

FREEDOM

JULY 14 1962 Vol 23 No 22

'Government and society are two distinct entities and care must be taken not to confound them. Society is the growth of mutual tolerance, friendship, and obligation; but government arises from physical force applied by the strong to the control and exploitation of vanquished foes.'

RAGNAR REDBEARD.

In this Issue:

ACADEMIC AUTONOMY
ANARCHISTS AND THE
WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT
OUT OF THIS WORLD
CORRESPONDENCE

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

"FREEDOM of Speech is a first condition of a free society" wrote the *Guardian* in the opening sentence of its editorial on the Trafalgar Square meeting organised last Sunday week by the so-called British National Socialist Movement. We agree. The "problems" that arise from the exercise of free speech today stem from the fact that we do not live in a free society! Obvious as this observation will appear to our readers, it is clear that it has not even occurred to the *Guardian* editorial writer and to millions of our fellow citizens who blithely refer to the free-society, the free-press, free-speech, free this- and free-that without for one moment asking themselves what these freedoms really mean. Some will define them by referring to the complete lack of them in the only totalitarian countries. Others will demand legislation either to guarantee them for the "right kind of ideas" or in order to curb the "wrong kind of ideas", without it entering their heads that in so doing they are revealing that they are authoritarians and not libertarians!

A free society is one in which no man has the power to coerce his fellow beings, or to deny them the equal right to eat, to express their views and to develop as free, responsible human beings. The basis, therefore of the free society is that while every individual will be free to express his "power" no group or class within that society will possess the physical means to dominate or coerce others or deny them access to the means of production. The basis of the society we live in denies all these principles. In this country,

'Free Speech'

as Prof Titmuss was pointing out in last Saturday's radio programme on "Poverty", one per cent of the population owns nearly half the nation's wealth—a bad start for the much-vaunted "free society". And the "free Press"? Take away Beaverbrook, Cecil King, Roy Thompson, Camrose and one or two other Fleet Street millionaires, and what is left of it? It will be said that what is left, which includes periodicals of every shade of religious, political and social opinion, among them FREEDOM and ANARCHY, is proof of the existence of a Free Press. We would argue instead that what exists is a combination of hard-won "rights" and tolerance by a ruling class which feels itself and the system sufficiently secure to allow expression of minority opinions. But a free press cannot exist where communications are monop-

olised by members of the privileged one per cent of the community or can be restricted, proscribed and controlled by any "higher authority".

To say that it does so legally is to beg the question of freedom. Every dictatorship legalises its barbarities. What has freedom to do with legality? In France during these past seven years every government has voted itself powers to suppress press opinion on Algerian affairs. How many times have those two respectable, and widely-read journals *l'Express* and *France Observateur* had their editions seized at the printers by the police because they dared criticize the "Colonels" and the "paras", with facts? Now of course de Gaulle agrees with them and is even prepared to line-up the colonels in front of the firing squad!

Limited, it ceases to exist

SECTION 5 of the Public Order Act of 1936 sets the limits of "free speech" in our unfree society:

Any person who in any public place or at any public meeting uses threatening, abusive, or insulting words or behaviour with intent to provoke a breach of the peace or whereby a breach of the peace is likely to be occasioned, shall be guilty of an offence.

We agree with the *Guardian* writer that "this leaves plenty of room for argument about definitions", but disagree when they say

that these are however "fairly well understood limits". The example they give, with its emotional overtones will obviously seem more than reasonable to, and acceptable by, the general public.

To vilify the Jewish people and to praise Hitlerism, as speakers at a Trafalgar Square meeting on Sunday are reported to have done, is likely to provoke a riot if there are people in the audience

MORE THAN FIFTY West German judges and prosecutors have asked for their premature retirement because "they felt uneasy about their activities" in the Nazi era. This was in response to a federal law requesting this ("if they in any way feel uneasy"), or the prospect of dismissal. According to the *Guardian* British advertising men are told that Germans are suspicious of slogans, and personalities are virtually unknown as boosters of sales.

General Hans Spiedel, Supreme Commander of Allied Land Forces in Central Europe won his libel action against Plato Films and others for the implications in *Operation Teutonic Sword*, a film, that he had been party to the murder of King Alexander and that he was the betrayer of Rommel to the Nazis. Policemen in Munich are being greeted with shouts of "Vopo" (East German Volkspolizei) after last week's riots and beatings-up.

The *Guardian* CLAIMS that the National Socialist Party has thirty-five members and as many probationers and supporters. Coventry's director of education said "This man is a source of tremendous embarrassment to the education authority . . . we feel that to sack him out of hand would make him something of a martyr, perhaps something that Mr. Jordan would like, and we don't want to do that. We have no evidence that he has ever expressed his views either to the school staff or in the classrooms." Flavus of the *New Statesman* said that Colin Jordan was, he suspected, obsessed with some personal inadequacy, real or imagined, and the victim of a monstrous inferiority complex. Not really dangerous 'but, pathetic and nasty'. On Wednesday, Mr Jordan was suspended on pay pending consideration by the school governors. He said "If this is a foretaste of martyrdom, then martyrdom is not a pleasant thing. I knew when I ventured into this that anything and everything would be thrown at me." Asked if he was happy to be called a Nazi, he said, "I am not happy, but it is a cross you have to bear. Our movement is not concerned with petty brawling and brutalities. We want to make Britain white". . . .

in the Unfree Society

whose families and friends have been the victims of the Nazis or were killed in the war against them.

On this basis then no political minorities should be allowed to express their ideas, good or bad, in public because clearly they must inevitably clash with the majority opinions, and "may lead to riots", etc. Pacifist speakers will undoubtedly provoke ex-servicemen in their audience; anarchist speakers will make capitalist listeners in their audience see red; an atheist speaker will provoke devout believers in his audience to the point where they might want to burn him at the stake; Gaitskell is like a red rag to a bull for some socialists; a food reformer who denounces the "cotton wool" that passes as bread to an audience including master-bakers may well provoke them to acts of violence such as frog-marching him off to the nearest bakery and rolling him in the flour bin.

The moment limits are placed on free speech, it ceases to exist, and there is no telling where the process

will end. We are always being reminded that free speech is one thing, licence another. How does one abuse free speech? By saying the "wrong" things instead of the "right" ones? In that case who is to determine what is right and what is wrong in the realm of ideas?

We have had many discussions with people whose ideas, religious, political or social, seemed to us nauseating, pitiful, reactionary or just plain stupid. They have never provoked us to start a riot or resort to fisticuffs to prove who is right. We have either abandoned the discussion as a waste of time, or have been provoked to expose our own ideas with a fluency which was highly convincing to us whatever may have been the long- or short-term effect on our interlocutors! And as most readers will know by now, this writer does not believe in the non-violent, "love and conciliation" approach to our oppressors. We have no doubts whatsoever that what we consider to be "bad" ideas can only be fought with other ideas: "good" ideas. Legislation curbing freedom of speech, may make life easier for the Commissioner of Police, but does not rid us of anti-social, racist hates and prejudices; it simply drives them underground. The three speakers at the Trafalgar Square "rally" may be rabble-rousers, but above all they are the symbols of a disease which is widespread, and flourishes and is contagious among what we would call ignorant, unthinking people; that is among those who seek scape-

Continued on page 3

New Secret US Base in Pacific 'Ready to Fire'

ANYONE who imagines that the present series of nuclear tests in the Pacific will end U.S. military activities in that area will soon be sadly disillusioned.

One of the largest Pacific Island construction projects undertaken in peacetime—and almost certainly the most secret—is almost finished.

It is the three-year 75 million dollar construction of a huge missile-launching base at Kwajalein, some 4,200 miles south-west of San Francisco and 2,700 miles north-east of Australia in the Marshall Islands.

This secret installation is due to commence operations soon, when tests of

the U.S. Army's Nike-Zeus anti-missile missile will begin.

Nike-Zeus is designed to be able to hit enemy missiles in space. The new installations at Kwajalein will launch the Nike-Zeus against target nose cones launched towards Kwajalein from Vandenberg Air Force Base in Southern California. It is believed that there will be an initial firing of 47 Atlas and Titan inter-continental ballistic missiles, each costing several million dollars.

The target nose cones will be intercepted by electronic means, not actually by Nike-Zeus explosive war-heads. The U.S. Dept. of Defence has already clamped rigid security restrictions on the area and does not intend issuing any communiques during the testings.

High priority has been given to the Kwajalein project. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has used contractors from Honolulu, Alaska and San Antonio, Texas to complete the rocket-launching pads.

The new radar transmitters are of such power that humans are not allowed within several hundred feet (access is by a 290 foot tunnel).

A 200 by 200 foot building provides air-conditioned housing for technical offices, scientific and machine shops. The main radar building is a steel and concrete structure 100 by 100 feet and 40 feet high.

The U.S. Army, Navy and Air Force are all involved in the experiments. The Army will attempt to catch missiles fired by the Air Force down the Pacific Missile Range, which is operated by the Navy. A.A.G.

Out of this World

ONLY 10 WEST INDIAN immigrants for Britain instead of the normal 250 left Kingston, Jamaica. Danny Blanchflower received protests at his work as a trainer with a segregated South African soccer club.

THE COMMITTEE OF 100 was refused the use of Trafalgar Square 'in the absence of written assurances that the meeting would not be used to advocate or advertise by speech or in the distribution of literature a future act of civil disobedience.' Thirty-five people, mainly Christians, wearing the Yellow Star of David, kept vigil on the steps of St. Martins-in-the-Fields during the National Socialist Meeting. Olgar Levertoff, speaker on nuclear disarmament, effectively kept the National Socialists from holding a meeting at Charing Cross Road by speaking for two hours without yielding the pitch. The Nationalists got tired and left. The Empire Loyalists interrupted a C.N.D. meeting to publicize the Caravan Campaign but were ejected by non-pacifists. Demonstrators threw tomatoes at Dr. Adenauer's car in Paris. The spokesman for the German panzers in Castlemartin said they had all been "very impressed by the discipline and correctness of the demonstrators". . . .

HILLINGDON HOSPITAL REPORTED that the conditions of Dr. Soblen, who was sentenced to life imprisonment, deported from Israel, attempted to commit suicide and is reported to be suffering from leukemia is "satisfactory". He is applying for a writ of *habeas corpus*. The defence counsel for the O.A.S. commander shot for terrorist activities, claimed that the execution was bungled, his client was still alive even after the

coup de grace was given. A doctor was called seven minutes later and the condemned man was shot dead after eleven minutes. The French Ministry of Defence have issued a denial. General de Gaulle paid homage at the funeral of a French General who shot himself because 'he had not the mental or physical strength' to serve on the new Military Tribunal to try O.A.S. plotters. A memorial by 6,825 prominent men and women was presented by a deputation asking for urgent steps to abolish capital punishment for murder. The Archbishop of Canterbury's signature was absent because he has already declared his opposition.

It is alleged by the Committee of 100 that the police used force to get fingerprints after the Greenham Common demonstration. Barry Walker (17) had his clenched hand forced open by two policemen. John Tremain was taken into a room by four policemen who forced a paperclip under his nail and said that if he didn't give his fingerprints his nail would be torn off and they would say it happened in a scuffle. He gave his fingerprints. A woman who refused to give her name was jailed for a month for her part in the sit-down. 38 other people were fined a total of £152 with £104 14s. costs. A computer programmer in the Pentagon quit his job and joined the picket against the Pentagon by non-violent demonstrators. . . .

A MAN WAS sent to prison for two months for assaulting a police sergeant with a hot meat pie. He said when charged, "I only hit you with a pie." A man charged in London with assault was defended and prosecuted by identical twins. A former warder in Fremantle (Australia) is serving a two month sentence in his old prison for taking a prisoner's letter out of the prison. A 32-year-old Negro prisoner in Western State penitentiary in Pittsburgh ended a six-and-a-half day demonstration and hunger strike against prison brutality. He had been up a 100 foot water tower,

Continued on page 3

ANARCHY 17

(NOW ON SALE)

includes :

- BENEVOLENT BUREAUCRACY
- CND & CD - Are they Opposed
- FREEDOM OF ACCESS

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

THE condemnation of Socrates by an Athenian court in 399 B.C. seems to have been the first assault on academic autonomy. In 1940 A.D. another philosopher, Bertrand Russell, was the victim of a surprisingly similar incident. His appointment to a chair at City College, New York, was revoked by an American court on charges which are not easy to distinguish from those on which Socrates had been convicted.

The charge against Socrates had read: 'Socrates is guilty of crime, because he does not believe in the gods recognized by the city, but introduces strange supernatural beings; he is also guilty, because he corrupts the youth. Two of the grounds against Russell were that he believed in atheism and advocated sexual immorality.

Socrates, of course, did not teach at a university in the modern sense, but his dialogues in the streets and markets of Athens and the homes of his friends, were an equivalent of the tasks ideally performed in universities today. It is, therefore, not too far-fetched to treat his condemnation as a violation of academic autonomy. Academic autonomy requires a context in which knowledge can be pursued and disseminated without coercion, intimidation or victimization. It also requires that universities be free to employ staff on the grounds of scholarly ability and integrity alone. Unhappily, academic autonomy is a struggling cause.

In the United States and even the British Commonwealth, but especially the former, the principles I have outlined have been flagrantly violated many times over the past few years (not to mention happenings in the other Western countries and in the Communist countries). Indeed, the groves of academe are as good a field as any from which to document Kropotkin's insight that 'two traditions, two opposed tendencies' have conflicted throughout the history of our civilization: 'the authoritarian tradition and the libertarian tradition'.

The representatives of the authoritarian tradition are unendingly fertile in

Academic Autonomy

their attempts to suppress the Socratic spirit. Business, political and religious interests, morality, racism and, today more than ever, 'security' are some of the excuses spawned. 'Security', indeed, is now a conventional cover-all under which all kinds of specific objections can be subsumed. It spares the authorities the trouble of making their objections public. It spares the victim the trouble of clearing himself, or of showing that a mistake has been made. And thus it spares the authorities the trouble of proving their case, if they have one, or the embarrassment of being found mistaken.

In 1960, for instance, the professor of social anthropology at Manchester University, Max Gluckman, was refused a permit to enter Australian New Guinea (the Dutch would have been quite happy to have him in their portion). Security grounds were invoked for the exclusion. In the resulting controversy in parliament and the press it came out that the British and Australian security forces had exchanged information, though what the dark secrets were remained secret. In 1961 an historian, appointed to Adelaide University, was refused entry to Australia altogether, but this time the controversy did succeed in uncovering reasons. The scholar concerned, Mr. Y. S. Brenner, had once applied for membership of the Communist Party and had actually belonged to the Israeli Stern Gang. His Stern Gang membership seems to have been the principal reason for the security decision, which is absurd when one considers that Brenner had taught at London University. If the British authorities, against whom the Stern Gang had directed its activities, had no objection, then why should the Australians?

One of the justifications for security measures, whether in Communist or Western countries, is presumably that a situation of cold war, espionage and subversion requires a check to be kept on real and potential enemy agents, including persons occupying positions giving them access to important information. Fair enough. But how, on this logic, can the victimization of persons in non-strategic positions be justified? In the United States the position is so serious that, as Bertrand Russell has pointed out, fully representative scholarly conferences can no longer be held because of the exclusion of so many foreign academics. Thus even archaeologists may be (and have been) prevented from attending conferences lasting only a few days!

American university authorities, with

some honourable exceptions such as Harvard, have shown little courage in resisting the pressures to which they have been subjected. Thus Leo Koch, an associate-professor at Illinois University, was dismissed after publishing a letter on pre-marital sex relations in the students' newspaper (in reply, be it noted, to another letter on the topic). A significant factor in this case was a bond issue of 195 million dollars which the university was intending to float; there is evidence to suggest that Professor Koch could have been an embarrassment to the attempt to obtain this. Even communism was dragged into the matter: a Rev. Ira Latimer of the Bureau of Public Affairs and the University of Illinois Dads' Association (!), sent a letter to the parents of every female student in the state in which Koch's letter was equated to an 'exhortation to sexual promiscuity' and was stated to be in accord with the 'standard operating procedure of the Communist conspiracy (which) is to demoralize a nation, as a necessary preliminary to taking it over'. According to another choice passage 'Animal Koch would reduce us to a sub-animal level'.

Racism is also likely to raise its ugly head in the United States; another dragon for the prudent administrator and teacher to beware of. Thus when Dr. Waldo McNair, Professor of English at the Louisiana State University, commented bluntly that the racists in the state legislature were 'a disgrace' and 'a national scandal', he drew a savage counterblast from politicians whose tempers had been soured by their futile attempts to block integration. 'We are going to instil a little Americanism, a little backbone into the university', promised Mike Johns, Northern Louisiana, when introducing a resolution withholding 25 million dollars from the university until it took action against McNair. The resolution was later amended to a censure of the professor and a demand that he, and unnamed members of the university staff, be investigated by the State Committee on Un-American Activities. Classroom spy systems, frame-ups on campus and censorship are other techniques used in the Deep South to keep niggers and nigger-lovers in their proper place. Advertisements of teaching vacancies may even specify that applicants 'must be in accord with the social climate of the state'.

Many university teachers have been attacked for their loyalty to the Socratic tradition of independence of thought; the case of S. S. Orr, formerly professor of philosophy at the University of Tas-

mania, deviates from this pattern. Orr was dismissed on the ground that he had seduced one of his students, but his contention that he was framed is widely accepted in academic circles. Putting this contention aside, there are two highly interesting facts involved in the case for all those who are concerned with academic autonomy. The first is that Orr had played an active part in criticisms of the administration, which had led to an embarrassing (for the university) Royal Commission. The other is that the Federal Council of University Staff Associations of Australia appointed a committee of inquiry which reported that the university, in the procedures which led to Orr's dismissal, 'manifestly failed to accord him "natural justice"; and that its attempt to justify the dismissal (by calling his character into question) was 'conduct plainly unworthy of a University'.

Even these few cases show the need for defending academic freedom where it has not yet been violated, as in Britain and New Zealand (at least in the post-war years), and for regaining lost ground wherever it has. What are some of the mechanisms operating to preserve academic autonomy?

An old trick of academics is voting with their feet; that is, leaving alone universities at which freedom is violated. Thus several staff members resigned from the University of New South Wales after Russel Ward's application had been rejected. The chair of philosophy at the University of Tasmania is lying vacant until justice is done. And at that university the entire staff of the Law School resigned in protest.

Publicity is another useful weapon in the righting of wrongs. All of the Australian cases discussed brought vigorous parliamentary and press criticisms to bear on those responsible, though unhappily without ever securing redress. Student demonstrations can also play a role in affirming the principles which are really at stake when university teachers are coerced or victimized. There were strong demonstrations at Illinois University on behalf of Professor Koch, in the course of which the university president was burned in effigy. And in San Francisco students from the University of California demonstrated to such effect against the House Un-American Activities Committee, that the mayor declared he would refuse to let the Committee use City Hall for its sessions should it return (the Committee made the feeble rejoinder that the mayor was surrendering 'to Communist-directed mob violence').

In the past scholars had a most

powerful sanction against oppressors: migration. At the time of what Richard Hofstadter calls 'their greatest independence', the universities 'unhindered . . . by physical apparatus, great libraries, worldly goods, and substantial college foundations . . . could and on occasion did migrate, taking with them their large numbers of students and profitable trade.' The growing wealth of universities and complexity of material equipment has made this form of protest nearly impracticable today, though as late as the 1930's Black Mountain College in the United States was founded by such a migration. When this kind of action is implemented the university as a whole is voting with its feet—how much more effective than when individuals alone do it!

Another means of securing academic autonomy would lie in some form of 'workers' control' of the university. If hiring and firing were both in the charge of the teaching and research staff, then universities would indeed be communities of scholars. A limited step in this direction would be the adoption of a thoroughly trade union attitude towards all infringements of the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge. It seems odd that the relatively uneducated members of a union (who would probably be regarded with fastidious superiority by some academics) should display so much more solidarity with victimized fellow-workers than is usually manifested in professional circles. Yet perhaps it is not so odd, for among professionals one man's misfortune is likely to be another's fortune. The hierarchical structure of any professional group inhibits sentiments of solidarity, and thus weakens the profession in times of crisis (it would be more useful to have a study of the fluctuating fortunes of academic freedom in the USSR, Nazi Germany or Franco's Spain). Medieval universities resorted to trade union weapons by ceasing or suspending lectures, the equivalent of striking. Has the method lost its validity? Can it for one moment be doubted that such means would be more effective in defending academic autonomy than mere petitions and resolutions of protest?

The Socratic spirit, Kropotkin's libertarian tradition, the Western intellectual tradition of Bronowski and Mazlish are besieged by enemies, and always have been besieged. It would be naive to expect the enemy ever to be finally routed. But this realistic pessimism does not imply that academics should never try to seize the initiative or that academic autonomy should be despaired of; on the contrary there are ways and means by which the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge can be resolutely protected. Kropotkin's declaration—'Between these two currents (the authoritarian and libertarian traditions), always alive, always struggling in humanity . . . our choice is made'—is a useful prophylactic against extremes either of optimism or defeatism.

K.J.M.

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

Lives of the Wits Hesketh Pearson 30/-
Co-Existence Plus Christopher Mayhew 4/6

REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

Ants Julian Huxley 3/6
Chiaroscuro Augustus John 5/-
Arrival and Departure Arthur Koestler 5/-
The War Lover John Hersey 5/-

SECOND-HAND

In Defiance Françoise Rigby (Proof) 3/-; New Road 4 Silone, Potts, Kafka, etc. 5/-; Letters from a Bank Parlour W. S. Hill-Reid 3/-; The Yoke and the Arrow Herbert L. Matthews 5/-; The Moral Basis of Politics Naomi Mitchison 4/-; Will the Bolsheviks Maintain Power?; also The Bolsheviks will maintain Power V. I. Lenin 2/6 (in one volume); Democratic Readings from the World's Great Teachers (ed.) W. M. Thompson 3/6; All Quiet on the Western Front Erich Maria Remarque 5/6; Carrotty Broom A. S. Neill 4/-; Two Adolescents Alberto Moravia 3/6; Charles Dickens Una Pope-Hennessy 3/-; Reason in Action Hawton, Robertson, Coates, etc. 5/-; Mussolini, Red and Black Armando Borghi 10/-; Thinking H. Levy 3/6; General Idea of the Revolution in the Nineteenth Century P. J. Proudhon (paper covers) 17/6; Failure of a Mission Sir Neville Henderson 3/6; Essays on English History Lord Macaulay 2/6; The Vigil of a Nation Lin Yutang 3/-; In Russia Now (1942) Sir Walter Citrine 3/-; Guiding Human Misfits Alexandra Adler 4/-; Prehistoric Man Joseph McCabe 3/-; Everyone's Affairs; a First Book for Citizens Robert Jones 2/6; Empire Days Paul H. Emden 4/-; The History of Evolution Sir Edward B. Poulton 2/6; Concerning Man's Origin Sir Arthur Keith 2/6; Insurgent Wicklow 1798 Luke Cullen 6/-; The Church Looks at Herself Martin Davidson 3/-.

PAMPHLETS

Anarchist Cinema Alan Lovell 2/-
The Meaning of Socialism Paul Cardan 6d.

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

SOLIDARITY

DEAR COMRADE,

The discussion concerning 'Solidarity' (FREEDOM, June 23) seems to have started on the wrong foot. Firstly, because the editor of FREEDOM hadn't done his home work and bothered to read the material outlining some of our ideas (for example on workers' management, a more advanced and specific conception than workers' control). Secondly, because Eric Morse in his letter of reply failed to give you a clear idea of where we stand.

To us 'socialism' means freedom. The only basis on which one can fight authoritarian societies (both East and West) is to reject their values. To fight them effectively, one must build organisations which contain within themselves the relationships for which we strive. For this reason among others 'Solidarity' rejects the authoritarian Bolshevik and elitist conceptions of organization. Neither do we think that the role of a socialist organization is to rule 'on behalf of the working class'. Our answer to your ironic editorial request for examples of who are 'the right people to rule' (Minority Action and Elites, June 23) would be quite different from that of all elitist organisations. We would say: 'not us—nor any other minority group'.

There is a difference between you and us. We believe that the establishment of a free society will take place through the action of the working class, which includes white collar workers. We may be old-fashioned in this belief, but we think there are solid historical and social reasons why this should be so.

In our industrial material you will see that we always stress that workers should

struggle to control their own lives and conditions of work. We don't ask them to support us. We ask them to fight for their own rights to a full human existence.

Throughout history, minorities have always ruled through their domination of the productive machine. Who controls production, controls society. None can be free as long as any are exploited. If the working class can win this 'struggle for democracy', if it can impose and retain its own management of production, it will make possible a new society. Men free in production can be free in all aspects of social life. New and meaningful institutions will arise completely controlled from below. This to us is the meaning of socialism; and this is why we believe in workers' power.

But what about the others (those not organized collectively at work)? Can they participate to an equal degree in the process of social transformation? Opportunities for effective action are less open to them. They can often only find individual solutions, emancipating themselves one by one, as someone once said concerning Ruskin College. This may be valid in itself but is unlikely to be socially significant. The problem is to find collective solutions. The logic of the class struggle leads, we believe, to such solutions. Many will doubtless assist in the struggle of the working class: but not if they maintain their 'middle class' identity, and seek to maintain a separate and superior status.

We must also take you up on one minor point. We do not criticize Trotsky, Lenin, Stalin, etc., because they were not Leninists, Trotskyists, Bolsheviks, etc.—but because they were.

Yours fraternally,
London, July 1. KEN WELLER.

WHITHER THE COMMITTEE OF 100

THIS question must be surely posed after the recent demonstration at Greenham Common. The base is comparatively near London so distance can be no excuse for smallness of numbers. We arrived at the base at about 8 o'clock Saturday evening and were shocked at the size of the demo, and the fact that only one gate could be effectively blocked.

The sit-downers were no greenhorns at this lark, one recognised the old faces, many having six or seven previous convictions. The police packed up arresting about 10.30 Saturday evening and left the rest to roast, or rather freeze, all night. At this point one must congratulate the bods who supplied as many blankets as were available and hot drinks. From one who was still frozen stiff, thanks a lot.

Many who were arrested early in the demonstration came back to sit down again thus helping to prolong the demo. Early Sunday morning the arrests started again and it looked at one stage as if the demo, would be finished hours before the 2.30 finish. The buzz went around "maximum non-co-operation", thus the gate was blocked for 23 hours.

The drivers of the furniture vans carting the sit-downers away were very co-operative, working late Saturday night and Sunday. Whilst it is appreciated that their regular wages probably amount to peanuts and the O.T. was welcome, it proves the fallacy of a union T.&G.W.U., theoretically on record against the bomb and its members (if they hold a card) acting contrary to its policy.

TWO LETTERS

A new innovation was introduced by the police when we were taken to the charge room, thumb prints and photographs were taken, we were informed they would be destroyed after trial. I for one am a born sceptic.

The police were very talkative, many discussions broke out, one in particular with a young constable but as the discussion began to grow serious, a two-pipper stepped in and ordered the constable away—can the message spread? I personally do not think so, once through police college and into uniform from then on you are lost to any progressive ideas, you are guardians of the state.

Many people applied for bail but did not receive it until 2.20, thus ensuring that there would be no return to swell the demonstration.

On Tuesday, July 3rd, Newbury received many return visitors due to appear at the Magistrates' court.

The Magistrate was tolerant to the point of letting everyone make a statement without shutting them up after the first few words, but the fines still remained the heaviest suffered in a London Court.

What now? Are the sit-downs losing support? Were immediate results expected by some? Is the expense of fines too heavy for some?

These are questions that have to be answered quickly. One basic fact will have to be accepted by members of Committee of 100 and that is that sit-downs are a form of civil disobedience, against the state, all our struggles will be against the state. Nuclear weapons are part and parcel of the state, no matter which government is in power, which means if any tactics are going to be successful, this fact must be recognised.

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

July 14 1962 Vol 23 No 22

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Continued from page 1

goats to explain their own feelings of inadequacy, and lack of purpose in life.

Kropotkin wrote somewhere that the only cure for abuses of liberty was more liberty. To cure the disease of racialism we need more fresh air circulating in the minds of people, more ideas, more stimulation of their rusty thinking processes. Legislation as proposed, aims at "protecting" us from the wrong ideas; which is what the Catholic hierarchy with its Index, its local censorship machine does to "protect" the faithful from sully-ing their God- Pope-filled virginal minds with heretical thoughts! What legislation does, whether it be backed by the force of the law or the threat of eternal hell-fire, is to dull the thinking processes of the faithful, and challenge the proscribed propagandists.

But let us be quite clear about this issue. Though we believe that free speech is possible only in a free society—and this does not exist anywhere in the so-called civilised world today—and though we deny the value of legislation either to create the free society or to protect free speech, this does not mean that we treat lightly or do not defend the hard-won rights secured for us by the radicals of an earlier generation, or that we should not fight to enlarge the horizons of "free speech". But we cannot demand to enjoy even a relative "freedom of speech" if we allow our disgust for certain ideas, such as expressed at that notorious Sunday meeting, to get the better of our reason and "provoke" us either to the use of violence, or support for those who would introduce legislation to prevent these ideas from being expressed publicly. So the self-proclaimed Nazis and anti-semites in our midst should be free to express their creeds in public?— Yes!

★

A GUARDIAN reader commenting on that paper's London Letter on the Trafalgar Square Nazis—"Bringing them down to size"—writes:

May I remind you that the German Nazi Party started with less than 35 members? May I also remind you that a malignant growth starts with a few cells only? Will we never learn!

We do not doubt that her intentions are well-meaning. But what are we supposed to "learn"? For the Guardian's correspondent it is presumably crystal clear: bad things start from small beginnings, and if that were only true of bad things, and assuming that there were no doubts or differences of opinion as to what was good and what was bad, it would be a simple matter to nip evil in the bud. But good things also start from small beginnings—we understand that Man developed from the amoeba—and therefore, unless one believes that society should remain static, one must accept, as part of life, that all kinds of forces are acting to change or modify the social pattern, for better and for worse (depending, for each individual, where one's interests lie), and what prevails depends on a large and varied number of factors.

We say, without hesitation, or fear of contradiction, that the free society is good and the authoritarian society bad. For the one can regulate its affairs as between equals without

the sanction of law and the threat of force—indicating thereby that everybody feels free to be himself; whereas the other, by the very fact of having recourse to force, implies that either a minority or a majority of the people feel themselves to be in a situation of inferiority in relation to a privileged, ruling class in that society.

The free society is based on the power of thought and love; of reason and imagination. The authoritarian society is based on the power of established privilege and indifference to the fate of one's fellow men; of naked power and blindness.

When Mr. Jordan and his pathological party exhibit their persons and their crazy ideas in Trafalgar Square neither free speech nor ourselves are threatened. If Mr. Jordan and his friends (or anyone else) were to attempt to prevent others from holding their meetings we would consider this an act of violence, and we only hope that we should have the common sense and the superior force to throw them out and keep them out. Ideas, good or bad, sway or provoke those people to acts of violence who have either not learned to think for themselves, or have abdicated their powers of reason to the blind worship of the infallible leader. (May we point out that the cult of the personality is equally harmful whether applied to a Gandhi and a Kropotkin or to a Hitler and a Stalin). To combat the demagogues who might ruffle the peace of the Public Order Act, politicians (the demagogues of the Establishment) offer legislation curbing free speech.

Anarchists must be unequivocal in resisting all legislation that in the name of free speech denies it to specified minorities. Our concern must be to encourage people to think for themselves, by stimulating thought in our discussions with them, at meetings, and through our Press. If only we introduce doubt into the minds of our fellow beings we have sown the seed from which thought, imagination, and curiosity can flower. We are not afraid of the corrupting influence of "alien" or conflicting ideas on our readers or on ourselves. In this issue of FREEDOM another critic from "Socialism Reaffirmed" has the freedom of our columns to really explain what it is all about (he agrees with us that his comrade a fortnight ago didn't) and two of our non-violent comrades make their comments on last week's editorial. FREEDOM is a confusing paper, some say. If it is, then those of our readers who feel that way aren't doing enough thinking for themselves.

The attraction of government for so many people in our age where full employment and keeping up with the Jones' leaves you no time to live, is that it saves you the trouble of thinking and taking decisions. In such a society free-speech, thinking and questioning are luxuries they cannot afford. Dr. Charlie Chaplin is reported as saying that his home in Switzerland has no television set because: "I would like my children to grow up with a bit of imagination".

If we can awaken, or stimulate the imagination of our readers, then anarchist propaganda will have achieved all that a Free Press and Free Speech should aim to achieve, now or in the free society.

Anarchists and the Working Class Movement

IT IS NOT TRUE, whatever the syndicalists may say, that the workers' organisations of today will serve as the framework for the future society and will facilitate the transition from the bourgeois to the equalitarian régime. This is an idea which met with favour among the members of the First International; and if I am not mistaken, one will find in Bakunin's writings that the new society would be achieved by all workers joining the Sections of the International.

To my mind this is a mistake.

The structure of existing workers' organisations corresponds to present-day conditions of economic life, which is the result of historic developments and capitalist domination. And the new society cannot be achieved without breaking up those structures and creating new organisations corresponding to the new conditions and the new social objectives.

Workers today are grouped according to the trades they practise, the industries in which they work, the employers against whom they must struggle or the businesses to which they are tied. What will be the use of these groupings when, without the employers and with business relations turned upside down, a large part of existing trades and industries will have to disappear, some permanently because they are useless and harmful, others temporarily because, though useful in the future, will have no *raison d'être* or possibility of existence in the period of social upheaval? of what use, just to quote one of a thousand examples that come to mind, will be the organisations of the marble quarrymen of Carrara when what will be needed is that they should go and cultivate the land and increase the production of foodstuffs, leaving to the future the construction of monuments and marble palaces?

Certainly workers' organisations, especially in their co-operative forms (which incidentally, under the capitalist system, tend to curb workers' resistance) can serve to develop among workers their technical and administrative capacities, but in a revolutionary period and for social reorganisation they must disappear and be absorbed in the new popular groupings as the circumstances demand. And it is the task of revolutionaries to seek to prevent the development of an *esprit de corps* in these existing organisations which would be an obstacle to satisfying the new social needs.

Therefore, in my opinion, the workers' movement is an instrument

Early Next year FREEDOM PRESS in collaboration with a group of comrades in California will be publishing a volume which will present for the first time to the English-speaking public a comprehensive study of Malatesta's thought on anarchism and the many questions which stem from it. The following extracts are taken from the section dealing with the attitude of Anarchists to the working class movements. The articles from which this section will be compiled were written between 1922 and 1927, that is after the failure of the post-first world war revolutionary situation in Italy to materialise, and during the period of consolidation of Mussolini's regime. With such a background to draw on Malatesta's approach could hardly be theoretical or academic—even if he were capable of being either! His views will be considered less controversial now than at the time but even so, we imagine they will still stimulate valuable and clarifying discussion in revolutionary workers' circles.

to be used today for raising, and educating, the masses, and to-morrow for the inevitable official clash. But it is an instrument which has its disadvantages and its dangers. And we anarchists must make every effort to neutralise the disadvantages, parry the dangers and use the movement as much as we can for our ends. This does not mean, as has been suggested, that we would wish the workers' movement to be the tool of the anarchists. Of course we would be happy if all workers, if everybody were anarchists . . . but in that case anarchy would be a fact and there would be no need for such discussions.

In the present state of affairs, what we would wish is that the workers' movement were open to all forward-looking, imaginative, propaganda, and participating in all the economic, political and moral activities of society, living and developing free from all outside control, from us no less than from the political parties.¹

There are many comrades who aim at making the working class movement and the anarchist movement all one, and where they can, as for example in Spain, Argentina, and to a lesser extent in Italy, France, Germany, etc., they try to give the workers' organisations a frankly anarchist programme. They are those who call themselves "anarcho-syndicalists"; or when they link up with others who are really not anarchists, they take the name

¹"Umanità Nova" Apl. 6, 1922.

of "revolutionary syndicalists". It is necessary to explain what is meant by "syndicalism".

If it is a question of the sought-after future, if, that is, by syndicalism is meant the form of social organisation which should replace the capitalistic and statal organisation, then either it is the same as anarchy, and is therefore a term which only serves to confuse matters, or it is different from anarchy and cannot therefore be accepted by anarchists. Indeed, among the ideas and plans for the future put forward by this or that syndicalist, there are some which are genuinely anarchist, but there are others which present under different names and in different guises, the authoritarian structure which is the cause of the evils which today we complain of, and therefore can have nothing in common with anarchy. But it is not of syndicalism as a social system that I wish to deal with, since it is not this which can determine the present activity of anarchists in regard to the working class movement.

What we are interested in are all workers' organisations, all the Unions constituted to resist the oppression of the employers and to reduce or destroy the exploitation of human labour by those who control the sources of wealth and the means of production. Now I say that these cannot be anarchist organisations, and it is not a good thing to wish that they should be, because if they were they would neither manage to do their job nor serve the ends which anarchists aim at in joining them.

The Unions are created to defend today the present interests of workers and improve their conditions as much as possible until such time as they are in a position to carry through a revolution which will make the present wage earners into free workers, freely associated for the benefit of all.

For the Union to serve its own end and at the same time be a means for education, and the field for propaganda aimed at a future radical social transformation, it is necessary that it should bring together all workers, or at least all those workers who aim at improving their conditions and who one succeeds in making capable of some kind of resistance against the bosses. Does one perhaps want to wait for workers to be anarchists before inviting them to organise themselves, and before admitting them to the organisation of resistance, when it would no longer be required because already

Continued on page 4

Out of this World

Continued from page 1

the leader of the revolt came down two days before. A man in West Kensington who posed as a female prostitute was charged with inciting or attempting to procure two police officers to commit an act of gross indecency, ten other similar charges, and finally for obtaining two pounds by false pretences. . . .

THE INDEPENDENT CANDIDATE for Leicester North-East said he was against the political machine but denied that he was an anarchist. Mr. 'Teasy-Weasy' Raymond, the Mayfair hairdresser, wants to be a Liberal candidate if he can get a seat where he stands an even chance of success. "I would hate to fight a hopeless seat," he said. Buck Ryan in the *Mirror* comic-strip is threatened with death by a female bomb-maker who claims that 'the anarchists are the master race'. Buck Ryan suitably chides her "that this isn't a Nazi Rally", but we must wait till Monday to see what happens next. . . .

THE AMERICANS LET OFF a small bomb but followed with the Big One. The *West London Observer* reprints Mr. Edward Teller's advice that fall-out is not so likely to give rise to harmful effects as are many chemicals in the food we eat; not as dangerous or as likely to cause cancer as smoking a packet of cigarettes a day. The United Nations Trusteeship Council called on the United States to make 'the most expeditious settlement' of compensation claims for the victims of radio active fall-out from the 1954 Pacific tests on the Island of Rongelap. The Council also noted that war damage claims for the Pacific islands territory had not yet been met. . . .

MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS of the U.S. said in Los Angeles, "Big business, big Government, big unions—each has helped erase some of the qualities of individuality from Americans". As the individual has become more submerged his voice is more distinct. . . . There has been such a deadening effect of radio and television on the American mind

that we may have reached a point where men and women who will sponsor the unorthodox points of view must be subsidised by foundations." *The Philadelphia Enquirer* thought that the academic honour for Charlie Chaplin was "a snide attempt to place Chaplin on the same plane with secretary Dean Rusk." On Friday, Chaplin received another degree, from Durham University, along with Doctor Spock, and on Sunday his wife gave birth to another child, their eighth. Mr. Kennedy sent a telegram of congratulations to Richard Rogers the 'pop' composer saying he reminds us in his songs "in charming ways of the strange and wonderful experience it is to be an American in the twentieth century." The Auxiliary Bishop of Messina is on his way to the U.S. with sixteen animal statues in cheese for President Kennedy as a mark of gratitude for a road built after the war with American aid funds. . . .

"ALICE IN WONDERLAND" was published one hundred years ago. . . .

JON QUIXOTE.

Correspondence

Contradiction?

The Editors, FREEDOM,

FREEDOM's editorial "Algeria: did violence fail?" contains the declaration: "We are certain that no privileged society will be destroyed if the revolutionaries are not prepared to use violence." Could it be the same pen that writes: "Anarchism will never (repeat never) be achieved by violence."? If it is, the writer seems confused.

If it were true that anarchism could not be achieved by violent means, how could an anarchist revolutionary achieve anarchism if he or she had to be prepared to use violence? If violence never leads to anarchism, then surely it

follows that anarchist revolutionaries should be prepared *not* to use violence at any stage of the struggle. Thus privileged society will not be destroyed, thus anarchism is unattainable and we waste our time in fairyland.

Anarchism is a society that negates the State, this does not mean a society that negates violence, though one would hope for a huge decrease in violence. Thus the means to the end of anarchy can entail the use of violence and still be in accordance with that end.

Surely it would be more satisfactory to state that anarchism will not be achieved by violence alone, but that the destruction of the State may involve violence, even killing in the last extreme. I think this is the attitude of the editors, though the confusion over this question leaves the position unclear, which seems very unwise when discussing such a topic.

The above does not advocate violence, but it poses a realistic assessment of revolutionary change. It seems unfortunate that the editors cannot make their position plain, beyond doubt (for it is certainly not so to this reader), leaving the impression that two differing things are being said in the same breath.

Hull, July 8.

J.W.

Definition?

DEAR EDITORS,

Some dictionaries define Anarchists as advocates of confusion and so I am somewhat less than impressed by the habit FREEDOM is developing of resorting to dictionary definitions of the ideas advocated by others in order to win debating points. Anarchists rightly expect others who wish to determine what Anarchism is, to consider the derivation of the word, to read the writings of recognized Anarchist thinkers, and to talk to those who call themselves Anarchist. The same reasoning would elicit that a Pacifist is a Peacemaker—*Pace facio*—that a personal renunciation of the use either directly or indirectly of violence stands at the centre of the Pacifist philosophy; and that those Pacifists who are active generally define a Pacifist as one who uses non-violence or a-violent means to combat war and the causes of war, and to build a society in which violence will have no place; and who rejects violence to achieve his object because he believes that ends and means are essentially inter-related. Logically of course therefore all

Pacifists should be Anarchists, just as there are very good reasons that all Anarchists should be Pacifists, but despite the Editors comment that the phrase Pacifist Anarchist is tautologous anyone who has read many of his editorials will see the need for the distinction. (The smear that was added that the phrase meant a qualification of Anarchism, implying something less than full Anarchism, is about as ill-founded as it would be to say that an Anarchist Individualist, Anarcho-Syndicalist or an Anarchist Communist is something other than an Anarchist).

Another of the debating points which one has come to accept is that Pacifists are doctrinaire about non-violence while anti-Pacifists are not doctrinaire about violence. It is of course well understood that it is not usual for the non-Pacifist to assault everyone he meets; but if those who claim not to be doctrinaire have intelligent meaning for their words, then it means that they have considered the propositions;—that non-violence is an effective means of social struggle, that all revolutions using insurrectionary violence have in order to become efficient become authoritarian, that an Anarchist society is nothing if not fraternal and that since means shape ends fraternity cannot be achieved by violence; and the deductions from them, that Insurrectionary violence like the Marxian concept of the workers' state involves carrying into the future society some of the greatest evils of the existing society. (It will no doubt be argued by the insurrectionaries that they only intend to use violence in the transitional phase, but this was also Marx's argument). If the editorials of FREEDOM showed any signs that these propositions

had been considered, FREEDOM's critics might be able to agree to differ, but since no effort is made to consider the Pacifist case (which the current editorial so rightly stresses, is the Anarchist case) the argument must go on.

Yours fraternally,
LAURENS OTTER.

P.S.—The divorce between *Peace News* and the PPU came through a vote at PPU Conference and at no time was *Peace News* financially dependent on the Union.

LAG 1962 Summer School

The Summer School will be held at Alan Albon's (Little Marshfoot Farm, Mill Road, Hailsham, Sussex) from Saturday, August 4th, to Monday, August 6th, under canvas. The cost will be 35/- per person (children *pro rata*). Deposit with booking 10/- per person.

Nicolas Walter, S. E. Parker, Albert Meltzer and Geoffrey Ostergaard have been invited to speak (subject to previous and future engagements).

Enquiries and Bookings (plus deposits) to Mary Stevenson, 6, Stainton Road, Enfield, Middx. Further details will be sent to interested comrades.

N.B.: CLOSING DATE WEDNESDAY JULY 18th. Food has to be ordered 2 weeks beforehand.

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

ANARCHISTS & THE WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT

Continued from page 3
the masses would be capable of making the revolution? In this case the Trade Union would be duplicating the anarchist group and would remain impotent both in obtaining improvements and in making the revolution. Or one has an anarchist programme on paper and is satisfied with formal, unconscious support, and so brings together people who follow the organisers sheeplike, and who will disappear, or go over to the enemy at the first opportunity in which it was necessary to really act as anarchists.

Trades Unionism is by its nature reformist. All that can be hoped from it is that the reforms which it demands and pursues are such and obtained in ways which serve revolutionary education and preparation and leave the way free to ever greater demands.

Every fusion or confusion between the anarchist movement and the trade union movement ends, either in rendering the latter unable to carry out its specific task, or by weakening, distorting, or extinguishing the anarchist spirit.

The Union can emerge with a socialist, revolutionary or anarchist programme, and indeed it is with such programmes that many workers' organisations were originally launched. But they remain faithful to the programme so long as they are weak and impotent, that is so long as they are propaganda groups, initiated and sustained by a few enthusiastic and convinced individuals rather than organisms capable of effective action; but then as they manage to attract the masses to their ranks, and acquire the strength to demand and impose improvements, the original programme becomes an empty slogan which no one bothers about, tactics are readjusted to contingent needs and the enthusiasts of the first hour either adapt themselves or must make way for the "practical" men, who pay attention to the present without worrying about the future.

There certainly are comrades who in spite of being in the front rank of the trade union movement remain sincere and enthusiastic anarchists, as there are workers' groupings which seek their inspiration in anarchist ideas. But it would be a too easy way of criticising, to seek the thousand examples in which these men and these groups in the reality of their day to day actions are in

Sit-down or Pay Up?

The London Federation of Anarchists has set up a small fund to assist comrades financially embarrassed as a consequence of taking part in sit-downs, etc. Donations would be welcomed.

L.F.A. at 17a Maxwell Road, S.W.6.

contradiction with anarchist ideas. I agree that these are the hard facts of life. One cannot act in an anarchist way when one is obliged to deal with employers and the authorities; one cannot let the masses act for themselves when they refuse to act and ask for, demand, leaders. But why confuse anarchism with what anarchism is not, and why should we, as anarchists, shoulder the responsibility for transactions and compromises made necessary because the masses are not anarchist, not even if they belong to an organisation which has written the anarchist programme into its Constitution?

In my opinion anarchists must not want the Trades Unions to be anarchist, but they must act within their ranks in favour of anarchist aims, as individuals, as groups and as federations of groups. Just as there are, or there should be, study and discussion groups, propaganda groups working among the public with the written and spoken word, co-operative groups, factory groups, groups

among the land workers, in the barracks as well as the schools, so special groups should be formed in the different organisations which engage in the class struggle.

Of course, it would be ideal if everyone were anarchist and that organisations functioned in an anarchist way; but in that case, it is clear that there would be no need to organise for the struggle against the employers, for there would no longer be bosses. But in the situation as it is, and recognising that the social development of one's work-mates is what it is, the anarchist groups should not expect the workers' organisations to act as if they were anarchist, but should make every effort to induce them to approximate as much as possible to the anarchist method. If for the life of the organisation and for the needs and wishes of its members it is absolutely necessary to negotiate, to compromise, and establish doubtful contacts with the authorities, so be it; but this must be done by others, not by anarchists whose role is that of pointing to the insufficiency and precariousness of all improvements which can be obtained under a capitalist régime, and of pushing the struggle towards always more radical solutions.

Anarchists in the Unions should struggle for them to be open to all workers whatever their views or party affiliations, on one condition: of solidarity in the struggle against the bosses; they should be opposed to the corporative spirit and any ambitions to exercise a monopoly of organisation or work. They should prevent the Unions from serving as an instrument to be manipulated by politicians for electoral or other authoritarian ends; they should advocate and practise direct action, decentralisation, autonomy and individual initiative; they should make special efforts to help members learn how to participate directly in the life of the organisation and to dispense with leaders and full-time functionaries.

In other words, they should remain anarchists, always in close touch with anarchists, and remembering that the workers' organisation is not the end, but just one of the means, however important, in preparing the way for the achievement of anarchism.²

²"Pensiero e Volontà", Apl. 16, 1925. E. MALATESTA.

HEY!

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT JULY 7th, 1962

EXPENSES: 27 weeks at £70	£1,890
INCOME:	
Sales & Sub. Renewals	£
Weeks 1-26	1,077
Week 27	14
	1,091
New Subscriptions:	
Weeks 1-26 (195)	221
Week 27 (11)	12
	233
	1,324
	DEFICIT £566

DEFICIT FUND

Oxford: Anon* 5/-; Pagnell: Anon £3;	
Glasgow: J.H.* 9/-; Wellington: P.J.S. 2/6;	
London: P.L. 5/-; Seaford: D.T. 8/-; Wolver-	
hampton: J.L.* 4/-; J.K.W.* 2/-; Belfast:	
"Liam" 4/2; London: L.S. 8/-; Shoreham:	
M. & D.* 2/6; Hull: G.J.S. 9/6; Hounslow:	
L.* 2/6; Leeds: G.L. 2/6; Alberta: B.G.*	
6/9; Gravesend: T.C. 5/-; London: A.S. 1/6;	
London: P. & G.T.* 10/-; London: Anon 4/-;	
London: P.R. 7/6; London: C.W.* £7/17/6;	
Surrey: F.B.* £1.	
TOTAL	16 13 3
Previously acknowledged	688 1 1
1962 TOTAL TO DATE	£704 14 4

*Denotes regular contributors.

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.

JULY 15 Maurice Goldman:
Time, Money and Death

JULY 22 Donald Room:
Alternatives to Money

JULY 29 Jack Stevenson:
Viva Zapata!

AUG. 5 No meeting—Summer School.

Hyde Park Meetings

Sundays at 4 p.m. onwards
(Anarchist time) (Weather permitting)

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.

2nd Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Morris Bradley's, 15 Pyrland Road, Newington Green, N.5.

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. at Tom Barnes', Albion Cottage, Fortis Green, N.2. (3rd door past Tudor Hotel). N.B.—June meeting in N.2 will be held at 45, Twyford Avenue.

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

NEW MEETING
3rd Tuesday, 1st meeting, July 16th, at Brian and Doris Leslie's, 242 Amesbury Avenue, S.W.2. (Streatham Hill, Nr. Station).

ANARCHY Nos 1-16

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.