

'No man is wise enough to foresee the secondary results of any proposed restriction, and no history is copious enough to record the evils that have ensued upon denials of liberty.'

GEORGE E. MACDONALD

1 | this Issue:

- OUT OF THIS WORLD
- DO SCHOOLS CAUSE DELINQUENCY?
- AROUND THE GALLERIES
- ANARCHISTS AND THE WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT
- LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

THERE are "socialists" who are opposed to Britain trying to gain admission to the Common Market—the EEC, while others are enthusiastic supporters; some eminent capitalist tycoons are as bitterly opposed to the EEC as others are enthusiastic; some say that the "unity" of Europe is a guarantee of peace while others declare that it is a further provocation directed against the Russian dominated bloc; some say the implementation of all the clauses of the Treaty of Rome is a first and important step towards "world government", while others that it is simply the building up of a third power bloc in which France and Western Germany will vie with each other to control it. Clearly, the role of the EEC is interpreted by different interests in different ways; hence for some it is a threat—political, economic, financial and even military, whereas for others it appears as the key to greater prosperity for the few or for the many, to "unity" in Europe for the first time, to the breakdown of frontiers, both physical and economic.

The fact that it can mean so many different and contradictory things should make the whole set-up of EEC and the negotiations for Britain's entry, highly suspect to all those who genuinely believe in real unity and co-operation among the people of all countries. Unlike those on the moderate Left who are now having second thoughts about the EEC, we anarchists have all along opposed the Common Market as an attempt by monopoly capitalism to exert a stranglehold on one of the most "prosperous" markets in the world, and to impose a "unity" from above, an economic, financial dictatorship as ruthless, and centralised as that which prevailed in Russia in Stalin's heyday!

All the member countries of the Six joined because each one of them considered that it would derive benefit from such a union. Britain is applying for membership on terms which the financial and other "experts" believe would be to the advantage of this country's economy. If Britain is accepted then it is certain that the agreed terms will be such that both Britain and the Six (or at least the dominating members of the "Community") will consider that on balance it will be to their mutual advantage. We have no doubt that it is the financial interests of the respective nations' ruling class and not a desire for European unity, mutual aid and the brotherhood of man, which will determine the issue. Just as Britain's "concern" for the Commonwealth in these negotiations is based not on particularly warm or loyal feelings for the people of the Commonwealth but on the very considerable financial and trading interests that exist between this country and the Commonwealth.

Hence the present "crisis" in the Brussels negotiations over guaran-

THE COMMON MARKET 'CRISIS'

Unity begins at home

tees for the food-producing countries of the Commonwealth. As things stand, assuming Britain enters the Common Market then she will be obliged to remove tariffs on food from the Six and impose them on the Commonwealth nations which at present enjoy preferential treatment. As a result food prices would rise and because of higher prices food production in the countries of the "Community" would be increased to the point where Europe, Britain fears, would cease to be an importer of food. Such a "calamity" would upset the economies of countries like Canada and Australia, and clearly seriously affect their ability to import industrial and manufactured goods. Britain's aim in the negotiations, therefore is to have written guarantees that food production in the EEC will be kept down, at a level well below "demand", so that the "Community" will be an outlet for food from the Commonwealth and other food-exporting countries. Britain's policy on food production was summed up by the *Guardian's* correspondent in these terms:

The best the British delegation can now get is a definition of world agreements which will tend to favour the Commonwealth when they come to be negotiated. Since it is accepted that they will offer equal terms to all outsiders, the important issue is how large a net importer of food Europe will be.

If European production is held down there will be substantial imports and the Commonwealth should do well.

The fact that this objective conflicts directly with the needs of British agriculture has escaped no one's attention; and the British delegation is being accused of having done Commonwealth food producers serious damage by giving the farmers of Europe annual review machinery with which to press the Community into fulfilling the treaty undertakings to increase "the individual earnings of persons engaged in agriculture." Does this not mean higher prices? And does it not, therefore, mean a more self-sufficient Europe? The short answer

Streamlined Capitalism

WE have no doubt that Britain will sacrifice Commonwealth interests, as of course she will also sacrifice certain home interests, if it is considered that the conditions for her entry to the EEC will result in an overall improvement of her trading possibilities and a strengthening of her financial position. And it is because some industries fear elimination if Britain enters the Common Market while others expect to do well out of it, that one has the amusing spectacle of the government being assailed from all sides by patriotic citizens warning them, on the one hand, that entry will spell disaster, and on the other that non-entry will result in a serious lowering of living standards in this country.

to this is that by low prices, high imports, and deficiency payments Britain has been able to reconcile the needs of the Commonwealth and home farmer. Under the Community System, where subsidies on this scale are out of the question, this is impossible.

The *Guardian's* correspondent adds the significant comment that the conflict between the needs of the British farmer and the Commonwealth farmer "casts doubt on the prevalent idea that Britain will act as a sort of spokesman for Commonwealth agriculture once she is in".

As a matter of fact we find it difficult to see how the economy of this country will be affected one way or the other whether she joins, or stays out of, the EEC. And for the simple reason that a country such as Britain which is one of the largest importing countries of the world *per capita* could quite easily, by a system of tariffs, give preference to those countries which not only supply her with her "needs" but also purchased from her the machinery and manufactured goods they need. British industry undoubtedly needs the markets of the Six; but equally, the Six need the British markets. So it's six to one and half-a-dozen of the other, and because it is so, we feel that the government's concern to agree the



After all General where should we be without centralisation?

terms for Britain's entry to the EEC is not motivated so much by considerations of "improving the economy" of this country, but is the result of pressure by the most powerful financial interests in this country. To our minds, Britain's entry into the Common Market will be followed by an increase in company failures, take-overs, and amalgamations; in other words, in a "concentration of capital". The capitalist machine will be streamlined, and so, more easily controlled to deal with the inflations and recessions and all the other artificial ills that beset it. We see the EEC as the consolidation of the capitalist system and not as the first steps towards the unity of the people of

Continued on page 3

200,000,000 viewers in America and Europe saw on Telstar, relayed from 3,000 miles up, the Hovercraft, the ceremony of the keys at the Tower; Big Ben, English policemen and tourists; the Eiffel Tower, *Tosca* in Rome; Sweden, Sicily, Yugoslavia; President Kennedy at a Press Conference, America on holiday, a baseball game and—a stranger in a world he never made—a Red Indian, Colonel Glenn on Space Travel; Quebec, Stratford (Canada) for *Macbeth*, the meditation room at UNO, San Francisco's Golden Gate, Niagara Falls, and faded out on the Statue of Liberty. . . .

Failure to communicate was in evidence at top levels. The Common Market talks bogged down on the point that Britain wished to keep trade with Australia, New Zealand and Canada at present levels, which was not agreed to, despite a fighting speech by Hugh Gaitskell at the Socialist International which, the *Express* says, demanded "Empire First". *Saturday Evening Post* reported Mr. Kennedy at a press conference was asked for his comment on "the so-called reverse freedom rides, whereby some Southern segregationists are attempting to send Negroes to the North". His frank, clear and fearless reply was: "Yes, I think it's a rather cheap exercise in a—you know, this country—



people are moving every day by the thousands—25 per cent. of our population lives in different states in the last decade than they did. There are hundreds, and thousands, of people coming from one state to another. So that this, rather, exercise in publicity to indicate if I—This man, it seems to me, really doesn't merit very much comment. I think he's—We have difficulties in every area. We have people who are out of work in every area. We have people who are inadequately housed in every area. And we ought to do better in every area." The American company presenting *The Premise* at the Comedy

Theatre, London, were refused permission by the Lord Chamberlain to present six sketches introducing an impersonation of President Kennedy, in spite of the White House's waiver. Mrs. Anne Randle visiting her husband Michael, in prison for eighteen months under the Official Secrets Act, was warned that talk on visits about nuclear weapons and the disarmament movement might lead to stopping of visits. Michael Randle was given seven days' solitary confinement and the loss of fourteen days' remission for an attempt to communicate with *Peace News*. . . .

Mr. Macmillan fortified by a vote of confidence from all his supporters proposed that a commission was better than an income policy. Mr. Harold Watkinson, late Minister of Defence, secured a job with an electronic group, specialists in missile and aircraft components. Sir Ivone Kirkpatrick gave notice to the Independent Television Authority that he was leaving to become chairman of the National Bank. The Socialist chairman of the National Bank, Lord Longford (formerly Lord Pakenham) is returning to politics and the class struggle. The Duke of Norfolk, Earl of Arundel, Earl of Surrey, Earl of Norfolk, Baron Fitzalan, Baron Clun, Baron Oswaldestry, Baron Maltravers and Baron Herries of Terregles in the Peerage of Scotland, not a team, but one man will manage the M.C.C. (cricket) team touring Australia, who feel that if he can run the Coronation he can run cricket. . . .

CND and Committee of 100 demonstrators pinned a CND badge to the US atomic submarine *Nautilus* in Portland Harbour. Mr. Kingsley Martin thought that if anyone had got into trouble in Moscow for distributing a "Trotskyist" leaflet he would not have been surprised, and added: "A group

of Russians in this country who went about distributing leaflets which suggested that British citizens should refuse to obey their own government would not be welcomed by our police". Mr. Arnold Kettle of the National Executive of the Communist Party found the distribution of the "Trotskyist" leaflets and the implied support of the *Guardian* for this activity, morally "a bit disgusting". A Mr. Nicolas Walter had previously pointed out that it is possible to be a left-wing opponent of the Communist Party and the Russian Government without being a "Trotskyist". The Chairman of the Docks Committee of 100 distributed leaflets in Russia to sailors from a Russian ship in the Royal Group of Docks. It was reported on the BBC European Service that Gerard Daeschel the Canadian pacifist had got into trouble at the Helsinki Youth Peace Conference for distributing leaflets. Mr. Desmond Donnelly failed to hold a comparable demonstration simultaneously in Trafalgar Square as promised if the Committee of 100 demonstrated in Red Square. Miss Pat Arrowsmith and the Rev. Michael Scott resigned from the national council of CND in protest against Canon Collons' implications (in a letter to *The Times*) that CND would not press for strikes against nuclear weapons. . . .

Mr. Kruchchev averred that he had an anti-missile-missile that 'hits a fly in outer space'. It had been planned to show delegates to the World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace, films of an anti-rocket rocket in action but it was felt to be undesirable. The Americans tested an anti-missile-missile (missile?) in the Pacific three days later. Mr. Macnamara, defence secretary, said he was confident that American missiles would be able to penetrate any anti-missile defence system "which has been

Continued on page 4

ANARCHY 18

is all about ➔

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

Comprehensive Schools

Is school a CAUSE of delinquency?

IT is usual to regard juvenile delinquency as the result of lack of proper "discipline" among children, and to regard the school as one of the agencies concerned in combatting the delinquent tendencies of young people. School-teachers often regard themselves, and are regarded by others, as middle-class crusaders bringing civilization to the under-socialized children of the working class. To accept such a picture is to misunderstand entirely the nature and meaning of juvenile delinquency. There is, in fact, some good evidence which indicates that the school itself is in some cases an active cause in the promotion of juvenile delinquency. Whereas Mr. Fagin knew just what he was about when he embarked on his training programme for young thieves, the heads and assistant teachers of the modern establishments which turn out young thieves, tearaways and blague mobs, are quite unaware of their success in this direction.

All social behaviour, including acts which are officially delinquent, depend upon a variety of causative factors, and we must be careful not to attribute undue weight to any one factor. Thus most young thieves come from homes in the lower income brackets, but it would be quite incorrect to assume that material poverty is the main direct cause of their thieving. It is not. As far as we can tell, with boys up to about the age of 16, robbery of one sort and another is carried out for the fun of it, and that nowadays material want is a minor factor. In the same way, the delinquency rate of a particular school cannot be taken as a direct measure of the success of the teachers' methods in (unknowingly) emulating Mr. Fagin. If we look at the juvenile court records

of any city, we see that schools vary a good deal in their delinquency rates, but part of this variability is due to the fact that the schools reflect the behaviour patterns of the immediate districts which they serve. Again it may be noted that certain types of school have very high delinquency rates, e.g. Roman Catholic schools—but this fact cannot entirely be attributed to their religious slant, because the R.C. faith is associated in this country with a certain ethnic group whose habitual mores bring them more often before the courts than others. The extent to which such moves are supported and maintained by the social practices of the R.C. church is another matter.

It will be appreciated from the above, that the question of investigating the extent to which juvenile delinquency is directly attributable to the methods in use in a particular school, is a complex one. It is, however, by no means insuperable. Some ten years ago such a study was carried out in Los Angeles, and five main factors associated with the development of juvenile delinquency were found to be of importance. Briefly, they may be summarised thus:—

1. The failure to provide a curriculum suited to individual abilities, interests and needs of pupils who had previously had a record of repeated failure and frustration.
2. The arbitrary enrolment of pupils in secondary courses without reference to their interests and capacities.
3. "Employment by the teacher of only one teaching method, i.e. talking".
4. Failure of the classroom teacher to be able to distinguish between poor achievement and limited intelligence.
5. Failure of the teacher to provide a permissive classroom atmosphere.

In England points 1 and 2 are officially met administratively by the provision of special schools and by grammar-technical-secondary modern division at the age of 11+. Almost any primary

school, however, has cases that they would like to transfer to an "Educationally Subnormal" (E.S.N.) school but cannot, partly because of administrative red-tape and partly because of the determined resistance of the parents. The parents resist transfer because of the fearful reputation of the E.S.N. schools. Whether the E.S.N. schools really provide a curriculum suited to the needs of their pupils is a matter of opinion. Some critics hold that they provide a niche for E.S.N. school-teachers. In theory, the provision of three types of school at the secondary stage was designed to meet the needs of three hypothetical types of children—a theory based on no practical evidence whatsoever. In practice, the treatment meted out in many secondary modern schools might be nicely calculated to preserve their tradition of a high rate of attendance at the Juvenile Court.

Point 3 is an excellent one, and is ably discussed by Dr. Nolan:—

"The study results showed that there was a definite relationship between the serious behaviour and maladjustment of certain students and the fact that in almost two-thirds of the recorded cases, classroom teachers had failed to differentiate their teaching methods to stimulate student reaction not only to auditory impressions (hearing) by their talking, talking, talking, but also to include stimulation by visual impressions (seeing), and by manipulative contacts (doing)".

I would supplement Dr. Nolan's criticism by suggesting that even where the classroom is hung like a Christmas tree with "visual aids" and action material is provided, the awful talk, talk, talk of the school-teacher is so powerful an irritant that many a child must develop a sort of psychological deafness and a deep-rooted cussedness. She writes:

"In some cases, only a change of program involving enrollment in a different teacher's class was the solu-

tion. In other cases, it was too late and there was no solution."

Except to boot out the school-teacher, I suggest. Yet it appears that in California, as in this country, it is virtually impossible to sack a school-teacher on the plain grounds that he is worse than useless at his job.

Point 4 is an important one and likely to lead to misunderstanding. Many tests of intelligence are verbally biased and owe their supposed validity to their correlation with academic achievement. It is extraordinarily humiliating for a child of comparatively superior intelligence to be patronised and treated like a half-wit by a school-teacher of comparatively inferior intelligence. The child may know quite well that the teacher is a fool, but a fool with a certain range of academic skills. Of this Dr. Nolan writes:—

"The study results indicated that many teachers do not have the training and ability to distinguish between the need for remedial instruction and the need for a modified curriculum, nor are they able to provide the correct type of program after the true position has been diagnosed. Evidence disclosed the fact that several teachers were of the opinion that a number of students were mentally retarded, when more adequate diagnosis later proved that they were in need only of remedial instruction in the fundamental tool subjects, mainly reading. Other cases were described where teachers were attempting to provide remedial instruction to certain students, when their real need was a modified curriculum."

Point 5 is fundamental to the whole question of juvenile delinquency. Let us try and get the facts of this much-publicised social phenomenon straight. The peak age for court appearance on criminal charges is 14-15 years. Much of the criminality at this age is of a comparatively trivial character, but it is nevertheless criminal by law. It is

overwhelmingly male, for the pattern of female juvenile delinquency is entirely different in character and lesser in extent. Most male delinquency is theft, but a good deal is connected with pretty pointless hooliganism. Now most boys indulge in a certain amount of criminal activity, but not sufficiently frequently for there to be much chance of getting caught. Where the activity is very frequent and the boy is stupid, or indifferent, eventually he will get caught, charged and labelled a J.D.

Juvenile delinquency is predictable to some extent, and one of the most efficient predictive factors is habitual truancy from school. The truant is certain of detection via the school register, and he may be repeatedly punished for it. Regular truancy is a reflection of the fact that the boy is utterly browned-off with school. Caning the truant at school may intimidate him into more regular attendance, but it should be obvious just what sort of trouble is being stored up for the future.

Society gets the delinquents it deserves. There is no real mystery about how juvenile delinquency arises, nor how we train up adult criminals from the ranks of the J.D.s via the approved school and Borstal system. The facts are there like the facts about corporal and capital punishment. But it would be making a great mistake to imagine that plain facts are welcome facts. No school-teacher will admit that he is actively encouraging robbery and hooliganism by the methods he uses in his classroom. He blames the children's parents, the comics and the "original sin" implanted in the children. It does not occur to him that his lessons are just the sort of stuff to give some children a loathing of learning nor that his policy of sustained insult is going to encourage the rougher mannered boys to be even rougher when they are getting a bit of their own back. It is a waste of breath to try to point out these glaring facts to most school-teachers, but next time you see a gang of young louts acting loutishly, just remember that it is likely that for ten years of their young lives they were subjected to a barrage of insults and moralizing, and so much talk, talk and talk from school-teachers, that when the Magistrate delivers his little homily on their behaviour, they will not turn a hair. G.

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

Man and the Sun Jacquetta Hawkes 30/-
The Two-fold Night Carlo Levi 16/-
The Way the Ball Bounces
Jack Lindsay 18/-
On the Contrary Mary McCarthy 30/-
Zamyatin D. J. Richards 10/6
A Life of One's Own Gerald Brenan 25/-
The New Rhythm and Other Pieces
Ronald Firbank 21/-
Guerilla Warfare
Mao Tse-Tung and C. Guerara 15/-
The Miners of Nottinghamshire 1914-44
A. R. Griffin 36/-
Anatomy of Prison Hugh Klare 4/-

REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

The Golden Bough (Abridged)
J. G. Frazer 10/6
Selected Poetry W. B. Yeats 5/-

SECOND-HAND

Days of Our Years Pierre Van Paasen 6/-; The World Scene from the Libertarian Point of View Meltzer, Woodcock, Rocker, &c. 2/6; Pity the Poor Rich Yaffle 3/-; Morality in the Nineteenth Century Joseph McCabe 2/6; The Religion of Woman Joseph McCabe (damaged) 2/6; Horizon, April 1946 Spender, Orwell, &c. 3/-; Horizon, April 1940 Pritchett, Spender, &c. 6/-; Horizon, May 1940 Calder-Marshall, Thomas, &c., 6/-; Our Worship of Primitive Social Guesses Edwin C. Walker 7/6; New Writing and Daylight. Winter 1943-4 Sitwell, Toynebee, &c. (damp-stained) 3/-; The Road to Wigan Pier George Orwell (L.B.C. damaged) 6/-; A Call to Manhood Guy Aldred 2/-; The Track Arturo Barea 3/6; The Land of Foam Ivan Yefremov 3/6; The Show of Violence Frederick Wertham 6/-; Jail Journal Richard Carlile 2/6; Essay on the Theory of the Earth M. Cuvier (1817 Spineless) 5/-; Ordeal by Slander Owen Lattimore 3/-; Castro's Cuba C. Wright Mills 7/6; A Handbook on Hanging Charles Duff 5/-; On the Eve of October V. I. Lenin 3/-; The Doctrine of Descent and Darwinism Oscar Schmidt 3/6; The Primitive Family C. N. Starcke 3/6.

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

IT was a week of charming trivia with the Calder mobiles at the Tate acting as a counterpoint to the comedy team of Betjeman, Gielgud, Sutton, Steele and Danvers at the Egyptian Hall, E.C.4. supplying the jingling words and the nostalgic music. The top brass among the critics decided that this was an occasion when they could dip a toe into the gutter to show that beneath the dark and well-pressed drape they are as earthy and as virile as their less intellectual neighbours. So with a loosening of corsets they pronounced the Calder mobiles a gay giggle. David Garritt of the Tory *Evening Standard* labelled them "a lark" and the rest of the slim white-fingered squad reacted accordingly. But try though they may they could not refrain from lapsing into the inevitable profundities about these charming toys. For toys they began as and though over the years they have become larger in size they still belong on the counters of the expensive toy shops to amuse and delight progressive parents.

These coloured strips of metal, so beautifully balanced, twist endlessly through their limited and ordained course as at the dictates of an artificial wind (courtesy of the Tate) they weave their mindless patterns. Yet basically they are Hampstead's answer to the aspidistra and the budgerigar. For while we of Hammersmith or Bethnal Green can discuss the relative merits of beer or tea as a leaf wash or the ethics of claw clipping, the owners of these expensive toys have nothing but watchmender's oil to be knowledgeable about.

Yet those who would wish to judge Calder as an artist would be well advised to visit his exhibition of gouaches at the Brook Street Gallery at 24 Brook Street, W.1., where in spite of an unfortunate catalogue opening—"Calder is the greatest living American painter"—(sic) is an exhibition of surprisingly good work. Abstracts wherein each isolated image hangs in virgin space, raw colours and twisting rods of finger-thick black that echo past workers in the same field yet have that touch of originality that stamps them with the seal of one man's unique personality.

The primitives of E. Box at the Arthur Jeffress Gallery of 28 Davies Street, W.1., and those of A. Cheshier at the Portal Gallery at 16a Grafton Street, W.1., offer slight and charming work by two people who are not afraid to profit by experience; for many a professional primitive knows that should

AROUND THE GALLERIES

he lose his artificial naivety the dealers will no longer have any use for him. Of the two people mentioned Cheshier is the more interesting in that he is less sophisticated than Box. His work however is on a slightly higher level than that of the brightly coloured plaster plaques that one sees on sale at holiday resorts and fairgrounds for like most primitives he is extremely selfish in his demands on his space and colour and the primitive will not surrender one inch of canvas for the sake of the whole. As they traverse their canvases every inch becomes and remains of major importance and in their refusal to tone down any part of their painting they kill the whole, for like children's art it is always two dimensional with every colour a thing of beauty but of a pristine rawness that turns their plea for communication into a bright and pretty pattern.

Yet Cheshier is fortunate in that he has chosen to act as the recorder of the vanishing traction engines and his meticulously drawn and coloured engines will be of permanent delight to engineering students as each succeeding generation re-discovers them.

The Whitechapel Gallery in East London's busy High Street have the retrospective exhibition of the works of the Australian painter Arthur Boyd and this exhibition found most of the critics a

little edgy, for after the fiasco of Nolan's meteoric rise and fall they were not too eager to re-discover another Colin Wilson of the brush. Like Nolan, Boyd will have a short and glorious period to regurgitate his strongly-felt interpretations of local myths and legends and when he has exhausted that subconscious well of memories, we shall be left with another spent visionary without talent to fill the London scene in search of an audience and a dealer. The people to whom the painter must pander are completely callous to those who are no longer fashionable and if yesterday's favourite lay rotting in the gutter they would use his face as a stepping stone as they minced into a gallery to view the latest favourite of fashion. But the words that Colin MacInnes wrote in 1957 for Sidney Nolan could still at this moment be applied to Boyd that he "is equipped with a poetic imagination, a critical intelligence, and with pictorial gifts that admirably serve their ends." Yet there are works on view that rightly plague the mind when we have left a gallery.

The sculptures of the German born E. R. Nele at the Molton Gallery at 44 South Molton Street, W.1., catch the world of the Berlin 'thirties and her ravaged metal castings have a cynical and a brutal air that stinks of the morality of "M" and "Metropolis" for they

AGGRESSION AND VIOLENCE

DEAR SIR,

Readers of FREEDOM, and editors, from time to time mention the use of force, violence, or aggression. For those anarchists who have abandoned "direct action" there is the intellectual resolution of the problem in a society based on violence, with children educated in violence, and sometimes given "loving care by violence." This to me is a disease that not only spreads but indoctrinated on each generation that follows. I read Arthur W. Uloth, Ernie Crosswell, Colin Ward, and others who disagree over violence, and yet I do seem to see a measure of truth in the conflict of anarchist thought which to me is

grounded on a philosophy of freedom of the individual including respect for other people. When Comrade Uloth poses his question of H-Bombs and shells in a "violent anarchist struggle" he assumes a condition or situation in which he has the anarchist fully organised into a "state" fully clothed in all the habits and details of which a "state" includes! I do not discount that he, or the others are wrong, nor do I say that he or the others are right, but I do say the problem is a PROBLEM, and it is not resolved, and to me this is the main point at issue, and is an issue for resolution. I find myself with the urge to go forth to "battle" much of the insanity,

are magnificent examples of work that holds the humanities in contempt, and her massed groups surge forward with no other purpose than to explore the rank corridors of death. Yet to protest her subject matter is futile for the graves of the murdered millions and the unstrung wire of the prisons is her answer but when they are bought to amuse or to decorate, then we must protest at the toleration and acceptance of the obscenities of all those in authority.

At the little-known St. Martin's Gallery hidden away at 11 St. Martin's Court, W.C.2., are the abstracts of Shmuel Dresner and Gerald Laing. Dresner, the Warsaw Jew, offers canvases of broken brush strokes that chant a hazkara for the honoured dead while Laing, the ex-Sandhurst cadet and resigned officer, has sought his inspiration from off the fading walls of history. The Byzantine painting of a forgotten saint still evokes memories of the forgotten faithful with its broken and peeling scraps of red and gold. Laing has gone to a past of mouldering manuscripts and crumbling heraldry to catch the emotion if not the faith, for both painters in their fashion are singing songs for the dead but the graveyard is a sterile workshop for the artist and Dresner and Laing have paid their debt to the past so let them cast away the tallith and the black tie and accept the present and face the future for all the agony and the misery of the past still awaits us and all its glory and all its wonder. ARTHUR MOYSE.

LETTER

but do not know where to begin? No one has resolved the problem. VIOLENCE PLUS VIOLENCE EQUALS VIOLENCE. This seems to me no matter which way one divides up the problem. The rulers are not swayed by love, nor do they all advocate the use of hate and force. Many have never considered the question. The burden is on the readers of FREEDOM to continue to wrestle with the problem. The admission of the problem would seem a substantial gain. It (the answer) is not left hanging in mid-air by stating it is not resolved! The Pacifists, The Marchers, the anarchists seem certainly all "right" to continue to peck away at the problem. Discussion does no harm! Disagreement neither . . . !

Waco, Texas, U.S.A., 27 July H.H.

UNITY BEGINS AT HOME!

Continued from page 1

Europe, and eventually, of the world.

★

UNITY must start at home! A united Europe, say, cannot possibly exist so long as the nations that comprise it are themselves divided socially and economically. How can they break down frontiers from above when peoples are divided from below by class barriers and economic differentials and the injustices which arise from the privileged society? There is nothing in the Treaty of Rome which suggests that the ultimate aim of a European "Community" will be the abolition of privilege, that is of the capitalist system. Indeed, the EEC is a kind of capitalist Utopia, in which the weak (capitalists) will perish; in which there will be no shortage of labour; where labour will be mobile and competitive; where a huge market protected by tariffs, will provide guaranteed minimum outlets for production. But, in spite of this it will fail. And it will fail simply because the productive capacity of all the countries within the tariff walls of the Community, and outside, will expand faster than the markets, that is, the purchasing power of the real producers.

Under capitalism the prosperous nations become more prosperous and the poorer nations poorer. We have no reason for believing that

anything the EEC might do will reverse this process. And there is nothing to choose between the policies of the Left and Right. The five "conditions" which the Labour Party has laid down for Britain's entry into the Common Market were summarised in last week's *Tribune* as follows:

Satisfactory trading arrangements for Commonwealth countries must be made. Similar arrangements must safeguard our trading partners in the European Free Trade Area. British agriculture must not surrender her sovereignty to European federal institutions.

There's nothing revolutionary in that, and the Labour Party will find allies for such terms among the Beaverbrooks and Montgomerys of the ruling class!

★

WE want the abolition of nation states and the removal of frontiers, but if it is to result in a happier, freer mankind, the initiative must come from below, from the people themselves. The growth of technology, and the possibilities of abundance for all mankind is in fact a threat to the capitalist system of privilege. Hence the attempt to concentrate economic power in fewer hands. Ours must be to break down that power, to decentralise, to see to it that the material and technical resources of this planet are used for the benefit of all mankind. Our Community, our Common Market is MAN!!

THE POWER OF A MYTH

WE hold that everybody should be free to believe what they like. When people also propagate their ideas they must expect those who disagree with them to seek to rebut them with argument. When religious people tell us that their belief is a question of Faith, there is no point in discussing with them; one can only point out that one lacks that faith. The trouble starts when these people want to communicate their faith to others; then they inevitably confuse faith with fact, beliefs with truth. A glaring example of this appeared in the *Daily Herald* earlier this month in the feature "As I see It" and was contributed by Nicolas Stacey, rector of Woolwich "and the former Olympic athlete". Now what this latter piece of intelligence has to do with the rector's views on "the power of prayer" is anyone's guess. We suspect that it was added to to give weight to his argument, for in this age of the cult of the personality it is notorious that what counts is not what is said but who says it. We reproduce the whole article, which is, most significantly, given the title "Let's not be blinded by science":

I have no doubt that in the past 10 days Sir Winston Churchill, whether he realises it or not, has been helped to keep going by other people's prayer.

Lord Attlee said earlier this week: "When you know that a very great many people outside your hospital bed are interested in you, it does something."

He should know. He has knocked on the door of death recently.

The veteran Labour leader was, perhaps unconsciously, proclaiming a profound theological truth. The power of prayer is enormous.

If we are able in the next life to look back on this one we may find that humble men and women, who pray regularly and faithfully, are achieving

more than all the politicians, preachers, propagandists and Pressmen rolled into one.

Recently, one of my curates nearly lost his foot in a motor-cycle accident. The casualty officer said it would have to be amputated.

Congregations in several churches prayed for the curate. The surgeons decided to try and save the foot. They succeeded.

And the operation was described by a specialist—usually cautious and guarded men—as a "miracle operation".

I cannot prove that it was prayer that helped the surgeons and the curate. In this sceptical and science-blinded age that takes some believing.

But in my work as a parish priest in a riverside area, I come across many curious happenings which could be related to prayer.

And I meet so many hundreds of people who say they have been helped by the prayers of others that I must believe that Christ's teaching and the Christian tradition are right.

Prayer works, and it works in a practical way.

The Christian believes that God has so ordered things in this world that He is, to some extent, dependent upon our prayers before He can work His will.

St. Augustine said: "Without God we cannot; without us God will not."

A doctor co-operates with God in His healing work on the physical plane.

He who prays is co-operating with God on the physical and spiritual level. Both are necessary.

Sir Oliver Lodge, the great physicist, has said: "Even in medicine, it is not really absurd to suggest that drugs and no prayer may be almost as foolish as prayer and no drugs."

Although prayer raises many problems and questions, there seem to be laws emerging.

Prayers for children seem more effective than for grown-ups—probably because a child's mind is less walled in by doubts and fears.

Love for the patient, as well as concentration, serenity and expectancy on the part of those who are praying, ap-

Anarchists and the Working Class Movement - 3

(Continued from previous issue)

THE workers' Union was born out of the necessity of providing for present needs, out of the desire to improve personal conditions and to protect oneself from a possible worsening of conditions, and is the Union of those who, deprived of the means of production and thus obliged by the exigencies of life to allow themselves to be exploited by those who possess those means, seek through solidarity with their companions in misery the strength to struggle against the exploiters. And at this level of the economic struggle, that is, against capitalist exploitation, it would have been possible and easy to achieve the unity of the working class against the owning class.

But for the fact that the political parties, which in any case have often been the founders and the first animators of the Trade Union movement, wished to use the workers' associations as a recruiting centre as well as weapons for their particular ends, whether of revolution or conservatism. Hence the divisions within the working class organised into many groupings under the influence of the political parties. Thus the intention of those who want workers' unity to remove the Unions from the tutelage of political parties. Buried under these intentions is an error and a lie.

If by politics is meant that which concerns the organisation of human relations, and more specifically, the free or limited relations between people and the existence or non-existence of a "government" which

takes upon itself public powers and uses force to impose its will and defend its own interests and those of the class from which it springs, it is clear that politics enters into every expression of social existence, and that a workers' organisation cannot be truly independent of the parties except by itself becoming a party. . . .

It is idle to hope, and in my opinion it would be a bad thing to wish, that politics should be excluded from the Unions, since every economic question of some importance automatically becomes a political question, and it is in the political field, that is, by the struggle between governors and governed, that the question of the emancipation of the workers and of human liberty will have to be finally resolved.

And it is natural, and clear, that it should be so. . . .

The capitalists can maintain the struggle in the economic field so long as workers demand small, and generally illusory improvements; but so soon as they see their profits seriously diminished and the very existence of their privileges threatened, they appeal to government and if it is not sufficiently understanding and not strong enough to defend them, as in the recent cases of Italy and Spain*, they use their own wealth to finance new repressive forces and to set up a new government which will serve them better.

Workers' organisations must therefore, of necessity, adopt a line of action in face of present as well as possible future government action.

One can accept the *status quo*, recognise the legitimacy of economic privilege and the government that defends it, and be content to manoeuvre between the different bourgeois factions and to obtain some improvements, as happens with the huge organisations which are inspired by no ideal, such as the American Federation of Labour and a large part of the British Unions—and then one becomes in practice the tool of one's oppressors and gives up the task of freeing oneself from servitude.

But if one aspires to complete emancipation, or even if one only wants specific improvements which do not depend on the will of the boss or the whims of the markets, there are but two ways of freeing oneself from the threat of government. Either by seizing the reins of government and using the public powers, and the collective force captured and held down by the rulers, to get rid of the capitalist system—or by weakening and destroying government by leaving to the workers and to all who in one way or another, by manual and intellectual work, co-operate in keeping social life going, the freedom to provide for individual and social needs in the way they consider best, but without the right or the possibility of imposing their will on others by the use of force. Now, how is it possible to maintain unity when there are some who would wish to use the strength of the organisation to get a seat in the government, while others believe that every government is of necessity oppressive and iniquitous, and would therefore wish to lead the organisation in the direction of struggle against every authoritarian institution now or in the future? How can social democrats, State communists and anarchists be held together?

That is the problem, and one

which can be overlooked at certain moments, such as in a clearly defined struggle, on which all are unanimous, but which always re-emerges and is not easy to solve so long as conditions of violence, and a diversity of opinion as to the means for resisting violence, exist. The democratic method, that is of leaving the majority to decide and of "maintaining discipline" does not solve the question, because it too is a lie and is not sincerely supported except by those who have or believe they have the majority on their side. Apart from the fact that the "majority" always means a majority among the leaders and not of the masses, one cannot expect, or even wish, that someone who is firmly convinced that the course taken by the majority leads to disaster, should sacrifice his own convictions and passively look on, or even worse, support a policy he considers wrong.

To say: let the others get on with it and you try in your turn to win over the majority to your point of view is rather similar to the argument used in the army: "accept your punishment and then put in your complaint"—and it is an unacceptable system when what one does today destroys the possibility of doing otherwise tomorrow. There are matters over which it is worth accepting the will of the majority because the damage caused by a split would be greater than that caused by the error; there are circumstances in which discipline becomes a duty because to fail in it would be to fail in the solidarity between the oppressed and would mean betrayal in face of the enemy. But when one is convinced that the organisation is pursuing a course which threatens the future and makes it difficult to remedy the harm done, then it is a duty to rebel and to resist even at the risk of provoking a split.

But then, what is the way out of this difficulty, and what should be the conduct of anarchists in the matter?

In my view the solution would be: general agreement and solidarity in the purely economic struggle; complete autonomy of individuals and groups in the political struggle.

But is it possible to see in time where the economic struggle becomes a political struggle? And are there any important economic struggles which do not become political right from the start as a result of government intervention?

In any case we anarchists should extend our activities into all organisations to preach unity among all workers, decentralisation, freedom of initiative, within the common framework of solidarity and not worry overmuch if the mania for centralisation and authoritarianism of some, or the intolerance of others, leads to new splits. For, if organisation of the workers is a fundamental necessity for the struggles of today and the achievements of tomorrow, the existence, or the longevity of this or that particular organisation is not all that important. What is essential is that individuals should develop a sense of organisation and solidarity, and the conviction that fraternal co-operation is necessary to fight oppression and to achieve a society in which everybody will be able to enjoy a truly human life.¹

E. MALATESTA.

¹Pensiero e Volontà, Feb. 16, 1925.
[*Reference to the Fascist régime in Italy and the Primo de Rivera government in Spain.—Ed.]

Anti-semitic teachers

DEAR COMRADES,

Whenever a discussion even touches upon the subject of Jews and anti-semitism, a crop of irrelevant similes are produced in the guise of rational argument (we have had annihilation of Jews and the Red Indians; Eichmann and a bomber pilot . . .). Now we have the C.O., anarchist, Labourite teacher and the anti-semitic teacher.

Unfortunately, as a Jew, my memories do not allow me the luxury of abstract irrelevancies. Reading of Jordan reminds me too vividly of the anti-semitic teacher at my Central London secondary school.

The fallacy of your argument is that the outlook of the other minority group teachers do not really effect the children. If an anarchist teacher gives examples and makes remarks which knock the sacred cows of capitalism only the convictions or prejudices of the parents are offended. The children are probably interested, amused or apathetic.

On the other hand, if such examples are anti-semitic the classroom is transformed into a place of adult hatred and bitterness.

When your argument meets reality its absurdity becomes obvious. Imagine an anarchist teacher taking the son of a prison official by the ears and banging his face into the wall until his nose bleeds shouting "dirty-authoritarian-boy". Or a communist teacher doing likewise with the son of a Trotskyist, shouting "dirty-left-wing-deviationist-boy". It happened—only my teacher shouted "dirty Jew boy" which makes it much more feasible, doesn't it?

If a Tory teacher (of unusual intellectual accomplishments!) finds the son of an anarchist in his class and calls him "Prince Kropotkin" it would provoke bewilderment more than anything else. But an anti-Semitic teacher can (and did) use nicknames which provoked worse than bewilderment, imitation and hatred.

We Jewish boys dreaded the lessons of that teacher and loathed the subject he taught. To us the classroom was an extension of the hostile world outside.

Perhaps I should now fight for the right of the Jordans to subject my children to these instructive experiences?

Yours fraternally,
Ilford, Essex, July 21. M.D.

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

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

ANARCHISM, VIOLENCE & PACIFISM

DEAR COMRADES,

I have been following the controversy about violence with interest and concern. Up to a point, the Editors' position seems to make perfect sense, but beyond that point, I simply cannot follow their logic. I agree completely that the kind of pacifism which does not oppose the state and the existing economic system (whether capitalist or State-socialist) is hopelessly unrealistic, and I see no possibility that any conceivable ruling class will ever be won over by love and reason, but I fail to understand how it follows from this that "unless the people are prepared to resist violence with superior violence, their movement must invariably be crushed." In what sense can the violence of the Algerian rebels (or the I.R.A. or Castro) be said to be superior to that of the armies opposing them? The Editors point out that what kept the movement going was the fact that they enjoyed popular sympathy everywhere, and I fail to see why an equally determined non-violent revolutionary group, enjoying the same popular support, could not have accomplished the same results. Surely it cannot be argued that the Algerian rebels achieved a military victory over the French forces, or even that their activities prevented the government from employing mass arrests and intimidation to crush the movement.

If the people are sufficiently opposed to the existing régime to launch a campaign of "mass strikes, demonstrations, etc." in what way is revolutionary violence needed to prevent the movement from being crushed? It seems to me that the withdrawal of support from the régime, particularly in the form of refusal to serve in the army, work in vital industries, pay taxes, etc., should be as effective a weapon against the power of the state as the small amount of actual military power the revolutionists are usually able to muster. It is true that

Out of this World

Continued from page 1

developed by anyone". President Nasser launched an Egyptian rocket which flew 375 miles and refused an entry permit to Elizabeth Taylor, otherwise known as Cleopatra. An American rocket to Venus failed in its aim through a mistake in its computer "programming". It cost seven million pounds. . . .

Prisoners in Lewes and Ford prisons got chicken for lunch when a fuse blew in a chicken factory and five hundred birds were thrown onto the market with no selling arrangements. An ex-MP was given four years of exclusively male company for indecency and offences with boys and young men. Six boys of eight to ten were sentenced in Texas to spend thirty days in girls' dresses for shoplifting and stealing. "Best way to keep boys out of trouble I know" said the judge. In Formosa the Ministry of Justice announced that convicts facing firing squads need no longer kneel because the posture hurts their dignity and feelings. In Russia four textile officials are to be shot for misappropriating State property, bribery and currency speculation. Seventeen Russians are to be shot for committing atrocities with a German punitive squad during the war. In Whiting, Indiana, an eighteen-year-old boy convicted for discharging fireworks dangerously on the 4th of July was condemned to read the whole of Gibbons' *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* within a month. A Soho bookseller and assistant convicted of publishing (i.e. selling) obscene articles (viz. photographs), appealed, on the grounds that the objects tended to corrupt a person who was incorruptible, that is, the police officer who purchased the photographs. He, by the nature of his calling, was incorruptible was, as one of the Judges said, "clad in spiritual asbestos"; therefore it was submitted that a test purchase by such officers would not prove the case. Their Lordships are still considering. . . .

A General Strike for Peace

DEAR COMRADES,

The second call for a World Wide General Strike for Peace will be made from 5 November to 11 November, 1962. People will be invited to promise: to stop work for the whole week, or for a day or an hour during the week; to boycott goods made by manufacturers of war materials (a list of whom will be published); to organize and support a week of public meetings against war; and to demonstrate in any other way they specify.

The short-term object is to contact as many people as possible and induce

them to question some aspects of the social set-up which they take for granted. In the United States, where it will be election week, they will also be invited to refuse to vote "for any candidate who supports the Cold War", a phrase which embraces all candidates.

The first call, in January of this year, was supported by about 10,000 people in the United States alone, and demonstrations in other countries included, for instance, a fifteen-minute token stoppage in Belgium; but there was no organized support in this country. It is now proposed to set up a committee in London

armed bands of guerrillas have frequently acquired a significant symbolic importance in the minds of the people, and in this way have helped keep up the morale of the cause, but this is, in many ways a dangerous situation and has not infrequently had unfortunate, even tragic consequences, once the existing régime has been overthrown (see Voline, "The Unknown Revolution", p.223 ff, for a consideration of some of the evil consequences of revolutionary militarism).

I realize that the non-violent tactics employed by most pacifists are frequently based on the assumption that governments can be influenced by love and reason, and are in consequence of rather dubious value to a revolutionary struggle. But surely this is not an argument against non-violence *per se*. I can see no reason why a thoroughly revolutionary technique of non-violence cannot be worked out if we were to devote the kind of study and experiment to this project that revolutionists of the past devoted to the investigation of high explosives and the techniques of guerrilla warfare, and I am convinced that the results of such inquiry might well achieve far more solid results than revolutionary violence possibly could.

Fraternally,
HOLLEY CANTINE.

Bearsville, N.Y., July 24.

DEAR SIR,

Your comments on pacifism and anarchism in the issue of July 7th will confuse many. In accepting the dictionary definition of "pacifism" as "the doctrine that the abolition of war is both desirable and possible" you must have left most pacifists gloomily wondering quite how they differed in their way of thinking from those of us who strenuously repudiate pacifism. Clearly, Ernie Crosswell's position accords best with that of most professed pacifists, namely, that the use of force has consequences so odious that to counter force by force would be to produce some hideous monster. A popular analogy of theirs is the turning of an alcoholic loose in a brewery. The violence of tyrants is to be met by non-violent resistance, strikes, or whatever. Force corrupts and dominates its employer.

Help Wanted!

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT JULY 28th 1962	
Weeks 29 & 30	
EXPENSES: 30 weeks at £70	£2,100
INCOME:	
Sales & Sub. Renewals	£ 1,113
Weeks 1-28	1,113
Weeks 29-30	35
	1,148
New Subscriptions:	
Weeks 1-28 (212)	239
Weeks 29, 30 (13)	13
	252
	1,400
DEFICIT	£700

DEFICIT FUND

London: B.L. £1; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; Nottingham: H.D. 13/-; London: A.T. £1/-; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/6; Bangor: J.T. £2; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; Lagos: O.H. 3/-; Stockport: F.G. 1/6; Southend: P.O.* 2/6; Shoreham: M. & D.* 5/-; Glasgow: A.J. 2/-; Cheltenham: L.G.W.* £4; South Shields: B.M. £2/3/6; Glasgow: J.H.* 3/6; Nuneaton: D.H. £1; Wolverhampton: J.G.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Stroud: S.L.R. 3/-; Belfast: "Liam" 2/6; Surrey: F.B.* 10/-; Coleman's Hatch: D.M.* £10; Chorleywood: S.E.E. 2/6; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; Shoreham: M. & D.* 2/6; Denver: W.S. 14/-.

TOTAL 25 8 0
Previously acknowledged 713 11 10
1962 TOTAL TO DATE £738 19 10

*Denotes regular contributors.

As a philosophy founded on an overpowering hatred of physical force we can sympathise with it, while rejecting it as a mode of action in the face of a concrete political situation—and so perhaps answer Lenin's foremost charge against the anarchists. Your remarks in the rest of the editorial are excellent in this respect. The Committee of 100 appears blind to the fact that the more successful their demonstrations and campaigns of civil disobedience the greater the provocation to the government to respond with armed force—as in the General Strike of 1926 and, much more recently, in the Crown Colony of Nyasaland. The Devlin Report put the position concisely: faced with a threat to its power, a government must either "act or abdicate." Governments, by their very nature, choose to act, and the pacifist must thereupon be prepared to find his place in history—and out of this world—together with the Anabaptists of Münster and the seven thousand Albigensians slaughtered while at prayer in the church of St. Mary Magdalene.

The only legitimate use of force is to repress force. There can be no hope of achieving freedom until no section of society is able to gain its ends through force. It is in the interests of all of us to enforce on each other, and have enforced on ourselves, a law against violence. Armed force must cease to be the instrument of policy, for that, as Clausewitz says, is war—war between a government and its people, and between government and government. The need is still that of Lenin's day, as indeed of all time: "a self-acting armed organisation of the population." "There must be no police, no bureaucrats that stand above the people; there must be no standing army, only the people universally armed." When the law against violence is rigidly enforced, only then will disarmament be possible and, indeed, seem almost natural, instead of being mocked at by the existence of unrespectable "biologicals". Only when men no longer fear force, nor can resort to it themselves, will we feel free to pursue our ends by whatever means as unique individuals we may devise.

It is impossible, within the scope of this letter, to develop these proposals further. They seem to me to be entirely consistent with the thought underlying your editorial. All the more puzzling, then, to see your patronising comment on Kropotkin and Rocker as "well-meaning old men who allowed their personal feelings to get the better of their reason and wisdom." You might well have suspected that men so much in love with peace and freedom would not be so monstrously wayward. Both saw that a tyranny based on force had to be met by force.

Your sincerely,

London, July 9 KRISHAN KUMAR.

'Solidarity's' Case

THE EDITORS, "FREEDOM", Ken Weller claims that "Solidarity's" case was not given well enough, but FREEDOM also has not used its strongest weapon, i.e. "Solidarity's" demand for "equal pay for all who work". A reading of the 'Meaning of Socialism' will show that this means what it seems to say: that each worker will receive the same wage. This is the point: "Solidarity" does not stand for the immediate abolition of the wages system. How then can they stand for 'freedom'? Quite apart from this, equal sharing is a fantastic demand especially when the world is capable of producing enough to give everybody what he thinks he needs. True it may take a little time to get production up to this level but not "a whole transitional period" and in any case equal sharing in the meantime would not be the most equitable method of distribution for all men are not the same. Surely those who speak so much about 'freedom' and 'initiative from below' should recognise this?

Yours fraternally,

A. L. BUCK.
Brynheulog, Nembridge, Mon.

FREEDOM

which can publish literature, invite and receive pledges, and act as an information centre for the November strike. Will anyone interested to take part in such activity please contact

IRENE ROOOM,
148A Fellows Road, London, N.W.3.

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.

AUG 5 No meeting—Summer School.

AUG 12 Keith Smith
In Search of Utopia

AUG 19 S.F.
Subject to be Announced

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).

Last Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Brian Hart's, 57 Ladbroke Road, W.11.

JAZZ CLUB

FRIDAY AUG 10 Jack Stevenson
The Golden Era

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.