

'When something becomes the fashion, that is the time to put a bomb under it.'

JOAN LITTLEWOOD.

**Direct Action as a Principle not merely a Tactic**

**THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.**

WE find ourselves unable to join the chorus of indignation from the Left over the outcome of the Salan trial. Not that we have any special regard for him; indeed had he fallen into the hands of those against whom he had waged war and terror in Algeria—not only since he "outlawed himself", but during the years when he was officially a French hero—and met his end at their hands, our feeling would have been that he had got what he deserved. We suspect, though we would like to be mistaken in our suspicions, that had this happened, a large proportion of the people who now wax indignant that Salan has cheated the firing-squad would be singing his praises and calling for a resumption of all-out-war against the "barbarous" Algerians. It will be pointed out to us that our attitude is as irrational as theirs. We can see that there is a common factor in the two reactions, as far as the fate of Salan is concerned. But those who today are indignant over the verdict, obviously feel this way because the Law has "let them down" (after all, the same tribunal had previously condemned Jouhaux to death for his part in the O.A.S. terror campaign, and since he took his orders from Salan it was not unreasonable to expect that a similar verdict would be returned; it has even been pointed out that if there were any "extenuating circumstances" they should have been in Jouhaux's favour since he, at least, could plead that as a French Algerian the issues affected him and his friends more intimately than say Salan who has no family ties with Algeria)—in other words their indignation has little to do with the magnitude of Salan's crimes but a lot to do with salving their own guilty consciences. The "majesty of the law" is to the blind supporter of government and Authority what the Confessional Box is to the equally blind follower of the Catholic Church. Because most anarchists, we think, are of the opinion that nothing positive is achieved either by punishment or by seeking scapegoats, we have no faith in the

## Salan, De Gaulle and the Majesty of the Law

# Old soldiers never die

justice of the law; and because we do not believe in the perfectibility of Man we would entrust to no-one the power to dispose of the life and liberty of another man. We are not upholders of the "sanctity" of the law (though we advocate that revolutionaries should not hesitate to "use" the law, as a tactic in their struggle and to resist persecution, if it serves to curb the power of the ruling class even temporarily) because only in a society in which social and economic equality existed in fact could one conceive of laws being formulated and applied with justice and in the interests of all. In our society it does not even exist in principle, let alone in fact.

WE are not advocates of "mob rule" as the alternative to the "rule of law". The "mob" is the offspring of, not the alternative to, the society which maintains inequality, and privilege, which upholds racial and social discrimination. Human indignation is a necessary and natural human reaction to the bully, the tyrant and the exploiter, and for this reason we would have been neither shocked nor surprised if Salan had been captured by the Algerians were given rough justice on the spot. But he was captured by the forces of law-and-order and tried according to the law. The law is not justice (only the other day a British judge said in a case that he would have been pleased to confirm the plaintiff's claim: "It would be justice—what I shall call natural justice. But I am here to administer the law as it stands") even though its application may on occasions coincide with what ordinary people would consider to be justice. The law both sanctions and condemns murder, violence, theft, assault. General Salan was respon-

sible for more deaths, for more Algerians and even Frenchmen being tortured during the past years than can be charged against ex-General Salan in the past months. For the former crimes he was decorated and looked upon as a hero; for the latter he is arraigned for breaking the law. Yet the régime which put him on trial, itself came to power on a wave of military rebellion in Algeria! And de Gaulle dismissed Parliament and assumed dictatorial powers—duly legalised of course!—and promised both the French people and the *colons* in Algeria that the war against the Moslem nationalists would be pursued to a victorious end. "Algerie Française" was his rallying cry then. What moral right has he now to judge his former supporters among the military caste for continuing to defend what had been for years a common cause. In their eyes the arch-traitor is de Gaulle.

But what of the French people, and in particular the Left which for most of the seven years of the blood bath in Algeria has acquiesced at the military repression, and the tortures and has given a hero's welcome to the "paras". Memories are short. Let us refresh them. In March 1957, when the "socialist" Guy Mollet was French Premier, FREEDOM quoted Agency reports that General Salan was priding himself with military successes against the "rebels", 700 of whom had been killed in the period from January 28 to February 5. That same year the achievements of General Salan and his "paras" were commemorated in Paris. FREEDOM's comment, in part, reads as follows:

It tells us something of the French mentality that the 14th July—the national holiday and the day the people stormed and destroyed the hated state

prison, the Bastille, in 1789—was celebrated this year by a monster military parade in Paris (an annual occurrence which an outsider finds difficult to reconcile with the event being commemorated!) and included some thousands of paratroopers as well as military equipment engaged in the Algerian war of repression which were specially brought over for the occasion. The traditional street dancing was banned since the government ordained that this 14th July, was to be a day of mourning for Algeria... There is surely something sinister in this linking of the *Quatorze Juillet* with military repression in Algeria. It is a marriage of the *forces of freedom*—storming the Bastille, liberating the prisoners and then destroying the prison—with the *forces of repression*—the military parade in which the paratroopers in their camouflage uniforms, which in fact made them stand out from the rest, were given a place of honour (later they despoiled themselves through the streets of Paris with starry-eyed fiancées on one arm and proud, chaperoning-prospective-mothers-in-law on the other). Just as the Bastille was the then symbol of repression so are the torture of Algerian "spspects"—French as well as Moslem—which has shocked the world and not a few Frenchmen (even though only a few among them have displayed the courage to speak out against these excesses). Thus 1789 was being commemorated not by a pageant of freedom but with the glorification of

those very forces against which the destruction of the Bastille was directed.\*

Political and economic considerations, as well as a realisation that Algeria could never be held down by force of arms, and not because of any love he might have for the Moslems or for their freedom, brought about the *volte face* in de Gaulle's Algerian policy. It has taken time, and during these years tens of thousands of Algerians, Moslem and French, have died (the Moslems, at least, have no grounds to complain, for until recently Salan and his troops were killing them legally, with the approval of the General himself). Yet the question which must sometime be asked is: what made negotiations with the "rebel" FLN possibly say a year ago and impossible four or five years ago? The ex-generals of the OAS point out that de Gaulle was prepared to negotiate with the FLN when, from a military point of view, the situation in Algeria had never been as favourable to France. Was it then, a question of personal pride that prevented him from even recognising the FLN when the military situation was not so "favourable"?

\*FREEDOM Reprints Vol. 7, 1957 pp.146-7. Continued on page 3

## ANOTHER TACTIC TO WIN LABOUR FOR CND?

IN a comment in the last issue of FREEDOM on the recent launching of INDEC, the Independent Nuclear Disarmament Election Campaign, by familiar names in the pacifist movement we pointed out that we would resist a government composed of professed pacifists with the same energy as we resist a Labour government, because once in office they too would have to resort to the machinery of coercion to do "good" as their predecessors did to do evil things. And in the course of our comment we made up an INDEC "shadow

cabinet" in which Pat Arrowsmith was the Prime Minister. Well, we are glad to report that Miss Arrowsmith has tendered her resignation even before being elected! In last week's *Peace News* a letter is published from her in which she wishes to make public the fact that "I have resigned from any association with INDEC". The reasons she gives are:

I think the only way we are at all likely to win the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (if we ever win it) is by means of mass industrial action. For reasons so obvious that they really do not need stating, working for industrial action and putting up independent Parliamentary candidates simply do not mix.

Everything is obvious once you have discovered it, but since it has obviously taken Miss Arrowsmith some considerable time to discover whatever she has discovered, others less quick in grasping the situation than she is, would undoubtedly benefit from a more detailed statement of her reasons.

As a matter of fact we don't believe our Pat has discovered anything at all. The above quote from her letter would be a revolutionary statement but for the inclusion of one word. The all-important word is "independent". This word and the remainder of the letter in which she states the reasons which apparently were so obvious that they "really do not need stating" makes it

quite clear that our Pat is still a politician, after all. We will quote the whole of her letter in the interests of Justice! :

One of the premises on which INDEC was formed was, I think, that the Campaign had tried hard but in vain to "win the Labour Party." So we got Scarborough, and must now not be afraid to divide the loyalties of many Labour Party members.

Well, the Campaign has NOT tried hard enough to win the Labour Party. It has never seriously attempted to win it at shop floor and TU branch level (even though the DAC tried to do this). Now at last CND is beginning to move in this direction and to pursue the possibility in some areas of strike action against the bomb. We are possibly four years too late in starting on this tack. However, both in London and on Merseyside there are clearly vast reservoirs of more or less untapped support for CND among industrial workers. I think we should try seriously to tap this potential before putting up candidates and so bitterly dividing the loyalties of many in the Labour movement. I should like to see 1920 repeated: to see the working people of Britain threaten mass direct industrial action and so prevent a war taking place. I believe putting up independent candidates is likely to militate against this possibility.

If the workers won't be tapped will Miss Arrowsmith then support the putting up of independent candidates? If so, to what purpose?



## Anarchist Flags in Belgrave Square

(From a Correspondent)

ON Saturday morning, May 26th, a demonstration was held outside the Spanish Embassy in Belgrave Square.

A group of five comrades demanded to see the Ambassador, and ask him to make a press statement supporting the striking Asturian miners, and guaranteeing that money sent by British Trade Unionists to aid their families would actually get there. The group saw the Counsellor, as the Ambassador was said to be away, and when he refused to give a satisfactory answer, declined to leave until he did.

The police were called, and after about half an hour the demonstrators were carried out of the embassy.

Meanwhile, a supporting demonstration was going on outside, with the red

and black flags of anarchism being raised in the unlikely surroundings of Belgravia. At its maximum, the procession of demonstrators numbered over fifty, carrying banners and posters demanding freedom for Spain, the release of imprisoned students and political prisoners, and supporting the strikes.

Press interest was negligible, and resulted in a solitary picture in the *Sunday Telegraph*.

Nevertheless, the protest was important in that it was called by the specifically anarchist and syndicalist movement in London; the Spanish C.N.T. and F.I.J.L., the London Anarchist Group and the Syndicalist Workers' Federation, and supported by members of those organisations and a few libertarian socialists.

## ANARCHY 16

(NOW ON SALE)

discusses

AFRICA

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

# Objections to Anarchism

The Editors, FREEDOM,

I think the idea of a pamphlet, or an issue of ANARCHY, dealing with common objections to anarchism is a good one—so long as the answers are carefully thought out. It probably does more harm to produce a facile 'answer' which obviously avoids difficulties, than to leave the objection unanswered.

For myself, the two most common objections I meet are probably very familiar to you. They are: (1) "Anarchists expect too much of 'Human Nature' (worst form this takes is my most hated cliché 'you can't change human nature') and (2) "Anarchist ideas are hopelessly primitive and could never work in a complex modern society".

I find that the first of these may be the expression of either of two opinions. Firstly, some people seem to have the idea that anarchists intend to bring into being some blissful co-operative utopia, peopled by perfect human beings (whatever they are), where all is sweetness and light, and there are no disagreements, nor even minor struggles. This at least is easy to answer.

Secondly, the above objection may indicate a more accurate conception of anarchism, but arise from a collection of misconceptions about a mythical 'human nature', i.e. the idea that all men, or the majority, or all except the objector, are basically selfish, acquisitive, aggressive, and desire to dominate their fellows.

Of course, with a little effort, one may eventually convince this type of critic that his theories hardly allow for the existence of societies such as the Yanis Indians, or the Arapesh of New Guinea, which have survived, not for a few crisis-ridden centuries, but for a thousand years or more.

At this point the objector generally

## 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

The Incomparable Max (Beerbohm) Ed. S. C. Roberts 36/-  
Woman in Parliament Jean Mann 21/-  
The Shapes of Sleep J. B. Priestley 18/-  
The Three Worlds of Boris Pasternak Robert Payne 18/-

#### REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

The Diamond as Big as the Ritz and other Stories F. Scott Fitzgerald 3/6  
The Soft Voice of the Serpent Nadine Gordimer 3/6  
Drama and Society in the Age of Johnson L. C. Knights 8/6  
Aphrodite Pierre Louys 3/6  
Old Calabria Norman Douglas 12/6  
The Acceptance World Anthony Powell 3/6  
A Buyer's World Anthony Powell 4/-  
A Question of Upbringing Anthony Powell 3/6

#### SECOND-HAND

Spies and Informers D. N. Pritt 5/6; In Defence of the Earth Kenneth Rexroth 4/-; The Dark Side of the Moon (pref. T. S. Eliot) 4/6; The Front Page Ben Hecht and Charles MacArthur 4/-; Hotel in Flight Nancy Johnstone 4/-; The French Eighteenth Century and Revolution V. Saint-Helme 3/-; T.U.C. General Council Report 1957 3/-; Materialism and Empirio Criticism V. I. Lenin 5/-; Pagan Christs J. M. Robertson 30/-; The Nature of Living Matter Lancelot Hogben 5/-; He Walks Alone R. J. Ellis 2/6; The Birth of Tragedy Frederick Nietzsche 5/6; Things to Come J. Middleton Murry 3/6; The Positive Outcome of Philosophy Joseph Dietzgen 5/-; The Acquisitive Society R. H. Tawney 4/-; The Metropolis Upton Sinclair 3/-; Property or Peace? H. N. Brailsford 3/-; The Crucifixion and Resurrection of Jesus W. A. Campbell 4/-; Decentralise for Liberty Thomas Hewes 3/6; Mammont Upton Sinclair 10/-; Landmarks in English Industrial History George Townsend Warner 3/-.

### 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

moves on to number (2) above.

I sometimes feel that even some anarchists share it.

What really bothers me about this one is not so much the suggestion that anarchist ideas of social organisation and control are inadequate, but the assumption that a centralised hierarchic structure (either in industry, or in government) is adequate.

It is a matter of opinion whether anarchist ideas are adequate or not (depending on what you mean by 'anarchist ideas', in the first instance). It would appear, I think, that a very good case could be made in support of the claim that the anarchists have a very good idea of how complex society is, and also of the only possible means whereby such a complex system can maintain itself.

However, it is not a matter of opinion that a system of the complexity of say a large industry cannot be run efficiently by a fixed hierarchic managerial set-up. (It is, in fact, very likely that such a system could not survive at all were it not for informal organisation structures of an anarchic type, existing alongside the formal structure).

This is a necessary result of some of the most basic principles of cybernetics. A prominent figure in this field—Stafford Beer, late of United Steel, has a very nice parable about this.

Imagine a large undertaking, organised along the usual lines with its struc-

ture depicted on the sort of organisation chart common to the theory of management—a pyramidal arrangement with 'lines of communication and command' running up and down the structure from the board of directors, at the top, to shop-floor or department level at the bottom. Beer's parable concerns a little martian scientist who comes down to investigate the earthlings.

He first observes all the people doing their jobs at the first level, the machinery they use, etc., and, being a very clever little martian, he soon works out how they all work, and where their brains come in, and the tremendous complexity of these brains. 'Ah yes', he says, 'quite advanced'. But he doesn't understand the significance of the chart on the wall.

Eventually, someone points it out to him and explains it all—how this varied activity he's seen is controlled through this hierarchic structure and all the complicated managerial set up. The little martian, somewhat shattered, absorbs all this and toddles off to make some calculations—he's well up on information, theory, etc.

Some time later he finishes his calculations and comes back.

"Ah yes", he says "I see it all now—the creatures at the top have heads four yards wide."

Although there are a number of objections to particular details of anarchist views which crop up pretty frequently

THE Americans have a strong regard for individualism and frequently display a healthy disregard for the law. The law in many ways does not seem to have yet subdued the people to a belief in law and order as opposed to individual action irrespective of its legality. In recent years a number of very fine films have been made on this theme of freedom and justice and sometimes, as in *Viva Zapata* dealt with revolution.

Justice and the law were the traditional basis for the Western, the strong individual defending the social order, the sheriff battling it out with the outlaws and in the end the order being eventually established under the law. The wrong doer was brought to justice even if only to pay off the censor for

THE National Film Theatre on South Bank, London has devoted half of its June-July programme to The Anarchist Cinema. Films by Buñuel, Vigo and Franju will be shown, together with programmes on Anarchist Humour (Spike Milligan, *Two Men and a Wardrobe* and *The Mukkinese Battlehorn* with the Goons); Anarchism Today Attention, and *Beware, It's a Grand Life, Sunday and Dom* (from Poland) British Anarchism (1) will include *Thursdays Children, The Vision of William Blake, Via Crucis* and *Four People*. British Anarchism (2) will be a 'live' programme with a film-illustrated talk by Alan Lovell, the organiser of the season and other talks by "British Artists . . . on their own work and in what way it could be called anarchist."

The first programme will be *A propos de Nice* (Vigo), *Le Sang des Bêtes* (Franju) and *Lage d'or* (Buñuel). The Buñuel films will be *Nazarin*; *Abismos de Pasión* (oddly enough, a version of *Wuthering Heights*); *Robinson Crusoe*, and *The Criminal Life of Archibaldo de Cruz*. Franju (who, some may feel a doubtful 'anarchist') contributes *La Tête Contre Les Murs* (*The Keepers*) his shorts including *Hôtel des Invalides* and the horror film, *Eyes Without a Face*. Vigo's *l'Atalante* and *Zéro de Conduite* will be shown as well.

Alan Lovell has given a course of lectures on this subject for the British Film Institute. He has been associated for some time with the Committee of 100 and is a frequent contributor of film criticism to *Peace News*. In the programme he writes:

The anarchist according to the popular myth, is the man who throws bombs at things he doesn't like. Certainly Buñuel, Vigo and Franju's films are often like bombs thrown at the church, the government, the military and other established forms of our society. By itself the explosive nature of these 'bombs' would entitle them to a season at the National Film Theatre. But there is more to their work than this. Their anarchism is not simply a political matter, it is a vision of life. The vision is of life as a conflict between the forces re-

I find that most critics come back to one or the other of the above positions in the end. I may say that anarchist ideas of social organisation appear to me to fit in very well with recent work in cybernetics, in particular in the

theory of 'self-organising systems', although I must emphasise that I have only a very sketchy knowledge of this work.

JOHN D. McEWAN.

Manchester, May 20.

## ... and how control thugs?

I thoroughly agree with your correspondent (A.C. 5/5/62) when he says "most people confuse freedom with licence".

Having read much anarchistic literature and debated with Anarchists in Glasgow; I have come to admire the philosophy intellectually and morally as the perfect system for a degenerating mankind. I have in fact become addicted to Anarchism and aim to help propagate its much needed message; but, alas, there is one point on which I cannot find, nor have I had it reasonably and logically explained to me by other Anarchists. That question is "how in an unpoliced, ungoverned society can one hope to control the ever-growing band of ruffians and thugs who wear drape or Italian modelled suits, and are, or were, called Teddy Boys, and whose vandalism (especially in this town) causes untold damage?"

On the Anarchist broadcast Colin Ward said "Well, probably the anarchist saying everybody knows is Proudhon's dictum that Property is Theft"—"Why should one wish to steal another man's house or his clothes?"

This is all very well, but it does not answer the question regarding the bottle-waving gangster, who is not concerned about property, intent only on fulfilling some animal desire to mutilate, or the

sex maniac who only kills, but by some strange mental quirk does not violate his dead victim (the violation would, I assume, be classed as stealing the sexual property of the victim).

As A.C. says "the anarchist society would have to be a very small one, and composed of kindred spirits".

How sensible that statement is. In order to achieve the perfect anarchistic Utopia one would have to use Himmler's intended tactics and seek to breed the "superman", either by specially arranged marriages or by test-tube experimentations. Because it would otherwise be impossible to (in our densely populated country) to try to create the perfect society without some form of police force to control the element that does not steal capitalistic property, but maims or kills for thrills. Until we answer that question realistically, not theoretically, we will never find the panacea for the number-one enigma that faces an anarchistic colony.

Please do not think I am trying to create problems that may have already been answered (although I have not read them, except in hypothetical form), but I am seeking a sensible explanation to the first question that is usually put to me while spreading the anarchist philosophy, which is—How does one control thugs without a policeman?

Glasgow, May 11. JOHN W. TELFER.

## The Rebellious Americans

the wild time he had had before. But now the hero is changing and it is remarkable that some of the films are allowed through the censor's gate considering the attack they make on the law and its chosen representatives.

Last year saw the release of Brando's *One-Eyed Jacks* which had the unique ending of the outlaw actually killing the sheriff and escaping into freedom and apparently happiness with his beloved. A greater justice than the law was apparent, the sheriff himself being brought to justice by the outlaw, the justice of the traditionally strong individual of the

West, but one who at the end remains the outlaw. A remarkable film.

On general release in London at present, *Lonely Are The Brave* is a film on the same theme. The determined individual opposed to the forces of the law, and this time very much a struggle for freedom itself and not a personal feud of vengeance. It is the individual against the mechanical age, the man of simple faith in the need for personal freedom, opposed to all the things which seek to confine him.

Kirk Douglas gives a laconic performance edged with his own peculiar kind

of physical masculinity and conveys the awesome feeling of just how physically reliant much of the world really is. In the tradition of the West he remains true to his own standards, is patient with the vengeful until made to fight, unafraid of the bully and restrained in his vengeance when his own turn comes, but above all he values his freedom, values it even above love. This is the great virtue of the Western hero, he is not afraid to be alone.

Shot in black and white on a wide screen, in rugged stony country, the film opens with the cowboy snipping the strands of a fence that bars his way, and which stretches across the landscape as far as the eye can see. He rides along easily, man and horse together in a harmony with nature, vastly different from the screaming unseen jet aircraft overhead or the roaring highway which he crosses, or the vulgarity of the car cemetery alongside the human one, just over the road.

The camera and the sound track record these and numerous other forms of this blustering, crude and vulgar society, in which the machines rule and man is coarsened into cruelty and indifference to others, while at the same time he gives his care and adoration to the machine.

In a wonderful piece of satire the cowboy shoots down a pursuing helicopter, a dreadful whirling contraption, piloted by two thoughtlessly hardened men who enjoy the hunt for the hunt's sake without thought for justice. The death throes of this mechanical monster chills the senses, for this crazy machine out of control careering blindly about the rocky canyon is designed to make us think on the implications of machines gone wrong in our gadget-conscious age.

The police are softened by the introduction of a sheriff sympathetic to the struggles of the cowboy trying to get to freedom. The sheriff is at times so sympathetic it begins to be a question why he does his job at all. Perhaps he is caught in the web as well. The woman, typifying the modern woman, consumed with her own fear desperately protecting herself against the savagery of today's 'realistic' world is well drawn and acted. She is just not capable of enough love, driven away from it into dread by the pressures put upon her, so they cannot come together.

No one in fact can come together with the cowboy for his sights are high, he wants freedom without any compromise, and when he is struck down at the end it is senseless, unreasonable death by accident that is not just or unjust, simply death brought about by the entanglement in the blind brutal machine of modern life.

It is a film to be recommended for all those interested in the struggle for individualism in the mechanical society and for justice for the individual in the coldly lawful age. It is a view of the contemporary scene, seen from the eyes of rebellious Americans. K.S.



This drawing by Rufus Segar is from the cover of ANARCHY 6, which was devoted to the Anarchist cinema

## The Anarchist Cinema

presented by organisation, power and violence and the forces represented by freedom, growth and spontaneity. This vision is so forcefully created that once you have entered their world you cannot forget it; it haunts you with its menace, its excitement, its outbursts of violence, its poetry. Above all, the anarchist cinema is a contemporary cinema. It has an immediate relevance to the age of totalitarian states and H-bombs, of concentration camps and torture, of protests and revolutions.

It would be wrong, as is too often done, to put the stress on the destructive side of the anarchists. The quality that one responds to most in all their films is the sense of what life, at its best, is like. You can see the quality most obviously in the children in *Zéro de Conduite*, in the lovers in *L'Atalante* and *The Keepers*. More surprisingly you see it in the sympathy Franju has for the 'executioners' in *Sang des Bêtes*, in the sympathy that Buñuel shows for Nazarin and Viridiana, the hero and heroine whom he

attacks so strongly. Indeed Buñuel's criticism of neo-realism provides a good introduction to the season, "Neo-realist reality is incomplete, official and altogether reasonable; but the poetry, the mystery, everything which completes and enlarges tangible reality is completely missing from its work." This programme is interspersed with a series on the Art of Persuasion including *Battleship "Potemkin"*, *Ohm Kruger*, *The German Story*, *This Happy Breed*, *Land Without Bread* (Buñuel), *USA 1962*, *Triumph of the Will* and *Baptism of Fire*. At the same time the Monday showings of Films from the Archives, such as *Intolerance* and *Caligari* continue.

Admission to these films is to members only, and the National Film Theatre has done a great deal of good work in reviving and preserving old films. Through the British Film Institute they have also worked to sponsor amateur films.

This programme promises to put anarchism on the cinema map, but one could wish for an Anarchist Film Society to show for example, early Marx Brothers, *Viva Zapata*, *Winterset*, *The Front Page* and films of the Spanish War. J.R.

## OLD SOLDIERS NEVER DIE

Continued from page 1

It could be argued that by negotiating from strength he could impose conditions which would favour the French, but in fact there is no evidence that the French delegation at the Evian discussions with the FLN managed to get away with anything on the strength of their present military "superiority" in Algeria. So the question remains and if it can be shown that thousands have died in Algeria to satisfy de Gaulle's pride, which of the generals is the biggest criminal, Salan or de Gaulle?

★

PERHAPS it is asking too much that French opinion should weigh the guilt of the leading actors in the Algerian tragedy in anything but the scales . . . of the law. What has for instance, been the reaction to the verdict in the Salan trial? The French Minister of Information is reported as saying after a Cabinet meeting called to consider the verdict that it was "a blow to the forces of order and to the police in general"; the parliamentary group of de Gaulle's own party, the U.N.R., considered that the court's leniency towards Salan created "a civil war atmosphere"; the Socialist Party's journal *le Populaire* calls it "an in-

## Justice and the Law

BROADLY speaking the role of the judiciary is two-fold: on the one hand that of interpreting the law and directing the jury on it as well as summarising for them the evidence as presented, on the other of deciding which of a range of punishments which it can award fits the "crime". In both of these roles human fallibility can play an important part for or against the "accused". Because the law profession is large and full of potential and successful careerists, it is, at the same time, both a freemasonry and a jungle. This ensures that a wrong interpretation of the law, or a biased summing-up by a judge will not pass unchallenged by the defence which is as interested in winning its cases and for the same reasons, as the shopkeeper is in selling an ever-increasing quantity of goods. Judges, with a few exceptions, are therefore careful to operate this part of the game according to the rules. But when it comes to punishment the judge is vested with powers denied even to the government which makes the laws he administers.

In theory, that is, since in this country, at least, it is the government which appoints the judges, and one is surely justified in assuming that political considerations as well as the legal eminence of the candidates, determine the choice. For if the considerations are that the best man shall occupy the post why is it that, invariably, with a change of government, there is a change of Lord Chancellor? And, incidentally, the Judge Advocate-General (the Chief-Judge Martial—an army official) is also appointed by the Lord Chancellor. The latter and any of his predecessors who are still alive plus the Lord Chief Justice, 7 Lords of Appeal in Ordinary, the Master of the Rolls and the President of the Probate, Divorce and Admiralty Division, compose the highest Court of Appeal, the House of Lords. The independence—that is from the policies of the government in power—of the judiciary is, to our minds, another of the myths

centive to crime"; the French Communist Party in a special statement said that the verdict was "inspired by class complicity, encourages the subversive activities of the O.A.S. and increases the fascist danger"; Louis Joxe, Minister for Algerian Affairs, according to the *New York Times*, told the Cabinet that the judgment could constitute "a blow to the morale" of the security forces. The same source "understands" that de Gaulle himself "expressed his anger at the verdict in the strongest terms" and without wasting much time about it he has sacked the Tribunal which was after all his personal creation. In general the political left was "outraged" and the political right was "delighted" by the verdict.

We find these reactions illuminating as well as typical of authoritarians who prate about the independence of the judiciary and the majesty of the law and who are "outraged" however, when it doesn't do what is expected of it, or reveals only too clearly that under the judicial wigs or the bald pates lurk human beings with all the weaknesses, the prejudices, the preferences and the interests common to all mortals, including the man in the dock.

which the politicians of the "democracies" use to brainwash the people into believing that "justice", the "law" are sacred heritages which no government can assail. In Russia they do the same thing; they even go a step further by declaring that the judiciary represents the interests of "the people"!

But even in the domain of punishment where we think judges have tremendous power to give vent to their personal likes and dislikes, to prejudices, and to pathological impulses—after all the victim can only appeal against sentence to a Court composed of judges of the same ilk who are as liable to increase it as they are to decrease it—governments, and the nation's gutter Press exert their influence and pressure in no uncertain terms, especially when the pressure is for more severe punishment. The judiciary are notoriously reactionary, and whereas they are only too willing to implement a government policy which calls for stern measures (e.g. the savage sentences following the Notting Hill race riots, or bank robberies with violence) they are equally reluctant to curb their own powers when a government shows a degree of enlightenment in its attitude to some forms of "crime" (e.g. homosexuality), or to the effectiveness of other forms of punishment (e.g. capital punishment) or to the possibilities of psychiatric treatment rather than punishment. With few notable exceptions the Judges of this country have been voluble, and some even pathological in their resistance to all more enlightened ways of dealing with "criminals". The zeal with which they cling to the "cat" and the rope makes one almost doubt that when from their judicial bench they express their "horror" at "the most disgusting" case they have ever had to hear, they are really being sincere, at least, in the indignation they are supposed to be expressing.

★

IT has recently been suggested in two most interesting articles by Colin MacInnes (wasted, we fear on

# But what does it mean?

ON reading a letter, an article or a book, we should of course try to discover what it means, but we should also be prepared to find that it means nothing. It is possible to string together a lot of words and phrases to give a semblance of a reasoned discourse, but by the use of suitably vague terms, to signify nothing beyond that which could be conveyed, by a more or less animal noise (Yah! Boo! Ugh! Yippee!). But if someone makes such a noise, or says simply "I don't like you", "You disgust me", "I think you're fine!", he shows a personal preference which may reveal more about the critic than the object of his criticism. The mask of pseudo-reason is therefore adopted. Indeed, it is the mark of a distinguished and accomplished hypocrite (Greek: *hupokrites* = an actor) that he knows how to use a lot of words, many of them emotionally loaded, and say precisely nothing relevant to his conclusions. The priest, the barrister and the politician must learn this art of saying much and meaning little, and of avoiding words of precise meaning.

If we are interested in ideas, rather than being content with the emotions engendered by animal noises, or simple cries of hatred or approval, then we should learn to study all that we read with the object of discovering what it means, if anything. We should not be content with terms which beg the question or which are utterly vague in meaning.

A letter in FREEDOM from A.C. invites such a critical exercise. That I pick upon this letter to dissect, among dozens of others, does not imply that I regard it as uniquely woolly or its writer as specially confused. He feels he wants to protest—and so he does in his own way.

Writing of anarchists he makes two allegations: (a) they are unable "to see their fellow men as they are", and (b) they fail "to comprehend that most people confuse freedom with licence". He goes on to discuss (a) in terms of how he sees his fellow men to be, but he leaves the terms "freedom" and "licence" unexplained. Later he refers to "true freedom". Is "true freedom" different from "freedom", and what does "licence" mean? Lacking any definition of the term by the writer, I look it up in the dictionary and find two meanings. "Licence. Leave, permission; from the government, etc. to marry, print something, preach, carry on some trade . . . Liberty of action especially when excessive, abuse of freedom, disregard of law or propriety . . ." Obviously the writer invokes the second meaning of the word; he implies that most people confuse freedom with excessive liberty of action and the abuse of freedom. But having made this statement and thus begun the preliminaries

for an argument (e.g. who is to define what is excess in liberty of action?) he goes no further.

"One may condition people to certain ways of behaviour, but a sense of true freedom requires a magnitude of spirit which is inborn". And what on earth does "a magnitude of spirit" mean? Has it any meaning? He states that there is a great deal of difference between the capacity of a man like Schweitzer and that of a racing tipster, which seems to me a reasonable enough assessment of capacity, and then goes on to say, "It used to be called the soul. Now it is the genes. Whatever it is, the capacity for thought and intellectual honesty is given only to a few". Indeed? When was such a peculiar meaning given to the term "soul", and when was the term "soul" replaced by "genes".

As it stands this stuff is utter confusion. But the reader may catch the drift of what the writer was apparently trying to say, i.e. that there are great differences between the capacities of different men, and these differences are the result of genetic, that is, inborn factors and not of factors associated with learning and environment. I make this assumption about the most probable meaning behind his rhetoric because he goes on to reiterate the old, old idea that, "the majority are slaves—to their acquisitiveness, their lusts, and whatever God's upbringing or choice has given them. These people must be governed because they are incapable of moral responsibility." The bit about "God's upbringing or choice" is a little obscure, but the rest is mere parrot-talk, and he does not acknowledge the source of his repeating.

Now it may seem unkind of me that I should pick on and pillory a rather indifferent letter which has been printed in FREEDOM, in slightly different forms, many times before. But by studying the mechanism of the standard brickbat letter in its more elementary forms we learn something of the nature of its more sophisticated counterparts. Some people express their animosity to their fellow men in general, and to libertarian philosophies in particular, by throwing over-ripe tomatoes. Others use bits of ill-digested Aristotle after the fashion of missiles. When criticisms are ill-written and obviously confused they impress no one, but I suggest that no greater respect should be paid to objections which come from more sophisticated sources. Men of sophistication, ability, power and superior education also suffer from hatred of the mass of humanity and have very strong reasons for wishing to discredit anarchism. Whether their brickbats are dressed up as sermons, political essays or philosophical treatises, they are also susceptible to critical dissection. The principal tool of analysis, I suggest, is to examine

closely the terms they use. Earlier I have questioned the usefulness of the term "licence", as it has a built-in acceptance of the idea that only such liberty as is granted by government or similar authority is not an abuse of freedom.

It is no novel idea that the words we use can serve the purpose of confusion rather than communication. Perhaps the most sinister aspect of Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-four* was "Newspeak", the new language in which "thoughtcrime" would be impossible. Authoritarian systems of thought depend upon the existence of words which beg the question. If a word like "sin" is used, certain theological assumptions are already accepted and we cannot get outside their framework. And when the question turns on some question such as "national honour" what are we to say? We can demand "What precisely do you mean by 'national honour'?" but I fear it only leads to a rehash of that superb speech Bonar Thompson used to give about "The great and glorious Cause of gabble, gabble, gabble, quack, quack, quack!"

G.

## The Spanish Strikes

The actual situation in Spain as a result of the strikes in the North which have lasted for several weeks is obscure. Last week's reports seemed to indicate that they were spreading to Barcelona and to a lesser extent to Madrid but latest reports do not give the impression that the strike movement is developing. Last Sunday Franco in his first public speech since the strikes began told a rally of 15,000 "veterans of the civil war" that the episodes in North Spain had been "encouraged from abroad and by lay organisations of the Church . . . Our enemies have taken advantage of minor failures of our labour organisations". *Reuter* reports from Madrid state that: "According to usually reliable political sources here, General Franco is expected to change his Government in the coming weeks. The strike appears to be receding now, and when it is over the general is likely to form what will be his sixth Cabinet since the Civil War ended."

It is expected that to meet the unrest shown by the workers he will call in Catholic and Syndicalist-Falangist leaders to carry out a programme including agrarian reform, a 10-year economic plan, and social betterment."

## Brazil's Expropriation Decree

President Goulart has signed a decree in Rio de Janeiro which was approved by the Council of Ministers establishing norms for expropriation of foreign public utility companies operating on an inter-state or national basis. The complete text of the decree is still unknown but the main points are reported to be:

A commission to report to the Council on which companies should be expropriated and to negotiate the terms of expropriation and conditions of reimbursement to shareholders.

Up to 10 per cent of the total value is to be paid immediately and the rest in instalments out of the companies' own earnings where possible with foreign exchange payments being kept to a minimum. The companies will have to agree to reinvest at least 75 per cent of the net receipts in Brazilian enterprises as defined by the National Planning Commission, and not in financing or participating in any Brazilian company already operating.

No companies are specifically mentioned in the decree, but the Canadian-owned Brazilian Traction Co. and the American Foreign Power Co. are at present engaged in inter-state operations.

What will the Kennedy Administration do about that? Will they give Brazil the Cuba treatment, or will they find a face-saving formula, such as calling expropriation by some other name!

the readers of the magazine *Queen*) that the assumption on which the anarchist philosophy is based is that of "innate human goodness". The evidence that anarchists have been advancing unceasingly makes nonsense of this assumption. If we believed in "innate"—that is inborn, natural—human goodness would we oppose all systems, all institutions based on authority. Conversely why do those who criticise anarchism on the grounds that mankind is basically wicked display such blind faith in the wisdom, and righteousness of political and religious "leaders"?

We do not for one moment believe in the independence of the judiciary, however independent they may appear to be on paper, for the reasons already elaborated above: that they are appointed by the government and that no individual in a position of power is capable of a judgment independent of his own prejudices and interests. The verdict of the Court in the Salan trial is a text book illustration of this anarchist contention. On the question of law there was no doubt as to his guilt. Salan in his statement when the trial opened saved them any head-scratching, or legal hair-splitting on the subject: "I am the leader of the O.A.S. My responsi-

bility is therefore complete". It was on the degree of guilt that the judges were vested with the powers of life and death over their prisoner. What were the "extenuating circumstances" which saved him from the firing squad, if not their own sympathies for him personally? To our minds a perfectly understandable and human reaction, but this is also the argument against the system which places power in the hands of individuals to dispose of the life and liberty of their fellow beings. For just as sympathy for the prisoner prejudices the judge in his favour, so antipathy for him, or a pathological dislike for the "crime" of which he has been found guilty, will prejudice the judge against him.

★

THE achievement of an anarchist society does not depend on men and women becoming angels. Anarchist propaganda has always sought to demonstrate that no man is able to run another's life for him better than he can himself; and that any man who has power over the lives of others will invariably be corrupted by that power. When enough people realise the truth of these statements then will the road to freedom be open.

## Summerhill and Anarchy

Colin Ward in the B.B.C. talk claimed that Summerhill was run on anarchy principles. I have never understood anarchy myself and am a subscriber to FREEDOM simply because it is the only journal that is open-minded about Reich and myself. So I'd like Ward or someone else to explain why my school fits into anarchy.

To me it is the Establishment with a difference. Votes send M.P.s to Westminster; votes in our general meeting make laws. In each case the minority is out. One difference is apparent; in our own meetings we speak and vote directly, not via representatives. Another difference of course is that we are a real democracy. I don't make the laws, only one or two life safety and health ones. We have no House of Lords nor any Cabinet.

I see the snag in majority rule, inclining to Ibsen's: "The majority never has right on its side," but I can't see the alternative in practice. Nor can I see an alternative to token punishments. Ian Leslie says that Burgess Hill had sanctions instead of rules. I don't know the difference. In Summerhill a punishment, a small fine, may appear to have no effect, but in the long run it has this effect, that no child is happy if not approved of by his fellows.

I once taught in a progressive school which needed no punishments of any kind. The moral authority of the headmaster was so strong that, well, in two years I never heard a four letter word. Anyway Summerhill grew by itself. I didn't start out with proposing punishments; the group took them for granted.

A word more about Ian Leslie. He writes: "We are still without experience of how a really healthy group of children would develop in an environment of freedom." Like Joad one can ask: What do you mean by healthy? To me healthy means balanced, aware, tolerant, capable of facing life and work, as un-neurotic about sex as is possible in an anti-sex civilisation. With this criterion I can think of dozens of old

pupils who are healthy, and quite a few who are high academically... two old boys have just sent me their latest books. One on maths I can't even decipher; the other, a critique of Marxism is almost too deep for my grasp. Ian's article gives me the impression that he is being bitten by the licence, not the freedom bug.

But, back to where I came in, please tell me why Summerhill fits into anarchism.

A. S. NEILL.

## Burgess Hill School

DEAR SIR,

It is with regret, if not indeed with despair, that all of us who are concerned with real education note the closure of Burgess Hill school.

For what we are witnessing is not merely the loss of a single school but another item in the trend which already seriously threatens the very existence of educational experiment in this country.

Ostensibly, lack of funds has been the enemy and ultimate murderer, of many fine progressive schools, based on the ideas of Neill and started during or since the more general radical thought of the 30's. Yet the finance of independent schools is simply a matter of public opinion. A school either appeals, and therefore gets pupils (cash), or does not. That the latter is increasingly true in the case of genuinely progressive schools, is a reflection in the trend of public thinking on education.

The results are, of course, inevitable, and can already be seen. One either chooses to be faithful to a bold and hugely important attempt to improve society, and consequently be driven slowly, but with awful certainty, to economic, domestic and social havoc, and ultimate closure: viz., Long Dene, Beltane and others (now of course, Burgess Hill), or one abandons serious experiment in order to meet the demands of a sick society and the school balance sheet. The Dartington of Hu. Child is a classic illustration of this.

In the ordinary course of Nature, Neill himself cannot hope for many more years. Are we then to be left with the spectacle of Kilquany House, in Scotland, alone seeking to maintain some sanity amid our educational shambles?

As one who was educated on Summerhill lines, I feel that the State Primary school in which I now teach, has already, in certain respects, surpassed the Bedales, latter day Dartingtons, and other so-called progressive establishments, yet one also feels oneself to be ultimately in the hands of governments, and working in a severely limited environment.

What is one to do, either as a teacher or a parent? Must we anticipate an end to independent experiment, and with it the alternative to Eton or the State? And if so, what hope can we hold for a healthy future society?

I should welcome the views of other FREEDOM readers.

Yours faithfully,

NEILL M. AITKENHEAD.

Bristol, May 14.

## An Advocate of Workers' Control

An engine-driver has had 30,000 leaflets printed in an effort to save the Western Region of British Railways from more closures.

Mr. Trevor Curtis, aged 46, of Gendros, Swansea, is to distribute the leaflets to colleagues in the region. They call for the formation of a committee of action. The leaflets say:

"The railways are now being subjected to hammer and chisel surgery, sounding the death knell with an icy stare for railwaymen of all ranks and people concerned with railways, leaving many small townships without a ray of hope for future development."

Railwaymen were fully aware of "the fantastic waste of money on the railways, and of the disastrous effects of increased fares and freight charges." The railways could become the cheapest and safest form of transport. But only if taken out of the hands of the bureaucrats."

Mr. Curtis said yesterday that Dr. Beeching was "the surgeon using the hammer and chisel." He realised his action could be described as rebellious and that he was running the risk of being dismissed. He added: "It is a chance I have to take."

The railwaymen themselves could run the railways more economically. Nationalisation had been a failure and he was advocating the overthrow of the British Transport Commission.

(Guardian).

# Letters

## Private Public Survey on that Broadcast

DEAR SIR,

I was surprised to read the criticisms of the broadcast on Anarchism in FREEDOM as, although I unfortunately missed same, I compiled some illuminating reactions to it from 26 people. Exactly half of them had never heard of Anarchism before; eight knew of it only through myself; and five were fairly well acquainted. All of them were interested in the case put forward by Colin Ward—the only criticism running on the lines "he was too polite to those bastards". This is possibly unfair but indicative. Without elevating my findings to the level of "T.A.M. ratings", none of the thirteen who had not heard of Anarchism before, had much difficulty in assimilating at least some of the points made, despite the speed. It undoubtedly proved to them there was one clear "anti-establishment" voice, and several wished to know more about it.

## 750 New Readers wanted this year

## Church Censorship in England: Medical Students' Paper Suppressed

HAPPILY there is nothing in this country like the Opus Dei in Spain; religious bigots who wish to censor other people's periodicals have no legal force, and must rely on more subtle weapons. But they are sometimes horribly successful.

In April of this year a London medical students' paper, "The Middlesex Hospital Journal", published a series of articles on "Family Planning". These included, among religious, medical and

student viewpoints, an article by the eminent gynaecologist Helena Wright, who advocated "trial marriages" and instruction for young people in the use of contraceptives.

Dr. Wright explained that she was dealing only with technicalities of sex and birth control, not the moral question. "Whether freedom of sexual intercourse without intention of marriage has a good or bad influence is too large a question for discussion here."

Unfortunately a copy of the journal came to the notice of the editors of "Church Times," who insisted on discussing the moral question, from their own particular anti-life standpoint. They deplored Dr. Wright's attitude, boasted that they had managed to get a similar article suppressed in the British Medical Association's booklet "Getting Married", and demanded that the governors of the hospital issue an immediate public disclaimer and ensure "that nothing of the kind was allowed to appear again."

The following week "Church Times" published letters of protest from the chaplain of the Middlesex Hospital the editor of "The Middlesex Hospital Journal" and others. But it called the arguments "specious but unworthy" and insisted that Dr. Wright's article was "an appeal for positive action likely to undermine the morality of students." The governors of the hospital received many letters from readers of the "Church Times", and called a meeting, at which it was decided that if the journal wished to continue it must change its name, so that the governors of the hospital would not again be blamed for its contents.

The Dean of the medical school, Sir Brian Windey, was unable to be present at this meeting, but he called a meeting of undergraduates later. Medical students are not usually interested in meetings, but this time over half the school was present. Sir Brian thought it would be a pity if "The Middlesex Hospital Journal" had to change its name after 65 years, so he decided it should discontinue publication instead, "until some arrangements could be made."

The students have since had another meeting, at which, I am told they sensibly decided to give the affair time to blow over before taking further action.

D.R.

## FREEDOM

by the continued making of the pistol—which can only be used for murder—which has no defence value whatever (the most ardent defender of police and army cannot claim they really need it, since they have no need to conceal their arms)—and supplies of which are always readily available to any criminal, solely because of its profitability. This is as significant, in its way, as the atom bomb.

It is has often seemed to me a mistake to treat the question of capital punishment as if it were a sort of half-way house to the main question of the abolition of prisons. The public is ready and willing to listen to the case for abolishing prisons, which in their present form represent the 19th century prison reform mentality—a monument to the stupidity of past do-gooders. Even Statist penologists are coming to realise the need for abolishing prisons. What holds the public back from greater support of this measure is the fear of violent criminals being loose—murderers in particular. It could have been educated to accept the abolition of prisons, had the issue of capital punishment been less to the fore than it has been. But the 20th century do-gooders have concentrated on the abolition of capital punishment, as an alternative to which they have put forward more sentences of imprisonment. London, W.C.1. A. MELTZER.

## LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP CENTRAL MEETINGS

meetings to be held at  
The Two Brewers,  
40 Monmouth Street, WC2  
(Leicester Square Tube)  
Sundays at 7.30 p.m.

JUNE 3 Jack Robinson:  
Evolution or Revolution?

JUNE 10 Raya Dunayevskaya:  
A Marxist-Humanist's Visit to  
West Africa.

JUNE 17 Nicolas Walter:  
The Committee of 100

## OFF-CENTRE DISCUSSION MEETINGS

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

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

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

Last Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. Tom Barnes', Albion Cottage, Fortis Green, N.2. (3rd door past Tudor Hotel).

Last Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Laurens and Celia Otter's, 57 Ladbrooke Road, W11 (for May and June).

## ANARCHY Nos 1-15 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.

## MONEY!

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT  
MAY 26th, 1962

Week 21  
EXPENSES: 21 weeks at £70 £1,470  
INCOME:

Sales & Sub. Renewals: £ £  
Weeks 1-19 ... 927  
Weeks 20-21 ... 49  
— 976

New Subscriptions:  
Weeks 1-19 (149) 171  
Weeks 20-21 (23) 26  
— 197

1,173  
DEFICIT £297

### DEFICIT FUND

Sale: D.F.M. 8/-; Glasgow: J.H.\* 2/6;  
Surrey: F.B.\* 10/-; Bordighera: K.W. 8/-;  
Southend: P.O.\* 5/-; Hartford, Conn.:  
M.G.A.\* £1/4/6; Dudley: M.E.H. 3/-; Wol-  
verhampton: J.K.W.\* 2/-; Wolverhampton:  
J.G.L.\* 2/6; Bilston: J.W.P. 2/6; London:  
S.B. 3/-; Hounslow: L.\* 2/6; London: C.P.O.  
6/4; Glasgow: J.H.\* 3/6; Sittingbourne:  
J.M. 5/6; Wolverhampton: J.L.\* 2/6; Wol-  
verhampton: J.K.W.\* 2/-; Hounslow: L.\*  
2/6; London: K.A.B. 10/-; Cambridge: J.R.  
1/4; London: B.D. 1/4; London: P. & G.T.\*  
2/6; Cardiff: M.G. 8/-; Hailsham: A.A.  
11/-; Victoria, Aust: Italian Comrades (per  
B.F.) £15/18/8; Wembley: F.E.S. 6/-.

TOTAL ... 22 14 8  
Previously acknowledged 594 10 5

1962 TOTAL TO DATE £617 5 1

\*Denotes regular contributors.

## 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.

### 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/-

### 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/-  
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