

# F R E E D O M B U L L E T I N

No. 11.

DECEMBER, 1930.

Price 1d.

## SOME PAGES OF ANARCHIST HISTORY.

In our last issue we said that a new paper named "Freedom" had been published on May 1st by the "London Freedom Group," that it contained a "Statement" full of malicious and wilful mis-statements concerning myself, and that a Protest signed by several well-known comrades had been sent to the Editor. This Protest,\* signed by A. Schapiro, M. Nettleau, Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman, and Errico Malatesta, appeared in the August issue of the paper. It flatly contradicted most of the points on which the charges against me were based, and concluded with the hope that "for the sake of the future of our propaganda in England . . . the older elements of the movement will rise above personal grievances, so as to be able to induce the younger generation to believe in them." This appeal met with no response. In reply to the Protest, the "London Freedom Group" referred to the "ugly facts" of 1914 and said there were those in their Group who thought that what had taken place in "Freedom" Office at that time was "an outrage on the principles of Anarchism."

In view of this attitude of the "London Freedom Group" several comrades have pressed me to reply in full to the original "Statement." As the Group ask that the assets of "Freedom" Office should be "returned" to them, our readers should know that the only member of the Freedom Group in 1914 now in the London Group is John Turner, whom we have been informed wrote the "Statement."

The Statement opens with a short history of "Freedom" from its foundation in 1886 and of the numerous comrades connected with it until 1914. It says that Alfred Marsh, who died in October, 1914, was Editor of "Freedom" and the responsible tenant of the office until the time of his death, and that John Turner was the responsible publisher. The Statement then continues:—

Immediately on the death of Comrade Marsh in this worrying time, T. H. Keell, who for some years had been the printer at "Freedom" office, took over, entirely on his own initiative, the whole of the assets of the paper and the things associated with its publication. He arranged that the tenancy of the office be transferred to himself. The name of John Turner, as publisher, was removed, without consultation or consent, and his own substituted! Without even a "by your leave" to those who had by continuous self-sacrifice for nearly thirty years, built up the movement and made the office possible, he then took personal possession of it all.

If that were true it would mean either that I am a Lenin and a Mussolini rolled into one or that the

London Anarchists were lacking in courage and energy in not going down to "Freedom" Office and throwing me into the street. But does anyone seriously believe it? In the first place, Marsh was not Editor at that time, as I took over the editorship in April, 1912. He had several times asked me to do so, and in a letter to me, dated March 21st, 1912, he wrote: "I have definitely decided that I must take a long rest. I cannot possibly go on any longer without a serious breakdown." A few days later we met and talked it over and I agreed to be Editor of "Freedom" from the next issue. With regard to the tenancy of "Freedom" Office, Marsh was never the responsible tenant. When I first took charge in January, 1903, rent receipts were made out in the name of Tom Cantwell. From 1904 they were made out in my name. As to the responsible publisher, Turner's name was removed from the paper in October, 1907! Thus we nail to the counter three deliberate lies.

Shortly after the outbreak of war in August, 1914, Marsh and I met Kropotkin in London, and at once it was made clear to me that there was a fundamental difference between us regarding the war. Kropotkin was fiercely anti-German and dwelt on the sufferings of the Belgians and the probable fate of France. All my arguments in opposition were swept aside. In view of this divergence of opinion, as Editor of "Freedom" I thought it better to let both sides state their case. Kropotkin's letter to Professor Steffen, in the October issue, was followed in November by a Symposium on the War, with articles by Grave and Malatesta, and also by Tcherkesoff, who was opposed to Grave and Malatesta writing in "Freedom." In the same issue was a letter by Robert Selkirk, a Scotch comrade, criticising Kropotkin's letter to Professor Steffen, and saying he was acting as a recruiting sergeant for the Allies. When I saw Tcherkesoff a few days later (November 28th) he attacked me bitterly for printing Selkirk's letter and said "'Freedom' could not be a free tribune and 'Freedom' must stop"! I replied that it would be published as long as possible. The next day I saw Kropotkin at Brighton. He also attacked me for printing Selkirk's letter about him acting as a recruiting sergeant, which I defended by saying that he who wills the end wills the means. I also said that all he had written to Professor Steffen was contradicted by what he had written in "Wars and Capitalism," which we had published just before the outbreak of war. Our differences were irreconcilable. On returning to London I consulted some comrades who had been

\* Since writing this reply we have decided to reprint this Protest in full on another page, for reasons there stated.

working with Marsh and me for some time at "Freedom" office, and I also saw Malatesta, Rocker, and others. As a result I wrote the following letter to Kropotkin:—

127, Ossulston Street, London, N.W.  
December 21st, 1914.

Dear Kropotkin,

Since we last met I have thoroughly thrashed out all your arguments in favour of the workers taking part in this war, and I must say frankly that in my opinion they are a contradiction of almost everything that we have told the workers previously, and also a contradiction of Anarchist ideas as generally understood. That I am not alone in this opinion is proved by the Anarchist papers that come to the office from various countries. The English comrades also combat your ideas vigorously, and it would be a disaster to "Freedom" if it were understood that your views were the editorial views. Up to the present I have been content to admit articles and letters from comrades who oppose your views, while the editorial side has remained neutral; but this policy is a cowardly one for me, and comrades have asked me why I remain silent when I feel so strongly on the matter.

The suggestion put forward by Tcherkesoff and yourself about stopping "Freedom" does not appear to me possible, and would render it very difficult to start again.

Therefore, it is my intention to bring out the next issue of the paper on a definite anti-war basis. It has always been anti-militarist and anti-State; therefore, to continue on those lines would be no alteration of the policy of the paper since I have been connected with it.

I am aware that in doing this I may lose the co-operation of Comrade Tcherkesoff and his wife, as we have never agreed on the question. But, in any case, the deadlock must be ended.

I hope, however, that you will send the conclusion of the letter begun this month; and if you do not feel inclined to write in "Freedom" on the war, that you will continue your translations of the "Modern State."

To oppose you on this question has been a severe struggle for me, but I have not done so hastily or without looking at all sides.

Hoping to hear from you soon,

Fraternally yours,  
THOMAS H. KEELL.

Kropotkin did not reply, but early in January Mrs. Tcherkesoff sent me a notice of a meeting called by Kropotkin, Turner and Tcherkesoff, to discuss "the critical position of 'Freedom' caused by the death of its Editor, A. Marsh." Marsh, as I have said, had ceased to be Editor for nearly three years. I went to the meeting, which was held at Tcherkesoff's flat on January 14th, 1915. Madame Kropotkin read my letter to Kropotkin, who was not strong enough to travel, and she seemed to think it was audacious, or perhaps impertinent, for me to have a mind of my own. In reply, I said it was my intention to stand by the letter and refused to accept the dictation of those present, some of whom, "Old associates of 'Freedom,'" to use Mrs. Tcherkesoff's phrase, had taken no part in the work of the paper for some years, and therefore were not entitled to decide the policy of "Freedom" or the control of the office, for which they wanted to appoint trustees. None of those present seemed to realise that for the moment only one issue was at stake. Was "Freedom" to be pro-war or anti-war? Were we to throw over everything for which it had stood since its foundation and tell the workers to sacrifice themselves in a war fomented by their masters? John Turner, who was present, complained that his name, as publisher, had been removed from the imprint of "Freedom" and mine substituted. I told him then that the change took place in 1907 at Marsh's suggestion.

A week or two later a notice of another meeting was sent me, but I refused to attend, and replied that

I was calling a meeting of comrades who had helped "Freedom" for some time past, and invited Tcherkesoff and his wife. The meeting was held on February 28th at Marsh House. Tcherkesoff came with his wife and three comrades. Among others present were F. W. Dunn, Mabel Hope, T. Sweetlove, and Lilian Wolfe, all very active in "Freedom" office at that time. Tcherkesoff denounced me wholeheartedly, but Mabel Hope, speaking on behalf of the others named above, said they endorsed my attitude and would support me in every way. Tcherkesoff proposed an Editorial Committee, but I said frankly that until "Freedom's" attitude on the war had been decided I would retain the editorship. After hours of heated argument Tcherkesoff and his supporters left the meeting. Those who remained decided to form a new "Freedom" Group and carry on the work. "Freedom" office and its "valuable assets" were not seized by us; everything went on as it had done for years past, except that Kropotkin and Tcherkesoff no longer wrote for the paper. If they thought our action was "an outrage on Anarchist principles," it was open to them to call a conference of comrades and explain the position, but they knew that as far as London was concerned we could rely on the support of an overwhelming majority of the comrades. I had offered to give Tcherkesoff the usual annual financial statement, but he declined to accept it personally.

On April 4th and 5th the Annual Anarchist Conference was held at Hazel Grove, Stockport, comrades from all parts of the country being present. At the afternoon session on the 5th (Easter Monday), George Cores, a member of the present "London Freedom Group," read a typewritten document, in which all the charges now revived against me were set out in detail. It was headed "The Freedom Group to all Anarchists." Having read the document Cores enlarged on it for some time and denounced me with all the virulence at his command. A full report of the Conference was printed in "Freedom" (May, 1915), from which I now quote:—

Being called on for an explanation, Comrade Keell gave a long and detailed statement of his position, in which he vigorously defended himself against the charges brought forward. Many comrades took part in the discussion which followed, and eventually the conference decided unanimously that Keell was fully justified in taking the steps he had to keep "Freedom" an anti-war journal, and that no evidence had been produced in support of the charges made in the protest, the bitter terms of which were especially deprecated.

This disposes of the misleading and ridiculous charge in the "Statement": "No propaganda was attempted, or conferences called. There was always the danger of questions being asked about 'Freedom.'"

After the Conference these charges were never made openly again here until May 1st of this year, but Anarchist papers abroad were given distorted versions of them. Jean Grave has written a pamphlet ("Kropotkin"), published in 1921, in which he says that at the outbreak of the war an Irishman named Kelly, manager of "Freedom" office, had refused to insert articles by Tcherkesoff and Kropotkin and had put them out of the office. Thus is history written! Grave pathetically goes on to say: "At that moment I did not imagine that 'good friends' with whom Tcherkesoff associated himself held the same coup in reserve for myself."

The new group settled down to work again, most of them living at Marsh House, where very successful social and propaganda meetings were organised, all the subscriptions and profits being devoted to the support of "Freedom" and the "Voice of Labour." Our anti-conscription propaganda was so effective that "Freedom" office was raided four times under the Defence of the Realm Act. Great quantities of books and pamphlets were seized, and most of our type and parts of our machine taken to Scotland Yard. In June, 1916, Lilian Wolfe and I were sentenced to two and three months' imprisonment respectively for an article published in the "Voice of Labour." The work, however, went on all the same when we were in prison, but whilst some comrades were printing "Freedom" the second raid took place and three of them were arrested for evading military service. The I.L.P. came to the rescue and printed our paper at their press in Manchester, and not an issue was missed. When we were sent to prison an appeal was made on behalf of "Freedom" and the response from the movement was immediate and generous. We had also secretly printed many thousands of leaflets for the Anti-Conscription League, who distributed them all over the country, much to the annoyance of the Press and Scotland Yard.

The war, however, broke up most of the Anarchist groups in the country, and propaganda fell off everywhere. Our group lost most of its members, some becoming C.O.'s and others going to the States. Still we carried on somehow, faithful friends at home and abroad providing the sinews of war. When Wm. C. Owen came to England he wrote for "Freedom," and during the winters of 1922-23 and 1923-24 he was the mainstay of the meetings of the Anarchist Discussion Circle, held at the Minerva Café every Saturday evening, which were a great success.

Unemployment and the disillusionment and reaction after the General Strike of 1926 played havoc with the circulation and income of "Freedom," and after missing nearly half the monthly issues in 1926-27, it finally ceased publication in December, 1927.

As the expense of the office in Ossulston Street was now more than we could afford, we had arranged to transfer the literature to its present home at Whiteway; but at a meeting held in February, 1928, to consider the possibility of restarting "Freedom," there was some opposition to an immediate move, so we decided to remain and see what could be done. We waited until the end of September, when our final notice to quit the office expired; and as no other scheme was put forward by the new Group, we had no alternative but to take advantage of Lilian Wolfe's offer of free accommodation and move to Whiteway. Although we were willing to work with the new Group if possible, and made them a present of literature for propaganda purposes when we left London, the revival of the old hostility of 1915 made friendly co-operation impossible. The publication of the "Statement" is sufficient proof.

John Turner speaks of himself with unctuous self-righteousness as one of those "who put Anarchist principles before everything." Let us see how much that statement is worth. In July, 1914, a comrade gave me a copy of a circular which had just been sent

out by the Shop Assistants' Union to its members, calling their attention to a ballot on the question of political action. After explaining why the Union's Parliamentary activities had been interrupted, the circular continued:—

Whilst not by any means looking to or waiting for legislation for all the reforms of shop life we are out to obtain, we ought to use every means in our power to bring them about, and the great extension of the Trade Union element in the House of Commons (in the Lobby and on the Benches) which the establishment of the Political Fund makes possible, will put an edge upon one of the most powerful weapons at the disposal of Labour, and eventually will enable us to determine our own conditions. . . . We appeal to you to give this subject the serious attention it deserves, and to exercise your right and privilege in voting upon a matter of such vital importance to you personally, and to the Trade Union movement as a whole.

Yours fraternally,  
JOHN TURNER,  
General Secretary.

This advocacy of Parliamentary action was one of the reasons for objecting to John Turner having a voice in the control of "Freedom" in 1914, as it seemed—to me at least—impossible for a man to be a Parliamentarian and an Anarchist at one and the same time.

As soon as I heard that a notice of the publication of the new paper on May 1st had been printed in the *Freie Arbeiter Stimme* (New York) for April 11th, I sent the following letter to the Secretary of the London Freedom Group:—

Whiteway, Stroud, Glos.  
April 23rd, 1930.

My dear Bessie,

From two or three sources I learn that the London Freedom Group (or Libertarian Association) intends to issue a new Anarchist journal on May 1st, to be called "Freedom." Before the title is definitely settled one or two things might be taken into consideration. If the object in starting the new journal is to have an Anarchist journal appearing regularly to express the opinions of the Group on the events of the day and the social question in all its bearings, why handicap its publication by using a title which will create confusion inside and outside the movement? However strongly your Group may feel on the question, others feel just as strongly the other way. An entirely new venture might be supported by the movement generally, whereas the use of the title "Freedom" will cause resentment amongst many Anarchists. Surely you must realise that outsiders, whom you no doubt wish to reach, will be inclined to scoff at the sight of an apparent awakening in the Anarchist movement being made the occasion of a public notification of a split or a quarrel in the ranks of the smallest of the propagandist bodies in the Socialist and Labour movement. Outsiders will know little and care less as to the rights or wrongs of the matter, and they are hardly likely to be attracted to the paper by the advertisement of a quarrel between people who preach brotherly love. Apart from any desire to score off those who have managed "Freedom" hitherto, is the game worth the candle? Is it too late to find some other title by the use of which this public washing of dirty linen can be avoided? Of course, you understand that we shall object to the use of the title "Freedom," but personally I would rather welcome an entirely new paper.

Please remember that in writing this letter I am influenced only by a desire to maintain a certain amount of dignity and self-respect in our movement. I have no fears for the memorandum or manifesto regarding myself which you intend to publish, I believe. In 1915 I was charged with all the crimes in the Anarchist calendar, and was acquitted by the tribunal to which some of your Group appealed. A rehash of these charges will make little difference in the opinions of those who know the work of our small Group, though it may cause misunderstanding among newcomers. So please clear your mind if you think my reasons for writing have anything personal about them.

Another point to be considered is that some day, sooner or later, there must be some form of co-operation between your Group and Freedom Press if you wish to spread Anarchist literature. Your readers—I am presuming you publish a paper

—will ask for some literature. What will you say to them? The situation is impossible. Just look a little way ahead and visualise the situation, not from a purely personal point of view, but from the point of view of the interests of the movement as a whole, and I am sure that you will realise that no good can come from accentuating the present disagreement. Two groups of Anarchists—both insignificant in numbers—running two papers, each of which is called “Freedom,” will be a sight for the gods and the target of every cynic in the Labour movement.

But, if the desire is to expose the “Dictator” of Freedom Press in all his wickedness to the public gaze, and thereby to prove by contrast the virtues and single-mindedness of his accusers, I have written in vain. Still, I felt the necessity of stating this point of view as soon as I heard definite news of the new paper.

Yours fraternally,  
THOMAS H. KEELL.

I received no reply to this letter, but on May 1st was favoured with a copy of the new “Freedom.” The “Statement” was evidently intended as a form of fraternal May Day greetings for Lillian Wolfe and myself. Probably the thought of their kindly action gave an edge to their appetite and a more joyous note to the speeches at their May Day dinner.

Had the members of the London Freedom Group given the matter a little more serious consideration they would not have allowed themselves to be led into publishing this false and fraudulent “Statement.”

## AN INTERNATIONAL PROTEST.\*

To the Editor of “Freedom.”  
Dear Comrade,

The undersigned have all received invitations to contribute to “Freedom,” which was to reappear again after 30 months’ silence. Most of us replied in the affirmative and sent our greetings on the occasion of the revival of “Freedom.”

Then came the first issue, May, 1930, and it is with a deep grief that we feel compelled, in spite of our promise to contribute to the paper—nay, because of it—to protest against the uncalled-for, harmful and misleading misstatements in the unsigned “Statement” published in the very first number of the New Series of “Freedom.”

We cannot understand what usefulness for our propaganda such statements can have. Their mischievous rôle is certainly clear: to make still deeper the cleavage within the meagre ranks of Anarchism in England, cleavage which ten years should certainly have helped to heal up.

We would rather not deal with the *spirit* of the “Statement.” The present Editors of “Freedom” are, naturally, free to have their own judgment on events. We will just pin down some misstatements, known to us as such, and attempt to draw a conclusion.

Says the “Statement”: “Immediately on the death of Comrade Marsh in this worrying time, T. H. Keell, who for some years had been the printer at ‘Freedom’ office, took over, entirely on his own initiative, the whole of the assets of the paper and the things associated with its publication. He

Did they really believe that Tom Keell seized “Freedom” and all the “valuable assets” of the office single-handed in 1914? Did they believe that the movement would have supported the paper for another thirteen years if he had done so? And do they honestly think they are entitled to demand that Freedom Press should be handed over to them? The truth is, they have taken themselves too seriously. A slight sense of proportion—and humour—would have saved them from their present undignified position.

We—and here I speak for all those now alive with whom I was associated—we were, and still are, happy in knowing that in 1914 we helped to save our movement from being swept away by the pro-war fever which attacked a few of our elders. We never doubted their sincerity and honesty, and in opposing them we never used harsh or bitter words. We met argument with argument, and everything that has happened since 1914 has proved that we were in the right. At least we have no blame to bear for the awful tragedy of the war.

It has not been a pleasant task to write this reply, but as the numerous Protests sent in failed to stem the flow of misrepresentation we thought it necessary to state all the facts plainly and simply.

THOMAS H. KEELL.

arranged that the tenancy of the office be transferred to himself. The name of John Turner, as publisher, was removed without consultation or consent, and his own substituted!”

Was it so difficult for the authors of the “Statement” to get hold of “Freedom” files and examine dates? They might have found, for instance, that already in the November, 1904, issue (*ten* whole years before the outbreak of the war) there is the mention: “Money and P.O.’s payable to T. H. Keell.” No one protested at that time. It took, for some unknown reason, 26 years to throw back at Keell this ridiculous and unfounded accusation, as if the change of name had taken place in 1914!!

Some of us, who were in more or less close touch with various members of the “Freedom” Group up to the outbreak of the war, knew Keell as the practical Publisher and Editor of “Freedom,” especially after A. Marsh’s desire, expressed in 1912, to be relieved of his main burden in the paper, owing to ill-health. No protests against Keell taking up the responsible work on the paper were at that time uttered by anyone. Why, then, this very much belated outburst against Keell?

We cannot help feeling that that “Statement” was called forth for no other reason than a petty desire on the part of its authors to “settle accounts” with Keell in connection with the strained relations which developed between the members of the “Freedom” group in the first months of the war in relation to the stand to be taken by Anarchists on that war, when Keell, opposed to the desire of the majority of the group to “shut up shop” because of their pro-war feelings, preferred to continue anti-war propaganda single-handedly.

We know that such tendency of “shutting-up shop”—rather than continue our revolutionary propaganda—existed within the ranks of the pro-war party

\* Having obtained our list of subscribers from one who feigned friendship up to December, 1927, and who copied it secretly while temporarily in charge of “Freedom” office, the publishers sent them No. 1 of “Freedom” (New Series); but as few of our subscribers received the August issue containing this protest, we have decided to reprint it in full.

among the Anarchists in 1914. We know that Jean Grave preferred to close the "Temps Nouveaux" and withdraw to England. We can but regret that there was no Keell among the French members of the "Temps Nouveaux" group.

"Freedom" represented no one but the man who ran it. No propaganda was attempted or conferences called.

So says the "Statement." We wonder whether the present group which publishes "Freedom" considers the pre-war "Freedom" as representing anyone else than those who ran it? Was really such unjustified attack on Keell necessary, or is it because "Freedom," New Series, happens to be issued by members of pre-war and pro-war "Freedom"?

Have present members of "Freedom" forgotten the International Manifesto published in "Freedom" of March, 1915, where side by side with Keell's name we also find those of G. Barrett (whom Marsh had wished to edit "Freedom"), F. W. Dunn (at that time active in "Freedom" and in "Voice of Labour"), Harry Kelly, Bertoni, Malatesta, F. D. Nieuwenhuis and many others? Have you, then, any right to say that "Freedom" represented during the war only "the man who ran it"?

What about the Stockport Conference, held on April 4th and 5th, 1915, endorsing Keell's attitude?

Did Keell happen to have been alone at that Conference?

No, dear Comrades. It is not with "Statements" of this kind that you will make propaganda. By such methods you can only sicken all those to whom you appeal at present and who had a right to expect that men who have spent scores and scores of years in the movement possess a little more sense of revolutionary dignity than they have proved to possess in the very first number of their new and original attempt to make propaganda. We had a right to expect that you will try to bring unity in our ranks, and represent a little bit more than your own selves.

We do earnestly hope that for the sake of the future of our propaganda in England—in a country where Anarchist work was generally before, during or after the war, at a comparatively low level—the older elements of the movement will rise above personal grievances, so as to be able to induce the younger generation to believe in them.

Yours fraternally,

A. SCHAPIRO.

M. NETTLAU.

EMMA GOLDMAN.

ALEXANDER BERKMAN.

ERRICO MALATESTA.

## MORE PROTESTS.

*The following protests were also sent to the Editor of "Freedom" but were not printed.*

Fairfax, Marin County,  
California.  
August 6th, 1930.

The Editor, "Freedom."

Sir,

A copy of the May issue of "Freedom" having reached me here, I was amazed to read your "Statement" and must emphatically take issue with certain statements which are certainly not in conformity with the facts.

I first met Alfred Marsh two years before his death in 1914, and saw him frequently, as at that time I was writing a column of notes for "Freedom." In all that time he only referred to John Turner on one or two occasions, and then only to tell me that John Turner was no longer interested in the Anarchist movement, and that his activities were all on behalf of the Shop Assistants' Union. I never met him during that period, and should certainly say that he was not the publisher of "Freedom" at that time (1912—1914).

It is also not true that T. H. Keell took over the whole of the assets of the paper on his own initiative. A group of us often met (sometimes in Marsh's Gray's Inn Road flat) and discussed the paper and its policy, notably when Kropotkin, Malatesta, Tcherkesoff, Marsh, Keell, myself, and several others met in July, 1914. It is quite clear that John Turner could not have been interested in the paper at that time, or else I am sure he would have been present at that meeting.

After the death of Alfred Marsh, a group of us, keenly desirous of keeping the paper alive at all costs, met frequently for discussion and work. In order to do this more effectively, we rented a house in the West Central District of London (Marsh House) as a

memorial to our late comrade. It proves quite conclusively how estranged from the Anarchist movement John Turner must have been at this time or he would have been conversant with all our activities, for all business was transacted openly, and he was at liberty to attend at any time. Indeed, we would have welcomed his attendance, because then as now the real workers in the movement were very few.

I have known T. H. Keell since 1912 and always knew him as Editor of "Freedom." When war broke out there was a question of suspending "Freedom," but most of us in the Freedom Group decided to carry on. Absolutely nothing was done by Tom Keell alone. He always had the consent of the Group. I worked in the movement with T. H. Keell until 1919. In all that time I found him a valiant defender of Anarchism. He possessed very great integrity, and always put the welfare of our cause first before all things. Through all the welter of war and its aftermath he patiently tried to keep "Freedom" from going down, and it is certainly a despicable thing to bring charges against one whose integrity has never been questioned by those intimately associated with him. The writer of the "Statement" should have been sure of his facts before rushing into print with such deplorable charges.

Elizabeth Archer was also closely associated with Freedom Group from 1914 until 1920, and joins me in protesting against the false charges contained in your unpardonable attack upon our comrade.

Truly yours,

MABEL B. HOPE.

ELIZABETH ARCHER.

*[The greater part of the cost of this issue of*

"Freedom Bulletin" has been guaranteed by these two comrades in order that we may reply in full and place the true facts before the Anarchist movement.]

10, Doughty Street, W.C.1.

May 29th, 1930.

The Editor, "Freedom" (New Series).

Sir,

I was rather intimately associated with "Freedom" some years before the war, being one of the two delegates (and spokesman in most embarrassed French) for the English movement at the Amsterdam Congress in 1907, and writer of the Report which was published in "Freedom" and later in pamphlet form; so may I be allowed to correct some errors relating to that period in the "Statement" in your May issue, which, uncorrected in your columns, must put you and your associates in a strange light?

Keell was a good deal more than "printer at 'Freedom' office" in those years; he was, to my own knowledge, and as Marsh avowed to me in 1908 and would be the first to declare to-day the pivot of all activities connected with it and the most devoted and reliable worker in the English movement. From the cessation of the "Voice of Labour" in 1907, until 1912, Marsh relied more and more upon Keell to edit the paper, and in the latter year got him to take full responsibility for it. Keell all this time had been responsible manager of the office and the paper, whoever had the name; in those years it was he who, more than any other man, "built up the movement and made the office possible." Then, you also do not seem to be aware, when we left him alone, he went

to prison, being apparently immune to the war fever which excused so many of us from accompanying him.

On the rest of the matters there will be plenty to put you right, for all who know Keell know that he has not changed in character or ambition, as unlike the avaricious creature you describe as man could be; so in consideration of your space I keep to my period, and my feelings to myself.

Yours truly,

KARL WALTER.

## TO OUR READERS.

We have been unable to publish the "Freedom Bulletin" with any regularity owing to lack of funds. If it is your desire that it should appear more regularly it is necessary that you should supply the cash. All the work of publication is done voluntarily and without expense, but printing, paper, postage, etc., cost money. Please send us whatever you can spare as quickly as possible. On your response to this appeal depends the future publication of the paper. Money orders, postal orders, and cheques should be made payable to Freedom Press, and crossed. Our only address is Whiteway Colony, Stroud, Glos.

## OUR GUARANTEE FUND.

The following donations have been received to date (November 29th) since the publication of our last issue:—T. K. Wolfe 7s. 8d., G. W. Tindale 3s. 6d., E. £1, H. A. Bertoli 2s., H. J. Stuart 4s., A. Platin 2s., G. Poul 2s. 6d., L. Organ 2s. 6d., G. S. 3s., M. B. Hope £2 2s., Mrs. J. Nielsen 10s.

## ANARCHISM.

Books and Pamphlets stocked by Freedom Press. A complete list will be sent on application.

\*Modern Science and Anarchism. By Peter Kropotkin. Paper covers, 6d.; postage 2d. (15 cents).

The Great French Revolution, 1789-1793. By Peter Kropotkin. 2 vols. Cloth, 5s.; postage 6d. (1 dol. 25c.)

The Conquest of Bread, By Peter Kropotkin. Cloth, 2s. 6d.; postage 3d. (60c.)

Mutual Aid. By Peter Kropotkin. Paper, 2s. net; postage 3d. (55c.)

Now and After: The ABC of Communist Anarchism. By Alexander Berkman. 6s.; postage 6d. (1 dol. 50c.)

\*General Idea of the Revolution in the Nineteenth Century. By P. J. Proudhon. Paper, 1s. (30c.) cloth, 3s. (1 dol.); postage 3d.

What is Property? By P. J. Proudhon. Cloth (1 vol.), 4s. 6d. (1 dol. 25c.); paper covers (in two vols.), 3s.; postage 5d. (85c.)

God and the State. By Michael Bakunin. (American Edition). Cloth, 3s. (80c.), Paper, 1s.; postage 2d. (30c.)

Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist. By Alexander Berkman. 10s. 6d.; postage 6d. (3 dol.)

Anarchism and Other Essays. By Emma Goldman. 6s. 6d.; postage 4d. (1 dol. 75c.)

The Letters of Sacco and Vanzetti (1920-1927). 7s. 6d.; postage 4d. (2 dols.)

\*Anarchist Communism: Its Basis and Principles. By Peter Kropotkin. 3d. (7c.)

\*The State: Its Historic Rôle. By Peter Kropotkin. 4d. (10c.)

\*The Wage System. By Peter Kropotkin. 2d. (5c.)

The Place of Anarchism in Socialistic Evolution. By Peter Kropotkin. 2d. (5c.)

Revolutionary Government. By Peter Kropotkin. 2d. (5c.)

Law and Authority. By Peter Kropotkin. 3d. (7c.)

An Appeal to the Young. By Peter Kropotkin. 2d.

\*Anarchy. By E. Malatesta. 3d. (7c.)

Evolution and Revolution. By Elisee Reclus. 2d.

\*Objections to Anarchism. By George Barrett. 2d.

\*The Anarchist Revolution. By George Barrett. 2d.

\*Anarchism versus Socialism. By Wm. C. Owen. 3d. (7c.)

\*England Monopolised or England Free? Wm. C. Owen. 1d. (3c.)

"Set My People Free!" By Wm. C. Owen. 2d.

Anarchism. By Emma Goldman. 2d. (5c.)

Postage extra—1d. for each 3 pamphlets.

\* Freedom Press Publications.

**FREEDOM PRESS, WHITEWAY COLONY, STROUD, GLOS.**

Printed by The Stepney Press for Freedom Press, Whiteway Colony, Stroud, Glos.