Freedom

VOL. XL.—No. 433. FEBRUARY-MARCH, 1926. MONTHLY: TWO PENCE.

NOTES.

Keeping Them Down.

Workers in the engineering trades, who at one time were termed the aristocrats of the Trade Union movement, have suffered grievous setbacks since the War, and are now one of the worst-paid sections of skilled workers. For two years they have been negotiating with the employers for an increase of 20s. a week all round, but at their last meeting with the national employers' federation the latter definitely refused any increase. When the mens' Unions took steps in different districts to get local advances, the employers threatened a national lock-out. Now they say they will post notices of a lock-out on March 13 unless the men on strike at a London engineering firm return to work in the meantime. This determined attitude of the employers, taken in conjunction with the refusal of any increase of wages by the railway managers and mineowners, shows that there is an understanding amongst employers on this question. Having beaten the workers down to a bare subsistence in order to safeguard their profits, they are prepared to use the weapon of starvation if they dare to demand more. This threat of a lock-out of engineers is apparently to be regarded as a warning to the miners also. The report of the Coal Commission is to be published early this month. From inspired hints in the press it may be assumed that the Commission will recommend an extension of the subsidy on a different basis if the mineowners will agree to reorganise the industry to ensure more economical working. But we are certain they will not recommend an increase of wages. The miners will have to continue working at their present starvation wage. A strike for better conditions is out of the question. The General Council of the Trades Union Congress says very clearly that the Trade Union movement "would stand firmly and unitedly against any attempt further to degrade the standard of life in the coalfields," and Mr. Cook, the miners' secretary, now asks for a united front "to protect their present low standard." So it looks as though May Day will be as peaceful as ever this year, in spite of all the fiery speeches on both sides. The miners and engineers and other workers must fight for the abolition of the wage system, which spells slavery, and to achieve this the first step is the abolition of land monopoly.

———

Landless Agricultural Labourers.

The attack on land monopoly is gaining in strength, but those who take part in the campaign as a step on the road to the abolition of slavery must beware of being side-tracked. Lloyd George and his Liberal supporters are not working to free the land to all, but to compel the landowners to grant better terms to the great captains of industry, who are bled mercilessly by the monopolists when they extend their works or renew old leases. In a recent letter to the *Times* Lloyd George says he wants "landowners of high standing to be convinced that the land policy is not in any way an attack on them." He further says there are over 900,000 agricultural labourers in this country, the majority of whom have no land in addition to their gardens, and often have not even gardens. These labourers have always been badly paid, and have found that their only chance of improving their position is to go to the towns. The new system of farming entails irregular employment for many of the labourers. So the scheme now is to keep them on the land by giving—or rather renting—them small holdings on which they can employ themselves until the big farmers want them. They are not to have sufficient land to make them independent, but they are to have "a stake in the country"—to which they will be tied. Of recent years sugar beet cultivation has been encouraged by means of subsidies, and sugar factories have been built in the same areas. Wages are higher in the factories than on the farms, but the labour exchanges refuse applications from agricultural labourers, on the ground that farmers must not lose their labourers. The farmers think they are still in the good old days when, as Carlyle tells us, Gurth the swineherd wore a brass collar as the slave of Cedric the Saxon. Lloyd George thinks that the labourers will be pleased to get small holdings and vote Liberal in return; his landlord friends of "high standing" will be well paid for their land, and landlordism get a new lease of life with the support of the new small-holders. It is an astute move, but there is a possibility that the workers who have been cheated of their natural right to the soil may take the attack on land monopoly more seriously and force it to a logical conclusion.

———

That "Locarno Spirit."

We should think that few idealists have any illusions left about the League of Nations after the recent intrigues regarding Germany's admission to a permanent seat on the Council. At Locarno, where Austen Chamberlain and Aristide Briand swore eternal friendship on behalf of Britain and France, it was agreed that Germany should be admitted to the League this month. Germany sent in her application in due course. As soon as it had been sent—but not before—France asked that Poland should be admitted at the same time, with the obvious object of counteracting any influence that Germany might have. Not only that, but Spain and other Latin countries were incited to make application, so as to strengthen the French group. Of course, the fat was in the fire here at once. English papers and Members of Parliament in all parties denounced this as being the old "balance of power" over again. How wicked of France, how impudent of Poland! They invoked "the spirit of Locarno," and denounced Austen Chamberlain because he was supposed to have promised Briand that he would support Poland's application. It would shatter British influence in the League, they said, and make the United States and Russia more hostile to it than ever. For the past fortnight the diplomats have been hard at work trying to reconcile the conflicting interests. Here we see how little things have changed, and what humbug the advocates of the League have talked since Versailles. We regard the League as one of the most reactionary bodies in existence, clothing its real purpose in a cloak of humanitarianism. It is a capitalist and an anti-revolutionary organisation, and represents Governments only and not the working people. No good for the workers can ever come out of it, and it was never intended that it should.

———

"Dry" Humour.

Recent news from the United States makes us wish that Mark Twain were alive to-day, as only he could do full justice to it. Vera Countess Cathcart was refused permission to land, on the ground that she had been guilty of a crime involving "moral turpitude"—to wit, adultery. Now everyone knows how moral New York is to-day, and it was certainly asking for trouble for an adultress to go there—and admit the crime. She should have known that the main industry of Hollywood is protected by the Tariff. In Los Angeles—the city of angels—they arrested the whole of a theatrical cast for performing an obscene play which had been played for many weeks in New York. Something lingering, with boiling oil, for them. To add to the humour a French press-cutting agency sent us several clippings to the effect that Anthony Bimba, editor of a Communist paper called *Freedom*, was to be tried at Brockton, Massachusetts, for having declared in public that he did not believe in God, which is an offence against a 250-year-old Blue Law—and the dollar. We were not surprised to read of the prosecution, but we were surprised to find a Communist editor calling his paper "Freedom," which, as Lenin so wisely remarked, is a "bourgeois idea." With the police so busy after these "moral turps," we are not astonished to read that there are "crime waves" in New York and Chicago. A medium should certainly get in touch with Mark Twain.

"WHEN I AM DEAD."

The fact that so many writers, representing a considerable number of thinking people, have recently in the *Daily Express* asserted their belief in human survival after death, must have come as something of a surprise to many of us. It is noteworthy that all who have expressed this belief, however, and—with one exception—all who up to the present have written on the subject of an after-life in the *Weekly Dispatch*, have been extremely vague as to the manner of survival: of the clerical contributors even, only one has made bold enough to take his stand on the creed which he repeats at least every Sunday, and say "I believe in the resurrection of the body," and the rest have left us with little more than a philosophical conception of some future state of existence.

Now Father Knox says that "a resurrection of the body some day seems necessary in order to explain why the body was ever there at all." If he is logical, then he must believe that all the plague rats, the mosquitoes, and the vermin which we endeavour to exterminate here must have bodily resurrection *because* they have had corporeal existence on earth!

Father Knox is a good-looking and, to all outward appearances, an able-bodied man. Would he be so ready to believe in the resurrection of the body if he had been deformed, hideous, or had spent his life on a sick-bed?

One can only think that the fact that the idea of Immortality is so widespread arises from the inability of many people to conceive of life as finite. It is true that many, on the other hand, will say they are unable to hold any conception of Eternity, but, expressed in terms of symbology, the majority will certainly admit it is easier to think of a circle—that which has neither beginning nor end—than a straight line, the two "ends" of which are really and truly to mark the limits of that line whether in space or on a plane surface. It is is indeed a strange paradox that our minds, which are usually characterised as "finite," should be capable of conceiving the Infinite!

Here no doubt the "believer"—of whatever creed—will say that this is a clear indication that man possesses a spirit, and it is *that* which contacts with the Infinite, the Immortal. But is it not more logical to say that since Mind is the highest human attribute of which we have any scientific knowledge, this conception of Immortality is purely a mental one, and not "of the spirit"?

Mr. Pemberton, the writer of the first article in the series in the *Dispatch*, said he believed that "man is immortal because he can conceive of Immortality." But man in general only has this conception because he has either heard of it or has read of it. And what of all those ancient peoples whom Mr. Pemberton thinks had no such faith? On his hypothesis they will not be living to-day, and his idea amounts to saying "If you believe in Life you will get it, and if you believe in Death you will get that."

And that nearly all ancient peoples, even in the tribal state, of whom we have any knowledge did believe in a life after death has been shown by Sir John Frazer in his monumental work "The Golden Bough," as well as by many other recent authorities on anthropology.

Mr. Pemberton has instanced the early Jews as among those people whom he thinks may not have believed in Immortality. But the Sepher Yetzirah, the Jewish ancient book of Wisdom, is one long chronicle of the unfoldment of the soul and its progression in Eternity. Regard the ancient Tarot, the oldest known book in the world—the "Bible of Humanity"—and there is the Kabala or Hidden Wisdom symbolising the involution and the evolution of the soul in its eternal state of be-ing. How then did the idea of immortality first arise?

May it not have been through the mental difficulty of the earliest thinkers to grasp the idea of a limit either to time or space? The ancients saw the sun set with the knowledge that it would rise again, and this was, of course, their only conception of Time; the natural phenomena to them seemed to have neither beginning nor end, and space seemed boundless. It was this which probably led them to infer that there was an after-existence. The rest of the people who held this belief did so then because they had been taught it by the earliest thinkers.

The difficulty is to be intellectually honest—to strip ourselves of every shred of early teaching—and even then there remains the probability of hereditary mentality, and, beyond that, of inherited memory. How much of our *tendency* even to believe in a life to come is the result first of our parents' mental attitude to this question, then of all the generations before them who, through absence of intellectual freedom in those days, believed in immortality because that doctrine was everywhere taught?

Suppose it had been possible to leave some of us on a desert island as infants, quite untaught, without any early instruction as to the existence of a God or anything else, that we remained completely isolated from the rest of mankind, and that some of us grew to maturity. What would we have seen around us? Perhaps some of our number dead, certainly some animals slain by others: there would have been clear evidence of the survival of the fittest. Is it likely that we would, under these circumstances, build up in our imagination (and strengthen that imagination into a belief) a picture of those dead beings having some intangible possession, called a "soul" or "spirit," which was endowed with a consciousness as real as those beings exhibited in their earthly life? The inference that we should is no more a certainty than it would have been if made in the days when man first made his appearance upon earth; and it must always be remembered that though we have early evidence of man's belief in immortality, such records may be late in the history of Mankind: we do not know how many Ages may have elapsed before man first conceived the idea of a life after death.

Again, how far is belief in Immortality due to the *will* to believe? For what is the most certain thing about all human nature? It is the will to live, that tenacity of life which is seen throughout the animal as well as the human kingdom. Now, if man were so profoundly, so inherently certain of a future life, why should he manifest such a dominating desire for self-preservation in his earthly life? Desiring life for ourselves, we desire it for others, especially those whom we love, and so we subscribe to a hypothetical belief in a life to come. This will explain why those at the point of death are so often heard to call by name those whom they hope—or sometimes fear—to see, the desire or the fear being sufficiently strong in some cases to cause actual belief in the appearance of someone departed.

But even this desire that life shall follow death is at bottom irrational, for few of us, if we will be wholly honest with ourselves, will say that life is worth while. That is to say, it may be worth while for a vast number of people, but what if even a few sufferers remain? Unless the idea of Eternal Existence appeals to all, its value is only partial.

If you promise eternal life to a sufferer, what certainty can you give him that it will be an existence better than his present one? And even if you have some unprovable but unshakable conviction that better it will be, is that going to make up to the sufferer for his pain or sorrow here? Time may be a healer, but it is never an effacer, and few of us can wish for survival of memory, if it is only the memory of suffering of which we have heard but never experienced ourselves.

Now, if we are to accept the claims of Spiritualism, we must accept the fact that memory does survive death, for nearly every séance gives "evidence" of this. But as the conversations of "spirits" show that memory is retained, why do we not remember our state of existence before birth? The Spiritualists in England (I am not speaking of those in France, who in general hold the doctrine of rebirth) deny the theory of reincarnation, even, in many cases, of pre-existence, and yet state their belief in Immortality! Is it reasonable to suppose that there is a "beginning" to an eternal state of be-ing?

Theosophists and Reincarnationists tell us they *can* recall past lives, but this of itself proves nothing, of course. The instances—given in all sincerity, one does not doubt—of recollection of previous existence can be explained by inherited memory just as well as they can by the theory of reincarnation, and with rather more foundation on fact.

Even pure clairvoyance, as distinct from "spirit control" or mediumship, which is claimed by some to reveal a future state, can be shown to be a mental achievement and nothing more. Some of the greatest clairvoyants in the world have laid down for their followers a definite system of training which is wholly a mental process.

If we leave out of the question our intellectual, our philosophical difficulty in accepting the idea of finite existence, and turn to evidential matter, is there anything here that can ever lead the majority of us to feel there is even any "balance of probabilities" on the side of a future life? That is to say as an individual state of

consciousness, for the continuity of life as such, in a non-individualised form, may or may not be true. Scientific evidence has so far shown that matter is indestructible, and that in the atom there is a force which seems indeterminable; so that until some further discovery either proves this theory wrong or modifies it we must accept the induction that Life itself is continuous.

But this is quite evidently a very different thing from saying "I believe in the resurrection of the body," or even in "the life of the world to come." Leaving out the first article of faith, which though it is repeated by thousands is accepted by few, what evidence have we for the second? Has any one person ever returned from the grave to tell us they are alive? Spiritualists will say most decidedly so, but their "proofs" do not bring conviction to all of us of the reality of human survival. I have been to séances, I have witnessed spiritualistic phenomena many times, but I have never seen or heard anything that is not capable of explanation other than the materialisation of a discarnate entity. The powers of the subconscious mind, we all know now, offer an ever-widening field for investigation; we know too that in necromancy it is possible to "conjure up" spirits, but not necessarily the veritable spirits of the departed. And Mr. Maskelyne has proved to the satisfaction of all who have witnessed his demonstrations that there is no one piece of phenomena claimed to be produced through spiritualistic agencies that he cannot produce by natural means.

Much of the spiritualistic phenomena can, of course, be explained by telepathy, or by the operation of the subconscious mind; some of it, unfortunately, by fraud or collusion; and for the rest there remains the possibility of a purely scientific explanation which will one day be discovered.

M. MITCHELL.

(To be concluded.)

KENYA'S SLAVE-DRIVERS.

Writing on Kenya, that East African colony of aristocrats, composed chiefly of titled land-grabbers and the useless litter of our public schools, Mr. Norman Leys has this to say, in his "Land Law and Policy in Tropical Africa":—

"In no country in the world is the unskilled worker so heavily, the large landowner so lightly, taxed. Natives pay most of the 20 per cent. import duties. The European pays a uniform poll-tax of a pound. An income-tax has fallen through, and there is no land-tax. The average able-bodied native pays in direct taxation for himself and his relations about a quarter of his total earnings. Taxation, in fact, is so high and wages are so low, and alternatives to wage-earning so completely absent, that other means of inducing natives to accept employment have been abandoned as unnecessary."

Yet, despite the fact that our Government has poured out money on bolstering up this pack of incapables, the thing is a financial failure. The attempt to levy an income-tax had to be abandoned because the colonists had no income on which to levy; and the last several hundred Europeans who since the end of the War received land grants have had their rents remitted and been given their land for nothing, except the cost of surveying it. As Mr. Leys says:—

"A few large fortunes were made, indeed, by men who bought thousands of acres for a penny or twopence an acre from the Government, and sold it for from two to ten or more pounds an acre. And a number made fortunes during the War out of fibre growing. But now it appears that the average European landowner, in spite of artificially cheap wages, in spite of machinery imported free of duty, in spite of produce carried on the State railway at less than cost, is making no profit at all."

The fact is, of course, that these colonists do not themselves expect to work, but do expect the native to work for them; and the native, an unspoiled child of Nature, will not work for wages if he can avoid it. By every means in its power our Government has sought to make him. It has made desertion a criminal offence. It has compelled every labourer to carry evidence of identity and proof of industry. It has co-operated with employers in fixing wages, which are now at about a halfpenny an hour—the lowest in the world. In one recent year there were over 3,000 prosecutions for desertion and other breaches of the law governing employees. And within the last twenty years the population has fallen by at least one-fifth.

Nevertheless, what a fine thing is the British Empire!

THE STATE AS PAUL PRY.

In the modern State the lives of its citizens are made the subject of close observation, and every year fresh legislation gives power to State and municipal authorities to poke their noses into the most private affairs of the people. This is shown most strikingly when anyone wishes to travel and applies for a passport or a visa. In "An Analysis of the American Immigration Act of 1924," by John B. Trevor, M.A., published by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, New York, the author gives the new regulations concerning the admission of immigrants, from which we take the following extract:—

"SEC. 7. (a) Every immigrant applying for an immigration visa shall make application therefor in duplicate in such form as shall be by regulations prescribed.

"(b) In the application the immigrant shall state (1) the immigrant's full and true name; age, sex, and race; the date and place of birth; places of residence for the five years immediately preceding his application; whether married or single, and the names and places of residence of wife or husband and minor children, if any; calling or occupation; personal description (including height, complexion, color of hair and eyes, and marks of identification); ability to speak, read, and write; names and addresses of parents, and if neither parent living, then the name and address of his nearest relative in the country from which he comes; port of entry into the United States; final destination, if any, beyond the port of entry; whether he has a ticket through to such final destination; whether going to join a relative or friend, and, if so, what relative or friend and his name and complete address; the purpose for which he is going to the United States; the length of time he intends to remain in the United States; whether or not he intends to abide in the United States permanently; whether ever in prison or almshouse; whether he or either of his parents has ever been in an institution or hospital for the care and treatment of the insane; (2) if he claims to be a non-quota immigrant, the facts on which he bases such claim; and (3) such additional information necessary to the proper enforcement of the immigration laws and the naturalization laws, as may be by regulations prescribed."

Besides all these particulars, the political views of the would-be immigrant are inquired into, and should he be an Anarchist or a Communist he will never be permitted to pass the Statue of Liberty which guards the entrance to New York Harbour. Mr. Trevor justifies these inquisitorial methods for new-comers, and evidently thinks the U. S. Government should apply them to its own citizens, for he quotes approvingly the following passage from "Sidelights on Criminal Matters," by John C. Goodwin:—

"Every citizen born in Germany is recorded at the nearest police barracks on the day of his birth. Following upon police investigation and annual reports these items of information are ultimately in the possession of the detective branch—the date and place of his birth, the names and past history of each of his parents, and of each of his blood relations and of his relations-in-law, his education, religious persuasion, changes of address, names of friends and associates, details of his marriage, and similar items concerning his wife, children, and members of his household. Should he at any time be arrested the following particulars are added to the veritable mine of information concerning him already in the possession of the police—finger-prints, anthropometrical and medical data, photographs, facts bearing upon his methods of crime, and similar data concerning his known associates. By an elaborate system of multiple-filing, indexing, and cross-reference his whole private history is laid bare at a moment's notice."

We doubt whether the registration of all these details concerning the affairs of the inhabitants of Germany has ever had the slightest effect in the prevention of crime; but we can imagine the enormous army of State officials employed year after year collecting, tabulating, filing, and checking this ever-growing mass of useless material. In this country we can see a tendency in the same direction, and if the output of "social" legislation continues at its present rate the "class war" of the future will not be between Capital and Labour but between "Officials" and "Non-Officials," when the last remnants of the army of officialdom will surrender amidst the smoking ruins of Whitehall and Tothill Street.

Push the sale of "Freedom."

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.

Strengthening the State.

The State can say, à la Coué, "Every day, in every way, I grow stronger, and stronger, and stronger." The Socialists and members of the Labour Party are assuring us continually that they are working to abolish the slavery of the workers, yet every day they try to put on the Statute Book new Acts of Parliament which will increase the power of the State over the workers. The Health Insurance Acts, Unemployment Acts, and all the rest of the so-called "Social legislation," have put the workers under the control of State Departments which have power to decide, to a great extent, what doctor he shall attend, when he is fit to work, and where he shall work. Should he protest, he risks losing the benefits towards the cost of which he has been compelled to contribute. State Departments decide at what age his children shall attend school, and at what age he shall have the privilege of sending them out into the world to earn a living. Should he and his fellows go on strike, a State Department holds an inquiry and issues a report on the rights and wrongs of the dispute, and if he decides to ignore their findings he is denounced as an enemy of society. More and more of his earnings are taken from him by the State, which decides how they shall be spent.

If he invests his savings in a shop, he must get a Government licence if he wishes to sell beer or tobacco or patent medicines. If he buys a motor-cycle he must take out a licence for himself. Should he desire to get a living with a taxi, he must first convince the police that he is trustworthy and not a "Red," and then get a police licence and a County Council licence for the taxi, not forgetting one or two for permission to drive, which may be cancelled by an arbitrary ruling of a police official.

Taken separately, these restrictions do not seem of very great consequence, but taken as a whole they mean that an ever-increasing horde of State officials is in control of our lives from the cradle to the grave. The encroachment of the State has been so insidious that few people have noticed it, but looking back over the last twenty or thirty years we can see the great strides it has taken. Every session of Parliament new laws are passed to regulate the lives of the community, and new groups of officials are added to the enormous number already employed by the State and municipal authorities. As soon as men or women become officials their outlook changes, and very few of them are long in office before they become little autocrats in their particular sphere.

Yet, strange to say, although almost every one who has had dealings with public offices and public officials, complains of their bureaucratic and autocratic methods, the public are everlastingly demanding that the State must undertake new responsibilities. They do not see farther than the end of their nose, or they would recognise that every new power they give to the State restricts to that extent their own liberty. Some day they will wake up to the fact that they have built up a power which they must break or it will break them.

Although many Socialists deride Anarchist ideas, there are others who say Anarchism is their ultimate aim, but that we must first pass through State Socialism so as to educate the workers in initiative and responsibility. They even go so far as to say that under Socialism industries must be decentralised. We never could see the logic of this position. In the first place, if you want to get people to use their initiative, and accept responsibility for their own actions, you must give them opportunities. But under State Socialism the State machine will naturally refuse people opportunities to act for themselves, as it will tend to weaken the power of the State. And as for the decentralisation of industry, the Socialists are every day erecting barriers against it. Every State Department which has any control of industry is jealous of its powers, which it seeks to strengthen in every way. With their powers increased by new legislation as the years pass by, they will be in a position to oppose decentralisation when the Socialists get into office again. The vast body of State officials have sufficient unity to-day to make it very difficult for any Government to institute reforms, and this class-consciousness grows in strength every year. All they want is to maintain their privileges and power, and they will fight as one man in resisting any attempts to take them away.

Those Socialists, therefore, who claim Anarchism as their ultimate goal must put their feet on the right road now, and seek to undermine the State, instead of strengthening it. To-day it claims power of life and death over every individual under its sway. We Anarchists have always, and will always, deny this claim, and we ask all who believe in liberty to take their place with us in helping to shatter to pieces any power that makes such a monstrous claim.

THE CLASSICS AND THE CLASSES.

Last week brought with it many stirring events, but perhaps none more important than the speech delivered by Mr. Baldwin at the general meeting of the Classical Association, in Middle Temple Hall, London, on January 8. The importance lies, of course, in the thought it should provoke, and in the view it gives us of the mentality of the Prime Minister and those he represents. It is a class whose philosophy of life it behoves us to understand quite clearly, for to a very large extent its conception of right and wrong, of the desirable and undesirable, shapes the destinies of this country and of the British Empire. It is almost needless to say that the speech has met, as yet, with practically no criticism, having been greeted almost universally with pæans of applause. The Bar appear to have been delighted with it, as is only natural, for its members live by the law, and the ancient institutions of the Roman Empire, for which Mr. Baldwin displayed such admiration, are the base on which our legal system rests. In fact, no one can be admitted to the Bar until he has qualified in Roman law. The Conservative press, as was inevitable, could find no words of praise sufficiently strong; and to most of us it is a soothing reflection that we have in our Prime Minister something more than a mere politician. It pleases us to think of him as a simple and unassuming country gentleman, forced into the stormy arena of politics against his will, and longing always for the quiet of his country home and books. That is a healthy standpoint, and there can be little doubt that in all these respects Mr. Baldwin is pre-eminently a sane and healthy man. There are, however, other angles from which he may be regarded as one of the most dangerous statesmen ever hoisted into power. Those angles also have to be examined.

To the student of Mr. Baldwin's speeches—and they are always worthy of patient study—it must often seem amazing that he ever came into politics, and still more that he has become the head of what is certainly at this moment the most powerful Government in the world. The United States may be outstripping us commercially, but the United States does not lay down the law to more than a quarter of the globe. In the art of forcing the lives of hundreds of millions of human beings into the mould selected by the ruler the United States is comparatively an infant, whereas our Government has at its back the skill of centuries of practice. To all this Mr. Baldwin, a very Thoreau in his devotion to the simple life, would seem to be most alien, but it is astounding how completely he fits into the picture. In every respect he stands exactly for the fundamental ideas and instincts that have dictated for centuries the course Conservatism has followed, and still is following. In his dress, in every turn of his speech, in all his handling of business, there is to be seen in Mr. Baldwin, first and above all else, the impersonation of perfect form. Standing by itself form is an invaluable thing; and because

of the Romans' devotion to form much of their literature has survived. But form, even in the matter of speech, is by no means everything, the great question being always whether the thing said is true and therefore deserving of survival. It is from this position that worship of the classics has to be examined.

Horace, for example, for whose polished odes Mr. Baldwin has so deep an adoration, was probably as great a sycophant as ever lived; and he was necessarily so because he lived and wrote in one of the corruptest periods on record, when Rome, the so-called Mistress of the World, was a sink of barbaric luxury and the hoarding-house of wealth stolen by force of arms from every quarter of the then known globe. Horace starts his Odes with a dedication to the literary patron on whom he was dependent, the first line of which, translated into English, runs: "Maecenas, sprung from a long line of Kings." He wrote charmingly of the necessity for fortitude, which is a virtue Militarism always holds in the highest esteem; but his Odes also reek with praise of vices for which we sent Oscar Wilde to prison, and in his Satires he gives salacious accounts of his love performances at Lucullan feasts. All that, however, may be allowed to pass, for it was part of the morality of the age, a morality founded on the institution of slavery in its grossest and most clumsy form—that of taking the victim captive and bringing him in chains to Rome. None of the ancient Romans, who discoursed so eloquently on the moralities, seems ever to have questioned the righteousness of that. It was part of the system into which they had been born and bred, and they imbibed it as naturally as they imbibed their mother's milk. But the one thing about which our own age thinks most vigorously and incessantly happens to be the question of how it is to get rid of human slavery.

It is from the Romans that we have inherited almost all that really matters in our laws, and more particularly they imposed on us, through the Norman Conquest, their system of Land Monopoly. Rome fell unquestionably in consequence of two great evolutionary processes; first, the degeneracy of those who had the guiding of her destinies, and, secondly, the general indignation and rebellion of the outside world. Both these resulted from the central fact that the wealth of the Empire had got into the hands of a tiny minority, computed generally and roughly at 10,000 persons, and the effect of that concentration was naturally the moral and physical degeneration of her plutocracy. When we burst into admiration of Ancient Rome we should remember these great facts. We should reflect on what followed the Fall of Rome, and think not only of the Dark Ages but also of what Rome herself became, and has continued to this very day. Rome has never recovered. Century after century Rome has remained a centre of war and civil strife; of feuds and assassinations; of burned-out creeds and superstitions; in short, a ruin of the past. It is entirely logical that the Italian people should be what they are to-day. It is not for nothing that, after a brief struggle for liberty, under the devoted leadership of a few chosen spirits, the Italians find themselves once more under a Dictatorship that waded to its throne through seas of blood. And those who chant most loudly their praises of that Dictatorship are boasting openly of their intention to revive the glories of the Imperial Rome of twenty-two centuries ago, and uttering their boasts amid the frantic cheers of Italy's representatives in Parliament assembled. All this touches us most closely. To us it is of the gravest significance that a large section of our governing aristocracy openly admires Mussolini, and that leading Tory papers sing his praises on every opportunity.

With the worship of form and fortitude under misfortune—usually to be practised by the other fellow—goes the adoration of order, to be secured at any cost, even though it be by the shooting down of thousands for the maintenance of what is freely admitted to be unjust. In the ethics of all ruling castes devotion to order invariably ranks as the first of virtues, and necessarily so, because its preservation is essential to their power. Let us have peace, even though it be a "Peace of Warsaw," is their invariable sentiment, and it is the order kept by the Roman Empire which the Conservatives invariably emphasise. In this, as in every line of his most beautifully phrased address, Mr. Baldwin runs absolutely true to type, and fits exactly into the framework of Conservative mentality. But Conservativism is only one side of a world-wide picture. Reverse the medal and you behold a humanity struggling desperately for some nearer approach to social justice; determined, somehow or other, to get it; and not troubling itself greatly as to whether the idol of Order suffers some damage in the conflict.

—W. C. O., in the *Middleton Guardian* (Jan. 16).

ANARCHISM'S EARLY SPRING.

The best reason for an unshakeable belief in the future of the Anarchist movement lies, as I see it, in the splendour of its past; in the fact that, generation after generation, it has produced a continuous succession of men and women whose ruling passion has been the conviction that Life must be set free. This has been the central motive of the never-ceasing struggle—a struggle necessarily carried on against enormous odds, inasmuch as its object is to reach, and enable all mankind to reach, those higher levels which are unmistakeably the ultimate abiding-place of Man. The entire Anarchist movement is based on the principle that slavery is the inferior and freedom the superior form of social structure and individual life.

Examine Anarchist literature and Anarchist teaching where you will, and always you will discover this as the central motive. It inspires the writings of a Stirner or a Nietzsche just as much as those of a Kropotkin or a Tolstoy; for one and all agree that a life stripped of individual freedom would not be worth the living. A strong and burning faith. A conviction which, when once it has gripped the intellect, never lets go. A conclusion, therefore, certain to produce a movement resolved to exhaust all possibilities for the attainment of its ends, and ready to meet the inevitable cost. And this surely has been, and is, the history of Anarchism. Beyond all controversy its advocates have suffered death and imprisonment by the tens of thousands, and are still suffering them. Beyond all question its leading exponents have toiled almost unceasingly, having before them no prospect of material reward. They have known beforehand that their fate would be, at best, obscurity and poverty; for no task can be more dangerous than that of defying rulers, and none more thankless than that of shaking men and women out of their accustomed ruts. This all the great advocates of Anarchism have understood, and, understanding it in all its bearings, they have stuck to their task unflinchingly. That is their glory, and the book I am about to review is a record of that glory. It is, in fact, an outstanding example of it, for it represents the labours of a lifetime, carried on of recent years amid a poverty few workingmen would be willing to accept; pursued without thought of personal gain; actuated solely by love of a great cause. I have never met Max Nettlau, of Vienna, but I know that what I have just written is true, and I have before me his latest work, "Der Vorfrühling der Anarchie" (The Early Spring of Anarchy).*

It is an extraordinary book; a monument of patient toil sustained through years; a labour of exploring, digesting, registering, and indexing vast masses of literature, much of which it is to-day impossible to procure; a labour such as not one out of a thousand among the most devoted would have been willing to perform. The book is a mine of historical and biographical wealth, and it seems to me more valuable than Eltzbacher's "Anarchism," which merely gives extracts from the writings of a selected few. Nettlau's work, on the other hand, shows you the men themselves; the conditions amid which they did their work; the influences of time and place that made them what they were; and only thus, as I believe, is it possible to interpret accurately the message of the past. How, for example, can Proudhon be understood without some knowledge of the passion for self-enrichment which came to the bourgeoisie of France with the crowning of Louis Philippe? How can one plumb the imperialism underlying Karl Marx's doctrines without some sense of the forces then operating to bring into existence Bismarckism and the German Empire? Similarly, here in England, there can be no adequate comprehension of our own Labour movement without some knowledge of the decisive part played for centuries by our landed aristocracy in moulding the nation's thought, and habituating it to expect salvation from "Those Above." To that our present, and most pathetic, reliance on the State as the Great Redeemer is clearly traceable.

It is impossible to review in detail a work of this character, but I propose to quote in full one passage dealing with Proudhon. Proudhon is, as Nettlau points out, exceptionally typical, for he played a lone hand throughout a long and hard career; flung himself fearlessly against the autocratic State Socialism which was sweeping everything before it during the twenty-five years of his activity, from 1840 to 1865; was pursued malignantly by all the State Socialists, including Marx himself; was constantly in trouble with the authorities, since he attacked the money-making bourgeoisie remorselessly;

* "Der Vorfrühling der Anarchie: Ihre Historische Entwicklung von den Anfangen bis zum Jahre 1864." Von Max Nettlau. 4 Mk. Berlin O 34: *Der Syndikalist*, Fritz Kater, Kopernikusstr. 25 II.

lived, when he was not in prison, in dire poverty, and managed nevertheless to turn out an amazing quantity of work, for which, somehow or other, he managed to find publishers. That in itself was a remarkable achievement, but it seems to me that there was something else about Proudhon which sets him largely apart from most of his predecessors, and makes him worthy of special study.

Proudhon had essentially the scientific mind. He examined the social machine, and sought, above all else, to discover the direction in which, according to evolutionary principles, it would be bound to move. He did not say, as have so many Socialists and Anarchists: "This is our ideal, and this is what we mean to have." On the contrary, he said: "My aim is to discover the tendency"; and the result of his examination was that the tendency was clearly away from militarism and towards industrialism; away from work done by orders issued autocratically from above, and toward work accomplished by mutual agreement under conditions of individual freedom. To have reached that conclusion, and to have expounded it clearly, was an immense achievement. The Socialists have not reached it yet, and the Communists are a thousand miles away from it, their one idea being to force society into the mould they have selected as ideal. In this connection it is not a little instructive to read (p. 137) the following pronunciamento issued by the "Association of Equalitarian Workers" nearly a century ago: "After the Revolution we want a Dictatorship, that we may put our principles into practice, break up all the Aristocracies, and thereby do away with all the present social uncleanliness." No, there is nothing new under the sun; and here we have, dug up from the past, what is still to be heard any day by those who take the trouble to listen to Communist speakers in our London parks. It is, of course, needless to remark that Anarchists also wish the abolition of all aristocracies, but we do not believe in putting in their place a new one composed of those idealists Bakunin hated so cordially and exposed so mercilessly. With Proudhon we do not believe that life should be conducted under the decrees of a selected few who arrogate to themselves the right to say: "This is the law, and we are its anointed priests."

The passage from Nettlau's book I select for translation runs as follows:—

> "Proudhon directed his attack not against persons but against institutions, wishing to drain away their sap and therewith their strength. A fortress can be destroyed or conquered, but a third thing can also happen to it; operations can be so conducted as to leave it to one side of the battlefield, or in the rear, and thus render it worthless or untenable. This is the position into which Proudhon wished to bring Property and the State. He did not want them to fall into the hands of a conquering dictator nor to be overthrown by some movement of violence which would be at once attended by much sacrifice and would be uncertain of its aim; but rather that it should find itself in the position of a bankrupt company, of an undertaking that had gone into liquidation, lost credit and prestige, and been deserted by its last possessor, while in its place the new and victorious society was bursting into bloom. This new society would rest on justice, on the exchange of equal values as between independent producers and consumers, and the regulation of all human relations by free contract—the so-called Mutualism."

This passage seems to me important because it outlines the structure society seems certain to assume when once the inequalities of special privilege have ceased to exist. That such a structure cannot arise until land and money monopoly—in other words, monopoly of the means of production and distribution—have been abolished, goes without saying. The pity of it is, however, that even to-day the Anarchist movement, as a whole, does not understand the essence of those monopolies. Some Anarchists think that peasant proprietorship is a justifiable ideal, whereas peasant proprietorship is merely land monopoly distributed more widely, and the only true principle is that the land should be for the equal use of every human being. Similarly, many believe that bankers monopolise money, whereas the fact is that, even in England, the issuance of money is a Government monopoly, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer the absolute dictator of our financial policy. Who, during and after the War, deflated and inflated the currency at their own sweet will? Clearly not the bankers, who are merely money and credit merchants. It was the Governments, and they exercised the prerogative formerly enjoyed by kings. The form has changed; the substance remains unaltered.

"The people perish in their ignorance," it was said of old; and surely the saying still holds true. Nettlau's work, the product of a lifetime of wide reading and deep study, should do something to enlighten that ignorance, if only it can be translated and brought into general circulation. And how enormous would be the gain! What strength and capacity would be added to our movement if even a few could be induced to drink of these clear springs; and here I would call special attention to passages in which Nettlau contrasts the activities of such men as Proudhon and Bakunin with those of many modern propagandists. These men of a former generation studied and understood the workings of the governing machine; they followed current events, and made themselves the interpreters of those events. To do that is to deal with life; it calls for constant watchfulness and individual judgment; it is incomparably more difficult than the writing of essays on the possibilities of an imagined future, and I myself consider it a hundred times more effective. Facts always appeal, but facts in themselves, uninterpreted, are dry as dust and worse than useless. How many Anarchists have made any serious study of the land question? How many have tried to get to the bottom of the money question? Yet without an adequate understanding of such subjects it is impossible to talk intelligently to any ordinary audience, and to talk to Anarchists alone, unless it be for the mutual clearing-up of thought-tangles, is waste of time.

The future that stretches immediately before us is full of promise, and I myself believe that the influence of our great propagandists is vastly under-estimated. Their triumphs were not on the floors of Parliaments or councils. They cared nothing about patching up ills the causes of which remained untouched. They operated in the largest domains of thought, stirring the masses out of their traditional apathy and enthusing them with a new hope. The harvest of their sowing is to be seen in that awakening of the spirit which is the most marked feature of this age; in an increasing restlessness under the yoke; above all, perhaps, in the growing revolt against Imperialism, which is probably the greatest danger now confronting the would-be rulers of mankind. That revolt is now world-wide, and this in itself is a gigantic fact.

W. C. O.

German Labour Delegation to Georgia.

Documents of the Social-Democratic Labour Party of Georgia. Paris: Published by the Foreign Bureau of the Party.

This pamphlet contains the resolutions adopted at the Third Secret Conference of the party held last summer in Georgia. It also contains a Memorandum to the German Labour Delegation which visited Georgia last summer, and a Letter to the Working Class of Germany, from which we gather that the Delegation, like the three previous Labour Delegations to Georgia, were content to accept as correct all that their Bolshevik hosts told them, and were convinced that the Georgian workers were never so happy as they are to-day, that the economic situation is very good, and that such a thing as terrorism is unknown there. The Memorandum and the Letter contain statements to the contrary, which will be ignored by most Socialist and Labour editors. We have a few copies of this pamphlet for distribution, which will be sent to any address on request.

No More War Movement.

Dear Sir,—There are no subjects of more vital interest to-day to the Labour and Socialist movement than those dealing with Disarmament, World Economic Organisation, Imperialism, and War Resistance. In the No More War Movement we are concentrating our thought and attention upon these and kindred subjects, and we want to place our services at the disposal of all those who are anxious, with us, to forward the cause of peace. We therefore invite any of your readers who are needing help in the provision of speakers on such subjects for public meetings or debates to write to us, and we will do our best to assist them.—On behalf of the No More War Movement, sincerely yours,

Lucy A. Cox,
General Secretary.

11 Doughty Street, W.C.1.

INTERNATIONAL ANTI-MILITARIST CONGRESS.

The secretary of the International Anti-Militarist Bureau (J. Giesen, Blauwkapel, Holland) informs us that the Bureau is organising an International Anti-Militarist Congress in Vienna this year, probably on August 1. Particulars will be announced later.

PERSECUTION IN RUSSIA CONTINUES.

(From the "Bulletin" of the Joint Committee for the Defence of Revolutionists Imprisoned in Russia.

The Abolition of the Solovetsky Camps.

Last June the Bolshevik Government decided to terminate the imprisonment in the Solovetsky of "members of anti-Soviet parties convicted of political crimes," and to transfer them to Tcheka prisons on the mainland. This important information was published by the Soviet press at the time in the most obscure corner, in very small type, in the same modest manner as the official papers had previously recorded the shooting to death of Socialists and Anarchists in the Solovetsky. Evidently the Government did not care by a display of the news to draw attention to the fact that growing protests of the libertarian elements throughout the world against the Solovetsky outrages had compelled it to take action. The "Anti-Soviet parties," however, cannot be duped by this "reform." We know that the Solovetsky prisons still remain, and that the inhuman torture of "common" criminals continues there as before. As concerns the politicals, they have been transferred from the Solovki to the worst penitentiaries of the Ural, Siberia, and Turkestan.

The fake reform should not mislead the friends of the political prisoners into the belief that the fate of the latter has been improved. As a matter of fact, only a very small number of the Solovetsky revolutionists have been liberated, and that conditionally only. Most of the others have been transferred to various prisons, while some have been exiled to such isolated and unhealthy parts of Northern Russia and Siberia that their lot is equivalent to slow physical and mental destruction. Numerous letters received by us from the prisoners and exiles amply testify to that.

On June 17 all the politicals in the Solovetsky Camp were transferred to the mainland. A number of them were immediately taken to Tobolsk, in Western Siberia, where a special prison had been prepared for them. The politicals there number 85 persons, among whom are six well-known Left Socialist-Revolutionists: M. Samokhvalov, J. M. Yerushimovitch, S. Panov, A. Popov, Filatov, and Ivanov. This Tobolsk prison is an old Tsarist penitentiary; the present regime is one of the most severe in Russia, and the politicals are kept in locked cells.

The transfer from the Solovki was accompanied by a number of unfortunate episodes, due to the arbitrariness and inhumanity of the administration. The most tragic case was that of Martsinevitch, a young woman of the Left S. R. Party. Seriously ill in the Solovetsky, she had asked to be sent to Moscow for treatment. Her requests ignored, she resorted to two protracted hunger strikes, which together lasted 31 days. But her heroic protests were of no avail. The endless wanderings from prison to prison, during the transfer from the Solovetsky, proved too much for the woman's shattered health. She died on the way, in the city of Kem, just eight months before the expiration of her sentence.

Similar was the fate of her friend Michael Lichtenbaum, whose condition necessitated a major operation, which was impossible in the Solovki. His demands to be removed to a larger city, where the operation could be performed, were persistently refused, with fatal results.

New Wholesale Arrests.

The information reaches us of numerous arrests of Anarchists that have lately taken place in Petrograd and Moscow, mostly of the labour youth, of workers and sailors. Over 80 of them are already exiled to Siberia, among them the worker Esperantist Haidovsky and his wife Alexeieva, at whose home the Tcheka confiscated some manuscripts, translations, and a typewriter. The prisoners have been sent away for three years.

For a similar term has also been exiled the student Golubiov, charged with membership in a group whose sole purpose was self-educational. The student Bayanov, an Anarchist sympathiser though never an active worker in the movement, received four years' exile. The Anarchists Motchenovsky and Ney, for several years already in prison, are now being subjected to a regime of increased severity.

After two years' exile in Ust-Sysolk the Anarchist woman Donskaia has been sentenced to "minus 30"—which involves exile with the prohibition to live in 30 of the largest cities of the country. A sister of Donskaia, though entirely non-partisan, was arrested in March and exiled to the Ural district. The Odessa Anarchist Kliumshev has without known reason been condemned to five years' concentration camp. Information reaches us from Moscow that the well-known Esperantist comrade, A. Levandowsky, one of the contributors to the Esperantist organ *Sennaciulo*, has been arrested. Cause unknown.

Persecution of Zionists.

The Foreign Delegation of the Zionist-Socialist Party of Russia informs us that during the period from March, 1924, to May, 1925, 3,617 persons were arrested by the Tcheka, charged with membership in the party. Out of that number 160 are still in prison, awaiting sentence; 157 have already been sent into exile; several hundred have been deported abroad.

The condition of those in exile is most tragic. Seventeen persons are at a place called Tiubi, which is 2,300 kilometres (about 1,300 miles) from any railroad. It took the prisoners six months to reach the place—*on foot*. One of them succeeded in escaping *en route*, in revenge for which the Tcheka imprisoned his wife, who had never participated in any political activities.

Life in Exile.

Notwithstanding Bolshevik claims to the contrary and the misinformation of publications like the New York *Nation*, it is the rule of the Communist authorities to follow imprisonment by exile.

That is to say, the political is *not freed* at the expiration of his prison sentence, but is ordered into exile to various points of European Russia, Siberia, or Turkestan. This *administrative process* (without trial) is in practice in Bolshevik Russia as it was in the days of the Tsars.

Arrived at their point of destination, the exiles immediately face a most serious situation. The Government allows 6.25 roubles per person, which is less than 13s. per month. The amount is by far too insufficient to support life; at the same time the politicals, in most cases, are not permitted to earn a livelihood by accepting some position. Generally it is out of the question anyhow, owing to local conditions. The exiles are practically left without means of support, depending chiefly on the contributions of friends and comrades. But their correspondence is always subject to the Tcheka censor: it is dangerous for their relatives or friends within Russia to communicate with them, while the exiles are punished for corresponding with revolutionists abroad. They are constantly under watchful eyes, and are compelled to report to the local police at stated times.

To you who read these lines we appeal. Contribute your mite to aid those that suffer for the sake of their ideals. Their very being in prison and exile is an eloquent demonstration that the spirit of liberty is not dead in Russia. Help these living martyrs.

All funds and communications please address to—
Fritz Kater (Joint Comm.), Kopernikusstr. 25,
Berlin O 34, Germany.

The Manager of Freedom will be pleased to receive and forward donations sent to him on behalf of the prisoners and exiles.

THE MODERN SCHOOL OF STELTON.*

We are pleased to welcome this record of the struggles of a handful of idealists to found a truly libertarian school in the United States. The execution of Ferrer on October 13, 1909, was the mainspring of the movement which gave birth to the Francisco Ferrer Association in New York in the following year, and the first Modern Day School was opened on the second anniversary of Ferrer's death. Although not definitely pledged to Anarchist principles, the moving spirits of the Association were Anarchists, and the School was run on libertarian lines. It was a success from the first, though the equipment was poor and the building not quite suitable for its purpose; but many well-known friends gave their services freely, and enthusiasm surmounted all obstacles. For three years the School held its own and seemed firmly established, but during the winter of 1913–14 unemployed activities at the house attracted the attention of the yellow press, which caused some of the timid ones to withdraw their support, and it looked as though the experiment would collapse.

It was then decided, if possible, to move the School to a Colony intentionally organised for that purpose, and the Ferrer Colony

* "The Modern School of Stelton." A Sketch by Joseph J. Cohen and Alexis C. Ferm. $1.00. Stelton, New Jersey: The Modern School Association of North America.

Association was formed to get funds and make the necessary arrangements. After another winter in New York the School was moved to Stelton on May 16, 1915. The chapter headed "Our Arrival at Stelton" gives a good idea of the courage of the adventurous spirits who took over the old farmhouse that day, six adults in charge of thirty-two children. Gradually, however, the place was licked into shape, and some of the comforts and decencies of civilisation provided for all. Financial difficulties, troubles with other colonists, and troubles due to the leaving of teachers who could not stand the hard conditions—all these things brought many anxieties, which are not absent even to-day.

At first, the education was almost entirely academic. Though it had good results from a conventional point of view, it was felt that they were not what should be aimed at by a libertarian school. So at the annual meeting of the Association in 1920 it was agreed to revolutionise the whole procedure and abandon the preparatory work and formal academic instruction, basing the development of the children on manual work and creative activity; supplying information when the child required it in its gradual development, and according to the real requirement of the individual child. Woodwork, weaving, printing, painting, and basket-making became the primary activities for teachers and pupils, academics being relegated to a back seat in the curriculum. Music, dancing, and games were also included. The soundness of this drastic change has been proven beyond a shadow of a doubt in the case of the younger children, but those associated with the School realise that the older children require something more to prepare them to face the practical problems of life. At present, as they grow up they are withdrawn and placed in other schools. In a capitalist world this difficulty seems almost unavoidable, but the early training of these children in an atmosphere of freedom is bound to have an influence on their adult life.

At any rate, the experiment has been worth while, and has inspired others to start schools on similar lines. The members of the Modern School Association have provided an environment where children can develop initiative and free expression, and in thus helping to create free and independent individuals they will find their reward for the work they have put into the School—work which has been a labour of love.

Everyone interested in education should read this book, which is illustrated with photographs of the children at work and play.

Death of a Leeds Comrade.

George Frost, of Leeds, sends us word of the death of an old and valued comrade, John Bardin, aged 70. Born in France, he was active in the movement there for some years until he came into conflict with the police at a May Day demonstration, when he was arrested and sentenced to five years' imprisonment. On his release he went to Germany, where he said he met and worked for a time with Malatesta, who was also in exile. After living in Italy for eight years he came to London and later on went to Leeds, where he married and settled down. A man of very deep sympathies, Bardin entered into the spirit of the workers' struggles, and was always willing to help in the propaganda. His death is a sad blow to the Leeds group, which has lost some of its most active comrades during the past few years.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

"The Sources of Christianity." By the Kwaja Kamal-ud-Din. 2s. 6d. Woking: The Basheer Muslim Library, The Mosque.

"Communities of the Past and Present." $1.00. Newllano, Louisiana: *Llano Colonist.*

"Ainsi Chantait un 'en Dehors.'" Par E. Armand. 10fr. Orleans: *L'en Dehors,* 22 Cité Saint-Joseph.

"Giustizia e Moralitá." By Pietro Kropotkine. 10c. Buenos Aires: Camillo Daleffe, Garay 3121.

"Errico Malatesta: The Biography of an Anarchist." A Condensed Sketch of Malatesta from the Book by Max Nettlau. 35c. New York City: Jewish Anarchist Federation.

"Miguel A. Bakunin: Un Esbozo Biographico." Por Max Nettlau. 15c. Mexico, D.F.: Grupo Cultural "Ricardo Flores Magon," Apdo. Postal 1563.

"War Resisters of the World: An Account of the Movement in Twenty Countries and a Report of the International Conference, 1925. 1s. Enfield, Middlesex: War Resisters' International, 11 Abbey Road.

"Politica e Magistura dal 1860 ad Oggi in Italia." By Saverio Merlino. Lire 6. Torino: Piero Gobetti, Via XX Settembre, 60.

"Miguel Bakunin, La Internacional y la Alianza en España (1868-1873)." Por Max Nettlau. 50c. Buenos Aires: *La Protesta,* Peru 1537.

"Dollar Diplomacy: A Study in American Imperialism." By Scott Nearing and Joseph Freeman. $2.50. New York: B. W. Huebsch and Viking Press.

"The Life of William Godwin." By Ford K. Brown. 16s. London: J. M. Dent and Sons.

"The Bolshevik Myth (Diary 1920-1922)." By Alexander Berkman. 18s. London: Hutchinson and Co., Paternoster Row.

"Freedom" Guarantee Fund.

The following sums have been received to date (February 28) since our last issue:—Jewish Anarchist Comrades in Toronto (per Milly Rocker) £2 1s., G. Davison £6, C. Hansen 8s. 2d., F. Hirsh £1 0s. 6d., C. C. Platt £1 0s. 6d., J. A. Osborne £1, J. Scarceriaux 4s., A. D. Moore 5s., J. S. R. 3s., G. P. 2s., H. G. Russell 7s. 6d., Wm. C. Owen 10s., M. A. Cohn £5, G. W. Tindale 2s. 6d., C. Sewell 2s. 6d., J. Hannah 2s. 6d., P. Hertford 4s., L. G. Wolfe (2 months) £2.

CASH RECEIVED (not otherwise acknowledged).
(January 12 to February 28.)

"Freedom" Subscriptions.—J. Armstrong, S. N. Wood, J. S. Ward, J. Colter, W. Anderson, J. G. Eltringham, J. Batey, R. Somerville, P. Parsons, A. W. Oxford, G. Davison, W. Ms., B. Hoobin, C. Taraboi, A. Symes, W. Barron, J. Nightingale, R. Fallon, A. Dodd, G. Wheatley, J. A. Osborne (2), A. S., M. Peacock, A. Bishop (2), H. J. Stuart, W. H. Whiting, W. Fraser, A. Smith, J. B. Barnhill, A. H. Springer, T. G. Vawdrey, B. Williams, W. Lagsding, P. Hertford.

Russian Prisoners Fund.—G. Davison £2.

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.

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