

FREEDOM

JULY 21 1962 VOL 23 No 23

'Evolution is "leading up to Anarchy" simply because it has already led us in nearly every other direction and made a failure of it.'

BENJ. R. TUCKER

In this Issue:

- THE CABINET PURGE
- ANARCHIST CINEMA?
- ANARCHISTS AND THE WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT
- OUT OF THIS WORLD
- LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

HOW many factors determined the Cabinet purge last week? And how many of these factors could be said to be in the public interest and not of sectional, party or personal interest? We imagine very few. Who, for instance really believes that by changing the heads of government the conditions of the working people of this country will undergo far-reaching changes for the better? If it were so then it would mean that the capitalist system is more elastic than those who oppose it seem to think. We do not believe there is any evidence to show that any of the schools of economic and financial theories have discovered a solution to the ever recurring crises of the system. When one finds the experts advocating diametrically opposed solutions to these crises, surely one is justified in assuming that neither remedy proposed will do the trick; that in fact there is no solution.

At most there are a series of "correctives" which can be applied, depending on the form the crisis takes, which may succeed in temporarily restoring the "balance". We have seen, for instance, how the bank rate can be manipulated up or down to check or encourage the movement of currency; we have seen the way the cold war economy is being used, above all in the United States to cushion recessions in consumer goods industries; we have seen how the purchase tax has been used to restrict home consumption of certain goods, or by its removal, to encourage spending. Hire Purchase too is being used to the same ends, and so on. All these measures will be used, and new ones tried, by all governments and Chancellors of the Exchequer whether the man in office is a Selwyn Lloyd, a Reginald Maudling or a Harold Wilson. The only way they may differ is in which measures they will use to deal with a particular "crisis".

The current "crisis" in this country, so we are told, is that production has not increased during the past two years. No political leader aspiring to government office would dream of suggesting that it was high time we stopped worshipping the God of increased production and started instead examining the question of production from the point of view of needs. (In seeking to make the railways pay their way, Dr. Beeching's criterion is, ostensibly, to reduce the size of the railways to fit present-day needs. This would be a praiseworthy objective if the needs were determined by the consumers and not by a hierarchy of top-level business men, and the

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!

Mac's Axe

solutions did not create as many problems as they set out to solve).

Those who believe in occasional cabinet shake-ups and purges, argue that after a number of years in office the executive gets tired and communicates its weariness, and dithering policies to the public and the leaders of industry. Surely the "public image" of government leaders, is created for them by the organs of mass communications. We do not know what goes on behind the scenes, the meetings between Ministers and the various pressure groups in Industry and High Finance, but "public opinion" is undoubtedly moulded by the Press, which during the past year has clearly been antagonistic to the Cabinet and its policies. In so far

as public opinion counts—at election time—Governments "in decline" can only change their "public image" by drastic purges of the men at the top. We do not think that anything will change in fact, for the reasons already given, but for the Tory voter who at recent by-elections has either abstained or has voted for the Liberals, Mr. Macmillan's purge of the Liberal Nationals and other "tired" men in his government will create the impression of a transfusion of new (blue) blood, and a change in the present fortunes of the Party. Whether they will be prepared to accept the continued presence of the aging Mr. Macmillan as leader is another matter. (If they are not the ever-ready Butler already has a foot in the door).

'A grim and daunting task'

WHAT matters to us is to make more and more people aware of the fact that the government reshuffle has been dictated to the Party leaders by electoral considerations. The Tory politicians want to be returned at the next general election, just as of course do Labour and Liberal. The Pay Pause undoubtedly accounts for much of the government's present unpopularity among the floating voters. But the Tories who abstained from voting at recent by-elections, is it possible that their criticism of the government is that it is too "liberal"? If so, then

during the coming months one can expect a curious mixture of vote-catching tit-bits which, we shall be told, are now possible thanks to the government's pay pause, and other unpopular measures...! But what has this to do with solving the crises of production, of distribution, of finance and the rest?

The Observer which refers to the new Chancellor and the recently appointed Governor of the Bank of England "as a two-man team of the new school of undoctinaire liberals" appears to welcome the appointments. But as to the problems

Crude Surgery on the Tory image

they have to deal with, they are less optimistic of a short-term solution when they write:

If we are ever to escape from the economic impasse to which the inadequacies of the world's currency system are bringing us, Mr. Maudling's main efforts will have to be in the field of international financial diplomacy where he faces a grim and daunting task. It would only raise false hopes to imagine that the really important reforms there

—without which any domestic relaxation will be as transient as on previous occasions—can be achieved easily or quickly.

Could it be that production in the interests of the people is hampered not only by the "inadequacies" but by the injustice of the world's currency system? And if so, why try to patch it up by "financial diplomacy". Why not have the courage to admit that the only practical, and at the same time equitable solution would be to abolish the money system as we know it today? The real productive capacity, the human skills, the machinery and the needs are all there, and are the only real incentives for putting human effort and machinery to their best use. The capitalist system simply inhibits production, depending for its prosperity on waste and useless as well as useful production.



of the water, or turn you over within a few seconds into the safest positions". The Report of the Government Chemist mentions the hazards of dangerous cargoes of aerosol dispensers with inflammable and vapourous propellants. Only 25 per cent of America's children could pass a simple fitness test said President Kennedy. The Government declined to accept responsibility for the side-effects of drugs prescribed by the National Health Service. Mrs. Jill Knight, delegate to last year's Tory Conference had cut from the BBC programme "Poverty in Britain Today" her remark: "What sticks in my gullet is that, with first-class education for their children, pleasant homes, a high standard of living, no fear of unemployment, and holidays on the Costa Brava, they still want more". She said the remark was taken out of context as she was referring to the tea-break strike at Fords—"I felt," she said "that the misrepresentation was bad from all points of view—my own, the Conservative party's and the BBC's". The Lancet stated that "we know how to make cars safe but manufacturers in a competitive market seldom do". The British Transport Commission announced that half the British Railway system carries 95 per cent of the goods and implied that 18,400 miles of track could be economically closed. . . .

THE HIROSHIMA ATOMIC Bombing Hospital reported that its death toll has risen to 247 since it was founded in 1956. 12,471 people considered to be suffering after effects visited the hospital within six months. The liaison committee for Bradwell nuclear power station considers that pills to provide resistance to radio active iodine in the event of accidental fall-out be issued to villagers within a mile-and-a-half of the station. Civil Defence Corps and the Auxiliary Fire Services it was announced are to be radically reorganised with annual bounties and time limits for completing training. CND was reported to have stimulated interest in civil defence and CND members had even joined. A high explosive shell two miles off target near Devises landed in a cornfield where three farm workers were busy. Two Iraqi MiG fighters bombed a Turkish gendarme post by mistake. Nine of the twelve handbells loaned to Bath Festival by Civil Defence are missing, they are government stores and we would like them back as soon as possible. They would be needed in the event of a nuclear war to warn the public'. . . .

MISS BRITAIN 1962 gave up her title. She is reported as saying, 'I'd rather go to Russia as a nuclear disarmament supporter than to America as a beauty queen'. This she denied. She had been on Aldermaston marches and felt that the publicity about her alleged political views would give her no chance in the competition. Ninetene people were charged with obstruction outside the U.S. Embassy in protest against space bomb tests. Desmond Lock was sentenced to fifteen months' imprisonment for inciting persons to obstruct pedestrians in Parliament Square and roads in the vicinity. This was a Committee of 100 demonstration and the Sessions chairman, Mr. R. E. Seaton, said: "I think you are a dangerous person and you must be kept out of the way." The House of Lords gave their reasons for dismissing the appeals of the six

Wethersfield demonstrators, finding "that the disposition of the armed forces is within the exclusive discretion of the Crown and the policy of the Crown in these matters cannot be challenged in a court of law. The criminal law of England was not devised to deal with issues touching on political opinions." A seventeen-year-old boy was fined £25 at Tunbridge Wells for making a false statement on a passport form, he had forged his foster-father's signature. He ran away to Europe and for six months lived adventurously in France, Switzerland, Italy and Greece. He said to a reporter: "I'm not ashamed of being described as a beatnik. I hate restrictions and discipline of any kind. And I'm afraid I'm the lazy sort. . . . I have delivered anarchist leaflets in Paris and worked on a fishing boat in Greece. It has been a wonderful life". . . .

PRISON OFFICERS ARE to get a 4 per cent pay rise as non-manual Civil Servants, back-dated from April 1st. The Prison Service Journal published by the Prison Commissioners stated that practically every prisoner leaves jail fatter than he went in and the pre-war diets which were on the 'verge of the punitive' have been changed and now inmates 'have really not much to complain of'. The catering service cooked and served 5,000 tons of potatoes, 5,000 tons of bread, 1,000 tons of cabbage, 1,000 tons of meat, 670 tons of fish and 7,500 gallons of vinegar. . . .

TWO BUSKERS ANNOUNCED the possibility of their retirement from West-End streets owing to punitive fines for obstruction (£30 in the last few weeks). Humphrey Lyttleton's jazz performance outside Lloyd's in the City during the Festival was halted by the police and replaced by a pipe-band because the crowd was too big. Mr. Lyttleton says if it was 'a riot', the Coronation, the Cup Final, VE Day and New Year's Eve are riots. Several roads round the Palace were closed for the Royal Gar-

Continued on page 3

More on the Anarchist Cinema

DEAR EDITORS,

Geoffrey Minish quotes comes before understand my antithesis between 'knocking people' and 'genuine argument and debate'. I think his letter shows he does. Unless I'm being over generous, the smart tone of his first letter is almost completely missing from his second letter and he argues the points I raised though his method of argument still seems to me to be that of the 'posh' press, particularly "The Observer".

In the first place he objects to my season for three reasons; the final symposium but just announces that he thinks programme, and the season's fashionableness.

1. He doesn't argue about the symposium, the tone of the writing in the it's superfluous. Such an announcement, coming before the symposium takes place from somebody who also says that he's not going to attend it seems to me just arrogant.

2. By the rules of argument, as I understand them, you can't run two sentences, which were separate in the original text, together and then extract four words from them to prove the writing sensational. Nor do you help your argument by distorting the context of your quotations. All the passage

Geoffrey Minish claims that he doesn't "to put the stress on the destructive side the anarchists" and not further down the page as he says. But in one sense I plead guilty to the charge of sensationalism. In a legitimate way, I think Buñuel and Franju are sensational directors and I tried to communicate this in what I wrote. But one would have to discuss the films in some detail

to substantiate this. That's why I asked Geoffrey Minish to see the films before he passed judgment.

3. The sentence "... the above-named are all directors of some notoriety, especially Buñuel, who is also highly fashionable, and fashion, unfortunately, is something to which the British Film Institute believes in paying tribute" is another good example of the Higher Journalism. In a very short space we are told that the directors are notorious (what's wrong with that—you'd expect anarchists to be notorious, I think) and then we move so quickly to fashionableness and the British Film Institute that it appears that all three directors are fashionable and the British Film Institute has put the season on for this reason. Now I happen to agree with Mr. Minish's attack on Sight and Sound and the National Film Theatre though I think he's rather ungenerous in the clever way he makes it. I made the same kind of attack in an article about Sight and Sound which I wrote in "Definition" some time ago. I still hold the same opinion. As for the fashionableness of the directors, Franju has never been fashionable. His two features were unsuccessful, financially and commercially, when they were shown in London. Vigo has been fashionable for

so long that the fashion almost certainly depends on his quality and not on a publicity campaign. In Buñuel's case when I began to think about the anarchist cinema some eighteen months ago for an article in "Definition", he was not at all fashionable and showings of his films were mainly confined to the pornographic cinemas in London. He has become a fashion since the showing of "Viridiana" here at the beginning of this year. My idea for the season was accepted by the British Film Institute last autumn so that they weren't guilty of playing to fashion either.

The real ground for Geoffrey Minish's objection is the narrowness of my choice. I plead guilty to this charge as well. Even without thinking about films too carefully, it would seem to me extraordinary that anarchism which is, after all, a minority position should have produced a wide range of work in a medium which is dominated by business considerations and shackled by censorship. One would expect anarchists to be very much in a minority here as well. I hoped people would get the impression that the main exponents of cinema anarchism were Vigo, Buñuel and Franju because that's what I happen to think. There's a real difference between Geoffrey Minish and me here

but he hasn't argued it yet and merely asserts that other films are anarchist as well. I don't agree but we'd need a long argument about the films Geoffrey Minish cites. I could be wrong and I'm open to conviction but Geoffrey Minish doesn't seem to want to convince me because he's soon off on the fashionable smear again.

I can't be held responsible for what Penelope Gilliatt writes in "The Observer". (Are FREEDOM and ANARCHY fashionable gimmicks because Colin MacInnes wrote about them in "The Queen"?). I thought her piece about the season was generous but I profoundly disagree with what she wrote in the passage Geoffrey Minish quotes. I'd also like to know how you issue an 'implicit' definition. An implicit definition of the season can only emerge out of seeing the films. Again I can't be held responsible if people don't bother to see the film and merely use the label. One of my objections to Geoffrey Minish is that his easy dismissal encourages that kind of attitude.

I still think Geoffrey Minish's definition of anarchist cinema is extraordinarily vague. A film advocating capitalism made in Russia would be subversive but how could you call it anarchist? "The Grapes of Wrath" attacks capitalism and in part advocates socialism in the context of America in the 1930's but it would seem to me incredible to describe it as an anarchist film. 'Subversive' is surely much too loose a word to be of any use whatsoever and I still think Geoffrey Minish would have to make it subversive from an anarchist point of view and define 'anarchist'.

I understand Geoffrey Minish's approval of Colonel Dax's caution in "Paths of Glory". I'm simply amazed that an anarchist should use that kind of argument. In any case, what about collective action from Dax and his men? "Paths of Glory" just doesn't consider any of the implications of the issues it raises. It seems to me, if I may say so, a good example of a 'fashionable' anti-war film, giving a general impression of radicalism and avoiding all the serious issues.

I haven't seen all the films Geoffrey Minish quotes. Those I have seen ("A nous la liberté", "Drole de Drame", "Hellzapopin" and "Some Like it Hot") seem to vary widely in subject, attitude and quality. I can't see any common denominator in them. And they raise all kinds of questions. Why, for instance, does Billy Wilder become an anarchist when he makes "Some Like it Hot" and stop being one when he makes "The Apartment"? If it's any consolation to Geoffrey Minish I wanted to show "A nous la liberté" in my season but wasn't able to get it.

When I called Chaplin a 'licensed entertainer' I was talking about the man as he reveals himself in his films. None of his films disturb—they are all based on the myth of the little man winning through by luck in the end. Of course Chaplin fought the Hollywood production system. So did Erich von Stroheim and Orson Welles. This doesn't stop me thinking that neither are anarchists and that Stroheim is a great artist and Welles a trivial one.

Geoffrey Minish can't resist the smart crack though. He can't come to the symposium because it's on a Saturday and that's his night for the pictures. Are we to take it that this proves what a down-to-earth proletarian he is? I bet he has fish and chips on the way home too. Since he has taken the trouble to write two letters to FREEDOM criticising the season, I'd have thought this showed how much there was a need for such a symposium where people could air their criticisms. His final crack is very typical too. Having more or less admitted that he was smart at the expense of Spike Milligan, he is now smart at the expense of the people taking part in the symposium. 'Those upper case British artists' he calls them. I wonder if he knows anything about Guy Brenton's attempt to break out of the stranglehold of British documentary? Or that John Arden's plays have been disastrous commercial failures? Is his sympathy reserved strictly for Chaplin?

One final point. The serious issues Geoffrey Minish raises would take too much space for one to go on arguing them in FREEDOM's correspondence columns. If anybody who runs one of the off-centre discussion groups thinks the issues worthwhile, would they be prepared to devote one of the discussions to them? And would Geoffrey Minish come along and discuss the issues with me?

Yours sincerely,

ALAN LOVELL.

CAN WE DO IT OURSELVES?

THE Anarchist Cinema Season at the National Film Theatre finished last Saturday, and should give a basis for discussion in FREEDOM.

Many fine films were shown, largely the works of Buñuel, Franju and Vigo. The chance to see such rarely shown films was taken by many people and although only a small fraction of the audience went so far as to buy this paper from the improvised anarchist bookstall outside, it was still an unusually good opportunity to spread anarchist philosophy among people prepared to consider it.

Most of the films were worth seeing for their artistic value and most of them were of interest to people wanting to change society. Some of the films like two of Franju's presented the world to us, largely without comment, leaving it to us to reject the values shown. In *Sang des Bêtes* he showed the brutality of the meat industry and in *Hôtel des Invalides*, the brutality of war. Buñuel, in *Nazarin* and *Viridiana*, showed attempts to change society by charity and the resulting disillusionment. There are also films showing human relationships and the protest of men against institutions and conventions.

Now, whilst these films are excellent in what they set out to do, they leave the solution of the problems to us. We must find the way of changing the world, other than charity or fighting institutions blindly.

Had these films shown some of the answers which anarchist philosophy offers, they would rightly have been called anarchist. As it was we had dissatisfaction and protest but no coherent alternative offered. We need anarchist films showing people using knowledge of anarchist philosophy to organise their lives to their mutual advantage and showing methods of combatting authority which are successful and have a workable alternative to substitute.

The organisers of the Season have equated anarchism with violent, blind rejection, with chaos and the hopeless eccentric or outcast. True, these are good themes for films and often show optimism and a search for freedom but do not present an anarchist case. Arthur Seaton in *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* rejects and protests but knows nothing of anarchism.

Many good films were not shown; *Viva Zapata* would surely have been more appropriate than documentaries on Notre Dame and the Theatre National Populaire. The climax of the Season showed under the title *British Anarchism* I a film on William Blake, a film of the crucifixion and various Christian superstitions, and an account of the efforts of polio victims to regain their strength. These were probably intended to show that through pain there is growth, and were ridiculous as a summing-up of the anarchist case.

During the evening, *British Anarchism* II was to have been a discussion in which "some British Artists will talk about their work and in what way it could be called anarchist". Unfortunately, the speakers showed no know-

ledge of anarchism, one of them describing his definition of it as empirical and whilst some discussion on the art of cinema followed, any references to anarchist philosophy was considered irrelevant.

This series of excellent films has been presented with an ignorance of anarchist philosophy which can only lead to confusion in the minds of the audience (perhaps this confusion is synonymous with anarchism in the minds of the organisers).

Can we correct this by presenting our own film season? Can we even set up our own film unit and try to present a better anarchist case? M.B.

LEON MORIN, PRIEST

EVERY political party has produced its renegade and every religious movement its heretic, and whether these off-beat characters have in the end been promoted to oblivion or have crashed to glory they themselves can be the only witnesses of their inner motives, and only traitors to themselves. But the tragedy lies not with those burning merrily for the greater glory but with the debris of emotionally unstable men and women who placed their faith in their self-chosen leaders, and now, leaderless and alone, crawl through an alien world seeking another human crutch to bear the weight of their blind misery—and God help those whom they finally choose. They are those pathetic caricatures of comic super-men who assemble in Bayswater drawing-rooms and slum alleys around the banners of their week-end Führer; the devout and the faithful forever on their knees before an unresponding painted altar and the lonely and afraid paying for the aid that never comes from the spirits of the uncaring dead.

They sit dry-lipped among the mass membership of the major parties ever waiting to scream traitor, traitor, traitor to the one-time rebel who now sits among the executive, for every dictatorship has spawned those who believed that the revolution had been betrayed, every

democracy those who whine that they were hoodwinked, and every religion those who found that their own lump of gilded clay was of the same earthly substance as their unenlightened competitors. But there is neither answer nor end to their problem for their agony began the day they left the womb and only the grave can offer succour.

Beatrice Beck in her autobiographical novel attempted to give the case for these people, and Jean-Pierre Melville now offers his film version to a London audience (the Academy Cinema) with "Leon Morin, Priest". The period is war-time Occupied France and the lonely widow of a young Jew who has been murdered by the Germans desperately seeks someone who will share her sorrows. An atheist and a communist, merely by label, she attempts unsuccessfully to find an inner peace in a barren lesbian courtship and then inevitably she seeks an answer in the equally barren world of manufactured religious mysticism. Her entry into this phase is occasioned when she stalks into a confessional with no other purpose than to tell the brain-washed priest her opinion of his particular religion and to the surprise of no one but herself she finds that she has now found another ersatz salvationist to carry her unwelcomed banner.

Jean-Paul Belmondo, known to us for his performance in "A bout de souffle", plays father Morin and Emmanuelle Riva, who appeared with distinction in "Hiroshima mon amour", the woman. The excellence of their performance merely adds gloss but not depth to a shallow case. For Jean-Pierre Melville the director has used this film to plead a point, and that is the justification of the ideal of celibacy for Father Morin is emphatic that salvation for the wench in the confessional lies not in his bed but in another life and in the meantime she must concentrate on prayer-bashing and leading the good life. In spite of the trivial and unimportant problem that the film poses it is still worthy of our

HE WOULD HAVE LOOKED SILLY

Sir—Mrs. Sutton was disappointed at hearing the National Anthem on the Duke of Edinburgh's birthday instead of a hymn for Whitsun (Letters, June 17).

I, on the other hand, was in my garden waiting for the B.B.C. signal, to hoist the Union flag for H.R.H.'s birthday. I'd have looked pretty silly if they'd played "Come, Holy Ghost..."

MAURICE H. JENKS,
(Win-Comdr., R.A.F., Ret.)
Highcliff-on-Sea, Hants.

—Sunday Telegraph, 24 June.

BOOKS?

We can supply

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

NEW BOOKS

- What is Property P.-J. Proudhon 42/-
Politics and the Novel Irving Howe 12/6
Authority and Delinquency in the Modern States Alex Comfort 10/6
The Grand Camouflage Burnett Bolloten 30/-
Prison Etiquette by the Inmates 7/6
The Uncomfortable Inn Dachine Rainer 18/-
In the Struggle for Equality B. Yelensky 17/6
Godwin and the Age of Transition (ed.) A. E. Rodway 10/6
Marx, Proudhon and European Socialism J. Hampden Jackson 8/6
Pope John and the Cold War F. A. Ridley 5/-

REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

- Voices of 'Dissent' 10/-
The London Years Rudolf Rocker 7/6

SECOND-HAND

- Can Parliament Survive? Christopher Hollis 3/6; What is Philosophy? Howard Selsam 3/6; To Tea on Sunday Leslie Halward 3/6; Geography and World Power James Fairgrieve 3/-; British Liberty in Danger (1940) Ronald Kidd 5/-; Letters from an Outpost Alex Comfort 4/6; A Source of Embarrassment Mary McCarthy 3/-; Karl Marx L. Perchik 2/6; Behind the Scenes of the Great Strike (1926) Hamilton Fyfe 6/-; The Battle for Homes Ted Bramley 2/6; An Outline of Political Geography (1942) J. F. Horrabin 2/6; Socialism and Superior Brains George Bernard Shaw 3/-; Looking Ahead (1947) Harry Pollitt 2/6; All About Geology Horace B. Woodward 2/6; Not Guilty: a Defence of the Bottom Dog Robert Blatchford 3/-; Poems of Human Service G. Spiller 2/6; Psychology for Everyone A. E. Mander 2/6; The Gadfly E. L. Voynich 3/-; My Favourite Books Robert Blatchford 3/6; America and the Intellectuals Burnham, Maier, Mills, etc. 5/-.

PERIODICALS

- Solidarity 6d.; New Left Review 3/6; Views and Comments, June, 1/-.

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

FILM REVIEW

attention for it has been made with care and understanding.

In a dozen isolated incidents Melville catches the diseased air of Occupied France and the reaction to a translation of governmental authority. The child accepting the altar bread as food off the ration; the men and women drifting along the streets on forced yet aimless journeys; the daily ritual of a religion performed not as an act of faith but merely to conform to a schedule.

Yet having accepted all this one wonders what would have happened if the priest and been seventy years of age, had no teeth and had suffered from halitosis or scabies. For who or what would have been the unfortunate recipient of a woman's emotional and sexual frustration; but there will always be a de Gaulle, a Macmillan, a Stalin, a Hitler or an Elvis for these unfortunates to suffer for.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

Anarchy 18 is about
Comprehensive
Schools
ORDER EXTRA COPIES
FOR YOUR TEACHER FRIENDS!

MORE ABOUT FREE SPEECH ...

LAST week we put forward arguments against denying to, or calling for legislation to prevent, those who profess thoroughly un-social views from expressing them in public if they so wish. The case of the self-professed anti-Semite, British National Socialist, Colin Jordan, was taken a step further when the Coventry schools government sub-committee decided to suspend him from his job as a school teacher. It is generally admitted that he did his job efficiently and without bringing his political ideas into the classroom. He has therefore been suspended for his political activities outside school hours. One can understand that with the publicity given to the meeting in the Press, the schools committee must have found themselves in an embarrassing situation but that is no excuse for taking the cowardly way out of suspending the man, for, in any case, having suspended him they have not dealt with the problem. Is he to be suspended on full pay for the rest of his working life? If not then he must either be dismissed or reinstated. If he is dismissed on what grounds other than that either it would be embarrassing for Jewish of coloured children to have to attend his class, knowing what his views are, or that parents have raised objections to their children being taught by this man?

If one succumbs to such pressures, we can think of a hundred other reasons why some parents might object to particular teachers. Many people would say that just as bad as our British National Socialist, are teachers who are atheists, or Conscientious Objectors, or unmarried mothers, or Anarchists or even just Labour Party socialists. As a matter of fact we do not imagine that the children at the school where Mr. Jordan taught were unaware of his political views. Our recollections of our schooldays are that we knew a hell-of-a-lot about our

teachers' private lives, their particular likes and dislikes and any "peculiarities", such as those who were homosexuals. Magistrates and the protectors of children's innocence, seem to live in a world of unreality so far as the young are concerned. Just as we knew how to cope with the homosexual masters—and this writer cannot recall any boy ever rushing to report "indecent acts" to the headmaster—we would also have known how to deal with any teacher who might vent his racist or other prejudices on any particular boy. After all, teachers do have their likes and dislikes irrespective of racial questions, and when one saw that a particular teacher "picked" on a particular boy we would react by having recourse to non-co-operation with that teacher or by giving him "hell" in other ways! This is the only safeguard that is needed to prevent the Mr. Jordans of this world from putting their anti-social ideas into practise in the class room.

Children are not hot house plants who have to be protected from racists, homosexuals and unorthodox ideas. Given freedom they can act in a responsible way; given an education which encourages them to think, which arouses their intellectual curiosity, they will be receptive to all ideas and be "corrupted" by none! It is only when education is an elaborate form of brainwashing—the morning prayers, the patriotic songs on Empire Day, the recognition that schooling was to prepare you to get a job—this was the pattern of "education" at our Elementary schools 30 years ago—one hopes it has changed!—that the young mind is unable to comprehend and sort out the realities of life outside. And these are the people who can only deal with their own feelings of frustration and inadequacy by seeking scapegoats among religious and racial minorities in their midst.

... AND BRAINWASHING

MR. JORDAN maintains "I have always left my politics at home. I have followed this rule meticulously and most successfully". We cannot imagine that an anarchist teacher, or a socialist, or a pacifist, or a christian teacher would pride themselves that they were able to keep their ideas and their jobs as teachers in two watertight compartments. If Mr. Jordan thought his racist ideas were good, positive, social ideas why be unwilling to allow them to influence his work as a teacher? A good teacher, to our minds, is not only one with the ability to arouse in his pupils an interest in the subject he teaches; that surely is only the beginning of his relationship with his pupils.

Thinking back to one's schooldays one realises that the teachers one still recalls vividly are just those who did more than teach their subjects; they somehow also got you thinking, and aroused your interest in the non-profitable (materially speaking) activities not included in the curriculum. We had teachers with all kinds of political ideas and prejudices; we cannot recall any boy being "corrupted" by them! How much more corrupting is—or was—religious education from early childhood, served up as an undisputed truth; or the teaching of respect for authority, the policeman, the government, royalty etc.

The people who are advocating that Mr. Jordan should be shut up both as a propagandist, and as a teacher, would be the last to object to religious instruction and drumming into children's heads respect for Authority, thereby showing how successfully they themselves have been brainwashed! Few people today will find Mr. Jordan's ideas acceptable. But how many millions blindly accept the mumbo-jumbo of religion and never question the validity of Authority in every sphere of social life! When people will be liberated from the authority of Gods and governments, they will also be liberated from the would-be Hitlers and other saviours of the Race!

Anarchists and the Working Class Movement - 2

(Continued from previous issue)
ONE must not confuse "syndicalism", which is intended to be a doctrine and a method for solving the social problem, with the promotion, the existence and the activities of the workers' Unions. . . .

For us it is not all that important that the workers should want more or less; what is important, is that they should try to get what they want by their own efforts, by their direct action against the capitalists and the government.

A small improvement achieved by one's own effort is worth more, in its effect on morale—materially too, in the long term—than a large scale reform granted by government or capitalists for doubtful ends or even out of the "kindness of their hearts".¹

We have always understood the vital importance of the workers' movement and the need for anarchists to play an active and forceful part in it. And often it has been as a result of the initiative of our comrades that workers groups have been formed which are more lively and more progressive. We have always thought that the Trade Union is, today, a means whereby workers can begin to understand their position as slaves, to want their emancipation and to accustom themselves to the solidarity of all the oppressed in the struggle against the oppressors—and that tomorrow it will serve as the first necessary nucleus for the continuation of social life and the reorganisation of production without bosses and parasites.

But we have always discussed, and often disagreed, on the ways anarchist action had to be carried out in relation to the workers' organisation.

Should one join the Unions or stay out though taking part in all the struggles, seeking to make them as radical as possible, in the forefront of action and danger?

And above all, whether within the Unions, anarchists should accept executive posts and thus lend themselves to those negotiations, compromises, adjustments and contacts with the authorities and the employers, which the workers themselves demand of them and which are part and parcel of the day to

day demands for better conditions or for the defence of concessions already won?

In the two years that followed the peace and up to the eve of the triumph of fascist reaction we found ourselves in a unique situation.

The revolution seemed imminent, and the material and spiritual conditions were, in fact, present to make a revolution possible as well as necessary.

But we anarchists lacked by a long chalk the strength necessary to make the revolution with our methods and relying exclusively on our numbers; we needed the masses, and they were quite prepared to take action, but they were not anarchist. In any case, a revolution without the support of the masses, even had it been possible, could have only resulted in a new domination, which even if exercised by anarchists would have always been the negation of anarchism, would have corrupted the new rulers and would have ended up with the return of the Statist, capitalistic order.

To have withdrawn from the struggle, and abstained because we could not do just what we would have wished to do, would have been a renunciation of every present or future possibility, of every hope of developing the movement in the direction we wished it to go. It would have been renunciation for all time because there will never be anarchist masses until society has been economically and politically transformed, and the same situation will present itself each time circumstances create a situation with revolutionary possibilities.

It will therefore be necessary at any cost to win the confidence of the masses, and be in a position to "push" them when they are in the mood for action, and for this it seemed useful to secure executive posts in the workers' organisations. All the dangers of reformism, corruption were pushed into the background, and in any case it was assumed that there wouldn't be time for them to take effect.

So it was decided to leave everybody free to act according to the circumstances and as they thought best, with the only condition of not forgetting that they were anarchists always guided by the overriding

interest of the anarchist cause.

But now bearing in mind recent experience, and in view of the present situation . . . it seems to me that it would be useful to return to the question and see whether it is a case of modifying our tactic on this most important aspect of our activity.

In my opinion, we must join the Unions, because by remaining outside we appear inimical to them, our criticisms are viewed with suspicion and at a time of agitation we shall appear as intruders and our participation coldly accepted. . . .

And so far as soliciting and accepting posts as leaders I believe that in general and in periods of calm, it is better to avoid doing so. But I believe that the damage and the danger lie not so much in the fact of occupying an executive post—which in certain circumstances can be useful and also necessary—but where the post becomes a permanent one. In my opinion, the executive personnel should be renewed as often as possible, both in order to give as many workers as possible experience of administrative jobs, as well as to prevent organisational work from becoming a profession and inducing those who do it from introducing into the workers' struggle concern about not losing their jobs.

And all this not only in the interests of the present struggle and the education of the workers, but also, and what is more important, with an eye on the development of the revolution once it has started.

With justification are anarchists opposed to authoritarian communism, which presupposes a government wanting to direct every aspect of social life, and places the organisation of production and the distribution of wealth under the orders of its nominees, which cannot but create the most hateful tyranny and the crippling of all the living forces in society.

The Unions, apparently in agreement with the anarchists in their aversion for State centralisation, want to dispense with the government putting the Unions in its place; and they say that it is the Unions which must take over the wealth, requisition all foodstuffs and be

Continued on page 4

Continued from page 1

den Party. President Tubman of Liberia made a State Visit and got very wet. Mr. Zdenek Fierlinger, the President of the Czech National Assembly visited the country as a guest of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. He apologised to Lord Layton for allegations in the 1952 Slansky trials that Lord Layton and his daughter were implicated in espionage plots. . . .

MR. FOULKES, PRESIDENT of the ETU was expelled from the Union with an *ex gratia* pension of £750 a year till he drew the Union pension in three years' time. He had been paid £1,485 and had the use of a Rover car. A Croydon transmission engineer died of burns after touching a 132,000 volt transformer at a sub-station. The NUT decided to send 'a friend' when Colin Jordan meets the school governors. Birmingham Trades Council thinks that wrestlers should be helped by the unions to secure their legitimate claims, it deplored their victimization for having joined unions, and defended their inalienable right to do so. The Variety Artists' Federation secretary pressed their case. . . .

THE PARIS COUR DE CASSATION announced that the military tribunal was wrong in acquitting three French Army lieutenants charged with torturing an Algerian woman so that she died. The Mormon Churches appeal for rating relief failed because their religious services were ex-

OUT OF THIS WORLD

clusive and not public. The Court of Criminal Appeal rejected a new move for an appeal by Alfred George Hinds. The Beaverbrook newspapers won a libel action against the BBC for an 'Any Questions' programme criticising *Express* newspapers. . . .

BURMESE TROOPS BLEW UP Rangoon University Students' Union after a riot in which sixteen students were killed and sixty other people were injured. The Army described the Union building as 'a cancer on the student body'. Portuguese students have been suspended from studies for between two and three years. This means that fifty of them concerned in recent strike action will automatically be called up for military service. Mr. Dennis Howell, Labour M.P. for Small Heath, claimed that the Ministry of Education 'incited students to immorality' by barring marriage allowances to students who wed in three-year training period. The *Saturday Review* lists among the achievements of the 1961-62 academic year were that of a student at Schenectady who kept a cigarette lighter flame alive for 83 mins., 30 secs.; a telephone talkathon at California Polytechnic kept up by one hundred students for 504 hours; four students at Fordham swallowed fifty-seven gold fish; eighty students in Oxford, Ohio, maintained a

see-saw endurance contest (in relays) for 144 hours and the Harvard elephant won out over fifteen others in the first inter-collegiate elephant race in history. . . .

A U.S. ENTERTAINER won an award of one million pounds for ruin of his career because he was branded 'communist'. Mr. Dennis Healy asked for Government action regarding Maltese citizens who were refused absolution or told it was a mortal sin to vote for the opposition in the elections. A Brooklyn rabbi denounced the police for handcuffing, stripping and putting motorists in jail for minor motoring offences; it happened to him. Hundreds said they were jailed with prostitutes and pimps because they had not enough money on them for parking fines. Joe Wilder, negro trumpeter in Benny Goodman's band claimed 'racial discrimination' by Russian taxi-drivers. Delegates to the Congress of the International Federation of Societies of Cosmetic Chemists claim to have a pill which will control the colour of the hair and skin by internal means and provide 'a neutral world-wide complexion'. . . .

THE CONSERVATIVE GOVERNMENT chosen by Mr. Macmillan was replaced by a Conservative Government chosen by Mr. Macmillan.

JON QUINOTE.

750
new readers
wanted
this year!

More about violence

DEAR EDITORS,

Maybe I'm dim. I have read your reply to criticisms of your editorial "Did Violence Fail in Algeria?" but I still cannot understand what you mean. Now I have just consulted my dictionary and find that violence can mean 'the use of physical force'. Well, if that is what you mean when you say 'violence' I am not very worried at all—but the Algerians and the Spanish Anarchists went further than that and you don't seem to have made any distinction. I still think you need to clarify your position.

I wish to point out right away that my advocacy of the use of 'love, conciliation and reason' was insufficient: I should have added the very necessary 'determination'. I have absolutely no time for Allen Skinner's brand of pacifism either.

I just cannot agree with your conception of the Clores and ICI's in relation to the man in the street. I see no class struggle in the sense that A is pitted against B. What I do see is a damned great festering ant-heap with Clore on the top and thousands of professional men in the middle and millions of Old Age Pensioners, Widows, unemployed and chronic sick at the bottom—all trying to get UP. I see Anarchists, like myself, about two-thirds of the way down the heap—but we are not trying to get up higher. Mr. Clore, at the top, is not activated, as you suggest, mainly by reason: he is activated mainly by fear. He knows as well as we do that the oppressed, underprivileged masses at the bottom of the heap will jolly well oppress him if he gives them half a chance. So he consolidates his position. The only possible way to affect him is to confront him with a mass of UNARMED people who can convince him that they will not oppress him if he gives up his power. If that is what you mean by a "superior force" I am with you all the way.

Our job is to somehow influence the masses—and it is those at the bottom of the ant-heap that should be most easily influenced (to this end I have suggested that it should be a tactic of the better paid professional members of the



Committee of 100 to refuse salary increments—as a gesture to the £10 a week workers).

It should be remembered that the vast majority of Clore's protectors (Armed Forces, Police, etc.) are, like us, near the bottom of the ant-heap: it is possible that they would come over to our side if we acted on non-violence principles.

I think this is long enough for a letter. Depending on your reply, I will endeavour to set out my ideas at length in an article for a future issue of FREEDOM. Slough, July 9. ERNIE CROSSWELL.

and suffering

DEAR COMRADES,

In his long articles, "Pacifism, Non-Violence and Anarchism", the FREEDOM editor who believes in the need for violence does nothing to answer the main point of my letter, except by a frivolous remark about an anarchist general staff. The situation I postulated must have occurred dozens, if not hundreds, of times in the Spanish and Algerian wars, although no doubt it was more often a village or a solitary farmhouse that had to be fired on, regardless of the consequences to unarmed and defenceless people.

Surely it is clear that with missile weapons in general use a lot of unarmed and defenceless people are going to be killed by both sides in any conceivable kind of conflict or struggle? (I try to avoid using the word "war", so that no suggestion of ordinary military strategy shall mislead people into thinking that I have in mind an anarchist staff issuing commands, though I strongly suspect one would come into being in the event, though it would not be called that).

An anarchist bullet, bomb or shell is just as lethal as an authoritarian one, nor is it any more capable of distinguish-

ing between a pregnant woman (let us say) and a fascist thug. This is to put it at its simplest, but what about the plagues and famine that are the inevitable concomitant of armed struggle, as in Algeria and the Congo for example? Germs and hunger are no respecters of political loyalties.

How any kind of violent struggle is to be waged without involving suffering for large numbers of non-combatants I cannot for the life of me imagine. I suppose that the editor has in mind some kind of *levée en masse* of the entire population, who then proceed to liquidate pockets of authoritarian resistance, which they are numerous enough to accomplish without involving the entire country in chaos and bloodshed. Even in Spain this mass popular resistance did not succeed in defeating fascism in the end, it held Franco back for a time, but the people seem to have ended by allowing an ordinary war to be organised, which they lost.

One may take the stand that the deaths of a large number of non-combatants are part of the inevitable price that has to be paid for freedom, even though many of these unfortunates did not wish to participate in the struggle (reactionaries!). But to reason like this is to reason like a militarist.

The advantage of non-violence is that the suffering falls largely on the heads of the non-violent resisters themselves. Desolation is not spread over the entire country. This is not of course to make a cult of suffering, as some non-violent resisters seem to do. However it does seem better that if someone has to be hurt it should be the people who actually chose to resist.

One also must take exception to the tone in which the article is written, for it tends to suggest that the anarchists believe in violence, at least sometimes, as opposed to the pacifists who do not. It is implied that those anarchists who are also pacifists are a deviant body, a minority, whereas in fact they constitute perhaps the majority of the movement, certainly a very large proportion.

London, ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

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.

ANARCHISTS & THE WORKERS' MOVEMENT

Continued from page 3 responsible for their distribution as well as organise production and barter. And I would see nothing to object to in this if the Unions opened their doors wide to all the population, and left the dissidents free to act and to have their share.

But in practice this expropriation and this distribution cannot be effected impulsively, by the mass, even if in possession of a Union card, without producing a harmful waste of natural wealth and the sacrificing of the weaker to the stronger; and even more difficult would it be to establish by mass meetings agreements between the different regions, and the barter arrangements between the various corporations of producers. Provision therefore would have to be made through decisions taken at popular assemblies and carried out by groups and individuals who have volunteered or are duly delegated.

Now, if there are a limited number of people who through long tenure of office are considered trade union leaders; if there are permanent secretaries and official organisers, it will be they who will automatically find themselves charged with organising the revolution, and they will tend to consider as intruders and irresponsible elements, those who want to take independent action, and will want to impose their will, even with the best of intentions—even by the use of force.

And then the "syndicalist régime" would soon become the same lie, the same tyranny which the so-called "dictatorship of the proletariat" has become. The remedy for this danger and the condition for the success of the revolution as a progressive force, is the "formation" of a large number of individuals

with initiative and the ability to tackle practical tasks: by accustoming the masses not to leave the common cause in the hands of a few and to delegate, when delegation is necessary, only for specific missions and for limited duration. And the syndicate, if organised and acting in a truly libertarian manner, is the most effective means to create just such a situation and just such a spirit.² E. MALATESTA.

¹"Umanità Nova", April 6, 1922.

²"Fede!", Sept. 22, 1922.

(To be concluded)

HELP!

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT JULY 14th, 1962

Week 28	EXPENSES: 28 weeks at £70	£1,960
	INCOME:	
	Sales & Sub. Renewals: £	£
	Weeks 1-27	1,091
	Week 28	22
		1,113
	New Subscriptions:	
	Weeks 1-27 (206)	233
	Week 28 (6)	6
		239
		1,352
	DEFICIT	£608

DEFICIT FUND

Southend: P.O.* 5/-; Surrey: F.B.* 5/-; Peterborough: F.W. 2/6; London: A.T. 2/6; Los Angeles: S.S. £5/5/0; Preston: A.M. 15/-; Canberra: H.E.M. 8/-; Hounslow: L.K.W. 4/-; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Sheffield: Anon £1/1/0; Sittingbourne: J. & M.M. 5/-.

TOTAL 8 17 6

Previously acknowledged 704 14 4

1962 TOTAL TO DATE £713 11 10

*Denotes regular contributors.

How would a free society deal with its psychopaths?

DEAR FELLOW EDITOR,

Mr. Teller's question in your issue of June 2 deserves a careful answer, and I would like to make my own attempt to provide such a reply.

What can an anarchistic society do about psychopathic (i.e., motiveless) criminals? To begin with—and this is not begging the question—we must be very clear that contemporary society can do nothing about such persons. Capital punishment has no deterrent effect upon them; if anything, it has a provocative effect: for every one it kills, it drives two more to go "over the line" and unleash their violence more furiously. When the State sheds blood in the presence of sharks, it does not frighten them but merely activates their appetites. Furthermore, prison is not much more helpful. The enforced sodomy of such places leads to more violence, and the psychopath comes out more furiously blood-blinded than he went in. Psychiatry (in the present society) is no more useful: the psychopath is intelligent enough to know, as the hipster knows, that psychiatry has become the ally of the State and is, thus, part of the conspiracy against which he is in insurrection. Robert Lindner, of Baltimore, had more success with psychopaths than any other psychiatrist, but only because he was himself a rebel who denounced orthodox psychiatry for its allegiance with authoritarian conformity.

Now, in considering the psychopath in an anarchistic society, we are committing a semantic and logical error if we do not, first of all, ask *would* he be produced there? We can manipulate the abstractions "individual" and "society" in our heads in all sorts of fictitious ways, but in actuality the two form a *gestalt* which cannot be taken apart so easily. As an example, you can think of "homosexual" and of "Trobriand Island society" and put the two thoughts together, but in actuality the STRUCTURE of Trobriand society was such that a homosexual could not, in fact, be produced within it—not until the missionaries came. (Malinowski quotes a native as saying, homosexuality and venereal disease were brought by the missionaries. *Sexual Life of Savages*, page 473). It was only after the social STRUCTURE had been altered by Christianity that homosexuality was able to fit into Trobriand life.

Similarly, the Zuni Indians have never had a murder, and cannot *understand* the very concept of suicide. These acts do not fit the characterological structure of Zuni society. (See Ruth Benedict's *Patterns of Culture*).

Another example might make the point even clearer. Until Grantley Dick-Read, childbirth was painful in Occidental culture, whereas in many African tribes it is not painful. This instance demonstrates fully that the "individual" cannot be separated from the "society": he *thinks, acts and feels* within a spectrum of possibilities defined by the society. Even when he is "maladjusted" or "rebellious", his behaviour fits society's definition of "maladjustment" and "rebellion". An article in the *Scientific American* a few years ago demonstrated that schizophrenic Irishmen have one type of delusions, schizophrenic Italians have a different type.

So, now, are we justified in importing the psychopath into anarchistic society and worrying about what that society will do about him? The psychopath is a product of authoritarian culture. His background shows the typical pattern of violent beatings from an authoritarian father, juvenile punishment, internalization of this parental and societal behaviour in terms of the philosophy that "might is right", and the final crystallization of a personality determined to be the "mightiest" of all by being the most brutal of all. In short, the molding of the psychopathic personality is dependent upon a previous context of authoritarian-coercive society. A libertarian-voluntary society would not mold personalities of this type.

How will anarchism handle psychopaths? The same way the Zuni handle suicides, the Trobrianders handle homosexuals, and Summerhill handles bullies. It will not produce them.

Sincerely,
ROBERT ANTON WILSON,

School of Living,
Brookville, Ohio.

P.S.—A final clarification: the psychopath imitates the coercive-authoritarian structure of the State, and of parents

who are also imitating that structure. He is, so to speak, a State with a membership of one. Take away the State as a model, create a society on libertarian instead of authoritarian lines, and the psychopath will have something different to imitate.

P.P.S.—While I'm at it, I might as well stick in a plug for the School of Living's new magazine *Way Out*, which is devoted chiefly to anarchist ideas. Free sample copy on request. Will by fellow editor let me get away with this free advertisement?

LONDON FEDERATION OF ANARCHISTS

CENTRAL MEETINGS

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

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. 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, W11 (for July).

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.

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