

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"I believe rather in drawing men toward good than shutting them out from bad."

—EMILE ZOLA.

Reflections on the 20th Century Borgias

GERMS FOR PEACE!

FOR the worrying type of person it cannot be said that there is ever a dull moment in the world we live in. Every day the Press provides us with a rich harvest of disasters, tragedies, murders and assaults, not to mention political crises and breath-taking accounts of brinkmanship at top level, which are guaranteed to kill or cure. And what is even more extraordinary is that when one imagines that government-sponsored scientists have plumbed the depths in their search for the last word in the instruments of human extermination, or that politicians have told the biggest lie, perpetrated the greatest injustice ever, or resorted to the most disgusting violence imaginable against their political enemies, one may live to learn that in their quest for power over their fellow beings, there are no limits to what politicians will do to achieve their ends, and, alas, no limits to what some of their lackeys are prepared to do in return for money, success and status.

★

THE atom bombs of Hiroshima and Nagasaki now appear as child's play compared with the potentialities of today's megaton H-bomb; the V1s and V2s which drove thousands of innocents to their graves and the mental hospitals are mere fireworks compared with the latest fashions in Missiles. But though existing weapons are sufficiently powerful to be capable of exterminating mankind, it is the height of political naiveté to suppose that politicians will rest, satisfied, or that scientists have exhausted their knowledge or their ingenuity. After all the H-bomb is a cumbersome and complex weapon, and just as "Progress" in aeronautics is measured by the increase of pay-load to dead load, as well as of speed, so Progress in death, in mass extermination, will surely be judged both by the speed of extermination and by deaths per bomb-ton. In this respect perhaps we cannot hope for spectacular Progress in the H-bomb (apart from the method of delivery, and no one can deny that the development of missiles is a big advance on the old-fashioned, conventional, jet-bombers) especially if the scientists' hands are tied by agreements to suspend the testing of these weapons!

But before the public accepts the H-bomb as yet one more unwanted paid-guest in the family circle, it should be reminded that this is no guarantee that it will not ultimately be saddled with other equally un-

wanted, "more ultimate" weapons. Of course we have in mind the news released last week that Britain's scientists have produced the last word in germ horrors. At the Microbiological Research Centre and the Chemical Defence Experimental Establishment, scientists are working on 40 or more plague germs, on polio type viruses, nerve gases, cholera and typhus germs. Their crowning achievement is the concentration of botulinus toxin (which in nature is formed when meat or vegetables are improperly canned) thousands of times more than it is found in nature. Professor E. Maurice Backett, Professor of Social Medicine in the University of Aberdeen described the effect of these germs in the following terms:

[It kills] principally by paralysing the nervous system. One small teaspoon of the powder contains enough botulinus toxin to kill a million people.

An *Observer* correspondent quotes experts as saying that 8½ ozs. of it "properly distributed would kill everyone in the world". The *News Chronicle* correspondent's authorities are more optimistic and put the quantity required at 16 ozs. In view of the fact that (thanks to the hard work put into the problem by scientists) the concentrate can be mass-produced cheaply, it matters little whether the quantity required is 8½, 16 or 160 ozs. The fact is that we are on the brink of yet another "revolution" in science and who knows, power politics as well! Here

at last is the portable mass-exterminator. In years to come, while Foreign Ministers are still busy in Geneva working out a formula for an "effective" control of H-bomb testing and production, every government will have planted innocuous-looking tourists throughout the world whose suit-cases will have no false bottoms, and whose only knowledge of their surroundings need be the location of the municipal water works. In one waistcoat pocket a miniature receiving set, in the other a phial of Botulinus toxin, such will be the uniform (with seasonal variations of course) and equipment of the armed forces of tomorrow!

★

A SOCIALIST Nuclear Disarmament Campaign supporter with whom we discussed this latest "unseen deterrent", as the *News Chronicle* correspondent so conveniently describes Botulinus toxin, declared that he would not be surprised if governments had been responsible for the publicity as a means of distracting attention from the H-bomb and the growing public reaction against its continued production and testing. When we argued that to us the new "deterrent" confirmed us in our view that until we campaigned uncompromisingly against war mankind could never be safe from the possibility of extermination by man, he replied that the testing and use of nuclear weapons not only threatened us but also generations yet

Continued on p. 3

The Economics of Study

IN a recent memorandum to a Committee set up by the Scottish Ministry of Education, the National Union of Students, has repeated its policy on the "Means Test". This is the system under which the value of the grant awarded to holders of State Scholarships to Universities depends on the income of the parents. The Union puts forward as its main reason, quite rightly, that at the age of eighteen people should be quite independent of their parents (they should of course be independent long before that, but that is more a psychological than an economic question). Besides that, it is felt that many boys and girls leaving grammar schools would be more likely to choose University education if they could be sure that they would not have to be dependent on their parents.

The word "independence" sounds very fine, but not many undergraduates get as much as £300 per annum, and probably the majority get considerably less. This means that the recipient has either to work during holidays or stay with parents. Neither of these is bad in itself but they both limit independence. The best immediate solution is the one advocated by the Labour Student Associations, of a living wage for students. This would put them on an equal economic footing with all other workers of the same ages, but it would imply far wider economic and social consequences than its protagonists usually consider.

Before considering these it is fair to notice that life for students without independent financial means is probably better in Britain than anywhere else in the world. Even the Swedish Students' Union has as its official policy the introduction of the British system of paying grants into its own country. There is in all other countries a far greater bias away from the working class and towards the professional, and where they still remain, the moneyed classes.

In a short note in the French anarchist journal *Le Monde Libertaire*, A. Devriendt mentions the recent agitation among students in Paris, and points out that even though it might be better for money to be spent on their education rather than on national defence, it must be remembered that students come from and represent the bourgeois tradition, and carry it on when they finish studying.

It is felt among some people even today, that a student is getting away with something by not having to start work until after twenty-one, and there can be little doubt that most find that they have got away with something at the end of it, in that openings to highly paid jobs lie open to them. It is strange that this does not cause more resentment among other workers than it does, but perhaps this can be explained by the general behaviour of students which gives ample opportunity for healthy despicement, making everyone else feel very relieved that they are not students too.

Mostly however, the two propositions are accepted as complementary; that a student lives on a low economic level while studying, and then makes up for it by pulling the cash in afterwards. Nevertheless the economic aspect of this isn't the whole story. It is hardly ever borne in mind that student life is fashioned by the demands of a coercive society for a particular type of person. The ideal graduate is one who has been so consistently deprived of money, sex, and responsibility that he will collapse gratefully into the first highly paid job that comes along, devote himself to it to the exclusion of all interfering thoughts, and make up for his lack of status in the real world by cherishing status in his own private world of chemical equations or production research. These are the people who go into guided missile research because the mathematics is fascinating, or into advertising because it presents interesting psychological problems. Academic specialisation provides the state with a wonderful solution of the problem of how not only to render intelligent people harmless, but to win them over to its side. Furthermore, there is very little disquiet about this among students themselves. After all once you've got a degree you don't have to worry about money. Independence is another matter. It is quite possible for someone who has been highly trained in the secrets of nuclear physics to turn away and do something useful in life instead, and some people do, but taken as a whole the "academic situation" has its products firmly enmeshed in a trap. Whether the person is of aristocratic, bourgeois, or working class origins, he has jolly well got a managerial future.

From the point of view of industry of course, the educational world is just one more assembly line. Not a week goes by without a cry for a higher "turnout" of technicians, or the doubling of the "output" of scientists in the next ten years. There may be some point in saying that it is preferable to spend money on education than on national defence, but considering the way in which the state disposes of its educational funds at the moment it is coming to much the same thing.

Increased grants for students? Not many of them are worth it.

P.H.

The Miners March Again

Where is a Constructive Union Policy?

LAST Saturday saw the return of marching miners to the streets of South Wales. Ten thousand anthracite miners with their families and sympathisers marched through the streets of Swansea in the largest demonstration seen there since the General Strike of 1926, in protest against the closing of six 'uneconomic' pits in South Wales.

The mile-long procession took nearly an hour to march to a recreation ground where a resolution was passed condemning the closures. Miners' union leaders and six local M.P.s headed the column, and at the meeting, Will Paynter, president of the South Wales miners, said: "We warn the Government and employers that the employed in this country have the power to defeat their policy, and unless this policy is changed it may be necessary for the employed to exercise their power in their own self-defence."

Now this bold talk is all very well; it might even have effect although this is unlikely. But it is one thing to attack the policies of the Coal Board and the Government—and Will Paynter and his buddies were (and still are) all for nationalisation, after all—and another to have constructive policies of your own.

By pinning their faith on nationalisation, the miners have supported the growth of a system which gives them no say in the control of their own industry and has simply meant the more efficient operation of capitalism in the mines and manipulation of the miners on a national instead of a local scale.

The Same Again

No different principles have been introduced into the coal industry. Miners are still cajoled to work by the big wages bait and exhortation and criticism when coal is needed—and tossed aside when it isn't. In many cases they are tossed aside earlier now than the NCB, operating all the coal-fields in the country, can close individual pits by arbitrary decision. In the bad old days an owner closed a pit only as a last resort—after all it was his means of income as well as the miners'—but nowadays such personal interests are not at stake. And we have yet to hear of an area manager's salary being cut when pits in his area are closed as 'uneconomic'. He is just getting rid of a headache and a nasty red entry in his ledgers.

So today things are happening which only two years ago were purported to be practically impossible. Remember all those large advertisements in the national press urging you to become a miner? They stressed the good money to be earned in the mines, told us what a modern industry it is, what grand opportunities for promotion exist, and above all sold us the idea of security. It was a secure job, a permanent job; the miners would never again be unwanted.

Where are those advertisements now? The Coal Board must have spent hundreds of thousands of pounds on its advertising for miners, but now it is saving that money by keeping quiet. Now, if one thinks in these sort of terms—and Will Paynter does—how about spending

that money on keeping open the 'uneconomic' pits from which the miners are being made 'redundant'? **American Coals to Newcastle!**

But the Coal Board now has a surplus of coal. Huge stocks pile up. It can't be exported because the price is too dear. On the contrary, Polish and American coal is coming into this country, and it has been alleged that coal can be brought from America and sold in Newcastle cheaper than British coal!

It's the old story; the story that led thousands of miners to sing in the gutters of London before the war while British (patriotic) industrialists bought their coal cheaper from abroad. The old story with a different cast at the top—a board of managers (most of them old owners and ex-union leaders) instead of rapacious capitalists. With a centralised administration to operate the nation's mines more efficiently and so that the nation's wealth and miners' lives should not be exploited to line private pockets. A new deal for the miners so that the spectre of unemployment should never again haunt the valleys of South Wales and the black lands of the Midland, Northern and Scottish coalfields.

No doubt staunch Labourites and Communists like Will Paynter will still not hear a word against nationalisation, but it can hardly be said to conform to the picture promised by its advocates. The board of managers are a highly paid bunch of capitalist-minded bureaucrats whose positions and incomes are safer than were those of many of the

Continued on p. 4

COURTESY ALL ROUND

General good humour and co-operation were reported when trains on London Transport's Metropolitan line were delayed for about half an hour during the rush-hour last night by a signal failure between Baker Street and Finchley Road. Because of the delay passengers were asked to leave two trains. "They were as good as gold," a station porter said.

M.G. 20/1/59.

A machine that says "Thank you" will be on show at the Catering Trades Exhibition which opens in London on January 28. It can be attached to a slot machine and when a sale is made a woman's voice expresses suitable thanks—a tape recording is started when the drawer is opened.

M.G. 21/1/59.

Don't keep
FREEDOM
to yourself
Pass it on, or better
still, order extra
copies for your friends

VOLUNTARY CHILDBIRTH

ANARCHISTS claim the right of each individual to exercise the widest possible choice as to the conduct of his or her own life. Voluntary parturition is surely one of the most fundamental components of this freedom; yet in many countries today the sale of contraceptive devices and of literature describing methods of birth control is prohibited, subject to severe penalties.

In this country there is no such prohibition and in theory no woman need bear a child against her will. I say "in theory"; for in practice a number of circumstances militate against the consistent and successful use of contraception by more than a small part of the community at the most intelligent and emancipated end of the scale. I name some of these, not necessarily in order of importance:—

1. The over-riding puritanical opinion among the "establishment" classes that you must not have "something for nothing"—that sexual pleasure is legitimate only when with it are associated the responsibilities of marriage and parenthood. As a result of this it is almost impossible for an unmarried girl in most walks of life to obtain reliable professional advice on contraception.

2. In most of the community fanatical taboos of the "you-must-never-touch-it" nature are brutally enforced throughout infancy and childhood. A result of this is a very widespread distaste (amounting often to something akin to superstitious awe) for the actual fitting of contraceptives. A great many women consequently just "leave all that to hubby" and because (a) the use of a condom is liable to reduce the satisfaction obtained from intercourse, (b) men too suffer to some extent from the inhibition just mentioned, and (c) being less directly affected by the consequences, "hubby" (or the boy friend) is the more liable to be occasionally careless, this delegation of responsibility, like any other, has its dangers.

3. Even where an apparently rational approach is possible and an effective method of contraception is in use, people

"miss out" or forget occasionally. I have a theory, which I would like to see discussed by someone professionally qualified to do so, that the taboo on "something for nothing" is so strong as to cause an unconscious guilt which can be assuaged only by the suffering of childbirth! I may be wrong, but this theory would go far towards explaining the prevalence of such "accidents" among highly intelligent and generally careful, reliable people, together with their readiness to admit the circumstances.

Anyway, for these and other reasons a great many women do become pregnant in circumstances which range from their not actually wishing to have a child at the time, to the many combinations of circumstances in which the birth of a child would be tragic for both it and the mother. Yet the law at present admits (and that only by the precedent of a Court decision which could at any time be reversed) only one ground for the deliberate termination of a pregnancy: that to give birth would endanger the life or gravely affect the health of the mother. This although the present state of the surgeon's art permits an abortion carried out under proper conditions and at the proper time to be a quite simple matter.

Despite the legal prohibition it is estimated that in this country one abortion takes place for every four live births. The vast majority of these must be undertaken under less than optimum conditions. Everybody knows of the suffering and bereavements that result, but few think to do anything about it. Those who would like to do something ought to support the Abortion Law Reform Association.²

The A.L.R.A. is by no means an anarchist group and the Bill which it is trying to get through Parliament is hardly revolutionary; it would provide that an abortion might be carried out on medical or social grounds, the arbiter to be the patient's doctor supported by a "second opinion". The Association's pamphlet "Abortion Legal or Illegal" starts as follows: "Today in hundreds of British homes, married women, faced with an addition to a family they think already as large as they can cope with, are trying to end the possibility of another child by dangerous experiments on their own bodies, in secrecy, and often in acute fear of the consequences." Thus it bases its appeal on the plight of the over-

burdened married woman who has already "done her bit". It does not suggest that women should be able to make their own decisions on this matter, the decision has to be made by two doctors who can be assumed "responsible". The requirement for a second opinion to be sought is a "safeguard" against "abuse". Indeed the main argument adduced by the Association has nothing to do with "principles", but is a question of expediency: since abortions do take place, and since the present law means that they take place in secrecy and therefore in dangerous conditions, the law should be changed to obviate the avoidable suffering which at present occurs. This very argument runs them into difficulties, for if one admits the right of the law to determine such things for individuals then one is at once open to the retort that "hard cases make bad law" and must face the fact that, basically, law is concerned with principles and not with the well-being of individuals.³

However, to deny a possible immediate benefit for the sake of ultimate principles is not, in my view, a characteristic of anarchist behaviour, and I am quite sure that even a very modest reform of the law, such as is proposed by the A.L.R.A., would be of enormous benefit, in the immediate future, to a great number of women. Some loopholes are better than none.

IAN LESLIE.

¹My contention that suffering in childbirth is sought is supported by the irate reactions provoked by the very suggestion, made by Grantly Dick Read and others, that childbirth could and should be pleasurable. Many of the most irate protests come from multiparae, who say they would not have "earned" their babies without having first suffered! The use of analgesia was for decades subject to the same sort of criticism, but won through more easily: unconsciousness avoids pain, but also denies pleasure.

²The Abortion Law Reform Association. Secretary: Mrs. M. S. Garrett, 18 Wyatt Park Road, S.W.2. Minimum subscription: 5s.

³As the learned Judge pointed out in a recent case where relief was denied to both "partners" in a marriage in which it had been shown that there had never at any stage been any sign of compatibility, "the law cannot concern itself with the happiness of the parties".

CINEMA

The Last Hurrah

JOHAN FORD has, in my opinion, a completely phoney reputation as one of the great directors. Film after film directed by him appears as so much rubbish, yet still the old mystique clings to him. He seems to be one of those men who build a reputation by cannibalizing the talents of others. Given a good director, a good script, a handful of good actors and a good camera man, Ford can occasionally turn out a good film but they are so few as to appear accidental to the original intent. Orson Welles, that ancient enfant terrible of the film industry, could do more with a five shilling box camera than Ford could do with the entire resources of Hollywood yet while Welles turned out box-office flop after flop that we still want to see time and time again Ford turns out success after success and who cares. Ford's latest phenomenal success is the direction and production of "The Last Hurrah", so he can blame no-one but himself for the 120 minutes of dreary bilge that appear after the credit titles. "The Last Hurrah" was written by Edwin O'Connor and was a rambling, maudlin, fictional account of the life and the death of one of the few remaining American political bosses.

The old-time American political boss, at a distance of 3,000 miles, did possess a certain grimy grandeur. Spawned and reared in the gutters and the alleys of the sprawling, growing American cities he fought his way up the only height that could offer him a handhold and when he arrived at the top of the political muck-heap he stayed there by sheer force of personality. There in the dusty corridors of City Hall he held his court and played man against man, group against group to hold his snarling kingdom together and when he suffered the rare occupational risk of a prison sentence he would stand on the steps of his City Hall surrounded by newsmen and with his expensive coat flapping in the breeze and his fedora crushed onto his mop of greying hair would call on God to bear witness to his innocence. While his slimy counterpart the financial wizard, baron or is it king? stole railways the political boss stole cities and though he played rough he lived high and from his political dung heap came the governors of the states and, whisper it softly, more than one of the presidents of These

United States. He was no common crook, no oily assassin like the greasy Capone or board-room spiv robbing and looting the land behind a façade of legal fiction but a man who fought his way through the political jungle and took the riches and the punishments that the alien city offered him as a prize or a beating that any fighter must gamble on and it is doubtful if the welfare of his fellow citizens at any time occupied his mind.

Ford produced and directed "The Last Hurrah" and one would have thought that here was a wonderful opportunity to portray an intriguing facet of the American political scene. Here was an occasion when the camera could have swept through the streets and the committee rooms from scabrous bars to inner sanctums.

It could have woven a pattern of a city that could have had the bite, the humour and the bitterness of a Hogarth print.

Instead we have Tracy in his perennial role of Everybodys Dad, surrounded by a bevy of professional Hollywood Irishmen all sporting hard hats and who appear to me to spend most of the film dashing *en masse*, through doorways, fighting bad bankers, ex-KKK-newspaper owners and anti-Irish blue bloods. From the number of priests who kick up their skirts in this film one would have thought that a dedication to the late Ronald Firbank would have been in order. Even the lunatic fringe is represented and badly acted by Wallace Ford but unless one has read the book one is only conscious of a rather boring gabby character mouthing unintelligible shouts.

During the course of the film Mayor Tracy takes the inevitable nostalgic stroll through the slums wherein he was reared. It must surely be an indictment of any professional politician's reign that after a lifetime in control of a city, the very slums that spewed him forth still stand and are still inhabited. One could only have wished that Ford had seen the film "The Great MacGinty" to learn how this type of film should have been made and then having seen that film turned "The Last Hurrah" over to Orson Welles. As for Ford? Well there's always an odd desert or two lying around to be directed.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats.)

New Books . . .

- Guillotine at Work G. P. Maximov 17/6
- Freedom Chooses Slavery J. F. D'Andrade 15/-
- Goldmund Herman Hesse 16/-
- The Unknown Tchekov A. P. Tchekov 25/-
- Historic Documents of World War Two W. C. Langsam 9/6
- The Square Root of Wonderful Carson McCullers 12/6

Cheap Editions . . .

- Great Philosophers of the East E. W. F. Tomlin 3/6
- Great Philosophers of the West E. W. F. Tomlin 3/6
- For Esme With Love and Squalor J. D. Salinger 2/6
- Lucky Jim Kingsley Amis 2/6
- Leftover Life to Kill Caitlin Thomas 2/6
- Dylan Thomas in America John Malcolm Brinnin 2/6
- Darkness at Noon Arthur Koestler 2/6

Reminders . . .

- William Godwin George Woodcock 5/-
- London's Underworld Henry Mayhew 7/6

Second-Hand . . .

- The Responsibility of Peoples Dwight Macdonald 10/-
- Virgin Soil Ivan S. Turgenov 3/-
- The Paris Commune of 1871 Frank Jellinek 4/6
- The Opinions of William Cobbett G.D.H. & M. Cole 5/-
- The Next Ten Years (1929-) G. D. H. Cole 6/-
- Attempts at General Union G. D. H. Cole 10/-
- The World of Labour G. D. H. Cole 6/6
- Look to Norway William Warbey 3/6
- Ordeal by Slander Owen Lattimore 3/-
- The Flag in the Wind J. M. MacCormick 3/6
- We Did Not Fight Pollitt, Russell, Sessoon, etc. 3/-
- The Creed of Kinship Henry S. Salt 3/-
- Philosophy for the Ordinary Man Rueben Osborn 3/-

We can supply ANY book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found!

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

VIEWPOINT

Cyprus in Perspective

THERE is considerable misunderstanding about what has been happening in Cyprus over the last three years. It is generally believed that Cyprus is in a state of war.

In war soldiers, sailors and airmen have generally speaking, to fight more or less pitched battles with similarly equipped, organised and uniformed opponents termed enemies. In my personal experience the attacking combatant's sole concern is to reach a point on the map without losing his life, while the defending combatant hopes simply to be allowed to stay put and remain alive. (Both were less concerned about being wounded, provided it was a "Blighty" one ensuring a passage home until the end of the war, and preferably a wound not involving permanent disability). The combatants wives and families stayed at home so as not to impede the course of battle, though maybe to suffer the attentions of the enemy air force—a risk considerably enhanced in the 1939-1945 war.

Such is not the position in Cyprus. Not only does the government permit and provide for the accommodation of its forces' families and, except during acute emergency, allow them to mix freely with Cypriots, while their menfolk come home after duty with strict instructions to unload and hand in to stores their firearms, but the point-to-point pattern of war is not followed in any true particular and opponents are termed criminals.

Without descending to the prime ministerial distinction between wars and armed intervention nor (believing as I do that violence under any other name would smell as sour) resorting to a conventional euphemism artlessly, I would say that what has been taking place between the British forces in Cyprus and the natives of that island is, in fact, police action.

People do not recognise the fact because they rarely recognise what police action is. It aims always and everywhere to repress and control in the interests of some exploitation, not necessarily vicious but always determined.

The methods vary according to time, place, particular policy and even personal inclination: but whatever the degree or style of practice, police principle remains constant and consistent.

In England a bobby may respond affably with: "The time, sir? . . . Certainly—just going on twelve. Not at all, sir. Good day, sir": but that is not what he is there for. The policeman's job is to intimidate and coerce a population into keeping an order determined by a government authority. This may entail no more than his wearing uniform to give general warning that the eye of the law is upon us. It may take the form of untrue notices warning motorists that an area is patrolled by plain-clothes police in private cars. It may be effected by patrolling the streets and bundling people into plain vans.

During the 1939-1945 war, a helplessly drunken little soldier in a northern England town, creating no disturbance except verbally, offered some cheek (not the other one) to a couple of policemen twice his size. One minion of the law promptly swiped the youngster across the face with a pair of handcuffs. A dozen stitches were needed to repair that boy's face, and he was falsely and successfully accused of resisting arrest.

Custodians of the law everywhere are prepared to act like that. Cyprus offers no exception and considerable opportunity from official reprimand. In Cyprus the police ideal is carried to a logical conclusion by force of arms in answer to sporadic violent lawlessness regarded as particularly serious because it is inspired by subversive elements of considerable political ambition.

Explicit warrant is contained in the official INSTRUCTIONS TO INDIVIDUALS FOR OPENING FIRE IN CYPRUS which were issued in December, 1955, following the declaration of a state of emergency the month previous. Couched in parliamentary language exacting an assessment of any critical situation as if the serviceman attacking or attacked were seated comfortably in a map room at headquarters, these instruc-

tions can be quoted damningly in Court Martial proceedings should the political wind veer unluckily; but in general they enable any coroner to exonerate any authorised individual who has killed say, some Cypriot attempting to escape an interrogation fearfully anticipated as brutal.

Individual responsibility is stressed with:— No. 1:

"Before you use force it is always your duty to assess the situation confronting you and to decide what degree of force is necessary. If having done this carefully and honestly, you decide that there is no alternative but to open fire, and then do so, you will be doing your duty and acting lawfully whatever the consequences."

Instruction No. 2 on "When You Should Fire" says:

"It is your duty to shoot if that is the only way: (a) To defend yourself, your comrades, families, the Police and all peaceable inhabitant against serious attack. (b) To protect against serious damage all Government property, e.g. buildings, installations, vehicles and equipment. (c) To disperse a riotous mob that you honestly believe will cause serious injury to life and property if not forcibly prevented. (d) To arrest persons committing acts of violence, or who you honestly believe have done so, or are about to do so, and to prevent their escape."

Instruction No. 3, somewhat shorter is on "When You Should Not Fire":

"(a) If it is obvious that you can achieve your object by other means do not shoot. (b) If you are a member of a party under the orders of a superior, do not fire until he orders you to do so."

Instruction No. 4 on "How To Fire" says:

(a) Always fire aimed shots. (b) Aim at the part of the body you are least likely to miss i.e. in the middle. (c) Never fire warning shots over people's heads."

Instruction No. 5 is for "Sentries And Picquets":

"(a) If you or the persons or place you are guarding are attacked with arms or explosives, open fire at once. (b) If you think you are about to be attacked in any way challenge loudly, bring your

weapon to the aim and call out the guard. If the person challenged halts get a member of the guard to investigate. If he does not and you really believe that he is about to attack you with arms or explosives shoot him at once; otherwise try to halt him with your bayonet."

"Escorts" are told by Instruction No. 6:

"(a) If you, your driver, passengers or vehicles are attacked with arms or explosives open fire at once and tell the driver to keep going and get away. (b) If you are only stoned tell your driver to keep going and get away. Don't fire unless the stoning is so serious that you really believe the vehicle may be stopped altogether and that you, the driver or your passengers will be seriously injured. (c) If your vehicle is obstructed by a road block try to remove it. If you are then attacked with arms or explosive, open fire. (d) Always be on the alert with your weapon at the ready."

Instruction No. 7 provides for "Individual Self Defence":

"(a) If you are attacked with arms or explosives shoot the attackers at once, wherever you are. (b) Don't join in brawls. Always avoid trouble if you can."

This manual of exemplary advice concludes with Instruction No. 8 on "Reports":

"You must always report any incident to the nearest Police or Military Post giving details:— (a) Location. (b) Details. (c) Method of attack. (d) Description of assailants. (e) When applicable, number of rounds fired and results."

He would be bold who complained of ambiguity in such comprehensive standing orders; but there is more than one kind of apprehension, and if the servant of the Crown must keep one eye on these regulations while the other is skinned for mortal danger, open or lurking, it is no wonder if he cannot always see straight and, without the Shakespearean warrant of "All's fair . . .", an unusual concern about what is expected of him renders the serviceman's actions and reports as suspect as those of police generally.

While recognising how beautifully such chapter and verse instructions suit the book of a government, in its perpetuating the notion of law-breakers being apprehended properly by conventional police forces reluctantly augmented by the military in the special circumstances

Continued on p. 4

Germs for Peace!

Continued from p. 1

unborn; that it was one thing to be killed or maimed in war, quite another to be responsible for millions of deformed creatures in generations to come as a result of our actions now. This is a very human and generous sentiment.

It is a very unrealistic one too, for it seems to us that we can only protect the interests of those who come after us by succeeding in being the masters of our own lives in the present. It is surely ridiculous to assume that a government will heed the warnings or the protests of people, however eminent they may be, speaking in the name of posterity, but who lack the militancy, the courage to defend human dignity in the present. H-bomb fall-out will be responsible for physical deformity in generations to come. But what of the social environment into which these future men and women will be born? Surely, those of us who profess to progressive ideas know what this means for us today. What have we done to clear the air for the future?

BOTULINUS toxin, from the point of view of our socialist friend, must be classified as a conventional weapon in war and power politics. On the one hand, as Prof. Beckett puts it: "it is now possible for anyone who really wants to, to bump off the human race" (and this, from the point of view of future generations is a much more serious consideration than a few million deformed creatures as a result of H-bomb test fall-out). On the other hand Dr. Brock Chisholm, former Director-General of the World Health Organisation, describes B.T. as being capable of killing "anyone who breathes it or touches it within six hours. It oxidises within twelve hours, leaving the area clean for occupation". Which means that future generations are spared (assuming of course that they are ever born), and therefore we assume that our socialist friend will not feel called upon to protest against B.T. as he does against the H-B.

QUESTIONS have been put to the government about the work of the two establishments referred to which are engaged on germ "warfare". In his reply, the Minister of Supply (and Poison?) said that the Ministry of Supply Establishments "were mainly engaged in research on defensive problems of microbiological chemical warfare".

Mr. Jones said most of the results obtained were published in open scientific literature. There was included the botulinus toxin referred to in recent newspaper statements.

This substance had been well-known for many years and the threat posed was grossly exaggerated since the toxin could not be easily disseminated and was not self-propagating. A number of useful defensive measures were known against it.

It was possible that other bacteria or viruses spelt greater danger. The purpose of his establishments was to determine and to reduce those risks, a task in which, in some respects, they had been notably successful.*

The establishments, declares Mr. Jones, are "mainly" engaged on research, etc. It would be interesting to know what they did the rest of the time! His reference to "research on defensive problems" implies that the government is not interested in the production of the weapons themselves. Yet it is difficult to know

how one can do the one without the other.

Dr. Chisholm recalled that in 1944 when he was Director-General of Canadian Army Medical Services he took 235,000 doses of anti-botulinus vaccine from laboratories in Suffolk Alta to Great Britain.

It was administered to British, American and Canadian troops, and word of it was "leaked" to German spies so that the Nazis would know the Allies could also produce bacteriological weapons. (Our italics).

So much for Mr. Jones' reassurances about "defensive research". As to the threat being "grossly exaggerated" on the grounds that (a) the toxin could not be easily disseminated, (b) a number of useful defensive measures were known against it, Professor Beckett thinks differently. When asked "how would it be used as a weapon of war" he replied, unlike the Minister, modestly: "I am no expert on this" but

I should imagine that an enemy agent would spread it. This could most easily be done by putting the powder in the water supply, say a large reservoir.

A teaspoonful in the water supply of a large city would be virtually undetectable and would remain long enough to do its deadly work of paralysing everyone who drank it.

As to immunisation against it he replied:

In theory, yes. But in practice, no. There are a number of difficulties. Botulinus exists in various forms and you might go to the trouble of immunising the whole population to one strain and then find they were exposed to another.

In any case, such an immunisation programme could not be hidden from the rest of the world and no potential enemy would think of using the particular toxin against which immunisation had been carried out.

And for good measure he adds: Besides, botulinus toxin is a relatively ineffective bacteriological weapon. Much more deadly things exist.

So before Botulinus Toxin Disarmament Committees are formed by well-meaning citizens, remember that Viruses are more deadly than the much maligned Botulinus toxin. Says the Professor:

Viruses. The bacteriologists have found means of changing relatively harmless virus into virulent, paralysing forms simply by passing them through animals a few times and then growing them.

Live virus is a much more efficient weapon than toxin, which is a once-for-all affair.

A virus is self-propagating and once planted in a susceptible population will go on killing until a vaccine can be made against it.

Q.—Which would be too late?

Yes. I am convinced that the bacteriological warfare people now have horrors ready to be used which make botulinus toxin a relatively harmless weapon.

One of the difficulties of defence against these things is that the research on which they are based is never published.

But Professor, grateful as we are to you for your blunt exposition of the facts, may we suggest that in your conclusion you cannot see the wood for . . . laboratories? and power politics? There is only one possible defence against these things. We, you, every one of us who can still think of society in terms of human beings and not systems or power blocs, who can distinguish between human dignity and cheap, ignorant pride, we can offer the only defence against these things: by requesting the scientists manning them to get out, and then smashing these establishments to smithereens so that no one may again use them in our time.

These establishments are not just the laboratories of death the professor has described. It is war, force, authority, power, as the instrument in the regulation of human relations, and production for profit and privilege in the economic sector, that must be combated if we honestly wish to remove misery and anxiety from the world today and ensure a background for our children and their children of hope instead of despair.

PEOPLE AND IDEAS:

A HOUSE OF THEORY

WRITING last week about G. D. H. Cole, I was bound to think of the difference between his own conception of socialism and that of his eminent students. Mr. Benedict Meynell writes in the *Manchester Guardian*, "for thirty years the 'Cole Group' met weekly in his rooms to read and discuss papers on socialism. Hugh Gaitskell is a product of this informal circle". Lord Attlee writes in the *News Chronicle*, "I recall when he was still an undergraduate he took an active part in Labour politics and ever since he has always been prolific of new ideas", and Mr. Harold Wilson writes in *The Times*, as another product of the 'Cole Group' that it was "undoubtedly Oxford's biggest contribution to the education and inspiration of successive generations of Oxford-trained Socialists". There must be many whose socialism was learnt without benefit of Oxford who would pay similar tributes to his influence by way of his books.

No one would guess from all this that Cole's socialism was any different from that of Messrs. Gaitskell and Wilson, and it was left to Vladimir Dedijer, writing from Yugoslavia in last week's *Tribune*, to put a slightly inaccurate finger on the difference:

"In my discussion with him in London, I discovered that he rejected the idea of the continued supremacy of the State as the political organ of the Government, but he believed that the State in its present form was destined to disappear and to be replaced by a sort of federal authority representing the community in its various functional aspects. He followed with the greatest interest the results of the experiments with direct democracy in Israel, Austria, Germany and Yugoslavia and especially lately in India, in the Sarvodaya movement of Bhawe and Narayan.

" . . . I am certain that in the future, under changed conditions, the British Labour movement will pay much greater attention to the visionary ideas of Cole on workers' control."

Reading all these valedictory remarks led me to wonder what Cole's influence would have been had he declined to put his propagandist zeal and his authority as a teacher into the support of the Labour Party. I don't suppose that if Cole had been an anarchist, all those clever young men would have become anarchists. (They would probably have written him off as able but eccentric, or said of him, as King Vidor once said of Isaiah Berlin, "Too bad he missed. Stuck there at All Souls, I mean"). But he would have served to keep the concepts of anarchism intellectually respect-

able amongst social theorists, and would have ensured that new creative thinking was brought to bear on them.

FOR anarchism suffers, as all minority movements suffer, from the fact that its numerical weakness inhibits its intellectual strength. This may not matter when you approach it as an individual attitude to life, but in its other role, as a social theory, as one of the possible approaches to the solution of the problems of social life, it is a very serious thing. And it is precisely this lack that people have in mind when they complain (wrongly I think) that there have been no advances in anarchist theory since the days of Kropotkin. Ideas and not armies, change the face of the world, and in the sphere of what we ambitiously call the social sciences, too few of the people with ideas couple them with anarchist attitudes. "The anarchists are gone", writes Iris Murdoch, comparing the labour movement of today with that of the nineteenth century (in her contribution to the symposium *Conviction*), and who is to contradict her?

Not enough people. In the swing to the left discernable in this country since the time of Suez-Hungary, what influence have the anarchists had? Philip Holgate, in an acute letter published in *FREEDOM* last November asked "What is the Success of the Newsletter Movement?" He might have asked too, why does the *Universities and Left Review* flourish—and improve its contents—while its semi-anarchist equivalent stumbles along and has only just escaped extinction? Or how did it come about that a month after the Malatesta Club, pride of the London Anarchist Group, had to close down, the people grouped around the U. & L.R. were able to open their Partisan Coffee Bar? These organs of the so-called 'New Left', whether in union militancy, publishing or catering, have been able to get more people, more money and more support since their beginnings in 1956, than the anarchists have been able to muster.

It is certainly not due to the intrinsic merits of their post-Marxist socialism; it has everything to do with the fact that we have not succeeded in putting anarchism back into the current of ideas. The biggest need today of anarchism, considered as a social theory, is for a body of social theorists, for a group of anarchist economists, sociologists, psychologists, to relate our ideas more closely to the social realities of the second half of the twentieth century, and

bring them back into the realm of those ideas which serious people take seriously.

MISS MURDOCH, (who is another teacher of philosophy from Oxford), in her essay under the title *A House of Theory*, declares that,

"Socialist thought is hampered, and the appeal of Socialism is restricted because our technical concepts are highly esoteric and our moral concepts are excessively simple and there is nothing in between. We need, and the Left should provide, some refuge from the cold open field of Benthamite empiricism, a framework, a house of theory".

Curiously enough, she brings us back to Cole, in her search for a new moral framework to replace the "rational 'tidying up' of capitalist society into which Socialism is in danger of degenerating", for she concludes,

"If we seek here for inspiration in our own tradition we have not far to look. The Guild Socialists dissented on precisely this point from their less ambitious and more purely Benthamite colleagues, in that the latter were concerned with the damage done to the consumer and the former with the damage done to the producer. The Guild Socialists were deeply concerned with the destruction of community life, the degradation of work, the division of man from man which the economic relationships of capitalism had produced; and they looked to the transformation of existing communities, the trade unions, the factories themselves, for the restoration of what was lost. Such ideas were and are easy targets for mockery, and in the old Guild Socialist form were doubtless quite impracticable; and they faded from the scene partly because they were tied to inadequate techniques, and partly because the conception of the Welfare State presented an easier and more obviously urgent and attractive target. With its achievement it is necessary to renew our study of the more difficult and fundamental problems of capitalism. We cannot live without the 'experts'. But the true 'open society' in the modern world is one in which expertise is not mysterious; and the only way to prevent it from becoming mysterious is continually to subordinate its activities to a lively and interested public opinion; and this in turn will languish without 'theories'. The Welfare State marks the successful end of the first road along which the Socialist movement in this country elected to travel. It is time now to go back and explore the other road, to go back to the point of divergence . . ."

We claim, and it is a claim that will need a great deal of hard work to substantiate, that it is the task of anarchism to provide that house of theory.

C.W.

Bakunin & Anarchism

MICHAEL BAKUNIN was a great landmark during the last century—a century of political unrest. An indefatigable fighter for world emancipation, for liberty and freedom—a revolutionary genius—a demon of destruction, a revolter against all kinds of authority, against all that is sacred, against the conventional, against the basis of exploitation. It seems to me that Carducci's Satan is the personification of the spirit of Bakunin, and the words he uttered the expression of Bakunin's thoughts and actions: "I level thrones and altars, and annihilate binding customs. With the goad of a restless aspiration I urge men on until they outgrow faith and fear, until the slave stands erect before the tyrant and defies his curse."

Bakunin's enemies from left and right make of him an apostle of universal destruction. And it could not be otherwise. A revolutionary, a radical thinker, a bearer of ideas is mental dynamite, and can cause a dangerous explosion, shattering the foundations of an existing respectable social order.

What Chapman Cohen said for the freethinker is equally true for the anarchist: "Often a freethinker is denounced because he is destructive or dangerous. What other is he expected to be? And would he be of much use if he were otherwise? I would go further and say that he is the most destructive of all agencies, because he is so intimately concerned with the handling of the most destructive of weapons—ideas. It is literally true that in human society the most destructive forces at work are ideas." And Bakunin was a bearer of the most destructive idea—anarchism.

I have no intention of writing an apology for this most calumniated and despised man. But can we remain silent

before the affront of the bourgeois press, which misses no opportunity of emphasising the "hideous, anarchist" crime, or of mentioning the main "teacher", Bakunin?

In its issue of Oct. 17th, 1958, the *Sydney Daily Mirror* in its special feature about Sergei Nichaev brought up the old question of the Nichaev-Bakunin relationship, depicting it in the blackest possible terms, making it seem shocking and sensational. "Bakunin, a veteran anarchist with thirty years experience of revolutionary intrigue . . . author of the notorious rabble-rousing and anarchistic 'Catechism of the Revolution'." And further: "This catechism: with its blood-curdling exhortation to acts of vicious terrorism became the bible of fanatical anarchists the world over, whose senseless slaughter and destruction broke out during the latter part of the 19th century."

I will not discuss here the authorship of the "Catechism" in question, but I must say that the acts of violence were independent individual deeds, without instruction or order from higher authority—a conscious personal expression directed against that social cancer, authority, and its implications.

It is irrelevant to suggest any comparison between such individual acts and the planned, cold-blooded mass-murder accomplished by authority. The mandarins of the authoritarian order are dishonest and hypocritical. They weep while devouring their victims. They wail over the fate of Alexander II or Umberto, or some other king or queen killed by enraged anarchists or half-mad murderers, but they never mention their own responsibility for millions of human corpses, for suffering and tears.

For present-day society, anarchists are what the Devil is for the church. It is the church that persecutes heretics, de-

populating many countries for God's sake. The devil is only invented for justification.

Let us assume the existence of an omnipotent god, a legislator, the embodiment of all authoritarian principles. Then the devil exercises its indubitable right to rebel, to break the chains of mental slavery. Then only is knowledge born and conscience awakened. Without the devil, without a spirit of rebellion, there is no progress, no science, no knowledge. Carducci was right when he made his Satan say: "I animate all who fight against servitude and somnolence. I inspire the revolutionary, the scornful, the sceptic, and the satirist. I shall distribute the fruit of the tree of knowledge."

Then what kind of judgment can we expect from the moralists, from the bourgeois scribes and the supporters of conventionalism? They scorn anarchists because Gaetano Bresci killed a man responsible for the massacre of hundreds. They call anarchists vicious terrorists of senseless slaughter, and meantime they glorify war and call "sense" the dropping of bombs and the killing of thousands of women and children, innocent populations. They call men like Stalin, Hitler, Mussolini, Franco and Churchill great men of virtue and sense, and never count the souls these have sent to eternity. It is not considered slaughter when millions die; it is slaughter when some understanding individual dies. Is any comparison possible?

Even so, Bakunin and his followers are immoral beings, blood-thirsty revolutionaries, the cause of social disorder and clashes. But we must bear in mind that law and moral convention are created for unthinking people. While superstition, myths and dogmas still exist, the anarchist will be misunderstood, and people will remain blind to facts and realities. They will live in their imaginary world of illusions, and will be lulled by the song of shrewd politicians and their newspaper scribes.

J.G.

*As we write on Monday we have not read the verbatim replies. The above is from the *Evening Standard* Stop Press report.

Miners March Again Continued from p. 1

ex-owners—who still, incidentally, are reaping benefits from the nation's wealth and the miners' blood through compensation.

Union's Weak Position

A hierarchy exists through which the miners are controlled and disciplined with the connivance of a sold-out union leadership—half of whom may well have their eyes on NCB jobs for themselves. During the time of great demand for miners and for coal, the unions were moderate and 'responsible' in their demands, not 'taking advantage' of the situation. With the result that now demand for coal has slackened, they are in no position to protect their members.

What are the unions to do? Plead with the National Coal Board to be decent to the miners, when the NCB is concerned only with efficiency and profit?

Does Will Paynter imagine that the Coal Board will tremble at his words when he makes vague threats at a miners' demonstration? The Board knows as well as Paynter himself just how unlikely it is that the unions will take any action—and that if the miners themselves take unofficial action Paynter will be there with the rest of the officers urging the men back to work so that negotiations may take place and the

whole business smoothed out with no unpleasantness.

The unions have no policy. As long ago as August 1955 the Coal Board closed down Brynhenllys Colliery at Brynamman, South Wales, and we made then the only constructive suggestion we saw anywhere*—that in the closure of 'uneconomic' pits was a great opportunity for the miners' union to demonstrate the efficiency and economy of workers' control by taking over those pits and staking the men—if necessary—in running the pits themselves.

Since then the situation has worsened. But the solution remains the same. Only workers' control of industry can create security for the workers and operate industry on the most economic lines. Any other form of control means numbers of unproductive controllers to be kept out of profits and means also that those controllers have powers over the workers, who thus remain insecure.

Freedom, responsibility and real security go together. But all that Will Paynter wants to offer the miners is the security of the slave—while he continues to support a system which doesn't even offer that!

*See FREEDOM Selections 1955, p. 174.

Well, do Something

Not so long ago, we attended a meeting of ardent let's-do-something boys. Actually, they were all mature men of long-standing responsibilities in the engineering world. But the occasion of the gathering turned out to be the urge to do something, to put an acquired talent to work, rather than to examine the worthwhileness of what there might be to do, or the presumable effectiveness of it, once done. We did not know whether to be amused or alarmed. We incline to the latter.

Yet, much of that spirit can be found elsewhere. These are times when some people do not choose to face up to things, when mere action is often mistaken for effective outcomes. Our preoccupation with what others may do scientifically, without any evaluation of the merit of what they may be doing, is an example. Our fanciful escapism in pouring funds into school facilities without questioning the education programmes themselves is another. Our confidence that past levels of industrial activity must be exceeded without once asking if they were not then too high. Our assumption that we, of all peoples, are singly possessed of virtues and that by greater efforts we shall soon have made the world a Utopia, where every human adores us—for our self-interest?

We are reminded of the definition of a fanatic—one who redoubles his efforts when he has lost sight of his objectives. From "Refrigerating Engineering," (U.S.A.)

Well, Hard Luck!

Manure spread by farmers sparked a minor uranium rush in Malaya.

An aero-magnetic survey was completed by Colombo Plan experts in 1957, but rumours circulated that over certain parts of Malaya the aircraft's instruments had shown strong reactions.

There was a minor run on geiger counters as several would-be prospectors took to the jungle, to return weeks later thinner and poorer.

Said a Ministry of Natural Resources spokesman: "The fields were radioactive all right—but only with phosphate manure."

Ground checks show no worth-while uranium in Malaya.

News Chronicle 20/1/59.

To describe Cyprus as being in a state of war blurs the view and seduces almost everybody into consideration of the respective attractions of seven-year plans, partition and Enosis at the first and frying-pan level of leaders fit only to cook the books.

What is required by all is a thorough knowledge of and interest in Cyriots for their own sakes and, first of all, sympathetic imagination enough to withdraw the warrant, remove the handcuffs and bring the bobbies back. For, so long as people subscribe to the theory of government and equate its too rough justice and police-delegated direction with freedom, then so long will they be deceived into accepting such situations as Cyprus presents today.

SAM WALSH.

LETTER TO THE EDITORS

PARANOIA

DEAR COMRADES,

I cannot entirely agree with Arthur Uloth's views on paranoia.

He states: "In fact, of course, nothing dies", citing as evidence the reduction of an organism to its elements which are subsequently incorporated in other organisms. Surely he doesn't seriously suggest that carbon dioxide and water are merely transitional forms of life. Isn't it the biological organisation or integration of these and other chemicals that constitute life? Putrefaction is effected by distinct organisms. It is not a continuation of the living process. True, life in general may survive but this is cold comfort.

Surely sex is an expression of oneness or dependence upon other people rather than their oneness with "nature". Anyway we are no more completely isolated than we are completely "at one" with "nature".

He seems to distrust individual consciousness. Initially of course self-awareness produces a feeling of isolation and an illusory sense of power or abstract freedom. But this is only the initial phase.

The next phase when the individual examines its mental processes, can be far more dangerous.

Now the brain consists of a mass of interconnected cells all identical in certain physical characteristics. The co-existence of identical characteristics constitutes a universal, and its assertion is a generalisation. The brain cells therefore constitute universal life and their simultaneous assertion of identity, i.e. reaction to stimuli, is in a sense a generalisation of life. The reception of similar stimuli, multiplication by communication and linkage represent a generalisation.

However the individual is not aware of this; only of the generalisations and the fact that they produce results. This process is aided by language or symbolism, the ultimate of generalisation. The individual thinks in terms of "all", "every" and "nothing". The brain consisting of millions of cells, this process tends to reach gargantuan proportions. There arise such concepts as God, infinity, eternity, nature, dialectical materialism, determinism, nation, humanity, values, etc.

A generalisation, however, can only be completely verified by checking every particular instant. This is however impossible in the aforementioned cases. The individual nevertheless tends to believe in their absolute truth. This form of mental intoxication was very aptly called "Wheels in the Head" by Max Stirner.

If one is obsessed with the general, particulars such as my life or my sex needs are of little import. An extreme illustration of this may occur in schizophrenia when sometimes there appears to be a complete divorce between the evaluation process and emotions or natural functions. As Wilhelm Reich pointed out, there is not such a great difference between the system-obsessed philosopher and the paranoid. A paranoid's self-assessment is far more universal than, and very little related to, his physical needs.

I don't think that paranoia will disappear when people achieve oneness with nature. Rather will it cease when individuals appreciate their mental limitations and understand that ideas can at best only approximate external reality. And since mental intoxication seems to be a phase through which every generation passes, I suspect paranoia will always be with us.

I suspect, also, that such concepts as "oneness" or the "indestructibility of life" are "wheels in the head".

Yours faithfully,
PETER G. FEAK.

Don't Stop Now!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 4

Deficit on Freedom £80
Contributions received £102
SURPLUS £22

January 16 to January 22

Miami: L'Incaricato, Picnic, Jan. 11th, per J.S. £8/15/0; Solihull: K.P.D. 5/6; London: A.U. 9/-; Sheffield: P.M.B. 19/-; Radcliff-on-Trent: D.V.C. 10/-; London: S.M. 3/-; Germinal Colony, Pa., per A.B. £8/15/0; London: F.W.F. 6/-; London: Anon. 10/-; London: P.F.* £1/0/0; London: J.S.* 3/-; Wolverhampton: J.G.L.* 2/6; Yorkshire: Miner, W.E. 3/-; Philadelphia: T.O. £1/5/0; Glasgow: E.T.C. 10/-; London: J.E.S. 2/6;
Total ... 23 18 6
Previously acknowledged ... 78 8 0

1959 TOTAL TO DATE ... 102 6 6

GIFT OF BOOKS: London: C.W.; Pondon: P.; Moline: E.R.J.; London: P.

*Indicates regular contributor.

And please introduce FREEDOM to NEW READERS

HAUL UP THE LADDER!

Work on a film was suspended at Shepperton Studios yesterday because the Association of Cinematograph, Television and Allied Technicians claimed that the film producers, the Boulting brothers, were still members and had not paid union dues for eight years.

The men decided to return to work, according to British Lion Films, after the brothers had agreed to pay any subscriptions which might be due up to eight years ago, when, the brothers claimed, the union agreed to suspend their membership. The film being made is "I'm All Right, Jack", which deals in a satirical manner with trade unions and big business.

M.G. 17/1/59.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Regular Sunday meetings now held at "Marquis of Granby" Public House, Rathbone Street (corner of Percy Street, Rathbone Place and Charlotte Street), 7.30 p.m.

FEB. 1.—Bill Gape on FREEDOM FROM A VAGRANT'S POINT OF VIEW

FEB. 8.—Ian Leslie on Subject to be announced.

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates: 12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00) 6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50) 3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies 12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50) 6 months 14/6 (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
London, W.C.1. England
27 Red Lion Street
Tel.: Chancery 8364

FREEDOM PRESS

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One*
Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity*
Vol. 3, 1953, *Colonialism on Trial*
Vol. 4, 1954, *Living on a Volcano*
Vol. 5, 1955, *The Immoral Moralists*
Vol. 6, 1956, *Oil and Troubled Waters*

Vol. 7, 1957, *Year One—Sputnik Era*
each volume paper 7s. 6d.
cloth 10s. 6d.

The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FREEDOM at 5/- a copy

VOLINE:

Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d.
(Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21)
The Unknown Revolution cloth 12s. 6d.

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

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

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.
The Education of Free Men 1s.

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

RUDOLF ROCKER:
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

GEORGE WOODCOCK:
New Life to the Land 6d.
Homes orhovels? 6d.
Railways and Society 3d.

JOHN HEWETSON:
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

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

ERRICO MALATESTA:
Anarchy 9d.

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI:
Neither East nor West paper 7s. 6d.; cloth 10s. 6d.

K. J. KENAFICK:
Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx paper 6s.

TONY GIBSON:
Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.

★
Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:
Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949:
A Tribute cloth 5s.
Journey Through Utopia cloth 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

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