

Freedom

AN ANARCHIST FORTNIGHTLY

Vol. 11, No. 12

June 10th, 1950

Threepence

"Revolutionaries themselves are the last people to realise when through force of time and circumstance, they have gradually become conservatives."

—Constant Lambert

The Right to the Necessities of Life

Will De-Rationing Meet Our NEEDS?

DURING the last few months the Government have relaxed the control of food consumption through rationing to a very considerable extent, and it may be opportune to consider the whole question in its broader aspects. Rationing represents an attempt made by a government to regulate consumption in the interests of the "community"—in so far as this term has meaning in a society like ours. Its overt aim is to see that in a situation

of scarcity, the normal operation of capitalist economics is to some extent suspended, and the usual outcome of scarcity, a considerable rise in prices, prevented. If it is not prevented, of course, the scarce commodities, even though they be necessities like basic foods, become available only to the higher income groups and pass right out of the range of the working-class family.

In the nineteenth century the distribution of goods according to spending power seemed quite natural to administrators and to the bulk of the ruling class. That it should to-day appear obviously unjust is an indication that the moral element which the earlier socialists and reformers imported into the discussion of political and economic

relationships has, at least to some extent, permeated thought in the twentieth century. The capitalist idea that it was quite fit that a commodity's scarcity should determine its price, and hence its distribution, was largely unquestioned a century ago; to-day such an economic mechanism is execrated under the title of black market.

The whole conception of price control and the attempt to secure equitable distribution through rationing derives from the recognition—belated and incomplete as it is—that all men have a right at least to the necessities of life. It is unquestionably a progress that such a conception should now be common property. But it is also indicative of society and of the administrative class that this conception is thought to have application only during wartime. The rights of the common man—

PAGE FOUR

MOTIVE FOR MURDER

A FORTNIGHT ago a girl was found dead in a Paddington hotel. Her head had been beaten in and one of her own silk stockings had been tightly tied around her neck.

Police enquiries led the search for the murderer to the village of Houghton-le-Spring, in County Durham, where a young baker fitted the description and name of the suspect. He disappeared, to be found next day dying from a self-inflicted shot in the head.

He was well-known in his own little community where, according to a *Reynolds News* report, the villagers were asking themselves "How could this happen? He never had a girl friend in his life."

It is about time it was generally realised that this sort of thing happens precisely because such men never have girl friends in their lives. Davidson was connected with the local church; he was a member of the Church Lads' Brigade. He was a member of a society in which free sexuality is frowned upon and any deviation from the normal is treated as a crime. Naturally shy and reserved, he found himself unable to tackle the barriers society erects against sexual expression in any other way but in furtive adventures with prostitutes.

It is society who is the murderer, not only of Donald Davidson but also of the girl or girls he killed.

***This case will be dealt with more fully in a later article.*

Making and Destroying

THERE are at least three ways of looking on cultivated land. It can be looked upon as a heritage from generations of hard-working men and women of the past, who have tilled the soil with love and care, keeping it fertile and in good heart because there is a fundamental relationship between the well-being of man and the well-being of the land.

Or it can be looked upon simply because it is good to look upon, because there is great satisfaction in seeing the beauty of fat acres of farming land, patterned by plough and pasture. Or, the land can be looked upon as a means of getting rich quick.

Making the Soil . . .

Three stories have been presented to

THE GOOD EARTH

to make a fertile top-soil. To break the force of the wind and prevent the soil from blowing away, they have covered the islands with networks of rock walls, patiently placing stone on stone, so that after years and years a simple living can be maintained for themselves and their livestock.

In the Midlands of England, in fertile Worcestershire, no such struggle has been necessary. The rich, deep soil readily yields its harvests, and generations of farming folk have made this part of the country famous for fruit, for wheat-production (30 cwt. per acre as compared with 19 cwt. for the rest of England and 7 cwt. for America), and for pastureland.

. . . and Destroying It

This land is not only useful and pro-

ductive, but beautiful, and to it go thousands of workers from Birmingham and the industrial dungeons of the Black Country to rest their eyes and nerves in the fresh air. But it has been decided by the Ministry of Fuel and Power that a great area of this lovely countryside, between the rivers Teme and Severn must be torn up in prospecting for open-cast coal.

Great machines will rape this earth, tearing huge pits 170 feet deep, piling up great mounds of black and useless sub-soil, creating a desert that will remain a barren eyesore for generations, perhaps for centuries. And for what? For a relatively small amount of poor quality coal produced at a loss for the sake of the export drive.

The machines necessary for this task must come from America. They must be bought for dollars to produce coal to be exported for foreign exchange to buy food which this land could itself produce if it were left alone! There is a limit to the amount of coal that can be got in this way; there is no limit to the amount of food that can be got from this land—taking the long-term view.

For sheer stupidity, this short-sighted government edict takes some beating, but it is to the credit of the people of Worcestershire that they are not taking it lying down. In the words of L. F. Easterbrook in the *News Chronicle*: "The protests are coming in not only from the county council and the district councils, from the organised farmers, farm workers, landowners and women's institutes, but from the town dwellers also. Never has Worcestershire been so united. Never, in peace-time, have her people been in such fighting mood. Good luck to them."

Plundering the Soil

And to illustrate the third way of looking upon the land, we go, as so often before, to America. There, great dust bowls are once again being created by "suit-case" farmers who are grabbing land, growing quick crops to cash in on the government-guaranteed high prices and thereby exhausting the land. When they pull out, a dollar fortune to the good, but leaving a desert behind them. From three million acres in the South-Western States, the top-soil is blowing away.

We have discussed the problem of soil erosion many times before. It is a problem that will exist as long as an irresponsible attitude looks upon the land as something to be plundered for quick and private profit—and to hell with the future. One American "farmer" was reported as saying: "It's a free country. A man has the right to do what he wishes with his own land."

Contrast that with the words of Robert Gill, an Aran farmer who has never made an easy dollar in his life: "The little that I can do," said Gill, "helps those that will come after me."

P.S.

SECRETS of the SECRET POLICE

ONE of the great advantages of being a regular reader of the daily press is that every now and again one comes across a piece of news which creeps in the column by accident. Glancing through the *Evening Standard* the other day, I found a report published quite casually, tucked away in two small paragraphs referring to a fraud case, which revealed quite the most astounding information since Zeus thought of changing himself into a human being.

The news may be ten years late, but as it concerns one of the most secretive of bodies, whose activities rarely come to public view, we may be excused for making the most of an occasional peep into their fun-and-games.

"Willoughby d'Eresby Walmisley, 54, war-time M.I.5 man and now an estate agent, of Clarges Street, Mayfair, W., was jailed for 18 months at the Old Bailey this evening for getting £1,000 by false pretences and fraudulently converting £1,355.

"Mr. Peter Crowther, M.P., defending him, said that in M.I.5 he was attached to G.H.Q. Home Command and in the event of invasion was to organise an underground resistance movement in Glamorgan."

—*Evening Standard*, 16/5/50.

Let us linger awhile on the comedy. The *Daily Herald* commences its story of the trial:

"Willoughby d'Eresby Walmisley, host at many a lavish boating and tennis party in the three-acre grounds of High Elms, 20-roomed house at Hampton Court, will not be seen on the trim lawns by the Thames for the next 18 months." (*D.H.*, 16/5/50).

We now try to see Mr. Willoughby d'Eresby Walmisley in the light of a Maquis leader in South Wales—we try to divorce him—name, accent and all—from his large house with trim lawns in the fashionable part of Surrey, and

picture him away from his "Three maids to run the house, gardener to care for the lawns, chauffeur to drive his two luxury cars"—and see him down in dear old smoky Glamorgan—the resistance leader of the coal-miners, the sabotage organiser of the steel-workers, the agitator of Neath or Merthyr Tydfil in the struggle against the English Gestapo.

Was Mr. Willoughby d'Eresby Walmisley the only actor in this wonderful game which must have cheered up many a soul in the dark days of 1940? That hardly seems credible. Doubtless the tentacles of this embryonic Maquis stretched all over the country. Perchance many bright lads with 'Varsity voices and hyphenated names descended upon the bewildered boilermakers of the Tyne and the puzzled pitmen of the Severn, and informed them that they were there to lead the sabotage, strikes and agitation—only needless to say, not too soon. One can only ask in wonderment how much of the compulsory charity we allow them they threw away on this incredible manoeuvre, by which M.I.5 evidently imagined it was going to change itself as if by the touch of a magic wand into a revolutionary organisation, in the event of a German invasion.

Such a revolutionary organisation would have had to struggle against the English Gestapo which would be working for the Quisling Government—that was already plain enough in 1940, and certainly M.I.5 knew it, since they read the columns of predecessor *War Commentary* avidly enough, and everything was explained to them there. And where did the Germans obtain their local national Gestapos? Not from the insignificant fascist organisations which gave off only a few premature traitors and small-fry collaborators, but in the main from the police forces already existing. And the way for M.I.5 to defeat the Nazi grip tightening would be simply to dissolve itself and burn its own records. Alas, our

injunctions that the British secret police should do so were unheeded. A lucky bomb did, it is said, manage to destroy some of the old ones, but the new ones were built up again fast enough.

It may be, of course, that alone among the countries of Europe, the British secret police would not, in the event of a Hitler victory, have handed over the political dossiers of all elements liable to be disaffected against Nazism. Had this unique event occurred it would have been a considerable surprise and perhaps disappointment to the police of the fascist countries, who so seldom failed to get the co-operation accorded to them by international usage owing to any indignation at Belsen and Buchenwald, before these became war-slogans.

We must ask ourselves, too, what ingenious exercise the hidden brains of our internal espionage system have thought up in the event of a Russian invasion? Can it be that even at this moment young Archibald Cholmondeley-Cholmondeley, special agent, is taking up residence in the Gorbals, and preparing for the day when he will be able to call upon the Glaswegians to rise against their oppressors (making it quite plain, of course, which he means)? We would point out to our regular but anonymous readers in Whitehall responsible for such high jinks that there is only one way possible for him to prepare—and that is to gain a reputation as a militant organiser beforehand, but to ally this with party politics. However, several organisations are already doing this job, and when the time comes they will jump on to whatever bandwagon is going. We are afraid that the ex-militants of the type known everywhere, who made the grade in party politics and became party leaders, who have already achieved, or will ultimately achieve, positions of power, will soon push amateurs like young Cholmondeley-Cholmondeley off the cart.

INTERNATIONALIST.

AFRICA Can Constitutional Methods Help the African Worker?

George Padmore: *AFRICA: Britain's Third Empire* (Dobson, 12s. 6d.)

A STRANGER in South Africa will be quickly informed of the folly of offering any opinions on questions of local political and social significance. He will be told that they are "peculiar" to that country and only understood after years of experience. The same advice is given liberally to strangers in other countries where similar conditions prevail.

Now there are three things common to all these countries. They all have a "colour" problem, the basis of which is a conflict between a majority of indigenous people and a ruling minority of European descent. They all have governments in which the majority have only token representation and a social pattern in which the material benefits are exclusively for the white minority. And, to refer back to our opening observation, it is this minority which will advise the stranger to keep out of local affairs because of their "peculiar" nature.

The stranger, however, if he is at all resourceful, will soon discover the reason for such a reluctance to discuss and explain local affairs. He will find, inevitably, that the "peculiar" problems are the same in all such countries and that it is not so much the problems as the methods used to solve them, which should not be discussed with strangers.

A study of George Padmore's *Africa* will throw this situation into sharp focus. The European settler or administrator's sense of guilt and uneasiness towards Africa springs partly from an awareness, subconscious maybe, of applying two different sets of principals to his life. Towards his own caste he will show kindness and consideration. Towards those he imagines to be socially inferior, the Africans, he will display indifference and hostility and, by extremists, an open brutality. It is not difficult to realise that this second attitude of the European springs from fear and social insecurity. It is a case of men who have gone forward and created an artificial society and now cannot go back. It is easier to face the consequences with a cultivated self-righteousness and an aggressive determination, than it is to face it with humility and an awareness of great wrongs done.

It is with a view to this coming crisis that George Padmore's book is valuable. He takes the reader from Gambia to Sudan, from Uganda to the Cape, filling in the historical and social background of the coming struggle. Very methodically the crimes of the European against his African subjects are listed. By a melange of starvation, subtlety and the sjambok, the African has been impelled to submit. To pay taxes when he cannot afford to buy food, to be ejected from his own tribal lands because mineral wealth has been discovered, to be conscripted into mines, to be flogged for the most petty

offences, to have strikes suppressed by shooting, to have no say in the conducting of his own affairs. Yet facts do not convey adequately a picture of this accumulation of human misery. Words are meaningless to describe suffering and human degradation repeated tens of millions of times. And one knows that the tragedy, the problem, is so wide, is so beyond even Africa, that it stretches to the very reader of this book, who will either refuse to believe the facts listed or shrug his shoulders helplessly.

Yet this is not to say that the book serves no purpose. It is a document which can be put to much good use, though one suspects by those already converted. It has also received the distinction of being banned by the Gold Coast Government. If the book disappoints, however, it is when the author leaves the facts of his case, as if they are not enough, and inserts some observations of his own.

For example, all through the main stream of this book is the theme of a European civilization and form of administration being imposed on a distinctly African way of life, and that this is the basis for much of the conflict. Yet the author, despite this, seems to see the Africans' objective as one modelling itself on the European. Parliamentary democracy, trade unions, national states, Rhodes Scholarships, wealth after the European pattern. At the beginning of the book he laments the passing of the old decentralized tribal life: "Before the disintegration of tribal society occurred, the Africans held their land collectively. That is to say, there was no private property in land, which was looked upon as nature's gift to all the people and not the exclusive possession of any particular section." Towards the end of the book he is saying: "If the workers also continue to draw closer together in the fire of the struggle for economic and social betterment, the tawdriness and retarding influence of tribalism will be sharply revealed, and a spur will be brought to national unity and the solidarity of the common people. In this way, trade unionism can reinforce political nationalism and provide the key which will open the door to Africa's future progress, unity and amity and the realization of the United States of Africa."

And the method to be used to bring this about? Despite the condemnation implied by all the facts with which he presents his case, the political manoeuvring the abortive conferences, the lies and treachery of the authorities, he persists in a belief that the solution rests in this direction. His mistake is to believe that by political action, by a democratic "gradualism", by allowing the African middle-class intellectuals to lead their more ignorant countrymen (not a Mister Johnson among 'em), by constitutional approaches to the British, that something can be achieved. One cannot help feeling disappointed that the obvious conclusions

to be derived from this book are not shared by the author.

For at intervals through the book he illustrates with some relish the success of direct action. Where conferences and appeals have failed, as in the case of savage taxes or unfair legislation, and the Africans have resorted to effective and concerted passive action, success has nearly always resulted. Sometimes it has

meant refusal to pay exorbitant taxes, once a successful boycott of British consumer goods. Again, the cocoa producers of the Gold Coast refused to sell their crops at profitless rates, crops on which the British were relying to balance their dollar accounts, until they were given a fairer deal.

Yet the author pleads: "... it is obvious to anyone even superficially

EDUCATION FOR PEACE

IN an article entitled "The Folly of Revolutionary Violence" printed in *Adelphi* in the Spring of 1947, George Woodcock wrote:

"The actual use of violence arouses a brutality which infects large masses of people. The terrible cruelties practised by revolutionary idealists... show that even the best intentioned people are capable of the worst deeds when they begin to use violence to achieve their ideas... As has been shown by the degeneration of so many revolutions, after the hated government has been overthrown, (their) actions can lead only to a reign of fear more crushing than that which existed before."

This quotation clearly shows George Woodcock's belief in non-violence, and has phrases "best-intentioned people", "worst deeds", "degeneration of so many revolutions", which are expressions of moral value.

In accepting his statement I also advocate pacifism as one of the aims of education.

A parent or teacher cannot avoid making a choice in determining the type of environment and opportunities he presents to children and upon which the possibilities of their development depend. One of the functions of a teacher should be to organise things that will lead to worthwhile activities. Not to organise is not to make children free but to make them impoverished; whereas they should be at liberty—to accept or not to accept grown-up suggestions. This applies as much to gardening or book learning as to practice in living in a non-violent society.

I am well aware that objection to pacifism as an aim of education is made in the name of freedom. It is said that to try to cultivate non-violent behaviour is to submit children to unwarrantable moral pressure. Yet people who make this objection at the same time insist on intellectual and social values without recognising the inconsistency, or do not realise that the essence of a non-violent approach itself excludes compulsion or force on the part of those who make it. It is a question of persuasion and of drawing out certain latent qualities rather than others.

In his book *Education for Peace* (Routledge Kegan Paul, 7/6), Herbert

Read seriously discusses the proposition that "mankind must be predisposed for peace by the right kind of education". The chapters appeared originally as lectures or articles—one of which inspired George Woodcock's, quoted above—and are based on Read's more complete statement in *Education through Art*.

What is the right kind of education? There can be no charge of indoctrination against Read. He believes it is to be found in the discipline of art, and his main point is that the moral basis of discipline should be aesthetic—not rational or legal or social. And in one sentence "Play is the prophylactic of war", he sums up nearly all the work and theory of A. S. Neill.

In the course of the book Read makes some penetrating comments on Freud who admits that he has left part of the riddle of group formations untouched. Freud says (in *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*, p. 70):—

"A path leads by way of imitation to empathy... Moreover, there is still much to be explained in the manifestations of existing identifications. These result among other things in a person limiting his aggressiveness towards those with whom he has identified himself, and in his sparing them and giving them help."

Read comments: 'It is precisely the significance of the process of identification for intellectual life that is our present concern. When Freud says that a path leads 'by way of limitation to empathy' he may or may not have been aware that he was indicating the path of art.* It is true that there is another path—identification with the leader—the totalitarian path in which there is no emphatic relationship with other people, but only a blind obedience to one command. But this is not what we mean by morality: morality is essentially mutuality, the sharing a common ideal. And the process by which we are induced to share a common ideal is none other than that indicated by Freud—the creation of an emphatic relationship with our fellow citizens by means of common rituals, by means of imitation of the same patterns—by meeting, as it were, in the common form or quality of the universally valid work of art.'

FREEDOM

acquainted with the problem and needs of these territories that without the friendship and active co-operation of the educated Africans there can be no lasting development and reconstruction in the colonies."

Which means that the white man's rule continues.

In fact, one would like to suggest that Mr. Padmore's idea that lasting development and reconstruction depends on the active co-operation of the educated Africans be changed to: "the active non-co-operation of All Africans..."

CHARLES HUMANA.

Read freely acknowledges his debt to another psychologist, Dr. Edward Glover, and in particular to his book *War, Sadism and Pacifism*. To those who consider that the abolition of government would make an end to inter-state war some remarks of Glover on State Parentalism are of intense interest since they are made on psychological, as opposed to ideological grounds. Glover says:

"State worship is a form of fetishism derived from the displacement of family dependence", and that "however useful the State may be in the regulation of material things it is nevertheless a backward and superstitious organisation."

ANTHONY WEAVER.

* Read notes that in discussing the various types of poetry in the *Republic*, Plato uses *imitation* to mean not copying some natural object or other, but the process by which the poet or actor assimilates himself to the person whom he is portraying, and thereby extinguishes his own personality for the time being. This is *empathy*.

ARCHITECTURAL STUDENTS CONDEMN BUILDING, ARCHITECTURE and EDUCATION

PLAN 6 (*Journal of Architectural Students Association*) pp. 32. 2/6.

IT would be a pity if readers missed this booklet under the impression that it was just another students magazine, full of gossip, private jokes and esoteric articles, because it is not really a journal at all, but an exciting and stimulating piece of pamphleteering in condemnation of the present state of building, architecture and education.

The booklet is extremely well printed, and its novel typographical arrangement is part of the argument, in that each page is divided into three—one part for each subject, and may be read either down the page, or from page to page in each subject. This is not a typographer's trick, but an expression of the interrelation of the subjects.

The authors of *Plan 6* explain their purpose as follows:

"In the first part our concern is to illustrate in the fields of building, architecture, and education, the process of breakdown. This we see in the individual in his isolation, and in society in its dislocation. In the second part, we attempt to re-orientate our minds towards the process of growth and life—the ever-changing relationships of individual, community, and the environment. These relationships, still seen through building, architecture, and education, we symbolise in the word *integration*, as opposed to dislocation, and we say that the many relationships evident within it are identified by their differentiation, as opposed to their isolation, from each other."

The booklet shows evidence of the influence of thinkers like Mumford, Kropotkin, Geddes, Reich, Read, and the Peckham experimenters, and I think it is encouraging that these young architects should be drawn towards such positive and libertarian writers, but I wish they could find rather simpler words to express their point of view. (They probably feel this too for they have included on page 32 a "Diagram Index" to explain their argument.)

On the other hand, the section on education is admirably written:

"The people who make up the school community are divided up rather in the manner of a military organisation. The head is to the teachers as a general is to his staff. The teachers are to themselves as a collection of specialists with little in common but mutual suspicion. The prefects are to the other children as sergeant-majors are to the other ranks. The children are arranged neatly into classes and receive promotion year by year. The whole machine is designed for the passive reception of instruction. The school is no more conceived as a stimulating background for activity than is the barracks-room. If boys and girls attend the same school they will enter at opposite ends of the building to ensure that there is no possibility of their seeing one another at their toilet. If a governor enters the school he uses the front entrance to ensure that he does not see the untidy squalor of the children's cloakrooms. If the baker enters he does so at the back lest the children should pick up his bad language. Small wonder that in this artificially contrived environment the teacher has found it easier to play the role of dictator than that of guide."

Plan 6 is lively and thought-provoking, and it is to be hoped that later issues will be of the same wide interest. W.

FOOTNOTE.—An architect who came into Freedom Bookshop was offered *Plan 6*. "There's an insult on every page," he snorted!

ORWELL'S UNPUBLISHED NOTEBOOKS

ALL but a few pages of the June number of *World Review* are devoted to George Orwell who died in January of this year. It contains much material of value towards an assessment of Orwell's social ideas and Mr. Stefan Schimanski, as Editor and publisher of *World Review*, deserves our thanks and congratulations for a beautiful production at a price well within the reach of everyone's purse.*

The volume consists of extracts from George Orwell's unpublished notebooks, a long personal memoir by Mr. T. R. Fyfe and a section headed *Revolutions* in which five writers each contribute a critical essay on one of Orwell's major works. There is also a short tribute to Orwell by Bertrand Russell, and an even shorter *Footnote about 1984* by Aldous Huxley which is, in fact, a terrible indictment of Western democracy.

* Copies of *World Review* are obtainable from Freedom Bookshop, price 1s. 6d. (postage 3d.)

THE notebooks were kept over two periods during the early part of the war: from May 1940 to August 1941 and from March to November 1942. The extracts published come from the first period. They seem to me to include a fair proportion of uninteresting material, but as the Editor points out, in so far as it remains "a true reflection of his ideas at the time" it is of interest for an understanding of Orwell.

The notebooks certainly reveal the struggle between Orwell the humanist and Orwell the "realist", and throughout these pages one continually finds examples of Orwell's healthy distrust of the ruling-classes alongside quite reactionary views which imply a belief in the possibilities of solving our problems by war, governments and the very institutions which at bottom he despises and mistrusts.

Thus: (24/6/40): "... If the invasion happens and fails all is well, and we shall have a definitely left-wing government and a conscious movement against the governing class..." Two sentences

later he writes: "Orders to the L.D.V. that all revolvers are to be handed over to the police, as they are needed for the army. Clinging to useless weapons like revolvers, when the Germans have sub-machine guns, is typical of the British Army, but I believe the real reason for the order is to prevent weapons getting into the 'wrong hands'..." And by 'wrong hands' Orwell obviously includes himself and the "conscious movement against the governing class."

Again, Orwell who believes in government, albeit "left-wing government" and who supports the war, has these reflections to make about taxes which are the life blood of governments and without which capitalist wars could not be prepared: (9/8/40) "Towards the government I feel no scruples and would dodge paying the tax if I could. Yet I would give my life for England readily enough if I thought it necessary. No one is patriotic about taxes." These sentences are also interesting for another reason. Orwell supported conscription during the war, which means being obliged to give one's life if the government thinks it necessary. Yet in his notebook it is "if I thought it necessary"!

BUT in spite of these and many more infuriating statements, I agree with Herbert Read that what "is fundamental to Orwell is a love of humanity and a passionate desire to live in freedom". One can charge him with having been too optimistic, of deluding himself into believing that power does not always corrupt or that governments could be "of the people", but the Notebooks also reveal a fundamental honesty even to the extent of including thoughts and actions of which he is obviously far from proud, and which many another person would have omitted as reflecting unfavourably on them if read at a later date. For example, he writes (22/1/41): "Yesterday I ripped down a number of these [People's Convention—Communist inspired] posters, the first time I have ever done such a thing..." At any normal time it is against my instincts to write on a wall or to interfere with what any-

From our stock...

We are pleased to be able to offer two books which are very important from an anarchist point of view, at reduced prices:

Alex Comfort's *Art & Social Responsibility* 3/6 (from 7/6)
Henrik Infield's *Co-operative Living in Palestine* 3/6 (from 7/6)

Order while stocks last

Africa: Britain's 3rd Empire	Shelley, Godwin and their Circle
George Padmore 12/6	H. N. Brailsford 5/-
Twilight in South Africa	Art
Henry Gibbs 15/-	Eric Gill 6/-
Shadow over Africa Michael Scott 1/-	Poetry London, No. 18 2/6

In Face of Fear (Michael Scott's Challenge to S. Africa)
Freda Troup 12/6

★

World Review, June 1950 1/6
Studies in Revolution E. H. Carr 9/6

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP
27 red lion st
london, W.C.1

THE KHAMA CALYPSO

THE banning by the British government of Seretse Khama, chief of the Bamangwato tribe, who married a white wife, has aroused dark-skinned people and their champions all over the world. But in the Caribbean area, reports *Worldover Press*, the protests are beginning to take the form of calypsos.

The composers of impromptu rhymes and tune are turning out verses which will ring through the region for many a day to come, doing more to hurt British prestige than formal manifestoes.

Some of the singers have been broadcasting over the B.B.C. before the present case arose. What will happen to them, Caribbean observers are asking, if they attempt to put their protesting compositions on the air? Here, for instance, is one:

*We hear loud talk of democracy,
But what is the position of Seretse?
He pinned his faith on the Socialist state.
Only to be told he must abdicate.*

THROUGH THE PRESS

UNDERSTANDABLE RELUCTANCE

THE last remaining band of nomadic Indians in Canada has signed a treaty with the Government and agreed to live on 34,000 acres of reservation in an area 36 miles north of Rocky Mountain House on the eastern fringe of the Rockies.

The treaty was signed by Mr. Malcolm McGrimmon, of the Federal Department of Indian Affairs, and a wandering band of Chipewyan Indians who hitherto have refused to make any agreements with a white man or accept a white man's money.

None of the signatories was willing to be the first to sign, apparently in the belief that to be first meant to be responsible for all the consequences of the treaty.

The Times, 22/5/50.

Readers who saw the recent article on the Red Indian in *The Leader*, will not be surprised at their reluctance.

THE ENGLISH VICE

Miss Naomi Jacob, the novelist . . . is in favour of the restoration of corporal punishment.

"The stupid, ridiculous sentences," she said, "should be increased tenfold. I personally should be very grateful . . . for the opportunity [of] birching one of these brutal criminals—or of using a good pair of hobnailed boots on one. And I should know where to inflict the punishment."

Children, too, should not be spared harsh words or a "cuff across the ear".

What was the occasion of this display of militance? Was it at some demonstration of the art of all-in wrestling?

Not so. The speech was delivered at the annual meeting of the Craven and Upper Wharfedale branch of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

Leader Magazine, 3/6/50.

STATE & SOCIETY

It should be noted that Stalin a year or two ago announced that the Party no longer holds that the state will wither away. Such a heresy against Marxist orthodoxy made surprisingly little stir: it was got over by one of the most skilful turns of dialectic argument. When state power is invested with cultural and moral and social monopoly it is more dangerous to the division of powers and plurality of functions than plain state domination, for a society which is so fully conditioned that all its organs work uncritically for the fulfilment of one of its cultural aims has no principles in it by which the trend can be challenged. Society is supreme—the state marches in its clothing—and it is not known as state. So the political faiths of our day are really social faiths using the vast apparatus of state power.

—Canon V. A. Demant in *The Listener*, 1/6/50.

DEPT. OF PROFOUND THOUGHT

What has Signor Pellizi to suggest? His solution can be stated in a single sentence. He believes that for the Fascist to have succeeded in Italy as the architects of a new social order, they would have had to organise the guilds or corporations on the lines of anarchico-syndicalism [sic].

—Review in *Times Literary Supplement*, 26/5/50.

Nought for Conduct

FOR years now the elementary and high school teachers of New York have been engaged in a running feud with the mayor of the city and the governor of the State over salaries and the absence of increases thereto. Like many another legitimate gripe against officialdom, that of the teachers has enlisted much sympathy and little active support. No one questions the justice of the teachers' cause, but as usual justice must take a back seat to expedient iron-bound principle, this time the one that denies public employees the privilege of striking.

This obviously places the teachers in an unenviable position, for above all professionals they are expected to hew close to the line rigidly grooved for them by form, taste, and puritanical standards of morality. For even Sanitation Department employees, were they to threaten a walkout, would not reap such general condemnation and calumny as would smother teachers similarly determined to improve their lot. Perhaps this is our tardy retaliation for the distasteful discipline to which teachers are called upon to subject us during our adolescent years, but whatever it is, for them we set up special rules as though at best they were three rungs beneath a jaded pickpocket, whose elementary rights we take such formal pains to protect.

As part of his strident campaign for re-election, His Honour Mayor O'Dwyer had pledged an "adequate" adjustment to teachers' salaries, but as is not infrequently the case, a flexible memory is Circea handmaid to political opportunism. The situation in New York, moreover, is uniquely contributory to such artifice, for all else failing, the mayor can claim impotence before the stern stewardship of the state, which is to say the governor. When backed against a wall the mayor neatly passes the buck to the state, hoping thereby both to shirk responsibility and to sidle out of an embarrassing predicament. In fairness to him it must be noted that the mayor is far from sovereign in fiscal matters, even purely municipal ones. That this anomalous situation is as though a bank president cannot receive a raise without the approval of one of his junior tellers, apparently does not discommode the majority of the citizens of New York City.

The Mayor's Nest-Egg

Came budget time early this year, and His Honor pulled every parliamentary trick in his extensive repertoire in the attempt to curtail discomfiting discussion of such matters as promises, privations and principles. Actually, if one can temporarily inactivate his orientation to a sense of fair play, one must accord His Honor some sort of palm for unadulterated gall. For here was an official who had just swilled at the public trough to the tune of \$15,000 per year heaped upon his former pay of \$25,000 (and has led his cronies to proportional gluttonies with the explanation [sic] that "in this kind of a job you have to put something away for a rainy day"), an official who had just returned from his third extended vacation since election day last November (and is already rumoured

to be planning a fourth), an official who had gained re-election on an anti-racketeering platform, an official who had cut innumerable political throats to promote his own aspirations—here was an official who was bleating inability to pay, etc., etc., etc., municipal morale, etc., etc., etc.

Finally, and still bemoaning a deficiency of ready cash for the purpose (latest indications point to another boost

NEW YORK LETTER

in subway fares—the second in two years—to help raise the money), he petulantly begrudged the teachers an increase of \$150 to \$250 per year.

The teachers, charging betrayal, retaliated by discontinuing their supervision of students' extracurricular activities.

His Honor's dignity was affronted. The action of the teachers was nothing less than lese majesty.

Students Skip Class-Struggle

On Monday, 27th March, several hundreds of high school students, aggrieved as much by the curtailment of their extracurricular activities as by any concern with the wage dispute itself, went to City Hall and requested an interview with His Honor. Insulated by a cordon of guards and secretaries, His Honor, wounded panjandrum sulking over this patent "lack of respect for lawful authority", angrily rejected the petition. "Communists!" he screamed.

The next day the demonstrators grew to several thousands. His Honor called out the police. No one, apparently, is quite so suspicious of the democratic process as those who materially benefit most from it.

Wednesday the demonstrators came to eight thousand at City Hall, with supporting rallies and walkouts mushrooming in high schools throughout the city.

On Thursday about double that number of students marched on City Hall. This time, club-wielding police—mounted, on foot, in squad cars—were deployed in force to handle the enemy. As, incidentally, was a small army of truant officers. The so-and-so kids had to be taught a lesson. His Honor had so ordered.

Friday the number of demonstrators before City Hall had dwindled to a few thousand. On Saturday none appeared. Nor, not unexpectedly, on Sunday.

On Monday, exactly one week after the eruption of this school-hour rebellion, City Hall and its environs were deathly quiet. Perhaps many of the students had repaired instead to Chelsea to cook up a hot reception for the May Day paraders, but His Honor saw fit to dispatch no truant officers to snare the ringleaders of this gang.

A Monday-to-Friday, nine-to-three o'clock insurrection of schoolchildren in New York had petered out.

It is superfluous to dilate upon the press and radio comments evoked by this affair. The comfortably unimaginative

reporters, given their lead by His Honor, dusted off the standard *bête noire* of the day: the Communists had fomented the uprising, they solemnly averred in concert, and eagerly let it go at that. It always has been easier to sloganize than to think. And safer, too.

The truth is that the authorities—municipal, parental, educational, social—are in mortal fear of the truth. When a flood threatens, flee. That's the way to live to see another day, and as a rule-of-thumb policy it is protective, if not exactly valorous.

The youths had gone to City Hall in orderly fashion. It was only when they found themselves confronted point-blank with the cloven hooves of police mounts, with hastily improvised barricades, and with the captious condescension of city officials that they kicked over the traces. It was borrowed license.

Nor was it difficult to sense that they were seeking something—something in compensation for having been cheated out of the grace of general profligacy relished during the war by their older brothers and sisters. Perhaps they resented the fact that another war would necessarily assume such shape as to deny them similar freedom.

Or perhaps they just went along for a lark.

Let Truce Prevail

With truce declared, His Honor has consented to meet with "duly accredited delegates" of the students to thrash out "misunderstandings". Each high school has what is known as a General Organisation, the principal function of the elected officers of which is to rubber-stamp official school policy. It is with these "accredited" delegates that His Honor will discuss the "issues". And who is to "accredit" them? None other than the president of the Board of Education, a venal politician of rather ill-repute himself a recent recipient of a salary increase from \$25,000 to 32,500 per annum.

In such an atmosphere flourishes this academic microcosm of the outside world.

THE MAN WHO KNOWS HIS VILLAGE

AMONG the more acute observations of modern sociologists is their emphasis on the fact that people who know one another well are able to solve what problems they have in common much better than those who are united only by the bonds of the social contract. Ideological hates do not prosper within the life of a village. Face-to-face experience of one another, through the years, produces too much common sense in people for them to believe very bad things of one another, or for them to fear one another very much. As Gordon Taylor, the sociologist, has said:

"Members of these groups . . . form assessments of one another, but they go further: each individual establishes positive links of affection or regard for other members. These links seem to

be based largely on shared experience, and acceptance of the other individual for what he is, good or bad. This is the case of social psychology against the large city, where a man can live all his life as stranger to the rest of the population. He can die of loneliness; he can turn into a criminal; he can become a philanthropist or a grafter, and not one of his next-door "neighbours" need ever know the kind of a man he is. The more closely packed together people live, the less they may understand of human beings, and the more isolated from natural human contact they may be. So, the sociologist proposes, let us divide our cities up into smaller units—into groups small enough for people to know one another. Let us abolish this anonymous mass which, knowing little, fears much, and feeds on suspicions and delusions.

Manas (U.S.A.), 17/4/50.

FOREIGN COMMENTARY

If You Accept Government You Accept War

FEW laymen knew anything about the powers of—or even the possibility of manufacturing—atom bombs until the newspapers headlined the Hiroshima attack. But to-day hardly a person has not heard of the H-bomb, and there is no secrecy about its potentialities for destruction, yet there is complete apathy among the people while the leaders of governments wrangle with one another, deciding among themselves when and if the diplomatic and economic deadlock will be "solved" by releasing a few H-bombs on the principal cities of the world. The "peace campaign" organised by the Communists is but a political campaign in which undoubtedly many genuine militant anti-militarists have joined because there is no other outfit for their work. But so far no rank and file international movement has come forward. Why is this? George Orwell in his *Notebooks* (see *World Review*, June issue) supplied the answer when he wrote, "If you accept government, you accept war, and if you accept war, you must in most cases desire one side or the other to win." This is not an original statement; Anarchists, among others, have been saying the same thing for decades, yet only anarchists, and they represent a very small minority in the world, seem to have understood its meaning. "If you accept government you accept war" is such a straightforward and simple idea, so easy to demonstrate and yet there are hundreds of millions of people in the world to-day who earnestly desire peace and who seek it through the most complex and tortuous systems of reasoning, when the solution is to be found in those seven simple words!

EVERY country in the world to-day declares that what it seeks above all things is Peace. Yet every country in the world is crippling its economic recovery by rearmament on an unprecedented scale, and scientists are using up their lives and knowledge in searching for ways and means of sowing death and destruction on an ever-increasing scale.

The April number of the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists* (Chicago) contains a long article by Dr. Hans A. Bethe, Professor of Physics at Cornell University, on the Hydrogen Bomb. In the section dealing with the Effects of the Hydrogen Bomb, he points out that "its power would be essentially unlimited and would increase as the amount of heavy hydrogen that can be carried in the bomb." He then goes on to deal with the effect of a bomb with "an energy release a thousand times greater than the Hiroshima bomb" and demonstrates that it would cause "almost complete destruction of buildings up to a radius of ten miles. A single bomb can obliterate almost all of greater New York or Moscow or London or any of the largest cities of the world". Of an "all-out war" fought with H-bombs, Dr. Bethe writes: "It would mean the killing of most of the inhabitants of the cities by direct action of the bombs, and possibly of many more people by radioactivity. Many of the survivors would perish for lack of shelter, others from hunger. The devastation that we have seen in Germany, and which overwhelmed many American visitors when they first saw it, would be nothing compared with the effects of hydrogen war."

On the moral issues involved in such a war, Dr. Bethe makes this very significant statement:

"It is argued that it would be better for us to lose our lives than our liberty; and this I personally agree with. But I believe that this is not the question; I believe that we would lose far more than our lives in a war fought with hydrogen bombs, that we would in fact lose all our liberties and human values at the same time, and so thoroughly that we would not recover them for an unforeseeably long time."

Now this is an important admission for it destroys the arguments of those intellectuals who have taken sides in the cold war on the ground that a Russian victory would be the end of all culture, moral values, etc., etc. . . . (or in the case of the pro-Russian section, that an American victory would have these same results). For, if Dr. Bethe is right, whichever side were to win the H-bomb war, all human values would be destroyed.

But even Dr. Bethe does not seem aware of the significance of his own statement for he then takes up a further two pages discussing questions of strategy and diplomacy, and pins his hopes for lasting peace on some sort of agreement being reached between Washington and Moscow to control the use of A and H-bombs. That idea "If you accept government you accept war" is too simple for intelligent and even sincere men like Dr. Bethe, who can only clearly understand such statements as $E=mc^2$.

Does the world face annihilation because we cannot see the wood for trees?

LIBERTARIAN.

Alex Comfort:	
BARBARISM AND SEXUAL FREEDOM	Boards 3/6. Paper 2/6
Alexander Berkman:	
A.B.C. OF ANARCHISM	1/-
George Woodcock:	
ANARCHY OR CHAOS 2/6, Cloth 4/6	
NEW LIFE TO THE LAND	6d.
RAILWAYS AND SOCIETY	3d.
HOMES OR HOVELS?	...6d.
ANARCHISM AND MORALITY	2d.
WHAT IS ANARCHISM?	1d.
THE BASIS OF COMMUNAL LIVING	1/-
Rudolf Rucker:	
NATIONALISM & CULTURE	21/-
Herbert Read:	
POETRY AND ANARCHISM	Cloth 5/-
	Paper 2/6
THE PHILOSOPHY OF ANARCHISM	Boards 2/6, Paper 1/-
THE EDUCATION OF FREE MEN	1/-
EXISTENTIALISM, MARXISM & ANARCHISM	3/6
John Hewarton:	
ITALY AFTER MUSSOLINI	6d.
ILL-HEALTH, POVERTY AND THE STATE	Cloth 2/6, Paper 1/-
Peter Kropotkin:	
THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE	1/-
THE WAGE SYSTEM	3d.
REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT	3d.
SELECTIONS FROM HIS WRITINGS (Chosen by Herbert Read)	3/6
ORGANISED VENGEANCE	
CALLED JUSTICE	2d.
FREEDOM PRESS	
27, Red Lion Street,	
London, W.C.1.	

LETTER TO THE EDITORS

FREE UNION AND FREE LOVE (See last two issues)

I AM afraid that Alex Comfort's letter concerning my article clouds rather than illuminates the issues I raised. He does not seem to have entirely understood the article himself, and hence he unwittingly misrepresents what I had to say. I feel that it is important that there should be no ambiguity about these issues, as the legacy of wilful moral obscurantism is too often replaced by intellectual haziness.

I wish to clear up five of the main points of confusion arising from Comfort's letter.

1. Changes of parents. What Comfort means, presumably, is repeated changes of those in *loco parentis* (as one cannot change one's parents); this must logically include nurses, schoolteachers and family friends, who make up the adult medium on which the child lives. I certainly did not advocate such changes. The concept of the monogamous family does in fact, imply divorces, broken homes, struggles for the custody of children, as the outcome of sexual diversity. The concept of free love entails a recognition of the true importance of motherhood, and it follows that a greater number of adults have an affectionate interest simultaneously in the children, irrespective of their own sexual relationships. This means, among other things, that children have a broader basis of both emotional and economic security than is possible when they are at the mercy of the unstable existence of a separate family in a jungle-like society.

2. "Extra-marital continence" and "Intra-marital continence". The former means sexual abstinence outside marriage, and the latter means sexual abstinence within marriage. The latter is advocated as a birth control method by some Catholics: what it has got to do with free love or monogamy I do not know. Perhaps Comfort confused his terms and meant "Inter-marital continence"—chastity between marriages, which makes better sense but is still hardly relevant.

3. "Cases of partner-switching which pass through the hands of the psychiatrist". These show adult immaturity, says Comfort. Of course they do—among other neuroses—precisely because they are, by definition, psychiatric cases! Presumably if we limit our study of cases of persons with liberal opinions, or anarchist tendencies, or Anglican principles, to those cases which pass through the hands of the psychiatrist, we will discover the neurotic roots of their personalities. Such an argument is not scientifically sound.

4. "Isn't the need for a perpetual sexual adventure being rather overstated?" I don't know why Comfort insists on the romantic convention of calling sexual activity outside marriage "adventure". However, accepting his terms, I would flatly answer—no. *Freedom* and the *Journal of Sex Education* are among the very few reputable journals published in this country which will give the matter any consideration. In general, there is a huge understatement of the case.

5. "I would derive pleasure rather than pain from other people's admiration of the woman I loved." In my discussion of jealousy, I was not concerned with admiration. Basking in other men's admiration of our womenfolk is, of course, common enough; and it does not contribute to women's freedom. The bourgeoisie lavish jewels upon their wives to this end, and show them off like their fine cars and horses to excite admiration. The emancipation of women involves a departure from this male attitude.

Comfort and I obviously have a great measure of agreement on the importance of emotional security and happiness as being the prerequisite for the healthy development of children, and also on the necessity for self-regulation in conduct. But I think he greatly underestimates the vast misery inflicted on children by the love-starved adult world; he seems to see in the revolutionary attack on conventional morals a bogey, since it threatens the security of theoretically established social customs. That these family and sexual customs exist in theory only, is revealed by all honest studies of the question—notably by the Kinsey Report; the reality is a welter of contradictory and unstable practices, which we need have no compunction in trying to replace by saner habits in accordance with the experience of our own lives.

G.

FROM PAGE ONE

Rationing: A Shallow Compromise

the consumer of the lower income groups—were only recognized when, during the first world war, the capitalist classes of the various warring states found that their survival depended on their ability to enlist the working-class in their economic battles. For the workers, rationing is justified on moral and equalitarian grounds; for the ruling-class it is a matter of necessary manoeuvring at particular stages of their struggles, and the moral gloss is far thinner—an argument in propaganda, hardly more. It is as well to remember that this double conception permeates almost all progressive legislation, and largely vitiates it.

Success of Rationing

It must be conceded that wartime rationing has been on the whole successful in providing that adequate amounts of the limited food supplies have been available to society in general and not merely to the rich. The rather obvious malnutrition of the inter-war years has been for practical purposes wiped out, and there seems no reason to doubt the part that food rationing played in maintaining health in wartime, and improving it. To say this, however, is by no means to say that that particular problem is now solved, or that no further improvement is possible.

And it is well to remember that, even during the war, there were a considerable number of persons in poorer districts who could not afford to take up all their rations. In well-to-do districts of the towns, people got their rations and no more, because everyone took them up; but in poorer districts the better-off could often secure slightly more by taking up the surplus at the retailers left by those who could not afford to buy all they were "entitled" to.

Nevertheless, the purpose of rationing was not, in this country, defeated and demoralized by the existence of a large black

ANARCHISM AND ITS RELATIONS WITH OTHER MOVEMENTS

Our position towards the I.W.M.A. [The International Working-Men's Association, or A.I.T. is the anarcho-syndicalist International to which syndicalist trade-union movements, particularly those of the Latin and Scandinavian countries, are affiliated. Its headquarters are in Stockholm.]

REAFFIRMING what has been said in the resolution on Syndicalism (see *Freedom*, 27th May), in which industrial action was considered as the most apt means of developing libertarian ideas, in view of the broad popular support which it engenders, the International Anarchist Congress declares its support of the I.W.M.A., considering it a genuine workers' organisation with a truly international character, and whose revolutionary aim is clearly defined.

In consequence, the Congress recommends support for the development of the I.W.M.A.'s activities by participation, where possible, in the organisation or among the rank and file, always stressing its ultimate aims.

Below we continue the publication of translations of the resolutions passed at the International Anarchist Congress, held at the end of last year in Paris. (Previous articles appeared in our issues of 21st January, 4th March, 1st, 15th and 29th April, and 27th May.)

As a specifically anarchist movement our relations with the I.W.M.A. could be of the closest and most active kind; even more than relations, a frank and cordial collaboration in all possible fields.

Youth Movements

We must point out the necessity to maintain and to establish fraternal and constant relations with Libertarian youth movements, with a view to influencing the greatest number of people with our ideas. We believe that by this method we can effectively contribute to awaken anarchist personalities and to retain them in our movement.

Believing that relations between different nations and their understanding of one another are the most solid basis for an effective internationalism, the congress

suggests that closer ties should exist between young libertarians throughout the world, either by direct contact or with the fraternal support of the international anarchist movement.

Pacifist and Anti-Militarist Movements

The International Anarchist Congress considers that the fragmentary and partial content of the pacifist and anti-militarist movements does not suitably represent the deeper reasons nor the origin of the problem of wars. The anarchist position on the questions to which pacifism is related, implies the complete analysis of all the social contradictions which are, after all, the causes that engender militarism and armed conflicts.

Nevertheless, the Congress manifests its sympathy for all those movements which are genuinely anti-war because they answer a deeply-rooted desire in Man for peace which is becoming stronger day by day as a result of the painful experiences of successive wars. The anarchist's task will consist in encouraging and giving expression to this desire by giving it a social and constructive content divorced from any unilateral position.

Notwithstanding, it is imperative to declare that to constitute pacifist or anti-militarist organisms in the name of Anarchism represents in principle a dispersion of efforts which not only will get us no nearer our goal but may even result in a weakening of our action in the domain just considered. The fact of devoting ourselves exclusively to subordinate activities will have a negative effect on anarchists; a weakening of indispensable integral action.

Anti-Religious Movements

The Congress points out that religious questions cannot be limited to the domain of ideas, since one must analyse and judge them as an integral part of a combination of authoritarian manifestations which have attempted and still tend to swamp the social problem as a whole.

This statement therefore advises, with regard to anti-religious activities, the adoption of a pluralist attitude, similar to the one suggested above with regard to pacifism: an absolutely integral position towards all that religion represents and engenders, without forgetting any of its phases nor any of its manifestations. As with the anti-militarist problem, Congress draws attention to the dangers represented by specialisation in this field resulting in a probable weakening of the movement as a whole.

(To be concluded.)

"GIVE FOOD AWAY," U.S. FARMERS CRY

Washington.

"WE of the U.S.A. must give away the food that we can't eat and can't sell—give it away quickly and give it away generously," a farm group has declared here after conferences with government and agricultural leaders.

That was the conclusion of 50 farmers, farm wives and others in farm-related jobs who spent two weeks in a seminar sponsored by the Friends Committee on National Legislation and the American Friends Service Committee.

"We believe we must drastically curtail our budgeting for war, and spend more real money on peace," the farmers statement went on.

W.P.

Special Appeal

May 19th to June 1st

Anon 2/6; London: B.G.D. 2/6; London: B.H.Y. 1/6; London: W.E.D. 10/-; San Francisco: T.C. 2/-; San Jose: G.P. £1/15/0; Thundersley: C.W. 1/-; Glasgow: A.M.C.D. 4/-; Anon* 2/6; Vancouver: M.P. £1; Cambridge: C.L.D.* 5/-; London: L.G.W.* 5/-.

Total	£4 11 0
Previously acknowledged	£114 12 1
1950 TOTAL TO DATE	£119 3 1

*After initials indicates contributors to the 5/- a month scheme proposed by a London reader.

FREEDOM Anarchist Fortnightly Price 3d.

Postal Subscription Rates
6 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$1).
12 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$2).

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
6 months 7/6 (£1.50).
12 months 15/- (£3).

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
27 Red Lion Street
London, W.C.1 England
Tel.: Chancery 8364.

Meetings and Announcements

UNION OF ANARCHIST GROUPS: CENTRAL LONDON

INDOOR Lecture-Discussions every Sunday at 7.30 p.m. at the Trade Union Club, Great Newport St., W.C.2 (near Leicester Square Station).

June 11th Speaker: Sam Fenaroff "COMMUNITY LIVING"

June 18th Speaker: John Hewetson "THE FRENCH TERRORISTS AND THE PROPAGANDA OF THE DEED"

June 25th Anarchist speakers "OBJECTIONS TO ANARCHISM"

GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP OUTDOOR MEETINGS every Sunday at 7 p.m. at -

MAXWELL STREET

with Frank Leech, John Gaffney, Eddie Shaw, J. Raeside

LIVERPOOL ANARCHIST GROUP

Open Air Meetings every Sunday, 7.30 p.m. on Lewis's blitzed site

COLNE & NELSON DISTRICT

Discussion Group held fortnightly, Sunday, June 18th, at 3.0 p.m.

at Twisters and Drawers Club, Cambridge Street, Colne (Lancs.)

NORTH EAST LONDON GROUP

Discussion Meetings fortnightly, 7.30 p.m. JUNE 13th TED MANN

"THE WORLD FOOD SHORTAGE"

JUNE 27th Don Taylor "TRENDS OF MODERN CAPITALISM"

Enquiries c/o Freedom Press

HAMPSTEAD

Discussion Meetings are held every Tuesday at 8 p.m. prompt.

at 5, Villas-on-the-Heath, Vale of Health, Hampstead, N.W.3