

'Were you looking to be held together by lawyers?
Or by an agreement on a paper?
Or by arms?
Nay, nor the world nor any living thing will so cohere.'

WALT WHITMAN

In this Issue:

COOL FOR KITTENS
'OPERATION ABOLITION'
THE WASTE LAND

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

THE READERS DON'T COUNT

FLEET STREET rumours almost invariably turn out to be inaccurate, but they do provide the day's sensational headlines, and this is what sells the papers. But the rumours which always seem to be accurate, in spite of official denials, concern newspaper mergers, takeovers and closures. All last week the rumours were being circulated that Beaverbrook was about to merge the one-and-half million circulation *Sunday Dispatch* with his *Sunday Express*, and thus push the circulation of that successful advertisement medium beyond the 4 million mark. And in fact last Sunday the rumour was admitted to be true by the managing Director of Associated Newspapers Ltd., owners of the *Sunday Dispatch*, (and publishers of the *Evening News* which last year swallowed up the *Star* and of the *Daily Mail* which did likewise to the *News Chronicle*).

★

WE are not opposed to "tradition" on principle—indeed we think some are so good that any future "free society" would do all in its power to give them new life!—but we do oppose the automatic acceptance that ideas, institutions or what have you, that have survived for at least a century are without question part of our heritage. It will be said, of course, that we wouldn't be anarchists if we didn't adopt such an attitude to tradition. This is a mistaken interpretation of the anarchist approach which is not one of attacking all that is established but of questioning the validity of "accepted" views and attitudes in the context of present day social and economic possibilities and aspirations. Perhaps we can illustrate what we mean by reference to the case of the *Sunday Dispatch*.

At a Labour rally in Devon last week-end Mr. Harold Wilson, the Labour Shadow Chancellor, declared:

I don't think that we as democrats can remain neutral about actions which may lead to our people having fewer and fewer papers from which to take their choice.

And he called on the Government to halt Press mergers at least until the Royal Commission on the Press made its report.

To our minds, Mr. Wilson was talking like some unimaginative schoolmaster who had been teaching the same class for so many years that he had ceased to give any thought to what he said; a human gramophone record, unaware that what he said might be right or wrong, outdated or even beside the point. The fact that the *Sunday Dispatch* has been published for the past 160 years means nothing unless

Our Unfree Press

we know something about the kind of paper it has been during this period. We sampled the *Sunday Dispatch* for a period of years in the '40s and we have no hesitation in describing it as one of the yellowest, sensationalist rags we have set eyes on, and whilst we passionately believe in the freedom of the press we are delighted that in this era of free enterprise capitalism (in which to disprove their faith in the advantages of "healthy competition" capitalist-dog is eating capitalist-dog to the point of indigestion!) the *Sunday*

Dispatch is the fourth Sunday newspaper to close within the last year! The only argument for the publication of many newspapers which specialist in rubbish as against a few mass-circulation newspapers publishing rubbish is that the former provides more work for journalists, printers, paper manufacturers, distributors, etc. than the latter. The "choice" to which Mr. Wilson refers is limited to rubbish. He may be prepared to defend such a choice to his dying party - parliamentary - breath. We who are not looking for

votes (nor "rely", as so many MPs do, to supplement their £1.750 "pittances", on occasional or regular well-paid commissions from the millionaire-Press), have no reason to spray the stinking dustbins of Fleet Street with attar of roses, and are free to judge a newspaper or periodical by quite different standards. In our opinion it is only in a really free society that one could hope to have a press which would publish objective reports on the news, on the grounds that only in a free society

Continued on page 3

The Big Wind

MANY people will feel that yet another step has been taken towards the aim of "peaceful co-existence" after the Khrushchev-Kennedy meetings in Vienna. The chummy hand-shake, the cosy luncheon, the shared joke and the wifely tete-à-tete must have eased the troubled minds of millions of people anxious about the future.

But what have we learned about the Vienna meeting, and what political agreements have been made which would justify a rise in spirits?

Little light was thrown on the possible outcome by the dozens of highly-paid pundits, skilled in the business of filling newspaper space and broadcasting time on these occasions with nothing more than wind, which is supposed to pass for wisdom.

In his first public address after his return to America Kennedy stated:

"Mr. Khrushchev and I had a very full and frank exchange of views on major issues which now divide our two countries. I will tell you now it was a very sober two days. There was no discourtesy, no loss of tempers, no threats or ultimatums on either side. No advantage or concession was either gained or given. No major decision was either planned or taken. No spectacular progress was either achieved or pretended."

But, he concluded, the talks had been "useful".

Since it must have been known that no advantage or concession would be gained or given, why was the meeting in Vienna planned at all?

We can be sure it was not only to satisfy personal curiosity.

It is often difficult to make sense out of political language, but we have become used to the devious ways of political exchanges between powerful states and when we read that "there was no discourtesy . . . no threats or ultimatums on either side" even though "no concession was gained or given" the implication is that the "way is being cleared again for negotiations"; the air will not be quite so heavy with abuse and threats between the Soviet Union and the United States—for the moment.

THREE FLOURISHING EMPIRES

LORD MARKS' EMPIRE

ONLY a few days before his "elevation" for public services and philanthropy Sir Simon Marks was lording over the 35th Annual General Meeting of Marks & Spencer Ltd., and with the kind of balance sheet they had before them, one can imagine that shareholders would think no honour too great for their chairman. Before then they had a ten-year success story, of increased turnover, increased profits, increased taxation(!), increased dividends (most important of all) and increased reserves. Look at some of the figures of this success story:

	1961	1952
	£	£
Turnover	166.5m.	75.8m.
Profits before taxation	20.4m.	4.9m.
Profits net	10.3m.	2.3m.
Dividends (net)	6.4m.	1.0m.
Profit retained in business	3.7m.	1.2m.

Dividend payments represent a 47½ per cent. return compared with a mere 40 per cent. last year. One of the interesting points which emerge from these figures is the way the rate of profit has increased in these 10 years. Thus in 1952 it was about 6½ per cent. whereas in 1961 it has risen to 12 per cent. Sir Simon referred proudly to the efficient and economic administrative machine which is the envy of businessmen all over the world. But even assuming that this is the major reason for the increased rate of profit and not increased prices the fact remains that the benefits of this efficiency are not passed on to the consumer but are put into the pockets of shareholders. We have always argued that any increases in profits tax which governments may impose are not borne by the shareholders if they can help it but are passed on to the public in the form of higher prices. In the figures above, though the turnover has a little more than doubled in ten years, profits before taxation have quadrupled. Taxation also quadrupled (from £2.7m. to £10.2m.) while net profit was more than four times greater in 1961 than in 1952.

How many workers, whose "loyalty and devotion" Sir Simon was the first to acknowledge, and whom he thanked "warmly and sincerely" on behalf of the Company, could tell such a success story with their wage packets?

THE UNION MINIERE EMPIRE

IN Brussels last month the Union Minière du Haut-Katanga held the annual general meeting of its shareholders, and the Chairman's report was again a success story. The gross profits for this company which employs about 20,000 people was 4,000,000,000 Belgian francs which is £28 million. Just supposing these profits were distributed to the people employed, instead of in taxes and dividends, then each employee would have drawn an extra £1,400 for the year, which is probably more than most Congo miners earn in their working lives! However the chairman was careful to point out that the private shareholders only received 39 per cent. while the Congolese Government and the Katanga Government received the other 61 per cent. except for a small matter of 88 million francs (£630,000) which was the Belgian State's share.

It would be interesting to know in what proportion the Katanga government and the Central Government shared the 61 per cent., and

also into whose pockets most of it went.

One most revealing passage in the Chairman's speech which should be noted by the critics of FREEDOM's "Congo line" is the following.

The hopes expressed last year to see the newly independent Congo follow its destiny in an atmosphere of peace and order have been dashed. However the trial has been less serious for union minière; the events of July 1960 only upset the life of the company during two or three days and were practically without any repercussion on its industrial activities as a whole.

That last sentence, which we have italicised, makes you think doesn't it? And by way of a postscript, what about Mr. Hammarskjöld's statement at the United Nations on Tuesday that "the grievous stage" in the Congo was over. His statement, according to the Reuter report, "was regarded as a virtual declaration that the crisis had ended".

What a joke!

DR. BEECHING'S EMPIRE

LAST Monday, Dr. Beeching, British Transport's new £24,000 per annum Chairman met the Press and outlined some of the treatment he proposed for the ailing railways. He came to the revolutionary decision that if the railway system was to show a profit then the consumer must pay more, for "fares,

Continued on page 4

ANARCHY 5

Out next week

is devoted to SPAIN

ANARCHY is Published by Freedom Press at 1/6 on the last Saturday of every month.



WHEN Martin Green left Cambridge in 1951 at the age of 24, he also left England; and since then he has lived abroad, teaching in France and Turkey and working at American universities. From time to time he has revisited his native land, and from time to time he has also published articles examining its cultural shortcomings. Seven of these have now been collected, connected by a personal commentary, and published as a book*. It is described in the blurb as an "extremely provocative and vigorous appraisal of life and letters in England and America today" and "a challenge of real importance". It is in fact much less than this. As an English publisher said to him three years ago, Green is "just another expatriate critic . . . sniping at England from a safe distance"—in this case the 3,000 miles of the Atlantic (the book is reproduced from an American original and is written in "mid-Atlantic" prose with an eye on two publics). But even if he says little that is new and even less than is relevant, he shouldn't be dismissed completely.

Green has made the not entirely fresh discovery that there is something rotten in the state of English culture. But instead of trying to define it, like Leavis (one of his heroes) or Raymond Williams, he prefers to treat it as if it were something nasty in the woodshed—it can be blamed for everything without anyone saying exactly what it is. He declares at one point that there is "some-

Distorted Reflections

thing wrong with England", but then relapses into further vagueness. English life is aristocratic when it should be democratic, dominated by the South instead of the North, and its chief quality is gentlemanliness instead of "decency". Now Lawrence or Orwell (two more of his heroes) could have carried this sort of thing off, one by rhetoric and the other by clear passion. Green has neither—his technique is the flat repetition of questionable generalisations:

"Culturally, everyone in England is a conservative" (everyone?); "every educated man in England is a gentleman" (every?); England "is no longer a gentleman's country, and all the men of sensibility are gentlemen" (all?); "the Welfare State is no gentleman's country, and an educated Englishman . . . cannot feel it to be anything but unpalatable, or at least unexciting" (cannot?); "the English educated man is hostile to democracy and contemporaneity and normality" and is "essentially anti-American" (??); English cultural leaders "have retreated from cultural responsibility" (??);

"affairs in England have taken a definite turn towards the feminine" (feminine?); "self-respecting, self-propagating passionate life—where will you find that?" (among most of my friends, to start with); "there have never been any working-class writers in England. And during this century, of course, literature has retreated up the social ladder. All our authors are public schoolboys" (never? of course? all?); "there has been no enthusiasm in England for a long time. But there could be" (there is).

There is plenty more of this, and it spoils his main thesis, which is important and true. If only he had dropped the hectoring tone he can't manage and the air of certainty he has no right to, and cut out the embarrassing and irrelevant commentary, and compressed the seven articles into one well-constructed up-to-date one, he would have been far more worth reading. As it is, what he says about a poem by Robert Graves applies with added force to his own book: it is "so impoverished by 'personal' feeling that the poem ends up quite crudely

pompous and stupid".

What it all really adds up to is this. Our culture is dominated by the upper-middle-class, self-conscious, exclusive, snobbish, metropolitan, "intellectual" "bourgeois", "gentlemanly" tradition. This of course is a matter of common knowledge—Leavis, Lawrence and Orwell aren't exactly obscure people as one might imagine from reading this book—and what is interesting is Green's remedy. He has two cures: "Americanism" and "decency".

I can see the point of calling in the New World to redress the balance of the Old, in culture as in other things, but not quite in Green's terms. "America, which we despise, stands for health, and we stand for sickness"—is it as simple as that? "Life, nowadays, has an exclusively American accent," he insists. "On the other hand, one would hate to be an American." So, apparently, the thing to do is to follow Heard and Huxley and Isherwood and Auden and be an Englishman living in America—best of both worlds and all that. In

fact, when it comes to the point, Green doesn't seem to like much in America either, except Salinger; and his idea of Britain's place in an American world is plain ingenuous nonsense.

The other cure is more interesting. "Gentlemanliness is a luxury, not a necessity, a self-deprecating archaism, not a natural part of life. Therefore what we need is a body of men, both fully democratic, unaristocratic in sensibility, and still fully convinced of the values of the few, in key cultural positions." I think Matthew Arnold put it rather better, but Green's "new type" has a lot to be said for it. Despite his manner, I like his "decent man"—as opposed to the gentleman—or the Anglo-Saxon moralist, or the Anglo-Saxon rebel". As he rightly says, "what is always essential is its puritanism"; but I am not so sure the type must also be lower-middle-class and middle-brow, let alone "all-round responsible"—this sounds a bit like Arnold's Philistines. Like most people who feel they have a good idea, Green worries his to death. It is absurd to treat Bloomsbury as if it only had time for "exquisite sensibility", as if Lawrence's remark about "blackbeetles" revealed more about Bloomsbury than about Lawrence's own character. I should have thought Leonard Woolf would make a better fourth hero than the one Green picks—Kingsley Amis. He is more of a decent man, more of a puritan, and certainly one of "the true transmitters of the Victorian heritage". And what about John Osborne—or Alan Sillitoe?

The real trouble with Green's book is that it isn't either a proper article or a proper book; as one or the other it would be more impressive and far less irritating. He should make up his mind whether he is going to write about himself, or England, or the Anglo-Saxon world, and plan his space accordingly, and decide on the right manner, and pick the relevant examples, and brush up his style. As it is he lacks the precision of Leavis and the passion of Lawrence and the honesty of Orwell and the irony of Amis; and he also lacks the urgency of Dennis Potter and the depth of Hoggart and the breadth of Raymond Williams and the clarity of Richard Wollheim (who has just written an excellent Fabian pamphlet called *Socialism & Culture*). And finally, if I may risk a gentlemanly criticism, he lacks the slightest touch of any sense of humour; his physical description of the "decent man" on p.123—a composite picture of Dr. Leavis, Lucky Jim and Lady Chatterley's lover—had me in fits, which I don't think was his intention. But I mustn't be unfair. This is a bad book, but an interesting one, worth reading once if you can borrow a copy, and perhaps even if you can't.

N.W.

*A *Mirror for Anglo-Saxons*, by Martin Green (Longmans 18/-).

BOOKS?

We can supply

ANY book in print. Also out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found! This includes paper-backs, children's books and text books. (Please supply publisher's name if possible).

NEW BOOKS

Spy Ring
J. Bullock & H. Miller 15/-
Fiction of a Generation
Whit & H. Burnett 18/-
Towards a United States of Europe
R. W. G. Mackay 21/-
A Clean Well-Lighted Place
Kathleen Nott 18/-
REPRINTS & CHEAP EDITIONS
A Dialogue with Death
Arthur Koestler 5/-
A Writer's Journal
H. D. Thoreau 25/-
Love's Coming of Age
Edward Carpenter 6/-
A Doll's House
Henrik Ibsen 6/-
Ghosts
Henrik Ibsen 6/-
Pillars of Society
Henrik Ibsen 6/-
Plays, Vol 5
Henrik Ibsen 30/-

SECOND-HAND

Spurs on the Boot (Italy 1942)
Thomas B. Morgan 3/-
In the Evening of my Thought
Georges Clemenceau (2 vols) 10/-
Red Dusk and the Morrow (1922)
Sir Paul Dukes 4/-
The Private Manufacture of Armaments
(Vol 1—and only)
Philip Noel-Baker 7/6
Colour Bar
Lealie Constantine 8/6
Tales from the Notebook of a Sportsman
(Series 1 only)
Ivan S. Turgenev 3/6
Chosen Country
John Dos Passos 3/-
The Intelligentsia of Great Britain (1935)
Dimitri Mirsky 6/-
The Cynic's Word Book
Ambrose Bierce 7/6
Capital Punishment as a Deterrent:
and the Alternative
Gerald Gardiner 5/-
Red Sky at Night
Ronald Matthews 3/-
Bertrand Russell's Best
(Ed.) Robert E. Egner 6/-
A Free and Responsible Press
(Report of Commission U.S.), 3/6
The Cross and the Arrow
Albert Maltz 3/6

PERIODICALS

Liberation May 1/9

Freedom Bookshop

(Open 2 p.m.—5.30 p.m. daily;
10 a.m.—1 p.m. Thursdays;
10 a.m.—5 p.m. Saturdays).

17a MAXWELL ROAD
FULHAM SW6 Tel: REN 3736

ONE of the most constant objections raised against the theory of an anarchist state is that "enlightened self-interest" might be all very well for those of us who are strong, healthy and resilient, but those who through no fault of their own are underprivileged and ill-equipped for life would be forced to "go to the wall", and consequently suffer much more through their "defects" than they have to in an authoritarian society. This statement, apart from containing a tacit acknowledgement that our society is more akin to a battle-field than a playing-field, also implies that Government is fulfilling a good and worthy function in helping the fallen back to their feet and safeguarding the interests of our weaker brethren. That at least is the theory, but the actual practice shows that it is yet another naked lie which continues to uphold the total mystique concerning the nature and function of Government and centralised authority, and far from being the cure, the Government is often the cause of these conditions. Proof that this is so can be seen in one of Her Majesty's Stationery Office's publications which recently caused a very brief and fatuous stir in the popular press.

Entitled "Delinquent Generations" it contains data and statistics to show "that a particular generation of children has had unusually heavy delinquency rates. Children born between 1935 and 1942 have been more delinquent over the whole post-war period than those born in any other seven-year period". The conclusion to be drawn from this is that in our midst there is a whole generation which has "fallen", or perhaps "been knocked flat on its face", would be a more apt description. Once having raised the problem however the report in no way suggests a solution or gives any social or humanitarian comment. It is all very much "just one of those things", and it is not the committee's job to more than present the facts in the ethereal and detached manner which is so typical of reports of this type.

It does however most clearly indicate how the Government deals with its fallen members and we have columns of statistics dealing with criminal prosecutions—the usual Government therapy for its own victims. On page 8 of the report it states that "the greatest 'crime-proneness' is thus found to be associated with that birth group who passed through their fifth year during the war . . . Whether this means that disturbed social conditions have their major impact on children between the ages of four and five is not proved, but this is a likely hypothesis." This hypothesis concerning critical stages in childhood is rather aged now, inasmuch as one can "prove" anything concerning a frail quantity like the emotional responses of children it should be this time have shown itself to be indeed a factual experience. Wilhelm Reich in his "The Sexual Revolution" said about this particular stage in a child's life:—"The fact that the child experiences his genitality at the critical age between four and six in the parental home, forces on him a solution which is typical of family education".

If Reich's theory is correct then this compels one to conclude that this "crime-proneness" amongst a particular generation is further complicated by being enmeshed in drives and compulsions that the Home Office Research Unit would

FURTHER CASUALTIES

never give a thought to, for not only did the social milieu take a toll on these youngsters but the war-time home itself was a trap, with the father's enforced absence almost forcing the child to make an Oedipus-based flight from his intolerable situation; all this being further complicated by a very understandable trend towards neurotic behaviour displayed by the mothers who were themselves suffering because of the war. So the problem is not and couldn't be as simple as the report assumes.

The peak years for "crime proneness" are given as 1935/1936, and referring to the time when this group came into maturity about 1957 the report states: "The crime wave among males has been associated with certain forms of dress and other social phenomena". This is so vague that it seems quite deliberately to avoid going any deeper, but presumably it means Edwardian clothes and rock 'n' roll. These particular "phenomena" obviously have their roots more in sexuality than in social environment. Both too were foreign to the everyday scene in Britain—one being the garb of a bygone era and the other being the unique rhythm and blues musical form of the American Negro. It is interesting to note that both these styles have now passed from the intense vogue they once had, being replaced by Italian

TO THE EDITOR OF
THE "NEW YORK TIMES":

My interest in your excellent May 8 editorial "Operation Abolition" arises from interest in college students and in the impression deliberately fostered by the film that their protest against the House Committee on Un-American Activities was a direct or indirect result of Communist conspiracy and agitation.

No link is shown in the film between the admitted or alleged Communists (who were present because subpoenaed by the committee) and the students who were leaders of the demonstrations. No distinction is made in the film between the disorderly activity of Communists in the hearing room and the two separate and independent student demonstrations elsewhere.

The peaceful and orderly picketing outside the City Hall, which was never involved in any altercation with police; or

The noisy but non-violent group of people inside the City Hall waiting to gain admission to a so-called "public hearing," whose singing and chanting were inspired not by Communists but by the committee's practice of admitting its friends and supporters by special passes in preference to those who had been waiting in line for hours.

Action Against Agitators

Francis J. McNamara, whose letter you published on May 20, accepts the film's lumping of these three quite different groups, and then goes on to say that "the entire demonstration was in the hands of veteran Communists." It is incredible that this could be so and no action be taken against such agitators under laws which are certainly adequate to prosecute for "inciting to riot." One must conclude that the evidence is not

styles and white vocalists.

The report however will take you no further than sterile statements of fact, and probably that is all the Government needed. No solution is suggested, no great schemes to assist these fallen, no free vocational guidance for the "crime-prone" persons who are getting older, and in doing so becoming more acutely aware of their needs and despairing of ever fulfilling them. No doubt as an academic exercise for governmental intellectuals this is all very interesting and elaborate theories can be evolved from these statistics, but the problem is not solved, and those who look to the Government will be sadly disenchanted.

In another 10 years we may see an additional follow-up report on the high incidence of divorce and suicide amongst the "delinquent" generations, but armed with the facts the moralist can easily shrug his shoulders and say it was only to be expected. Then it can all be quietly forgotten because Governments assume that the H-Bomb has assured us of an era of everlasting peace, and there won't be any more "delinquent" generations. Or could it be that they will increase and multiply when the ever-lurking threat of the Bomb begins to be transmitted to future four- and five-year-olds? For the Government's sake, I do hope so.

D.G.

'OPERATION ABOLITION'

The editor of our American contemporary *L'Adunata dei Refrattari* draws our attention to the report we published on "Operation Abolition" (FREEDOM April 15) from an American correspondent who, he says, "on the subject of the incidents of San Francisco in May 1960, simply repeats the version of the yellow press: on one side the communists and their 'stooges' on the other the police, the "Un-American Activities Committee and their supporters—and between them a complete vacuum." Our colleague encloses the following letter published in the *New York Times* which, he maintains, "describes the three phases of those events more clearly than anything we have published" and adds that the writer, a Chaplain at Columbia University, is above suspicion so far as political loyalties are concerned.

We regret publishing the misleading report, and can only hope that in publishing the *New York Times* letter we shall be doing something towards straightening the record.

at all so clear as Mr. McNamara assumes.

Mr. McNamara notes that dismissal of charges against all but one of the students arrested does not clear them of guilt. Neither does it convict them.

The judge based his action on police reports "which must be accepted as true." The Mayor and the Sheriff and the Chief of Police of San Francisco and other authorities cited in support of "Operation Abolition" have likewise

accepted these reports as true, although the police were as much participants in the so-called "riot" as were the students.

And when the one student, Robert Meisenbach, was brought to trial last month for initiating the violence, the police could not convince a jury of their version of events, and the student was acquitted. So J. Edgar Hoover's analysis of the San Francisco incident need not necessarily be taken as infallible.

Concern for Civil Liberties

In view of the rising concern on the college campus with social injustice and the denial of civil liberties—a concern which many of us regard as encouraging evidence of healthiness of outlook of our current college generation—it is particularly unfortunate that social protest should be indiscriminately identified with Communist-inspired subversion.

In my own opinion, young people will want to avoid collaboration with known Communists even in quite legitimate causes. But there is no evidence of such collaboration in the San Francisco incident—in fact, the students were expressing views shared by non-Communist groups such as the Episcopal Diocese of California, Northern California Board of Rabbis, A.F.L.-C.I.O. Central Labor Council, and over 700 faculty members from near-by campuses.

"Operation Abolition" labels all efforts to protest the committee's long and distasteful record as *ipso facto* evidence of Communist conspiracy. For this propaganda venture the committee must take the blame. Your conclusion that the committee ought to be abolished seems inescapable.

JOHN M. KRUMM,

Chaplain, Columbia University.
New York, May 20, 1961.

OUR UNFREE PRESS

Continued from page 1

is truth not the luxury "which we can ill-afford" today but the *health of the community*. If it is argued that complete objectivity is unattainable, that no news-gather, even in the free society is free from certain environmental and other prejudices, such arguments (with which, incidentally, we would agree) far from proving that a free press is an impossibility are, to our minds, the strongest argument for a decentralisation of the press, as well as for the decentralisation of news-gathering. (Furthermore there will be no objectivity in journalism so long as the "star" system, the cult of the personality, persist.)

★

TO-DAY the national press exists not to keep the public informed but to make money. Thus, the proprietors of the *Sunday Dispatch* are less concerned about their loyal 1½ million readers than with the fact

AND OUR free one!

By contrast the publication of FREEDOM and of our magazine ANARCHY is a question of co-operation between readers and publishers. Since February we have been publishing FREEDOM in its new look as well as our 32-page monthly magazine. March and April were encouraging months, and hundreds of readers responded to our circular letter, renewing their subscriptions to both journals, many of them adding a contribution to the Deficit Fund. Most of those who replied added words of encouragement for our attempt to move forward rather than accept the easier path of retreat to a more modest programme of activity. May, however, has been a disastrous month. Subscription renewals dropped right off, the Surplus became a Deficit, and because we have no financial reserves we have suddenly found ourselves unable to meet our commitments. There are probably a thousand readers of these lines who last March received a reminder that their subscriptions had expired and who have not yet troubled to reply. Theirs is the responsibility if at this moment FREEDOM is in serious financial difficulties. Most of them are comrades and sympathisers who have been readers for a long time, and who know that we won't stop sending them the paper—just as we know that in due course they will renew their subs. But in the meantime we are desperately looking for the cash to pay our bills in order to keep going.

Though we pay no salaries and have no shareholders demanding dividends, to do the little we do in the way of propaganda we have to find £75 (\$210) a week (this does not of course include Freedom Press publications or the activities of Freedom Bookshop). To do more, that is to be able to send out more specimen copies and to advertise in a few sympathetic journals as well as build up a small reserve to buttress the slack months and to finance F.P. publications we should be aiming at £100 a week. It's a lot of money for our group as individuals, but 3,000 postal subscribers would make us solvent. And if 2,000 of our readers were to contribute only 1/- (15c.) a week the Deficit Fund alone would cover that amount. We must confess that we get a feeling that those who are our comrades, in the main

that the paper is losing £600,000 a year, and this is how it should be in a capitalist society. The wails and moans from Labour politicians and the journalists and printers has nothing to do with the freedom of the press but a lot to do with their personal interests. If the 1½ million readers of the *Sunday Dispatch* were to feel deprived as a result of the closure they should react, as the journalists reacted last Saturday night over bread and butter interests. They have not and will not simply because they read the *Sunday Dispatch* as they will read the *Sunday Express* next week with the same kind of fatalism which makes it possible for them to work for one master today and another tomorrow. They accept the *Sunday-Dispatch-Express* line that a few give the orders and the majority are born to obey. The life or death of a newspaper they have grown to accept as part of the Sunday morning breakfast, is a matter outside their control.

completely overlook the financial problems we have to face each week, taking for granted that as we have managed to keep going so far, we will go on managing. We hope we will, but if we do it will not be with "pennies from heaven" but because enough of you shoulder your responsibility for introducing new readers, selling the paper at meetings and contributing to our Fund.

We think few publishing groups produce so much for so little money as we do, but that "little" is still a lot of money to find each week if everybody does not do his share. First of all we appeal to those who receive the paper and have not yet renewed their subscriptions; please do so now. Secondly we appeal to all those who said that they could get new readers if FREEDOM was more attractive or if it was published as a magazine. We have done our bit in satisfying both demands by improving the presentation of FREEDOM as well as publishing a magazine. What about you? Thirdly the Deficit. £20 a week has now become a minimum for keeping our heads above water. A few readers send us regular contributions; we need many more to follow their example. And finally a word to our comrades in America. We send bundles of FREEDOM and ANARCHY to groups and individuals who do not pay for them but who send contributions instead to the Deficit Fund. A number of these groups, particularly on the West Coast give us most generous support but there are many other groups who in the course of the year do not even contribute the price of paper and postage for the copies we send them. Will they respond to this appeal?

The millionaire Press cannot pay its way with a circulations of 1,500,000 copies. The free press can keep going with a circulation a thousand times smaller. The reason lies in the one word: solidarity. The capitalist Press depends on the national advertisers. We depend on the active participation of our readers as writers, distributors and financial supporters to publish our paper. They publish their papers to make money; we publish FREEDOM to communicate and exchange ideas. They fold up when they stop making profits. We shall only close down if we no longer have the means to carry on!

General Strike

SOCIALISM is a science, contend Marxists. Without the dialectic method of approach there could be no understanding of the intrinsic nature of society, no penetration into that mysterious machine called history and no understanding of the dynamic forces of which history is made. Therefore an insight into social, political and economic phenomena depends upon a study of the marxist redaction of Socialism.

Regardless of the merits or demerits of this "scientific" approach, the danger of Marxism is in its practical application, in the assumption of monistic tendencies, uniqueness, and "the only one way", etc. It is by these means that it becomes a religion rather than a science.

One of the many sects of this religion is the Socialist Labour Party of the U.S.A. Daniel De Leon—the founder—was the only one to attain the remarkable honour of being the only infallible interpreter of Marx, and the truth lies with him. So, when the strike was raging in Belgium, the *Weekly People* (Saturday, Jan. 28, 1961) published an extract from "Flashlights of the Amsterdam Congress" (1908) in which De Leon argues against the general strike resolution.

In the hands of the Anarcho-Syndicalists the general strike was advocated as an anti-war measure and as a means of accomplishing the social revolution. The workers should use it to overthrow the capitalists and thus enable the syndicalist trade-unions in the mines and factories to become the basis of a new "federalist" social system. Capitalism once destroyed any renewal of centralised authority could be prevented by the syndicates of workers controlling the means of production, etc., in their own interests.

Anyway, the Syndicalists failed. And their failure indicates their utopian attitude towards the workers themselves. Solidarity, the principal prerequisite of the general strike proved a myth. The workers do not necessarily have a common interest after the policies of "divide and rule" have been exercised over them by countless governments. Free society in its turn, threatens the illusory security of those who are accustomed to the order of master-slave relationship, and, therefore, is undesirable. Malatesta was right when he said:

"being born and having lived in bondage, being the descendant of a long line of slaves, man when he began to think believed that slavery was an essential condition of life and liberty seemed to him impossible. In like manner, the workman forced for centuries to depend upon the will of his employer for work, that is bread, and accustomed to see his own life at the disposal of those who possess the land and capital, has ended by believing that it is his master who gives him food and asks ingenuously how it would be possible to live, if there were no masters over him." (ANARCHY, p. 7).

Nevertheless any revolutionary reconstruction of society must similarly presuppose "the refusal of man to be an

object" both socially and as an individual.

De Leon's parliamentary reformism must also assume proletarian solidarity as its basis and with this assumption, which is still not an impossibility, the general strike weapon of the underprivileged.

However, De Leon sees things differently. "The strike spells 'physical force'. As such it is neither a creative power, nor yet, at the modern stage of civilisation, the all sufficient method that physical force once was . . . the test applicable to the strike as a partial manifestation, is pre-eminently applicable to the strike as a general manifestation. A partial strike may be a skirmish and skirmishes may be lost without the loss being fatal; the general strike—aimed at without regard to the principle established by modern exigencies—is a general rout and that is fatal . . . the posture of the advocate of the 'General Strike' is obviously archaic."

"Archaic", if it does not follow De Leon's interpretation. That is to say, the general strike is not a self-sufficient force for social reconstruction. It supplements the ballot and the parliament. The final decision does not lie in the hands of the workers but in the hands of the bosses, leaders, and bureaucrats, whose interests oppose those of their followers. The Social-Democrats and the various labour parties give sufficient proof of this. Result: instead of using the bourgeois institution to change society in favour of the workers, it was the institutions that changed the workers' representatives to further the interests of the ruling class. Russia is perhaps one of the best examples of this.

Reformism involves collaboration and trust of the capitalists. It means the workers forget that all past concessions have been won by protest never through the goodness of the employer's heart. Their own so-called leaders become big shots who would be stupid to revolutionise a status quo which is already so comfortable for them. A strike may fail but the victor is still consciously recognised as the enemy, and the strike is always a form of protest. The ballot means that workers are not put by force into a cage, which they resent and from which they will try to escape at any opportunity. They are rather persuaded, with the help of their own leaders, to be good workers, good citizens, etc., and so to willingly build their own cage and act as agents of the inquisition against any of their "fellow workers" who fail to do likewise. Any concession becomes a gift from above and the workers are grateful for crumbs from a table they have supplied with food.

But more interesting is Chauvin as quoted by De Leon: "The general strike is an alluring notion. No doubt the chimera sticks in the heads of many a working man. Is that a reason for us to yield to delusion. Quite possibly we may if we did, ingratiate ourselves with working men who now look upon us

with disfavour, if not suspicion . . . A policy of ingratiation looks to the immediate present as sacrifice of the future . . ."

It is always the future which is given to us by politicians. The future of a workers' paradise, of justice, of equality. But they themselves have an interest in the present, to secure a position of good income, a sinecure if possible, and then deliver sermons to their faithful that all this is historical necessity, to be sacrificed on the altar of the horizon of time where await the classless society, the heaven of the proletariat. But even utopia is an act of parliament. . . .

It is strange that Marxists who regard political institution as a superstructure, not as active social causes, should seek to accomplish social revolution by a conquest of power, using political liberties and petty reformism as preliminary conditions, absolutely necessary for workers' emancipation.

Despite De Leon's attempt to represent any strike as insufficient without the sanction of the "second court" of parliamentary action, it is in these legalistic activities that the workers play the part of sheep in need of shepherds and let their destiny be decided by those who are estranged from them.

The failure of Anarcho-Syndicalism was due to the success of authoritarianism in the Socialist movements. The workers gave up the general strike, and direct action as weapons in the struggle for emancipation. Instead of relying on themselves they looked for a Messiah, they thought their salvation would come as a manifestation of the supreme will, an act of leaders, of managers, of state institutions. They forgot the call of the First International; the emancipation of the workers is an act of the workers themselves.

Australia. S. MCKAY & G.

IN BRIEF

TWO PROPHETS HONoured BY THEIR COUNTRY?

At Sotheby's on Monday Mr. V. Safronchuk of the Russian Embassy, bidding for the Moscow State Library, paid £620 for a collection of Tolstoy letters. It is believed to be the first time that the Soviet Government has entered the auction rooms of the West as a buyer.

The 13 letters autographed by Tolstoy were written in English to J. C. Kenworthy between 1874 and 1896 and were on the subject of Christianity and socialism. Kenworthy shared Tolstoy's Christian-socialist views and arranged for the translation and publication of Tolstoy's writings in England.

The Soviet Embassy also acquired an autograph letter dated 1894 from the anarchist Peter Kropotkin to J. C. Kenworthy for £26, and was the underbidder when Abramsky, the London book seller, acquired for £920 a series of 36 letters from Turgenyev to his friend, the editor of the *Berliner Allgemeine Zeitung* which were on literary subjects and written between 1868 and 1881.

Bookseller 3/6/61.

CHURCH'S NEW INVESTMENT POLICY PAYS DIVIDENDS

The investment income of the Church Commissioners has doubled in 13 years. The total market value of Stock Exchange securities held by the commissioners at the end of March, 1961 was £186,100,000. Of this amount, industrial ordinary shares accounted for £128,100,000 against a book value of £75,200,000.

These points are made by Sir Mortimer Warren, the secretary to the commissioners, in an article in the spring issue of the "Stock Exchange Journal".

He recalls that a new investment policy was adopted in 1948 when the commissioners began to buy industrial shares. Until then the Stock Exchange investment portfolio was almost wholly in gilt-edged and other fixed interest securities. But money is invested, he points out, in only 288 companies.

"They have never adopted the policy of buying something of everything and hoping that a large mixed bag would average out favourably. Moreover, as a matter of conscience, they have not bought shares in the drink trade, in newspapers, in entertainment enterprises, or in the obvious armaments industry. The last-mentioned item is, in practice, the most difficult to avoid, because is not every engineering company likely to be engaged in the manufacture of armaments in time of need?"

CINEMA

Cool for Kittens

THE prime motive of *Some Like It Cool* (Cinephone) might be the advertisement of naturism. If so, there are two points that need to be made. The first is that naturism seems to be very expensive. It requires a large income to commute between London and South Devon or Woburn, or any other of the select spots where denudation is practised. Most of the participants own Bentleys or Crestas, and so can afford it. The second point is that, withal, there is very little to do once one is naked. The main activities are splash-one another and reading the *Guardian*, which is amusement on a fairly primitive level. I am told that some camps in the region of London offer overnight prices that compare favourably with railway hotels. If you are a traveller this is worth considering. Certainly the company is more attractive.

However, the nudist message is ill represented without its moral tenet, which is that nudity is more becoming than clothing. Whatever other means there may be, this message cannot be presented on the screen. The sad situation is that one may photograph female breasts, but the sex organs (except those

of children) are still taboo. Hence legs must be crossed, and movements towards the camera are cut. The effect is to make everyone look slightly spastic. This frustrates the only other value the film might have had, which is to give the same kind of enjoyment provided by the nude in art.

The market for these films is undoubtedly partly pornographic. The naturists (and the distributors) try and pretend it is not. Hence the coyness ("without any clothes on" is a substitute for 'nude') and the emphasis that Britain's naturist camps are morally above reproach. This seems to indicate that a much greater change in our culture is necessary for moral health than merely the exposure of certain selected areas of flesh (whether before or away from the public view).

The Fruit is Ripe is a pastiche of *The Wages of Fear*, *Bitter Rice*, and others. Like many French films, it has a political slant: it is the bad bosses who drug and rape, and the good workers who trudge the drab countryside looking for work when their strike is broken. Apart from two kittenish fruit-pickers, this film is sordid and not at all cool.

ARTHUR FOOTE.

In brief

DELEGATES to the Conference of the National Union of Vehicle Builders passed a resolution last week calling for support for a policy:

Based on the ultimate aim of world-wide disarmament, both nuclear and conventional, and support for a United Nations which included all nations.



ALARMING revolutionary trends were reported from the conference of the National and Local Government Officers' Association last week where it was decided that the right to strike should be written into the constitution.

In 1957 conference rejected a similar motion asking for the right to withdraw labour.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP CENTRAL MEETINGS

Every Sunday at 7.30 pm at The Swan, Cosmo Place, Southampton Row WC1 (Holborn, Russell Sq Stns)

JUNE 18 Albert Meltzer on Radio Freedom

JUNE 25 Bob McKean: Syndicalism

All Welcome. Liquid refreshment available.

Hyde Park Meetings

Every Sunday at 3.30 (if fine) On the Grass

Jazz Club

Friday 23rd June at 4 Albert Street, Mornington Crescent N.W.1. at 8 p.m. Jack Stevenson on Common Ground

The Meeting to be held 15 June at Fellows Road has been postponed.

OFF-CENTRE DISCUSSION MEETINGS

1st Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. at Jack and Mary Stevenson's, 6 Stainton Road, Enfield, Middx.

Last Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Dorothy Barasi's, 45 Twyford Avenue, Fortis Green, N.2.

1st Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Colin Ward's, 33 Ellerby Street, Fulham, S.W.6.

3rd Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. at Donald Room's, 148a Fellows Road, Swiss Cottage, N.W.3.

Freedom

The Anarchist Weekly

FREEDOM appears on the first three Saturdays of each month. On the last Saturday, we publish **ANARCHY**, a 32-page journal of anarchist ideas (1/8 or 25c. post free).

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM and ANARCHY

12 months 30/- (U.S. & Canada \$5.00)
6 months 15/- (\$2.50)
3 months 8/- (\$1.25)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies

12 months 45/- (U.S. & Canada \$7.50)
6 months 22/6 (\$3.50)

AIR MAIL Subscription Rates (FREEDOM by Air Mail, ANARCHY by Surface Mail)

12 months 50/- (U.S. & Canada \$8.00)

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only.

1 year (40 issues) 19/- (U.S. & Canada \$3)
6 months (20 issues) 9/6 (\$1.50)
3 months 10 issues 5/- (\$0.75)

Air Mail Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only.

1 year (40 issues) 40/- (\$6.00)

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

17a MAXWELL ROAD LONDON, S.W.6. ENGLAND Tel: RENOWN 3736.

Correspondence

How do we Educate?

Dear Mr. Editor:

Recently a friend handed me a copy of the Feb. 11 issue of FREEDOM. It all sounded so familiar, though I cannot make out whether you advocate the Anarchist Communism of Kropotkin or the Anarchism, just plain Anarchism of Tucker and Josiah Warren, but the thing that I do notice is that you are not aware that you get from a book what you bring to it.

All the propaganda in the world does not add to man's understanding, his intelligence, his character, in other words, his education. In my early days we did so much talking, so much propaganda that if the human being had been up to it he would at least have understood what we were trying to say even though they may not have agreed with us. I heard Kropotkin the first time he lectured in New York at the Grand Central Palace and afterwards I met him when Emma Goldman gave a reception to him in a musical studio.

But I was intimate with Tucker before he left for France after his outfit was destroyed in a fire.

Some seven years after we gave up our own school we were asked to take over the Modern School in Stelton and we spent much time trying to make "Radicals" understand freedom in education. All to no avail. The human being cannot understand anything beyond his make-up, his growth, his education. Schooling and propaganda may add something to his information but not his education excepting in the sense that everything helps him to "grow up".

If Radicals of all kinds spent as much time in trying to understand education of the young, beginning with the kindergarten there might be some hope of something being accomplished. A S. Neill is doing more for freedom than all the propaganda papers put together. It sometimes seems too bad that so much energy should be put into work that gets us nowhere when it might be put to some use elsewhere. I mean, in education, in trying to understand Froebel and his "Education of Man" and Neill and even Dewey.

Of course Man will not stop doing what he is impelled to do by his own nature. Man did not make himself, even though he is the result of what he has done and how he has lived. It is so difficult to know where and how to

place your energy so that it will be of some avail, will accomplish something of value. Freedom seems so far away in view of the growing strength of centralized governments. People want to be taken care of, they call it Social Security. For that they enslave everybody.

At the bottom of it all seems to be the monopoly of the land. We have no right to stand upon the land without paying tribute to some individual. Unless the land is freed there can be no real freedom and the Georgists seem to be the only group that understand this. I heard George speak in 1888 and have been interested in the land question and free trade ever since, but it makes me sad when I see how little this is understood. Nature seems to force us to go on in its own way to destruction.

You'll forgive this long screed. You can see how I am forced to chatter in my own way. ALEXIS C. FERM. Fairhope, Alabama, May 13.

[One finds the following interesting reference to Alexis Ferm in Emma Goldman's autobiography "Living My Life": "At the Sunrise Club I came to know many persons of advanced ideas. Among the most interesting were Elizabeth and Alexis Ferm, John and Abby Coryell. The Fermes were the first Americans I met whose ideas on education were akin to mine; but while I merely advocated the need for a new approach to the child, the Fermes translated their ideas into practice. In the Playhouse as their school was called, the children of the neighbourhood were bound by neither rules nor text-books. They were free to go or come and to learn from observation and experience. I knew no one else who so well understood child psychology as Elizabeth and who was so capable of bringing out the best in the young. She and Alexis considered themselves single-taxers, but in reality they were anarchists in their views and lives. It was a great treat to visit their home which was also the school, and to witness the beautiful relationship that existed between them and the children."—EDITORS.]

Brecht and Butter

DEAR EDITORS,

I suspect that J.R. has let anti-communism blind him to what is the real theme of "The Visions of Simone Machard". This, it seems to me, is one in which anarchists have always been interested: how in times of crisis people act together for their human needs or to defend themselves, and how those with power and property resist this, even collaborating with an enemy if by so doing they retain that power and property. How well Brecht has dealt with this theme is a matter of opinion but it is certainly not a slight theme. I don't know how anyone can see in this "a tribute to La Belle France in her hour of need".

I have the feeling that J.R. read the programme notes on entering the theatre and sat with soured view throughout the play. But what is wrong with a plain statement of the facts about French collaboration with the Nazis in 1940? Why drag in the Nazi-Soviet non-aggression pact?

ARNOLD HINCHLIFFE, Translator of "The Visions of Simone Machard".

Degrees do matter

It appears to me that A. W. Uloth has missed every point in my letter. I do not hold that all governments are as bad as each other, on the contrary I find some governments much better than others. The basic point in my letter was to draw attention to the fact that degrees in all situations do matter. Shooting six elephants is cruel, deplorable and unnecessary, killing 6,000 makes the tragedy infinitely worse, and should that number mean complete extinction of the species it would be nothing but an abomination. No doubt Eichmann could have used the same reasoning as A.W.U., kill one, kill six million, it doesn't really matter after the first is dead.

New Departures & Communication

To the Editors of FREEDOM,

I am really very sorry that my review of *New Departures* should have provoked its editor to reply at such length and with such heat. I don't want to prolong the argument interminably, but I think Michael Horovitz was so upset that he missed my point.

I said not that comment and criticism are necessarily superior to creative work, but that where this is so something is wrong with the creative work (Pound's *Cantos*, *Finnegan's Wake*, *Big Table*, *New Departures*). I have no time for the "league table conception of art", or for mere label-sticking, or for cultural party lines, or for most of the things Horovitz accuses me of—as a more careful reading of my review would show. But I do insist on my criticism that most of the stuff in *New Departures* "doesn't mean anything or say anything or communicate anything"; and I also insist that all published writing should do one of these things.

I tried to discriminate between the contributions to the magazine to be fair both to its readers and to those of FREEDOM; I also tried to describe them so that the latter would have some idea what they would like. Horovitz says I used "labels"—but words are labels, after all. I tried not to measure the contributions but to say briefly what they were. Ableman's was "schizoid", but it got something across to me; Cage's was

LAG SUMMER SCHOOL

The LAG Summer School will be held at Alan Albon's (Little Marshfoot Farm, Mill Road, Hailsham, Sussex) from Saturday, August 5th to Monday August 7th under canvas. The cost will be 35/- per person (children pro rata). Deposit with booking 10/- per person.

The theme for this year is "Anarchism and Respectability" and the speakers will be: Alan Albon, Colin Ward and Bob Green.

Enquiries and Bookings (plus deposits) to: Mary Stevenson, 17a Maxwell Road, S.W.6., closing date Friday, July 14th. Further details will be circularised to interested comrades.

As suggested in my letter, thinking only through principles doesn't require much thought, the thought processes have already been trimmed by the principle and there remains little need for real thinking. I cannot recall in history when the English were ever persecuted because they were Englishmen, or for that matter, the Germans as Germans or Russians as Russians *ad infinitum*. Minorities have all had their fair share of persecution when they were alienated from their geographic home.

But at least integrations with the indiginous population offered succour and refuge. This cannot be claimed for the Jews who either didn't want to, or were not allowed this facility.

It is extremely difficult to argue with an attitude that refuses to acknowledge detail, that recognises no degrees and sees equal danger from a bow and arrow as he does from the atom bomb. A.W.U. makes a difficult opponent, he is too well padded by principles and idealistic fantasy.

"psychotic", and it also failed to get anything across to me at all. What else can I say? As for party lines, the only one I was conscious of was the slightly paranoid defence of *avant-garde* writing and the regressive fondness for obscurity—all right, so these are psychological categories, but the point is whether they fit.

The real argument is that of communication. Private writing can have several functions—self-expression, amusement, the acting-out of fantasies, psychotherapy, self-clarification, recording, and so on. Public writing, however, has the basic function of communication, though of course it can include those of private writing and can also just make money. When writers hand their work to an editor, and he hands it to a printer and then hawks it up and down Charing Cross Road and tries to get advertisements and reviews, the implication is that someone is trying to say something to us. This is an attempt at communication.

Why everything should be "cut down to size for so-called communicability", I am not sure. I should have thought that the art which makes emotion communicable brings things up to size. Every creative writer has to make some compromise with his audience—if he really wants an audience, that is. This is not to make communication the only end or to elevate the reader above the writer. A balance must be found so that the transmitter and receiver both work at optimum strength.

I suspect that much of *New Departures* is private writing, or at best clique writing. I am perfectly aware that "freedom provokes diversity and diversity preserves freedom"; I am not trying to suppress *avant-garde* writing in general or *New Departures* in particular, simply to say what I think of them when I am asked. And it really isn't good enough to claim that "our wide range through arts makes criticism redundant"; critical freedom is at least as important as creative freedom, if only to keep the creators in their place. Horovitz shouldn't be worried—if a creator is any good he will always beat his critics!

Hampstead, June 9.

N.W.

Dr. Beeching's Empire

Continued from page 1 clearly, are too low". He would also cut out those services which cannot be expected to pay their way, and of course he proposes to streamline the staff, paying better wages to those who are retained and giving "ability" a chance to climb the ladder. For another thing in Dr. Beeching's opinion the top management levels of the organisation were "too thin" and that more top posts were needed. He was going to promote some as well as bring in a "sprinkling" of good people from outside.

That the railway system needs a shake-up there can be no doubt. But we say this in the interests of the consumer, for the better use of the system in the public interest. As we have frequently pointed out, and we are not paid £24.00 a year to put forward what seems obvious to us, any fool can make the railways or the mines pay simply by raising the prices, by cutting production or

the services to the point where demand exceeds production, and reducing staff to a bare minimum. Such methods will lead to fewer trains and packed trains.

It may get the Railways out of the red but because the main burden will have to be met by the hundreds of thousands of people who travel to London to work each day, and by an increase in freight charges it simply means that there will be a corresponding increase in the cost of living which they will seek to cover by new wage demands, which of course will be met by the public, etc. . . . The experts call it a vicious spiral! In the end the public pays whether the railways make money or lose money. So why waste time trying to run them so that the balance sheet at the end of the year is nicely balanced? How much more useful it would be to reorganise the transport services so that all who wish to travel can, and in comfort. LIBERTARIAN.

STOP THIS DEFICIT!

WEEK 23

Deficit on 'Freedom'	£460
Contributions received	£422
DEFICIT	£38

June 3 to June 9

London: B.L. 16/-; Leeds: G.L. 2/-; Glasgow: M.K.* 5/-; Sydney, N.S.W.: G.M. 80/-; Kirup, Australia: F.L. 21/-; Sydney: L.D. 26/1; Hong-Kong: M.S. 1/6; Frankfurt: H.B. 26/11; Glasgow: J.H.* 1/6; Birmingham: A.W.H. 4/-; Elizabeth, N.J.: E.N. per L'Adunata 21/-; London: D.T. 2/6.

Total 10 7 6
Previously acknowledged 411 14 0

1961 TOTAL TO DATE £422 1 6

*Indicates regular contributor

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
Vol 9 1959: Print, Press & Public
Each volume: paper 7/6 cloth 10/6
The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FREEDOM at 5/- post free.

PAUL ELTZBACHER

Anarchism (Seven Exponents of the Anarchist Philosophy) cloth 21/-

CHARLES MARTIN

Towards a Free Society 2/6

RUDOLF ROCKER

Nationalism and Culture cloth 21/-

ERRICO MALATESTA

Anarchy 9d.

JOHN HEWETSON

Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2/6 paper 1/-

VOLINE

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

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:

Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A tribute cloth 5/-
Journey Through Utopia cloth 18/- (U.S.A. \$3)



FREEDOM PRESS PUBLICATIONS