

'We need—and we may well be getting—a generation that, when a finger is pointed at it demanding its life for slogans and bogus causes, will return the appropriate two-fingered answer.'

JOHN O'LONDON

In this Issue:

- IS THE INCIDENT CLOSED?
- FORTY MILLION FALLOW ACRES WHILE MILLIONS STARVE
- THE HOOF MARKS OF THE VANDAL

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

'DO NOT ANSWER' —SAID THE JUDGE

FROM the Attorney General's opening remarks in the Committee of 100 trial at the Old Bailey which has just ended, it was clear that the prosecution (and in spite of his assurance to the Jury that "this is not a prosecution by the Government. The Government do not prosecute and have no responsibility for the institution of proceedings") had no intentions of letting the Defence convert the trial into a platform for nuclear-disarmament. Fortunately Patrick Pottle, one of the

six on trial, undertook his own defence, and being a determined young man cross-examined the chief prosecution witness brilliantly though the combined efforts of the judge and Attorney General prevented the witness from answering his pointed questions. But not before he had drawn two significant replies. The unanswered questions, if the jury were intelligent people, did not need an answer from the witness box, for they were directed to all of us inside and outside the Court.

that the American aircraft at Wethersfield were vital not only to the defence of this country but also to Nato. The following is a statement made by Sir Winston Churchill in the House of Commons . . .

The Judge.—To quote from a document is not cross-examination.

Pottle.—Sir Winston Churchill said: "We must not forget that by creating atomic bases in East Anglia we have made ourselves the target . . . of any Soviet attack."

The Judge to Air Commodore Magill.—Do not answer that.

Pottle.—What do you consider to be an emergency? What is this emergency you are talking about. Would it be beneficial to the state and the people of this country to send off bombers carrying nuclear weapons against whoever is attacking us? Would this be beneficial to the state and are the people going to gain from this?

The Judge, to the air commodore.—You must not answer that question.

Pottle.—Do you agree with the statement of the Attorney General in his opening speech that those who are responsible for the national security must be the able judges of what the national

duty to carry it out.

Pottle.—Would you press the button that you know is going to annihilate millions of people?—If the circumstances so demanded it, I would.

Pottle.—You would slit the throats of all the two-year-old children in this country?

When the Judge objected to that question, Pottle said: "It is the same as saying he would press the button to explode a nuclear bomb."

Pottle.—You have given your opinion

'Do not answer that!'

Pottle, who is defending himself, then asked Air Commodore Magill: "Have you read all the facts of the nuclear bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki?"

The Judge.—Do not answer that.

Pottle.—Is there any official order from the Government that you could not accept?

The Judge.—He is an officer in her Majesty's Forces.

Pottle.—So there is no decision that you would not accept?

Air Commodore Magill.—It is my

AIR FARES AND THE COLD WAR

AN illustration of the effect of capitalist competition took place last week when the nationalised air corporation, B.E.A. announced that it proposed to withdraw a number of services, including those to the East European capitals Belgrade and Budapest, and some to the North of Scotland and the Isle of Man.

Now among the "idealistic" arguments put forward for the development of large scale air travel, two that figure prominently are the advantages of connecting people from countries with different social systems, and of making easier access to places where other forms of transport are long and tedious. It is precisely on services like that that B.E.A. is choosing to make the economies that it claims have been forced upon it.

The reason for the cuts is said to be that B.E.A. risks losing a big share of the traffic on the profitable European routes now that licences have been granted to a number of privately owned air companies to operate in competition with them. These companies have been temporarily kept out of the long-distance

market, where B.O.A.C. is making a large loss, and speaks of half empty jets flying to and fro across the Atlantic, but in each case they represented themselves as being liberal capitalists out to introduce competition into air travel, bring down prices and provide a better service to the public. Of course, in order to concentrate enough strength to challenge the state monopoly it was necessary for a whole series of mergers to take place between the private air lines, with the active encouragement of the government, and eliminate any wasteful competition within the ranks.

After only a few months of competition the results are beginning to show, not in improved coverage of the air routes, or in cheaper fares and greater freedom of travel for ordinary people, but in concentration of effort on the already well covered routes, resulting in loss of efficiency and waste of resources, and a reduction in the few services which B.E.A. as a public corporation, had been forced to provide "merely" because they were useful to people.

At the same time Dr. Beeching is going from strength to strength in his plans for cutting down the railway system. North Scotland has already suffered heavily in this way, and one of the points put forward to defend these cuts is the increased use and cheapness of air travel. The government has consistently refused suggestions that railway travel should be organised on the basis of service to the community, and the Unions have been threatened with the argument that if they refuse to accept the staff cuts and delayed pay rises being forced on them, the government will let the whole system decline without doing anything to help. However, the taxpayers' money, which is so sacred when it comes to subsidising the railways, is being used to subsidise B.O.A.C.

Like the motor car industry, the air-plane industry is going through the period of mergers, unemployment and closing of factories. After several years of full-scale development in which fantastic efforts were being put into the race for supremacy in jet airliners, it has reached a stage where restriction of effort is more profitable to the people in control.

Of course, the government is prepared to pour money into the aircraft industry because of its importance in the cold war. Not only are the more "conventional" aeroplanes still needed to carry bombs, as described in the R.A.F.'s advertisements for fathers and career masters, but research and technological progress in aeroplanes goes hand in hand with that in missiles.

Generally speaking, economists expect services to the ordinary people to come as a kind of by-product of some other motives in society, either the struggle of individuals for profit or the efforts of the State for self-preservation. To our mind this is one of the most dangerous myths current, and it is difficult to undermine because there are periods when it seems to be working, with full employment, expanding ranges of consumer goods and services being marketed; but the time usually comes when it is no longer in the interests of the firm to operate a particular air flight, or the government finds that railways are no longer necessary to a war economy while air lines are. Faced with such a problem, the people are powerless to answer, because they are unable to conceive of an alternative other than private capitalism or state control. The most important factor is economic power, and that in turn depends on the attitude of the millions who produce the wealth of the country without, at present taking much interest in how it is used.

P.H.

But by those Unanswered Questions shall they be Judged

security requires?

The Judge.—You cannot ask him whether he agrees with what the Attorney General has said.

Pottle.—Do you agree with the statement made by Mr. Duncan Sandys in 1957 when he was Minister of Defence when he said: "Bases cannot defend people"?

The Judge.—Do not answer.

Pottle.—You have said that you would accept any order from the state that was given to you. Eichmann's defence was . . .

The Judge.—You cannot mention him in this case.

'Do not answer'

Pottle.—Would you consider a Soviet attack on Britain in the interests of the Soviet state?

The Judge.—Do not answer.

Addressing Pottle, the Judge went on: "I have tried to give you a broad indication of the things you are not to put to the witness. You do not seem to be paying the slightest attention to what I have said."

Pottle.—As the Attorney General has mentioned international law perhaps it would be appropriate for me to quote from the United Nations Charter?

The Judge.—No.

Pottle.—There is a document *Defence Outline of Policy* issued by the British Government. Perhaps I can quote from this and put a question to the Air Commodore about the nuclear deterrent. . . . "It must be frankly recognized that there is at present no means of providing adequate protection for the people of this country against the consequences of an attack with nuclear weapons. In the event of war the fighter aircraft of the R.A.F. could unquestionably be able to

take heavy toll of bombers but a proportion would inevitably get through. Even if it were only a dozen they could, if loaded with megaton bombs, inflict widespread disaster."

The Judge.—It is quite irrelevant, do not answer. I rule the question inadmissible.

Pottle to Air Commodore Magill.—Do you agree with Mr. Harold Macmillan when he said in Moscow in February, 1959: "It is impossible to hide from ourselves the dangers of a war by miscalculation or by muddle?"

The Judge.—Do not answer that question.

Pottle.—The point I have been trying to make is that I agree with the Attorney General when he says: "This is a very serious case." Pottle then protested to the Judge that he was not being allowed to put questions that were part of his defence. It would be for the jury to decide what was prejudicial to the safety or interests of the state.

The Judge.—You will have an opportunity of addressing the jury later.

Pottle.—I ask if you will reconsider your ruling. There are six people in the dock and the only way we can defend ourselves is to cross-examine witnesses that the Attorney General has put into the box. Every question asked is ruled out of order so we are left with no defence.

Patrick Pottle's examination of Bertrand Russell was also successful in spite of the Court's attempts to gag him and to "protect" Russell.

Pottle then called Lord Russell, who took the affirmation, saying he had a conscientious objection to taking the oath. He refused a chair and said he would stand. He told the court that he had been made a member of the Order

Continued on page 4

ANARCHY 13 OUT NEXT WEEK discusses DIRECT ACTION

ANARCHY is Published by Freedom Press at 1/6 on the last Saturday of every month. ORDER YOUR COPY NOW!



THE HOSTAGE OPENED IN PARIS LAST WEEK

WHEN Mayakovsky shot himself on the 14th April, 1930—"turning proudly away from us all, even when he was lying down, even in his sleep, he was going away from us in a stubborn endeavour to reach something" was the description by Pasternak who was a personal friend. This was only one of a series of suicides: Yessenin hanged himself, Kuznetsov died by his own hand, Mayakovsky wrote his own epitaph.

As they say
 'the incident is closed'
 Love boat
 smashed against mores
 I'm quits with life.
 No need itemizing
 mutual griefs
 woes
 offences
 Good luck and good-bye.

Now 'the incident re-opens with the staging at the Mermaid Theatre of Mayakovsky's last play "The Bed-Bug". In the excellent programme-notes Dmitri Makaroff (the translator) mentions that "the poet committed suicide for no apparent reason".

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

What They Did in Dublin to "The Ginger Man"
 J. P. Donleavy 16/-
 Nights in the Gardens of Brooklyn
 Harvey Swados 18/-
 Red Liner
 Fenner Brockway 15/-
 What Price Co-Existence?
 Sir J. Slessor 21/-
 The Derbyshire Miners
 J. E. Williams 90/-
 Our Examination
 Samuel Beckett, etc. 25/-
 The Economics of Socialism
 Reconsidered
 Henry Smith 30/-

REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

Les Enfants Terribles
 Jean Cocteau 2/6
 The Lost Childhood, etc.
 Graham Greene 3/-
 Brother Cain
 Simon Raven 3/6
 Thurber Country
 James Thurber 3/6
 The Harder they Fall
 Bud Schulberg 3/6

SECOND-HAND

Our Building Inheritance
 W. H. Godfrey 3/-
 Low Notes on a High Level
 J. B. Priestley 3/6
 The Children of the Nations
 Poulton Bigelow 4/6
 Everybody's Political What's What
 Bernard Shaw 6/-
 Essays of Today and Yesterday
 Robert Blatchford 3/-
 Essays of Today and Yesterday
 J. B. Priestley 2/6
 The Man who was Afraid
 Maxim Gorky 3/-
 The Mystery of Marseilles
 Emile Zola 2/6
 Britain Faces Germany (1937)
 A. L. Kennedy 3/-
 Looking Backwards, &c. (3 novels)
 Edward Bellamy 7/6
 Thomas Hodgskin
 Elie Halevy 10/-
 The Secret of High Wages
 Bertram Austin & W. F. Lloyd 2/6
 The Spirit of Place
 D. H. Lawrence 3/6
 Finisterre
 Fritz Peters 4/-
 Class 1902
 Ernst Glaeser 3/-
 Tom Tit Tot
 Edward Clodd 4/-
 Margaret Ethel McDonald
 Ramsay MacDonald 4/-
 Economic Determinism
 Lida Parca 4/6
 The Intermediate Sex
 Edward Carpenter 5/-
 Tono Bungay and a Modern Utopia
 H. G. Wells 4/-

PAMPHLETS

Strike Strategy
 National Rank & File Movement 2d.

Book tokens accepted

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

Is the incident closed?

(AS THEY SAY)

dead poet in the party paper the next morning [15.4.30]—as a title to the picture, so that none should miss it—were these guilty words:

"The preliminary data of the investigation show that the suicide was due to causes of a purely personal character, having nothing to do with the social or literary activity of the poet."

"This is the same as saying," remarks Trotsky, "that the voluntary

For those with eyes to see . . .

THESE PRELIMINARY NOTES on 'the incident' are necessary to explain "The Bed-Bug".

Mayakovsky's attitude to the Soviet Government and the revolution, which he helped to make, was ambivalent, and so his play is split down the middle, as it were.

This play will not please the anti-Soviet faction in its first act, and the pro-Soviet faction in its second act.

Pasternak says of Mayakovsky: "He was spoilt from childhood by the future, which he mastered rather early and apparently without great difficulty". The future, which Mayakovsky saw and fought for, was not the future he saw working in the 'thirties when Stalin's

death of Mayakovsky was in no way related to his life, or that his life had nothing in common with his revolutionary-poetic creative work—in a word, to turn his death into an event out of the police records. Not true, not necessary, and not clever."

Trotsky's typical comment is an indication of Trotsky's attitude. The truth is that a poet and artist, like Yessenin, like Kuznetsov, like Mayakovsky, can have nothing but an uneasy truce with the states set up by the Marxes, the Stalins, the Lenins, the Krushchevs, or the Trotskys.

apparatus took over art, poetry and culture.

According to Eastman it was only in early February 1930 that Mayakovsky made his peace with R.A.P.P. In April he made the ultimate peace.

"The Bed-Bug" has been written (in Paris in 1928) and produced in Moscow in February 1929 to a storm of criticism. For some reason (which can readily be guessed), it was revived in Moscow in 1960.

The first act is in Moscow in 1929 (on Lunarcharsky Street) the hero, is an ex-revolutionary who is on the verge of making a bourgeois marriage for money. His jilted girl-friend shoots herself at the news. The period is that of

the NEP (the new economic policy) when Lenin had given the new party line 'enrich yourselves'. We are shown the small traders who have grown up on this policy, and how the herring bought at the State Co-op was an inch shorter than the herring bought from the private trader—and the sad reflection "what was the revolution for?"

After a wedding-feast (which seems to owe much to Georg Grosz for its coarseness and caricature), there is a fire in which the wedding guests, bride and our hero-groom Scrofulovsky are all killed.

The next scene is fifty years after. The inverse utopia has been achieved. Zamyatin was expelled from the All-Russian Union of Writers in September 1929 for his inverse-utopia *We* (the precursor of "1984").

Scrofulovsky is thawed out from an ice-block in the basement where he has been in a state of suspended animation for fifty years. Coming back to life he brings with him a bed-bug. The man is a rare specimen, a drunkard, a smoker, a singer and musician. He escapes from the laboratory, after an encounter with his jilted girl-friend who has also been 'resurrected'. His parasitical companion the bed-bug has also broken loose and both of them are responsible for several regrettable bourgeois deviations in this antiseptic prophylactic society. The bed bug is captured through the heroic efforts of the zoo staff.

Scrofulovsky volunteers to go into captivity in the zoo so that he may act as host to his one link with the old world—the bed-bug.

The play concludes with Scrofulovsky 'putting on an act' for the fascinated observers at the zoo, and then, after being taken out of his cage, makes a dash for liberty, appealing to members of the audience to join him in his cage. He is recaptured, drugged by an injection and put back in his cage. Then we can all go home.

The production and translation has a verve and vulgarity which Mayakovsky (a futurist) would have approved. Whether we like it or not is a question of taste. Sometimes Mayakovsky's verse (like Whitman's whom he resembles) is in very doubtful taste.

The setting is contemporary (with Mayakovsky, and Myerhold, that is), and the open-stage of the Mermaid enables audience-participation to an alarming extent, subjecting them to the attentions of pedlars, tramp of firemen, the hunt for the bug, and the pleas of Scrofulovsky.

A delightful quartette, Carlo Marks and his Red Hot Four, Freddie, Len, Carlo and Joe (mysteriously replaced in the second act by Leo—after a revolver shot—who resembles, of course, Trotsky). The music, specially composed by Leonard Salzedo is apt, tuneful and evocative.

Joss Ackland is excellent as Scrofulovsky, with a physical resemblance to the author—who, by one of those strange coincidences which illuminate his life, took the part of Jack London's autobiographical "Martin Eden", in a film which Mayakovsky himself scripted.

Bernard Miles has directed the play (under a pseudonym) and also plays a part excellently.

"Ingratitude is the reward of the world" is an old German proverb and the critics have been severe on this play, but I think we have reason to be grateful for the Mermaid reviving 'this incident' for the light it throws upon the dilemma of the revolutionary artist. A light which can be seen by those who have eyes to see it.

And not just for its de-Stalinification value.

J.R.

SAD PROFESSION

"Young negroes don't get the chance to hear the jazz top liners", writes Billy Taylor, because the Negro clubs don't book them. (The implication should be obvious . . .)

The whole of the Studs Terkel sleeve-note for Big Bill Broonzy, reprinted in "The Jazz World", is a damning indictment of the evils of segregation and its pernicious effect in creating colour lines among the negroes.

Gary Kramer's valiant attempt to probe the incidence of drug addiction among jazz musicians, "Skybook: Narcotics and Jazz", is an intensely interesting failure. He takes no account of the vicious American laws with regard to addiction. (In America it is a crime to be an addict, even though the addiction may have been acquired through use of drugs in hospital treatment). The trouble appears to lie in Mr. Kramer's complete inability to distinguish between a rejection of the currently accepted social mores and genuinely sociopathic behaviour such as the delinquency of the teenage gangs that make Central Park unsafe after dark, and the delinquency of the Pentagon that makes the whole world unsafe at any time. For instance he refers to the beat generation as a "startling antisocial product of our times", whereas most readers of this paper would, I think, regard the "beats" rejection of American values as evidence of a high rather than a low development of sociality.

On the other hand Mr. Kramer's investigation does a great deal to clear away the mythology built up by the popular press about the "Jazz-mad dopefiend", and many of his comments and conclusions are both valid and valuable. For instance: "It is still not sufficiently appreciated by white people, even basically sympathetic ones, what a destructive effect the routine life experience of the negro has on his personality . . . certain oppressive features of life in slum neighbourhoods, commonly experienced, weigh heavily on a significantly large number of individuals living there. When the pressures become unbearable these individuals become vulnerable to drug use and/or the associated pathologies of "Street Corner Society". Mr. Kramer's position is that of the well-meaning right-wing liberal; what he sees is right; but he is rather blinkered and doesn't see too clearly. Anarchists will find his arbitrary judgment of what constitutes anti-social behaviour a little strange. Among the activities of slum dwellers that he regards as anti-social he lists, prostitution, gambling, gang warfare, racketeering and illegitimacy and anti-authoritarian behaviour. However, within the limits of this rather orthodox

attitude, I feel that he has established a valuable basis for future research.

Like all anthologies this book has its low spots. The omission of the monumentally dull "desert island disc" choice of the world's jazz critics would have been a vast improvement, and the only reason I can think of for the inclusion of Elliot Horne's "The Argot of Jazz" is that the editors must have owed him money.

The book begins with a quotation from "Dr. Zhivago" that is considerably more apposite than these prestige borrowings from the "respectable" arts usually are, and ends with one from Billie Holiday that might be the plea of humanity itself: "I want to get it over real quick. I want to die soon. Why? I got no guy. And who the hell will care? You tell me how the hell can you tell? Sure, they love my singing. But me? I'm tired. I'm human, I want to be loved".

This book will be of interest to everyone concerned about human society, not just music lovers. In spite of the two indicated low spots it's a book I wouldn't be without. The only major fault is the price. 18s. is a trifle high for a book that appeared in the States a 50 cent paperback. One finishes the book with a heightened understanding of Bizet's exclamation:

"Music! What a splendid art, but what a sad profession!"

JOHN PILGRIM.

LETTER

The broken hearts of the sick society

When writing to a friend abroad some months ago I expressed the opinion, after telling him of my recent slight coronary thrombosis, that the 'powers that be', by their frustrating actions, were, virtually, breaking people's hearts.

I was, to say the least, mildly surprised to find that the idea at the back of my mind received some support in an article in the "Chest and Heart Bulletin" of April, 1961, which I had not previously—and only recently—read, in which Dr. H. Stephen Pasmore says:

"In heart disease the practitioner senses . . . undercurrents of emotional conflict" and "many cases of coronary thrombosis are precipitated by mental factors."

This seems to bear out an opinion I had formed that much of the stress and strain of modern life which is a basic cause of cardiac troubles can arise from a desire of people to do a job well and conscientiously being frustrated by the many combinations we all encounter

which prevent us from doing so—"red tape", domineering attitudes, carelessness of others, and so on. We cannot all develop—and some who acquire often lose through constant battering—a protective shield (the "thick skin") to deflect these constant, but needless, buffetings.

I feel sure that many other general practitioners and specialists agree with the observations of Dr. Pasmore and, even more certain that patients, and patients relatives and friends, can furnish abundant evidence to support him.

A study of the incidence of cardiac failures in firms with high profit and/or disturbed labour-relations records, and in proverbially "go-slow" occupations like the Civil Service and local government, should reveal some, to say the least, interesting statistics relating illness, whether cardiac or other, to 'pressure' tactics.

B. CECIL BEVIS.

Southampton, 15th Feb.

Forty Million Fallow Acres While Millions Starve

LAST year in the United States net farm income rose \$1,000m (£340m) and income per farm increased almost \$350 (£120); government stocks of farm products were reduced for the first time in 9 years; government subsidies were less than the previous year as were also food prices.

With these "gains of 1961" to support him, President Kennedy in his Message on Agriculture delivered to the Congress at the end of last month, called for "permanent legislation" to consolidate these "gains" and "to provide a realistic and comprehensive programme for agriculture in the years ahead—a programme with which we can continue to move forward towards full utilisation of our abundance".

The passage we have italicised, and the proposals which are contained in the Message to Congress, if acted upon—and there is no reason to suppose that they will not be—will indirectly be responsible for millions of people unnecessarily dying from starvation in the world, as well as being directly responsible for creating real antagonisms between the peoples of the world which in the long run could lead to war for justifiable *lebensraum*. We do not look upon the power struggle of the Big Powers as genuine problems or differences, as between people. But we do consider that just as the "class struggle" within a nation is real, because based on facts so the antagonisms between the "have" countries and the "have-nots" are a fact, and become increasingly so with the growing awareness among the people of the have-not countries of the disparity between their standards of living—or should one call it their "struggle to keep alive"?—and that of the self-styled "affluent society".

President Kennedy's Message to Congress admits that the situation in the United States is one of superabundance and not scarcity:

"Our rapidly growing capacity to produce far outruns the growth of our domestic and foreign demand for food and fibre. This offers us an opportunity to manage abundance, rather than scarcity, an opportunity that is unique among nations of the world. It is relatively new even for the United States" (our italics).

Yet, on his own admission, these producers of abundance did not live on the fat of the land:

"The 1.5 million efficient family farms which produce 87 per cent of our total production are technically progressive, but their return on labour and capital has not kept pace with the rest of the population. Their incomes are highly sensitive to year-to-year fluctuations in farm output, especially when it is unrelated to demand.

The other two million or more farm operators who produce 13 per cent of all farm products sold have especially low incomes because they own or control too little land or too little capital, and often possess too little skill or managerial ability" (our italics).

So before we proceed further let us make the point that in the United States where not only too many cars and gadgets are produced but also too much food, those who enjoy the lowest standard of living are those who produce the *staff of life*. (It is ironic that those who enjoy the highest standards of living are engaged in producing the weapons for the *annihilation of life from this planet*!). This is not a specially

"American" phenomenon; it is universal. It has little to do with efficiency: after all, very often a bumper crop results in a *depression of prices* whereas a poor crop has the effect of making prices soar. The co-called law of *supply and demand*, which is the guiding light for millionaire-liberal-presidents such as Kennedy, has really no relation to efficiency which is a ratio: of useful work performed to the total energy expended*. The operative words are "useful work". Today one seeks to reduce "the total energy expended" on an operation, without asking whether the work performed is, in fact, "useful". Obviously it is necessary to define what is "useful" as well; indeed, so distorted has our language become in the hands of the mass-communicators that one needs to define "work". For instance, in last Sunday's *Pictorial* a full page headline in the City Page advises its 5 million readers on "How to Make your Money Work".

"Work" as defined by the Oxford Concise Dictionary as the "Expenditure of energy, striving, application of effort to some purpose". We find it difficult to conceive how money could be made to "work" yet millions of our fellow beings accept this as normal and are among the first to condemn workers for "slacking" or for being "anti-social". What is more anti-social than money? What is more inefficient than the "application of effort" to no "purpose"?

So far as President Kennedy is concerned, the two goals he has in mind are: "improving income and reducing costs" both of which have meaning only in terms of the money system. He confirms our view when he goes on to say that these can be achieved

only if farm output can be reduced below needs for several years and then be allowed to increase at a rate equal to the growth in demand. That is the framework of logic and fact. . . . (our italics).

How can one glibly talk of reducing food production in the United States below the national needs and export markets *knowing that half the world's people are desperately hungry*, unless one is indifferent to the plight of one's fellow beings? In his four-part programme for agriculture, President Kennedy declares that it should be designed to "make maximum use of our productive abundance". He adds in the same breath that:

our agricultural resources can advance the cause of peace and freedom throughout the world; they assure Americans of a high standard of living; they can be an important weapon against poverty and disease.

To this end, what does President Kennedy propose? In his Message he tells us that in the 1950's farm output increased by more than a quarter while use of labour declined by one-third. Furthermore prices are lower today in relation to other prices than "during the first two decades of this century". And in the words of the President, these increased harvests are obtained "*from 40 million fewer acres*". To this important revelation he added the even more important estimate that

*This writer, as an anarchist, is only interested in efficiency in the performance of necessary but routine, dull jobs; in other words, in doing the necessary with a minimum of effort. Not because one is work-shy but because one can only create for oneself a philosophy of life if the time required to maintain life is small in relation to that available to live, love and grow! In a society in which needs and not profits regulate production, all work will be useful.

our ability to produce more than the market can absorb will continue as far into the future as we can safely predict, outpacing population growth. Instead of a shortage of crop-land, as many have long predicted, it now appears that by 1980 we will need 50 million fewer acres than we have today (our italics).

Ignoring for a moment the President's predictions for 1980, and take the figure of 40 million acres that have actually gone out of production in the United States. These are not just numbers; they are acres of fertile land which according to Professor Dudley Stamp could, if used, feed 40 million hungry mouths†.

The same authority maintains that "the crop-land and ploughable pasture" available in the United States could support a potential population of 500,000,000, which is double the estimated population of the United States in 1980. Yet if the considerations which guide the President and his advisers apply, by 1980 some 90 million acres of food-producing land will be fallow or devoted to uses other than that of producing food.

Before we discuss the uses to which the President considers this land could be put, we want to give our British readers an idea of what these figures mean. The total area of England and Wales is 37 million acres; *thus the area of food-producing land that has been put out of production in the United States within living memory is larger than the whole of England and Wales*, and that in the opinion of the President of the United States *a further area as large as the total cultivated land of France will go out of production in the next twenty years without lowering the living standards of the American population which by then will have increased by 65 millions!*

The fact that "each year one million people move from the farm to the city", that many others seek part-time employment to supplement "meagre returns" from farm labour is not, in consequence, a problem of the land, so far as the President and his advisers are concerned. For these displaced persons any hardships and sufferings should be "alleviated", and they should be "assisted in their efforts to acquire needed skills, obtain jobs, and further their education". In spite of paying lip-service to the task of combatting hunger and contributing to "economic development throughout the free world" it is clear that the American ruling class is not moved by the starving millions as such, but only in so far as they are a factor in the power struggle, the cold war. And in fact their food surpluses are not available even on payment to the starving people of the "unfree world", countries such as China (presumably they are to Franco's Spain and Chiang's

†See *Our Undeveloped World*, by L. Dudley Stamp. Faber 1953, p.182.

AUSTRALIANA

(From our Melbourne correspondent)

Japan has displaced Britain as Australia's best buyer. Figures for the first 4 months of the financial year show Japan, £65 millions, Britain £61 millions, U.S.A. £33 millions and China £28 millions. (The latter Government not recognised by Canberra). As one wit remarked: "I can't say I know you but your money looks familiar."—Land of plenty. The banana crop has been so successful that orders have gone out to plough in 40,000 cases (3 million lbs.) The Growers' Federation says that the market is in danger of collapse. Retail city price including hospitals 9d. per lb.

Teachers in Victoria have threatened mass action unless The Teachers' Tribunal grants them a new award before March 31st. Simultaneous meetings in 57 country areas are planned on February 22nd.

Time and a Place. Famous Chinese concert pianist Fou Ts'ong (son-in-law of Yehudi Menuhin) and his wife marched out of their Melbourne hotel when he was refused dinner for not wearing a tie. Temperature was 100.3 degrees. "It was

China as members of the "free world"!). In any case the President did not make it clear what proportion of this American generosity was free. After pointing out that the hungry American millions (in spite of abundance!) were probably going to be subjected to a "food stamp programme" which had been tried out in eight communities with "encouraging results", he went on to say that

We have also increased our shipments of food to other nations under P.L.480, thus using our agricultural abundance to combat hunger and contribute to economic development throughout the free world. . . . We have markedly increased programmes under which U.S. food is used to further projects for social and economic development in emerging nations, assists such projects in 11 countries, as compared with only 2 in 1960. And more than three-fourths of the local currency accruing from the sales authorised under Title 1 in 1961 will be used for economic development programmes (our italics).

But let us not split hairs. The case against the American capitalist system is so overwhelming as stated by Mr. Kennedy himself that we do not need to rely on conjecture.

(1) He admits that last year "government stocks of farm products were reduced for the first time in 9 years. (2) He points out that feed grain surpluses cost the government \$500 millions in 1961 and proposes that the acreage allotted to this purpose should be "large enough to meet annual domestic and export requirements, for all purposes under the programme, less that amount which is to be deducted from the carry-over stocks to reduce them gradually to a level no higher than that required for stability and security. And "payments for diver-

ted acreage would, of course, continue to be made to support farm income while surplus stocks are being reduced".

If we understand this last remark correctly it is an assurance to the farmers that they will earn as much from their unutilised acres as they hope to earn from those which the government will permit them to cultivate. (3) He confesses that "the problems of wheat production are much the same as for feed grains. He therefore recommends:

a wheat programme which will reduce wheat stocks to manageable levels, improve the competitive position of American wheat in world markets, and maintain the income of wheat producers. To achieve these objectives, national wheat acreage allotments will be established by estimating the actual requirements each year for milling, seed and for export, and deducting a number of bushels that will permit us to draw upon our surplus stock on hand to gradually reduce the carry-over to the level required for stability and security.

Once again farmers would receive payments to "maintain producers' incomes" where their land was diverted from wheat to soil-conservation uses" and the Secretary of Agriculture would be in a position to "offer such payments as an incentive for further voluntary acreage diversion".

The common theme in the President's arguments is that the prosperity of the farmers, the nation and the markets is dependent on the passing of legislation to control the acreage under cultivation, the compensation of farmers so affected being less costly than the subsidies which would otherwise have to be paid, not to mention the high

Continued on page 4

Angry Archaeologists Argue

Necropolis, April 1st 2084.

The archaeologists Professor Huntley and Professor George Jones have been roused to bitter controversy about the excavation finds (licensed by the World-state) on the site of Necropolis which succumbed to some unknown disaster about one thousand years ago.

The site has only just been declared safe by the authorities. Professor Huntley gives it as his opinion that Necropolis was destroyed by a natural catastrophe. Professor Jones claims that it fell into disuse and was abandoned for life in smaller cities. Necropolis, he claims was merely a suburb of the earlier city Meglapolis.

Professor Huntley claims they worshipped something called "Christianity" and produces as evidence a cross on a circle and the letters "B.N.P.". Professor Jones says the chief worship was "Mammon" as has produced what he calls "coins" inscribed in an extinct language "Dei Gra" meaning "free of" or "without God". He has found evidence of other cults with symbols of segmented circles and the initials C.N.D. Professor

Jones claims to have found evidence of pilgrimages (held at the Spring Equinox) to propitiate this "Mammon" whose shrine was located near Reading.

On the other hand Professor Huntley claims that Christianity evolved into something known as the "sit-down" a gathering for worship. Professor Huntley has discovered extensive traces of pilgrimages to "the City" which was the incarnation of fertility rites. He denies Professor Jones' theses that Necropolis' civilisation was based on agriculture and inclines to the belief that Moloch the god of consumption was the latter development. The "mass-media" the mysterious source of the City's wealth was the practical realisation of the earlier Christian "mass" which accomplished the difficult technical feat of "transubstantiation" (i.e., turning one thing into another) which we have unfortunately now lost.

Professor Jones submits that all this is nonsense, and he doubts if there was a Necropolitan civilisation and certainly the Meglapolitans who preceded them, were savages, with their frequent wars, sacrifices to the god Auto and their habit of carrying around blow-pipes which eventually killed the carrier.

These widely differing views on the nature of Necropolis leave the layman in grave doubt as to the competence of the learned authorities. It is undeniable that they are both excavating on the same location but the hypotheses advanced from the evidence excavated seems wildly contradictory.

Speaking as a mere man in the street, without any pretensions to scholastic finesse or academic background it would seem unlikely that any civilisation, tribe or culture with such inherent contradictions could survive for the period alleged by the pundits. It is impossible to believe that a civilisation, tribe or culture of the size and extent claimed for it could have disappeared overnight leaving only the archaeological tit-bits over which now the Professors Huntley and Jones snarl like two dogs over a bone—to lapse into folk-lore.

The classical poet Shelley speaks of visiting archeological remains in a desert—such as Necropolis now is—finding two stone stumps of legs on a pedestal with the words "My name is Ozymandias, King of Kings: Look on my works, ye Mighty, and despair. . . . Round the decay . . . the lone and level sands stretch far away."

One might say the same of the Necropolitans.

such a hot day" said Fou Ts'ong "after all, it was only lunch. Dinner would have been a different matter."

The Society of Friends has issued a statement opposing an immigration policy based on racial discrimination. It declares, "It is clearly the duty of us all to work for conditions under which all men, irrespective of race and colour, can enjoy decent living and working conditions here in Australia"

Housing. It is almost impossible to find a rented house in Australia for less than £8 or £9 per week. Ask any new settler. Figures from Canberra therefore are revealing. Of 7,724 rented houses available 5,877 are rented for less than £3/10/- per week and of these 1,600 were charged between £1/10/- and £2/10/- Regardless of who gets elected.

Seen on Television. Duchess of Westminster. Quizzed on her opinion of the man who purchased the family's "Sunday Times", Mr. Roy Thompson, she said, "Oh, that's the man who believes in selling newspapers like sausages. Well I suppose it follows. Journalists do have thick skins and what they produce is composed of some pretty dubious material." Tut, Tut. Whatever will Lord Snowdon's family think?

F.W.

JACK SPRATT.

Forty Million Wasted Acres

Continued from page 3
charges for the storage of surpluses for which there is no "demand"!

These arguments may make sense to an accountant. But if you were one of the hungry millions would you not demand that this surplus land be made available to those who need it? What in fact does the President propose to do with the surplus acres?

I recommend legislation to encourage a comprehensive survey of land uses, to undertake a research programme on the conversion of land to alternate purposes . . . [to] the permanent utilisation of acreage to fulfil other needs.

To our minds, so long as there are people in the world going hungry there is only one use to which crop-land should be put, and it is of course the growing of food. But for the humane President of the United States an "effective land use programme" in the American age of abundance would include the acquisition by local organisations in which the Government would share of land for the "development of forests, wild life and recreational resources".

Have the Americans a moral right to squander land in this way? Must the world just stand by and watch good land going out of cultivation as part of a policy when there are millions of landless workers throughout the world who ask for nothing more than a piece of land on which to feed their families?

FREEDOM PRESS PUBLICATIONS

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
Vol 10 1960: The Tragedy of Africa

Each volume: paper 7/6 cloth 10/6
The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FREEDOM at 5/6 post free.

FAUL 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/-

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

HERBERT READ
Poetry and Anarchism
cloth 5/-

TONY GIBSON
Youth for Freedom 2/-
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.
Food Production & Population 6d.

E. A. GUTKIND
The Expanding Environment
(illustrated) boards 8/6

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

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:
Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949:
A tribute
cloth 5/-
Journey Through Utopia
cloth 16/- paper 7/6



Hoofmarks of the Vandal

THE worst enemies of a country are often its own inhabitants, often the very people most prone to trumpet forth their patriotism. In no land is this truer than in England, which is supposed to be a country of nature lovers and poetic mystics.

There are three stages in the destruction of a landscape. During the course of stage one the hordes prowl upon the frontiers, or establish little outposts here and there in the territory. Stage two arrives when some well-intentioned people notice what is going on and succeed in having the area proclaimed a National Park. The third stage arrives with the slicing up of this piece of the national heritage. Parts are allotted to oil refineries, parts are handed over to the tank regiments of native and foreign armies as training grounds, one bit is set aside for an atomic power station or a rocket base. Finally the hills are crowned with wireless masts and the conquest is complete.

When I was in Spain in 1959 my heart sank when I heard, as part of the propaganda for the regime, that a National Park had been established somewhere or other. Farewell the beauties of Spain. This is a fatal sign. When areas start getting set aside as National Parks their doom appears to be sealed.

The idea of setting aside certain areas and preserving them sounds sensible, but in fact it is a step in retreat. Either the whole country is to be regarded as worth keeping (or making) beautiful, or none of it is. The whole trend of events shows us that it is impossible to keep little islands here and there. Eventually someone is sure to come along who needs this very stretch of coast, or line

of hills, and has the power to take it, whether it belongs to the Nation, the National Trust or whoever.

These thoughts were provoked by reading in "The Guardian" (26/1/62) of the dismay of the National Parks Commission at the increasing demand for sites for wireless, television and radar masts on high, remote hills, often in areas of great natural beauty.

A chain of radar stations has already been proposed by the Ministry of Aviation on the South Downs, the hills of Surrey, Shropshire and South Devon. Some monstrosities already exist. A few years ago the top of Beachy Head was defiled by something that looked as if it had been designed by the illustrator of a science fiction magazine. The enormous oblong, which turned continuously (radar presumably), could be seen for miles. It has now come down again, but the area is—or was till recently—still cordoned off. For it is not only the mast, monster or whatever that one objects to, it is also the fact that these installations required to be barricaded and defended within an ample tract of land, so that the Thing and its keepers can be safe from intrusion.

Of course this is national defence. It is so that when the powers that be have decided that it is time for us to die we can be given four minutes in which to make our peace with God. I take it that the disappearance of the Thing from Beachy Head was due to the progress of modern missile development. The poor creature could no longer cope with the pace of modern life, and was relegated to some quiet paddock to end its days in peace.

But commerce is sacred too.

"More demands are expected in the next few years from 'nationalised' industries, great corporations and local authorities, individual industrial concerns, and haulage contractors' the report states. The commission is particularly concerned because, so far, the many demands appear to be 'entirely uncoordinated'."

Of course. No villain need be. All that is necessary is a brutal, unlovely economic system, which produces people to match. In a civilisation (?) orientated towards greed and death one can expect nothing better. What is surprising, when you come to think of it, is that anything worth having survives at all. This is partly due to the energy of enlightened minorities, to the inefficiency of authoritarianism and—not least—to sheer luck. Life is always unpredictable.

The march of the pylons is justified by frequent advertisements in progressive periodicals, on the grounds that Mrs. Everywoman cannot have her electric tea-cosy without a line of gaunt giants to carry the power over the hills. Actually I find these monsters less repulsive than the menagerie of the military. Partly for the rather sad reason that I have seen them all my life and become accustomed to their presence, and partly because, apart from a few spikes and warning notices, they are defenceless. They do not require, each one of them, to be defended by an armed camp, a little citadel of barbed wire enclosing acres of ground.

Almost all areas are areas of outstanding natural beauty. Even in a completely flat country you have a sense of space and distance, and the vastness of the sky. One cannot hope to save some

'DO NOT ANSWER' said the Judge

Continued from page 1

of Merit in 1949. He was a Fellow of the Royal Society and of Trinity College, Cambridge, and he had won the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1950.

Pottle: A lot of evidence has been brought into this case on the history of the Committee of 100 and why the Committee feels justified in committing civil disobedience.

The Judge told Lord Russell: "Just listen to me. If any question is asked which you think will incriminate you, you are entitled not to answer."

Pottle then asked Lord Russell his purpose in forming the Committee of 100.

Lord Russell: My purpose was to try to avoid the extermination of the people of this country and of many millions elsewhere.

Pottle: Did you agree with the Committee's decision to go to Wethersfield? The Judge: Bear in mind what I told you.

Lord Russell: Yes, I did.
Pottle: Can you explain your purpose in wanting to go to Wethersfield?—It seemed that this country and a lot of the major countries of East and West were in dire peril and it was our duty to make it known.

Pottle: Is one of the purposes of committing civil disobedience to get the facts known about the dangers?—Yes, in my opinion.

Pottle: Do you feel that people can disobey the law any time they want to? The Judge: No. What his views on that are, are completely irrelevant.

Pottle: As president of the Committee of 100 he must have a purpose.
The Judge: He has told us what his purpose was.

Pottle: He has said his purpose was to make the country aware.
He went on to ask, "Was it your purpose . . . ?" but the Judge interrupted to say: "You must not lead him. You can ask him had he got another purpose."

Pottle then asked the question and Lord Russell replied: "That is a little difficult. My ultimate purpose is to prevent a nuclear war."

Pottle: On September 12 you were sent to prison because you would not deny your political beliefs . . .

The Judge: That is quite irrelevant.
Pottle: I have a statement made by Lord Russell . . .

The Judge: It is inadmissible.
Pottle: Do you think your purpose in going to Wethersfield to ground United States bombers was justified.
Lord Russell: I think it was.

Pottle: You have said that you feel

you are justified in committing civil disobedience . . .

The Judge: You can't answer that.
Pottle: I thought he had answered that.

The Judge: Yes, but that too was inadmissible.

Lord Russell agreed that he and the Rev. Michael Scott were authors of a pamphlet which had been exhibited entitled "Act or Perish."

Pottle: Have you thought it funny these past few weeks that the six people in the dock gave out this leaflet and are in the dock for doing so and yet you who wrote it, are not accused?

The Judge: Don't answer.
Pottle: Did you conspire and incite people to go to Wethersfield base?

The Judge then repeated his warning about incriminating questions and Lord Russell had difficulty in hearing.

Pottle: The Judge is saying you need not answer if you think it would be incriminating.

Lord Russell (to the Judge): Have I not the right to incriminate myself?

The Judge: My duty is to warn you, the same as for witnesses who might not know. You are perfectly entitled to incriminate yourself.

Filthy Lucre

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT FEBRUARY 17th 1962	
Expenses 7 weeks at £70	£490
Income from Sales & Subs.: Weeks 1—6	£226
Week 7	£40
	£266
DEFICIT	£224

DEFICIT FUND	
Woldingham: F.B.* 10/-; S. Shields: B.M. 9/6; Glasgow: J.H.* 2/6; Birmingham: N.J.B. 5/-; Hounslow: L.* 5/-; Southend: P.O.* 5/-; Falmouth: R.W.* 5/-; Brooklyn: O.A. 17/6; Twickenham: D.F.P. 11/10/-; London: A.B.F. 11/8/-; Shoreham: M & D.* 2/6; Romford: S.W. 2/-; Redhill: L.M. 10/-; Woldingham: F.B.* 7/-; Belfast: H.C. 13/8/-; London: S.B. 8/-; Wanstead: D.A.P. 8/-; London: J.H. 17/13/-; London: T.K.* 10/-; London: P. & G.T.* 5/-.	
TOTAL	£19 11 0
Previously acknowledged	£182 1 5
1962 TOTAL TO DATE	£201 12 5

*Indicates regular contributors.

Lord Russell: Well, I do.

Pottle: Did you conspire and incite people to block Wethersfield base?—Yes.

Do you feel you are just as responsible as the people in the dock?—I do.

Pottle: You have said in "Act or Perish" that civil disobedience is justified . . .

The Judge: I have said you can't ask that.

Pottle: You have taken a decision to commit civil disobedience. Can you elaborate on why you have taken this decision?

The Judge: No he can't.

Pottle attempted to put a further question which the Judge refused and Pottle then told the Court: "I have no further questions. I would like to thank Lord Russell and say he is an inspiration to us all."

Another significant aspect of this trial has been the general silence of the Press. Apart from the Times which gave reports which were long enough to be coherent, and the Daily Worker, the other newspapers we have seen including the Daily Herald, hardly dealt with the case at all.

The sensational A6 murder trial was obviously their cup of tea. It should also be noted in this connection that apart from the Tuesday issue, the Guardian coverage of the trial was very poor, and the B.B.C. news omitted reference to it altogether for at least two days in all their bulletins. This of course raises once again the problem of communications so far as such movements as the Committee of 100 and other minority expressions of the people are concerned. To rely on the capitalist press is chancy; they either ignore you or distort you; very rarely do they report you.

Clearly the trial was something quite different to what emerges from the columns of the Press. Let us hope that the initiative is quickly taken to issue as a pamphlet a transcript of the trial. The unanswered questions, the awkward questions, by these the ruling class stand condemned and our comrades vindicated. Let us honour them by continuing the work of building up a movement of responsible, determined people who by their example will inspire millions of their fellow beings throughout the world to refuse ever again to take up arms in the senseless slaughter called WAR!

FREEDOM

areas and let others go. Being scheduled as such an area did not save the Pembroke coast from rifle ranges, oil refineries and German tanks. On the contrary. First you reserve your area, then you start to make exceptions to your rules, forced to this course by "national necessity", or some other respectable abstraction. Just in the same way has the United States government carved, or permitted to be carved, slices here and there and here again from the supposedly inviolate Indian reservations.

William Blake dreamed of building Jerusalem "in England's green and pleasant land", but it looks already too late. By the time we get to the New Jerusalem we shall find nothing but streets, a few tame parks with mown grass, roaring motorways, atomic power stations, heliports and a population of monsters with large heads, minute limbs and withered bodies.

A.W.U.

BRING OUT YOUR JUMBLE

The L.A.G. are holding a Jumble Sale at 5, Caledonian Road, N.1. on Saturday, March 24th, at 2.30. Have you anything suitable? In Aid of L.A.G. Funds.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP GENERAL MEETINGS

meetings to be held at
The Two Brewers,
40 Monmouth Street, WC2
(Leicester Square Tube)
Sundays at 7.30 p.m.
FEB 25 Bill Christopher
The Rank and File Movement
MAR 4 Phillip Sansom
Anarchism and Direct Action
MAR 11 S.F.
A Visit to Utopia—or Was It?

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.
Last Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Laurens and Celia Otter's, 57 Ladbroke Road, W.11.

CAMBRIDGE ANARCHIST GROUP
GEORGE WEBB
"The Achievement of Anarchism and the Prevention of War"
Tuesday, 27th February, 8.30 p.m.
Place: consult Krishna Kumar, St. John's College.

ANARCHY Nos 1-11
Still Available 1/8 Post Free

Freedom The Anarchist Weekly

FREEDOM is published 40 times a year, on every Saturday except the last in each month.
ANARCHY (1/8 or 25 cents post free), a 32-page journal of anarchist ideas, is published 12 times a year on the 1st of each month.

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM and ANARCHY
12 months 32/- (U.S. & Canada \$5.00)
6 months 16/- (2.50)
3 months 8/6 (\$1.25)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 47/- (U.S. & Canada \$7.50)
6 months 23/6 (\$3.75)

AIR MAIL Subscription Rates (FREEDOM by Air Mail, ANARCHY by Surface Mail)
12 months 52/- (U.S. & Canada \$8.00)

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only
1 year (40 issues) 20/- (U.S. & Canada \$3)
6 months (20 issues) 10/- (\$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.