

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Liberty means responsibility. That is why most men dread it."  
 —BERNARD SHAW

## BOYCOTT S. AFRICAN GOODS!

LAST Friday, June 26, (South Africa 'Freedom Day') the non-white peoples of South Africa launched a boycott campaign against all goods produced by firms the principals or owners of which are known to support the Nationalist Government and its apartheid régime.

This is the intensification of a boycott which has been practised sporadically for some time. Now it is being put on a national basis with the resolve to continue indefinitely until the cruel exploitation of African workers by their white masters—with all its aspects of slave labour—is replaced by more humane relationships.

But the campaign is not being limited to South Africa. Through the Committee of African Organisations, an appeal is being made to the people of Britain to show their disapproval of the vicious racialism of the South African Government by refusing to buy South African goods at all.

One third of South Africa's total exports come to Britain. We spend £110 million every year on South African wines, fruits, tobacco and canned goods. And a large proportion of these goods are produced on farms that employ labour in conditions of slavery.

### A Chance to Act

Every time we enjoy a juicy 'Outspan' orange, or a bunch of grapes or wine made from the grapes, we help to provide the need for a police raid to round up some more Africans to be carted out to the farms. Every time we light up a 'Craven A' cigarette we help keep that boot on an African's neck.

We have often bewailed how little we in Britain can do to help the South African workers. Now is the chance to do something that will demonstrate clearly—even to the Nationalists blinded by prejudice—that we hate what they are doing in the name of European culture.

The African National Congress has sent to this country (and the story of how he got to this country is not for publication!) the secretary

general of their youth section, Mr. Tennyson Makiwane. The ANC recognised that they needed a spokesman on the outside, and Mr. Makiwane is the first of their officials to leave the country to put the Africans' case to the world. He was one of the original list of 156 leaders of anti-Nationalist opinion to be charged in the infamous and farcical Treason Trial.

### 1,760,000 Arrests!

At a press conference last week, Mr. Makiwane said that 1,760,000 Africans were arrested last year on Pass Law offences. Outlining the purpose of the boycott campaign, he said:

"The South African government is pursuing a policy of racial discrimination and unprecedented persecution of the non-white population of South Africa. This policy has already precipitated a grave crisis, and serious deterioration of race relations in the country. The recent riots in Durban are a clear warning that the danger point has already been passed.

In spite of international condemnation of racial practices, in the United Nations and elsewhere, the government of South Africa shows no intention of reversing its policies. In fact, recent events have shown that the government is intensifying discriminatory and oppressive measures.

Non-European students have been excluded from the South African Universities; the government is intensifying the hated pass-system and applying it to women; whilst the horrors of the farm slave-labour system recently exposed, have shocked the whole world, and compelled the government to make at least some show of suspending the system. However, the people are calling for the complete destruction of the machinery of exploitation.

Now the South African government is trying to pull off the colossal bluff that it is extending self-government to Africans through the so-called Extension of Bantu-Self-Government Act. It is hardly necessary for me to point out that this act is in fact intended to take the Africans back to tribalism: it has already met with the firm rejection of the African people, and the outspoken contempt of all right-thinking people in the Union and abroad.

In the face of this mounting oppres-

sion, the people of South Africa, led by the African National Congress and its allies, are launching an economic boycott of all firms supporting the present régime. We should note that this is virtually the only form of protest left legally open to them.

Continued on p. 4

## All Africa Will Rally!

AT a public meeting in London last Friday, launching the campaign for a boycott of South African goods, Julius Nyerere, president of the Tanganyika African National Union, pledged the support of his organisation—which embraces the whole of Tanganyika—to support the boycott.

It is thought that it will spread to Kenya—largest African importing country from S.A.—and that the government of Ghana will soon find it impossible to stand aside from giving support for the boycott.

While all Africa will rally, all people of goodwill in Britain must also play their part. So far the British press has shown exactly where it stands—by ignoring the campaign (with three exceptions).

Support for the campaign can be offered to the Committee of African Organisations, at 200 Gower Street, London, N.W.1. (Euston 2763) who are organising pickets and demonstrations in as many busy shopping centres as possible. They are appealing for help.

Picketing so far carried out has brought sympathetic response (and of course, some of the reverse), but much more needs to be done to make an effect.

## The Politician's Art of GETTING NOWHERE AT GENEVA

AFTER 41 days of getting nowhere at Geneva, assuming getting somewhere was the intention, the four Foreign Ministers (Britain, France, U.S.S.R. and U.S.) agreed to a three-week recess. Few can deny that they need a rest, it is an exhausting business walking round in circles.

In fairness we have to acknowledge that one major problem was solved in the early days of the conference. After serious discussion and private consultation a decision was reached as to the shape of the table at which they were to sit. Perhaps we will be forgiven when we admit to having forgotten whether the four major World Powers settled for a round or a square one, but a decision was made which included an "occasional" to accommodate the silent observers from East and West Germany who must have been disappointed if they hoped for a settlement of the "German problem".

According to one newspaper commentary "the Western powers have not come out of the conference too badly. They have surrendered no vital position in Berlin"; the Russians likewise, which is no more than we expected. The puzzle is that so few people seem to see how farcical these conferences really are, convened ostensibly to "discuss" decisions already made in secret before the representatives ever meet.

A *News Chronicle* editorial (June 22nd) comments that: "The failure of the Foreign Minister's Conference at Geneva can have surprised few people. The Conference has done no good but it has also done no great harm." A fair commentary on political techniques in our time.

Judging by the vague and meaningless statements emitting from the Government here, we are left with the conviction that Geneva amounted to nothing. As stated above no positions were surrendered in Berlin and no progress was made on the cessation of nuclear tests. Commenting on the latter, the *Observer* editorial (June 21st), states that the Soviet Union understands the need to avoid war as clearly as do the Governments of the West and asks the following question to which it supplies an answer:

"... if some perception of our common interest in avoiding war is slowly emerging, why does it not show itself in the other negotiations at Geneva, those on the cessation of nuclear tests? There is little sign of progress there, either. Indeed, the world awaits the first French nuclear test—and half suspects Western diplomacy of stalling at Geneva to allow this event to take place."

At home the Government also hopes that stalling tactics will have the right effect on the electorate bluffed into the belief that efforts towards "peaceful negotiations" are being tirelessly made by the Tories. Macmillan's speeches to his supporters are optimistically on a school-boy level suitable for consumption by lady Conservatives. The pointlessness of the whole situation is accidentally underlined by Selwyn Lloyd who best sums up the result of Geneva in these astonishing words:

"The time has come for East and West to pause and consider not only what each had really been saying [at Geneva]—but, even more important, what they had been meaning!"

## The Latest Statement on Nuclear Weapons The Labour Party's Damp Squib

IT was very soon clear that the revised joint statement on nuclear weapons and disarmament issued last week by the Labour Party and the Trades Union Congress, was no political bombshell, but a damp squib which will neither prevent the growth of the Nuclear Bomb Club, nor "unite" and strengthen the Labour movement in readiness for the electoral fray when it comes. For the leaders have committed themselves to nothing new.

They reiterate their determination

to extend indefinitely the H-bomb test suspension which has been observed by the three members of the Bomb-Club since November. And because "it has now been accepted by the Medical Research Council that all exposure to radio-activity is potentially dangerous, and the greater the exposure the greater the danger [so] that there is thus no 'safe limit'" the Labour Party will continue to observe it even if "other countries were to break the truce". In such a case they would "immediately initiate fresh negotiations for an international ban on all tests".

They make it equally clear that there is no question of their accepting the policy of unilateral nuclear disarmament by this country—a policy which has been "decisively rejected both by the Trades Union Congress and the Labour Party" for "nothing has happened to weaken the arguments against it". So all that the Labour Party will do if returned to power is to take the initiative of offering to give up the Bomb (made in Britain) if all countries except Russia and the United States, agree to renounce any ambitions or plans they might have to produce their own nuclear weapons. The Labour politicians consider such a step deserving of praise by the foreigner and justifying a feeling of smug virtue by the Britisher, for

ful would leave Russia and America as the sole nuclear Powers we should be making some sacrifice in power and influence. It was because of these considerations that the Labour Government decided in 1946 to make our own atom bomb, and that the Labour party decided some years later to support the production by Britain of her own hydrogen bomb. But we hold that, in the circumstances and under the conditions we have laid down, this sacrifice would be abundantly justified in order to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to more and more countries throughout the world.

The frank admission, that Britain joined the nuclear-club for reasons of "power and influence" and not as some people seemed to think at the time, for reasons of "defence" against Russian threats to our "independence and freedom", expose the Labour Party's plan as worthless because one-sided. Indeed, the Labour politicians recognise this when they admit that

we can hardly deny these nations the right to follow our example. For all the arguments which prompted us to make our British nuclear weapons can be used with equal force and validity by the French or Chinese, for example, for producing their bombs.

Such sweet reasonableness and tolerance indicate not a change of heart but that the political leopard does not change its spots, and that when the Labour politicians talk of making "sacrifices" in power and influence if their proposals are accepted, it is a lie, which de Gaulle

Continued on p. 3

## BUT BUSINESS IS BUSINESS

TEL AVIV, JUNE 26.

A storm is brewing here after the disclosure by the German weekly *Der Spiegel* of the sale of a large quantity of Israel-made anti-tank grenade throwers (for the use of riflemen) to the German Army.

Not only "Heruth, the main Opposition party, but also "Ahduth Avodah", which forms part of the Government coalition, are attacking the deal and the independent newspapers, both morning and evening, are highly critical. "Haaretz" asks whether the Government considered the international implications of the sale, which establishes in the eyes of the world the fact of West German-Israel friendship, and wonders how the memory of Nazi atrocities against the Jewish people and arms supply by Israel to the German Army can co-exist side by side.

The Prime Minister has considered it prudent to attack the Ahduth Avodah party, and to claim that as both its Cabinet members knew of the coming transaction the party is not entitled to claim that it was surprised. *Davar*, the Labour Federation's daily, which usually expresses the opinion of Mapai (the Premier's party), defends it mainly on the ground (also advanced by Mr. Ben-

Gurion) that the proceeds of the German sale help the Israel defence forces to acquire much-needed modern arms elsewhere, but a feeling of embarrassment on the part of the writer is evident.

Mr. Ben-Gurion has said that he told the Cabinet last winter of the orders for arms from West Germany and other countries and the Cabinet authorising him to complete the arrangements.

There can be no question that the news has come as a painful shock to many Israelis, who cannot help recognising the continuity between the Bundeswehr (the present army), the Wehrmacht and the Reichswehr, and who do not regard the reparations agreement between Bonn and Jerusalem as having spelt the unreserved rehabilitation of the German people in the eyes of the Jews.

A different question is whether Israel's Parliament, the Knesset, will be able to muster a majority in order to compel the Government to cancel the deal, as the various parliamentary groups have, especially in view of the forthcoming elections, each one different aims. It is, therefore, not yet clear how things will go in the Knesset next week.

(Manchester Guardian).

## A Bad Business!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 26

Deficit on Freedom	£520
Contributions received	£470
DEFICIT	£50

June 19 to June 25

Springfield, Ill.: E.B. 3/6; Slough: E.C. 2/3	
Glasgow: T.M.C.G. 2/-; London: J.G. 10/-	
London: D.O. 4/6; London: Anon.* 2/-	
London: M.H.S.* 2/6; London: J.O.H.* 2/-	
London: J.S.* 3/-; London: P.F.* 10/-; Manchester: R.L.C. 2/-; Glasgow: S.M. 2/-	
Doncaster: B.S. 1/-; Los Angeles: R.B.G. 7/-	
Wolverhampton: J.G.L.* 2/6; Van Nuys, Cal.: Picnic, June 7, per J.E. £8/10/3	
Greenford: Anon. 7/-; Sheffield: H.W. 5/-	
Total	12 17 6
Previously acknowledged	457 12 6
1959 TOTAL TO DATE	£470 10 0

\*Indicates regular contributor.

BOOK REVIEW

# A History of Anthropology

FROM APE TO ANGEL, by H. R. Hays, Methuen, 36s.

THIS book is a good popular summary of the history of anthropology, though it has some curious gaps. Very few of the societies described in it would really meet the exacting standards of the anarchist, but mutual aid seems to have been the basis of most of them. Yet I can find no mention of Kropotkin's work. Is this controversy, war of each-against-all or mutual aid, then so completely dead? I doubt it, and in any case a work dealing with the history of anthropological theories should devote a chapter to it.

"As a corrective to the nineteenth-century Darwinian concept of the competitive struggle for survival, Ashley Montague traces the co-operative element in life forms and in society in detail . . .", we are told, and then we are given a compressed summary of what are in fact Kropotkin's ideas. I have heard that Ashley Montague was influenced by Kropotkin, if so there is no mention of it here.

The majority of anthropologists have been men and women of liberal type, sympathetic to the often disappearing races they were studying, devoid of the arrogance of the missionary and the imperialist. Many of them had a strongly romantic streak. But it seems to me doubtful if anthropology can ever become a wholly exact science, any more than psychology. The prejudices and preconceptions of the investigator have to be taken into account in assessing his work. Moreover the amount of sheer knowledge that is now available is confusing. The man who believes that early society was monotheistic to begin with will find all the evidence he needs—and so will his opponents. There is plenty of ammunition for both sides in the matriarchal-patriarchal controversy, and for those who either support or oppose

the theory of the diffusion of culture.

"Anything you please you may find among your useful savages . . . You have but to skim a few books of travel, pencil in hand, and pick out what suits your case", wrote Andrew Lang in his criticism of Tylor's theories. It is only fair to add that he did exactly the same himself.

In fact this book is somewhat slanted, being written rather from the liberal-managerial-progressive point of view. The theory of cultural degeneration is discredited by being linked with the name of Archbishop Whately, thus giving it an air of mystical spuriousness. "The degeneration theory of savagery (that primitives regressed from the civilised state) had to be fought vigorously before social anthropology could progress." Why? Surely the point is not whether social anthropology should progress or not, but whether in fact degeneration can be shown to have taken place or not. As it can.\* Why should the recognition that mankind can go backwards as well as forwards harm the study of social anthropology anyway? It fits in less well with the liberal-progressive philosophy of life, but that is another matter.

While the number of different cultures is very great, very few are unauthoritarian and none (including modern cultures) free from irrational taboos and restrictions. Modern society does not appear to be becoming less taboo-ridden, however much the nature of the taboos are altering. A sort of profound anxiety seems to have seized mankind at a very remote epoch, with unpleasant consequences, varying from the chopped off fingers of some Stone Age peoples to the Hydrogen Bombs of the up-to-date savage. Human institutions tend to frustrate natural desires as much as to gratify

\*A simple case. Some South Sea Islanders isolated on atolls without boats. They had lost the art of making them, or the need. Did they fly there? A more complex example. The relapse into barbarism of twentieth century Germany, a social rather than technical degeneration. There seems to be some indication though that, due to the isolation of Germany and the expulsion of Jewish savants, technical degeneration would have set in eventually.

them.

In the past such a situation could just be tolerated, since explosions of aggression could have only a limited destructive effect. (Very few human societies studied by anthropologists have avoided warfare, though there are occasional examples). Nowadays such a state of affairs could lead to the destruction of the human race, but no one really seems to know what to do about it.

The distinction between savage and civilised does not really exist. To the Victorians it seemed obvious, but nowadays it is impossible to draw the line anywhere, because so many atrocities (of the kind associated with savages hitherto) have been committed by the most advanced civilised nations. Scientific knowledge has been used by barbaric and superstition-ridden despots to increase their power and destroy their enemies.

Lubbock wrote, "While savages show us a melancholy spectacle of gross superstition and ferocious forms of worship, the religious mind cannot but feel a peculiar satisfaction in tracing up the gradual evolution of more correct ideas and of nobler creeds." Comment is superfluous.

It was all very fine for Frazer to regard indulgently the cruel punishments inflicted on seducers and adulteresses in some cultures, because "superstition has strengthened the respect for marriage and has thereby contributed to a stricter observance of the rules of sexual morality." This was written prior to the First World War. Since then the past has come back into the present. Such gruesome playfulness is no longer funny after Belsen and Hiroshima. Although it is unlikely any of us will live to see the introduction of the custom of eating unfaithful wives alive, we have already seen the reintroduction of the medieval pogrom with all the aids of modern science.

The United States may be considered as the home of modern anthropology. At least many leading modern anthropologists are Americans. This makes them less than just to the theory of cultural diffusion. A jibe was once aimed at Elliot Smith, who believed that agricultural civilisation came originally from Egypt, and nowhere else, that he was

influenced by his imperialist British patriotism, and saw all things coming from one "mother country". (But Egypt was a strange choice for a British patriot surely?). The argument is two-edged. Most American ethnologists and anthropologists scout the idea that American Indian cultures came originally from the Far East, though it is almost a certainty, and get extremely emotional about it. Isn't this due to the same sort of patriotism, an irrational repudiation of the Old World which is characteristically American?

The truth is that the epoch and coun-

try of the anthropologist is bound to colour his work to some extent. It would be a dull subject if such were not the case. Living in a declining imperialism probably affects the present writer too, and makes him a bit sceptical about the attitude of H. R. Hays, particularly with regard to the title he has chosen for his work. Our road from ape to angel seems to have been a rather bloody one. Since apes are fairly amiable creatures and angels an unknown quantity, one wonders whether it would have been better not to have taken it. But are we really on any such road at all? ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

## Abolition of Capital Punishment LETTER & COMMENT

THE EDITOR,  
Sir,

"Kick Out the Hangman"

I have read with interest the article under the above heading in your issue of the 23rd May.

Capital punishment can only be abolished by Members of Parliament. In the present Parliament this means that it could only be abolished if supported by a sufficient number of Conservative Members.

Anyone who has any knowledge of the parliamentary situation with regard to capital punishment knows that there is no prospect whatever of Conservative Members of Parliament disobeying the Party's Whip shortly before a General Election, and that no campaign of whatever size or character undertaken at the present time has the remotest prospect of success in the lifetime of this Parliament.

There is, however, I hope, reason to believe that the next Parliament, whatever its political complexion, will complete a reform long overdue.

Yours, etc.  
GERALD GARDINER,  
Chairman,  
National Campaign  
for the Abolition of  
Capital Punishment.

London, June 22

[Mr. Gardiner's logic is indisputable, but how depressing it is! No less depressing is the fact that on the question of capital punishment, "public opinion" is even more reactionary than parliamentary opinion. Perhaps, for this reason Mr. Gardiner puts all his eggs in the Parliamentary basket, and so far as abolishing the death penalty this may be the quickest solution, but at a price. We are not quibbling. We too want to see the degrading, terrible, practice of legalised murder abolished. But we are also aware of the fact that if it is achieved through Parliament and not as a result of a widespread understanding of human frailty and deep social conscience then the punishment which will replace the death penalty will in its turn offend the feelings of decency of most of those people who campaigned against the death penalty.

A hint of things to come was provided by Mr. Butler, the Home Secretary in a written parliamentary reply to Mr. C. Osborne (C., Louth). He said that a person sentenced to life imprisonment might in an extreme case—where, for example, it was necessary for the protection of the public—be kept in prison until he dies.

"Each case is considered on its merit. The factors taken into account include the circumstances of the offence, the age and character of the offender, the likelihood of his being a danger to the public if he is discharged and, in the case of non-mandatory life sentences, the level of determinate sentences being imposed by the courts for similar offences.

"Since 1920, six prisoners serving life sentences have been discharged after serving for twenty years; none has been detained longer. The average period has hitherto been nine years; but this will not necessarily be so in future because prisoners sentenced to life imprisonment will include murderers who, before the Homicide Act, would have been hanged and whose cases present no mitigating features."

First things first, yes. But let us beware that in salving our own consciences so far as the death penalty is concerned we are not responsible for condemning men to a living death compared with which a quick death might seem to them almost preferable.—EDITORS]

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sets)

### New Books . . .

Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female Alfred C. Kinsey 56/-  
In the Struggle for Equality B. Yelensky 17/6

Guillotine at Work G. P. Maximoff 17/6

From the Other Shore Alexander Herzen 15/-

The London Years Rudolf Rocker 25/-

Pierre-Joseph Proudhon George Woodcock 28/-

The Political Philosophy of Bakunin G. P. Maximoff 42/-

### Cheap Editions and Reprints . . .

And So To Bed Samuel Pepys 3/6

Advocate for the Dead Alex Weissberg 2/6

Scottsboro' Boy Heywood 3/6

Uses of Literacy Patterson & Earl Conrad 4/-

Richard Hoggart 4/-

### Second-Hand . . .

Substance of Economics H. A. Silverman 4/-

Look to Norway William Warbey 3/-

Communist Challenge Kenneth Ingram 3/-

Life of Henry David Thoreau Henry S. Salt 3/6

Soviet Opposition to Stalin George Fischer 5/-

Essay on Contemporary Events C. G. Jung 3/-

Essays in Rebellion Henry W. Nevins 4/6

Birth of Tragedy Friedrich Nietzsche 6/-

The Attack R. H. Tawney 5/-

Guild Socialism Re-stated G. D. H. Cole 5/-

Impossibilities of Social Democracy Dr. A. Schaffle 3/6

Lenin James Maxton 4/-

Guilty Men Cato 2/6

Shall Our Children Live or Die? Victor Gollancz 2/6

### Periodicals . . .

Humanist, July 1/-

University Libertarian, No. 9 1/-

New Departures, No. 1. Beckett, Schwitters, etc. 3/6

Liberation, June 1/9

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

## CONVERSATION PIECE

# No Cups Outside

I WAS having a cup of tea in the City Literary Institute the other night, which is a misfortune that could happen to anyone, when I had a visitation from another planet.

It happened thuswise. I had finished my tea, which, served in a plastic cup, has acquired a further exotic taste rather like one might imagine mescaline, or peotl or soma. Undermined by this heady brew I made a democratic gesture of returning my cup and saucer to the counter. This was almost fatal because I stepped upon a piece of banana skin left by a civics student and plunged head first to the floor.

My saucer described a parabola in the air and when it came to earth it had expanded three times its size and a gnomish character was upon it.

"You don't believe in flying saucers, do you?" he said.

"Well, I am at the moment inclined towards a willing suspension of disbelief."

"Perhaps you wonder how I come to speak English."

"Yes," I said.

"I took it at the Country Illiterate Institute . . . And why I am here?"

I nodded. All this was a little heady. "Our Astronomy class had a field-day excursion among the nebular galaxy and I was assigned to reconnoitre on this particular crumb of cooling clinker."

For a moment I was seized with a paroxysm of cosmic patriotism but recollected I was in this world to broaden my mind so I belted up.

"I suppose you are interested in our bomb explosions?"

"What explosions?"

I explained to him about the H-Bomb.

"No, we haven't noticed anything. One or two planets have disappeared but that's in the natural course of events, it isn't significant, except to yourselves, of course. But why do you make these bombs? Is there a market for them? Are they useful? Or is it just beauty and pleasure like fireworks?"

"No, we need them as weapons."

"Is some other planet invading you?"

"No, it's a defence against Communism."

"What is that, a disease?"

"No, it's a political philosophy."

"Can you get rid of a philosophy with a bomb?"

"No, but we don't intend to use the bomb. It's to stop the others thinking they can use it and that we haven't got it."

"What others? I thought you said it was a defence against an attack of philosophy in the world."

"No, it's a defence of the West against the East."

"You mean you're still fighting amongst yourselves? Perhaps it's your hobby, now you've solved all your problems like climate, food-growing and distribution, the common cold and crime."

"We haven't solved them!"

"Well you great boobies, what are you threatening each other with these bomb things when you've got other things to see to?"

"Well, we've penetrated outer space, at least a dog, two monkeys and four mice have."

"One world at a time, my friend. We from our planet still have one or two problems like the problem of death and the problem of perpetual motion to resolve but we have leisure to follow up our hobby of space-travel. You are putting the cart before the horse. And you, to use your idiom, are in the cart."

I adroitly changed the subject.

"What is your planet like?"

"A little like this. We started with the same basic conditions but we took all the right turnings. Our evolution was conscious."

"Don't you want to meet our leaders? I'm sure they'd like to meet you. The newspapers too."

"Who are your leaders?"

"Why," I said, "you know, old so-and-so," with great difficulty I recollected the name.

"But who is this man?"

"He's our elected leader."

"Leader?" this saucer-boy seemed very stupid.

"He's the one we've chosen to take us where we want to go."

"To where he wants to go?"

"No, we're democratic."

"To where we want to go . . . Don't you know how to get there?"

"Of course we do."

"Then why do you want taking?"

I ignored this, it seemed to be best.

"Do you want to meet our leaders?"

"If they've led you to the state I hear you're in they must be bigger boobies than you, so I don't want to see them."

"No, no, it's the Others who are to blame for things being like this."

"The Others?"

"Yes, the East."

"Well, if the East is leading the West into a mess why not exchange leaders or amalgamate, perhaps the Western leaders could get the East into a mess."

I looked at him very severely. Perhaps he was pulling my leg.

"Are you a materialist?" I said.

"Well, I'm here . . . if that's what you mean."

"But don't you believe in an After Life?"

"Yes, I believe that something happens after life."

"What do you mean?"

"Death. That's another process."

"Don't you believe in a God who made this world?"

"Well . . . I can't believe in one of the gods that this world made and if he made the other worlds as well he must have been versatile."

"Don't you look at the wonders of space from your flying saucer, don't you think of the wonder of a Creator who made all this, from the Cosmic Cup to your Flying Saucer?" (I rather fancied this phrase).

"No sir. As I look around at this Earth of yours as you call it, and as you have made it, and I say, 'take away this cup' . . ."

The canteen staff were trying to bring me round with another cup of tea which I firmly refused, and staggered to my feet ready to face another session of Creative Writing.

J.R.

## 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*

Vol. 8, 1958, *Socialism in a Wheelchair*

each volume paper 7s. 6d.  
cloth 10s. 6d.

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

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

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

ERRICO MALATESTA : *Anarchy* 9d.

27, Red Lion Street,

London, W.C.1.

## THE LABOUR PARTY'S DAMP SQUIB

Continued from p. 1

Adenauer and the others can see through without even looking!

THERE is only one way out of the present threat to mankind, and that is a gesture directed to the hearts and imagination of the people, not to the politicians who cannot afford either! That gesture should consist in announcing to the world that Britain is disarming completely (we stress this fact of complete disarmament because the Labour Party envisages the possibility of this country, as part of NATO strategy, ending her production of nuclear arms and concentrating her defence effort "on the building up of conventional forces, leaving the responsibility for the production of nuclear weapons entirely to the United States"). Such a gesture could only earn the contempt of the world's politicians because they would see it as being contrary to all the traditions of the political game. The L.P. statement confirms this view

There is not the slightest evidence that, if we were to take this step, it would induce America or Russia to follow suit or in any way influence the policy of General de Gaulle or the Chinese Government.

And they are quite right, but only because they think in terms of power politics and not in solutions which make their appeal to the people themselves.

And here we reach the impasse, the limitations of political parties. There is in fact no solution to the present arms race, nor to the specific issue of nuclear weapons, within the framework of power politics. It is a Gordian knot which can be cut through by revolutionary, unconventional methods, but will resist those, who, even with the best intentions—and we do not include the politicians among them—would seek to unravel it.

What we are trying to say is this: if tomorrow the social conscience in this country could express itself, it would be useless to seek to use it to influence either the American or Russian administration. But, to our minds, it would have a profound influence if we directed that social conscience to the ordinary peoples of the world.

Can you visualise the persuasion of our arguments if we used only a part of the resources and human ingenuity, now wasted in developing weapons of extinction, for broadcasting to the world that we had abandoned them, and with the rest made a significant contribution to raising the standards of living of the starving other half of mankind? And are you aware of the fact that this could be achieved without lowering the existing standards of living in this country? Indeed, we could even "afford" to provide a decent living for everybody in Britain as well!

THAT is all very fine, but it's not practical—do we hear somebody object? "Not Practical" for whom? If you are thinking of the interests of the politician and the Trusts, we agree. Without the backing of force, deprived of privilege, they are lost; are humble citizens like you and me. For us, the ordinary people, what we have proposed is practical because it is what we want. The Russian people want leisure, the necessities of life and they want to live in peace just as much as we do in this country. But only by bypassing the politicians—whatever their professed ideology—can we acquire the power and the social responsibility as individuals which we need to build a world at peace; a world in which every human being will feel able to be himself.

WRITING in the May issue of the review *Volontà*, Giovanna Berneri remarked that "the literature of the events in Spain from 1936 to 1939 has grown in the last few years, but the true story of the period has yet to be told." She was discussing a new study of the Spanish Civil War, *Spagna* by Pietro Nenni, the Italian socialist leader. The book is, she emphasises, a politician's, a party man's interpretation of events, while "most of Nenni's judgments on the anarchists could have been read in the columns of *Pravda* or *Isvestia* at the time." In refuting Nenni's denigration of the Spanish anarchists she cites the evidence of non-anarchist foreign observers. Carlo Rosselli, Aldo Garosci, Francesco Fausto Nitti, George Orwell, H. E. Kaminski, and Gerald Brenan. She points out how politicians, because of their mode of thinking, have sneered at, or dismissed as an absurdity, the collectivisation of industry and agriculture in Catalonia, "because they would alienate sympathy from abroad, because they were in the middle of a war, etc., etc." Nenni for instance sees the agricultural collectives as an expensive diversion, to which Giovanna Berneri answers that they were in fact a necessity, and could have resulted in the solution of Spain's biggest problem, that of the land. "In the chaos of July 1936, in spite of the immense difficulties and risks, first the industrial workers and then those of the land, saved the situation, by ensuring, through their direct control of the means of production, the continuity of social and economic life."

The history of the Spanish war and revolution was again discussed at a meeting at the *Eliseo* in Rome on June 4th, reported in *Umanità Nova*, where Nicola Chiamonte and Giovanna Berneri denounced the misrepresentation of history given by a Communist speaker. In Britain there has been little attempt at re-assessment, compared with the large number of (mostly ephemeral) books which appeared at the time here. V. Richards' *Lessons of the Spanish Revolution* (published by Freedom Press), a critical appraisal of the part played by the Spanish anarchists, is alone in the field, while the two chapters in that book on the agricultural collectives and the collectivised industries are the only sources of information in print in English on what may, historically, be considered the most important aspect of the Spanish revolution.

It is a well-known failing of the anarchist movement that, in relation to its size, it devotes too much of its attention to its past, and too little to attempts to exert an influence on the world of today. But there are other reasons beside the sense of historical justice for wanting to see a critical and analytical account of the Spanish collectives. Sooner or later, the issue of workers' control of industry is going to come back into prominence, and when it does, the experience of Spain must be discussed. Marie Louise Berneri, in an article we reprinted recently, claimed that,

"Never again can it be held that workers and peasants are unable to organise and control their society and their lives without direction from a government of 'leaders'. Virtually for the first time in history the Spanish people showed what workers' control of production can do; that production for need is entirely practicable and not at all the 'utopian dream' of the sneering or patronising sceptics."

We need to be able to provide the evidence to substantiate this claim. We want to know what were the sources of strength and of weakness, the limitations and the triumphs. To what extent can the types of organisation adopted be described as anarchistic? What would their subsequent evolution have been?

ANOTHER reason why such a study is overdue is because of the importance of the Spanish collectives in the sociology of co-operative undertakings. Writers who have drawn attention to the social and industrial malaises of our society have paid a great deal of attention to collective experiments of one kind or another, for very good reasons. Erich Fromm, for example, in his *The Sane Society*, after discussing the structure of the French *Communautés du travail*, remarks that they

"are not, of course, the only examples for the possibility of communitarian life. Whether we take Owen's communities, or those of the Mennonites or Hutterites, or the agricultural settlements of Israel, they all contribute to our knowledge of the possibilities of a new style of life. They also show that most of these communitarian experiments are executed by men with a shrewd intelligence, and an

immensely practical sense. They are by no means the dreamers our so-called realists believe them to be; on the contrary, they are mostly more realistic and imaginative than our conventional business leaders appear to be. Undoubtedly there have been many shortcomings in the principles and practice of these experiments, which must be recognized in order to be avoided."

We have to place the Spanish collectives in this tradition, as a guide and spur to future action. Fromm probably did not know about the Spanish experience, for he goes on to say:

"The question is whether conditions similar to those created by the communitarians can be created for the whole of our society. The aim would then be to create a work situation in which man gives his lifetime and energy to something which has meaning for him, in which he knows what he is doing, has an influence on what is being done, and feels united with, rather than separated from, his fellow man. This implies that the work situation is made concrete again; that the workers are organised into sufficiently small groups to enable the individual to relate himself to the group as real, concrete human beings, even though the factory as a whole may have many thousands of workers. It means that methods of blending centralisation and decentralisation are found which permit active participation and responsibility for everybody, and at the same time create a unified leadership as far as it is necessary."

Can we claim that the Spanish collectives give an answer to the question of Fromm's first sentence? (It may be that his curious requirement of a blend of centralisation and decentralisation were met by the Spanish collectives, for in Gaston Leval's *Social Reconstruction in Spain* occur some sentences which must bring misgivings to anarchists: "Administrative centralisation is one of the most outstanding features", p.11, and "Its organisation was on federal lines—conducted both from above and below—pressure from below, direction from above", p.23. This may be an unfortunate choice of language, or it may indicate that, constructive achievements though they were, the collectives did not reach, in their brief life, the kind of organisational structure which we would call anarchistic. We need to find out.)

In his *Paths in Utopia*, examining the theories of Marx, Proudhon, Kropotkin and Landauer, and various co-operative experiments, culminating in what he calls the "signal non-failure" of the Jewish *kibbutz* and *kvutzot*, Martin Buber declares in favour of

## PEOPLE AND IDEAS:

# EVALUATING THE SPANISH EXPERIENCE

"the new communes—they might equally be called the new Co-operatives—I mean the subjects of a changed economy: the collectives into whose hands the control of the means of production is to pass".

He too appears to have been unfamiliar with the Spanish experience, which might lend force to his argument. Even Dr. Henrik Infield, who has done more than anyone to promote the study of co-operative communities, and especially to arrive at reliable means of evaluating them, seems to have published nothing on the Spanish experience. All this points to the need for a new effort to put the Spanish collectives "on the map" from the point of view of anarchist history and anarchist theory, from the point of view of the advocate of workers' control, and from that of the sociologist and that of the student of the sociology of co-operation.

ONE of the reasons why the subject has been given so little notice outside anarchist circles is the fact that the Spanish revolution has been so misrepresented and its events so distorted, both at the time and since, that most of the people who might benefit from its experiences and lessons are simply unaware of its existence. Another is the lack of published material and documentation, particularly of a comparative kind—comparisons, for example, with the Soviet *kolkhoz*, the Chinese commune, the Israeli *kvutza*, the Mexican *ejido*, the Indian *Gramdan* villages, the Yugoslav "workers' collectives", and the rather more genuine workers' councils that sprang into a brief existence in Poland and Hungary in 1956.

The printed sources for an evaluation of the Spanish collectives are given in *Lessons of the Spanish Revolution* as follows:

Gaston Leval: *Né Franco né Stalin. Le collectivité anarchiche spagnole nella lotta contro Franco e la reazione staliniana* (Milan, 1952).

A. Souchy: *Entre los campesinos de Aragón* (Barcelona 1937).

A. Souchy and P. Folgare: *Colectivizaciones. La Obra Constructiva de la Revolución Española* (Barcelona 1937).

J. Peirats: *La C.N.T. en la Revolución Española, Vol. I*, pp. 297-386 (Toulouse, 1951).

A few chapters from the first of these books have been translated in *FREEDOM* and *Resistance* and were reprinted in the course of last year in the New York *Views and Comments*. Readers who are able to translate from Italian or Spanish and would like to collaborate in an effort to re-assess the Spanish collectives are invited to get in touch with me.

Another essential source is the material to be found in the relevant newspapers of the period, yet another is the groups of exiled Spaniards with first-hand experience, another, which will probably have to wait until a change in the régime, is Spain itself. One prime necessity for any serious evaluation is to secure corroborative material from non-anarchist sources, as this anecdote from Franz Borkenau's *The Spanish Cockpit* illustrates:

"The gap between ideals and reality is sometimes grotesque in Spain, and people are completely satisfied with their own good intentions without bothering to put them into effect. In the village committees the anarchists seemed usually to take the lead, and among other achievements they prided themselves upon the abolition of private commerce in the harvests. All crops were now sold direct to the trade unions, I learnt and I was inclined to admire this extraordinary feat of organisation. My curiosity, in one case, went so far as to ask for an interview with the man who was charged with the commercial handling of the main crop, which in this instance was wheat. And then came disappointment. There was no such man; thus there was visible dismay on the faces of the committee members when I asked to see the man who did not exist. After a few minutes they decided to admit that the crops were handled exactly as before, by private merchants. In fact, the problem of the handling of export crops such as the Valencia oranges is far beyond the capacity of small villages. But if the ideals of *comunismo libertario* could not be put into practice, at least it was nice to talk about them."

If this were typical; if the achievements of the village collectives and the collectivised industries were more wishful thinking than accomplished fact, it would be a waste of time for us to attempt to draw conclusions from them. It is because we believe that this story is not typical, that we think that a systematic and critical examination would be useful.

## CORRECTION:

BAKWIN AND BAKUNIN

Our typesetter is getting infected by anarchy. In the review of Mr. and Mrs. Ritter's *The Free Family* in our last issue, the reference to Bakunin should be to Bakwin. Dr. Harry Bakwin is the American authority on babies. Bakunin wasn't interested in babies (although two old ladies in Naples, who were still living in 1948 claimed to be his daughters).

# The State of British Education

## I The Teachers

IT might be expected that parents would treat the matter of suitability of teachers as one of great importance and it is most unfortunate that so many mums and dads exhibit no interest at all. To some of them, probably as a result of their own schoolday disciplining, the teacher, particularly the headmaster, is something approaching a deity: quite absurd, of course, since the teaching profession harbours all types ranging from the genius to the dullard, the sadist to the ordinary and, as we all know, at least its fair share of that most despised and misunderstood "creature", the homosexual.

Let us take a look at the men and women who are paid, so miserably we are told, to take charge of our children for about 35 hours each week: we will take one aspect at a time:

(a) HONESTY. There are perhaps degrees of dishonesty and it may be that judgments should be modified by situations, but there is no valid excuse for the fact that whereas roughly half of our University lecturers reject Christianity it is impossible to find one solitary State School Headmaster who openly admits to unbelief. We are assured that there is no religious test for teachers but even if there is a virtual atheist bar in operation against headmastership it is not easy to excuse: the honest teacher only stands to lose promotion money, not his job.

(b) UNSELFISHNESS. Teachers are quite as mercenary as the next man. Lately, the press has positively bulged with their clamourings for higher salaries. Much of this begging and demanding, in the case of the clergy, has been effected by representatives of their organisations but, as with the clergy again, many a teacher

has pled his case tearfully, often making apparently compelling comparisons with salary scales in other public professions. Teachers' Unions have passed strong resolutions demanding more money for the (spiritual?) guardians of our children, sometimes giving the impression that they might be a little strike-conscious and we have seen pictures in the papers showing hundreds of teachers marching through London to demonstrate their solidarity in matters of pay.

One poor destitute wretch wrote up to the *Times Educational Supplement* bemoaning the fact that he would have to wait till he was 35 years old before getting a miserable pittance of £900 p.a. The writer had half a mind to open a relief fund for the poor chap but no doubt *Observer* correspondent Dinah Brook will take the barrel-organ out for him ("When the teacher is the only one in the classroom without a television set in the home, he can't help feeling his position")! So all those cars one is so used to seeing parked in the school entrances must belong to the pupils... which only goes to show that first impressions can be faulty in the extreme!

(c) SNOBBERY. It is to be hoped that the snob does not predominate in the staff rooms but we are left in little doubt that snobbery does rear its ugly head in Secondary Schools where the Assistant Masters have recently passed a resolution insisting that "all new entrants to the teaching profession be required to furnish evidence that they have successfully completed a recognised course of training"—this in the face of a most serious teacher shortage. One can appreciate the necessity of such a rule in the huge centralised, stereotyped, educational systems of today. There is no time to find out what a chap is like.

Education must march on, from one certificate to another diploma. Unfortunately our educators do not see or will not heed the fact that it just cannot work anyway unless direction of labour is applied to the teaching profession—and the teachers would all say "We can't stand for that in the free world".

(d) LOYALTY is another quality which is rather rare in teachers—that is, if some reports are to be heeded. There is no doubt that some teachers are most devoted and loyal (the writer once had cause to be grateful for free coaching from one such teacher), even if their causes are misguided, but here is the other other side of the coin: "In spite of a serious shortage of teachers in Britain, the number migrating has increased over the past few years at a rate greater than that of almost any other profession" (*Manchester Guardian* report). This report went on to say that "the main attraction overseas seems to be the higher salaries, though some complain of the smugness of the British Education System and the lack of opportunities."

Of course, from our standpoint, the only application of loyalty would be to the human race as a whole and therefore we would applaud every teacher who emigrated so long as they went to educate the millions of under-privileged in Africa, and other such areas, with the right ideas. But they go to Canada where there's "opportunity".

(e) KINDNESS. Unfortunately, Dr. Arnold remains very much in charge of the classrooms. It is tragic to have to report that the "spare-the-rod-spoil-the-child" educator has just been given encouragement by the United Nations General Assembly Commission on Human Rights which rejected a Russian motion read-

Continued on p. 4

## Boycott South African Goods

Continued from p. 1

Meanwhile, at the All-African Peoples' Conference in Accra in December 1958, the delegates, as a spontaneous gesture of indignation against the racial policies of the Union of South Africa, called for a **BLANKET BOYCOTT OF ALL SOUTH AFRICAN GOODS**. This decision is an essential complement to our own internal and more limited boycott, and the A.N.C. gives it its fullest support. We call upon all those, in this country and abroad, who sympathise with the heroic struggle for freedom and human rights of the oppressed people in South Africa, to lend their support to the boycott of all South African goods.

### A Means of Solidarity

For anarchists and indeed libertarians generally, this boycott is of special importance. Firstly because it provides a means by which those outside of South Africa can bring pressure on the psychopaths in power there. Secondly because the plight of the Africans and coloureds in South Africa is desperate; they have no other means available to them. In this, we and they can join in solidarity in answer to the régime we all hate.

Thirdly, by using the means of boycott, of direct action, the Africans will discover their strength. The blind riots of last month in Durban were not to be wondered at, nor to be stupidly condemned, but they don't achieve much. The hopes for political action fade as the Government whittles away the constitutional rights of the non-European.

The Africans have virtually two choices of action: violent revolution or economic struggle. The very doubtful outcome of the former (with the South African Government being supplied with Saracen armoured cars by the British Government) both in chances of success and probable consequences, make it a most unfavourable choice of action. From every point of view, the economic struggle is the line which promises most.

### Immediate Gains

It is the channel through which immediate gain may be made. For already victories can be chalked up to the boycott as a weapon. Just as in Montgomery, Alabama, the Neg-

roes ended segregation on the buses by the boycott, so two years ago did the Africans of Johannesburg defeat attempts of the bus companies to raise the fares by the same method. And the present economic boycott has already had effect, too.

A few weeks ago the Africans began a boycott against potatoes as a protest against slave-labour on the dreaded Bethal farms. There is now no market for potatoes in the African areas.

Lists of firms to be boycotted are being circulated and one almost immediate result was that one large firm hurriedly came to terms with the African National Congress.

This is a large canning co-operative, Lengeberg Kooperatie, whose directors and members are believed to be predominantly Nationalist, but who have preferred to

agree to ANC demands rather than face the consequences of boycott. This firm has agreed to recognise the Africans' trade union, to allow the union organisers to collect dues and hold meetings in working hours and to reinstate victimised workers. Not bad for a start!

### The Real Power

Through this method the Africans can discover their strength. They can come to the realisation that for all the military power in the hands of the state, the real power in society is in the hands of the people.

The Africans and coloureds provide by far the greatest majority of the working class in South Africa. They produce and distribute the wealth. As producers alone they have tremendous power which they have yet to organise and to use

through the strike and other techniques of struggle.

But they are also the vast majority of consumers, and through the power this gives them can they strike at those who own and control the means of life.

But a large part of the prosperity of the European South African comes from selling in the rich, white, markets of the world the products of poor, black, labour. We can show our disgust with his methods by refusing to buy those products, at least until he operates conditions acceptable to the Africans and in line with civilised, European practice.

The least we can do to help the non-white workers of South Africa is to do whatever we can to bring pressure on his ruling class in the way that matters most.

**BOYCOTT THE PRODUCTS OF SLAVE LABOUR!**

**BOYCOTT SOUTH AFRICAN GOODS!**

## Letter to a Newcomer

### Is Anarchism Possible Now?

DEAR NEWCOMER,

You ask me if anarchism is possible in our modern world. It is true that government and authoritarian organisations have so permeated society that it is almost impossible to conceive of any alternatives. Nevertheless many anarchists including myself, consider that anarchism is practicable in an industrial society.

I cannot give you a brief and comprehensive answer but I shall endeavour to provide one or two pointers in the hope that you may be sufficiently interested to investigate anarcho-syndicalism further.

Before describing how an anarchist society would work it is necessary to pinpoint two almost unconscious assumptions which are prevalent today. These ideas are inherent in the form of present society and hence instilled into us from childhood.

The first assumption is that the state is a necessary, permanent and almost sacred institution. This is in our opinion a mistaken idea. The state is merely a territorial unit formed sometimes by the majority of its members for convenience and mutual protection. More often however it has been created

by a powerful and privileged minority in order to delineate its sphere of influence. National currency and national laws merely serve these ends.

Whether the state is formed by a majority or a minority it invariably ends in minority control for in consolidating force, military or police, it produces powerful officials. Hence even in allegedly democratic states general direction of public affairs is delegated to a few people backed up by a permanent, and therefore influential, body of government employees.

The second assumption is that organisation, especially in the economic field, necessitates centralised direction. One can understand why this should be a common idea in a society dominated by the state. Nevertheless in the economic field other factors must be considered.

Industrial organisation is still largely based upon the form of individual capitalism. The primitive capitalist was self-employed and hence directed his business, his property. As business expanded other people co-operated, but under his instructions and further expansion necessitated the appointment of subordinate officials. In a highly competitive market economy this form of organisation had survival value.

This authoritarian trend was reinforced by the state which favoured individual competition at the expense of co-operation. In Great Britain alone we have many examples. There was the plundering of guild funds by King John. There were laws restricting guild activity, forbidding trades unions and other workers' organisations.

The land enclosures acts in seizing commonly-owned land not only enriched the wool barons but provided a cheap and subservient labour force for the industrialists.

Hence although the individual capitalist may be almost obsolete in some societies, the form of organisation persists. No matter what consultation may take place between employer and employee, control is in the hands of a minority, be they private directors or state managers.

But is this form of organisation necessary in a non-competitive and egalitarian society? We think not.

### Special Measures to Protect Shopkeepers?

A resolution calling for the reintroduction of flogging and compensation for victims of attacks on shopkeepers was passed at the National Union of Retail Tobacconists' conference at Paignton, Devon, yesterday. The resolution also urged that the increasing number of attacks on shopkeepers be brought to the notice of the appropriate authorities with a view to maximum enforcement of penalties.

Moving the resolution, Mr. R. Icton of Darlington, said the victim appeared to be of no consequence. More sympathy was shown to the criminal. The attacks were becoming daily occurrences, and the public was "fed up" with the "kid-glove" treatment of the criminals. [Why not re-introduce the death penalty for stealing while we are about it?]

A syndicalist society means simply control by the majority, which may be obtained by various means. In one organisation there may be no managers whatever, with individual departments co-operating voluntarily, if necessary by contract. In another organisation officials may be appointed and removed by ballot. In yet another, officials exert only a moral control over their fellow workers. In all cases important policy decisions are made by the workers as a whole. The concepts of employer and employee have no meaning in this context.

Co-ordination between groups, or syndicates, would be effected by liaison officers or committees in some cases delegated by their respective syndicates, in others experts appointed for their knowledge. In no cases would these officials be able to force their decisions upon the syndicates.

You might accept the foregoing as practicable but consider state control necessary in other fields. Let us examine a few of these.

**Distribution:** A centralised distribution organisation is unnecessary, particularly in the light of modern development. Electronic computers, regionally placed and fed with information about world production, and demand, would enable storage depots to function independently, gauging stock positions and requirements.

**Currency Control:** But why have a currency subject to manipulation by local governments? Why not an internationally recognised standard of currency? Or do we need currency at all?

**Trade Agreement and Protection:** Surely it would be better for international industry to negotiate direct instead of using the medium of manipulative governments?

**Health Service and National Insurance:** This is a recent state development. In the middle ages guilds protected their members and controlled hospitals. Trades unions and other societies provide these benefits today. In a syndicalist society, syndicates would collectively support health organisations which would be available to all.

**Education:** Syndicates would subsidise this also.

**National Law:** First we have the problem of working rules, customs, *modus vivendi* or local rights. National organisation is unnecessary for these. If greater fields of activity require more general rules, state enforcement is unnecessary. The Hanseatic League and the Cinque Ports, for example, needed no state support. So far as local arrangements are concerned, Kropotkin has pointed out that "law" subject to local democratic control existed long before the state usurped this function.

Another problem is that concerning disputes. Most disputes are purely local so why should they be subject to national control? Furthermore, why should such disputes be submitted to authoritarian officials? Why not voluntary arbitration or, if this fails, a majority decision by all affected parties?

I hope that the foregoing has given you some idea of the anarchist approach and, if it hasn't entirely answered your question, it may encourage you to consult our literature on the subject.

Yours faithfully,  
P.G.F.

## Solidarity with a Comrade

### The David Bell Fund

As reported in FREEDOM a fortnight ago, David Bell was heavily sentenced at Lambeth Court to nine months imprisonment for refusing to accept conditions of exemption from National Service.

He has now decided to appeal and this is being arranged by the C.B.C.O. It has been suggested that fellow anarchists and other sympathisers contribute towards the cost of it. The London Anarchist Group has therefore set up a fund both for this purpose and to assist him, during and immediately after his term of imprisonment.

So, how about it, comrades?

David has suffered hardship twice for putting pacifist-anarchism into practice. First at North Pickenham (Swaffham) and now at Lambeth Court. Surely, the least we can do is to offer him our material support!

Please send any money you are able to give to the address below. A list of contributions received will periodically appear in FREEDOM.

PETER FEAK & MAX PATRICK.

Send your gifts (money, postal-orders, cheques) to:— PETER FEAK,  
27, Walcot Square,  
Kennington,  
London, S.E.11.

LIST 1. DAVID BELL FUND

A.A. 5/-; J.A. 2/-; D.B. 5/-; P.F. 10/-; M.C. 10/-; M.P. 3/-; J.R. 10/-; P.T. 5/-; A.U. 5/-; L.W. 5/-; H.K.H. 5/-; M.G. 5/-; J.G. 20/-; N.D. 2/6; S.B. 2/-; L.J. 1/-; F.H. 2/6; K.A.N. 2/-; A.F. 3/6; H.L.M. 6d.; A.S. 2/6; P.H. 5/-; B.R.M. 2/6.

TOTAL TO DATE—£5 14s. 0d.

MAX PATRICK.

## 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.

JULY 5.—Tony Weaver on  
A PHILOSOPHY OF WAR  
WITHOUT VIOLENCE.

### THE UNIVERSITY LIBERTARIAN

Number Nine now available

Price One Shilling

from Freedom Bookshop

or by subscription

(6 copies 7/-) from

John Upton,

228 Holmesdale Road,

London, S.E.25.

Back numbers 2—8

still available.

### SUMMERHILL SOCIETY MEETING

At a meeting organised by the Summerhill Society on Friday, 26th June, at 7.45 p.m. at the Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, London, W.C.1., Paul Ritter will be speaking on "The Free Family". A later meeting, on Friday, 10th July (same time, same place), will be addressed by John Aitkenhead, founder and headmaster of Kilquhanity House School.

Admission to these meetings is 2s. at the door.

## 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

27 Red Lion Street

London, W.C.1. England

Tel.: Chancery 8364