

Freedom

Vol. XL.—No. 436.

AUGUST-SEPTEMBER, 1926.

MONTHLY: TWO PENCE.

NOTES.

A Pyrrhic Victory.

It is related of Pyrrhus, King of Epirus, that after a dearly-won victory over the Romans he said: "One more such victory and we are utterly undone." We imagine that must be the feeling of the mineowners and the Federation of British Industries to-day. They have at last forced the miners to agree to concessions on the question of wages, but at a cost to themselves and traders generally that will take them many years to recoup. In this long-drawn-out struggle the money-bags of the capitalists have beaten the stomachs of the miners and their wives and children. Whether the terms now to be settled could have been obtained at any time previously, we cannot say. That is for the miners to settle with their officials. But we sincerely hope the miners have been thinking hard during their long rest and learnt some lessons. Surely they can now see that so long as the land is monopolised by their masters, and so long as the wage system lasts, these struggles are certain to occur again and again. There cannot be, and there should not be, peace between exploiters and exploited. But we hope that their sufferings have bred in the miners' breasts such a fierce hatred of the present system of Monopoly and Privilege that they will never rest until it is destroyed root and branch. Let them not waste time and energy in discussing whether they were betrayed by the General Council last May, but concentrate on the task of securing free and equal access to the natural resources of their native land.

How Long, Oh Workers?

If the happiness and well-being of the people is a true test of any form of society, then it can be said definitely that Capitalism is a failure—in this country, at any rate—and must soon be replaced. To-day the numbers of unemployed and of those dependent on Poor Law relief are truly appalling. On August 23 the total number of persons recorded on the registers of employment exchanges in Great Britain was 1,558,900, exclusive of those who ceased work in the coal-mining industry on account of the dispute. It also excludes those who do not sign the register because they are not entitled to benefit. A conservative estimate would be a total of 2,500,000 at present idle. On June 26 the total number of persons in receipt of Poor Law relief was approximately 2,338,000. Anyone with a spark of imagination can realise the tremendous amount of misery and suffering represented by those figures, and we marvel at the audacity of those who still attempt to justify Capitalism and the credulity of those who believe them. The destitution rampant to-day is absolutely unnecessary. The soil of this country is as fertile as any soil in the world, and our machinery has reached a degree of productiveness which would not have been dreamed of fifty years ago. Yet we have allowed our rulers to mismanage our affairs to such an extent that the volume of poverty and starvation among the people is probably far greater to-day than at any time in the history of this country. We almost lose hope of our fellow-countrymen when we find them so lacking in spirit and personal dignity as to tolerate such a situation. They have fought foreign enemies on countless battlefields; they have colonised and made fruitful vast territories, and built up sturdy and vigorous nations overseas; yet here at home they are so lacking in manhood that they are content to stand idle in the market-place and hold out their hands for the pitiful relief which the "Guardians of the Poor" dole out to them. Is there no indignity, is there no humiliation, is there no amount of suffering for their women and children that will rouse the workers to sweep away this unjust system and the unjust stewards who have despoiled the national estate? Or will they for ever cringe and bend the knee to the monopolist, the priest, the politician, and the swarm of parasites who batten and fatten on their toil?

People in Glass Houses.

The Rector of Milborne St. Andrew, Blandford, Dorset, probably by this time realises the truth of the old saying, "People who live in glass houses should not throw stones." He has been engaged in a correspondence with the Duke of Northumberland on the question of mining royalties, which he says are "wrested from the labour of the workers" and bring a curse with them, and therefore should be abolished. This roused the wrath of the Duke, who has constituted himself the champion of Landlordism. After pointing out that the Church of England receives £400,000 a year from royalties, he charges the Rector with ingratitude to landowners, who have endowed the Church, her institutions and schools. He then says:—

"The workers know that while you condemn the descendants of Norman freebooters, your Church was endowed by them and owes her status to them. If they were freebooters, the clergy must have been receivers of stolen goods which you have no intention whatever of giving up. The workers know also that while you denounce 'the present system,' you are part and parcel of it, your Church is the very core of it, and you are personally making a very good thing out of it. They know that while you condemn feudalism, your Church is the only remaining relic of feudalism in this country; while you condemn privileges, you belong yourself to a privileged caste; and while you condemn prerogatives, your Church bristles with them."

All of which is pretty hard hitting and quite true, except that the Duke is himself a relic of feudalism. Just now when we read so much of the intervention of the Bishops in the mining dispute it is well to remember that the Church has always worked hand in hand with the privileged class, and has ever been a stubborn opponent of reform. The Duke has turned the tables on the Rector, but his letter shows very clearly that landlordism is the fundamental basis of all privilege.

Banning "Red" Literature.

A friend sends us a cutting from the *Auckland Star* (New Zealand) of June 25, containing a report of a discussion in Parliament on the censorship of imported literature. Mr. H. E. Holland, leader of the Labour Party, protested against the banning of working-class literature. The Hon. Downie Stewart said there was no ban on working-class literature, but only on anything that might incite to violence, lawlessness, and sedition. We know what he means by "sedition"—anything likely to incite the workers to throw off their shackles. There was no regular rule, therefore he had created a Board to deal with the matter. It was reasonable that society should protect itself against inflammatory literature urging present-day revolts, but books dealing with revolution in a purely historical sense, such as the French Revolution or Moses' revolt against Pharaoh, were not objectionable. If our modern Pharaohs continue to harden their hearts, we can imagine the story of the successful revolt of the Israelites making very good propaganda. The United Mine Workers have sent a circular (published in the *New Zealand Worker* of June 23) to all the Unions urging them to agitate against the censorship, and saying they have no intention of allowing the ruling class "to be the dictators of what we shall or shall not read." Unfortunately, the authorities control all the means by which literature is imported, therefore the ban is very difficult to fight. During the War the Australian Government published a list of 210 publications that were forbidden entry into Australia, *FREEDOM* being honoured with a place in the list. Alexander Berkman's "Prison Memoirs," Emma Goldman's "Anarchism and other Essays," and Voltairine de Cleyre's "Selected Works" were also included. Our paper, however, managed to run the gauntlet occasionally. These people dread a change of any kind. "The system is a very nice one for us, so why should we alter it?" They think that if they sit on the safety-valve they can prevent the steam accumulating. The Tsar tried it, with disastrous results to himself.

REFLECTIONS ON THE GENERAL STRIKE.

Since the press has regained its freedom to speak authoritatively on subjects it knows least about the papers have been filled with long dissertations on the merits and defects of the General Strike. Most writers have little to say in its favour, or have shown much misunderstanding of the nature and meaning of the subject. This is as it should be as regards the bourgeois press. It is either ignorant of the historic mission of the General Strike or it cannot afford to interpret correctly the signs of our times. Naturally, the bourgeois press is too deeply concerned to tell the truth. We need not, therefore, be surprised to read all sorts of rubbish about the great event which for nine days so disturbed the placidity of the middle class.

Much more surprising is the lack of understanding displayed on the subject by many writers on the Labour press, especially the writers who choose to pose as the Left Wing section in the Trade Union ranks. Thus, they lay the entire blame for the failure of the strike at the door of the Right Wing leaders, who they tell us were cowardly and at the same time childishly callous. Messrs. Thomas, Clynes, and the rest, we are assured, were simply carried off their feet by the promises of Sir Herbert Samuel, the chairman of the Coal Commission, who, though posing as interested in the fate of the miners, is in reality a devoted servant of the ruling class.

Far be it from me to hold a brief for or excuse the Trade Union leaders who went down so ignominiously at the very moment when the General Strike was gaining such momentum. Having watched for nearly two years the sayings and doings of Messrs. MacDonald, Thomas, and their colleagues, one could, without being a prophet, predict exactly their stand in such a vital event as a General Strike. But to lay the entire blame for the collapse of the strike upon them may be an easy way out for those who are equally responsible, but it does not explain the share in the muddle of the ultra-red leaders, the Left Wing Trade Unionists.

If these good people would only look into themselves they would have to admit that they have aided and abetted the growing centralisation of Trade Unionism, which excludes initiative on the part of the workers in any great economic issue. And they would have to admit also that they have never taken the slightest pains to acquaint the workers with the historic significance of the General Strike, nor have they prepared the masses for the moment when the General Strike will be imposed upon Labour. Far from doing that, the so-called "Red" Trade Unionists have always joined in the cry of their conservative colleagues, pointing to the General Strike as "impracticable Syndicalist or Anarchist nonsense." They have, therefore, themselves to blame for what they now consider a betrayal on the part of the Right Wing elements.

While British Trade Unionism deserves the credit for having been the pioneer in establishing the right of workers to organise, and in having built up a powerful institution in the economic struggle, it must at the same time be pointed out that it has remained stationary and is hopelessly out of date as a fighting organisation. Trade Unionists have laid much more stress on the need of rigid centralisation, of huge funds, of the antiquated idea of contracts between Labour and Capital, than on the fighting spirit of the workers, so that at the present time Trade Unionism has become ultra-respectable. It owes its position and the consideration accorded to it by the Tories to its inherent conservatism. At the same time the workers are nowhere so hampered in their movements, so hedged in by the Trade Union machinery, and so lacking in power of decision and initiative, as they are in England.

Naturally, out of such an old-fashioned institution no new vital fighting force could come. The question then is: How did the General Strike happen after all? The answer is that conditions are stronger than theories. The conditions of the miners had become so appalling, and the mineowners so determined to increase the woe of the miner's life, that a General Strike was inevitable—inevitable because Labour at large was made to realise that a reduction of wages and an increase of hours for the miners must needs affect their own economic conditions.

I insist that a clear-cut understanding of the nature and scope of an issue is indispensable if the issue is to be met adequately and fought successfully, and it is precisely because Trade Union leaders have neglected to instruct the rank and file that they were not able to meet the issue. But for this neglect the General Strike would from its very inception have been truly general, which it most assuredly was not. Neither would the General Council have failed

so completely in utilising the splendid spirit demonstrated by the workers during the strike.

The General Council, however, showed both ignorance and lack of vision. That was best demonstrated by the way the men were called out after the General Strike was decided upon. Instead of bringing about a complete stoppage of production, the strike was inaugurated on the instalment plan, the workers being called out bit by bit. Thus, while the printers, not nearly so important to the success of the General Strike, were called out, the men employed in the power, light, and food services were allowed to go on—a ridiculous situation, which many of the workers realised; but, bereft of voice or decision in the matter, they had to submit.

Of course, knowing that the rank and file had never been taught to face an issue to its last consequences, the General Council no doubt felt that a complete General Strike, if not settled within twenty-four hours, may lead to serious results. Most of them had been trained in terms of the House of Commons, in closed-door negotiations and wire-pulling. Besides, they were much more concerned in safeguarding the Trade Union funds, which the Government threatened to confiscate. On the other hand, the Left Wing members, who are such devotees of the Moscow Dictatorship for Russia, were not very eager to see the General Strike lead to a Dictatorship in Great Britain. Neither the one nor the other realised that there is a third way out. A General Strike can be truly effective only if a new spirit will penetrate Trade Unionism, the spirit of Syndicalism, which is after all the only basis for economic organisation to meet the needs of the modern economic struggle. Besides that, Syndicalism prepares the masses for fundamental social changes on a federative libertarian basis, away from the State and its crushing dictatorship.

A General Strike which has its roots in Syndicalism and free initiative for activity as a vision for the workers is the only strike which is likely to compel the enemy's attention. The General Strike was not of that nature, hence it could not achieve what it set out to do, namely, to force the mineowners to meet the demands of the miners, and to pave the way for greater economic improvements for all the workers. As it is, the miners were betrayed, and the Labour leaders are now engaged in recriminations, a sorrowful spectacle after such a great beginning.

And yet, the General Strike was not in vain. That it should have happened at all in Great Britain is among the wonders of our day. Still greater is the spirit of solidarity so admirably demonstrated by the workers. One had to be in London during the nine historic days to see their fine fortitude and their joyous abandon to the situation, their utter disregard of the hardships the strike entailed for them, to realise that the General Strike was not in vain. No amount of political wire-pulling, of constant talk in the House of Commons, nor yet endless discussions on Socialism in the Labour press, has struck so deeply into the minds and hearts of the masses, nor have they aroused such profound interest in the social question. On the other hand, the General Strike has demonstrated to the ruling class how very close to the abyss it stands, how great the menace it has escaped—this time.

We Anarchists, who have always stood the brunt of ridicule and condemnation because of our stand on the General Strike, are now vindicated. We have proved that we stand much closer to the realities of life and the social struggle than our political opponents. All the more reason why we should increase our efforts to bring to the workers a better understanding of the meaning, purpose, and efficacy of Syndicalism and its most effective weapon in the economic struggle—the General Strike.

EMMA GOLDMAN.

The Evil of Government.

The evil of government is not due to the election of bad men as rulers, or to the failure of our rulers to represent that unascertainable mass preference, but to the wrong of rulership itself. Rulership means mastery or slavery, a thing to be reformed only by its abolition. Reformers all see and feel the wrongs of government, but seem unable to see that the wrongs are inherent in the thing itself, hence blame the king, congress, legislators, form of government, or *modus operandi* of the machine, and proceed to invent all sorts of chimeras to render ideal or perfect force-founded States, which not only the experience of the centuries past, but all logic and reason, shows can be nothing but a curse to mankind—*The Mutualist*.

GODWIN'S "POLITICAL JUSTICE."*

When Mr. Ford K. Brown's "Life of William Godwin" was published early this year (see review in *FREEDOM*, April-May issue) we expressed a silent wish that a publisher would be bold enough to reprint "Political Justice." It was, therefore a great pleasure to us when our wish was so soon gratified by the receipt of these two volumes.

"Political Justice" was the first reasoned statement of Anarchist principles ever published. When it appeared the French Revolution had stirred profoundly all classes in Great Britain, bringing fear to the ruling class and hope to the ruled. Everyone was discussing the relative merits of a Monarchy or a Republic, when Godwin launched his trenchant indictment of all forms of Government and Authority. It naturally caused a great sensation, and Godwin soon became famous. "No work in our time," says Hazlitt, "gave such a blow to the philosophical mind of the country." And De Quincey said it "carried one fearful shock into the bosom of English society, fearful but momentary. . . . Mr. Godwin advanced against thrones and dominations, powers and principalities, with the air of some Titan slinger or monomachist from Thebes and Troy, saying, 'Come hither, ye wretches, that I may give your flesh to the fowls of the air.'" Although the price of "Political Justice" was three guineas, four thousand copies were sold, and it is recorded that it "became so popular that the poorest mechanics were known to club subscriptions for its purchase, and thus it was directed to mine and eat away contentment from a nation's roots."

Godwin's main argument in "Political Justice" is that the supreme law is the general welfare, and "that will most contribute to it which enlarges the understanding, supplies incitements to virtue, fills us with a generous consciousness of our independence, and carefully removes whatever can impede our exertions." He had unbounded faith in his fellow-men if they had equality of opportunity to improve themselves morally and materially. "There is no characteristic of man which seems at present at least so eminently to distinguish him or to be of so much importance in every branch of moral science as his perfectibility." But he must have liberty and political and economic equality. And he says: "The real enemies of liberty in any country are not the people, but those higher orders who profit by a contrary system." So he proceeds to analyse ruthlessly the "higher orders" who stand in the way of the changes necessary for the gradual improvement of mankind.

"A king is necessarily and almost unavoidably a despot in his heart. . . . He has been used to unhesitating compliance, and it is with difficulty he can digest expostulation and opposition." Of a ruler under a limited monarchy he says: "He may not choose any one of his measures. He must listen with docility to the consultation of his ministers and sanction with a ready assent whatever they determine. . . . He must not express to any man his opinion, for that would be a sinister and unconstitutional interference. To be absolutely perfect he must have no opinion, but be the vacant and colourless mirror by which theirs is reflected."

Godwin is just as severe when dealing with aristocracy. "Aristocracy in its proper signification implies neither less nor more than a scheme for rendering more permanent and visible by the interference of political institution the inequality of mankind. Aristocracy, like monarchy, is founded in falsehood, the offspring of art foreign to the real nature of things, and must therefore, like monarchy, be supported by artifice and false pretences."

Legislation, he says, "is in almost every country grossly the favourer of the rich against the poor. . . . The rich are encouraged to associate for the execution of the most partial and oppressive positive laws." Law was originally devised that ordinary men might know what they had to depend upon, "and there is not at this day a lawyer existing in Great Britain presumptuous and vainglorious enough to pretend that he has mastered the code." Law tends "to fix the mind in a stagnant condition, and to substitute a principle of permanence in the room of that unceasing perfectibility which is the only salubrious element of mind."

Religious establishments are quite as harmful to the cause of truth.

"Here then we have to consider the whole honours and revenue of the church, from the archbishop who takes precedence next after

the princes of the blood royal to the meanest curate in the nation, as employed in support of a system of blind submission and abject hypocrisy. Is there one man through this numerous hierarchy that is at liberty to think for himself? Is there one man among them that can lay his hand upon his heart and declare upon his honour and conscience that his emoluments have no effect in influencing his judgment? The declaration is impossible."

Godwin concludes, therefore, that there is no hope of these institutions ever being useful in bringing about the revolution in the minds of men which he desires.

"The true instruments for changing the opinions of men's minds are argument and persuasion. The best security for an advantageous issue is free and unrestricted discussion. In that field truth must always prove the successful champion. . . . But when we lay down our arguments and take up our swords, the case is altered. . . . We must therefore carefully distinguish between informing the people and inflaming them."

The man who works for the regeneration of his species must be prepared to wait years before trying to reduce theory into actual action; but if the multitude are impetuous he will not "sternly pass sentence upon every revolution that shall by a few years have anticipated the term that wisdom would have prescribed."

In Book VIII Godwin explains his system of equal property. Now though we as Anarchists have always avoided drawing up plans for a nebulous future—"first catch your hare"—we have found it very interesting to study the plans of others, and Godwin's is no exception. In introducing it, he says:—

"The subject of property is the keystone that completes the fabric of political justice. According as our ideas respecting it are crude or correct, they will enlighten us as to the consequences of a *simple form of society without government*, and remove the prejudices that attach us to complexity. There is nothing that more powerfully tends to distort our *judgment* and our *opinions* than erroneous notions concerning the goods of fortune. Finally, the period that shall put an end to the system of *coercion* and *punishment* is intimately connected with the circumstance of property's being placed upon an equitable basis. . . . However great and extensive are the evils that are produced by monarchies and courts, by the impostures of priests and the iniquity of criminal laws, all these are imbecile and impotent compared with the evils that arise out of the established system of property."

In a system of equal property, where everyone does his share of the work, Godwin reckons half an hour a day seriously employed in manual labour would supply the whole with necessities. "It is the unnecessary employments that at present occupy the great mass of the inhabitants of every civilised nation, while the peasant labours incessantly to maintain them in a state more pernicious than idleness." Godwin emphasises the point that there is nothing in his system of equal property that can be represented as a scheme of government, nor anything that would interfere with the cultivation of individuality or prevent people following the dictates of their own judgment, and it would entail no restrictions or superintendence.

If we remember that "Political Justice" appeared at a time when, as Godwin says in his Preface, "the people of England have assiduously been excited to declare their loyalty, and to mark every man as obnoxious who is not ready to sign the shibboleth of the Constitution," we can see that he was not lacking in moral courage. Even in the second corrected edition, published only three years later, there was sufficient "treasonable" matter to send him to prison had the Government thought a prosecution advisable.

This edition is reprinted from the first edition. The parts principally omitted are the sections that Godwin himself intimated might be passed over as unessential to his main thesis. In a very sympathetic Introduction Mr. Preston says: "William Godwin is one of the men who most deserve a rereading in our time." We thank him heartily for making it possible for many to read him for the first time.

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

* "An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice and Its Influence on General Virtue and Happiness." By William Godwin. Edited and Abridged by Raymond A. Preston. 2 vols. 16s. London: Alfred A. Knopf, 38 Bedford Place, W.C.1.—Can be obtained from *FREEDOM* Office.

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 PERILS OF NATIONALISATION.*

It seems to me imperative that we recognise clearly and acknowledge frankly the discredit into which the State is falling. To my thinking, this has been for many years past one of the most marked tendencies of the age; and the War, which exposed so many shams and brought to the surface so many realities previously hidden, gave that tendency a powerful impetus. It was then that the world was shown the omnipotence with which the State had clothed its chief officials, enabling them to send millions to the shambles, and to usher in an era of corruption in the form of grossly fraudulent commercial contracts, brazen profiteering, and financial thimblerrigging of the most demoralising type. The world then saw the great and supposedly civilised Governments debasing the currency as recklessly as did ever the absolute monarchs of the Dark Ages—a tremendous fact which should convince us that Governments are precisely the ones who should *not* be entrusted with the issuance and control of the circulating medium. It saw the men at the head of the official machine carving up continents and annexing as colonies lands inhabited by alien peoples whose crime was that they had not armed themselves adequately against the invader. It saw them deliberately undoing all that science had accomplished in the way of annihilating distance and bringing the whole human family into close touch, officialdom doing this because it needed revenue wherewith to meet its own extravagances and found in protective tariffs the easiest method of raising cash. In short, the State is Militarism, and embodies in its most odious forms the principle of coercion.

I preface this brief paper with these reflections because they lead me directly to my subject, and express a vital truth we shall do wisely to digest. For if we are ever to become a world-moving force we must have on our side the all-powerful instincts of the masses, and those instincts are all against the State. In the main this world is peopled with agriculturists, and always the peasant hates the State, which is to him simply a tax-gatherer and a tribute-levier who takes from him by force, and without rendering any substantial equivalent, a portion of his product. Nor is it at bottom otherwise with the industrial population, for they have no liking for the restrictions the State imposes on them, stand in dread of the policeman and all the machinery of the law, and have little faith in politicians. Indeed, I submit that distrust of the politician has now become almost universal, and that this is one of the most significant features of the times. If we are to win the support of the masses we must avoid, above everything, all suspicion of being upholders of the State; and, passing now directly to my theme, "The Perils of Nationalisation," I remark that he who favours Nationalisation thereby enrols himself as a supporter of State ownership and control.

The objections to State ownership and control are not merely, as Herbert Spencer put it, that "Government is invariably slow, stupid, wasteful, and corrupt," or that the State is an insatiably encroaching autocrat who, no matter what the form of government, can exist only by reducing citizens to the status of subjects, and compelling implicit obedience to its decrees; or in the fact that it is at once the creator and ally of those great monopolies which seem likely to reduce the masses of mankind to abject slavery; or that it covers the face of the earth with spies and informers, thereby instituting veritable reigns of terror which muzzle free speech, check the growth of thought and knowledge, and lead straight to those Dictatorships beneath which more than half of Europe to-day is groaning. These and other objections which it would be tedious to enumerate are perhaps the least weighty portions of the indictment, for the

gravest charge to be made against State ownership and control is that it will plunge us into, and probably keep us constantly in, world-wide war. This is by far the most serious argument that can be urged against a measure which to-day enjoys a temporary popularity with those who see no farther than the end of their nose; and because I think it such I chose "The Perils of Nationalisation" as the subject of this paper.

It is a fortunate thing that the prime materials for the sustenance of life, such as the commoner kinds of foods and metals, are so widely distributed that no one nation has a monopoly of them; but with many other things, themselves essential to the maintenance of civilisation as we know it, this is not the case. There would be, for example, a tremendous outcry if the world found itself suddenly deprived of tea and coffee; but the actual fact is that 64 per cent. of the world's coffee comes from Brazil, which recently made an abortive attempt to corner it, while 72 per cent. of the tea supply comes from India and Ceylon, British possessions. Again, 55 per cent. of the wool comes from Australia and New Zealand, and not long ago the Australian Government, which is largely under the influence of Socialist philosophies, proposed to hold up Australia's portion of the world crop, hoping thus to raise prices for the benefit of its own subjects. Similarly, 52 per cent. of the gold and 62 per cent. of the diamonds come from South Africa, while, on the other hand, the United States produce 56 per cent. of the cotton and tobacco grown, and, in the Philippines, 100 per cent. of the manilla hemp. I could extend the list, but it would be useless.

As we all know to our sorrow, many of these indispensable commodities are already under the control of a few private monopolists; and, for example, the fact that a large proportion of the world's oil trade is now in the hands of three powerful groups, and the tobacco trade in those of two, is one of the most unsatisfactory features of our present economic development. Imagine, however, what would be the condition if Great Britain were able to say: "Our Government is the sole owner of all this large percentage of tea, and rice (57 per cent. of which is grown in India), and gold, and so forth; and as the world cannot get along without these things, we propose to take it by the throat and exact whatever price we choose to fix." Imagine the United States taking the same line, or other countries which also have, by reason of their soil and climate, a similar monopoly of certain products. What condition more provocative of war could be conceived, for not only would there be generated an intense indignation against the country that was holding the others up to ransom, but also, in certain circumstances, it might be necessary to compel her to disgorge. Then, on either side, the fires of national patriotism would burst into blaze, and once more the world would be turned into a slaughterhouse. After our experience in the Great War can anyone question the fierceness of those fires, or the facility with which they can be kindled?

At present Great Britain and the United States are working hand in hand, and the vast volume of their mutual interests forbids a quarrel. Nevertheless, not many months ago almost the entire American press bristled with articles in which Great Britain was denounced furiously for holding up the price of rubber under the Stevenson Agreement, to the immense loss of the people of the United States, who to-day are using more rubber than all the other countries of the world combined. If I remember right, this led to diplomatic protest; but Great Britain was able to show that the agreement had been entered into not so much for the sake of establishing a British monopoly as for that of saving Eastern planters from ruin, and for the time being the threatened storm blew over. But the incident was most significant, a dark shadow cast upon the screen by ominous events that yet may come.

What I am driving at is this. When Henry George wrote "Progress and Poverty," half a century ago, it was impossible for him to foresee the world-revolutionising developments of the last fifty years, and in his condemnation of Nationalisation he could not employ the arguments I have been using. Nevertheless, he did condemn Nationalisation in the strongest terms, emphasising the power with which it would clothe bureaucracy, and the consequent tyranny and corruption to which infallibly it would give rise. And the never-to-be-forgotten truth is that Henry George's gospel was distinctly an Individualistic gospel, being based on the teachings of Herbert Spencer and other uncompromising Individualists, and on the fundamental principle that I and you and everyone of us depend for our very existence on the natural resources of this planet. George's doctrine was that this priceless gift of individual life can

[* This paper by WM. C. OWEN was read at the Third International Conference to promote the Taxation of Land Values and Free Trade, held in Copenhagen, July 20-31. We think it worth reproduction here, without necessarily agreeing with the principle of the Single Tax.—ED. FREEDOM.]

only be enjoyed as it should be when each individual has secured to him free and equal access to natural opportunities.

Throughout our propaganda we talk incessantly of the common right to land, and I suggest that in doing so we fail to call sufficient attention to the fact that this is also the most essential of individual rights; and we have fallen into this negligence under the influence of the Socialist movement, which habitually minimises the importance of individual rights, and even scoffs at them, its basic tenet being that the interests of the individual must always be subordinated to those of the majority, as disclosed by popular vote. That is a position we should consistently reject, in the most uncompromising and decisive terms. We should reject it, in the first place, because it is radically unsound, being false to the fundamental facts of life; and, in the second place, because, looking at the question from the merely opportunistic standpoint of policy, there is nothing whatever in making concessions to or allying ourselves with Socialism. Already it is self-evident to all careful students of contemporary affairs that the Socialist philosophy of life is false, its basis being that whatever is decreed—or supposedly decreed—by the majority must be accepted by all as the law of their daily lives. Inasmuch as this presupposes that the voice of the majority is the voice of God, this philosophy has necessarily broken down, and the policies based on it have failed disastrously. Where powerful leaders, such as the ex-Socialists Lenin and Mussolini, taking advantage of the chaos into which the War had plunged society, have been able to impose Socialism on a nation they have created ruthless dictatorships. Where such leaders or such circumstances have been lacking the various Socialist parties have shown themselves mere flies upon the wheel of professional politics, powerless in any way to alter the course of the machine and making no impression on public thought. And it is public thought that has to be revolutionised, a task that can be performed by those alone who awaken the intelligence and conscience of the masses to some truth at once so simple and so vital that it alters completely men's outlook on life, rescuing them from their eternal slavery to sterile phrases and forcing them to face realities. The publication of "Progress and Poverty" had that effect, but only on the cultured few, for its argument was too elaborate and exhaustive to be comprehended by the masses. Now it is the masses we have to reach. It is to them we have to go, and we can go to them successfully only by laying before them a truth so plainly vital that they accept it instinctively and thenceforth find it impossible to let it go.

The trouble with the masses is not that they are incapable of understanding and appreciating a great truth, but that they are befogged by the sophistries of lawyers, politicians, the priesthood, and all that army of word-twisters Special Privilege has at its command. It is essentially the business of these professional sophists to keep the masses bewildered by the mists and mirages of half-truths; to prevent them from peering beneath the surface and thereby discovering the false basis on which the existing system rests—happily with an increasing restlessness and with an insecurity that becomes more manifest from day to day. And obviously the tactics these defenders of Things as They Are pursue are those we should avoid, for our end is the exact opposite of that for which they strive. Our object is to undeceive the masses; to get their heads out of the clouds; to show them realities.

May I be allowed to add, in the interest of frankness, that I write as an Anarchist, and that for many years past I have called myself an Anarchist because I am convinced that man's destiny is to be self-governing; that Freedom is his inevitable goal, and the State, as the incarnation of coercion, his most deadly foe. If I thought, as most Anarchists still think, that Henry George's teachings would lead to Nationalisation and the complete supremacy of the State, as sole owner of the means of life, I would no more think of associating myself with them than I would think of chaining myself to a leper. That road, in my settled conviction, leads straight to death; and I learned long ago that what keeps so many earnest and thoughtful people from becoming interested in our movement is the delusion that we are, at bottom, as many a noted Anarchist writer has asserted, State Socialists. I understand that this is a delusion, the real object of our movement being that every man shall get all he justly earns, and nobody one penny out of the exploitation of others. However, and let there be no mistake about it, the delusion is widespread, and for many years past I have made it almost my chief business to do my best to counter it. I wish our movement to do likewise, and for that reason I contribute this paper.

"FREEDOM'S" FORTIETH BIRTHDAY.

DEAR KEELL,—FREEDOM will have its fortieth birthday next month, and I am sending you a trifle towards a further and, as I trust, far greater extension of its activities. Doubtless many others, conscious of the invaluable work already accomplished, will be doing likewise; for, while proud of the long past, they will recognise that our real concern is with the future, and that it will find us still standing in the ring, more resolute, more competent, and better equipped than ever.

FREEDOM has never been a popularity-hunting paper, and should not be. Its function is to make clear the lines that the attack, when finally developed, will have to follow. That is always the essential, and also the most difficult and dangerous, work. The upholders of Things as They Are snap their fingers at mere aimless scattering of mud, but scent instinctively as their real enemies those who strike at the root and undermine the foundations of the rotting structure.

For years past I have been interested in tracing FREEDOM's international influence, as mirrored in foreign exchanges. With the War and the Russian Revolution the masses were stampeded into sterile emotionalism and unreasoning passion, and almost everywhere they prostrated themselves before new idols of clay whose feet were set on sand. To bring them back to realities became at once the crying need, and few were those who bent themselves wholeheartedly to that laborious and thankless task. FREEDOM was one of the few. It summoned the whole world of Anarchism to be true to its name and to understand that its mission is to overthrow rule by the exploiter, no matter what his label, by assisting men in that struggle for individual liberty which alone can redeem them from slavery.

On that basis we can all unite, and for such unity the times are calling clamorously. Alike in the spiritual, the intellectual, and the material domain, in politics as in economics, Dictatorship is in the saddle, and means to ride. We have to throw off that rider. We have to wrench ourselves out of the straitjacket now strangling us. We have to consider also that in such a struggle small efforts and unconsidered skirmishing amount to nothing. If FREEDOM is hewing straight to the line, it should be supported most generously, personalities being forgotten in concentration on the general aim. As against the compact array of Special Privilege stands the huge army of the Disinherited, of those who have been given no chance in life, still dispossessed and therefore at present helpless. Our business is to rescue them from helplessness by aiding them in their struggle to force open the door of equal opportunity, and in that struggle to the very edge of his personal ability every one of us should go.

The future of FREEDOM ought to be made secure. Like all other effective movements we should give our representative organ the support of a substantial sinking-fund. Without weapons none can fight, and if we choose to do so we can certainly equip this old-time warrior with the arms he needs. He is fighting where the battle is most difficult; in the country which is the backbone of Caste, Imperialism, and all those monopolistic forces with which Anarchism is irreconcilably at war; in the country, above all, which is still wedded to those cowardly opportunisms which serve only to dissipate our time and strength, and bring us nowhere. It is here, therefore, that eventually the fight will be the hottest, and here that there should be no failure of adequate support.

I enclose a money contribution from an old friend, and hope it will be one of many. The time is ripe for a great enlargement of FREEDOM's circulation, and for the assumption of other new activities rendered at present impossible by lack of funds.—Yours, as always,

WM. C. OWEN.

"FREEDOM'S" BIRTHDAY FUND.

With its October issue FREEDOM celebrates its fortieth anniversary, the first number appearing in October, 1886. We therefore intend to make this a special number, with new and original articles from well-known comrades. Errico Malatesta, Max Nettlau, Rudolf Rocker, and Wm. C. Owen have already sent or promised contributions, and we hope to get several others. Our readers can also join in the celebration by sending us contributions in cash. This year, owing to scarcity of funds, we have only been able to publish once every two months. It is impossible to continue like that; FREEDOM must come out at least once a month or cease publication. We need £100 by the end of the year to clear off our debt to our printers and to ensure publication monthly in the New Year. We therefore appeal earnestly to all our friends to celebrate FREEDOM's fortieth birthday by sending us as much money as they can and as soon as they can. A birthday gift for FREEDOM! Who can refuse?

THE COAL LOCK-OUT.

The coal lock-out is nearing its end, and the end will be as dreary as has been the course of the dispute. Now that the Executive have been given power to negotiate a settlement, with the sole reservation as to the lengthening of hours, it needs no prophetic powers to foretell a reduction in wages and the loss of some other hardly-won conditions of work. It could hardly be otherwise. The men went into this fight merely to defend the *status quo*. If they are now going to negotiate, they must necessarily retreat from that position, and as they have nothing with which to bargain they will be forced to accept a reduction in wages or a lengthening of hours or—both.

In South Wales the owners make no secret of their determination to return to the eight-hour day. "Even with a substantial reduction in wages," they say, "the seven-hour day will not give economic results." And there is, perhaps most important of all, one other point that will be in keen dispute, that of district settlements. To give way on this matter will be to undo the last twenty years' work of unifying the forces of the British miners. According to a well-known West of England paper, the view is expressed in mining circles (owners) that if the leaders are prepared to discuss district variations there is every prospect of peace; but it is no exaggeration to say that peace will have been secured at the cost of the life of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain. District settlements will destroy all sense of solidarity amongst miners. When district settlements were the order of the day, Yorkshire miners were pitted against Welsh miners, and Welshmen against those in Scotland. If the South Wales Miners' Federation called a strike, the press started screaming that Durham or some other English district was stealing the South Wales export trade. To-day they say that America or Germany is stealing our markets; then it was some English or Scotch district. The owners, naturally, want to return to those days.

Here in South Wales there are thousands of underground workers receiving for a six-day week £2 12s., some thousands more £2 8s., and others even less. At the moment of writing there is some talk of accepting a 10 per cent. reduction. These men have been hard put to it to make the ragged ends meet at all; they cannot hope to bring them within measurable distance in the event of a reduction. The distress that the Premier denies the existence of was a very real and potent factor in these Welsh mining valleys long before the stoppage. At least the men are starving in idleness now; then they were starving while working. This is no mere rhetoric. Many have been the attempts by men in work to get Guardians' relief to supplement their miserable earnings; by the middle of the week they could, and did, prove utter destitution. Now the miners' officials have been given power to secure peace at the expense of these men's wages.

The owners also want what they call a permanent settlement, or at least for five years, in order to regain the markets lost during the stoppage. The last stoppage in the industry was in 1921. It is five years last month since that settlement, but in April of this year the owners had so far recovered their markets and put the industry on an economic (blessed word) basis that they asked for further reductions and longer hours. What guarantees can they offer that if they get another five years' truce the result will not be the same? None.

Four months has the struggle lasted, due entirely to the grit and determination of the rank and file. No body of men ever received so hard a blow as did the miners in the initial weeks of their fight, when the General Council of the Trades Union Congress called off the General Strike and left them to fight alone. That shameful desertion by the politicians of the Trade Union movement would have had a fatal effect on a less determined body of fighters, but these men merely shrugged their shoulders and went on with their business.

The methods of Russell Square have been keenly criticised by the men. As the weeks went by there was a growing feeling that a mistake was being made in leaving the safety men at work. These men were being used for purposes other than safety work. Thousands of tons of small coal were trucked by these men at various collieries and consigned to the patent fuel works at Swansea and Cardiff, but no serious effort was made officially to cope with this abuse. Attempts to stop it were made by the exasperated rank and file, but they were sporadic and led only to the police court. In many cases the so-called safety men were engaged on new work underground, such as preparing new engine houses, etc. And the locked-out men were being continually admonished by their officials: Be orderly; do not make any disturbance. But in spite of much dissatisfaction owing to the inactivity of their leaders, the men realised only too well the dire

result of a defeat, and carried on from week to week in as equable a spirit as could be expected. They have undoubtedly been beaten so far as maintaining the *status quo* is concerned, but they have not been beaten by "inexorable economic laws" but by bad generalship and the traitorous conduct of those who set themselves up to be leaders of men.

WILLIAM MAINWARING.

THE ORLEANS CONGRESS.

Our French exchanges have been giving great publicity to the manifesto issued by the Anarchist Communist Union at its recent Congress in Orleans, France. In its fourth paragraph the members responsible for this manifesto announce that Communism is their economic creed, and declare that they "are Communists because Communism is the only form of society that assures to all and each an equal share of the social well-being, notably in respect to children, the aged, the sick, and those whose natural endowments are below the average." In the next paragraph they declare that they are also "Individualists, in the sense that, by putting everything in common, they give each and everyone the material possibility of developing his full individuality according to his pleasure."

For the rest, they proclaim themselves the uncompromising enemies of all authority, whether it be that of the State, Capitalism, Religion, Patriotism, the morality imposed by Officialdom, or any other form of coercion. As they put it: "Anarchists are against all Dictatorships—those of yesterday, to-day, or to-morrow"; and this last, at any rate, is a statement with which the entire Anarchist movement, if true to its name, must perforce agree. There will, or should be, also general agreement with the declaration that Anarchists stand for decentralisation as opposed to centralisation; and necessarily so, inasmuch as they believe that revolutionary changes must come from below, through the spontaneous action of the masses. The steps by which these ideals may be attained, as by the establishment of Communes which shall regulate by mutual agreement their own internal affairs and their relationships with one another, are elaborated at some length.

On these it seems useless to dwell, for this section of the Manifesto ends with the remark that the proposals outlined will be realisable "immediately after the triumph of a social revolution which shall have annihilated every form of authority and brought about the total expropriation of the possessing classes." That seems, indeed, sufficiently obvious, it being self-evident, for example, that there is not the faintest possibility of self-governing Communes being established so long as the land remains the monopoly of a comparatively few individuals, be those individuals lords or peasants. Clearly, therefore, the first task is the effecting of a Social Revolution. Furthermore, and as clearly, if the Revolution is to come from below, its accomplishment and the direction in which its forces will operate must depend on the thoughts and wishes of the mass. If the triumphant mass desires an enlargement of individual liberty, it will shape the institutions of the future toward that end. If, on the other hand, it follows the deceptive phantom of Unity, which Popes and secular Dictators hitherto have led it into following, it will snap its fingers at individual liberty and instal a Communist Dictatorship which will, as it fatuously imagines, secure to all material equality. The task of Anarchism is, therefore, a double one: first, to help along to the best of its ability the great revolutionary change now manifestly impending; secondly, to urge that the new form of society shall have Freedom as its cornerstone.

To those who have any acquaintance with Anarchist history and literature it will be self-evident that the fourth paragraph of this Manifesto cannot hope to bring about that united front so earnestly desired by many. The entire school of thought known as Individualist Anarchism will be in arms against it, for that school holds that a declaration that there *must* be Communism necessarily implies that it will be made compulsory, which brings us back directly to Dictatorship. In that school's view, the means of existence having been set free from that stranglehold of Monopoly which alone renders exploitation possible, every individual should be at liberty to use them as he thinks best, alone or in combination with such partners as he selects.

However, these conflicting theories—the one sprung directly from State Socialism and the other from the Protestant revolt against the Dictatorship of the Church of Rome—have still to battle for supremacy. It may be that the very intensity of the struggle against the forces now holding humanity in the grip of slavery will gradually work the problem out.

W. C. O.

OUR BAKUNIN.

How is it that Anarchists the world over, though little given to hero-worship or dwelling on the past, have united to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of Michael Bakunin's death? The answer is that this man was an extraordinary figure; that the influence of his thought is only now beginning to be appreciated, and that the record of his career is an inspiration to every earnest soul. A plain slab of granite marks Bakunin's grave in Berne, and by a simple recital of his multitudinous activities and achievements our German comrades have wisely sought to keep his memory green. In "Unser Bakunin"* (Our Bakunin) they have set out with discrimination the main story of his life and the pith of his philosophy, to which they have added the judgments passed by various Anarchists now living. The task of welding into a condensed and intelligible whole an enormous mass of historical data they naturally entrusted to Max Nettlau, who for many years has made Bakunin's life and teachings his special study.

What made Bakunin the outstanding figure he unquestionably was, and is? As I conceive, he owes his pre-eminence to the fact that he consistently refused to tie himself to creed or party, and thought and taught in terms of life. He found the Individual the basis of all life, and Authority, in all its manifold forms, the foe that cramped and paralysed at every turn the Individual's struggle to climb from the animalism of a decaying past to the humanism of a nobler future now struggling into birth. Bakunin is the evolutionist *par excellence* in the domain of politics and economics.

The heart of the evolutionary philosophy is individual struggle, through which come development and strength. Bakunin grasped that verity, and his teaching is that the Individual must struggle untiringly for Freedom, precisely in order that, with added powers, he may be able to emerge from animalism to humanism. His teaching calls for strength acquired by struggle, and it is plainly a true teaching, for without exercise all faculties wither; and however mysterious may be the workings of this great fact we know as Life, it is inconceivable that it can be constructed on any other principle than that of strength.

We know how the priesthood, whose gospel is submission, raged when biologists first explored this field of thought; but how much greater was their fury sure to be when Bakunin invaded with this vast heresy the whole domain of practical politics, and bade the humble and submissive bow the knee no more, whether to Church or State, to man-imagined or man-imposed Authority, in any form or under any name! Here clearly, in the germ, was a worldwide gospel of revolt. Here self-evidently was the creed that eventually would nerve the hitherto nerveless mass into rising from its knees and tossing all rulers off its back. Here, therefore, was an arch-enemy, to be crushed at any cost. For half his life this man of exalted genius and towering thought was hunted down as a mad hound.

He never wavered, and there was no subduing him. It was a necessity of his nature to keep on struggling. Men who think with passionate sincerity have to be true to their own thought, and Bakunin was passionately sincere. He had to fight, and to fight not only with those already in authority but also with those who, still classed among the disinherited and professing to be their champions, were seeking themselves to climb into the seats of rulership. In Karl Marx and his Social-Democratic followers Bakunin found his bitterest and most unscrupulous foes. His revolt against Marxian Imperialism is historic, and, though regarded at the outset as merely a factional quarrel, was really an epoch-making event. Continuously it has spread and spread, until to-day under one or other of these two banners is enlisted the revolutionary thought of all the world. From Marxism have sprung by an inevitable logic such Dictatorships as those of Lenin and Mussolini, both devotees of Marxism, which was itself a lineal descendant of that Jacobinism which Lenin praised effusively. From Bakunin comes that unshakeable opposition to Dictatorship, no matter what its form or label, which the Anarchist movement, supported by a vast mass of public opinion still for the most part silent but beginning to murmur discontentedly, to-day is showing.

As Bakunin's views of life differed profoundly from those held by Marx, so did his propaganda methods differ. Marx concentrated on the production of volumes which not one out of a thousand of his

professed followers really studies. Bakunin, on the other hand, decentralised and sowed his seed broadcast. Wherever he discovered an opportunity for propaganda, as by the insertion of a letter or article, he utilised it. He travelled widely, and seized on promising human material wherever he could find it. He formed new groups continually, and developed them assiduously by untiring correspondence. Many of his letters are in themselves exhaustive treatises, full of sound analyses and practical advice respecting the problems of the immediate hour. For he combined a genius for thought with a genius for action, and in action he himself was always eager to play his equal part. It is a thousand pities that this correspondence has not been translated into English, for it would throw floods of light on many of the problems with which we ourselves are now struggling distractedly. For the most part we in Great Britain are looking at life almost exclusively through the spectacles of State Socialism, and the vision thus afforded is miserably inadequate and distorted.

Here it is impossible to go into details, and it would be unnecessary if this brochure could be translated, for it gives a most competent account of Bakunin's teachings and career. Its publication and energetic circulation would open many eyes now closed, enabling them to understand how it is that the Socialist wave has now spent its force, and that another and far more powerful tide is setting in.

"THE LOVE LETTERS OF AN ANARCHIST."

(To the Editor of FREEDOM.)

SIR,—Will you allow me to take advantage of your very kind review of my book, "Love Letters of an Anarchist," and give myself a little free advertisement while at the same time defending Anarchism against your reviewer's extraordinary assumption that there can be such a thing as orthodox Anarchism.

Surely, if there is one dogma to which every Anarchist must subscribe it is that every Anarchist is a heretic; and if there is one heresy which every Anarchist must spit upon with venomous contempt it is that Anarchism can be orthodox.

Every Anarchist is a law unto himself, and every creature is at heart an Anarchist, and the moment that he ceases to be an Anarchist at heart he dies.

Fortunately, for other creatures, it happens that the law which each creature is to himself is so limited by circumstance that unless it fulfils certain conditions the creature perishes. A creature is only permitted to exist by Nature provided that it wishes to do what Nature allows it to do, and all life is one vast experiment to discover what Nature wants and permits, and an endeavour to grow in such a way as to be allowed to exist.

That droll institution which we call *The Law*, which we clothe in crimson, and before which we abase ourselves, is only droll in so far as its decrees are contrary to those of Nature—and Nature decrees differently for monkeys, Hottentots, Englishmen, and myself.

Nature is no doctrinaire, because she has no psychological bees in her bonnet. She does not suffer from a violent Oedipus complex. She does not transfer her unconscious hatred of her father onto the State, and proclaim herself an "Anarchist"; nor does she transfer an unconscious longing for her mother onto Mother Earth, and call herself a "Single-taxer," supporting her unconscious desires with oceans of ingenious rationalisations, most of which beg the question.

When Anarchists fulminate against Socialists and Socialists against Anarchists, Nature chuckles, and taking the humble biologist aside she points to the spermatozoon, saying, "There is your original Anarchist." Then she points to the ovum, and says, "There is your original Socialist. They at any rate do not flatter themselves that they are independent of one another, each possessing the whole of Truth. Some day men will be as wise as they are, if they do not annihilate one another first."

And when Anarchists and Socialists join together to fulminate against the iniquity of the Law and the slavery that it imposes upon them, Nature takes the psychologist aside and shows him that it is not the Law that enslaves them, but themselves; that in 99 cases out of 100 their angry denunciations are due to their own unconscious repressions. "However," says Nature genially, "if it were not for them the laws would never be altered. The knave is more useful to me than the fool, and the conscious hypocrite than the knave; but it is upon the unconscious hypocrite that I have to depend principally for the spear point of Progress. The unconscious thief is the only person interested in catching the thief, and so it is likely to continue for many years to

* "Unser Bakunin." Mk.1.20. Berlin O 34: Der Syndikalist, Fritz Kater, Kopernikusstr. 25.

come. Still, man is gradually becoming rational, things are much better than they were, and they improve daily."

Your reviewer says that "Liberty is the mother, not the daughter, of perfection." He is perfectly at liberty to lay the flattering unction of this dangerous half-truth to his soul, but, fortunately for the world in general, Nature has no illusions on this point. Nature never begs the question, therefore she realises that man has ample liberty at present with which to perfect himself—he can alter England to-morrow if he wishes to—and she has no intention of treating man as a rational animal until he becomes one.

The proposed abolition of the Marriage Laws which he urges provides an excellent example. Those who are sufficiently free to ignore the Marriage Laws can do so. In England the Law encourages them to do so, by fining them if they marry. But one has only to think of the hordes of diseased and ill-tended children which would be launched on the world if the Marriage Laws were abolished to realise that, constituted as man is at present, even our iniquitous and grossly immoral Marriage Laws are better than none at all.—Yours faithfully,

RICHARD HOPE.

[Mr. Hope misrepresents our reviewer. He did not urge the abolition of the Marriage Laws. As they are not compulsory, Anarchists advocate ignoring them; and we have pointed out that a steadily increasing number of men and women are doing so. But we should like to know how the "iniquitous and grossly immoral Marriage Laws" prevent "diseased and ill-tended children" being launched upon the world. Both Church and State will "solemnise" marriages between syphilitic and consumptive persons providing they pay the fees.

Man has not ample liberty at present to perfect himself. If an individual or a group of individuals wishing to live their lives in their own way, without injury to others, were to ignore the Land Laws and settle upon a piece of unused land, all the forces of the Law would be brought to bear against them. If the people as a whole wish to ignore these laws, they are strong enough to do so; but the individual is helpless.

Regarding what Mr. Hope terms our reviewer's "extraordinary assumption" that there can be such a thing as orthodox Anarchism, we would point out that the word "Anarchist" has a very precise and definite meaning—one who is opposed to all forms of government. Mr. Hope is not opposed to government. In Chap. XXIII of his book he advocates the retention of the Monarchy and a reformed House of Lords, the latter to be elected by the House of Commons, thus retaining the present system of government. Therefore, in presuming to speak as an Anarchist he is misleading his readers as to the real meaning of Anarchism. We have given him his "little free advertisement," but he has only proved how muddled are his ideas of the subject.—ED. FREEDOM.]

"Freedom" Guarantee Fund.

The following sums have been received to date (August 31) since our last issue:—W. Douglas 10s., Wm. C. Owen 10s., W. D. £1, M. Greenfield 10s., G. P. 2s. 6d., International Libertarian Picnic, Colma, Calif. (per J. J. Nathan), £1 0s. 5d., M. A. Cohn £2 1s. 1d., L. G. Wolfe £2. Thanks to all.

CASH RECEIVED (not otherwise acknowledged).

(July 9 to August 31.)

"FREEDOM" SUBSCRIPTIONS.—J. Heyerick, J. D. Winton, R. Pestiecio, J. H. Naylor, B. Adams, J. Searceriaux, G. Billings, B. B. S., C. Taraboi.

Publications on the Russian Revolution.

THE BOLSHEVIK MYTH. By ALEXANDER BERKMAN. Also "The 'Anti-Climax,'" the chapter rejected by the Publishers. 12s.; postage 6d.

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

LETTERS FROM RUSSIAN PRISONS. Reprints of Documents by Political Prisoners in Soviet Prisons, Prison Camps, and Exile. With Introductory Letters by 22 well-known European and American Authors. 10s. 6d.; postage 6d.

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

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

Russia and the British Labour Delegation's Report: A Reply. 4d.; postage 1d.

West London Anarchist Communist Group.—Open-air Meetings at The Grove, Hammersmith. Wednesdays, 8 p.m. Sundays, 7.30 p.m. Other meetings announced from platform. Speakers welcome.

LEEDS.—G. Frost, 31 Windsor Street, Leeds, is willing to speak at meetings within a reasonable distance. FREEDOM and Anarchist literature on sale or to order. 1s., post-free.

The Road to Freedom.

A Periodical of Anarchist Thought, Work, and Literature.

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

ROAD TO FREEDOM, STELTON, N.J., U.S.A.

ANARCHISM VERSUS SOCIALISM.

By WM. C. OWEN.

32 pages, with Wrapper. Price, Threepence.

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. 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.

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.

ETHICS: ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT. By Peter Kropotkin. 12s. 6d.; postage 6d.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

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.

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

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

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

SCIENCE VERSUS DOGMA. By Charles T. Sprading. 6s.; postage 4d.

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

THE SPIRIT OF FREEDOM IN EDUCATION. By Elizabeth Byrne Fern. 1s. 3d., post free.

THE MODERN SCHOOL OF STELTON. By Joseph J. Cohen and Alexis C. Fern. 4s.; postage 4d.

WALDEN. By Henry Thoreau. 2s.; postage 3d.

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.