

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"It is safe to say that governments have committed far more crimes than they have prevented."

—R. D. INGERSOLL.

## The Rail Strike RAILMEN MUDDLE THROUGH

LAST Monday's partial token strike by railway workers gave London a taste of what the whole country may expect if the official national strike begins on February 14 as announced. And, partial as it was, it brought chaos to London.

The circumstances surrounding the strike were themselves chaotic and confused. It had first been called by the London District Council of the National Union of Railwaymen to give a jolt to the Transport Commission and to draw public attention to the plight of the lower-paid railway workers.

But the national executive committee of the NUR had appealed to the London men to call off their one-day token strike in view of the decision to begin a full-scale stoppage a fortnight later. This appeal had some effect, and several branches within the London district announced that they would not take part in the token stoppage, although others were determined to carry on.

Then, on Sunday—the day before the strike was to be held—the London District Council backed away from the stoppage, while at the same time declaring its solidarity with those workers who were going through with it!

### Surprising Support

With this shilly-shallying on the part of the 'leaders' it was surprising that there was as much support for the strike as in fact there was. Some of the Underground lines were completely without trains and on none was there much more than 50 per cent. of normal service. The morning rush-hour threw hundreds of thousands of travellers on to the buses, which are normally over-full, and as thousands of commuters brought out their cars to get to work the roads became jammed. From Central London right along the main roads to the inner suburbs traffic jams were solid, while at the bus stops long queues waited hopelessly for buses that were already full.

An appeal made over the radio for the train crews to come in for the evening rush hour met with no response. In fact the service was now scantier as crews which had clocked in in the morning walked out. To add to the discomfort of those struggling to get home, it rained like hell.

All this might have been calculated to destroy completely the public's sympathy for the railwaymen,

but in fact it didn't seem to. In a television programme on Monday evening, not one member of the travelling, discomforted public who was interviewed expressed anything but understanding for the men. This was to a large extent due to the reasonable tone of the Press coverage which while deploring the strike, had nevertheless shown the poor wages earned by railwaymen and explained how they had been kept waiting for nearly two years for a wages review commission to enquire into their conditions.

### Useful for Division

This commission has still not reported back. Their report is due in April and the Chairman of the Transport Commission, Sir Brian Robertson, has used this fact to divide the railwaymen's unions.

For one of the nauseating features of this dispute is, once again, the division which exists between the three unions which organise—or rather, disorganise—the railmen, and their 'Anything you can do I can do better' attitudes.

This week's token strike and next week's national stoppage are measures taken by the NUR and will not have the official support of the Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen or the Transport Salaried Staffs Association. The footplate men and the clerks are, in

the main, better off than the majority of NUR members, who include the lower-paid workers.

### A Source of Weakness

ASLEF and TSSA, therefore, feel they can afford to wait until April, and it was their readiness to do so which enabled Sir Brian Robertson to say that he could not break existing agreements because the workers' side was not united. He has admitted (in advance of seeing the enquiry commission's report) that a wage increase is justified, that the money is 'there' to cover it, and has promised that any increase agreed upon in April will be made retrospective to January 11—the date when the NUR really began to threaten a strike.

But because ASLEF and TSSA can afford to be more patient than the NUR, Sir Brian will not grant an increase now! No wonder the NUR is bitter—but then ASLEF had to fight a strike alone with official blacklegging by the NUR, a few years back!

This jealousy and division by workers' organisations in the same industry is ridiculous and a major source of weakness for the workers. If ever there was a case for an industrial union along syndicalist lines it exists in the confusion among the transport workers today.

## American Dissenters

THE only contact that most of us have with citizens of the United States and the 'American way of life' is by way of the usual means of mass forms of communication.

Film stars apart, we know more about the personal lives of politicians, their hobbies and habits, than about the people who vote for them, unless of course it is true that all Americans live like the President and his mate!

Personal contact with Americans in Europe is not always rewarding, for some odd reason they avoid discussion on American political and domestic life although generally there is no lack of interest in 'world affairs'.

Nevertheless it is possible through the means of communication we have to get some idea of the 'average' American: Their class divisions and pursuit of material security, the hopes and prejudices seem to differ very little in kind from the average Britisher.

What we rarely hear in this country are the views of the American minority, particularly the liberal minority, and how they react to what is described as the affluent society. Is there a group of dissenting citizens in open rebellion against 'organisation man' and the loyalty demands made by the state in exchange for material well-being, or has the voice of reason been silenced in American intellectual life for fear of 'McCarthyism' and possible ruin?

In a televised programme from America last Wednesday, lasting an hour and a half, a number of Americans, interviewed by Kenneth Tynan, expressed their views on conformism and ventured a spirited criticism of the complacent society.

This was meaty stuff for a healthy anarchist appetite. From the Unitarian minister who deducts the 80% of his tax returns which goes to making armaments before sending it to the Government and who has been jailed for practising his Christian Principles, to the Secretary of a small trade union who still thinks in terms of equality and the brotherhood of man, there was a wealth of individual protest against insanity and apathy.

Writers, poets comedians and University professors contributed to this programme; young people of the 'beat generation' pictured in Greenwich Village and San Francisco seem to have earned their title only because they refuse to conform, have no interest in 'getting on' but happily write their strange poetry in communities insulated against commercialism.

The Professor from Columbia University spoke with a familiar voice when he said that the current malady is apathy; people are content to leave decisions to their leaders, they neither consciously conform or not conform, they just are. The same speaker put the view that American intellectuals have no voice, no magazines or papers or money with which to launch them, dependent presumably on the whims of odd television or radio producers and magazine editors through which occasionally they can express their views.

(Readers of FREEDOM will remember the silence of the press in this country (with three exceptions) on the issue of protest a few weeks ago against Franco's treatment of prisoners—over eighty leading intellectuals unable to make themselves widely heard because they had chosen the wrong time to criticise Franco.)

Perhaps the important thing is that there are articulate people who see society for what it is and are willing to stand against organised authority when it attempts to deprive them of freedom, and who are determined to find alternative ways of expressing their ideas.

## DE GAULLE'S DILEMMA

IT is reported that de Gaulle's broadcast last Friday was received by the insurgents in Algiers with cries of "de Gaulle to the gallows". As we write these lines M. Lagailarde, their ex-paratrooper leader, is being locked up for the night in the Santé gaol in Paris (with Muslim "suspects" as his nearest neighbours?), while M. Ortiz, the famous café-proprietor insurgent has disappeared into thin air.

Apparently M. Lagailarde is to be tried for "endangering the security of the State". His trial, if it comes off, should be an interesting spectacle since not only was M. Lagailarde the ringleader in last week's revolt but also played a prominent part with the military in the much more serious disturbances in May 1958, in defiance of the government of the IVth Republic, and to the accompaniment of cries of "Long Live de Gaulle".

The General in fact was swept into office on the tide of rebellion in Algeria. Yet such is the opportunism in the political game that in less than two years his sponsors have become his most outspoken enemies and his erstwhile enemies have become reconciled, almost lulled into support by the apparent dynamism of this man, who contrasts with their own inertia and impotence and their fears of a coup by the Right (in France itself) organised by the high-ups of the Army.

THE present disturbances in Algiers cannot have come as a surprise to de Gaulle since he could not have imagined that his action in removing General Massu would be accepted without protest by the

Algerian settlers. It is clear that whatever de Gaulle thought in May 1958, about the possibilities of a solution of the Algerian problem which would favour the large European minority there, the hard facts of the military situation during the two years in which he has enjoyed dictatorial powers, have convinced him that there is no purely military way out. No-one can accuse de Gaulle of not having pursued the military campaign in Algeria energetically and ruthlessly. Indeed he used this argument to convince the settlers that France had no intention of "abandoning" them.

Frenchmen of Algeria, how can you listen to the liars and conspirators who tell you that, in granting their free choice to the Algerians, France and de

Gaulle want to abandon you, to withdraw from Algeria, and to surrender to the rebellion? Is it abandoning you, is it wanting to lose Algeria to send and maintain there an army of 500,000 men, equipped with enormous supplies; to agree to the sacrifice of a substantial number of citizens; to concentrate in this very year a thousand milliards old francs by way of civil and military expenditure; to undertake a vast work of development and to draw out from the Sahara at great effort and great cost oil and gas and carry them to the sea?

But what de Gaulle was also making clear to the settlers (as Mr. Macleod was making clear to the Kenya settlers at the London conference this week), was that he was much more interested in an independent Algeria, economically linked

Continued on p. 3

MOST people are accustomed to think of radio as being sponsored by either public or by commercial interests. In the USA, however, they now have three radio stations which are independent of these defenders of power and privilege. Two of these stations are on the West Coast and the other has just opened in New York.

The group behind these stations is the Pacifica Foundation, which was started by some conscientious objectors after World War II. They obtain their income from the voluntary subscriptions of their listeners and their small technical staffs are assisted by bands of helpers who give their services for nothing.

In New York their stations came on the air one Sunday in January this year and, in the words of Joyce Eggington, "announced that it could only exist on listeners' subscriptions. A minimum of 12 dollars (about £4. 13s.) was unblushingly suggested, which would entitle listeners to fortnightly printed program-

## It can be done INDEPENDENT RADIO

mes and the privilege of listening in . . . without a conscience."

In a society so infected by money values as is the U.S.A., the sceptic might think that such a venture would prove a failure. But, Joyce Eggington continues:

"Surprisingly to everyone but the Pacifica Foundation, listeners rushed to contribute. Americans are growing so tired of commercially-sponsored entertainments that New York subscriptions are rolling in at the rate of hundreds a day.

"The honesty of these subscribers is amazing, since anyone may cheat by tuning in . . . for free.

"But most of those who do, write in and confess it ('I'm afraid I can't afford 12 dollars, but I want you to know how much I enjoy your station.')

What is also surprising about such a response is that the Pacifica Foundation

not only broadcasts 'egghead' plays and music, but provides a platform for dissident voices as well. One week's programme of the New York station, for example, included a recording of a Communist Party conference and a lecture by Aldous Huxley. (The West Coast stations, I believe, have included such 'extremists' as Ammon Hennacy in their broadcasts).

In a world in which the term 'American' has come to be regarded as a synonym for the brash and the tawdry, it is good to know that there are some Americans who still have enough belief in non-commercial values and in free co-operation to give their services and support to such a project as this. Would that we could have such a radio here! (With acknowledgements to Liberation and the News Chronicle)

S.E.P.

### Muddling Through!

#### PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 4	
Deficit on Freedom	£80
Contributions received	£82
SURPLUS	£2

#### January 22 to January 28

Newcastle, N.S.W.: B.C. £2/0/0; Donaghadee: J.T. £1/0/0; Epsom Downs: P.C. 1/-; Enfield: M. & J.S.* 5/-; Sydney: M.J.C. 1/-; Wirral: G.S.G. 6/-; London: J.W.A. 2/10; London: J.S.* 3/-; Bronx: Workmen's Circle, Ferrer-Rocker Branch, per M.G. £8/10/0; Slough: E.C.* 3/-; London: J.W. 7/6; Surrey: E.S. 10/-; Wolverhampton: J.G.L.* 4/-; Surrey: F.B.* 5/-.	
Total	13 18 4
Previously acknowledged	68 4 1
	£82 2 5

GIFT OF BOOKS: London: G.C.; Enfield: J.S.

\*Indicates regular contributor.



# The Report (and a Counter-Report) on Carlton Approved School

## 'Anti-Authority' Youth and Authoritarian Masters

"I want you to banish from your mind any idea that your son has been sent here for punishment . . ."

—routine letter from

Approved School to parents.

"We call it 'jug' or 'doing a stretch'."

—Approved School boy.

ON the night of August 28th, a demonstration took place at Carlton School followed by the exit of the boys next day to the home of Mr. & Mrs. Talcott Williams, where a list of their grievances was typed out. At this stage the boys got to hear that the police were standing by in School Lane, and it was rumoured that the managers intended to have the 'ring-leaders' picked out for punishment. "From that moment the situation worsened rapidly." The boys made for the school buildings and hooliganism broke out. During the afternoon the representatives of the Press arrived in large numbers. Some of them induced boys with gifts of cigarettes to pose for photographs on top of and about the school buildings and on ladders against the windows in attitudes of aggression, armed with stones or bricks, the photographs thus obtained being published in some of the national newspapers on the following day.

At the request of the Home Secretary, Mr. Victor Durand, Q.C. held an inquiry and his report was published last week. He found two main causes: the insufficient development of personal relations at the school for drawing together into a close working relationship the boys, headmaster, assistant staff and managers, and the deterioration in the type of boy coming to the school. He made certain recommendations about Carlton School and some about Approved Schools generally, and the Home Secretary has announced that the Government accepts his

findings, and that the promised legislation on the treatment of young offenders would be delayed until later this year as a result.

Before discussing these findings it is as well to mention something of the history of the approved school system. It owes its origins to local private activities in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, when, to prevent children from being committed to prison or to save them from transportation, such schools as that of the Philanthropic Society at Redhill, or Mary Carpenter's Kingswood Reformatory, or the first Ragged School founded by John Pounds, a radical shoemaker, were inaugurated. In the 1850's the Reformatory Schools Act and the Industrial Schools Act gave the first governmental recognition to these schools, provided for financial assistance and inspection, and led to more being founded, while, after the Children's Act of 1908, a number of local authorities entered the field. Today each such school has an independent board of managers drawn from a

voluntary local association, a charitable or religious organisation, or a local authority, while the Home Office exercises a general supervision by its inspectors to see that the basic statutory regulations are observed. Finance is controlled by the Home Office.

The term 'Approved School' was adopted in the Children and Young Persons Act of 1933; because they are schools approved by the Secretary of State, for the reception of children and young persons committed to them by Juvenile Courts for education and training. The name was chosen as a neutral term to dissociate the schools from the sinister connotations which had grown up around the words 'reformatory' and 'industrial school'. Ironically, one of Mr. Durand's recommendations is "The desirability of changing the name 'approved school' to some designation more consistent with its fundamental purpose of social and personal rehabilitation and less likely to inspire resentment in older boys".

### I. The Last Resort

The grounds on which a Juvenile Court can make an Order of Committal to an Approved School are because the child or young person may have broken the law, or because his parents may be unable to control him, or because he is a persistent truant from school; or because he is so neglected or exposed to bad associations or moral danger as to be in need of care or protection. Since the Act of 1933 there have been two categories of girl's schools, and three of boys': junior, intermediate and senior. The senior schools take boys aged between 15 and 17 on admission, with 19 as the latest age for leaving. The period of detention, for a boy aged 15 or 16 on committal, is three years or until he reaches the age of 19, whichever is the shorter. It is usual for boys to be released on licence before the expiry of the full period of detention. An important duty of managers (which Mr. Durand shows to have been ignored at Carlton) is to release a boy on licence as soon as he is fit for it.

The process of selecting children for approved schools, is, in spite of the existence since 1943 of Classifying Schools, in the opinion of Barbara Wootton, who is both magistrate and sociologist, "extremely haphazard" and dependant on the personal attitude of the magistrates, but there has been a tendency during the last decade to use them

### 2. Deterioration

In his report on Carlton, Mr. Durand notes that the school had in the past been considered by inspectors as suitable for training "the more robust and vigorous boy, but not for the more disturbed, timid or immature. It appeared that in 1958 it had been found necessary to depart from this pattern of suitability because of the acute demands for vacancies in senior approved schools." Carlton, he also noted, lacked the services of a visiting psychiatrist. On the "deterioration" in the type of boy coming in, he said that there was a lethargy among the boys, "some of whom stirred with energy only to abuse and defy the master trying to persuade them to go on the playing fields . . . Anti-social and anti-authority characteristics among boys committed for training in the past two years had increased and worsened."

Now in 1947 a much more serious "disturbance" took place in an approved school in Staffordshire, resulting in the death of a master of the staff. The then Home Secretary called for a report which enumerated as contributory factors:

1. The long periods spent in the school arising from deferment of release on licence.
2. The particular isolation of the school and its lack of contact with any outside community along with the lack of opportunity for boys to be allowed away from the school at any time or for any reason.
3. The limited facilities for indoor recreation and purposeful work in the school.
4. The way in which discipline was maintained through the use of collective punishment—always a source of grievance because of its indiscriminate nature—and the withdrawal of privileges.
5. The poor quality of the relationship existing between the boys and the headmaster.

3. The failure to institute regular staff meetings with the object of helping the staff to develop sound methods in effective teamwork.

4. The omission to ensure that the boys had adequate opportunity for un-

hurried private discussion with the headmaster as they might reasonably require it.

5. The rather limited range of recreational interests and activities.

### 3. General Recommendations

Among his general recommendations are a review of the salaries of house-masters "in the light of the inability of approved schools to recruit sufficient people on the present terms" (House-masters earn less than teachers, their salaries being negotiated by a different body; the salary is £575 to £845 a year), an urgent demand for more capital expenditure on approved schools, and for "the establishment of one or more schools as necessary, with closed facilities, for boys not essentially unsuitable for approved school training, but who need to be held securely for a period to achieve progress with their training."

He also makes recommendations which should require new legislation:

1. Some form of statutory provision should be made urgently for facilitating the prompt temporary removal from an approved school, of unruly or subversive youths, by the police, when this is necessary to avoid a serious threat to discipline.

### 4. Home Office to Blame?

Many people will be disappointed at this report. These recommendations as to legislation affect fundamental legal safeguards: *habeas corpus* in one instance, and the taking of powers of decision out of the court in another. The hope that Mr. Durand would recommend that the approved schools be taken out of the control of the Home Office and put under that of the Ministry of Education has not been fulfilled. (The journal *Education* remarked in November:

"The Home Office has not proved a good department to run schools. It is dominated on the one hand by its punitive and police responsibilities, and on the other by the tradition of shameful exploitation which distinguishes the official attitude towards social workers such as probation and welfare officers. These particular defects come from causes more serious than parsimony, through the hypocrisy of this kind of skimping at the expense of the idealists is bad enough.")

Mr. Durand refrains from emphasising the responsibility of the government itself for the retention of unsuitable old barrack-like buildings such as Carlton which cannot be adapted to the house or cottage system. The pamphlet *Making Citizens*, written by a former inspector of the Children's Department of the Home Office and originally published by the government in 1946, says that

"It may seem surprising in view of the shifting of emphasis from restraint and regimentation to community—even family—living, that the cottage system has not been generally adopted for Approved Schools. There has, perhaps, been a lack of enterprise here . . ."

There has, and it has continued. In the early 1950's the Select Committee on estimates recommended the closing of those schools which cost most per place per week (which is like recommending that a hospital should refrain from accepting tuberculosis cases because they cost more than influenza ones), and the Home Office accepted this demand with a wholesale closing of smaller schools. "I can think of no pronouncement" writes Donald Ford in *The Delinquent Child* "which has created greater damage to a vital service than this particular one," and he goes on to point out that "it would have been far better to have re-organised and kept in being a large number of schools and reduced them all in size; this would not have been quite so easy a task nor would it have effected quite so much in the way of direct saving, but it would have resulted in a far more flexible and responsive service."

### 5. Deprivation of Liberty

Mr. Ford, who writes from the widest possible experience in this field, also remarks that:

"It is always a source of amazement to me how little heed is paid on occasion by so many people to the fact that other members of the community, even if they are children, are deprived of their freedom. It is a fact that the removal from home and the deprivation of liberty consequent upon sending a child for training in an Approved School seem to count

2. In view of the emergence of a small but exceedingly difficult hard core of anti-authority young people and the likelihood of this problem increasing, consideration should be given as soon as possible for removing from an approved school, to Borstal or other suitable training institution, any youth aged 15 or over found to be unsuitable for approved school training or likely to exercise a seriously detrimental effect on the training of others in the school.

3. With the object of preventing as far as possible the committal of unsuitable cases to approved schools, consideration should be given to statutory provision for courts, when they are in doubt whether approved school training is the right remedy or whether training under the Prison Commission would be more appropriate, to commit young persons aged over 15 but under 17 to 'residential training' for the purpose of observation in a classifying school, and for ultimate allocation by the Secretary of State in the light of the classifying school's report.

for so little in the eyes of many observers and commentators.

"To the children these things constitute primarily their punishment; they are always eager to discover precisely what their punishment is. They are never convinced that they have been removed from home for training; they look on the training as a scheme devised to keep them occupied during the time that they are away from home. In some schools I have wondered just where the truth lay in this matter."

It would, of course, be grossly unfair to suggest that the majority of Approved Schools are run like Carlton. Many Approved School staffs, are, as Roy Perrott remarks in the *Guardian* 16/11/59, trying "to cultivate an atmosphere which is something like that of any progressive boarding school". He goes on:

"One of the important questions that now arises is whether public opinion is ready to let them go on moving in this libertarian 'progressive' direction. Much depends on whether it thinks the treatment of delinquents is too 'soft', on its reaction to disturbances like those at Carlton school, on whether it thinks the schools are operating on sensible and reasonably successful lines."

### 6. 'Public Opinion'

If public opinion means the leaders of the 'responsible' newspapers, it would go further in its criticism than Mr. Durand. *The Times* remarks that the Managers got off "rather lightly" and the Home Office "most lightly of all". The *Daily Telegraph* says that the report makes it plain that "Carlton has been a very bad school indeed" and that Mr. Durand's belief that it should remain open under the same headmaster "does not convince." The *Guardian* says squarely that the disorders "may end by doing more good than harm". But if public opinion means the Home Secretary, the likelihood is that he will introduce into his new Bill on young offenders Mr. Durand's reactionary proposals as a sop to the 'get tough' element in Parliament, just as the Detention Centres were introduced to placate those who regretted the abolition of the birch. These proposals emanate not from a desire to help the most difficult offenders, but from fear of them. Do you lock a boy up because you hope to train him or because you are afraid of him? We have always been told that the essence of the approved school is that it is open. To enclose it is simply to make it a Detention Centre. The Detention Centres as originally constituted, on the "short sharp shock" system did not work. Everything their critics said about them turned out to be true. Now they have been considerably modified, they are said to be working better (and Mr. Butler who wants to appear as an 'enlightened' penologist, of course takes the credit), but Dr. Max Grünhut in the current number of the *British Journal of Delinquency* warns us of their very limited value. Yet this appears to be the kind of institution Mr. Durand

Continued on p. 3

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 8 p.m. Sat.)

Reprints and

Cheap Editions . . .

Poetry of this Age	J. M. Cohen	5/-
The Americans	Geoffrey Gorer	3/6
Poems	Boris Pasternak	32/-
Recollections	Alexis de Tocqueville	12/-
On Modern Poets	Yvonne Winters	12/-
Lorca: the Poet and his People	Arturo Barea	10/6
Paris Mitchell of King's Row	H. Bellmann	3/6
Poems	Walt Whitman	14/6
Mythology	Edith Hamilton	4/-
Gandhi: his Life and Message	Louis Fischer	2/6
An Analysis of the Kinsey Reports	Donald P. Geddes	4/-
Cultural Patterns and Technical Change (ed.)	Margaret Mead	4/-
The Way of Life	Lao Tzu	4/-
Reconstruction in Philosophy	John Dewey	3/6
Eight Great Tragedies	Aeschylus, Sophocles, etc.	4/-
The Statesman	Henry Taylor	4/-

Second-Hand . . .

Living my Life (2 vols.)	Emma Goldman	42/-
Selected Writings of William Morris		3/6
William Morris Prose Selections		3/6
Dream of John Ball	William Morris	3/-
Peter the First	Alex Tolstoy	7/6
The Essays of Michael Montaigne (Vol I only)		2/6
Walt Whitman: a Study	J. A. Symonds	3/-
Walden	H. D. Thoreau	2/6
Selected Plays	John Webster and John Ford	3/6
The Case of The Fox	William Stanley	5/6
Economics and Syndicalism	Adam W. Kirkaldy	3/6
Roads to Glory	Richard Aldington	3/-
Thus Spake Zarathustra	F. Nietzsche	3/6

Periodicals . . .

The Humanist, February	1/-
Africa South, Jan.-March	4/-
Liberation, December	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!

otage free on all items

Obtainable from

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



## DE GAULLE'S DILEMMA

Continued from p. 1

to France, than an Algeria which albeit "French" was a permanent drain on the French economy!

In this realistic approach it is not surprising that de Gaulle should now have the backing of, it is said, 80% of the people of France, since it is they who have been called upon to make the sacrifices in men, materials and money to maintain a situation in Algeria which benefits a minority of the European settlers and which will be increasingly difficult and costly in the years to come, as well as untenable—as all the colonial powers have learned or are in the process of learning.

WHEN, therefore, de Gaulle made his offer of self-determination to Algeria last September he was guided not by any liberal feelings for the Muslims, but by the failure of his military campaign to pacify the country or to intimidate the F.L.N. leaders. He had been no more successful than the much maligned politicians of the 4th Republic. Furthermore the intransigence of the European settlers had proved as much a stumbling block to any political settlement that he could put forward, as it had been to his predecessors. The declaration of September then was an admission of failure of a particular policy.

The new policy depends for its success on the one hand on winning the support of the Muslims, on the other of curbing the demands and the privileges of the European Algerians. This latter he cannot achieve so long as the Army is paid by Paris but works for the "colons". Hence reluctantly (yes, for again it is an admission of failure for a de Gaulle to have to recognise that the army is not under his thumb) he must have a show-down with the Army. Massu and other military leaders are relieved of their posts. And in his broadcast speech last Friday he underlined his action for the benefit of any other would-be usurper of his powers.

I now turn to the Army which, thanks to magnificent efforts, is about to achieve victory in Algeria, but certain elements of which would appear to be tempted to believe that this war is their war and not that of France, and that they are entitled to a policy which is not the policy of France.

I say to all our soldiers: Your mission does not involve any equivocation or interpretation. . . .

Listen to me carefully. Faced with the insurrection of Algiers and in the midst of the agitation, the Delegate-General, M. Paul Delouvrier, who is France in Algeria, and the Commander-in-Chief acting may have not wanted themselves to unleash a pitched battle. But no soldier, on pain of a serious crime, must at any moment associate himself, even passively with the insurrection.

In the last resort, public order will have to be re-established. The means to be used in order that the law shall remain respected may be of different kinds. But your duty is to re-establish order. I have given and I give orders to this effect.

Strong words, mixed with flattery however, for a political leader has few resources with which to implement threats when he has lost the "loyalty" of the army! And de Gaulle is no Superman nor is there any indication that he is more than average so far as politicians go. "What may save him—declared a writer in *l'Express* last week—is just that strength for which he has been reproached more than anything else: that he identifies himself with France". And in the present situation it would appear that de Gaulle

Continued from p. 2 recommends for the "hard core of anti-authority young people". Mr. Durand is a barrister, and as such is well able to evaluate the evidence put before his enquiry, and to enumerate the breaches of the regulations committed by the staff and managers of the school. But as to what should be done about "unruly and subversive" boys, his opinion may be no more valuable than that of an undertaker on the preservation of health.

### A Counter-Report

On the evidence put before his enquiry, we should like to present our own report, not to Mr. Butler, but to the public opinion he is so deferential about.

1. We recommend that the "hard core of anti-authority young people" of Carlton School be congratulated on drawing attention by their "disturbance" to the fact that the school was administered in such a way that (to quote Mr. Durand) "Many boys capable of deriving benefit from this form of non-penal training were likely to have their prospects of social rehabilitation gravely endangered".

2. That their efforts (though under persuasion from the representatives of the popular press) to demolish the school, be recognised as well-founded in view of the total unsuitability of the premises. Mr. Durand's recommendation that the "camping allowance" (stopped by the Home Office as one of their little economies) be restored, should be implemented in order to provide a camp in the grounds this summer, while the readers of the popular press should be invited to provide equipment. The object of the camp should be to accommodate the boys, and anyone else caring to lend a hand, while they are demolishing the premises and building a new community in village form.

3. At the enquiry certain masters at Carlton were very highly praised and none of the 43 boys who gave evidence had anything to say to their discredit. We suggest that a further enquiry into the character and methods of these masters, compared with those of the masters criticised by Mr. Durand, might be instructive.

4. A further field of enquiry might be why, on Saturday, August 29th, the "anti-social" boys were highly sociable with Mr. & Mrs. Talcott Williams who prepared their list of grievances, and whether Mrs. Williams might be persuaded to participate in the administration of the school. Are there any women at all on the staff?

5. The retired military gentlemen who seem to dominate the board of managers and the members of the staff who find it difficult to persuade their lethargic boys on to the playing field, might with profit read Mr. Alan Sillitoe's story *The Loneliness of the Long-Distance Runner* in order that the idea might possibly penetrate them that a recalcitrant youth may be superior to those whose idea of rehabilitating him is to make him a healthy, team-spirited racehorse.

has the support of the mass of the French people, which they have been expressing by inundating him with telegrams, and last Monday the three Trades Unions—Communist, Socialist and Catholic—unanimously for once, agreed to stage a general one-hour strike throughout France to show that they were behind the General!

THE hostility of the people of France to the recent disturbances in Algiers and to the role of the Army chiefs in dealing with the situation, and not de Gaulle's speech, are to our minds largely responsible for the collapse of the movement. It remains to be seen whether de Gaulle now takes advantage of his "popularity" in metropolitan France to clean-up the Army and round-up the "ultras" in Algeria as well as to put forward proposals for a settlement in Algeria which can be accepted by the F.L.N. He missed similar chances in May 1958. There is no reason to assume that he will take such action now, except perhaps that this time he will be forced into action by circumstances and events stronger than "moi, de Gaulle" or driven out of office!

## . . . And a Counter-Report

6. And while on the subject of literature, we might recommend everyone who lays down the law about anti-social teenagers to read the first-hand account of August Aichhorn, Bruno Bettelheim and David Wills, of how they dealt with the 'problem' faced so unsuccessfully by Carlton School.

7. They might also consider the work of Homer Lane in this country 40 years ago, and in the interests of disseminating this kind of information, might pay some attention to the plea of A. S. Neill and Lord Sandwich that David Wills' book about Homer Lane, which has been rejected by five publishers, should find someone or some organisation willing to finance its publication.

8. Further, they might consider how much more rewarding the therapeutic approach is than the disciplinarian or even the 'educational' one. Barbara Wootton remarks in her *Social Science and Social Pathology* that

"Though schools differ greatly from one another, it is probably fair to say that those which are included in the public educational system (and a high proportion of those outside it) are on

the whole imbued with authoritarian values and employ authoritarian methods. The virtues which they inculcate are those of discipline and hard work, of respect for, and obedience to, properly constituted authority. Children are at least expected to behave politely and respectfully towards their teachers. But not towards their psychiatrist. Typically, the climate of the clinic is permissive rather than authoritarian: the role of the adults is to help, indeed to serve, not to command, the children."

Carlton School, we may remind the public, employed neither the full-time nor the occasional services of a psychiatrist nor a psychiatric social worker.

9. The public might also observe the methods of Mr. George Lyward at Finchden Manor in Kent, where he takes youths of exactly the kind Mr. Durand describes as "unruly, subversive, anti-authority, and anti-social" and gives them a respite from being morally judged, re-educated and institutionalised. His is a community where there is no forced discipline, no corporal punishment, no locks, no fixed hours, no bed-time, no fixed terms or holidays, no uniforms, no curriculum, and no conventions of cor-

rect behaviour. The meals are cooked and served by the boys and the staff are mostly former pupils. "I run a community," says Mr. Lyward, "of which no-one is expected to be a loyal understanding member. I have had the joy, in consequence, of continually watching a larger proportion of people co-operating without stimulants, than in any community I have known, where 'community spirit' is preached in and out of season as an ideal, to be achieved by all and sundry from the moment of entry, regardless of their capacity or their prior needs." Mr. Lyward's work is so totally different from that of the moralisers that we need hardly mention that his community is on the rocks. People who want to help it and to give time for Mr. Lyward to write about his ideas and methods can send contributions to Friends of Finchden Manor Trust, c/o Messrs. H. N. Murray & Co., 9-11, Cophall Avenue, E.C.2.

10. Finally, to all who believe that the way to deal with wayward youth is to lock it up, we commend the slogan which in one way or another sums up the whole question, and which should enable them to see the futility of Carlton School, Mr. Durand, and Mr. Butler: *Force may subdue, but love gains.* C.W.

### Theatre

## 'Bloomsday' at the Unity

BLOOMSDAY is Thursday, 16th June, 1904, the day on which James Joyce first went out with his future wife and on which the action of his novel *Ulysses* takes place, both in Dublin. The Unity is a grubby little theatre in Goldington Street, Somers Town (the dilapidated area south of Camden Town between Euston and St. Pancras stations), where proletarian plays have been produced for 24 years. When you consider that *Ulysses* is perhaps one of the finest extant examples of bourgeois decadence among modern novels and that the Unity people didn't break with the Communists until 1956 (if then), you may well wonder how on earth it has come about that a dramatised version of such a work should be put on at such a theatre. Those responsible don't seem to be quite sure themselves. "Joyce's *Ulysses*," the duplicated programme begins, "a strange choice for Unity Theatre?" And even the adaptor, Allan McClelland, answers his own question "Why dramatisate it?" with four more questions: "To arouse curiosity? To experiment? To hear Joyce's language? To hear echoes of many of our modern dramatists? Perhaps. . . ." Comrade Zhdanov wouldn't have cared much for any of these reasons. Isn't it said that people have to look for reasons for trying to dramatisate *Ulysses*?

Not that the dialectical arguments for and against producing *Bloomsday* are really relevant to us (though we may reflect on the irony of events that has made this very unproletarian play so popular in just the way that happens to Miss Joan Littlewood's efforts further east). Indeed one might have thought that a much more weighty negative argument would be the near impossibility of reducing Joyce's gigantic rambling masterpiece to the confining limits of three acts spread over a mere two and a half hours. Remember that from stately plump Buck Mulligan shaving to Molly Bloom falling asleep the eighteen episodes of the book deal with the lives of three people over eighteen hours and 742 pages (in the Bodley Head English edition). To recite the whole of Molly Bloom's soliloquy alone would take up all the time available; and the Circe episode which was produced at the Arts Theatre last summer as *Ulysses in Nighttown* did just that. Nor is *Ulysses* a straight narrative novel. True, there is plenty of dialogue, but there is also a great deal of monologue and there are long and very difficult passages of the most elaborate pastiche, burlesque, parody and fantasy in general—all hard enough to appreciate when you have the book in your hands for several weeks. Notwithstanding all these appalling obstacles, it must be agreed that Mr. McClelland has done a brilliant job. *Bloomsday* isn't *Ulysses* (any more than the play *The Ginger Man* was the novel *The Ginger Man*), but it is an excellent representation of it. The Circe episode has had to be omitted for copyright reasons, and the Oxen of the Sun episode, for example—which is as long as Molly's soliloquy—has to be com-

pressed into little more than two short speeches; but the play has caught the spirit of the novel. The main characters—Stephen Dedalus (the aloof poet), Leopold Bloom (the wandering Hungarian Jew), and Molly Bloom (the personification of femaleness)—seem to walk straight out of the book. The Dublin dialogue sounds impeccable to a Londoner. Various stage-tricks are skilfully used to suggest the complexity and fantasy of the original—when Bloom reads his letter the girl who wrote it declaims it to him from backstage; at the funeral he darts about among the mourners dropping thoughts like pebbles as he goes; in the Nausicaa episode, lame little Gerty MacDowell reads aloud from a book on her lap the novelesque account of what is actually happening on the stage; and Molly's bed appears high up on the right as her mind wanders away with her memories.

Inevitably there is some distortion of emphasis. The literary arguments and parodies are almost eliminated and the dialogue passages become dominant; the anti-semitic bits are played up and the sexy bits played down (the end of the Nausicaa episode, for instance, must be incomprehensible to anyone unfamiliar with its unexpurgated original—but then Bloom can hardly masturbate on the stage, even at the Unity Theatre). Nevertheless the selection of passages and events seem to be faultless; the only bad lapse is to make Bloom come to bed after Molly's last words, which should surely be the end of the play as they are of the novel. But it is doubtful if, apart from this, any version of the book could have been more right.

Mr. McClelland is in charge of the production as well as the adaptation, and again he scores a triumph. Having forced *Ulysses* to become a play on paper he gets it across the footlights as a play in action as well. In this he is excellently backed up by the actors, all of whom seem to be perfectly in character and perfectly in tune with each other. As one would expect in such a place, the scenes of low life are particularly impressive. But little pathetic petty, bourgeois Bloom, the archetypal *homme moyen sensuel*, is made touching—but not sloppy—by Joe MacColum, whose performance compares well with that of Zero Mostel at the Arts. Stephen and Molly are nearly as good (Denys Hawthorne and Helen Goldapple). The "cast of Dubliners" (nineteen of them) is excellent. Altogether everyone concerned deserves praise (though the business of getting tickets and drinks is complicated by bad organisation and lack of space—like the Theatre Royal, they seem to be embarrassed by a full house). Perhaps the best thing about this production is that it shares with the Theatre Royal and (at its best) the Royal Court—and with odd plays like *The Ginger Man* and *Roots*—the ability to create as it were the reverse of the *Verfremdungseffekt* we hear so much about. It is an "involvement-effect" (whatever the German for that would be) that manages

to come out from the stage and sock you in the guts, knocking all the breath out of you, so that for a moment you are on the stage too and sharing the action with the actors. This could be experienced at its best in the last moments of *A Taste of Honey* and *Roots*, and it is an extraordinary achievement to have got it out of such intractable material as *Ulysses*. N.W.

### BOOK REVIEW

## ZLY

ZLY, by Leopold Tyrmand, Michael Joseph, 18s.

THE Iron Curtain countries have their juvenile gangs too. They also seem to have their crime fiction addicts, judging by this Polish offering. Except that the background is Warsaw, not some American city, or Paris or London, there is little new in it.

These sort of stories have never been distinguished, they could hardly be, for humanitarianism, but they seem to my (admittedly prejudiced) eye to be getting more and more brutal. The hero of *Zly* is a reformed tough, who decides to clean up the Warsaw underworld by beating up its more notorious inhabitants, especially youthful gangsters.

There are no Marquis of Queensbury rules in this. Not only does he knock his enemies unconscious but he afterwards kicks them. The modern attitude seems to be that this is the only practical way to deal with lawbreakers, teenagers, Nazis and other scapegoats. In fact it merely reduces one to their level, but who cares about that?

If one has to become a Nazi to fight Nazism, then Nazism has won. In spite of the military defeat it looks as if Hitler really was victorious. Nowadays there are no limits. As the forces of the State become more and more powerful the private conscience becomes weaker.

It is interesting that the relatively un-free countries beyond the Curtain should throw up the same types as the "free world" (so-called). The underworld of Warsaw is much the same as that of New York. The bigger fish eat up the smaller. The police are still helpless, however much they may be respected (as they were not, for instance, in the Sherlock Holmes stories), and everything has to wait till Superman sails in, delivering good old Anglo-Saxon (or Polish) socks on the jaw. The hero of this book is in fact compared to Zorro, but it is Superman he most resembles, by his prowess with his fists and his ability to dash about all over the place in an almost supernatural manner. East and West have met, proving Kipling wrong again, for the three millionth time.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.



## A Page of Letters to the Editors

## Why we dislike Parliament

DEAR FRIENDS,

Nicholas Walter asks why anarchists are so angry about Parliament; he believes that we can "walk to freedom" by way of the delinquent asylum known as Parliament! I personally hate Parliament because it is an insult to me and my fellow men. Indeed N.W. in his earlier 'revisionist' article says: "I am not alone in thinking that the completion of Guy Fawkes' work might be a good idea", in fact it would be a bloody good idea, which doesn't mean to say that anarchism would be helped at all by such a humane and sensible action.

After meeting N.W. I think readers of FREEDOM ought to know just how far he is from anarchism. He is not revising anarchism but speaking of Libertarianism—I mention this because Nicolas constantly talks of "we" and "us" when talking of anarchists.

Last week in FREEDOM, N.W. wrote: "Rhodesian Africans have been jailed, but Hungarian Freedom Fighters who didn't get away have been shot"—yet, apart from the fact that this implies that imprisonment is better than a quick death, I can assure you Nicolas that white Rhodesians would love to shoot the African Nationalist leaders if they thought they would get away with it. However, they know this would result in a mass uprising. And it is the same with every Government. Does anyone think that Freedom Press would be allowed to remain functioning if the Government didn't realize that its suppression would cause more fuss than FREEDOM ever has? We are enjoying licence, not freedom.

Today as long as any Government remains in existence we are in immediate danger of annihilation. Even if Direct Action and the pressure of public opinion compelled nuclear disarmament to be undertaken, the next war would soon bring nuclear bombs into use—especially as one side saw itself being defeated.

One can understand anarchists of long-standing, shrugging in hopelessness at those who wish to do anything. The only course is self-emancipation and the personal assistance one can give to others to free themselves. Perhaps man will live for ever with Governments. Perhaps anarchism will die out—I now see what a struggle it is for the anarchist movement to keep steady and not slip backwards, let alone advance. We, at least need not wait mystically for "the day", we may be approaching the day when libertarianism replaces anarchism in the slow demise of libertarian thought.

What futility to worry or care or try. We're beat. Though it is worth trying . . . to live with love, dignity and sincerity, let's not worry about a movement. Perhaps when H-Bombs have started to fall, people will at least awake. As Jack Robinson said in his talk "Anarchism 1960?", the chances of this are fairly good, yet the chances of being wiped out are even greater.

Imagine an anarchist society evolving as a result of an awakening due to falling Bombs, only for it to be wiped out by radiation! Hell, I must be a masochist! Or maybe this is a bit of realistic and reasonable anarchist thought that will be proved as we cease to exist.

Yours fraternally,

JEREMY WESTALL.

## IT'S WAR THAT MUST BE ABOLISHED

DEAR FRIENDS,

I think it is illogical to protest against France for wanting nuclear bombs when Britain, USA, and USSR already have them. At the same time we demonstrate in protest of French bomb tests it seems we should be demonstrating against all nuclear bombs in whatever nation they might be, if we are to be logical. I think that responsible people the world over should begin now to plan for international protest marches in April to arrive April 14 in Moscow, Washington, Paris, London, and all other national capitals demanding the complete abolition of all military weapons. (It makes no sense to ask for nuclear disarmament alone, as so many organizations are doing, for this is the same as saying that war is all right if you use the right weapons. Nuclear weapons are the logical result of a war philosophy. Besides, germ warfare can be just as devastating if not more so than nuclear war).

The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament in England plans to have a March on London the week of April 11 and Peacemakers in the USA are going to march on Washington the same week. Who is going to plan the marches on Moscow, Paris and all the other capitals of the world?

Yours for Peace and Freedom,

France, Jan. 27. RICHARD FICHTER,\*  
(\*Member of World Citizens for Peace and Freedom).

## Anti-Semitism—Viewpoint from Germany

DEAR COMRADES,

I suppose you have heard of the anti-Semitic propaganda in Germany. Allow me to give my opinion on these outrages. I am in a position to tell you the facts, I have plenty of Jews who are my friends, and I am a member, and cashier of the Anti-Nazi Union here in Wuppertal.

This propaganda was made by teddy boys, and only a few of them were slightly hurt by people who caught them while they painted their anti-Semitic slogans on the doors of Synagogues, and on the doors of houses where Jewish families lived.

Anti-Semitic propaganda in Germany can only be considered as a hoax, because Jews are very scarce in this country; they had to flee from the brutality of the Nazis, and only 25,000 (4%) have come back. And they are very careful not to offend anybody, either in politics or in business. They want to live in peace after the long years of persecutions.

The anti-Semitic propaganda is so far nothing but the loutish shabby tricks of teddy boys and teenagers, who know nothing of the terrible history of the Nazis. They have the intention to become "heroes" with their smearing the doors of Jews. And the press of the World helps them with all its might, this propaganda goes all over the World, and with few risks to themselves, the most is a few months in jail for misdemeanour.

The government, and the teachers at the schools and Universities are in the first place responsible for these events. The government for what it has done, and the teachers for what they have not done. The governments, so-called democratic, put the high Nazis in the responsible highest places of the government, so that even real Democrats were forced to be very careful in their words and attitude to these former Nazis, who were their superiors, if these democratic civil servants intended to be promoted.

The teachers at the schools, grammar schools and universities, above the age of 40 years, have all been forced by Hitler to join the Nazi party, otherwise they had to quit the service. Of course not all of these forced members of the Nazi party were real Nazis at heart, but many die, or were already Nazis. These teachers have to teach German history to our youth, and in that they have failed dismally. The teachers have not taught them the German history of the last 30 years, i.e. the time when Hitler ruled. The reason for this must be that the teachers try to avoid questions from the pupils about what they have done during the Nazi régime. The same attitude can be noted in the parents, who have been adherents of Hitler; they tell nothing of the Hitler era. The ignorance of the events during the Nazi time is in the German youth incredible and frightful. It is understandable that the teachers and parents fear the questions of their children and pupils about their behaviour during the Nazi régime. They try to be models of virtue for their children and pupils, and cannot therefore reveal the facts. By their silence teachers and parents try to eliminate a horrible past.

The young teachers, who have not been in the Nazi party, when they studied the Party no longer existed, have to be very careful how they speak of the events of the Nazi period, concentration camps, killings by the millions, torture, terror, etc., because their superiors have been Nazis, and promotion of the young teachers depends on them. Out of these facts and surroundings did the anti-Semitic propaganda develop.

Of course, this propaganda has to be watched and investigated; whether these teddy boys were not simply exploring the ground to see how the German people would react to this propaganda. Anti-Semitism is also an excuse, a stalking-horse, for a terror government which

strangles liberty and the most elementary human rights. It is possible that these teddy boys are only a puppet, and that the strings are being pulled by mighty men, and these men may be in Germany, or France, England or the U.S.A. That is now the question.

Yours fraternally,

WILLY FRITZENKOTTER.

Wuppertal, Jan. 19.

## ... and Israel

DEAR SIR,

The recent outbreaks of anti-Semitism in Germany and elsewhere are surely a disgusting and distressing phenomenon, and every effort should be made to disclose their common originator—if any—and to stop them. But when Israeli leaders angrily and very loudly protest on international platforms against anti-Semitism and national discrimination, they should be reminded by sincere friends of Israel that the Arabs are also Semites, and that the enforcement of exile and decay on a million of Arab refugees and the degradation and spoliation of 200,000 Israeli Arabs are acts much more substantial and inhuman than the smearing of swastikas.

He that thunders against filth should first clean his own hands.

For "The Third Force"

movement in Israel:

M. STEIN, Chairman.

A. ZICHRONY, Secretary.

Tel Aviv, Jan. 19.

## Report from Australia

DEAR FRIENDS,

This is in the nature of a brief report which may be useful for publishing in your paper.

We have here in Sydney an anarchist group of cosmopolitan content, originally started by two Bulgarian comrades. It now consists of English, French, and Australian comrades as well, and has contact with German, Italian and Spanish friends not intimately associated with the group.

In 1959 we published two issues of an Anarchist Review, and have distributed as widely as possible Anarchist and Syndicalist literature amongst radical groups of workers and intellectuals. We have consistently taken part in forums and discussions which have awakened interest here, such as dealing with the Hungarian revolt, the publishing of Pasternak's book, etc.

In common with groups in most of the other Western countries, we have difficulty in establishing any wide contact amongst the workers' organisations. Those unions not dominated by the Communist Party are either in the grip of the usual social-democratic and reformist officialdom, or are well on the way to sliding into American type business Unionism, and the chief characteristic amongst the rank and file is apathy.

This indifference to social problems (which are quite as sharp here as in Britain, for example) extends to the student youth. The Universities here are factories for the production of technicians and professional business men, and inspire no original thought, and certainly no student action.

We do have contact with a group at the Sydney University who call themselves the "Libertarian Society". Their leading members are mostly ex-university students, but there is not any real ideological agreement with them. They disseminate a philosophy largely composed of a deadly cynicism and despair, very intellectually presented (large doses of Reich and Freud) whose main result seems to be to produce a determined hedonism of the "to-morrow we shall die" variety.

As to the precise political orientation of our group, we are without exception what might be described as organisational anarchists (Anarcho-Syndicalist or Anarcho-Communist) and we find ourselves very much in agreement with the American friends organised in the Libertarian League as expressed in their magazine *Views and Comments*. We occasionally use some piece of propaganda from this that fits the situation here in Australia.

We do have regular contact with the A.I.T. in France, and are in a position to receive communications in French, Spanish, Russian, Bulgarian, English, German and Esperanto.

One point that has presented itself for discussion in our group is the situation that exists between the original Bulgarian organisation—U.A.B.—with its secretar-

iat in Paris, and the new grouping who call themselves the G.A.B.E. (Bulgarian Anarchist Group in Exile). Our group, like the rest of the international movement, is not qualified to judge between the rival points of view existing between these two bodies. What does concern us is the accuracy of reports reaching the international Anarchist press.

We have seen in some Spanish language papers (*El Libertario de Cuba, Tierra y Libertad*) and in FREEDOM, London, and the C.I.A. Bulletin, that the new GABE has established contact with another Bulgarian group in Australia. This statement is quite a mystery to us. We have contacts all over the Australian Commonwealth with Anarchist individuals, and we have no knowledge of this group. There are within our group Bulgarian anarchists of active experience who are in association with and in agreement with the Paris Union (U.A.B.) but these comrades also have no knowledge of any other organised group in this country.

Please understand that we do not make this statement in order to claim any exclusiveness as to the only anarchist organisation here, but merely in the interest of truth and accuracy. We would indeed welcome co-operation with any other group, but we have to say that to our knowledge no such group exists.

It is necessary to be realistic when assessing our strength, and the tendency to exaggerate is always a human weakness on the part of individuals. There is one Bulgarian Libertarian individualist here in Sydney who was once associated with our group, but who has long since disassociated himself from any group activity. This man is known to sympathise actively with the group that is newly constituted under the name of GABE. If the secretariat of the GABE could furnish us with details of this hitherto unknown group in Sydney, it would clarify for us what is at present an ambiguous and somewhat mysterious situation. As an affiliated group of the A.I.T. based on firm anarcho-syndicalist principles we would like to be in full possession of the facts regarding the strength of anarchist forces here in order to be able to play our part effectively in the struggle for the propagation of our ideas.

Sydney, Jan. 18. D. F. WEBB,  
Secretary,  
Sydney Anarchist Group.

## QUESTIONNAIRE

Have you completed and returned yours?

## 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*  
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

## VOLUME:

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

## V. RICHARDS:

*Lessons of the Spanish Revolution* 6s.

## E. A. GUTKIND:

*The Expanding Environment* 8s. 6d.

## PETER KROPOTKIN:

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

## JOHN HEWETSON:

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

## GEORGE WOODCOCK:

*New Life to the Land* 6d.  
*Homes orhovels?* 6d.  
*Railways and Society* 3d.

## MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI:

*Neither East nor West*  
paper 7s. 6d.; cloth 10s. 6d.

## 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 10s. (U.S.A. \$3)

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

## MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

## LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP and MALATESTA DEBATING SOCIETY

## IMPORTANT

IT MUST BE THE GYPSY IN US!  
THE LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP  
HAVE MOVED AGAIN!

MEETINGS are now held at  
CAMBRIDGE CIRCUS  
"The Marquis of Granby" Public House,  
London, W.C.2.  
(corner Charing Cross Road and  
Shaftesbury Avenue)  
at 7.30 p.m.  
ALL WELCOME

FEB. 7.—Philip Sansom on  
ANARCHY OR LAW?

FEB. 14.—Arlo Tatum on  
WAR RESISTERS'  
INTERNATIONAL AND  
ANARCHISM

FEB. 21.—Max Patrick on  
APPOINTMENTS AND  
DISAPPOINTMENTS

## DEBATE

Semi-final in East London  
Debating Competition

Motion:

THAT FREEDOM THROUGH THE  
LAW IS PREFERABLE TO THE  
FREEDOM OF ANARCHY

Opposers: London Anarchist Group  
Proposers: City Literary Institute  
At the City Literary Institute,  
Stukeley Street, Drury Lane, W.C.1.  
On Saturday, 6th Feb. at 7 p.m. sharp.

## 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. \$4.80)  
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