

Freedom

VOL. XLII.—No. 446.

NOVEMBER-DECEMBER, 1927.

MONTHLY: TWO PENCE.

NOTES.

Peace in Industry.

With Christmas coming along, it was quite a seasonable proposition of Sir Alfred Mond and some other big employers of labour to write to the Trades Union Congress and suggest a joint meeting between himself and his friends and the General Council of the T.U.C. to discuss "taking steps to place British industry on a basis that would enable it to meet foreign competition." When the Devil was ill the Devil a saint would be. The General Council are to discuss the letter on December 20, and, judging from what their chairman and secretary have said, there is every probability that the employers' invitation will be accepted. Mr. Citrine, general secretary of the T.U.C., writing in the "Industrial Relations" Supplement of the *Manchester Guardian*, says: "The approach to a new industrial order is not by way of a social explosion, but by a planned reconstruction in which the unions will assume a larger share of control in directing industrial changes." He suggests a National Industrial Council and Councils for each industry, where representatives of Capital and Labour could discuss matters. He hints that if there is a satisfactory improvement in the conditions of labour the Unions might discipline their members by abolishing "absenteeism" and "ca' canny." He also suggests profit-sharing and co-partnership schemes, but not on an individualistic basis. Oh, no; the workers cannot be trusted to handle their own money. He conceives these schemes in operation "on a collectivist basis with the Union acting as steward and trustee." There's a nice way to approach a new industrial order. Let us sit at the same table with the employers and we will see if it is not possible to get our Union members to produce more. You give them a penny or so more an hour and a constant job, and we will hold the whip. No more general strikes, no more social explosions. We hope the Union members will notice that, according to Mr. Citrine, in the new industrial order the old industrial relationship of master and man, exploiter and exploited, is to continue. Mr. Citrine had better think again.

The War Danger.

If anyone thinks that the "War to end War" has achieved its object, we would advise him to read a pamphlet entitled "The War Danger," published by the No More War Movement (11, Doughty Street, W.C.1; price 6d.). The author, Mr. F. Seymour Cocks, has linked together a series of diplomatic incidents in Europe during recent years which show the bitter antagonism between France and Italy in the Balkans and elsewhere. On one occasion last year French and Italian troops were facing each other on the frontiers ready to fire, war only being averted at the last moment. Since then France has signed a treaty with Jugo-Slavia, which Italy followed immediately with a treaty with Albania. Italy has neither raw materials nor coal, and could only fight if supported by another Power; and the French Press openly speak of Italy as Britain's ally. When King George went to Rome some years ago we said that, as France had a dominant military position in Europe, Great Britain would make an alliance with Italy, as she was the only other Power that had a fleet of any consequence. To-day British statesmen are playing the old Balance of Power game in Europe that they have played for centuries. If we look across the Atlantic, the position is not more hopeful. The failure of the Naval Disarmament Conference between Britain, America, and Japan has embittered the relations of Britain and America, and this feeling is transparent in President Coolidge's message to Congress on December 6. He boasted that America had a foreign commerce "unsurpassed by any other country," a sea coast "studded with the richest cities in the world," and the "greatest treasure ever bestowed upon any people." The size of the Navy which America is to have will be solely for America to determine. A naval expert writing in the *Daily*

Telegraph on December 8 says that when the new U.S.A. ocean-going cruisers are built the American Navy—in this type, at least—will have attained, not merely parity with the British Navy, but "actual supremacy." In ten or twenty years' time the clash of British and American capitalism will reach a crisis, and unless a very radical change takes place in the mentality of both countries nothing can prevent a struggle. Looking at the state of the world to-day, does anyone really believe that the Russian Government's proposal for universal disarmament can be—or was intended to be—taken seriously? It is really an Anarchist proposal, for if carried out it would abolish Governments and frontiers, which rest on armed force. Our rulers show no sign of committing suicide.

The I.L.O.

When the League of Nations was formed by the Allied Powers they thought they should show their gratitude to the workers for the part they had played in the Great War. Labour throughout Europe was very restive, and something had to be done. So they formed the International Labour Organisation, and the principles on which it was to work were embodied in the Treaty. Someone signing himself "Wanderer" tells us all about it in the *Daily Herald* of December 8. His article is headed "What I Found at Geneva," and he has evidently only just discovered the I.L.O. He says "the Labour Covenant of the Peace Treaty was worth getting." What is this wonderful Covenant, and what has it done? The I.L.O. is composed of about fifty States, each of which is represented by two Government delegates, one employers' delegate, and one workers' delegate—three representatives of Capital and one of Labour. The second part of the I.L.O. machinery is the International Labour Office (don't get mixed), with a governing body comprising twelve Government representatives, six employers' representatives, and six workers' representatives (again three to one against Labour). Then there are the guiding principles, all nicely moderate—nothing extreme about them. Labour should not be regarded "merely" as a commodity; the right of association for all "lawful" purposes; the payment to the employed of a wage adequate to maintain a "reasonable" standard of life; and the adoption of an eight-hour day to be "aimed at." The employers' Governments decide what is "lawful" and "reasonable," and if they have "aimed at" an eight-hour day they have certainly missed it. Labour everywhere is more restricted in its "lawful" activities than when the Covenant was signed, and many millions of workers are still seeking a "reasonable" standard of life. The eight-hour agreement has not yet been ratified, but Baldwin gave the miners an eight-hour day instead of their seven-hour day, an example which has just been copied by the Dictator of Spain. It does not seem to us that the I.L.O. was "worth getting."

On Winning the Political Battle.

The Labour Party has appointed a committee to draw up a programme for the General Election. The following lines by Auberon Herbert may help them:—

"Winning means securing for our side the larger crowd; and that can be only done, as we know in our hearts, . . . by clever baiting of the hook which is to catch the fish. . . . In the political pool you must skilfully combine all the glittering attractions that you have to offer, you must appeal to all the different special interests, using the well-chosen lure for each. You must utilise all the ambitions, desires, prejudices, passions, and hatreds of the people. . . . The best men in every party stoop unwillingly, but they are not their own masters. . . . The great game laughs at all things . . . but the purpose of securing victory. Men must conform, or stand aside. . . . As our system works, it is the party interests that rule and compel us to do their bidding. It must be so, for without unity in the party there is no victory. . . . When we have taken our place in the great game, all choice as regards ourselves is at an end."

Shaw and Mussolini.

Bernard Shaw is not going to compromise his reputation for good sense by showing generous indignation over anything whatever. We knew that long ago, but his apology for Mussolini has given the final proof. If he merely kept silent over things that bring forth a protest from every decent human being, one could ignore him; but when he actually lifts up his voice in defence of these things it is time to point out that, in the eyes of some people at least, his reputation is a despicable one.

In his defence of Mussolini he quotes history like a Christian quoting the Bible, and his letters leave the impression that he considers that two blacks, or, better still, a large number of blacks, make a white. Because Italy is not the only place and the present not the only time in which a tyranny has been established by a coup d'état, therefore no one should protest against Fascism. Shaw tolerates all that Mussolini has done or yet may do, however much of a "filthy business," because he has succeeded in doing it. If any have suffered, that is a mere bagatelle. I suppose he also thinks it all right for Latimer, Wat Tyler, John Ball, and others to have suffered for *trop de zèle*. It is certainly not a thing for which he with his cherished "reputation for good sense" is likely to suffer.

The blots on Mussolini's rule, according to him, are due to the blots on human nature (whose human nature, that of a William Morris or of a Winston Churchill?). But human nature is not all blots, otherwise we should still be going about knocking each other on the head with stone hatchets as the whim might take us, and those who were not clever enough to break the other fellow's head or had some foolish scruples about doing so ought, according to Shaw's philosophy, to accept whatever was done to them against their wills because the doer was strong enough to make it an accomplished fact. What a world it would be if the whole race were composed exclusively of Shaws and Mussolinis! I wonder how the Shaws would enjoy it, and whether when there was no one else to bear the brunt of the accomplished facts G. B. S. has such a respect for, and no one to protest on their behalf, the Shaws would begin to do so for themselves. But then they would no longer be Shaws but men. Fortunately, there have always been people lacking the "good sense" to refrain from trying to alter accomplished facts that didn't suit them, or the human race would be likely to have died of dry rot long ere now.

Shaw tells us that the democratic idealism of the 19th century is as dead as a door nail, merely showing us that he himself is radically incapable of ever having understood such writers as John Stuart Mill and others of his school, including Buckle.

He says that some of the things Mussolini has done go further in the direction of Socialism than the English Labour Party would venture. Well, that is not saying much; and if Shaw thinks those things cheap at the cost of castor oil, not to mention other methods of persuading people to accept them *faute de mieux*, as he says, there are others both here and amongst the Italians who are at present suffering under those benefits in whom democratic idealism and the belief in liberty are not dead, who do not share that opinion.

"Yet, Freedom! yet thy banner, torn, but flying,
Streams like the thunder-storm *against* the wind."

All the tyranny Shaw saw was of the kind denounced as characteristic of Socialism. What of the numbers in prison, the two thousand Italians who have been deported to the volcanic islands of Sicily or subjected to "compulsory domicile," while thousands have fled from Italy to escape this beneficent régime?

However, as he does not happen to be one of the victims Shaw can devote all his attention to preserving his reputation, of which he is as jealous as a Society beauty is of her complexion, in order to maintain which she has recourse to the paint-pot and finally ends by being a Society whore posing as a free-lover. Bernard Shaw has been damning himself bit by bit for years past in the eyes of every one with courage, generous feeling, and the ability to see clearly through his superficial cleverness in misrepresenting ideas that he is intellectual enough to know are right and feasible, but too cowardly and greedy of popularity—to obtain which he will prostitute his intellectual honesty with an unconsciousness of his indecency which could not be outdone by the lowest courtesan that ever sold her body—too cowardly and careful of his reputation in the eyes of those whose opinion is worth nothing, to support. And an ideal must die, forsooth, because if it did not the great and much-worshipped G. B. S. would be forced to have a sneaking feeling that all his life he has been a poor shabby apology for a man instead of the daring, advanced

intellectual giant he has fooled some people, including himself, into taking him for.

Because no indictment can be brought against Mussolini that he cannot meet with a crushing *tu quoque*, Shaw apparently thinks we should be content to balance a wrong committed in the name of one country by a wrong done by another and so close the account. But does he not know that there have at all times, in all countries, been men who have protested, each according to his strength and ability, against wrong whenever they saw it, whether in their own or any other land; and that for doing so they suffered in various degrees, some in pocket, some in social ostracism, some in misunderstanding and hatred of their own flesh and blood, exile, imprisonment, death.

He is sorry the Socialists in Italy were not able to take command after the war. Why did they not do so? It was as open to them as to Mussolini to use the methods he employed. Why, Malatesta was asked to lead them; but he did not believe in dictatorship. It would be impossible for Shaw to understand such an attitude. He is evidently incapable of conceiving that there can exist people who say with Byron,

"I will war, at least in words (and—should
My chance so happen—deeds) with all who war
With Thought; and of Thought's foes by far most rude
Tyrants and sycophants have been and are.
I know not who may conquer; if I could
Have such a prescience it should be no bar
To this my plain sworn downright detestation
Of every despotism in every nation."

I suppose he would say they are incapable of setting up a dictatorship of their own, and if they get knocked on the head by the dictatorship of the moment it is only what they must expect. True; but I would not be the man who could view the process with philosophic equanimity.

Dictatorships war with thought, and it is thought, not dictatorships, that changes public opinion and brings about progress; and we shall go on thinking and expressing our thoughts in spite of castor oil, prisons, and death. If we fall the earth will bring forth yet others. And the Bernard Shaws will go on sneering and congratulating themselves on possessing the common sense that keeps a whole skin. But skins do not remain whole when there is a man inside them, and as long as there are men the ideal of Liberty will live when Shaw and his reputation are dead and buried.

JAMES TOCHATTI.

In Memoriam Elisée and Elie Reclus.

To me—I confess it frankly—the reviewing of such a work as Joseph Ishill's "In Memoriam" volume on Elisée and Elie Reclus* is an appalling task. I pick it up, read a page or two, and fall immediately into a fit of musing. Let me attack it where I will, the effect is always the same. Memories, often painful, but often charming, sweep in on one; half-forgotten struggles spring again into life, and in imagination one is re-fighting battles on which, as it then seemed to us, not only the future of our own movement but that of humanity itself might well depend. The lives of these two Reclus brothers covered a period when propaganda was extraordinarily intense; when conflicting theories and strategies were battling desperately for supremacy; when it was very generally believed that the entire structure of what we still call Civilisation was about to crumble into dust; when hopes ran high and a heroic few faced gaily every risk and threw away without a murmur all that to most men makes life worth the living, that they might hasten, be it by ever so little, the dawn of a new era. Both these men were of that heroic type, as were indeed, I think, nearly all whose personal reminiscences and tributes make up a large portion of this volume. There is hardly one of them who did not incur, in one form or another, those frightful penalties Authority imposes on all who dare to pit their puny individual strength against its freedom-crushing rule. Hardly one who had not to pay, sooner or later, what would seem to the ordinary man an awful price. In the 359 pages of this most striking volume much of that spirit-stirring record is to be found.

This book makes a strong appeal to the emotions, but it does more than that. It faces us with Life's profoundest problems, and shows us how they presented themselves to minds of the very highest calibre—minds exceptionally well trained, exceptionally courageous, and exceptionally honest. To me, constitutionally opposed to hero-worship, that is the chief value of such works. Through them we are given the opportunity of watching fine minds at work; have laid clearly before us

*"Elisée and Elie Reclus—In Memoriam." Compiled, edited and printed by Joseph Ishill. \$10.00. The Oriole Press, Berkeley Heights, New Jersey, U.S.A. Can be obtained from FREEDOM PRESS. Price £2 post free.

the problems that taxed so heavily their thinking powers, and in our turn are called on to bring our own later experiences to bear on them.

In an admirable introduction Mr. Ishill quotes C. L. James as saying that the real strength of Anarchism is "not in count of heads but weight of brains"; and you will find, on p. 296, Elisée writing to a friend: "I cannot imagine Anarchism without Communism." Were he still alive he might have found reason to revise that opinion, for this is perhaps the most perplexing problem with which Anarchism has now to grapple. On that very point there is to-day within our ranks the widest difference of opinion among comrades who are at once perfectly sincere, intelligent, and well informed; for much has happened since those words were written, rather more than forty years ago.

Here, indeed, is to be found another of the reasons that make the reviewer's task so difficult. Both the Reclus were at once men of exceptionally comprehensive thought and also, Elisée more particularly, men of action. The field traversed by their activities was enormous, and both mental and physical activities necessarily unloose a flood of thought. I find myself, for example, in doubt as to whether I am altogether an admirer of that Puritanic vein so strongly in evidence, as it appears to me, in Elisée's character; and, while I agree with his view that the great evolutionary processes by which Life is developed make for increased happiness, and must be regarded, therefore, as ultimately merciful and based on Love, I doubt whether he would have found himself in accord with much of Tolstoy's teaching, of whether Tolstoy would have approved of certain of his activities.

Let us look at him from another angle. Elisée Reclus, like Kropotkin, Bakunin, and many other noted Anarchists of his day, expended much time and energy on the formation of insurrectionary groups; but whether that is to-day the proper or most fruitful field for Anarchist energy is open to argument. To many it seems that experience and logic are against it, for results do not appear to have justified the energies put forth; and if, as Anarchists profess to believe, the masses must work out their own salvation, it would seem that the all-important task is to imbue them, and not merely a select minority, with revolutionary ideas. I myself hold that opinion, and, having no confidence in merely mechanical organising, consider propaganda, of the finest quality obtainable, and issued in the largest quantities possible, the first of needs. And in emphasising the importance of quality I am thinking at this moment more especially of the work of Elisée Reclus. It lives by reason of its style; by the grace of diction and crystalline clearness by which its thought is presented to the reader: He was a delightful writer, and no matter what phase of the social question was his subject, he adorned it with all the wealth of illustrations drawn from what seemed to be an almost inexhaustible fund of knowledge. That sort of knowledge does not grow on hedges. It has to be earned by the hardest kind of work, by close and sympathetic contact with Life in all its manifestations; by that thirst for realities which inspires men with the love of learning for its own sake. On the work of Elie Reclus, less famous than his brother but esteemed most highly by those whose judgment carried weight in all literary and scientific circles, a similar verdict must be passed.

For my part I should never dream of presenting Bakunin, Kropotkin, Proudhon, the Reclus, or other of Anarchism's great exponents, as guides to be followed as the bell-wether is followed by his unthinking flock. That would be to misunderstand the whole purport of their work, as they themselves would have admitted instantly. They are, as must be every true teacher, mere stimulators to self-thought, to self-action, to self-development. They are the yeast that sets up the fermentation without which, no matter how perfect its mechanism or numerous its membership, every movement must remain a dull and lifeless lump.

Joseph Ishill by giving to the public this "In Memoriam" edition is aiding that fermentation most effectively. He has produced a beautiful work, alike by reason of its illustrations and general get-up, for it is a splendid example of the printer's art. He has collected a body of Anarchist opinion which should be invaluable to every propagandist, student, and seeker after truth. Moreover, he has done it single-handed, himself setting the type, conducting all the correspondence, and performing the other varied labours such a production entails. Not for profit, but because it was work he loved. Not as an idler pursuing his pet hobby, but as a wage-worker who, returning from his day's work in the City of New York, has dedicated during two long years all his evenings to this special task. May his magnificent tribute to the Reclus brothers influence many others as their example evidently has influenced him.

W. C. O.

An Anarchist Encyclopædia.

We have received, and with the deepest pleasure, a number of sections of "L'Encyclopédie Anarchiste" (The Anarchist Encyclopædia), now being published in Paris under the directorship of Sebastian Faure, to whose comprehensive intelligence, enterprise, and energy is due, as we understand, the birth of this colossal work. In this he has had the co-operation of noted Anarchist writers and scholars throughout the world, and more particularly, as he himself acknowledges in a preface, the active help of "L'Œuvre Internationale des Editions Anarchistes," of 72, Rue des Prairies, Paris (XXe). The title-pages carry as their motto, "Well-being for all; liberty for all; no coercion; everything by free agreement," and the statement that this is not a commercial undertaking but a work of libertarian education, carried on by its editors and publishers solely for the purpose of propagating everywhere the sentiments and convictions to which they have consecrated their lives. The dedication is "to all those who, braving privations, calumnies, and persecutions, are battling, wherever they may be, to assure and hasten the coming of an Anarchist society." "Neither Gods nor Masters" is the greeting sent to all those at present bowed beneath the yoke of State, Capital, and Church, to which is added the reminder that "with ourselves, entirely with ourselves, and only with ourselves, lies our salvation." And again: "It is for the millions of pariahs of all nationalities, at present the victims of our detestable social organisation, that this work is intended; that it may bring them the light of knowledge and spur their energies to the point at which, animated by the Spirit of Revolt, they will resolve to make themselves free."

Sebastian Faure's preface appeals to me greatly. He states that his long-cherished ideal was to create a work that would place at the disposition of the militant revolutionist the knowledge needed for effective propaganda, presented methodically, expressed simply and clearly, with a view to having it translated into various languages for circulation almost everywhere. To this conception he had been led by his realisation of the luxuriance of Anarchist thought and literature, side by side with a too frequent lack of method and the difficulty of getting access to the innumerable books, pamphlets, journals, reviews, and other publications the movement has produced. What could be more desirable, or, indeed, imperative? As Faure himself remarks, there is probably no other movement so habitually misunderstood and misrepresented, and this is not a little due to the incompetence of those who claim that they are speaking for it.

The first part of this work is devoted to a definition and explanation of words and terms of general use in controversy, and to an exposition of the philosophy and teachings, tendencies and methods, of such thought and action as may truly be called revolutionary. In this number there is not the space needed for a criticism of the various articles, but those contributed by Sebastian Faure, who writes from the Anarchist-Communist standpoint, Armand, of *L'En Dehors*, an Individual Anarchist, and Bertoni, of *Le Reveil*, to name only a few out of many excellencies, seem to me specially illuminative. On the other hand, I cannot but regret that the land question, which lies at the root of the entire capitalist system and involves our relation to the primary source of all supplies, receives such scanty treatment, despite the fact that the article devoted to it opens with the remark that it has been studied far too little by Anarchists in general. Yes, indeed; for most of them appear still to regard it as mainly of interest to the agricultural community. Could anything be more ridiculous? In an industrial epoch the land question is essentially an industrial one, for Imperial Capitalism is fencing in as its own preserve all the natural resources of this planet, and is thus enabled to keep Labour in the wage-slavery of licking into marketable shape the raw material, not for its own use but for the private profit of the monopolist.

This publication reflects the greatest credit on its editors and collaborators. It ought to prove of incalculable value to our cause, which is that of the abolition of human slavery.

W. C. O.

Notice to "Freedom" Subscribers.

Many subscriptions to FREEDOM have some time yet to run, while a few have been paid quite recently. We wish to be perfectly fair to all, and ask our subscribers to let us know whether they will accept books or pamphlets from the list on the back page or wish to have the balance returned in cash. If we do not hear from a subscriber we shall regard his or her balance as a welcome donation towards our debts.

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.

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

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

The Editor is not necessarily in agreement with signed articles.

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

"Freedom" Suspends Publication.

It is with profound regret that we announce that with this issue FREEDOM suspends publication. We have struggled hard to avoid this decision, but our ever-increasing debts have allowed us no option in the matter. We simply cannot go on in the spasmodic manner of the past six months, piling up debts which we can see no hope of clearing off; so we stop now before we are overwhelmed.

The principal cause of this stoppage is the small circulation of FREEDOM, with a consequent heavy deficit on each issue. To increase the circulation and bring the deficit within bounds it was absolutely necessary that the paper should appear regularly each month. The response to our appeal last winter for funds for this purpose enabled us to publish FREEDOM regularly for the first half of this year; but still no increase of circulation took place; and as we were unable to maintain monthly issues, suspension sooner or later was inevitable.

We have done our best to produce a paper which would place Anarchist ideals before the people; and if our efforts have not met with the success they deserved, that is not our fault but our misfortune. To-day the tide flows strongly in favour of the State as the beneficent deity which will right all wrongs. Some day, we are convinced, the tide will turn. When that day comes we hope a better and a more vigorous FREEDOM will arise and carry on the fight for human liberty.

Meanwhile we appeal to all our readers to help us to clear off the debt to our printers for which we have made ourselves personally responsible. We can ill afford to bear this burden alone, and we are confident that our readers would not wish us to do so. Many accounts at home and abroad are sadly in arrears. These we trust will be settled as quickly as possible and thus reduce our liabilities.

Although FREEDOM ceases publication, we still intend to carry on the sale of literature at Freedom Press, 127 Ossulston Street, London, N.W.1, to which address all communications should be sent. All Anarchist publications in print will be stocked as before, and lists will be issued from time to time. If you can no longer distribute FREEDOM, push the sale of Anarchist literature.

THE FAILURE OF SOCIAL REFORM.

Here have we been expending enormous enthusiasm, labour, and money in improving the conditions of life, with the notion in our heads that we should thereby be improving life itself, and after seventy years we find no convincing proof that the quality of our people is one whit the better than it was when for a large part they lived in filth, were ravaged by disease, bred at random, soaked themselves in alcohol, and took no thought for the morrow. Our boasted social reform, we are thus tempted to think, has been a matter of bricks and mortar—a piling up of hospitals, asylums, prisons, and work-houses—while our comparatively sober habits may be merely a sign of the quietly valetudinarian way of life imposed upon a race which no longer possesses the stamina to withstand excess.

One of the most obvious tests of our degree of success in social reform directed to the betterment of social conditions is to be found in the amount of our pauperism and the condition of our paupers. If the amelioration of the conditions of life can effect even a fraction of what has been expected of it, the results ought to be seen in the diminution of our pauperism and the improvement of the condition of our paupers. Yet, so far as numbers are concerned, the vast army of our paupers has remained fairly constant during the whole period of social reform, if indeed it has not increased.—HAVELOCK ELLIS ("The Problem of Race-Regeneration").

After Ten Years.

The tenth anniversary of the Russian Revolution has just been celebrated in Russia in the presence of delegations from many countries, who have been sensibly impressed by the enormous demonstrations in Moscow staged for their edification. Enthusiastic speeches were delivered about the wonderful progress made in ten years and the idyllic conditions in which the Russian workers find themselves, and great stress was laid—by the visitors—on the only Workers' Government in the world. An investigator who has recently returned from Russia writes in an American exchange: "It should be remembered that all the factories, mines, natural resources, mills, and railroads belong to the Government and that the workers own, control, and run the Government." The last ten words of that sentence are either a deliberate lie or the writer is simply repeating a statement he has heard so often that he takes it for granted. In doing this he follows the example of many other simple-minded or unscrupulous guests of the Russian Government.

We have been reading "Bolshevist Russia," by Anton Karlgren, Professor of Slav at the University of Copenhagen (George Allen and Unwin), in which the author gives a totally different picture of social conditions in Russia. He visited Russia every year from 1904 to 1916, was correspondent to the Swedish press in the days of the first Duma (1906), and for some months in 1924 studied conditions on the spot. He says he "took less interest in the Bolshevist theoretical propagandist writings than in the Russian literature and newspapers which reflected these theories as translated into practice."

In the first chapter Professor Karlgren shows us how the elections are managed by the Communists. It is true, he says, that only the proletariat are allowed to vote, but it is a drawback that the proletarian voters may not decide to which members of their class their votes may be given. The Communists choose the candidates for whom the workers are "free" to vote. "If they ordered us to elect a horse in the village Soviet we should be compelled to do it," was the remark of a peasant. One result of this policy was a boycott of the elections to such an extent that the heads of the Communist Party got alarmed and sent out orders that some non-party representatives must be mixed with the Communists, so as to regain the confidence of the masses. Accordingly non-Communists were admitted to the Soviets, but not more than could be easily handled by the party. The Councils are dominated by the Communists, who claim for themselves the presidency of the village Soviets with membership of the executive committees. How much political influence can proletarian voters have under these conditions? The Communist Party in Russia have never disguised the fact that they intend to "guide" the masses in their political and economic development. Lenin and Trotsky were perfectly frank about it, and their successors in office have carried on their policy. "Workers' control" was a slogan for foreign consumption only.

In the Trade Unions and other industrial organisations the same methods are used, with a resultant lack of interest in Trade Union affairs. When an election is to take place in a factory, the list of candidates is drawn up by the "Party-cells," little groups of members of the Communist Party amongst the workers. "Then follows the general election-meeting, where the forms of procedure are simple in the extreme. The meeting is informed that the chairman has received from the Party-cells a list containing the following names—who votes against them? Dead silence reigns in the room; to demand discussion would be a bold proceeding, to put up any opposition foolishness. The president's tap is heard—the proposed candidates are unanimously elected." This has become such a scandal that *Pravda* and other papers have been compelled to take notice of it, as it has destroyed the belief in freedom of election which the Party wishes the workers to retain.

Even in the Communist Party itself the pretence of democracy has been thrown to the winds, as Trotsky himself has complained. The struggle which has ended so disastrously for him and his friends was waged on the question of freedom of discussion within the Party, which was denied them by the "old gang" in office. We may be sure that if this freedom is not allowed to Party members, non-party workers could not expect to have it. Professor Karlgren writes:—

"But where is the supreme power? To find this we must, after peeling off 99 per cent. of the Russian proletariat as entirely superfluous, do the same with practically all the Communist Party, for nothing of supreme power is seen here either. Narrower and narrower grows the circle where we may look for the real centre of power, and not until we come to the innermost circle of the Party government do we reach our goal. There we have, at long last, the real dictators. Instead of the people's power upheld by the wide ranks of Russia's masses, a most pronounced

oligarchy; instead of millions who have become masters in their own house, a handful of people who have managed to create and now manoeuvre the most efficient machinery for the subjection of these masses that the world has ever seen!"

The author gives numerous instances of the red-tape methods of the bureaucracy, which he quotes from Party papers and reports, and also from two books on village life by Jakovlev, a Communist writer, published in 1923 and 1924. "Nothing is so simple as not to require for its settlement a long journey into the bureaucratic labyrinth, no trifle so unimportant as not to need a multitude of writings." Jakovlev says that for every peasant who does not pay taxes nineteen documents are drawn up, and these travel round from authority to authority in fifteen different stages. "Russia," says Karlgren, "expected to find in the Bolsheviks men who could restore the ruined land, but they have found, instead, rattling typewriters, pouring out a flood of papers on great and small matters—principally the latter—in which all fine ideas and reformation plans are drowned and perish."

In their dealings with the peasantry the Communists have retreated even further from their original plans than Lenin, who admitted the defeat of his policy. At the Party Congress of April, 1925, the class-warfare against the rich peasants (*kulacks*) was entirely stopped, and these "dirty bloodsuckers," as they were usually called, are now recognised as the basis of the Bolshevik financial system. More grain must be produced for export, and a gradual reversion to capitalist methods of production is taking place. The *nep* policy which Lenin introduced in industry has been extended to agriculture. All the decrees against hired labour have been scrapped, and to-day the well-to-do peasants are the pets of the Communists.

"More land? Just help yourselves! The right to rent land, abolished after the revolution, was brought in again for their benefit, and, so that they might feel secure in their tenancy, the lease was fixed for twelve clear years. Hired labour? Take what you want! The employment of hired labour, hitherto strictly forbidden and branded as exploitation, was allowed to an unlimited degree, 'with suspension, if necessary, of the eight-hour day.' . . . It was essential to create a well-to-do peasant bourgeoisie, for that is, after all, the economic backbone of the peasant class. This now became the Bolshevik principle. Stolypin was, twenty years before, of precisely the same opinion."

It is natural that such a catastrophic defeat of Bolshevism as was implied in the acceptance of this new policy should arouse strong opposition from the die-hards of the Party, and it found strong expression at the congresses of April and December, 1925; but on both occasions this opposition was ruthlessly beaten down. The sophisticated reasoning with which Lenin justified the new economic policy in industry was used now to justify the new attitude to the rich peasants. It was not a step backward but a gigantic stride forward! The leaders said:—

"The creation of a class of small capitalists in the villages will contribute to economic improvement in the rural districts; the rural districts' economic improvement will give the State increased financial resources; increased financial resources for the Soviet State implies that it can work with much greater energy for Communism and look after the proletariat's interest; therefore, the creation of a capitalist bourgeoisie in the villages means a great advance for Communism and for the proletariat."

How about education, "the third front," as the Communists call it? The writer in the American exchange whom we quoted in our first paragraph says: "To-day most all Russian citizens between the ages of ten and fifty can read and write. The illiterate is disappearing." Where did he learn that? Let us quote Lunatcharsky, the Minister for Education. Speaking at the end of 1924, he said:—

"Seven years have been wasted. In seven years no such advance has been made on the third front as may safeguard us against the continual increase in barbarism; we cannot say that the people are even beginning to be able to lift themselves from the barbaric state in which they were kept by Tsardom."

Fru Krupskaja, Lenin's wife, well known as one of the most influential leaders in educational work, says:—

"The investigations in the villages, which, to a certain degree, show up their educational physiognomy, disclose a somewhat dark picture. Reading-rooms are a rarity, so are libraries; the schools are destroyed; in a word, we must face the truth and see clearly that the educational state of the village is exceedingly disturbing."

And Rykov, one of the Communist chiefs, speaking in May, 1925, said:—

"We cannot hide from ourselves that, as far as culture is concerned, we have not only achieved no revolution, but, generally speaking, we have done very little in comparison with what was needed on our part."

We do not expect that any of the delegates to the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the Russian Revolution will have read any of these speeches, or would abate their chorus of jubilation if they did; but we place more reliance on them than on the faked reports they will bring home to their deluded and fanatical followers.

The Russian revolutionary workers have been betrayed, and are now dominated and exploited by a new ruling class.

Abolishing War

There is nothing more hypocritical than the talk of the Great Powers about disarmament or limitation of armaments. While they are talking about it and calling "conferences" to discuss the subject, they are proceeding to increase their military and naval strength. The "discussions" serve to make the people believe in the "good intentions and peaceful aims" of the various Governments and give the latter time and opportunity for war preparations.

Liberals who fall for this obvious game must be very naive indeed. As to the masses, they are unfortunately too patriotic or inane—which is the same thing, essentially—to stop to ponder over the significance of the situation. The fact is that all the Powers are actually and intensively preparing for a new war in the near future. Here and there are already heard thinly-veiled hints about the "inevitableness" of another international slaughter.

The policeman who has nothing to do all day but to wield his bludgeon comes to itch for a chance to use it upon someone's head. The fellow who is in the habit of sticking a loaded revolver into his pocket will sooner or later find an opportunity to use it—generally sooner than later. That is the psychology of such a condition, and indeed it contains a certain "inevitableness" in itself.

The same holds true of nations and Governments—the same psychology brings about the same results. The men that compose the armies and navies, men constantly, for years, trained in the art of killing, must necessarily develop the desire and tendency to practise what they have learned. This applies still more forcibly to those in authority—to the higher officers and generals—who may expect not only to apply their knowledge and skill in war but also to profit by such application, by gaining emoluments and honours at less personal risk than the common soldier. Add to this the mental attitude created by "patriotic" education and the jingoistic spirit of every military establishment, and you have a national powder cask that needs only the least spark of opportunity or excuse to set the world afire.

This is the situation in Europe to-day; in the whole world in fact. And the political atmosphere is charged with potential opportunities.

What can be done about it?

The advocacy of anti-militarism is a good and necessary thing. It is vital to educate the masses to the danger of war, to the stupidity and criminality of it. But important as this work is, I do not believe that we can prevent the coming war by such propaganda alone. In the first place, this propaganda reaches comparatively but a very small minority of the people. Secondly, its effect is almost nullified by the Church, which always favours war; by dominant education, which cultivates national and racial hatreds; by the press, which does similar work, and—most important of all—by the actual conditions of dominant capitalism. Concerning the latter; just as an illustration. Millions of workers are employed throughout the world in manufacturing materials and munitions of war. Can any moral preachment induce them to leave their employment? We might succeed in persuading a few to do so, but the hundreds of thousands who earn their daily bread by doing actual war preparations cannot afford to give up their jobs, even if our propaganda were to reach them. To hope for that is utopian.

Yet as long as the implements of war will be manufactured they will also be used. For that reason—and it is merely one of the many—moral preachment alone can never abolish war.

There have always been movements in the history of man's progress that tried to make man happier and better by improving him instead of improving the conditions under which he suffered. Take Christianity, for instance. For two thousand years it admonishes man to be "better," but it has never lifted a finger to give him the opportunity to be better. If anything, he has become worse. True, he has learned to write and read, has obtained a smattering of so-called education, he has learned even to fly. But that has been accomplished without the Church and without religion. Indeed, in spite of the Church, which has always fought the efforts of science and popular education. But though man can fly now, is he "better" than before, in any sense whatever? Surely he is no more rational or human, unless the slaughtering of millions by modern artillery is more rational and human than the killing of a few hundreds with bow and arrow.

Anti-militarist preaching alone can hope to have no more real effect upon human life and conduct than Christianity has had. Moral preachments which are not coupled with the immediate material interests of the masses, and which do not offer

the opportunity of actual application, cannot become a vital influence in the behaviour of mankind.

By this I mean to say that anti-militarist propaganda alone cannot prevent or stop war as long as existing conditions compel men to exist by means of war and war preparations, and as long as there is opportunity and capitalistic necessity for war.

To be effective, anti-militarist agitation must begin with the parents, continue in the school, reach the workers in the munition factories, spread further to the masses at large and prepare them for international solidarity and general refusal to do war preparation and war service.

Yet even that would not be sufficient to bring about a cessation of war—as long as capitalism and government exist. More important than the methods I have mentioned is the effort to abolish the very system of subjection and exploitation—the system of authority and slavery—upon which our whole civilisation is founded. Not only capitalism. For we had wars long before there was any capitalism. It is the subjection of man by man, of class by class, of nation by nation, that makes for war. In short, the spirit of dominance and authority, of compulsion in whatever form. Unless we eradicate this spirit together with the institutions which permit its exercise, unless we entirely abolish both capitalism and government, we cannot hope to have fought the last war.

I am convinced it is more possible and more practical to abolish the twin gods of Mammon and Mars than to try to abolish one while leaving the other intact: to do away with war while capitalism remains.

I am convinced of it because the propaganda to abolish government and capitalism touches the immediate, vital everyday interests of the workers throughout the world. Exclusive anti-war propaganda does not so deeply and generally appeal to those interests. For that reason you can, for example, induce a thousand workers to stop their work and strike for better pay. You can even organise a general strike in a given industry, on the basis of immediate improvement of conditions. But could we organise a general strike against war preparations? A general strike against war would mean revolution, and it is for that that we should work.

Social reforms, limitation of armaments, Leagues of Nations, and similar efforts are dangerous makeshifts that only confuse the real issue. Nor can the unseating of one Government and the replacing of it by some other accomplish any real, fundamental change in social life. Not even if such a Government calls itself "proletarian" and rules in the name of the "dictatorship of the working class." That is all mere shifting of political actors, while the scene remains the same. It is the scene that must be changed, the scene on which national and class struggles are taking place, the scene of Authority and Exploitation. And should that change require another war, a social revolution, let it come and be the last.

ALEXANDER BERKMAN.

THE LAND QUESTION—A REPLY TO W.C.O

The criticism of "What Is Mutualism?" by my old friend, W.C.O., in FREEDOM of September-October, in which he discusses occupancy and use of land, was indeed a surprise. Thirty-two years ago, after an exchange of several letters, I was able to convince him that Communism was no good, and I think I can now show him that the Single Tax is equally worthless.

To our statement that "the capital needed to work the land and to transform the new materials by means of all those machines and contrivances soon became more important than the land itself," he answers: "Our landed aristocracy is the richest and most powerful in the world."

Will W.C.O. seriously contend that the income from the land in England that goes to the landlord is larger than the profits which go to the owners of all the factories and mills where the products from land are fashioned for use, the income from the railroads and ships that haul them, the profits of the stores and shops where they are sold over and over again in the various stages of production through which they must pass before they reach the consumer, and all the rent that is paid for houses, plus all the interest paid to the bankers and other moneylenders who furnish the credit for which all these industries, and the farmers also, must pay? Does he really think that all these sums combined do not amount to more than what goes to the landowner? If he does, I am sure we can show him some figures that will quickly dispel his illusion.

The growth of land values in the large cities has been very great; but how it can be reduced by a money reform which will cut out interest and profit I will be glad to prove at

another time, and confine myself now to putting myself "to the trouble of studying the land question." Thus I will begin by asking W.C.O. who has created the billions of dollars of land values in New York City? And to whom should they go?

Were they created by the people of New York City? Or by the people of the State of New York? Since many more of the products of labour from the different States of the Union have been sent into New York City than have come out of it, may it not be that all Americans are entitled to a share?

Canada also has sent much produce, and so has Mexico; and so have the other countries farther south; and those beyond the seas have contributed in different measure. Now, what I want to know is, who are the persons who should get this rent, and in what proportion should it go to each individual?

If we study the question closely, we find that *the amount of rent that each individual pays in New York City for the use of land on what is one of the most valuable business locations is no greater than it was fifty years ago; or two hundred years ago.* Nor does the man who goes to New York City pay more there as a tenant than he did before in a business quarter in a smaller city.

On page 35 of "What Is Mutualism?" mention is made of a business building in New York City situated on a valuable site which is about two acres in size. The building is fifty stories above the ground and three below, and is occupied by 15,000 persons. The site is worth \$10,000,000; the building cost four times that sum. The annual rent of the land is therefore about \$600,000, an average of \$40 a year for each occupant.

Fifty years ago there was a six-story building on this site, occupied by 1,500 persons. The site then was worth \$1,000,000, and the annual rental was \$60,000, which is again just \$40 for each occupant. Two hundred years ago it was a vegetable garden, and the gardener paid exactly \$40 a year rent.

The great difference in the value (which is fully admitted) of locations on which the Single Taxer dwells does not affect the amount of rent which each individual must pay. As the value of the site increases, each individual simply occupies less ground space and the amount he pays remains practically the same.

So, while waiting for W.C.O. to answer my question as to how he would apportion the rent, and while he is metaphorically travelling from Alaska to Patagonia to find the persons to whom it should be given, and in what shares, I will reiterate and amplify what we have already told him in said book—that the believers in the occupancy and use theory say that these 15,000 tenants should refuse to pay this rent and keep the money in their own pockets; in other words, begin a rent strike. If the tenants of the Duke of Westminster should all at once refuse to pay him his million pounds annually, and if the tenants of the other members of the landed aristocracy followed their example, the occupancy and use system could be put into effect soon; and a fraction of the British population could bring it about.

If, on the other hand, they have to wait until a majority are converted to the Single Tax and then wait until a Single-Tax Government is elected, with a further wait until the tax is assessed and collected, it will be a long time. If they expect that, after it is collected by the Government, it will be handed back to the tenants, I am afraid they will have to wait forever. I have never heard of a Government that did that.

HENRY COHEN.

Los Angeles, November 18, 1927.

Notice to all Comrades and Friends.

A few comrades have requested us to call a meeting early in the New Year to discuss the possibility of resuming the publication of FREEDOM. We are quite willing to do so if there is a general desire for such a meeting; but it must be clearly understood that before the paper can start again all debts must be cleared off and sufficient money be in hand to carry on regularly for some time. We shall be very glad to receive suggestions from all comrades and friends interested.

You cannot do better now than subscribe to

The Road to Freedom.

A Periodical of Anarchist Thought, Work, and Literature.
Subscription, \$1.00 (4s.) a year.

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

Subscriptions, 4s. a year, can be sent to FREEDOM PRESS, 127, Ossulston Street, London, N.W.1.

A Few Words at Parting.

On laying down my pen for the last time as Editor of FREEDOM I feel moved to say a few words.

In January, 1903, Alfred Marsh, the Editor at that time, wrote and told me that Tom Cantwell, the compositor on the paper, had been taken ill, and he would like me to come and talk over the question of the printing of FREEDOM. As a compositor myself, I had helped Cantwell on several occasions during the previous year. I met Marsh and agreed to be responsible for the printing of the paper. Thus began my connection with FREEDOM which has lasted just a quarter of a century.

In the following September, having served my apprenticeship, as it were, Alf Marsh asked me to take over the business side also. For four years I did this work in my spare time. In January, 1907, the *Voice of Labour*, a weekly paper, was started. This, however, could not be a spare-time job, so I threw up my old one and came to No. 127 as printer of both papers. That was a strenuous time! Alf Marsh was editor of the *Voice of Labour* for the first two months, but ill-health compelled him to resign, and from then until the end of September, when the paper ceased publication, the work of editor fell on my shoulders. I had never written but one article in my life before. Perhaps that accounted for the death of the *Voice*!

Being without family responsibilities and not wishing to work for a boss again, I remained on FREEDOM as compositor, and set the type until December of last year (except during the War, after Scotland Yard had stolen our type).

In April, 1913, I agreed to Alf Marsh's repeated requests to take over the Editorship. Illness again caused him to resign, much to my regret. He was the most unassuming Editor that one could imagine. The eleven years we worked together were a great pleasure to me, and his passing in the early days of the War was a sad blow. The club started in Mecklenburgh Street in 1915 was named Marsh House in memory of him.

Twenty-five years is a long time to look back, but those years have been the happiest in my life for they brought me into personal touch with many sincere, earnest, and devoted comrades. To work with them was indeed a pleasure and an inspiration, and my greatest regret was when the War came in 1914 and split our group asunder. One doubted the judgment of those members who supported the War, but one never doubted their sincerity. The bitter words spoken in those days are now forgotten in remembering the many years we worked so amicably together.

The War years tested the fibre of all those who then rallied to FREEDOM. "Dora" made the publication of an Anarchist paper difficult if not dangerous, but everyone stuck it out, and when two of us were sent to prison other comrades came forward and set the type and printed the paper at the office until it was again raided and they were imprisoned in turn. Still the paper came out, and the amount of money that came in from the movement then was far greater than we have since received in these piping times of peace. A little persecution seems necessary to liven up some comrades.

During the many years the paper has been running the only work that was paid for was the type-setting. Everything else was done freely by comrades for the good of the cause. That is a record of which the Anarchist movement may well feel proud in these days when subsidised papers flourish everywhere.

Now FREEDOM closes down after an existence of forty-one years. The work it has done for Anarchism was recognised by the movement when it celebrated its fortieth birthday last year, and we fervently hope that some day in the near future other comrades will come forward, inspired by a great faith in human liberty as opposed to a soulless State Socialism, and carry on the struggle for Anarchism.

THOMAS H. KEELL

A Memento of "Freedom" Office.

FREEDOM has been published at its present address for nearly thirty years. Previously, it was the office of the *Torch*, an Anarchist journal published by the Misses Rossetti, one of whom wrote a book of her experience under the title of "A Girl Among the Anarchists." Our office is, therefore, one that has played a great part in the history of the Anarchist movement in this country. As the building is to be pulled down next summer by the London County Council, we have had four separate photographs taken of the premises, showing the entrance from Ossulston Street, the building from outside, the machine room and warehouse, and the editorial and composing rooms, with the Editor. A few copies of this unique set of photographs (unmounted, 6in. by 4½in.) are for sale. Price 4s., post free. Early application should be made, as the number is strictly limited.

PRINTED PAGES.

THE FUTURE OF MARRIAGE.*

In this book, one of the "To-day and Tomorrow" series, Dr. Haire attacks the current standards of sex conduct, standards based, as he says, "largely on long-standing religious and social commands and prohibitions, many of which had a real value in some earlier condition of society, but are now obsolete and obsolescent." His frankness in handling the subject will give a severe shock to conventional folk, but it is necessary to shock people who take things for granted and think the law as laid down by the churches centuries ago must last for ever. Our author says that modern marriage gives rise to an appalling amount of quite unnecessary suffering, and he suggests ways and means of avoiding it. Birth control methods are now becoming so widely known that he looks to trial marriages (without legal ties) for young people to find out whether they are suited to each other before making a legal marriage. This also would prevent much prostitution, a great deal of which can be traced to unsuitable unions. He contrasts the sex standards of the ancient Jewish and Greek civilisations, based on differing economic conditions. The ancient Jews forbade fornication and adultery, but allowed polygamy, concubinage, and divorce by consent. In ancient Greece fornication and adultery were not only tolerated, but regarded as a matter of course, and prostitutes enjoyed a comparatively high status. "Homosexuality became so general in some communities that it was considered a disgrace if a young man did not have a male lover." During a trial for this offence at the Old Bailey many years ago, the judge remarked that it was "an offence peculiar to the clergy." Possibly their study of Greek classics may account for it.

We agree entirely with Dr. Haire in his desire for increased sex freedom, but differ profoundly with him when he advocates State support of children, which will necessarily bring with it, as he admits and advocates, State control of births by means of sterilisation of the unfit. The medical fraternity will decide who are fit to procreate and who are unfit, and we are to have all our sexual matters arranged for us by this fraternity, who even to-day are in the mass but children where disease is concerned. The author is so obsessed with his idea of producing healthy children for the State that he suggests that women be picked out to be *breeders*! (Bernard Shaw proposed this many years ago, and included men.) He also thinks that in the future reproduction will be carried on artificially. Women who do not wish to mate in the ordinary way will be impregnated with the semen of males picked out as "specially desirable fathers." Ye Gods! If this is to be the future of marriage, our worst dreams of State control will have come true.

Havelock Ellis has pointed out the danger of the encroachments of law in sex matters. He says: "We have to be on our guard lest our efforts for the regeneration of the race lead us to a mechanical and materialistic conception of life, to the conception of a life regulated by codes and statutes, and adjudicated in law courts. Better an unregenerate life than such a regeneration! For freedom is the breath of life, and no regeneration is worth striving for which fails to increase the total sum of freedom and of joy."

However, in spite of Dr. Haire and his State Socialist friends, we think that Dame Nature will still provide many happy and sensuous hours for those for whom "there is nothing half so sweet in life as love's young dream."

THE FUTURE OF MORALS.†

Mr. Joad's little book, another of the "To-day and Tomorrow" series, comes as a delightful tonic after laying down "Hymen." It is a strong protest against the increasing tyranny of herd morality, which is specially noticeable in America to-day, and is fast taking hold here. "Depart one hair's-breadth from the standard habits of thought and accepted codes of conduct, and the herd will make your existence intolerable until you toe the line." Mr. Joad's sarcasm bites deep. "America is our most advanced nation in morals as in everything else, and if we want to know what England will be like to-morrow, we cannot do better than look at America to-day. . . . The objects of American civilisation are to substitute cleanliness for beauty, mechanism for men, and hypocrisy for morals."

In the United States standardisation in industry is being followed rapidly by standardisation in everything else—one State passes a law against teaching evolution in the public

*Hymen; or, The Future of Marriage." By Norman Haire. 2s. 6d. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.

†"Thrasymachus; or, The Future of Morals." By C. E. M. Joad. 2s. 6d. Same publishers.

schools, and immediately other states pass similar laws; anti-evolution, anti-Anarchist, anti-Syndicalist, anti-Red Flag laws are now in force in States dotted all over the Union. We have no anti-evolution laws here, but how many editors of our great journals have dared to come out flat-footed and say that Dr. Barnes was right when he said: "Darwin's triumph has destroyed the whole theological scheme"? Fear of the herd prevented them.

Mr. Joad specially emphasises the growing freedom of women in sexual matters, at which he rejoices. So many opportunities of earning her living are now open to a woman that she is no longer forced into marriage as a livelihood. This has put her on a footing where she can to a certain extent decide the conditions of sexual intercourse, and here Mr. Joad thinks that birth control (or the use of contraceptives) will play a big part. Women will more and more refuse to enter into a lifelong partnership with a man as a condition of intercourse and new relationships will arise between them with equal freedom as the basis. "Conventional morality," he says, "like many of our institutions, such as matinees, concerts, and God, is kept going by women, and directly women withdraw their support not all the opposition of men will avail to save it." He is not afraid of any ill-effects as the result of this greater liberty in sex.

Of course, the herd will fight hard against it, and the author expects a revival of Puritanism which may produce reactionary legislation. "Libertarianism in thought and conduct is decreasing and will continue to decrease. The cult of uniformity is hostile to the liberty of the individual, and in order to secure the performance of conduct of which the herd approves, the legislature is likely to assume a more positive control over men's lives than has been customary in the past." The growth of Puritanism will bring a growth in hypocrisy. "The world, in short, will become a paradise for the average man and a hell for the exceptional one." This victory for bourgeois Puritanism, however, will be more apparent than real; and Mr. Joad thinks the ultimate victory must be on the side of greater sexual freedom.

We have thoroughly enjoyed the author's castigation of those whom we may term the new Puritans, and we should say there is more than a trifle of Anarchism in his mental outlook. There are only 92 pages in the book, but he has put a tremendous lot of good stuff into them.

TWO VANGUARD PRESS BOOKS.

"Proudhon's Solution of the Social Problem." P. J. Proudhon. Including Commentary and Exposition by Charles A. Dana and William B. Greene. Edited, with Introduction by Henry Cohen. 50 cents.—This is an exposition of Proudhon's system of mutual banking which he claimed would solve the social problem. He worked it out thoroughly in detail, and as the monopoly of banking is to-day being attacked from all sides, this book should be studied by all interested. The articles by Charles A. Dana, written at a time when Proudhon's fame was at its height (1849), are of especial value.

"The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study of Institutions." By Thorstein Veblen. 50 cents.—This book, first published in 1899, has run through many editions. It contains 404 pp.—for 50 cents (2s. 6d.)! The author traces leisure as a sign of social superiority from primitive times, and shows its varied expression in the classes to-day. All productive work is menial, therefore if you wish to prove your social superiority you must have leisure. This does not imply idleness, but your occupation must not be of a productive character. Even among the so-called lower classes signs of this theory can be found. The burglar's or pickpocket's contempt for the contented "honest" workman is proverbial. Mechanics are barred from membership of many amateur clubs on that ground alone. As an analysis of society the book is well worth reading.

"FREEDOM" GUARANTEE FUND.

The following sums have been received to date (December 7) since our last issue:—Pierovitch 2s. 6d., H. G. Russell 5s., C. Blandy 5s., G. Teltsch 8s. 2d., M. A. Cohn £5 2s. 5d., N. Melinsky £1 0s. 7d., Sam Cohen £1 0s. 6d., E. M. 5s., L. G. Wolfe 10s.

We have many heavy debts to pay, and hope comrades and friends will help us to pay them. All donations will be acknowledged by post.

CASH RECEIVED (not otherwise acknowledged).

(October 1 to December 7.)

"FREEDOM" SUBSCRIPTIONS.—Theodore, R. G. Davidson, G. Robertson, F. Boyd, H. E. Henderson, A. T. Rogers, Librado Rivera, J. B. Barnhill, A. Park, P. von Arx, G. Senior,

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. 3d.
 THE ANARCHIST REVOLUTION. By GEORGE BARRETT. 2d.
 ANARCHISM VERSUS SOCIALISM. By WM. C. OWEN. 3d.
 ENGLAND MONOPOLISED OR ENGLAND FREE? WM. C. OWEN. 1d.
 "SET MY PEOPLE FREE!" By WM. C. OWEN. 2d.
 ANARCHISM. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 3d.
 ANARCHISM AND DEMOCRACY. By JOHN WAKEMAN. 1d.
 AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2d.
 THE CHICAGO MARTYRS. With Portraits. 2d.
 ANARCHISM AND OUTRAGE. 1d.
 FOR LIBERTY: An Anthology of Revolt. 6d.
 REFLECTIONS ON POLITICAL JUSTICE. (Selections from the Writings of WILLIAM GODWIN.) 4d.
 THE CRUSHING OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 2d.; postage, 1d.
Postage extra—1d. for each 3 pamphlets.
- MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM. By PETER KROPOTKIN. Paper Covers, 6d.; postage 2d.
 THE GREAT FRENCH REVOLUTION, 1789-1793. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 2 vols. Cloth, 5s.; postage 6d.
 KROPOTKIN'S REVOLUTIONARY PAMPHLETS. With Biographical Sketch and Notes by ROGER N. BALDWIN. Cloth, 2s. 6d.; postage, 3d.
 FIELDS, FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS. By PETER KROPOTKIN. Cloth, 2s.; postage 4d.
 THE CONQUEST OF BREAD. By PETER KROPOTKIN. Cloth, 2s. 6d.; postage 3d.
 MUTUAL AID. By P. KROPOTKIN. Paper, 2s. net; postage 3d.
 ETHICS: ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 12s. 6d.; postage 6d.
 RUSSIAN LITERATURE. By PETER KROPOTKIN. 3s. 6d.; postage 4d.
 GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By P. J. PROUDHON. Paper, 1s. 6d.; Cloth, 3s.; postage 3d.
 WHAT IS PROPERTY? By P. J. PROUDHON. Cloth (1 vol.), 4s. 6d. paper covers (in two vols), 3s.; postage 5d.
 PROUDHON'S SOLUTION OF THE SOCIAL PROBLEM. Edited by HENRY COHEN. 2s. 6d.; postage 3d.
 ECONOMICS OF LIBERTY. A Statement of Proudhon's System of Social Organisation. By JOHN BEVERLY ROBINSON. Cloth, 2s.; postage 3d.
 GOD AND THE STATE. By MICHAEL BAKUNIN. (American Edition). Paper, 1s.; postage 2d.
 PRISON MEMOIRS OF AN ANARCHIST. By ALEXANDER BERKMAN. 10s. 6d.; postage 6d.
 THE BOLSHEVIK MYTH. By ALEXANDER BERKMAN. 10s. 6d.; postage 6d.
 ANARCHISM AND OTHER ESSAYS. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 6s. 6d.; postage 4d.
 MY DISILLUSIONMENT IN RUSSIA. By EMMA GOLDMAN. 6s.; postage 4d.
 INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY. By BENJAMIN R. TUCKER. Selected and Edited by C.L.S. Cloth, 2s. 6d.; postage 3d.
 WHAT IS MUTUALISM? By CLARENCE LEE SWARTZ. 2s. 6d.; postage 3d.
 THE STATE: ITS HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT. By FRANZ OPPENHEIMER. Cloth, 2s. 6d.; postage 3d.
 MAN VERSUS THE STATE. By HERBERT SPENCER. Paper, 6d.; postage 2d.
 THE EGO AND ITS OWN. By MAX STIRNER. 6s.; postage 4d.
 AN ENQUIRY CONCERNING POLITICAL JUSTICE. By WILLIAM GODWIN. 2 vols., 16s.; postage 9d.
 ON PROPERTY: ESSAY FROM "POLITICAL JUSTICE." By WILLIAM GODWIN. Cloth, 3s. 6d.; postage 3d.
 SHELLEY, GODWIN, AND THEIR CIRCLE. By H. N. BRAILSFORD. 2s.; postage 3d.
 A HISTORY OF FREEDOM OF THOUGHT. By PROF. J. B. BURY. 2s.; postage 3d.
 LOVE'S COMING OF AGE. By EDWARD CARPENTER. 2s.; postage 3d.
 NEWS FROM NOWHERE. By WILLIAM MORRIS. Cloth, 3s. 6d.; paper, 1s. 6d.; postage 3d.
 A DREAM OF JOHN BALL. By WILLIAM MORRIS. Cloth, 3s. 6d.; paper, 1s. 6d., postage 3d.
 FREEDOM AND ITS FUNDAMENTALS. By CHARLES T. SPRADING. Cloth, 6s. 6d.; postage 4d.
 SCIENCE VERSUS DOGMA. By CHARLES T. SPRADING. 6s.; postage 4d.
 A VINDICATION OF NATURAL SOCIETY. By EDMUND BURKE. 8d.; postage 1d.
 THE SPEECHES OF THE CHICAGO MARTYRS. 2s.; postage 2d.
 LIFE OF ALBERT PARSONS. By LUCY E. PARSONS. 12s.; postage 6d.
 SYNDICALISM AND THE CO-OPERATIVE COMMONWEALTH. By E. PATAUD and E. POUGET. Paper covers, 2s. 6d.; postage 3d.
 THE SPIRIT OF FREEDOM IN EDUCATION. By ELIZABETH BYRNE FERM. 1s. 3d., post free.
 WALDEN. By HENRY THOREAU. 2s.; postage 3d.
 ALBUM OF THE FUNERAL OF PETER KROPOTKIN IN MOSCOW. With 30 Photographs. 1s., post free.

Orders, with cash, to be sent to
FREEDOM PRESS, 127, OSSULSTON STREET, LONDON, N.W.1.

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