

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"In all ages hypocrites, called priests, have put crowns upon the heads of thieves, called kings."

—ROBERT INGERSOLL.

Vol. 14, No. 23

June 6th, 1953

Threepence

MICHAEL SCOTT DEPORTED

ON ORDERS OF THE GOVERNOR OF NYASALAND

ON the orders of the Governor of Nyasaland, acting apparently with the support of the Colonial Office, the Rev. Michael Scott was deported from Nyasaland on May 28, and sent by air to Britain.

FREEDOM has pointed out how widespread is the African opposition to the scheme for Central African Federation. Despite the fact that the Africans number six millions, the representatives of the few thousands of Europeans have with the active support of the Colonial Office pushed the scheme through the legislatures. The Africans are virtually without representation, and deputations of their leaders have been refused audience in London by the Colonial Secretary. It is difficult to see how they can continue their struggle against federation by legal means, but this recent deportation order shows that the supporters of federation are unwilling to permit even the legal right to protest and register opposition.

Michael Scott is well known as a champion of the rights of Africans, and was refused permission to re-enter the Union of South Africa by Dr. Malan's government last year, an action which aroused the indignation of many liberals in England. Now it seems that the Colonial Office is imitating Dr. Malan.

The Rev. Scott had spoken against Central African Federation at a meeting last month of the Nyasaland African Congress and there seems little doubt that the Nyasaland government and the Colonial Office are determined not to let this question be discussed by so able a white champion of African interests. The very same evening that Scott was deported the Colonial Office issued a statement:

"On May 12 Chief Gomani, a native authority on the Ncheu district of Nyasaland, issued a written notice inciting his people to civil disobedience in relation to agricultural laws and the non-payment of taxes. Gomani was invited to withdraw the written notice, which was illegal. He refused to do so and the Governor of Nyasaland suspended him as a native authority from May 19.

"When the suspension took place Gomani was out of his district and his son (Willard Gomani) attempted to arrange a public meeting in the district at which the Rev. Michael Scott and

leaders of the African Congress were to be present. Permission to hold the meeting was refused on the grounds that it would cause public disaffection.

"When Gomani returned to Ncheu on May 23, he was required to leave the district in the interests of public security, and in consequence of his refusal a deportation order was signed by the Governor. (In this context deportation means removal from one district to another in the same territory.)

"Meanwhile Gomani moved to another part of the district accompanied by the Rev. Michael Scott, and early on May 26 the police attempted to serve the deportation order on Gomani at Lilulu. The police were obstructed by a crowd which had assembled and tear smoke had to be used before Gomani could be removed to a waiting car. After the car had driven off, Gomani made an attack on the driver, which brought the car to a halt and the chief was removed from the car by some bystanders and subsequently fled with his sons Willard and Samson together with the Rev. Michael Scott into Portuguese territory."

It is clear from this official account (at the time of going to press, Scott's and Gomani's version of what happened is not available) that the authorities have acted on the letter of the law regardless of any spirit of justice. Progressive and moderate opinion in England has been shocked by this arbitrary deportation. The *Observer* (31/5/53) issued the following acid editorial comment:

"DEPORTATION WITHOUT TRIAL"

"The deportation of the Rev. Michael Scott from Nyasaland—which followed Southern Rhodesia's refusal to grant him a visitor's entry permit—shows the extravagant lengths to which the Colonial Office is prepared to go to defend its position on Central African Federation. Autocratic powers of banishment and deportation are being invoked, in the place of trial by law, in some British

colonies in Africa with increasing frequency.

"Although the Colonial Secretary told the House last October that action would be taken to encourage Colonial Governments to ensure that British subjects have the right to normal judicial processes before being deported, nothing has been done to implement this in Nyasaland and in certain other colonies. As the position now stands, Mr. Scott has no opportunity of clearing himself in a court of law of the strange-sounding allegations made against him by the Colonial Office. There is to-day no safeguard against a Governor using his autocratic powers to rid himself of political opponents.

"It is anomalous that if the authorities in Northern Rhodesia had wished to deport Mr. Scott from that territory, the matter would have come before a High Court judge. It is time that the practice of denying any person a fair opportunity to defend himself in a court of law should be ended in all territories for which we are still responsible. Meanwhile, it would be as well to suspend judgment on the facts leading to Mr. Scott's deportation, as well as that of Paramount Chief Gomani, until their own versions of what happened are available."

It is exactly this kind of brutal disregard of the opinion of subject Africans which preceded the resort to violence in Kenya. Liberal and progressive people are only too ready to forget this kind of governmental provocation when finally passive resistance and peaceful agitation are seen to be fruitless, and an exasperated and determined opposition begins to imitate the government's method of force, coercion and violence. When that happens the timid progressive is only too ready to denounce an opposition goaded beyond endurance, and forget the rights and—more especially—the wrongs of the dispute.

Sir Lincoln Evans Wins His Spurs (& £5,000 p.a.)

WHEN Lincoln Evans of the Trade Union Congress was awarded a Knighthood last January, the Bevanites loudly protested and *Tribune* carried a headline "Why the Sir, Lincoln?"

They maintained that it was rather strange that a Tory Government pledged to denationalise the steel industry should honour the leader of the Iron and Steel Trades Confederation, the steel-workers' union which had consistently supported nationalisation. *Tribune* wanted to know what Evans had done from a Tory point of view to earn his title.

We can now see, however, that the operation was actually being carried out as payment in advance, for now, nearly six months later, Sir Lincoln Evans is one of the three T.U.C. members offered jobs on the new Iron and Steel Board which is to control the steel industry on the denationalised plan.

The job he has collected is one of the permanent full-time appointments on the Board (that of vice-chairman) and as a little inducement to serve his country's interests, his salary will be £5,000 per annum.

So 1953 is turning out to be quite a good year for Lincoln Evans. First a Knighthood and then a job at £100 a week—and all he had to do was to go against the wishes of the members of the union which put him where he is (or was) and be prepared to join with steel owners in a Tory plan for running the steel industry for private profit.

Union Opposition

Not unexpectedly, Evans' action has provoked some criticism in union circles.

Not the knighthood part—the trade union movement has long since got used to its leaders becoming knights and even peers—but the new job has presented the movement with a new situation, so a protest, if only a token one, has to be made.

This is the first time that a nationalised industry has been de-nationalised, so it presents the first opportunity for a union leader to take up such a job. After a few more have followed in Sir Lincoln's footsteps it will cease to be news and so nobody will even comment upon it inside the trade union hierarchy.

When Walter Citrine got his knighthood, he was the first trade unionist to be so honoured and it caused a tremendous stir, but now such things are taken for granted and it's only outside the unions themselves that any strong comment is made.

At the moment there is a special reason for this. The Labour Party are desperately looking for a policy which will appear to be different from that of the Tories and the best they can think of is to propose more nationalisation. The unions, however, have become somewhat lukewarm on this issue and so do not feel very badly about de-nationalisation either.

Only the Rank-and-File

The leading attack on Evans' acceptance of his new job has come from Robert Willis, general secretary of the London Society of Compositors and representative on the General Council of the T.U.C. of the printers. Printing is

AMERICANS CHANGE THEIR MINDS

P.P.U. Secretary Released from Ellis Island

THE American authorities have on second thoughts decided to unconditionally release Stuart Morris, Secretary of the Peace Pledge Union, who has been held on Ellis Island for the past fortnight. Though he had been granted a visa by the American Consulate in London for a two months lecture tour sponsored by the American Quakers and the War Resisters League, this was not recognised by the immigration officials when he arrived at New York airport on May 15, and he was immediately taken to Ellis Island. Six days later at an Immigration Department hearing before Judge Mac, Stuart Morris was told that he would be excluded from the U.S.A. on the grounds that he (1) Regards his pacifism as superior to the law. (2) Is opposed to conscription and is ready to take any constitutional means to induce COs to refuse service in the armed forces. (3) Is critical of the policy of the US Government in regard to co-operation with the United Nations 'police action' in Korea; the crossing of the 38th Parallel and the advance to the Yalu River. (4) Believes the US should recognise the Peking Government. (5) Is opposed to US policy in Germany. (6) Had been a party to the violation of the British Official Secrets Act during the Second World War.

"I have every reason," said Judge Mac, "to believe that the applicant is seeking to enter the US incidentally to engage in activities prejudicial to the interests and well being of the US.

"His lectures are for the purpose of inducing a further and enlarged objection to military service in the US armed forces. I don't consider that the purposes of the application are bona fide."

Later Stuart Morris was offered parole

The London publication, *East Europe*, has issued figures based on studies of incomes in the Soviet Union, which indicate that there are in the U.S.S.R. 780 millionaires—artists, inventors and scientists whose fortunes each total more than a million roubles. *East Europe* figures a rouble as about equal to 1/9d. (25 U.S. cents).

a trade highly unlikely to become nationalised, so Willis can be both political and principled about it without ever having to deal with nationalisation himself.

However, it is only among the rank-and-file that any real disappointment with Evans' action will be felt, and nobody takes much notice of them, after all. The workers still seem to have some naive ideas about their leaders being there to look after their interests and to serve causes in a principled manner, but the leaders themselves are much more realistic.

That is why, at the meeting of the General Council where Willis made his

Continued on p. 4

on conditions that he did not carry out his lecture tour! Mr. Morris replied in a statement which was published in a number of American journals and which is as reasonable as the authorities attitude is hysterical:

"I am grateful for the offer to parole. I cannot accept the condition that I should not lecture or engage in any public activities pending my appeal. That would seem to me to acquiesce in the decision of the Special Inquiry Officer, which I cannot do.

"I came to the United States in perfectly good faith and on a perfectly legitimate mission, for the pacifist has a moral right to be heard anywhere in the free world. I know of no reason why I should be excluded from the United States and debarred, whether by my own voluntary act in accepting conditions or by actual exclusion from lecturing on subjects chosen for me by Americans whose integrity and record of service to the community is beyond doubt.

"If, in the climate created by Senator McCarthy, the McCarran Act is to be used to prevent a British pacifist from proclaiming his conscientious convictions and where necessary criticising American policy (as also the policy of his own and other governments) in a friendly and constructive manner, the question ceases to be only a personal one and becomes a matter of principle.

"The inconvenience of further detention on Ellis Island is nothing compared with the value of emphasising the principle involved by refusal to accept voluntarily any conditions that I should not lecture in the United States as I have already done not only in Britain but in several other countries in the free world."

Just a fortnight after his detention the Board of Immigration Appeals overruled the New York immigration authorities and ordered that Stuart Morris be released immediately on a temporary visitor's visa. The decision was announced with approval by the Department of Justice which added this comment:

"The Board of Appeals noted that neither Mr. Morris nor the organisation to which he belongs urges resistance to conscription or illegal avoidance of conscription, and that he does not attempt to seduce troops from their allegiance, as he recognises the right of anyone to serve in the armed services just as he respects the rights of those who on conscientious grounds do not wish to serve. There is no reason to believe that he will engage in activities prejudicial to the public interest."

From which one can conclude—if one compares it with the original six points for excluding Stuart Morris—that either Judge Mac and the Immigration Department are so incompetent that they ought to be sacked . . . or else it has been thought expedient by the Government to overrule them. A certain loss of prestige for the Immigration Dept. was a small price to pay compared with the propaganda value to the Communists and others of the exclusion of a genuine pacifist who could hardly be accused of trying to overthrow the American government by violence!

MANKIND IS ONE

SOUTHEND justices granted bail to coloured ex-boxer Larry Gains in his own surety of £50 pending his appeal against a three-month prison sentence for stealing £222 12s. 5d. from the Shoeburyness British Legion Club, where he was steward.

Solicitor Mr. Ivor Myers said he had been instructed by Gains' former manager Mr. Harry Levine, "and other well-known sporting men in London who are conscious of Gains' past record and reputation both in and out of the ring, his war service and services to charity."

Mr. Myers said notice of appeal had been given and added "Notwithstanding the result of this case Mr. Levine and his associates have undertaken to refund to the British Legion every penny they have lost."

In the newspaper in which the above appeared is also a photograph of a smiling African girl, the caption to which reads: "She won two out of three major prizes at the annual prizegiving of St. Leonards Hospital, Shoreditch. Less than five feet tall, she is Nurse Modupe Ebu Oluwa ("Thankful Gift of God") Scott, from Nigeria."

And finally, last Thursday it was announced that Miss Peggy Cripps, daughter of the late Sir Stafford Cripps, was to be married to Mr. Appiah who comes from the Gold Coast. The couple after their marriage (which is approved by their respective families) will settle on the Gold Coast.

[See Editorial Black and White, p.3]

6000 TONS OF POTATOES DUMPED

The 300,000-bushel surplus nightmare of 20 Lond Island potato growers showed little signs of abating to-day in spite of long lines of trucks hauling the potatoes to non-profit institutions to which they were offered gratis.

Yesterday trucks came from as far away as Ambler, Pa., more than 230 miles each way, to grab at the offer made by the farmers' group at Amagansett, L.I.

But their combined efforts only removed some 120,000 pounds, or less than 3,000 bushels.

The Suffolk County group warn that the deadline for free potatoes ends tomorrow, after which the tubers will have to be dumped at sea or they will rot too quickly to handle.

The Amagansett growers were caught with the surplus after reading an alleged typographical error in a Dept of Agriculture bulletin last year. They claimed the farmer's guide underestimated potato plantings by nearly 800,000 acres.

On the basis of that information, they stored last year's crops in the hopes of getting a better price for them this Spring.

(N.Y. Journal—American, 6/5/53)

THE difficulties, within the present economic and social system, of creating new and rationally designed towns as part of a planned decentralisation—which were examined so intelligently by Harold Orlans in his recent study of the Stevenage project (*Stevenage*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 30/-), are made the subject of Mervyn Jones' novel, *The New Town*, Cape, 15/-. The hero of this book, Harry Peterson, is a Welsh schoolmaster who, having gone through difficult times before the war, does well in the army and, finishing up as a staff colonel, is put in charge of the construction of a new town on the Essex coast.

From the beginning he is involved in frustration, partly personal owing to an unwise marriage, but mostly brought about by the manifold difficulties which he encounters in trying to combat the conservative "natives" of the district where he works and in attempting to gain materials in the constricted and regulation-ridden post-war setup. Schedules fall far behind, plans are cut and trimmed through these negative pressures from outside, and the yellow press joins in the hunt against Peterson and his associates. Finally, as a result of the rearmament programme, the authorities decide that the original decentralist intentions of the new town are to be dropped, and that instead it is to become merely a residential appendage to an American-owned oil refinery. Peterson resigns in protest and begins a campaign against this setting aside of constructive plans for destructive purposes; the book ends with a losing fight which Peterson

NEW NOVELS

makes as an independent parliamentary candidate pledged to support the New Town.

While in detail one might be inclined to agree with the attitude which emerges from *The New Town*, in general it is a sympathetic book, ranging itself on the side of a philosophy in which the positive aspects of life take precedence over negation and death. The hero seeks, however inept his actions at times may seem, to create a background in which working people can live fuller and more happy lives.

So much for *The New Town* considered as a "novel with a message". The level of its writing is varied, dropping at times into cliché, at other times pleasing for the apt originality of its images. For instance, a disgusted, houseless Londoner throws a piece of brick into a static water tank. "The scum shivered at the disturbance, then slowly re-arranged itself, like a roomful of officials settling themselves at their desks after pigeon-holing an application." The characterisation is a little wooden; the central personal triangle of Peterson, his wife, and his secretary remind one, to its own detriment, of the similar triangle of bitch wife, worthy suffering man and understanding honest girl which Ford portrayed so much more masterly in the *Tietgens* tetralogy. The minor characters, like the cockney worker Stiver, have often a great deal more life and convincingness than the leading figures. Yet in general, taking into account its manifest weak-

nesses, *The New Town* is a readable and reasonably good example of that tendency to realism in a minor key which is one of the current modes of the English novel.

Another of these fashionable fictional modes is that of studied whimsicality, which is followed by E. P. B. Linstead's *Awkward for Joseph* (Bodley Head, 12/6). This is a wartime novel, but not exactly a "war novel" so much as a novel of military life. It tells of the somewhat frivolous incidents which befell an unenthusiastic soldier who found himself shunted to a salvage depot for old boots and bottles in the neighbourhood of Maidenhead. The blurb tells us that Joseph "is probably a modern descendent of The Good Soldier Schweik"; there is little, however, in common between the strong and obvious humour of *The Good Soldier Schweik* and the (at times) rather thin whimsicality of *Awkward for Joseph*. The army is, indeed, guyed—in a very soft-pawed way, but Mr. Linstead's most effective work is in representing the Maidenhead snobs with whom Joseph and his single fellow-soldier become involved. It would be straining too far to try and suggest that *Awkward for Joseph* is an effective anti-military novel, for the army as an active element is almost non-existent, but as a study in the manners and mannerisms of the English middle class it is most of the time amusing. Those who take their satire strong should read elsewhere.

GEORGE WOODCOCK.

The Almighty's Dilemma: Glut

The Glasgow Daily Record of May 15, 1953, furnishes the following report from Washington:

"The U.S. Government is trying to get rid of millions of pounds of surplus butter, cheese and dried milk worth more than a thousand million dollars (about £35M.) which nobody wants to buy. It has been dumped in the Government's lap through the price support programme which compels the Agricultural Department to buy up all excess farm production to keep it off the market and thus assure farmers of continued high domestic prices. The Government wants to give away what it cannot sell, to prevent the food from rotting in storage. Huge quantities have piled up and millions more pounds are coming in each day. Government spokesmen blame the unusually suitable grazing weather for the over-production of dairy products. Unless there is a severe drought to create a shortage the Government will have to continue buying up these products until July, when output slackens . . . About 90 million pounds of dried milk are being offered free to welfare agencies in Europe, N. Africa and the Middle and Far East. Recipients must pay transport costs.

"There is enough butter in store to supply every family in the U.S. for six weeks.

"Honey is offered at the bargain rate of 12 cents (11d.) a pound. Olive oil, which costs up to 5 dollars (about 35/-)

a gallon in shops is available at little more than half price."

19 years ago *Forward* carried this:

"The gods themselves must be baffled when considering just what is best for the Capitalist system. Take the U.S. for instance. For years nature was bountiful. Cattle and hogs multiplied, and wheat grew so that granaries were bursting. That was bad for Capitalism, and so, to maintain prices the Government ordered the slaughter of hogs and cattle, and the restriction of wheat production. The gods—desirous of giving a helpful hand, we must assume—have now sent a severe drought and tremendous heat, so that the cattle are perishing and crops being burnt up. Whereupon the U.S. Government is now stepping in to counteract the effect of the drought. 'What in heaven's name do these amazing humans really want?' ask the despairing gods."

In the year previous, the *Sunday Referee* informed us that in Cyprus the starving peasants were reduced to a diet of grass, roots, and wood.

A Glasgow press item, May 13, in this year of disgrace 1953, tells the plight of an old man who dropped unconscious in Maryhill and was dashed to hospital. He was suffering from acute STARVATION. The capital letters of that final word is the paper's own emphasis.

"If there be one sin against the Holy Ghost for which there can be no forgiveness it is the sin of starving people amidst plenty."—Keir Hardie.

And "Yaffle", 23 years ago, dealing with a "catastrophic glut" at that period obliged, in his inimitable style, with:

"GOD'S REPLY—

Your prayer to hand,
I note that though
You praise me for the flowers that grow,
The bees that buzz, the trees that stand—
In short, the beauty of the land—
You blame me for the lack of food;
This seems to me a trifle crude.
A glance at your supply of wheat
Suggests more bread than you can eat.

A fact I hoped would please you, but
Your business men complain of 'glut',
While as for butter—I note how
The progeny of Eden's Cow
Is multiplying at a rate
Beyond my planned initial estimate.
In short, I see on every hand
Supplies exceeding all demand,
And if men starve—I'm not the cause;
But man's quaint economic laws."

We are not here passing the buck to America. Capitalism in its own interests operates as and when the occasion demands, in a similar fashion everywhere. Abundance to it spells disaster. Blight, chaos and war are the necessary accompaniments to its continued existence.

How long will the human race suffer and endure its ghastly, pestilential inflections?

H. T. DERRETT.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS

New Books . . .

Sex Beliefs and Customs
(Foreword by Norman Haire)
Albert Ellis 18/-
Introduction to Malthus
(based on 3rd Programme talks)
D. V. Glass (Ed.) 10/6
William Godwin David Fleischer 12/6
Gold Coast Revolution
George Padmore 12/6

Second-Hand Books . . .

Creative Demobilization
A. E. Gutkind 5/-
The True Believer Eric Hoffer 5/-
Diagnosis of Our Time
Karl Mannheim 3/-
Beards Reginald Reynolds 6/-
British Pamphleteers
(Ed.) Reynolds & Orwell 10/-
Paths in Utopia Martin Buber 7/6

Pamphlets . . .

The Spanish Church and Politics
John Langdon Davies 1d.
The Crown and the Cash
Emrys Hughes 6d.

Publications . . .

Libertarian No. 4 3d.
Perspectives No. 3 2/6
Prometheus 6d.

Kindly Note: Postage extra in all cases.

Obtainable from

27, RED LION STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1

Controversy:

I WAS rather surprised that Edwin Peake (*FREEDOM*, May 23) should choose the logical positivist's standpoint to criticize my article on "Mysticism and Anarchism" for, although logical positivism is still the fashion in some universities, its inanities and contradictions have been pointed out by Professor Joad in "A critique of logical positivism" and by Maurice Cornforth in "Defence of philosophy", the first a rather boring and the second a damnable book, but both instructive in different ways.

However outdated I may sound I am for metaphysics, simply because thought is metaphysical, and 'discoverable reference' does not exhaust reality. Edwin Peake's thought is a metaphysical entity, and a 'discoverable reference' only to himself. I, or any other person, can only refer to his writings or to his words, and never to the thought from which presumably they originated. The whole of science, besides, as E. F. Galdin states in his "Power and limitations of science" is based on the metaphysical assumption of cause and effect, and scientific statements cannot be put forward as the opposite and negation of metaphysical thought.

As for Ogden and Richards' memorable phrase a few remarks are necessary, the first of which being that it hardly makes sense. "Spurious entities" are not genuine entities, and entities that are not genuine are not entities at all, and it is

Spiritual Forces

impossible to conceive how the universe could be peopled by them. If however the designata of the expression 'spurious entities' are such symbols as 'God', 'soul' and 'spiritual forces', there is no reason why we should not add to their family 'logic', 'positivism', every term in logical positivist philosophy, any abstract noun in the dictionary, and indeed every word insofar as every word is a symbol. The principle of sufficient reason, on the other hand, should tell us that if the universe was peopled with 'spurious entities', and that in every century and society, there must have been a need for so doing, various needs in fact and some of them vital, not the least of which was the need to understand. The words and other symbols by which we now explain the universe will probably be considered 'spurious entities' in a few centuries' time, and I doubt whether we are more satisfied with our scientific interpretation of the universe than were the so-called primitive peoples with their mythology, which Max Muller, a forerunner of the logical positivist's short-sightedness, defined as a disease of language. I even believe that the universe of such peoples was more pleasantly populated with spirits and gods than our own with atoms and atom bombs. The words 'God', 'soul', and 'spiritual forces', moreover, have a designatum, although, obviously, not impersonally verifiable. A

statement containing such words as perfectly understandable to a person with an experience of the same kind as the one the person making the statement wished to communicate or clarify. 'Hunger' is not objectively verifiable although its symptoms and consequences, may be; the word 'hunger' has no discoverable or even undiscoverable reference for the person who has never experienced what the word 'hunger' designates. Yet the logical positivist, if he be such a person, would not hesitate to make or accept statements about hunger, and that shows the congenital weakness of logical positivism, consisting in assuming that 'meaning' is merely verbal, conceptual and conventional, with no reference to any kind of strictly personal or vital experience.

Words with their reference to personal experience can enter into statements with pluripersonal application on the empirical and pistological assumption that different persons may have similar experiences and can connect them with the same symbols. The paucity and fixity of such symbols may be used to refer to dissimilar experiences, and misunderstanding may follow, especially if there is no desire to understand, but it is a risk to be taken. Those who wish to understand can in most cases, with a little patience, a little effort, and a little

Continued on p. 3

(continued from our last issue)

It is particularly dangerous to isolate a specific primitive people, whose way of life happens to be stable and free, and draw the conclusion that they owe their felicity to certain cultural or psychological patterns, which, if duplicated elsewhere, would produce similar results. For example, the free sexual behaviour of the children and adolescents in the Trobriand Islands is sometimes cited as the reason why these people have such a well-integrated and non-authoritarian culture, and the conclusion is drawn that if only this society would adopt the Trobriand Island pattern of sex education it would rapidly get rid of its social tensions and authoritarian behaviour patterns, and become as free and harmonious as theirs. One has only to examine the culture of the inhabitants of the neighbouring island of Dobu, to discover that this theory is rather drastically oversimplified. The Dobuans have the identical sexual institutions as the Trobrianders, but in every other respect their culture is dissimilar, being thoroughly unharmonious and vicious. The Dobuans, in fact, virtually alone among Pacific Islanders, found life on the slave-labour plantations of the white imperialists so much more satisfactory than their own 'natural' way, that they never made any effort to escape.

Even those primitives whose social institutions were completely free and harmonious were not impervious to corruption and eventual destruction when confronted with a new situation for which they were psychologically unprepared. The Eskimos, for example, whose way of life might well serve as a model for a libertarian society, and whose adjustment to the physical environment was so nearly perfect that white explorers who visited their region largely adopted Eskimo techniques as superior to anything in their own heritage, proved, in most instances, incapable of resisting the attractions of western materialism when it was introduced to them by the fur traders, and permitted themselves to be enslaved and their culture largely destroyed before they realized

their mistake. Superficially, it might appear that their old way of life must have been inferior to that offered them by the traders or else they would not have abandoned it, but a closer examination of the situation reveals that they were rather the victims of a monstrous fraud, which they lacked the sophistication to penetrate in advance. The Eskimos believed—and were encouraged in their belief by the fur traders—that they could take only what was good from the whites, and retain their own institutions and values (in a few places, in fact, they have actually succeeded in doing this) but for the most part they got themselves so deeply involved in obligations to the trading post—obligations which they could not fully understand because of their very elementary knowledge of arithmetic, but which the deep sense of social responsibility which is part of their cultural tradition would not let them repudiate—that they found it impossible to continue their old life of hunting and fishing, which provided them with adequate food and clothing, but not with the 'valuable' furs which the white men demanded in return for their commodities. They had therefore to become trappers of luxury furs—which unfortunately belong to species which are of little value for food—and thus become dependent on the trading post not only for the few articles like needles and rifles which they could not produce for themselves and which did greatly improve their ability to cope with the environment, but for sustenance as well. Similar examples could be cited from virtually all of the areas where primitive man has come in contact with western commercial civilization.

An intelligent libertarian can learn a great deal about socially harmonious free institutions from the more or less accidental creations in this field that primitive peoples have achieved, but it cannot afford to make the mistake of assum-

ing that the primitive, unconscious quality of these institutions is worthy of imitation, as many of the back-to-nature philosophers frequently maintain. The fact that these societies have proven to be so easily corruptible under the impact of the material temptations of western imperialism indicates that 'nature' alone is insufficient to guarantee that healthy institutions will survive, and that an element of self-consciousness and sophistication is essential to prevent them from being undermined and eventually destroyed by superficially attractive alternatives. The savage, like the wild animal, to a large extent lacks the ability to evaluate the results of adopting a new course of action. He can be induced to commit himself to obligations whose full consequences he cannot possibly understand, if the bait is sufficiently alluring. Societies that remained free and healthy only as long as they were not tempted by unscrupulous traders and slavers, or by well-meaning but short-sighted missionaries, are not a satisfactory model for building a new social system, unless care is taken to avoid the defects in understanding which brought about their destruction.

It is the chief characteristic of true social maturity that the probable consequences of a course of action are examined and that one steers clear of actions which are likely to have undesirable consequences. We have undoubtedly a long way to go before we can say with complete assurance exactly what course of action will prove most satisfactory in all respects, but we would be foolish in the extreme if we should turn our backs on the lessons already learned, and, by raising spontaneity and unconscious choice to a principle, attempt to change society without making full use of the critical faculty and empirical observation. The values of an intuitive and instinctual way of life cannot outweigh the disadvantages that too much reliance on the instincts makes it impossible

THE ENVIRONMENT OF

BLACK & WHITE

THE ravages of the Colour Bar in the western world are in general so appalling that it is easy to gain the impression that its origins are very deep-rooted indeed and will require a very great advance of progress before they are overcome. Since our gaze on this matter is mainly directed to the United States or the Union of South Africa or Kenya or, in past days, to India, it is not surprising that our feelings are of despair for in these countries the Colour prejudice is very serious indeed. Fortunately the world is not comprised of these countries and a more cheerful state of affairs does exist elsewhere.

The eminence which coloured people have reached in athletics and boxing has been relatively untouched in Great Britain at all events by colour prejudice and men like Joe Louis, Randolph Turpin or Macdonald Bailey enjoy a warm popularity. When the coloured athlete, Jesse Owens, won many of the events for America in the Olympic Games in Berlin in 1936, Hitler refused to shake hands with him, and popular reaction in this country was outraged at the discourtesy. Even the exceptions prove the same rule as when the West Indian cricketer, Leary Constantine was refused admission by certain West End hotels: for again the outcry against this manifestation of colour bar was intense and immediate, Constantine's popularity being only too apparent.

It was the same during the war, when American coloured troops were made very welcome by local populations who did not hesitate to show their dislike of the segregation attitude of the U.S. Army authorities.

Of course it would be quite untrue to say that colour prejudice does not exist in Britain. But the instances of it have been mainly exhibited by magistrates, or hotel keepers or others associated with the moneyed classes. The colour prejudice which seems to afflict the working class in America or the whole white community in South Africa is not found as a general manifestation here.

Some recent happenings confirm this happier picture. The solidarity which his white friends have shown

to the boxer Larry Gains has shown in what esteem he is held personally and how ready they are to come forward on his behalf when he is in trouble. Then there is the coloured nurse, Miss Scott, at St. Leonard's Hospital, Shoreditch, who won two out of the three major annual prizes for nurses this year.

The tortuous and unfair attitude of the British government in the case of Seretse Khama and his white wife, Ruth, must have done much to discredit colour prejudice. Now a new blow has been struck by the daughter of Sir Stafford Cripps whose forthcoming marriage to a West African has recently been announced. Miss Cripps' fiancé told the Press that there is no colour bar in West Africa and that many thousands of mixed marriages have taken place there.

These are encouraging aspects of a very cruel and dispiriting picture. Such instances do not mean that colour prejudice is not a terrible problem in many parts of the world. But they do tend to show that such prejudice is not a national reaction in relations between people of different skin colour. Looked at over a long period, the history of India also contains encouraging aspects.

In the eighteenth century and earlier the white trading companies assuredly plundered Indian wealth. But they did not regard Indians as inferior people, there was none of the *herrenvolk* attitude of which the Nazis did not by any means possess a monopoly. William Hickey, for example, in the eighteenth century lived openly in Calcutta with an Indian girl, had children by her and entered society with her—a procedure which seems to have been regarded as perfectly natural by his friends. It was only during the nineteenth century that the situation epitomized by E. M. Forster, in *A Passage to India* became general. Now that the Indians have gained formal independence it seems likely that their "inferior" status is disappearing also and the ugly business of colour prejudice will once more disappear into the past.

It is true that psychological questions rather deeper than mere prejudice enter into the colour problem, and it certainly appears to flourish most where the white population is influenced by a calvanistic puritan fear of sex. But it does seem also that fear of the coloured population is required before the neurotic mass anxiety of the whites fastens on them as objects of fear-hatred. Colour prejudice flourishes most where whites have treated the

Casals Heads Spanish Refugee Appeal

Pablo Casals, world-famous cellist and General Lazaro Cardenas, former President of Mexico, have agreed to serve as honorary co-chairmen of Spanish Refugee Aid, Inc., a new committee that has been formed to relieve distress among the 160,000 Spanish Republican exiles in France.

James T. Farrell, the novelist, is chairman of Spanish Refugee Aid, whose sponsors include Alfred H. Barr, Jr., Albert Camus, Hodding Carter, Dorothy Day, Mrs. John Dewey, Waldo Frank, Harold Gibbons, the Rev. Donald Harrington, James Lieb, Jr., A. J. Muste, Louis Nelson, Reinhold Niebuhr, Mrs. George Orwell, A. Philip Randolph,

Herbert Read, Michael Ross, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., George N. Shuster, Norman Thomas, George Woodcock and Charles Zimmerman. The committee's offices are at 45 Astor Place, New York City.

"A few of my American and European friends have joined together to form Spanish Refugee Aid," stated Mr. Casals in a letter from Prades, France, where he is organizing the Fourth Prades Music Festival. "The veterans of the Spanish Civil War, in exile since 1939, are forgotten casualties of the first war against fascism. Many of them are in hospitals, ill with diseases caused by the miserable conditions under which they live. Thousands are destitute, in need of food, clothing, medical care and, not the least, of moral encouragement. Americans cannot honorably continue to ignore their debt to these people."

Spanish Refugee Aid, according to its executive secretary, Nancy Macdonald, expects to raise a minimum of \$50,000 this year. Almost ninety per cent. of this will go direct for relief, all administrative expenses—including office help, rent and mailing—coming to only eleven per cent. of the total budget. "Many people have the mistaken idea that the Spanish Republican exiles are pro-communist," observed Mrs. Macdonald. "The fact is that at least ninety per cent. of them are strong anti-communists, with vivid memories of communist treachery and terror during the Civil War. The tiny pro-communist minority is well cared for by the world communist movement, but the great non-communist majority has in the past few years been shamefully neglected by the free world. We have set up Spanish Refugee Aid to help this majority."

American Comics In Sweden

STOCKHOLM (WP).—Anxiety over an influx of American comic books is stirring many Swedish cultural and peace groups. The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, at its last Swedish-branch convention, adopted a resolution calling for a campaign against the worst ones, and an effort to find means of promoting the reading of good literature by children. It is estimated that Sweden buys \$5,000,000 worth of cartoon books from the U.S. annually.

SANTIAGO (WP).—President Ibañez of Chile recently stated in a public address that there are now about a million illiterates in the country, out of a population totalling a bit over six millions.

coloured man worst, for example, in South Africa or in the America founded on slaves. The same process seems to be occurring before our eyes in Kenya and in the territories affected by the scheme for Central European Federation. The lesson is a simple one too obvious, on the face of it, to need stating: it is that injustice, cruelty and brutality breed resentment in those who receive them and a need to justify themselves by *herrenvolk* ideas of a "master race" in those who commit them. Conversely, harmony is to be achieved by mutual respect and kindness together with a regard for equity. These are simple observations, some would say naïve; but the world stand in as much need of them to-day as at any time.

Spiritual Forces Continued from p. 2

sympathy, understand what another person means however loose, incorrect, and illogical the statements in which the meaning is couched.

In speaking of 'spiritual forces' I did not hypostatise an abstraction, but I simply gave a name to the hypostasis manifesting its presence through a particular class of phenomena groupable under the heading of an abstraction. Hypostasis is what lies under the phenomenon, and although anyone except a mystic will agree that it cannot be an object of knowledge, of volition or action, testifies to its reality as does that mental operation which leads to believe that a thing exists independent of anyone knowing that the thing exists. It is not merely a coincidence that the Greek word hypostasis was sometimes translated into Latin by the word 'persona', and that the war waged against hypostasis in the modern world has led to the contempt of all personal values and to the treatment of persons as objects.

By 'spiritual forces' I mean personal forces, forces operating from and within the individual, while 'psychological forces' can be collective and be manipulated from outside the individual, usually to the disruption or paralysis of the intellectual virtues which Dean Inge listed in his book on Plotinus, and so are all moral and in many cases even physical virtues. The inclusion of the latter is wilful, meant to make clear that the present writer does not oppose spirit to matter or soul to body, but recognizes each pair depending on and inseparable within the same hypostasis.

If, finally, an empirical criterion is wanted, and leaving speculation we turn

to men and their actions, we shall observe the presence of a spiritual force wherever there is a resistance or a refusal of the person to be turned into or be used as an instrument. Spirituality is the autonomy of the individual and the free choice of his ends and modes of behaviour as a social and a universal being. It is the opposite of instrumentality, and in its ability to oppose coercive and psychological forces acting within and against society it is itself a social force. My choice of words and abstractions in making these statements can be taken of course, as merely an excretion or a reflection of what goes on inside my skull, but I didn't invent the words or the abstractions nor the phenomena I try to interpret by means of these words and abstractions. A scientist working out a set of formulas is very much in the same position and if my statements are wrong so are many formulas that scientists work out before they hit on the correct one. Speaking of spiritual forces I do not more hypostatise abstractions than does a scientist speaking of temperature and pressure or of space and time. The only difference is that temperature and pressure can be measured while spiritual forces cannot, but there again the argument can be pushed forward and we can say that the scientist hypostatizes his measurements. If ever a universe was peopled by spurious entities it is a universe peopled with measurements, a universe where man is the measure of everything only in the sense that he is no longer a person but a thing to be measured in all sorts of ways and for all sorts of purposes.

23rd May, 1953. GIOVANNI BALDELLI

FREEDOM—2

to function on a high enough level of awareness to be able to guard against corrupting influences.

IV

To both the economic determinists and the naturalists, freedom is something of an afterthought, an additional benefit of the proper environmental conditions, which however, are chiefly desirable for other reasons. To the former, freedom is one of the end-products of an economy which provides leisure and material abundance for all; it consists primarily of the ability to engage in cultural activities, and while the importance of such activities is frequently stressed, they are considered distinctly secondary to material well-being. To the latter, freedom results from living a life close to nature and in accordance with basic instinctual drives; it consists essentially of the ability to resist domination by external authority, which is obviously of very great importance, but only as a means of preserving the good society from destruction; the paramount values of this society are contentment and emotional stability.

Both of these definitions of freedom are incomplete, and somewhat patronizing. They both suggest that man is chiefly an animal, whose appetites—for either material possessions or instinctual gratification—take precedence over everything else. Moreover, both of them are too preoccupied with the satisfaction of these appetites to be able to provide an adequate basis for any kind of freedom. Leisure, and at least enough material security to prevent anxiety about the satisfaction of elementary physical needs, are undoubtedly primary prerequisites for freedom, but both of them can very well exist in a thoroughly regimented society—they are not infrequently to be found in prison, for example. Likewise, the satisfaction of instinctual drives—at least to the

extent required to prevent the individual from succumbing to neurotic compulsions to dominate others or submit to domination—cannot be ignored in any serious consideration of the conditions for freedom, but it also is no guarantee of freedom. For too many primitive peoples who possessed, to the highest possible degree, the gratification of their instinctual needs have been enslaved and their societies destroyed by the temptations and lures of western imperialism (quite apart from those who perished as a result of physical attack) to permit an objective observer to retain much confidence in the ability of instinctually satisfied but naïve people to remain free under pressure.

A truly free society must, of course, satisfy the animal needs of man, both material and psycho-physiological, but it must do much more than this. Starting from the assumption that freedom is itself a fundamental human need—a need that can be denied for considerable intervals to most individuals, but not without seriously damaging their personality—it must cultivate an outlook that values freedom for itself, as a specifically human quality. Animals in the wild state seem to possess in some measure the urge to be free, but once domesticated, they almost invariably become well adjusted to captivity, and after a few generations—provided their appetites for food, sex and companionship are taken care of—are able to put up with conditions of enslavement that are almost completely unnatural—witness the cows in a modern model dairy, for instance—without suffering or rebelling. Man, however, perhaps as the result of his more complex nervous system, cannot adjust so perfectly to enslavement: he can ultimately become outwardly apathetic and resigned, but the wish for eventual freedom seldom dies out altogether, and may manifest itself suddenly and violently even in life-term convicts and individuals who possess the greatest amount of the qualities which differentiate man most sharply from the other animals—creative ability and intellectual curiosity—are also those who have the strongest desire

for freedom, and are frequently willing to endure great physical hardships and instinctual deprivations in order to attain it.

It follows therefore that a society which is sincerely interested in extending and preserving freedom, both in order to protect itself from being destroyed or corrupted by external forces, and because it recognizes the human importance of the urge itself, should place the highest value on the cultivation of the intellect, encouraging learning, the development of the critical faculty, and creative activity on the part of everyone from earliest childhood. This does not mean that the extension of formal education is of any particular value: on the contrary, the type of schooling in punctuality and obedience that is the main feature of most formal education is the direct antithesis of what is needed for freedom. We need a new kind of education, without regular classes or hours of study, which permits the student to learn things for himself by participating in various activities, and which emphasizes the rôle of art, and creative speculation, as basic factors in the development of a free personality. The creative impulses of small children, instead of being deadened by routine school-work, or rendered passive by the present-day emphasis on art 'appreciation' rather than actual creation of art by the majority of people, should be strengthened, whenever possible, by providing children with the facilities for creation and an atmosphere free from direct or indirect coercion. To-day only those children whose creative impulse is especially strong—the reason for which is still to be determined—manage to remain creative after they reach maturity, and thereby retain some capacity for free living. The libertarian goal is to permit everyone to develop to the point that only these few individuals attain in existing society.

HOLLEY CANTINE.

Anarchism and Industry-1

ONE of the arguments that are often levelled at the Anarchists is that their ideas are unworkable in a modern industrial society, where administration has to be centralised in order to be efficient.

Recent experiences of nationalisation, however, have done something to dispel the myth of the efficiency of centralisation. In practice the establishment of a centralised administration is shown to necessitate an unwieldy and costly army of bureaucrats, while the remote control operated by the central authority tends to slow up and make less efficient the actual administration of the work.

The only way in which a nationalised industry has shown itself to be able to operate better than one in private hands has been in the matter of capitalising the industry. The vast resources of a nationwide, 100 per cent. monopoly, able to draw on loans from the Treasury, have been able to re-equip industry which has been allowed to deteriorate under private hands.

But even in this centralisation has failed to make the best of the tremendous opportunities. There was recently disclosed, for example, a case where the National Coal Board had sent a particular piece of mining machinery to a pit where the working conditions made it quite unusable. But this machine, worth a couple of thousand pounds, was lying idle in this pit for six months, the Board blissfully unaware of its waste.

In this particular case the miners finally protested to the Coal Board and pointed out that in future it would be better if they were consulted upon the installation of new machinery. "After

all," they said, "miners might be taken to know something about mining."

Similarly, Welsh railwaymen protested last year about the waste and gross inefficiency in the running of the Western Region of British Railways. They demanded effective control be taken out of the authority's central offices in London and re-established in their own region.

The Capitalists Did It

It has always been the advocates of State control who have built up the idea of the efficiency of centralisation and it should be remembered that it is of only recent development in this country. Previous to 1939 all the economy of this country was in the hands of capitalists who carried on their business, except for those in monopolies, in competition with each other. And they seemed to be able to arrange import-export trade and build up world-wide organisations for buying and selling without a centralised authority to control them.

And the weakness of free enterprise capitalism; its dependence upon market conditions beyond its control; being subject to the fluctuations of commodity prices and so forth, are precisely the features that are unaffected by nationalisation. Unless the whole of a nation's economy comes under State control, as is the case in the totalitarian States, nationalised industry can no more stabilise a country's economy than can free enterprise industry and in any case it remains simply capitalist industry dominated by a bureaucracy instead of by an owning class.

Even for the workers the claims of nationalisation to be "better" than free enterprise are shown to be exaggerated. Many workers really thought that State control was a step in the direction of workers' control, but apart from organised consultation committees, on which union officials are represented, the workers have no more say under the State than they do under private bosses.

In the daily Press, union representation on the joint consultation committees is usually referred to as "the workers' side". We read of "the workers agreeing to" this, that or the other. But in fact, of course, it is not the workers at all, it is the trade union which has made

agreements with the employees—and in nationalised industries the unions merge with the Executive so that you cannot tell the difference.

Ex-Union Officials' Function

On every nationalised Board there is a certain proportion of ex-trade union membership, lifted from the top ranks of the union concerned, where they have already been reactionary enough, and the process is completed when they are finally bought off by the inflated salaries—anything up to a £100 a week—offered them by the Board.

But this does not work in the interests of the workers. Just the opposite in fact. The ex-union officials on the Boards are a "buffer" between the employers and the trade union representatives. They are old comrades, after all, and their presence makes it even easier for the union men to be persuaded to be "reasonable" and to "see the Board's point of view".

It is true, however, that in the main the workers are still faithful to the idea of nationalisation—not quite as enthusiastic as in 1945, but these things take a long time to work themselves out. The unions and the Labour Party have been plugging nationalisation for so long, that we can hardly expect disillusionment to follow experience too suddenly. And, to be honest, the picture is not all black.

In the field of purely material conditions, some improvements have undoubtedly been made. In road transport for example, proper maintenance and better working conditions have been introduced since nationalisation, but these are improvements which very clearly could have been won by the workers themselves had they been organised to do so. And the improvements in working conditions in nationalised industries have not been out of proportion with improvements elsewhere, anyway.

Neither are they the result of deliberate policy more than of the particular circumstances of the post-war period. From 1945 to 1951 the "seller's market" created an inevitable prosperity for British capitalism. It was able to afford improvements in working conditions and—more important perhaps—the shortage of labour put the workers in a strong enough position to exert pressure to back up their demands.

SAFETY FIRST

A Story With a Moral

A GERMAN correspondent of the Los Angeles magazine *Manas* writes:

In that fine book, *The San Quentin Story*, I read that in California about 2,000 people had been indicted within 5 years for murder or manslaughter. I doubt whether in all Germany, with about six times the inhabitants of California, one would have as many bloody crimes as that. Why is it that the criminal record, especially for capital crimes, is so much higher in the U.S.A. than anywhere else? I cannot believe that the reason is that the character of Germans, as a whole, is less violent than that of Americans. What happened under the Hitler régime has made such an assumption impossible.

But there is one decisive difference. Germany has been unarmed since the war. It is difficult, even for criminals, to obtain fire arms. As the mere possession is heavily punished—sometimes with 10 years of imprisonment—criminals avoid carrying fire arms if possible, there is so much risk. Further, there is no need for weapons! Criminals can be absolutely sure that all other people are unarmed.

An American burglar who wants to steal in a certain house, has to carry a pistol. The owner of the house may happen to be awake, or to come home at the wrong moment. Seeing the burglar, he will shoot immediately. There is mutual fear between the two, each knowing the other to be armed. Fear attracts violence, not only in international but also in private life.

The German burglar, during the years since the war, was nearly always unarmed. He knew that the home-comers, as decent, law-abiding

people, were unarmed. In case of being discovered, the burglar would run away. There is less risk in that than in a duel with firearms. He might be seized, of course, but this may happen to the man with the pistol as well, and it is worse to be caught after having shot a man.

Recently we read that a New York policeman who had been hunting a group of burglars for weeks, woke one night to see a dark figure slipping through his bedroom. He immediately took his pistol and fired. Then he put the lights on and found that he had killed his wife. Such an accident would be quite impossible in this country. During 1945-1949 not even policemen had pistols. They could not shoot burglars, nor other people by accident. Even now, they would not shoot without first calling "Hands up!" They can be pretty sure that no burglar has a pistol.

The experiment of disarming a whole nation has had a remarkable consequence. In the nation of Hitler and Himmler, whose soil has been dishonoured by the bloody concentration camps of Auschwitz and Buchenwald, of Belsen and Ravensbrück, crimes of violence are now less frequent than nearly anywhere else in the world. The death penalty has been abolished without any visible increase in crimes.

"Safety first," we say, but is there more safety when both the decent people and the criminals are armed to the teeth, or when both are unarmed?

I need not point to the international sphere. The U.S.A. and the Soviet Union have a different philosophy. We cannot help that—but how safe this world would be if both were unarmed!

Sir Lincoln Evans wins his Spurs

Continued from p. 1

criticisms, the company present soon passed on to items of more importance to the workers of this country, like the forthcoming Bermuda conference, the independence of Austria and the text of a message of congratulations to the Queen on her Coronation. P.S.

Later

Tribune for the 30th May has returned to the attack on Lincoln Evans, with a long article by Michael Foot, who claims that Evans has repudiated the official policies of the Labour movement and is collaborating with the Tories on a Board which various Labour men have denounced as a sham and a "piece of calculated deception".

Foot maintains that Evans refused to serve on the Labour-appointed nationalised Board, but has now accepted a job with the de-nationalised Board. More important than Evans, however, in Foot's opinion, are the other two members of the T.U.C., Andrew Naismith, Gen. Sec., of the Amalgamated Weavers' Association and J. Owen of the National Union of Blast Furnacemen.

Evans, after all, has given up his union job and Foot seems glad to wash his hands of him—but the other two are hanging on to their union jobs, while still collecting £1,000 as part-time members of the new Board.

Michael Foot considers this to be "a sensational development in relations be-

tween the Churchill Government and the T.U. movement". But is it so sensational? It does not represent a radical alteration of policy, but only an extension of the amicable working together we were promised after the Tory's electoral victory.

It seems a little late in the day to be so het up about the reactionary nature of our unions!

However, for the record, we reprint below Lincoln Evans' own statement in reply to the *Tribune* attack. We make no comment on it and leave our readers to make what they can of this business for themselves.

The *Manchester Guardian* (29/5/53) quoted Lincoln Evans as follows:

"Let me put the *Tribune* right on certain facts. They invite me and my colleagues to submit our case to the democratic votes of our unions. They are a little behind the times. On two occasions when the question of my union's relationship with the new Board was discussed at our delegate conferences, a resolution to boycott it was defeated in each instance by an overwhelming majority. Further, it was at the request and with the approval of my own Executive Council that I accepted the position.

"No objection was raised by the party or the T.U.C. to the provision for trade union representation on the new board. Indeed, the party insisted, by an amendment, on the creation of full-time appointment, which obviously would apply to trade union representatives. Are trade unionists, therefore, to be condemned for accepting positions created as a result of our own policies? Or is the view to be accepted that public service ceases to be public service when performed under a Government other than one of our own choosing?"

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

INDOOR MEETINGS

At 9, Fitzroy Square, Warren Street, London, W.1.

JUNE 9—John Hewetson on CONTRACEPTION: ITS SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS

JUNE 16—Discussion on THE RELATIVE THREATS OF CATHOLICISM & COMMUNISM
Opened by Rita Milton and Philip Sansom

The meetings will be held on TUESDAYS at 7.30 p.m.

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM

Alternate Wednesdays at 7.30 p.m.

LIVERPOOL

DISCUSSION MEETINGS at

101 Upper Parliament Street, Liverpool, 8.
Every Sunday at 8 p.m.

GLASGOW

OUTDOOR MEETINGS

from now until further notice at MAXWELL STREET, Sundays at 7 p.m.

With John Gaffney, Eddie Shaw,

MANCHESTER LIBERTARIAN GROUP

Meetings at LAND O' CAKES HOTEL, Gt. Ancoats Street, (by Daily Express)

at 7 p.m. on 2nd & 4th Sundays in every month. June 14, 28, etc.

Enquiries to:

J. Pinkerton, 12 Alt Road, Ashton-Under-Lyne, Lancs.

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:

12 months 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)

6 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)

3 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies

12 months 27/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)

6 months 13/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers:

FREEDOM PRESS

27 Red Lion Street

London, W.C.1 England

Tel.: Chancery 8364

FREEDOM PRESS

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI:

Neither East nor West
cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d.
Workers in Stalin's Russia. 1s.

SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM

Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One*
paper 7s. 6d.

TONY GIBSON:

Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
Food Production and Population 6d.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.

PHILIP SANSON:

Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.

ERRICO MALATESTA:

Anarchy. 6d.
Voie—What For? 1d.

M. BAKUNIN:

Marxism, Freedom and the State.
paper 2s. 6d., cloth 5s.

HERBERT READ:

Art and the Evolution of Man. 4s.
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism. 3s. 6d.
Poetry and Anarchism.
cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.

The Philosophy of Anarchism.

boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

The Education of Free Men.

1s.

RUDOLF ROCKER:

Nationalism and Culture.
cloth 21s.

ALEX COMFORT:

Delinquency 6d.
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom.
paper 2s. 6d., stiff boards 3s. 6d.

ALEXANDER BERKMAN:

ABC of Anarchism. 1s.

PETER KROPOTKIN:

The State: Its Historic Role. 1s.
The Wage System. 3d.
Revolutionary Government. 3d.
Organised Vengeance Called Justice. 2d.

JOHN HEWETSON:

Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d.
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State.
cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

GEORGE WOODCOCK:

Anarchy or Chaos. 2s. 6d.
New Life to the Land. 6d.
Railways and Society. 3d.
Homes or Hovels? 6d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living. 1s.

F. A. RIDLEY:

The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age. 2d.

WILLIAM GODWIN:

Selections from Political Justice. 3d.
On Law. 1d.

Marie Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:

Marie Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute. cloth 5s.
Journey Through Utopia. cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)

K. J. KENAFICK:

Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx. Paper 6s.

27, Red Lion Street,
London, W.C.1.