reverse, tyranny and exploitation, will slowly in abyss mankind in perdition and death....

"And now cheer up. With brotherly heart I embrace you.

"BARTOLOMEO V.

"June 9, 1927, Dedham Jail, Mass."

Printed Pages.

THE GREAT FRENCH REVOLUTION.*

The Vanguard Press has earned our thanks for republishing Kropotkin's great work on the French Revolution, which has been out of print for some time. As the English publishers of the original edition (1909) had to surrender the stereotype plates of it during the War, in order to get fresh metal for new books, they said the cost of resetting the type at present rates made it impossible to reprint the work at a popular price. However, urged on by our comrades in the United States, the Vanguard Press undertook its publication and have produced it complete, in two cloth-bound volumes, at the price of \$1.00, which places it within the reach of all. Containing 610 pages, it is wonderful value for the money.

In the first chapter Kropotkin says that up to the present the historians of the great French Revolution "have confined themselves to the political history, the triumph of the middle classes over the Court party and the defenders of the institutions of the old monarchy. . . . But the *popular* history of the Revolution remains still to be told. The part played by the *people* of the country places and towns in the Revolution has never been studied and narrated in its entirety. Of the two currents which made the Revolution, the current of *thought* is known; but the other, the current of *popular action*, has not even been sketched."

In 1886 Kropotkin began to study this side of the Revolution. Unfortunately, he says, he was not able to make any researches in the National Archives of France, and his studies had, therefore, to be confined to the collections of printed matter in the British Museum, which are, however, in themselves, exceedingly rich. Of this material he made good use, and we can understand the origins of the Revolution, its ebb and flow, and the events which led to the eventual dictatorship of Napoleon, far better after reading this book than by the study of any other.

Kropotkin emphasises the part played by the peasants seizing the land, which destroyed the power of the old feudal aristocracy and abolished serfdom in France, and which subsequently led to the abolition of serfdom in the rest of Europe. He also shows how the Girondins in the Convention, whose main aim was to protect property and keep all the gains of the Revolution for the rich, were swept away by the revolt of the masses in Paris and other large cities. Critics of this book have said that Kropotkin emphasises unduly the part played by the masses; but as other historians have emphasised the part played by the politicians and philosophers, Kropotkin simply redresses the balance.

The work of Anarchists in the Revolution is also well brought out by extracts from speeches and pamphlets of their opponents, an account of which was written by Kropotkin in two numbers of FREEDOM before this book was published (December, 1903, January, 1904).

For years past we have received orders for "The Great French Revolution," and now it has been republished we are sure there will be the big demand for it which it deserves.

KROPOTKIN'S REVOLUTIONARY PAMPHLETS.†

We welcome this book, which puts in a handy form many of Kropotkin's pamphlets, some of which are still in print and some now out of print. Two of them are translated into English for the first time—"The Spirit of Revolt" and "Prisons and Their Moral Effect on Prisoners." In his "Introduction" and "The Story of Kropotkin's Life," Mr. Baldwin sketches Kropotkin's work in the Anarchist movement, and does full justice to the subject in the space at his disposal. Included in the book is the article on Anarchism which Kropotkin wrote in 1905 for the eleventh edition of the "Encyclopedia Britannica." The "partial bibliography" at the end will be an aid for further study by new readers. In the list of "Pamphlets in English" we miss two which were reprinted from FREEDOM—"The Coming Revival of Socialism" and "Socialism and Politics"; but as only small editions of them were printed it was quite easy to overlook them.

This cloth-bound book has 307 pages and we are still wondering how it can be sold for 50 cents. It is a book that would be very useful to give to an inquirer—or to any Labour leader.

*"The Great French Revolution, 1789-1793." By P. A. Kropotkin. 2 vols., cloth, \$1.00. New York: Vanguard Press.—Obtainable from Freedom Press, 5s.; postage 6d.

†"Kropotkin's Revolutionary Pamphlets." A Collection of Writings by Peter Kropotkin. Edited with Introduction, Biographical Sketch and Notes by Roger N. Baldwin. 50 cents. New York: Vanguard Press.—From Freedom Press, 2s. 6d.; postage 3d.

A HISTORY OF THE STATE.*

Many books have been written on the origin and development of the State, but few writers have ever traced its history so clearly and frankly as the author of this book. In his preface to this, the second American edition, Mr. Oppenheimer says:—

"The State may be defined as an organisation of *one class* dominating over the other classes. Such a class organisation can come about in one way only, namely, through conquest and the subjection of ethnic groups by the dominating group. This can be demonstrated with almost mathematical certainty."

There is no beating about the bush in that declaration. There are no "ifs" and "buts" to destroy the clearness of its meaning. The State is founded on conquest, he says, and he proceeds to give chapter and verse to prove his statement. If the workers were to grasp the truth of his statement they would never again appeal to the State to help them against their exploiters. The State is the creation of their exploiters.

Once a State has been founded, the same forces that brought it into being urge its extension and require it to grasp more power. This explains the Imperialism of to-day. "The economic want of the master group has no limits; no man is sufficiently rich to satisfy his desires." Consequently new lands and new groups of people yet unexploited are sought out and brought under control. Thus the State expands until it reaches the boundaries of another State. Then in the place of warlike robbery we have true war in its narrower sense, with equally organised and disciplined masses hurled at one another.

Of course, it is not expedient for the ruling class to rely solely on the power of the sword, and they justify dominion and exploitation with anthropological and theological reasoning. Bravery and warlike efficiency being the only virtues of a man, the victors declare themselves to be the more efficient, the better race. "And since the tribal god of the ruling group has become the supreme god in the new amalgamated State religion, this religion declares . . . that the constitution of the State has been declared by heaven, that it is 'tabu,' and that interference with it is sacrilege." How often we meet with this sort of argument in parish magazines.

In dealing with the modern State, Mr. Oppenheimer notes an entirely new element, its officialdom, which he thinks might become a moderating and order-making force but for the fact that it is drawn from the ranks of the dominant class.

Mr. Oppenheimer will have nothing to do with the Anarchist theory, which makes form and content of the State as inseparable as heads and tails of the coin; no government without exploitation. He says we would smash the State, "even if thereby all the economic advantages of a division of labour should have to be sacrificed." We were not aware that Anarchists are opposed to the division of labour, but we do not see that a State is necessary for that purpose.

His view of the future of the State is very hazy, something resembling State Socialism; but in spite of that the book is well worth reading for its clear exposition of the origin and growth of States.

THE PEASANTS' REVOLT.

The story of the Peasants' Revolt of the fourteenth century has been told in verse in Southey's "Wat Tyler" and in beautiful prose in William Morris's "Dream of John Ball." It has now inspired Mr. William Chandler, who has written a two-act play entitled, "Thirteen Eighty-One: An English Tragedy."†

The word "tragedy" is the keynote of the play. We sense it from the opening of the first scene and it runs through to the end, when the ranks of the peasants are broken by the killing of Wat Tyler. A herald announces that

"All who are found in London town this night
Without fair business, shall to Tower Hill
To their beheading."

On hearing this Jack Straw says:

"Like dreary bagpipes droning a death-watch,
Those mournful words have banished all our hope."

The poor simple peasants who put their faith in young King Richard's word that he would grant them freedom from serfdom, and who thereupon returned to their homes, were

*"The State: Its History and Development Viewed Sociologically." By Franz Oppenheimer, M.D., Ph.D. Translated from the German. 50 cents. New York: Vanguard Press.—From Freedom Press, 2s. 6d.; postage 3d.

†"Thirteen Eighty-One: An English Tragedy." By William Chandler. 10s. London: H. Biskeborn, 21 Rednall Terrace, Hammersmith.

afterwards hunted like rats and slaughtered ruthlessly. "Put not your faith in princes."

This little volume was printed on a handpress from a bold black old-style type, which is very pleasing to the eye. The edition is a limited one—250 copies. A third of them have been printed on handmade paper, at 21s. The book is a delightfully artistic production, but its price puts it completely out of the reach of a working-class reader.

TO COMRADE SACCO'S WIFE AND CHILDREN.

(The following is a translation of a letter which has been sent to the wife of Nicola Sacco by Russian comrades.)

The undersigned, Anarchists and Russian exiles now resident in Western Europe, having noticed the reports published in the bourgeois press as to the Bolshevik Government intending to obtain your consent to the transfer of Sacco and Vanzetti's ashes to Russia, and their invitation to you to take up your residence in that country.

Knowing that the Bolshevik-Communist Party and the Russian Government have hitherto exploited the names of Sacco and Vanzetti exclusively in the interest of their party and its prestige, while deceiving systematically the Russian workers as to the part they have played towards the Anarchist movement by the forbidding the holding of Anarchist meetings in defence of our martyrs, in which our comrades, Bar-mache, Rogdazy, and others were to have participated;

Would have you remember that the very crime committed on Sacco and Vanzetti has, thanks to the Bolshevik Government, overwhelmed equally the Russian Anarchists who, like Sacco and Vanzetti, were fighting Capitalism.

Bearing this in mind, it is necessary to remember also that the Bolshevik Government has killed secretly and without trial our comrades Kogan and Achtyrski, and that hundreds of Anarchists are perishing in prison and in exile, from which you will be able to judge how hypocritical is the Russian Government when it declares its sympathy for you and its solidarity with Sacco and Vanzetti.

We are convinced that if Sacco and Vanzetti knew the truth concerning the Bolshevik power and its attitude toward the Anarchists, they would have risen against the Bolshevik tyranny which is destroying the liberty of the working class with the same ardour as that which they revolted against the yoke of the American bourgeoisie.

After what we have just said, you, Sacco's companion, will understand that this manœuvre by the Bolshevik politicians is solely for the purpose of exploiting our revolutionary comrades' great names.

The Bolshevik Government's proposal could have been considered sincere only if it had coincided with the promulgation of an amnesty for the Anarchists, Syndicalists, and revolutionary workers actually imprisoned in Russia or exiled from it, and if, at the same time, the Russian Government had legalised the Anarchist workingmen's movement.

On behalf of the Group of Russian Anarchists now abroad.

ARCHINOV. MAKHNO.

On behalf of the Anarchists imprisoned in Russia.

LAZAREVITCH.

Paris, August 30, 1927.

"FREEDOM" GUARANTEE FUND.

The following sums have been received to date (Sept. 30) since our last issue:—E. F. Dean 5s., G. W. Tindale 2s. 6d., W. D. £1, Comrade Hanke Trust Fund £1, C. Taraboi 8s. 3d., C. Blandy 5s., E. Richmond £1, J. Rosende 5s., B. Everard 2s. 6d., G. P., 5s., D. Dent 2s. 6d., J. Hope 4s., M. B. Hope 4s., Max Baginski £2, C. Hansen 8s., L. G. Wolfe 10s.

CASH RECEIVED (not otherwise acknowledged).

(July 22 to September 30.)

"FREEDOM" SUBSCRIPTIONS.—C. W. Veness, G. B. Wheeler, J. Myers, Wm. Fraser, A. S. Frost, W. H. Harrison, H. Hiscox, I. Tanaka, B. Everard, L. C. Savage, H. Briner, L. Organ, B. Black, W. N. Hills.

RUSSIAN POLITICAL PRISONERS' FUND.—J. Rosende 5s., J. Hope, 4s.

Agents for "Freedom" in U.S.A.

NEW YORK CITY.—Rand Bookstore, 7 East 15th Street.

Jimmie Higgins Bookstore, 106 University Place.

PATERSON, N. J.—Pet's News Stand, Market Street.

The Road to Freedom.

A Periodical of Anarchist Thought, Work, and Literature.

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

ROAD TO FREEDOM, P.O. Box 486, MADISON SQUARE STATION, NEW YORK CITY, U.S.A.

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? WM. C. OWEN. 1d.

"SET MY PEOPLE FREE!" By WM. C. OWEN. 2d.

ANARCHISM. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 3d.

ANARCHISM AND DEMOCRACY. By JOHN WAKEMAN. 1d.

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.

REFLECTIONS ON POLITICAL JUSTICE. (Selections from the Writings of WILLIAM GODWIN.) 4d.

THE CRUSHING OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 2d.; postage, 1d.

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.

THE CONQUEST OF BREAD. By PETER KROPOTKIN. Cloth, 2s. 6d.; postage 3d.

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

ETHICS: ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 12s. 6d.; postage 6d.

RUSSIAN LITERATURE. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3s. 6d.; postage 4d.

GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By P. J. PROUDHON. Paper, 2s. 6d.; Cloth, 5s.; postage 3d.

GOD AND THE STATE. By MICHAEL BAKUNIN. (American Edition). Cloth, 3s. 6d.; paper 1s. 6d.; postage 2d.

PRISON MEMOIRS OF AN ANARCHIST. By ALEXANDER BERKMAN. 10s. 6d.; postage 6d.

THE BOLSHEVIK MYTH. By ALEXANDER BERKMAN. 10s. 6d.; postage 6d.

ANARCHISM AND OTHER ESSAYS. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 6s. 6d.; postage 4d.

MY DISILLUSIONMENT IN RUSSIA. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 6s.; postage 4d.

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

ECONOMICS OF LIBERTY. A Statement of Proudhon's System of Social Organisation. By JOHN BEVERLEY ROBINSON. Cloth, 2s.; postage 3d.

INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY. By BENJAMIN R. TUCKER. Selected and Edited by C.L.S. Cloth, 2s. 6d.; postage 3d.

WHAT IS MUTUALISM? By CLARENCE LEE SWARTZ. 2s. 6d.; postage 3d.

MAN VERSUS THE STATE. By HERBERT SPENCER. Paper, 6d.; postage 2d.

THE EGO AND ITS OWN. By MAX STIRNER. 6s.; postage 4d.

AN ENQUIRY CONCERNING POLITICAL JUSTICE. By WILLIAM GODWIN. 2 vols., 16s.; postage 9d.

ON PROPERTY: ESSAY FROM "POLITICAL JUSTICE." By WILLIAM GODWIN. Cloth, 3s. 6d.; postage 3d.

SHELLEY, GODWIN, AND THEIR CIRCLE. By H. N. BRAILSFORD. 2s.; postage 3d.

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

A HISTORY OF FREEDOM OF THOUGHT. By PROF. J. B. BURY. 2s.; postage 3d.

LOVE'S COMING OF AGE. By EDWARD CARPENTER. 2s.; postage 3d.

NEWS FROM NOWHERE. By WILLIAM MORRIS. Cloth, 3s. 6d.; paper, 1s. 6d.; postage 3d.

A DREAM OF JOHN BALL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. Cloth, 3s. 6d.; paper, 1s. 6d.; postage 3d.

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

SCIENCE VERSUS DOGMA. By CHARLES T. SPRADING. 6s.; postage 4d.

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

THE SPEECHES OF THE CHICAGO MARTYRS. 2s.; postage 2d.

LIFE OF ALBERT PARSONS. By LUCY E. PARSONS. 12s.; postage 6d.

THE SOUL OF MAN UNDER SOCIALISM. By OSCAR WILDE. Limp cloth, 2s. 6d.; postage 2d.

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

THE SPIRIT OF FREEDOM IN EDUCATION. By ELIZABETH BYRNE FERM. 1s. 3d., post free.

THE MODERN SCHOOL OF STELTON. By JOSEPH J. COHEN and ALEXIS C. FERM. 4s.; postage 4d.

WALDEN. By HENRY THOREAU. 2s.; postage 3d.

ALBUM OF THE FUNERAL OF PETER KROPOTKIN IN MOSCOW. With 30 Photographs. 1s., post free.

Orders, with cash, to be sent to

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

Printed by the UTOPIA PRESS and Published by the FREEDOM PRESS, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W.1.