

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"All political parties die at last of swallowing their own lies."

—DR. JOHN ARBUTHNOT.

(1735).

Vol. 10, No. 41

October 10th, 1953

Threepence

20,000 AFRICANS EVICTED FROM NAIROBI COLONIAL FASCISM

THE latest news items from Kenya continue to show that ruthless governmental repression continues there unchecked by any effective white opposition. Since General Erskine's appointment the forces of "law and order" have not stopped at any method in the struggle to subjugate the African population—avowedly on the Malayan model. The difference with Malaya is ironical, however, for where General Templer justifies his brutal methods of curfews, collective fines, destruction of villages and of crops, and unrestricted use of the death penalty, on the grounds of exterminating the Communist menace, in Kenya there is no such menace, Communism having no hold at all. Indeed, the methods of General Erskine and the white population will provide Communist agents with just the handle they need to exploit and to develop a hold which is at the moment quite lacking.

A Nairobi dispatch last Monday (5/10/53) announced that "more than 500 police supported by a battalion of British troops" had "launched a city-wide operation to evict nearly 20,000 Africans from Kenya's gangster-ridden capital."

The dispatch continues:

"The Government ordered that all Africans in Nairobi without a job, or without permission to be in the city, should return to their tribal reserves.

"These moves follow action by General Sir George Erskine, East African Commander, who has sent in the 1st Battalion Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers to help to quell Mau Mau gangsterism and the threat of a general strike.

"Nairobi's newly-appointed police chief, Mr. John Timmerman—he formerly headed the colony's Criminal Investigation Department—said: 'The Mau Mau have been working through unemployed spivs and hangabouts, to intimidate and organise large-scale crime for their funds.

"Many thousands of these types, including their women and children, are in the capital. They have to be evicted.

"Police and troops will carry out wide-spread checks of all Africans throughout the city.

"Africans without work papers, and those possessing forged identity documents, will be charged before magistrates, fined, and sent out of the city."

"Mr. Timmerman said that loudspeaker vans and pamphlets would inform the African population of the Government's order.

"Anyone wishing to leave the city voluntarily would be assisted by the authorities.

"The pressure on illegal Africans is going to be remorseless, and will go on until we have cleared the city.

"The comb-out operation is likely to last two or three weeks—depending on how many Africans leave voluntarily.

"Between 400 and 600 Africans have been repatriated from Nairobi to the reserves each week recently. But many have filtered."—*Reuter*.

"Gangsterism and the threat of a general strike". These words might almost have been written between the lines, so to speak, for they reveal the social meaning of this operation, while at the same time the generally abusive language used throughout is intended to prevent sympathy with the Africans' plight.

Landlessness and the Rural Exodus

Ever since the beginning of the Kenya "troubles", FREEDOM has emphasized the basic social causes of unrest among the African population. The foremost among these, and it is generally admitted in all informed circles, is the land hunger of the native cultivators. They have not enough land on which to maintain their families and hence look with justifiable hostility at the reservation of parts of the country for the exclusive use of

Have you renewed your
Subscription to
FREEDOM?

white settlers. From the beginning ordinary foresight and prudence has urged that land reform should be vigorously undertaken in order to allay this grievance. The early tentative attempts of the governor to do so however, were shouted down as "giving in to Mau Mau terrorism", and they very soon gave place to the policy of out-and-out repression under the direction of General Erskine.

This policy has included the driving of whole populations, or of those who failed to co-operate completely with the police, away from their reservations. It has in fact exacerbated the land question instead of helping to solve it. Africans so driven off their lands—described in the above dispatch as "many thousands of these types (unemployed spivs and hangabouts), including their women and children"—have had no alternative but to drift into the towns. They have been driven from their lands by General Erskine's bands and so they are "without work papers" and in consequence "will be charged before magistrates, fined and sent out of the city."

It is not difficult to reconstruct the actual picture. These men and their families, evicted in the first place from the land, create in the towns a mass of unemployment, and the injustice of their position and inadequacy of any public method of providing for them, must pro-

voke sympathy and discontent. Hence the threat of a general strike. And the government's answer is to evict them once more, to try and cover up a problem which is naked while they congregate in the towns by dispersing human misery in the countryside.

If these families are driven back to the country districts they will have no means of subsistence, no public welfare means of subsistence. In such circumstances, to feed their families it seems impossible that they will continue to respect property rights. The government will then dub them bandits and we shall doubtless read that "such and such a number of Mau Mau terrorists have been killed in a clash with the police".

What is Happening?

FREEDOM has no means of finding out directly what is happening in Kenya. But we do know the main social and economic problems, we do know something of social history elsewhere, and we have for long studied government methods and government phraseology. With this equipment it is not difficult to read between the lines of the news dispatches which do reach us.

Nor in many cases is reading between the lines required. Mention of "work papers", "identity documents" (of sufficient importance to make it necessary to forge them when lacking), of check-ups by police and troops—all this reeks of fascist methods, of the Gestapo in Poland, of Russian police operations in satellite countries. "The pressure on illegal Africans is going to be remorseless"—illegal Africans means unemployed, means families driven into the towns from the countryside by General Erskine's strong-arm methods.

Is it not also plain that such methods can only increase racial tension and are digging the white man's grave in Africa? And how long will civilized people in England continue passively to condone the ruinous course of events in Africa?

MALAN WINS OUT

THE attitude of the white population in South Africa is finally exposed by Malan's almost unopposed victory in his struggle to place the Cape Coloureds on a separate voting register. The opposition party of Mr. Strauss has been successfully split by Malan on the question of colour just because from Smuts' time there has never been any stand made on the colour bar question. Such a political platform must reflect the white electorate's attitude. Had there been a substantial opposition to the Nationalist's

position, the opposition would have sought to make use of its votes by paying at least lip service to its opinions. But this has never happened, and the United Party is likely to pay for it with political extinction.

Malan has thus been able to pass his Coloured Voters Bill, to destroy the opposition, and to make it unnecessary to alter that part of the Constitution requiring a two-thirds majority in order to change the rights of voters.

African's Voting Strength

The course of the struggle between the Nationalists and the United Party shows how little the vote of Africans already counted. The millions of Africans were of worthless voting strength to the opposition, who would otherwise have used them. Now they are still further disfranchised and the ballot box has become even more meaningless, if that is possible, in the struggle for their rights. Such a situation is teeming with possibilities of unrest, because the African can now only resort to direct action. Any such action can scarcely be unaffected by the racial bitterness that Malan and the majority of the white population have created by their determination to secure white superiority. And since the African population outnumbers the white by many times such a situation seems fraught with danger for the whites. Fear is no very good motive for acting better towards coloured people: but it does seem that common prudence should make them halt their present campaign of racial intolerance. There is however no indication that they realize this, but rather every indication to the contrary.

More Arrests in Spain A Call for Solidarity

THE press reports that the Barcelona police have recently arrested thirty persons accused of anti-Franco activities, most of them members of the anarcho-syndicalist organisation C.N.T. Previously to this eighty persons had been arrested on similar charges, among them the General Secretary of the C.N.T. Cipriano Damiano Gonzalez and the delegate to the C.N.T. in exile Emilio Quinones.

In these round-ups the police also succeeded in seizing the presses on which our Spanish comrades were printing their underground paper *Solidaridad Obrera*. As a reply to this serious setback, the editors of the Paris edition of *Solidaridad Obrera* have started a fund to raise one million francs (£1,000) with which to provide their comrades in the underground movement with the necessary machinery to carry on the work of publishing their clandestine paper, and they appeal to all friends of the C.N.T. to contribute to this fund. Already nearly half the amount has been raised. Donations should be sent to *Solidaridad Obrera*, 24, Rue St. Marthe, Paris 10, France.

5,000 DOCKERS OUT ON MERSEYSIDE

As we go to press 5,689 men, representing more than a third of the labour force on the Merseyside docks, are on an unofficial strike over the dismissal of one of their members.

An Appeal Against the Death Penalty

[The Appeal Against the Death Penalty was published as an editorial in the July issue of the Italian monthly *Il Ponte*, an independent journal dealing with Politics and Literature. So far we have seen no mention of this noble appeal to world opinion in the English press, and in making it available in translation, FREEDOM hopes that it will meet with the support it deserves. We have nowhere seen the case against the death penalty better expressed, and coming from a country where the death penalty for "public" crimes has in any case been abolished (though we understand that certain Christian-democratic circles have been pressing for its re-introduction), adds to its international appeal. Suggestions for parallel activity in this country with that outlined in the Appeal will be welcomed by FREEDOM. Readers wishing to express their views to the Editors of *Il Ponte* direct should write to: La Redazione, Il Ponte, Piazza Indipendenza 29, Florence, Italy.—EDITORS].

IT seemed two centuries ago that for the banishing of torture and the death-penalty from the civilised world the words, glowing with humanity, of an Italian would have been quite adequate as they ranged themselves against "the useless prodigality of punishments which had never made men any better". It seemed that the simple little book of Cesare Beccaria¹ was on the point of emerging victorious in the battle against the gal-lows tree.

But it was an illusion. To-day the death penalty is in full vigour, in and outside Europe, in the majority of great nations calling themselves civilised and the mechanical modernity of the apparatus with which the torture-chamber of old tries to disguise itself as an operating theatre merely serves to increase the icy cruelty of the punishment.

Every day, from East to West, condemned men who climb the scaffold pose yet once more, as they take one last look at mankind from their high platform, the same haunting problem that touches

to the quick every human conscience as an accusation of complicity.

There arise from all sides words of peace and liberty, of the vindication of the equal moral dignity of each person. But can these sentiments be expressed without hypocrisy as long as there exists in the world the death penalty consecrated by law? Can a society claim to be civilised in which murder, simply because it is preceded by the semblance of judgment, is legitimised like an act of justice? And can one seriously continue to believe that the irreparable evil produced by one killing can be remedied by the irreparability of a second killing simply because the cloak of authority has been cast over it?

Alas, however many justifications are being sought for by jurists, the death penalty remains always, as the saying goes, *le plaisir de tuer son prochain en cérémonie* (the pleasure of killing one's neighbour ceremoniously); but an official ceremonial cannot suffice to change the nature of a slaying.

Every time a new experience brings the sinister liturgy before our eyes, the generous fight against the death sentence flares up again, a fight that has been waged in vain for centuries against this savagery. But of all the known arguments the most irrefutable is that which Cesare Beccaria places at the centre of his proof: the uselessness, the blind and insensate uselessness of the death penalty. "A man hanging on a rope is of no use to anyone", said Voltaire. What is the use of killing? Who benefits? What is remedied?

★

AT the source of every crime there lies an individual problem of a moral nature and a collective problem of a political and social nature. The death sentence suppresses the former without solving it and leaves the second open and with raw ends.

In the last ten years we have repeatedly had brutal proof of this. In the dialogue between the exigencies of redemption and pacification which is unfolding itself in the world's two halves there insinuates itself every now and then a sentence of death by which one of the interlocutors believes in his ability to conclude the argument to his advantage by suppressing the voice of his opponent. There are some people who deceive themselves that the dialogues of peoples can be reduced to a dialectic competition of Capital sentences. To the gibbets of Prague an adequate answer is considered to be given by the electric chair at Sing Sing; perhaps here and there replicas and counter-replicas at the same level of argument are now being prepared. Each of these episodes raises in opposition in some part of the world, a tidal wave of pity and contempt. But perhaps the greatest pity should go not to the condemned to whom the gibbet or the electric chair gives the halo of victorious martyrdom but to the executioners who are the ones truly discomfited, because by killing, they have shown their recognition of the fact that for confuting the voice of the opposition they had no means other than that of silencing them forever. This is true for crimes called "political", but all crimes, even the so-called "public" ones are political in the sense that behind them there remains a problem involving the fact that human beings live together and that it is not solved by suppressing the man in whom the problem has on occasion taken an individual aspect. Once the man is dead, the problem is more alive and imperative than before. This has been said in England even in cases of non-political crimes, such as the case of Bentley or that of Evans brought up again by the sentencing of Christie. Even when authority, by formal homage to the law, closes the door to pity and denies mercy, that spectre remains in the conscience of the living and creates a sense of error and shame.

Continued on p. 3

2 Concluding the Review of the Important Freedom Press Publication by Dr. E. A. GUTKIND:

THE EXPANDING ENVIRONMENT

THERE are four principles which Gutkind suggests as the basis for a revolution of environment. They are: the new scale, the new mobility, the new purpose and the new oneness. In his description of the new scale he gives his clearest picture of the type of physical environment he is recommending, and the one which separates him most sharply from other theorists of town-planning, whether those who advocate the idea of the linear town, or the Satellite town, or the vertical city, or 'open development', (which he characterizes as "conveyor-belt architecture for the suburban nobility").

The new scale is the composite result of two heterogeneous processes: of a shrinking of cities and towns to the small units of organic communities and of an expanding of their living space:

"In essence it is comparable to a galaxy of stars all more or less of the same order and dispersed over the country at intervals which are determined by the functional interrelationship between the community units but not by their distance from a central city. In the past the intervals between units of settlement increased in proportion to their distance from the urban centre: the greater the power of attraction of the centre, the more numerous and closer together were the smaller units of settlement. Instead of one galaxy for the whole country we had quite a number, each, so to speak, with its own planet and each planet with all the minor stars revolving around the sun, the Capital. If this comparison with the heavenly bodies is not to the liking of the more earth-bound people I would suggest that the new system looks like confetti strewn over the country by a rather orderly and methodical visionary. All the round pieces would be of the same size, their different colours indicating different functions and standing out clearly from the green carpet of the landscape which remains the main and ubiquitous feature."

The 'new scale' is a union between the infinitely great and the infinitely small. "In terms of physical planning this means that the numerous small communities must be made organic entities within the wide framework of regional unity. . . . In a 'stateless' world only functional 'states' can exist. The 'stateless' world would correspond to the region without absorbing cities, and the functional 'state' to the community units which are related to each other by their diverse functions. There can be nothing like a 'sub-state' i.e. the region, but only a flexible framework of indefinite extension filled and vitalized by the limited community units. We must avoid all rigidity and discard all notions of performance. Growth and transformation are always accompanied by characteristic patterns and structures."

The 'new mobility' is the result of the welding together of time and space into the fourth dimension, which is a utilitarian application, "is the result of the awakening to the immense possibilities which a life, without ideal and material boundaries and without the over-mastering attraction of the big urban centres, holds in store. It means the mobility of men and of immaterial and material goods."

The 'new purpose' in Gutkind's terminology cannot be summarised without distorting his meaning, but "like the 'new mobility' it is an attitude, an identifica-

tion on all levels of life with environment and society. It is a human and not a material problem. It cannot be introduced to order. It must grow out of insight, vision, and a spirit of adventure."

The 'new oneness' is the result of the other three principles and under this title Gutkind elaborates his view of regionalism. His 'new oneness' is, we might say, the ecological balance or economy of the regional organism.

"Regionalism in the usual sense has been restricted to the structural unity of more or less clearly defined regional units. The new regionalism is free from all limitations. It is a centre-less and limit-less conception. It is the equivalent of an expanding environment, expanding materially and ideally. It is more than a mere decentralization which proceeds always in relation to a centre. Hence its name. It is a dispersal, a scattering apart, and its final result will be the End of Cities and the Rise of Communities."

THE book invites comparison with other works on the 'philosophy', (as opposed to the technique), of physical planning. Like Ebenezer Howard and Patrick Geddes, Gutkind drives home his point with engaging diagrams annotated with captions listing the qualities and defects of contrasted types of environment. Howard's attitude is pragmatic and reformist, Geddes is synoptic and reformist, Gutkind's is certainly synoptic (as might be expected from the author of *Our World From the Air*), but is revolutionary—he has no use for the 'conservative surgery' for cities which Geddes advocated. Geddes approached the human environment through biology, Gutkind through cosmology. The closest comparison would be with Lewis Mumford's *The Culture of Cities* and with Arthur Korn's newly published *History Builds the Town*. Korn's illustrations tell the same story

as Gutkind's, on a more lavish scale (his book costs six times as much) but his text reads like breathless lecture notes and he wears the blinkers of Marxist dogmatism—economic determinism is not necessarily a bad yard-stick of city development, it is merely insufficient. Gutkind is closest to Mumford, they share an insistence on regionalism and a profound humanism, but from the point of view of anarchism he has a less equivocal attitude towards the State and his regionalism is more radical to the extent of the difference between dispersal and decentralization.

IF anarchism is an attitude to life, and anarchy a possible form of society, one can say that Gutkind's essentially

anarchist approach has led him to advocate an environment which is the physical expression of anarchy. This is why his book is valuable to readers of FREEDOM. What of its value to town-planners? His ingenious and witty postscript leaves no doubt of his attitude to current theory and practice in planning. His message is: You're wasting your time and you can't see the wood for the trees! But the planner is only the servant of society, like the plumber, and the popular press is constantly reminding us that a world in which planners were given their head would be intolerable. To replan this country as an "expanding environment" would be a valuable exercise but nothing more, when for instance the Treasury will not permit the Ministry of Transport to authorise the bits and pieces of road-

widening which are merely one of the prerequisites of the L.C.C.'s County of London Plan. However radical his approach the technician concerned with our physical environment can only grab at the opportunities which arise from "piecemeal social engineering" until we have a society which demands more drastic changes in its surroundings. If it is widely read Dr. Gutkind's book can help in creating such a society and even to-day, even within governmental society it has an urgent message for countries like India or China or Israel which have an older cultural heritage but less environment lumber than the West, where in this book's final words, "We build our environment in the crude manner of pioneers or parvenus but with less instinctive certainty than primitive societies. Like Prometheus who provoked the wrath of the gods by his theft of the fire, we seem to draw down on ourselves the vengeance of nature and the destructiveness of our own works."

Tomorrow's Sun has Set

WE can conceive the Renaissance man full of vigour and wonder looking at himself and the world around as though both were bathed in a perpetual dawn; and we can imagine medieval man collected in prayer and patient under suffering dreaming of a light in heaven or Galilee to break the dusk enwrapping all things near and far. And so with men of all ages and civilizations we can pick out a day or night aspect, perhaps that of a season, and see it reflected and predominant in the whole pattern of their life, eliciting and sustaining a corresponding typical feeling.

Starting from the eve of the French revolution down to our present day there has been one such typical feeling not confined to any particular country or class, and yet not expressive of the type of society that during this time con-

queringly fashioned the world according to its urge and views. It was a feeling, in fact, directed against the society of the day, from which those who had it saw themselves excluded, and which they wanted to destroy precisely because it was a society meaningless and hostile in its fruits and institutions to the vast majority of its nominal members.

It was a feeling which the Marxian analysis made the prerogative and distinctive feature of the industrial proletariat, but which history, both before and after Marx, proved to be a deeply fulfilling motive force among the peasantry and groups of the bourgeoisie as well. The decay of traditional religion as social cohesion, the undisguised and ruthless exploitation motive of capitalism, the increase and concentration of population at the same time as an unparalleled development in the means of information and communication making for a greater awareness of misery in the world and responsibility for its existence, are some of the factors that made this feeling possible, and fed it continually, but none of them singly nor all together can explain it exhaustively or be considered its cause.

When a man works for twelve, ten or eight hours a day, feeding, resting and scraping a few pleasures in order simply to be fit to work again; when the drudgery of his movements or the skill he has acquired are not seen as related to the work in hand, but he is indifferent to its product and only interested in a retribution that robs his work of its social value; when he owns nothing, decides nothing, and changes nothing; when his freedom is freedom to starve, and then even his slavery does not save him from starvation, life can only appear to him as a cruel interminable day, with no promise or intimation of rest or respite. Even old age and death fail to seduce with the promise of release. Made an

object moving and moved about in a world of objects, he finds that Time is no longer a cycle and a rhythm within his person, but that it has itself been objectified, given the immutability and permanence of Space, transformed into a place from which he will be removed when no longer useful, no longer an object, but a bit of refuse.

From this reality, from this condition in which humanity is made senseless and denied, there arose in him another reality, that of another day to come, a to-morrow that would succeed to-day not through an intermediate night, but cataclysmically through a new sun exploding from the old, scorching and destructive in its first eruption, but then shining equably and friendly on all deserving to survive. To-morrow's sun made itself felt even to-day; a feeling for its hidden presence and impending glory effected a transvaluation of values; oppression, degradation, exclusion from society, and sub-humanity became a source of pride, of faith and courage; they marked out the deserving to survive, and allowed them with the chris that made them soldiers for the redemption of mankind. Life was given meaning and warmth, and every condition that strengthened brotherhood among the oppressed, every action against exploiters and oppressors was a magical or a surgical step towards the revolutionary cataclysm. The reality of to-morrow's sun could be denied by the sceptic or the objective sociologist, but was affirmed each time that men and women fought and died for its sake.

But now this sun has set, not certainly everywhere but in many continents and islands of the oppression-conscious human race. Many are still touched by its rays and draw spiritual sustenance, but they are many only relatively and in isolation. The brotherhood of this sun-worship has been split and broken. Per-

Continued on p. 3

CINEMA

WE ARE ALL MURDERERS

Are We All Murderers? At the Curzon.

THE French title to this film has been turned into a question in the English version. The French attitude is more realistic since the answer to the question is undoubtedly 'yes'.

The subject is capital punishment and the scene is mainly set in the condemned cell where prisoners pass in and out on their way to the guillotine.

Every aspect of capital punishment is explored and the motives that lead to the crime of each of the prisoners in the death-cell.

The main character is René Le Guen, a young illiterate criminal who stumbled into murder as a trade in the Resistance. He tries to save a German Gestapo officer who has been accused of one of his murders but he is not believed. One of his victims is a Swedish bath attendant who gets in the way of his bullet. The Swede's widow regrets it is not as in her country where the income earned by murderers serving sentences goes to the support of the victim's dependents.

One of the tenants of the cell is a doctor who has been condemned for poisoning his wife in order to marry his mistress. He maintains his innocence throughout and cynically asks, on an appeal to the President, whether the President knows he had a mistress or not.

Another of the condemned is Bauchet, who being unable to sleep because of his child's crying has, in a fury, killed it with a poker. He struggles on the way to the guillotine and has to be drugged.

The third tenant is Gino, a Corsican who has killed a man in a vendetta, knowing full well the consequences. When he dies, which he does bravely, his brother kills the brother of the victim and the vendetta continues.

A fourth condemned man is a sex maniac who, the doctor testifies has been cured of his aberrations by a brain operation. The doctor pleads for the man and ridicules the doctrine that he must be executed as 'an example'. The doctor asks does one cure T.B. by making an example?

These four cases show the bankruptcy of capital punishment as a policy, and the responsibility of society to-day for its murderers. Le Guen is the product of a society which thinks it can turn murder off like a tap. The doctor is the only person who knows whether he is innocent or guilty, the evidence is purely circumstantial. Bauchet was not responsible for his actions at the time of the murder, and poor social conditions had led to it. Gino was well aware of the results of his action and thought the risk of detection worth while.

These cases typify the futility of capital punishment either as a deterrent or a reformative influence, and the anti-social attitude of vengeance. A prison doctor testifies about the young criminals who go about with a dotted line tattooed on their necks for the convenience of the executioner, he also speaks of the number of condemned who have themselves seen an execution (this is born out by the English statistics of a majority of condemned having seen public executions). It is palpably true that no one executed for murder has ever committed murder again, otherwise the deterrent effects of capital punishment are negligible, either like the Corsican vendettist the criminal believes that either he can get away with it, or that it is "worth swinging for", or like Bauchet or the sex-maniac they are incapable of weighing up the case at the time of their deeds. It is also obvious that the death penalty with its attendant notoriety has an attraction for some people, witness the number of people who regularly give themselves up whenever a murder is committed.

Capital punishment has obviously no reformative influence for the person executed. Its effects on others serve only to debase the value of human life. If the murderer is mentally sick he may be cured, if society is sick which it is when, as to-day the environment produces heroes in war and murderers in peace, society must be cured by revolution.

It is possible to conceive of a murderer voluntarily working off his obligations in a practical financial form to the dependents but the stupid vengeance of the eight o'clock walk with all its attendant grotesqueness is a dead end. A murderer who locked up his intended victim and said "Six weeks from to-day, unless anybody changes my mind, I shall kill you", and in six weeks time did kill his victim, would be labelled as a monster. The State does precisely this and we can see in *Are We All Murderers?* the effects upon men of this monstrosity of capital punishment.

It is easy to be sentimental about capital punishment. It is possible to tear it out of the context of society, but upon reflection that violence permeates this society of ours that the State, and its mechanisms, the guillotine and the noose, the atomic bomb and napalm are all answers that we are all murderers as long as we consent to these things being done, whether in the name of democracy, peace or justice.

This is a fine film and deserves a wide showing for its quality of stimulating thought. J.R.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS

If you read . . .

The Expanding Environment E. A. Gutkind 8/6

You may like to read . . .

Community and Environment E. A. Gutkind 12/6

Cheap Reprints . . .

Gulliver's Travels; Erewhon; News from Nowhere; Cranford; Sentimental Journey each 3/6

Nationalism & Culture Rudolf Rucker 21/-

Remainders . . .

The Unknown World of the Child Dr. Andre Arthus 2/6

Man; an Autobiography George R. Stewart 5/-

New Pamphlet . . .

How to Read the Newspapers Alex Comfort (MAPW) 3d.

New Periodical . . .

Encounters: Stephen Spender, Virginia Woolf, etc. 2/6

Obtainable from

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

LIFE OR DEATH

EXPEDIENCY being the dominant factor in politics to-day it is not surprising that the signing of the military and financial agreement between Spain and the United States should have done no more than evince a few short-lived murmurs in the world's Press, and a protest at the recent Labour Party conference (which was obviously not sensational enough to be widely reported). The fact that the agreement is one between America and Spain does not however, exempt America's cold-war allies from their share of responsibility in the political implications of the agreement so far as Franco is concerned. FREEDOM has already expressed the view (5/9/53) that the agreement strengthens Franco's fascist régime, and his stranglehold on the Spanish people. Such a view is confirmed from a source which the general public might consider less "prejudiced" and more "objective" than a journal, such as FREEDOM, which shares the Spanish revolutionary workers' feelings that they have been betrayed and abandoned not only by the democratic governments (did they expect anything else?) but by the workers throughout the world as well.

The *New York Times* (Sept. 28) in a Leader on the "Agreement with Spain" which it attempts to analyse "coolly and reasonably" since "we are now dealing with a *fait accompli*", holds the view that "political and moral issues" should have outweighed the "strategic". This is a somewhat surprising attitude in these days of political realism! Even more surprising is the way the *N.Y. Times* reminds its readers of the Big Three statements and United Nations resolutions of 1946 which stated, among other things that:

"In origin, nature, structure and general conduct, the Franco régime is a fascist régime patterned on, and established largely as a result of aid received from Hitler's Nazi Germany and Mussolini's fascist Italy."

As if what was said about Spain in 1946 has any more validity to-day that what Mr. Churchill said about Stalin when Russia was fighting a life and death struggle on behalf of freedom and democracy!

The *N.Y. Times* comments that "[Franco's] régime has not changed in any way since 1946, and the condemnation—which is a moral, as well as a political one—still stands". It goes on to suggest that the negotiators "kept this in mind" if one is to judge by the text of the agreement which "could not have been less cordial or more hedged with reservations and contingent phrases". But it is also clear that the *N.Y. Times* finds this a difficult thesis to support as the concluding paragraphs of the editorial demonstrate:

"When all these things have been said, one must still conclude on a note of profound regret. *If there had been any chance of the Franco régime being overthrown by internal developments, that is now gone. As we strengthen the Generalissimo's military forces we strengthen his grip on the country, and our economic aid will have a similar political effect. We fought World War II to defeat fascism, and now we are making a pact, if not an alliance, with a fascist Government.*

The preamble to the new defence agreement mentions the 'high purposes' of our common aims—meaning the struggle against communism. But surely the highest purpose of American policies is to defend and propagate democracy against all totalitarian ideologies—fascist as well as communist. If this be forgotten or overlooked in the process of making agreements with Generalissimo Franco, the cause of liberty will suffer grave damage." (Our italics).

But this will not be the last occasion on which the *New York Times* will have to express its "profound regret" if it persists in this kind of

thinking: "We fought World War II to defeat fascism, and now we are making a pact, if not an alliance, with a fascist Government". May we suggest that once the *N.Y. Times* drops its illusions about the objectives of World War II, it will perhaps understand a little more about the line-up for World War III.

The idealism of Governments in the last bloodbath were summed-up in his usual masterly fashion by Churchill when he said that "our" allies were all those people who were prepared to kill Germans! And the watchword to-day has not changed—and judging by the anxiety shown in the "democracies" to rearm the Germans—nor have the actors in this sordid game. But as things are at present the West will this time support the Germans! And after all has it not been pointed out by some American Senators and Congressmen that Franco was in fact the first European politician to fight the Communist scourge on Germany's side?

Either one must abandon this nonsense that wars are fought by the forces of good on one side and those of evil on the other, and face up to the political and economic realities of conflict—or one must sink into the apathy which silently accepts permanent conflict as normality and looks upon the unceasing struggle that has been waged by the Spanish people against Franco during the past 17 years as a hopeless and quixotic attempt to achieve the impossible.

It is for the ordinary people—the cannon fodder, the factory robots and the future civilian victims of World War III—to decide on which side of the line they stand: for Life or for Death. There is no fence in this dilemma.

*Priests were the first deluders of mankind,
Who with vain faith made all their reason blind;
Not Lucifer himself more proud than they,
And yet persuade the world they must obey:
Gainst avarice and luxury complain,
And practice all the vices they arraign.
Riches and honour they from laymen reap,
And with dull crambo feed the silly sheep.*

MARVELL. An Historical Poem. (1674?)

Three Years Discussing an Abstraction

IN October, 1947, the American Federal government filed a suit against 17 Banking firms in which it was charged that these firms had conspired to dominate the securities field and to have achieved a partial monopoly by which they controlled management of \$14,375,000,000, or 68.9 per cent. of all securities issued in the nation between 1938 and 1947.

They were accused also of using the Investment Bankers Association of America as an instrument to lobby against regulatory legislation. The association had been named as a co-defendant, but was dropped in mid-trial Nov. 19, 1951, "without prejudice," at the Government's request.

In November 1950, the trial was started at the Federal Court House and only ended last Friday when Federal Judge Medina dismissed the suit. The legal costs to the Government are esti-

mated at between £500,000 and £1,500,000 and the defendants are expected to have incurred something like £2 million in costs. The record of transcript briefs and exhibits have mounted to 108,646 pages totalling five million words, and the judge's opinion will take up 300 pages. The key finding is that: "What is now taking shape is not a static mosaic of conspiracy but a constantly changing panorama of competition among the seventeen defendant firms."

★

THE whole business is so staggering that one finds it difficult to comment in a few sentences. When we read of the case, our immediate reaction was one of despair that men could be so completely absorbed with false values as not to see that they had spent 3 years in preparing the documents and 3 years discussing an abstraction. If those 14

billion dollarsworth of securities were put on a bonfire and the 17 Banking firms ceased to operate the world would still exist. If the workers of the world stopped producing we should all die of starvation. And what then would be the use of all the millions of securities, and the vast sites occupied by the banking houses and the rest? It may be argued that without the banks large scale industry would not be possible and that the system would collapse. That is probably true. But then "systems" have been created and have been collapsing for centuries, yet man seems to have survived. The whole trouble is that the tail is wagging the dog and the majority of the people in the world have been so conditioned by those who operate the system, and have become so stupid, that they cannot see this. And of those who do only a few have the energy and courage to say so whatever the consequences.

Tomorrow's Sun has Set

Continued from p. 2

Perhaps the most telling sign, and a cause more than a sign, is the fact that those who most loudly proclaim the reality of to-morrow's sun are no longer a catholic brotherhood, not even a class, but the classless cadres of a party whose avowed intent is to seize and develop the State machine, and to make it foolproof together with oppression. To-morrow's sun in their hands has become a means to an end, a source of energy that can be exploited and controlled, a sun no longer but something like electricity or the mineral wealth of the subsoil.

Thus degraded and reduced, the revolutionary spirit of the masses has been found to be on the decline by communists and anti-communists alike. The former blame the upper layers of the proletariat, the so-called labour aristocracy whom they say have been bought to the bourgeoisie, and the latter congratulate the capitalists for discovering that they can make better profits and live more securely by paying high wages and introducing machinery than by exploiting the cheap and begrudging labour of the unskilled. The truth, however, lies deeper. Revolutionary spirit refuses to fit into any deterministic pattern. It comes from a feeling of the meaning and quality of life it is everybody's fate to find and live by. If to-morrow's sun has set it may be partly because to-day seems or has indeed become more bearable and self-sufficing, maybe oppression has become more subtle and intermittent or awareness of oppression has been lulled to sleep and blunted, but we shall

stand a chance of fathoming all the implications and lay our finger on the real cause if we succeed in discerning what has taken its place.

Whatever the diagnosis of the last war, and however successful the various attempts to make it fit into a philosophy of history, its impact on the vast majority of those who survived, whether interested in a philosophy of history or not, has been to shake and shatter faith in a rational interpretation of human events, to show any attempt at such interpretation as irrelevant and futile. For millions it meant the plunging into a night of horror, into an Inferno comparable only to that of Dante's imagination, but unlike Dante's without a compensatory Purgatory and Paradise, without the unfathomable justification of a divine will. Millions who survived the war were deported or sent to die slowly in a prison camp, they lost their country, their family, all that they had built or were building with, all that they had been living or hoped to live for. Those who did not lose so much or did not lose anything at all could not remain insensitive to the disaster, and a shadow of precariousness and unreality stretched over all they valued and cherished most. After the last war the human heart has ceased to throb in the old wonted way. A new feeling has taken root, at least in the subconscious, a feeling of eschatological doom, without apocalypse. There is no dawn or midday, no evening nor to-morrow, but lurking, encompassing night. The night of the last war fuses with the night of the war to come, and the atom or hydrogen bomb makes the

physical end of mankind not only a mythical perspective but an imminent scientific possibility.

Under impending doom animals and men huddle together with their kind, finding in it the last comfort and protection, but the doom our age envisages is of a peculiar kind. It is both from without and from within; it will come and crush from the midst of men themselves, and yet from a will and a power that cannot be located, beyond human control. The very acts of union, most clearly intended to avoid the catastrophe and seemingly most likely to succeed are also those that can bring nearer and provoke the hour of disaster. Faith in oneself, in one's nearest and in the human race has gone, and selfishness and self engrossment have acquired huge and sinister proportions even to the point of making the end desirable. The faith and heroism, the patience and passion of all ages past appear stupidly spent, and are damned wholesale as though the present plight was their inevitable and purposed result.

The voice of anarchism, thin and scattered, hardly heard anywhere amidst the clamour of selfishness and hysteria, and the hypocritical preaching meant to cover both, urges to hope and love, not to despair of mankind. It is most doubtful it will succeed in reviving the faith in to-morrow's sun, in making it rise again. But it may bring and watch the birth of a new feeling. Its utterings are not dictated by sentimental weakness or sheer nostalgia, they are not to still a conscience demanding action beyond frustration and bewilderment, but the only possible act of faith and faithfulness, an active hope in the unpredictability of man that will dispel the night.

GIOVANNI BALDELLI.

An Appeal Against the Death Penalty

Continued from p. 1

Execution does not serve as a warning and an example since even among common criminals the end of the condemned man assumes—the exalted pages of Jean Genet show this—the glory of a heroic destiny of which those condemned to lesser sentences dream in their cells of becoming worthy. It is no way, either, of closing a debate by creating a certainty because it leaves behind it, in the consciences of the slayers, the implacable gadfly of doubt.

★

THIS explains why, in the history of punishment, the sentence of death has always anxiously sought a justification in confession or, at least, in a simulacrum of it. Torture was invented so that the inquisitors should sleep in peace. In order that the Judge should not have on his conscience the burden of having condemned an innocent man to death, a method has been discovered of tormenting an innocent man until brutified by pain he gives in and acknowledges himself guilty. Methods, from whatever side one regards them, are reduced to the same thing: to give to a political murder the appearance of an act of justice; the trial transforms itself into a theatrical tableau of spectacular confessions. Or else the extortion of confession insinuates itself as a last torment in the death cell to induce the condemned man to deny his innocence in exchange for his life.

But even these expedients do not solve the problem. What does *guilty* mean? What does *innocent* mean? Be the man condemned guilty or innocent the death sentence is never, as executioners fancy, an expiation or a purification, a closing of the account. The account remains unclosed; the death sentence, when it is not a conscious hypocrisy to evade a social problem which it is more convenient not to confront, resembles, in every aspect, the magic rites by which savages imagine that they suppress in effigy, in a chosen

victim, the pestilence which is ravaging a tribe.

Do not say that the sentence of death pronounced by your tribunal is just because your prisoner is guilty, while the death sentence pronounced by your enemies is unjust because their victim is innocent. These distinctions will not give us peace of mind. The death sentence is always unjust; it does not strike down this particular man, but Man and the civilisation of man. Not to kill is the first rung in the ladder of civilisation; whoever thinks he can ascend the other rungs by omitting this first one, deceives himself. He will feel the sensation of ascent, but all of a sudden, at the first shock, he will fall back to the depths of barbarity.

★

IN the United Nations Charter of the Rights of Man is recorded the Right to Life; but it does not exclude that this right must give way to the death penalty. But, then, so long as the denial of the right to life which is man's greatest possession is considered legitimate, every other confiscation of less essential benefits is automatically justified. The legality of the death penalty is the most expressive symptom of acquiescence to every oppression of man; a society that honours the tyranny of the executioner cannot but accept every other less absolute tyranny; when the laws admit of sentencing a man to death it is illusory to believe that the penalty of poverty, the penalty of economic slavery, the penalty of ignorance can be abolished; cruel penalties these, but all less cruel than death.

We must tear from the back of the death sentence the cloak of austere legality with which it is disguised—for under the torn-off mantle is murder. All feel that the death penalty—at least for political crimes—rather than an act of justice is always an act of civil war directed to crushing a competitor, to silence opposition. But the same

is true of all crimes; the death sentence is always an act of civil war which, denying life to a man, denies the very reason for human community.

★

TWO centuries ago it seemed that a single voice could have sufficed to cause the scaffolds of Europe to tumble. The time has come to give heed again to that voice, to repeat it, to make it become the voice of multitudes and the demand of the people. As long as it is allowed to kill a man there cannot be peace among men. It is not the fault of governments, it is not the fault of judges, it is not the fault of hangmen—it is the fault of those who are silent and acquiesce. We are all responsible for the death penalty, and more than others, people of culture, and jurists more than anybody. For the killing of Slansky, for the killing of the Rosenbergs, we all equally feel remorse. While so many hopes are now raised by the pacific idea of the United States of Europe, hopes that could be the first step towards world understanding, let us seek to acquire stability for this common patrimony of moral ideas (of which the European Community must be the proclaimer) the repudiation of the death penalty. May the abolition of the death penalty which was faced up to two centuries ago in Italy become one of the fundamental keynotes of the Commonwealth of Europe!

In such a hope we launch this appeal to the end that a vaster movement can spring from it and from which practical ways will be easily found if we succeed in meeting, in Italy and outside Italy, with friends who are as convinced as we are of the utility of this movement and are disposed to help us organise it. We will send out this invitation as widely as possible; we await support, suggestions, and proposals from men of good will.

Abolish the death penalty; the battle for peace begins here. The concept is so great that perhaps the modesty of those who to-day raise it again will not suffice to prevent the death penalty from continuing its victorious march throughout the world. *Cesare Beccaria: Dei Delitti e delle Pene* (On Crimes and Punishments) 1764.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

Is The Health Service Reactionary?

Yes!

It is noticeable that both comrades P.S. and Hewetson do not attempt to really answer the main point of my letter on the N.H.S., which is: What are anarchists doing defending a compulsive State scheme, the penalties for non-compliance with which include the organized vengeance of law? Neither P.S., for all his verbal fireworks, nor John Hewetson squarely face this issue. And I must insist that this is the heart of the matter, for if we are to justify coercion in this respect because of any alleged benefits it may bring (and I have yet to be convinced that the function of the N.H.S. could not be equally well carried on by voluntary associations, even in this society) then we may as well go the whole hog and support the compulsive enforcement of nudism, vegetarianism, teetotalism, orgone-therapy, euthanasia and so on, all of which may be—for all I know—of benefit to the old and unhealthy. In other words, to adopt the attitude of my two critics could lead one to a position of support for the forcible imposition of any scheme that both they and the State agree will benefit the 'people'. The fact that even the most apparently innocent of State schemes is merely the iron fist clad in a velvet glove seems to have escaped their notice.

Now to deal separately with some of the points they raise.

Firstly P.S. I can never quite understand why P.S. always finds it so necessary to ransack the vocabulary of a witless sarcasm when replying to any criticisms I make of his ideas. Perhaps I touch an exposed nerve of his when I do so, but I can assure him, in answer to this particular outburst of bad temper on his part, that if I were to write letters every time I read something with which I disagree in FREEDOM I should need the paper to myself every month or so—and I am not alone in this respect. I do not do so because I have neither the time nor the money for the paper and ink it would require. In any case, one of the things I like about the anarchist movement is the liberty to have one's own interpretation of our basic principles. The time when I think it necessary to protest is when I consider an interpretation contradicts these basic principles and his 81 words fall into this category.

I most certainly do, in my present circumstances, accept the dole if I am unemployed. Since the State robs me of the contributions each week to keep its scheme running I endeavour to get back a little of the money stolen from me when the bureaucrats think I qualify for this honour. If comrade P.S. were to have his money taken from him by an armed bandit and the bandit were to hand him back sufficient money to barely exist I am quite sure he would accept it, but I am equally sure he would not approve of banditry on those grounds. Similarly, because I accept the dole it does not mean I defend the State's "benevolence" in handing back part of the money it forcibly takes from me, nor do

I urge my fellow-workers to do so. The same applies to the N.H.S. and the closed shop. P.S. uses the money system enforced by the State, but I have not noticed him going around defending it—yet! Nevertheless, it is undeniable that under the capitalist system one would find it very difficult to exist without using it.

As for practical alternatives—since P.S. is such a practical man on paper, let me re-phrase his final question to me in a more fundamental manner: Has P.S. any alternatives which are practicable here and now in place of the present society regulated by capitalists and government? If so will he please expound them for us—or stop criticising the supporters of this society? If he replies—the anarchist society, then he answers his own question as well as mine.

Secondly, John Hewetson. Comrade Hewetson does not seem to have paid very close attention to what I wrote in my previous letter in regard to the N.H.S. and the voluntary schemes. I was careful to state that 'many of the so-called benefits of the N.H.S. could be obtained from previous contributory schemes' and that 'whatever faults the previous voluntary schemes may have had, at least they did not compel us to belong to them'. I did not wish to imply that any of these schemes, by itself, was as comprehensive in scope as the N.H.S. nor to give the impression that they were without faults, but to point out that the voluntary principle upon which they were based was a far better one, from an anarchist point of view, than the coercive principle upon which the N.H.S.—like the preceding N.H.I.—is based. For a few pence each week under the Hospital Saturday Scheme men, women and children could obtain free treatment in hospital. Co-operative societies, also, gave aid to their members in the payment of fees for dental and optical treatment. These schemes were not necessarily local in character and I do not think that, even if they were, the income level of a given district was the only criterion of the quality of service offered. Surely an important factor would be the rate of con-

tributions and the number who contributed? In any case, if the State has become so suddenly inspired by Kropotkinian principles as J.H. seems to think, what stopped it from making the N.H.S. voluntary instead of coercive? Could it be that it had its own interests well in mind (cannon fodder, increased production) and that any benefits which accrued to its subjects were purely coincidental? Or am I interpreting anarchism too literally again?

J.H.'s point about food and shelter being organised in this society on the basis of an equivalent exchange is certainly a novel one for an anarchist. I was always under the impression that they were supplied on a basis of profit for the manufacturers and landlords. This seems to me to be hardly an equitable form of exchange, but rather a decidedly inequitable one. Perhaps comrade Hewetson has a different conception of equivalence to mine, however, in which case I would be glad if he could explain it in greater detail.

To conclude: I think enough has been written on both side for comrades to decide their own position in relation to the question at issue and as far as I am concerned the controversy is at an end. However, I would like to close my side of the discussion with a quotation from Malatesta which I earnestly commend to my critics:

"Certainly it is a good thing, while we are awaiting the revolution—and it also serves to make it easier—that the workers should seek to earn more and work fewer hours in better conditions; it is a good thing that the unemployed should not die of hunger and that the sick and old should not be abandoned. But this, and other things, the workers can and should obtain by themselves, by direct struggle against the bosses, by means of their organisations, and by individual and collective action, developing in each individual the feeling of personal dignity and the consciousness of his rights.

"The gifts of the State, the gifts of the bosses are poisoned fruits that bring with them the seeds of slavery. We must reject them.

London, Oct. 2. S. E. PARKER.

No!

S. E. PARKER (FREEDOM 26/9/53) appears to have got his facts wrong. Without going into the question of the necessity of a National Health Service, may I just state a few of these?

(1) Although called a National Health Service, the scheme cannot be compared with any other nationalised service as it makes practically no charge to the user, being kept out of taxes. Even the Labour Party triumphs, when gas, coal or any other nationalised board makes a profit. A profit in the Health Service however, is not visible.

(2) The N.H.S. is not coercive. If you prefer a private doctor you can go to him as long as he is paid directly. If you prefer to make use of the N.H.S. you can go to any doctor and ask to be

put on his list. There is no payment at all. It seems that S. E. Parker has confused the N.H.S. with the Insurance contributions workers have to pay weekly. These are entirely separate issues, and even the membership numbers are different.

(3) No hospital kept entirely by voluntary contributions has been nationalised, the Tories saw to that. *The Royal Masonic, The Florence Nightingale, etc.*, are still private hospitals. Only hospitals which were already highly subsidised by the taxpayer were taken over. In nearly all cases the same people still administer them.

(4) There has been no further centralisation whatsoever. The same bodies like the *London Executive Council* still administer the service.

(4) S.E.P. says: "Workers used to form amongst themselves various sick clubs and mutual aid societies". This sounds very fine but it is just not true. Before July 1948 over 75% of all people organised by approved (State approved!) societies were "members" of the Prudential. Scores of the approved societies were just labels where fees were collected by commission agencies for the few large insurance companies. S.E.P. makes other mis-statements showing that he knows very little about this scheme.

The Hospital Saturday Fund died years and years before the N.H.S. was introduced, and only the Hospital Service Association existed, and still exists, as the N.H.S. never stopped any voluntary body from functioning.

Finally, I think that it is a retrogressive measure and a perversion of revolutionary thinking, which progressive people seek to discourage, if under the flag of anti-state propaganda ideas are attacked which originally grew out of the idea of the community spirit of human society. We cannot fight the institutions of schools, sanitation, hospitals and a dozen other important services only because in a capitalist society these institutions are financed and administered by governments. We can still oppose the capitalist system and abolish government. In this way we will free ourselves, but instead of abolishing these essential services we will improve them.

London. M.P.

HAVE YOU OBTAINED A NEW READER FOR FREEDOM?

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

TRUE LOVE STORY TOMMY LOVES WINNIE

A PATHETIC little romance has been going on for some time now, occasionally hitting the headlines as messages between the two parties are made public. The pathos comes in through the fact that, like, alas, many romances, the true affection seems somewhat one-sided, and try as he may, Tommy seems unable to stir in Winnie's heart the true love which obviously flows from his own.

First indication that an affair was going on was when, last January, Tommy O'Brien sent a telegram to Winnie Churchill* wishing him good luck on his voyage to America, and in his discussions with General Eisenhower. Tom's family and friends were upset about this, because they thought he was being a little forward in sending a billet-doux of this nature to such a grand person as Winnie, but Tom, his heart aflame, would not listen to reason.

How many clandestine meetings Tom has persuaded Winnie to have with him, we do not know. How many times he has climbed the balcony, to pant his undying love, and how many times Winnie has let him hold hands, we do not know.

All we do know is that, a few nights ago, Tom was invited to dinner with Winnie at the villa of Lord Beaverbrook (well cast as the old nurse in *Romeo & Juliet*) at Cap d'Ail on the French

Riviera. This tête-à-tête in such romantic surroundings, with the blue Mediterranean sighing on the beach below the balcony, raised Tom to such dizzy heights that when he left, hugging himself with glee, he was bursting to tell the world of every sweet word his loved one spoke to him.

Unable to find a convenient rooftop to shout his glad tidings from, he had to make do with an audience at a dinner party in Newcastle—and we may judge the strength of Tom's passion by the fact that the journey from Cap d'Ail to Newcastle had not damped his ardour one bit.

So once again the romance hit the headlines when Tom disclosed some of his intimate conversation with Winnie—

*See FREEDOM 10/1/53.

conversation that revolved around the romantic topic of 4-Power talks.

Alas, Tom has now blotted his copy-book and Winnie is furious with him for telling the world their secrets, and the next day the papers carried headlines like "Winnie Snubs Tom", which must have nearly broken the poor boy's heart.

However, we must say this for Tom—he's a fighter. Knowing he had put his foot in it, he hurriedly came back with a proposal that should have pleased Winnie no end. This was that Tom's family should move away from their relations next door—who were the bitterest opponents to the match between Tommy and Winnie—and then the field would be clear for an elopement.

But alas again, this has only caused another family row and now Uncle Arthur is the one to snub poor little Tommy.

Truly it can be said that the course of true love never runs smooth and at the moment Tommy is in disgrace on all sides. However, *nil desperandum* Tom! All will come well in the end of you will only play your hand correctly and curb that impetuous tongue of yours.

If we can give you a word of advice, Tom—here's what you should do: Next Sunday in the confession box, admit that you have allowed your passion to overcome your humility, and get down on your knees and ask for God's guidance. He's always on the side of the social climbers and we are sure He will not fail you now.

PHYLLIDA Q. SMYTHE.

Readers: Watch carefully for the next instalment of our True Love Story. Will Tom win Winnie's hand? Will he get the Knight-hood he's after? Buy your FREEDOM regularly and don't miss the next episode in this True Romance.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

TOWER HILL
Tuesdays at 12.30 p.m.

INDOOR MEETINGS Watch this column for announcement of new meetings in October

NORTH-EAST LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM Alternate Wednesdays at 7.30 p.m.

OCT. 21—ANARCHISM, COMMUNISM & CHRISTIANITY. A Symposium on the "Prometheus" Article.

TYNESIDE ANARCHIST GROUP

A group has recently been formed in this area and will hold meetings on alternate Sundays at 7.30 p.m. at the home of D. Boon, 53, Louvain Place, Newcastle-on-Tyne to whom enquiries should be addressed. The first meeting will take place on October 10th at 7.30 p.m.

GLASGOW

OUTDOOR MEETINGS from now until further notice at MAXWELL STREET, Sundays at 7 p.m. With John Gaffney, & others

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

E. A. GUTKIND: *The Expanding Environment* 8s. 6d.

V. RICHARDS: *Lessons of the Spanish Revolution* 6s.

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.

Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity* paper 7s. 6d.

TONY GIBSON: *Youth for Freedom* paper 2s.

Food Production and Population 6d.

Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.

PHILIP SANSOM: *Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step* 1s.

ERRICO MALATESTA: *Anarchy* 6d.

Vote—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 boards 3s. 6d.

PETER KROPOTKIN: *The State: Its Historic Role* 1s.

The Wage System 3d.

Revolutionary Government 3d.

Organised Vengeance Called Justice 2d.

ALEXANDER BERKMAN: *ABC of Anarchism* 1s.

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 orhovels? 6d.

What is Anarchism? 1d.

The Basis of Communal Living 1s.

F. A. RIDLEY: *The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age* 2d.

★ 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.