

Freedom

AN ANARCHIST FORTNIGHTLY

September 16th, 1950

Vol. 11, No. 19

ANARCHISM: The philosophy of a social order based of liberty unrestricted by man-made law; the theory that all forms of government rest on violence, and are therefore wrong and harmful, as well as unnecessary.
EMMA GOLDMAN.

Three pence

Wage Freeze Rejected, Equal Pay Accepted, But T.U.C. Sanctions Sacrifice

THIS year's Trade Union Congress at Brighton, turned out to be a rather more stormy affair than usual. The General Council, encouraged by their smooth passages in recent years, apparently looked forward to a rubber-stamp congress again this year, but misjudged the depth of feeling engendered by nearly three years of wage freeze in a period of rising costs of living.

However, in spite of a lot of noise and confusion, nothing very unexpected happened. The T.U.C., as already reported in *Freedom* (8/7/50) had recognised that with the post-election burst of de-rationing and the rise of prices following last year's devaluation of the pound, the wage freeze could not be continued much longer, and had sought to replace it by a policy of "flexible restraint". The surprise for the General Council came from the fact that this policy was rejected in no uncertain manner, but since at the present moment there are wage claims outstanding or in the offing for no less than four million trade unionists, the rejection of restraint was really only to be expected.

The only decision which is likely to cause any real embarrassment for the union leaders

is that which demands equal pay for equal work for women. This principle was first accepted (in principle) by the T.U.C. in 1882, had been underlined (in principle) by the present government, but perpetually avoided in practice. This year, Betty Jones, vice-president of the Civil Service Clerical Association, warned the General Council and the Government that they could expect a repetition of the suffragettes' campaign of direct action if the principle was not implemented in fact. Her resolution was passed by the Congress with a 2 million majority, in spite of Arthur Deakin of the General Council leaving the platform to direct the delegation of his union (Transport & General) how to vote. Since the General Council had asked for this resolution to be referred back to them, his action deserved the jeers it drew from the other delegates.

"NOTHING LESS THAN THE BEST"

It is often remarked upon that trade union leaders are very much out of touch with their members. Two sentences used by Herbert Bullock, T.U.C. President, in his opening ad-

dress, showed that he at least is very much out of touch with present-day realities as well. Calling for a minimum wage of £5, representing a raise for lowest-paid workers, he went on to say, "The workers of this country are worth nothing less than the best." The best—on £5 per week to-day! It is no doubt a very long time since Mr. Bullock had to keep himself and possibly a family on £5 a week. In his exalted position as leader of the giant National Union of General and Municipal Workers he earns several times that sum, and the very fact that there are trade unionists to-day earning less than £5 a week is due to Mr. Bullock and his ilk toeing the Government's line on the wage freeze for so long.

Certainly the workers, who produce all wealth, deserve the best, but please Mr. Bullock, don't pretend they will get it on £5 per week!

ACCEPTANCE OF WAR ECONOMY

The real task facing this year's Trade Union Congress, however, was to line the unions up solidly behind the Government on international questions, to begin the softening-up process which paves the way for acceptance once again of a war economy and its consequent austerity. This the Congress very successfully accomplished, from rejecting a resolution to ban the atom bomb, to passing a resolution welcoming higher production—although what the point is in producing more goods to be destroyed

PAGE FOUR

TRADE UNIONS OPPOSE SYNDICALISM

THE fact that both the T.U.C. Council and its critics within the trade union movement are rigidly opposed to the idea of Workers' Control is exemplified by this report of the final session of the Congress on September 8th.

"The delegates turned to the nationalised industries, and after a short but at times exceedingly sharp debate rejected a resolution recommending changes in the existing administration. Sponsored by the Chemical Workers' Union, the resolution expressed the opinion that existing methods of control and administration were not in keeping with democratic principles and had not fulfilled the hopes of the workers. Congress should therefore urge the General Council to consider at the earliest moment an entirely new structure of administration and control based on the establishment of an industrial parliament. These parliaments would have limited aims as laid down in the Nationalisation Acts, but full executive powers within the democratic limitations of the British Constitution."

"Remarking that his union had worked out a structure of industrial democracy, which, unfortunately, he had not time to outline, Mr. R. Edwards suggested that if they wanted democracy in industry it must be based on local government, which was the best expression of democracy. "Replying from the platform, Mr. Lincoln Evans described the idea behind the resolution as the old one of guild socialism and syndicalism, which Congress had rejected for many years. The council's view was that the application of democracy to industry had to be made through the development of joint consultation."

"This interpretation of his remarks stung Mr. Edwards to reply that it was nonsense to confuse the resolution with syndicalism, which could only arise in the case of economic collapse. 'And,' continued Mr. Edwards, 'we do not envisage such a state of revolution in this country. We would never dream of submitting syndicalism as a solution. We say there is no industrial democracy in the nationalised industries.'"

"The resolution was defeated by the 'noes' shouting the 'ayes'."

Why SHOULD Miners Risk Their Lives?

THE mine disaster at New Cumnock, Ayrshire, draws attention to the two basic facts about coal mining. Firstly, that it is the most dangerous occupation in Britain: the average number of men killed each year is nearly eight. Secondly, that it is the industry upon which the whole economic structure of the country is built. Sir Harold Hartley of the British Association in his presidential address to its recent meeting that by grace of our magnificent coal industry we live and indeed flourish.

But is it in fact a matter for pride that we "flourish" at the expense of an occupation which inevitably kills and injures many who work in it?

The National Coal Board's official journal, *Coal*, recently warned that a coal shortage is threatened by the fact that coal consumption is rising steadily—and will rise still further when the arms programme gets under way—while the number of employed miners continues to shrink. *The Observer*, 3/9/50, commented that "with full employment it is about as hard to get volunteers for the pits as for the Services," and suggested that, "one remedy would be to invite more mining recruits from abroad, perhaps from Italy, where unemployment is severe."

In other words, since men are not fools, and will not, when the fear of unemployment is reduced, willingly enter this hard and dangerous occupation, we should look abroad, to countries where plenty of unemployment means plenty of men who cannot afford to be concerned with their own safety and comfort, and import them, as though they were a commodity to do the work for us, and our armament programme, and our export drive.

If ours were a society which valued human beings more than balance sheets, would we not be devoting far more attention to developing other sources of power—hydro-electricity and the harnessing of tidal and wind power and of solar heat? And to the invention of more efficient methods of storing electricity and of transmitting it over long distances, inventions upon which the effective use of these insufficiently used natural sources of energy depend.

But the brains and the research funds which might be used for these programme are too busy perfecting the application of atomic energy to the problems of efficient mass-destruction.

Meanwhile, coal miners continue to be killed and injured.

MILITARY JUSTICE

"It is ironical that in the same week that the Prime Minister appealed for volunteers to defend democracy, three British soldiers should be hung after being convicted by a court full of amateurs in a trial of which only the scantiest details have appeared in the press, and under conditions which denied them the right of appeal to a judicial body."

THESE were the opening words of an article in *The Tribune* last week on the courts-martial system by a former court-martial officer. This scandalous aspect of the case mentioned has been discussed in the press, together with the macabre and pathetic details of the visit to the condemned men by their mothers, and the War Office's remarks on the "stoic" behaviour of the men and the "remarkable self-control" of the mothers.

It was certainly a feast for the sensational daily papers, but there are further points bearing on the hypocrisy of the authorities which were not mentioned.

The three soldiers were found guilty of the murder of an Egyptian garage watchman in Cairo—a brutal and premeditated killing. Now anyone who has served in the forces in the Middle East will confirm that there is an "unwritten law" in the army: "If you run over a Wog, go back and run him over again to make sure he is dead." You won't find it in army orders—the War Office will vigorously

deny it, but it is an inculcated attitude nevertheless and there are a lot of people who have seen it done.

Talks are now going on between the British and Egyptian Governments on the future of British forces in Egypt, the Suez Canal Zone and on the future status of the Sudan. The British Government, for the reasons of strategy, is anxious to dissuade the Egyptians from insisting on the complete evacuation of British troops. Mr. Bevin wants to place the arrangements with Egypt "on the basis of a free partnership between equals".

At the present delicate stage in the negotiations, it was necessary not to remind the Egyptians that the army regards them as an inferior race. Consequently, the three soldiers must die. In other "occupied countries" repressives are the accepted thing for military racketeers who murder one of the inhabitants. But other occupied countries can't turn the army out. It will be recalled that one of the three soldiers shot the unfortunate Egyptian, but they were all hanged. Presumably it was decided that they were all responsible. But when apportioning the responsibility, why stop there? Is not

the military system, which brought the three soldiers to Egypt in the atmosphere of idleness alternating with meaningless activity, and continual personal irresponsibility, and which inculcated in them an attitude of contempt for "the natives", responsible for the deaths of the four men—the three soldiers and their victim?

THE RIGHTEOUS HYPOCRITES

THE following letter (from Alex Comfort) recently appeared in the *Manchester Guardian*.

"The level of unreality at which the House, as well as British and American propaganda, has discussed the Korean war is an index of the degree to which we have become hypnotised by the inspection of our own righteousness. Some prominent Allied politicians seriously believe that the Anglo-American reoccupation of Korea on behalf of the Syngman Rhee regime will be greeted with enthusiasm there—the din of propaganda makes it wholly impossible to assess the support which either competitor actually commands, but a return of the fighting across a peasant country, prepared by heavy bombing of towns, and ending in a reversal of the expropriation of local landlords, may speak a good deal louder to the Korean public than Mr. Acheson or Mr. Lie.

"We are only entitled to denounce Communist peace petitions as a fraud if we are equally critical of our own pretensions. If one is fraudulent, so is the other, at least in the eyes of a large part of Asia. We may think that in supporting the United States to-day we are securing our own prestige as liberators to-morrow; in fact, we are helping to identify ourselves with two of the most unpopular and undesirable policies of the present time—support for the landlord and the yamen, and the use of indiscriminate massacre, in threat or in fact, as the prime weapon in any conflict. Most of our defeats in Asia come from the first of these associa-

tions, and the growing disquiet of Europe, as well as the strongest Communist argument against the West, comes from the disgraceful example of the second which we set during the world war.

"In spite of the arguments about Russia's alleged intentions and the facade of legality at Lake Success, we can only regard Korea, as well as the rest of the cold war in all its manifestations, as part of a conflict between two totally irresponsible power groups, both in a psychopathic state of fear, both prepared to commit unlimited atrocities if war comes, and both meriting our whole-hearted resistance. As inhabitants of an increasingly vulnerable island we can ill afford the illusions which our foreign policy embodies. The Atlantic Pact converts us into a target area without offering any protection more tangible than the promise of subsequent liberation. It is not enough for Mr. Attlee to give unreserved public support to President Truman in Korea while frantically plucking his coat-tails over Formosa in private. If we find ourselves on the wrong side in Asia, or even, to-day, on the worse of two almost equally objectionable sides, we shall have dug our own grave, as well as that of any Anglo-Asiatic co-operation in the future. The only answer to Communist charges that we support reaction is to repudiate it in fact, a repudiation which extends to American satellite Governments and to Russian police methods with equal force. The only answer to the peace campaign is to dissociate ourselves from civilian massacre as a policy. It is high time we did both."

Direct Action Frees Miner!

PROMPT action by 2,000 miners won the freedom of one of their mates last week in St. Helens, Lancs.

John Horrocks took part in an unofficial strike last March, and, as is now usual under nationalisation, was, with 24 fellow strikers, subsequently summoned by the National Coal Board and fined £10 for breach of contract. He refused to pay, and so was arrested and sentenced to 28 days' imprisonment.

Immediately, 1,200 miners at Sutton Manor and 800 at Bold Collieries refused to work until he was released. The N.C.B. rapidly climbed down—while the N.U.M. found the necessary amount to secure his release—then agreeing not to press for immediate payment by Horrocks.

This represents a resounding victory for the miners, and is exactly the way to deal with the totalitarian methods of the N.C.B.!

DELINQUENCY

By Alex Comfort

Now you'll notice that I have not been talking in specifically revolutionary or anarchist terms about this problem, because most of the work which is being done to-day is not being done by revolutionaries, but by psychiatrists who are trying to work, if not with, at least in, the existing order. Now I think their work is important, and for this reason—delinquency is not limited to crime. The further we go in the anthropology and psychology of delinquency, the clearer it becomes that the mechanisms which make some people into thieves or persistent murderers are not dynamically different from the mechanisms which make people into the other kind of delinquent, the socially-accepted and unpunishable delinquent, with whom we are at odds whenever we criticize power and coercion as institutions. This is not a theory peculiar to anarchists. It has a very wide, and, I believe, an increasing acceptance in psychiatry. As anarchists, the desire to dominate is the "crime" which worries us most. We recognise that at the moment the delinquent activities of governments, and of individual psychopaths in them, are a greater threat to social advance than even the most serious examples of punishable crime. The individual who is clever or lucky as well as delinquent may be able to express his basic character-disorder in an unpunishable form—if he is unlucky or of low intelligence he will express it in what is commonly known as crime. In another context, the aggressive psychopath who bashes people and robs them may well be psychodynamically identical with the sadistic warder who bashes people and is allowed to do so, or the bucket-shop proprietor who goes to prison, with the demagogue who rises to be head of his party.

For this reason, a scientific attempt to ferret out the actual, concrete factors in society, the family, and the individual which lead to "crime" of the delinquent type is in itself a revolutionary activity, if by revolution we mean the attempt to alter inadequate social patterns by deliberate action, and any contribution to this study, even if the people who make it do not realise its wider significance, is of vital importance to us as revolutionaries. And it has another side. We're not always very logical. Most of us, I think, refuse on principle to be indignant, and to react by demands for revenge, against bandits or murderers, because we say that their behaviour is the outcome of defects in society. On the other hand, we are very often indignant, and we may react equally sentimentally, at the activity of power-groups or of individuals like Franco and Stalin who seem to us to be acting brutally or wickedly in their own fields. I don't want to suggest we should lose our healthy social indignation, any more than I suggest we should come to shrug our shoulders when we come across a multiple murderer, but I do feel that any revolutionary movement which is able, as I believe we are able, to ground itself in psychiatry should thereby acquire a balance and a principled approach to social evils which it can get in no other way. I believe that there is only one possible kind of revolution, a revolution based on a scientific study of the things we wish to foster and the things we wish to eliminate, and those are the criteria which we have to fulfil if we are to make a contribution to human progress. And it goes further than that—it is known to-day that not only governmental power but revolutionary activity itself is a very common cloak for psychopathic tendencies in the participants. We all know the psychopathic crank, to our cost, and being a minority party we have to guard against him: for all I know, I may be one. The application and reapplication of rational criteria to our own response and opinions is a positive duty, and an extremely difficult and arduous one. Is our hatred of coercion or authority based on evidence, or is it a discharge of aggressive tendencies which might have landed us in Dartmoor or in the Cabinet? It's a point I won't pursue, but we should mention it in passing. "The Delinquent" or the psychopath is invariably someone else, not the person who uses those words.

Now the crucial question for us is this—can we hope to interfere effectively to prevent the development of the delinquent type of behaviour disorder? Is it, as Lombroso suggested, and as a very few penologists still suggest, an innate defect? I think we can answer that with an unqualified "No." There is no significant evidence whatever to support such a view, except in a very limited number of mental defectives and organic psychotics who are destructive or troublesome, and even these can to some extent be trained as well as restrained. Is it, then, an economic effect? Does poverty breed crime to the extent we formerly believed? Up to a point it does, though some of that crime is hardly delinquency—crime, as I hope to show in a minute, is a breaking-down or breaking-out process, and like other explosive forms of behaviour many non-specific stresses can contribute. But poverty is by no means the only cause, and any simple economic view is not enough.

If you read the press, you will see that the causes of crime, especially juvenile crime, are known to practically everyone—bishops, magistrates, doctors, social workers, postman, and editors. Unfortun-

ately, no two of these agree what they are. The most commonly cited are low moral standards in the home, either through lack of religious teaching or through the supposed growth of pilfering, fiddling and so on, lack of what is termed parental discipline, and the notorious fact that children steal because they want things—if they pinch sweets it is because they want sweets but won't save up for them, which is the spiritual-commensense theory in another form.

The only way to deal with this kind of assertion is by proper observation, to see if it is true. I'm going to devote the rest of my time to one particularly important study on these lines which has just been published, that undertaken by Stott for the Carnegie Trust. So far as I know he is no anarchist, so I can quote him without any charges of special pleading. His series of cases covers 102 youths between 15 and 18 in English approved schools—this is a smallish

In the second half of his Summer School address, Alex Comfort describes the results of a very close study of the social and family backgrounds of a group of boy delinquents. The extent to which such studies bear out the intuitive analyses of the earlier anarchists is of extraordinary interest.

In his final section, Comfort turns attention to the way in which modern psychiatry can assist the problem of how, and in what circumstances, free men arise. His whole lecture is an eloquent plea for the use of the observational and analytical method in the forming of the sociological views of a revolutionary movement.

sample, but the results and the method were both of great general importance. I can't unfortunately do more than summarise Stott's findings, but the book can be obtained from public libraries under the title *Delinquency and Human Nature*, and I commend it to everyone here.

Stott's primary finding is that in almost every case the actual offences, whatever they were, whether sexual, larceny, or other, represented breakdown-reactions to enormous internal stress. In no case did a boy steal because he wanted something—unwanted objects were stolen, stolen objects given away. Parental discipline ranged from very severe to absent. Religious upbringing was indifferently present or absent. In Stott's own words, delinquent breakdown is an escape from an emotional situation which, for the particular individual and with various conditionings of his background, becomes at least temporarily unbearable. The motives of the offences Stott summarises as avoidance-excitement, which is apparently particularly associated with housebreaking, inferiority-compensation, delinquent-attention, resentment against parents, desire for removal from home, in that order. One important deduction from this finding is that criminal parents are not an important determinant, for this reason: the satisfaction or relief which the delinquents got from their offences were not concrete ones, like gain or advantage, but depended almost wholly on the fact that crime is something which society rejects, which brings punishment, gets them sent away from home, or scandalises parents. The boy whose father is a burglar does not try to spite him by stealing. The largest number (53%) engaged in crime as a means of forgetting their home problems in a round of adventure. Others deliberately courted detection to spite their parents or to escape from home. I think that a reading of the 102 detailed case histories here gives us a truer picture of what we are up against in dealing with the persistent criminal than does any examination of the later part of the process. The old lag has a hard shell—he is in equilibrium with himself, and one can't easily break in. But he is the end result of the same process. Stott shows very clearly that delinquency is a neurosis, if by a neurosis we mean a repetitive kind of response to a situation we cannot cope with, which is in itself inappropriate and useless, but which has become fixed as a habit.

For our purposes, we need to go further, and see what the stresses were which produced this pressure. They were all in essence tensions within the family. Summary gives little idea of them—to realise what these boys had to contend with, in "good" (respectable) homes for the most part, one has to turn to the case histories; Stott gives us broad headings which indicate the type of anxiety source, but not its intensity or the total absence of any real means of escape for the victim: anxiety over parents' health, desertion threats, being unwanted, estrangement from parents, unsatisfactory parents, neurotic, hysterical, stupid, over-severe; homes upset by quarrelling, separation, remarriage and so on. Under these one can make out, if one wishes, some of the more classical Freudian outlines. There is no one paramount cause—

any major stress which impairs the stability, the confidence of the affection in a family can, under the right conditions, produce delinquency, some more than others, but in every case the aggression, irresponsibility or cruelty of the delinquent is the outcome of learning—it is a response he has acquired, not a character-trait, but a way of reacting to a situation. And the treatment which is required, this being so, is one of deconditioning, of "placing the delinquent in an environment in which his emotional wounds can best heal". How far this is from the orthodox legal idea of punishment I need hardly stress.

I have neither the time, nor, I think, the authority to try to apply the lessons of what I have been saying to our ideas of changing society, except to point out to you once again that the family, in view of its part in character-formation, and the whole nexus of personal

relationships which contribute to it, is the key not only to the problem of delinquency in its limited sense but in all the wider social and political contexts which interest us in our desire to found a non-coercive society where individuals respect one another without external sanction. There is plenty of room here for discussion and study. There are two points I would like to make. First of all, most of the work in this field seems to me to give us extremely strong grounds for encouragement. The political field, and the type of revolution by a *levée-en-masse*, which earlier radicals looked for, have never been bleaker in prospect: the new knowledge and study of the mechanisms of human societies and of individual character-formation gives us, I think, not only a field in which to work with every hope of success, but also an assurance that the ideas which we have espoused, for various reasons, conscious or unconscious, since the time of William Godwin, are becoming increasingly the currency of scientific thought. Secondly, I want to stress the importance of our keeping up with the work which is going on, of seeing all the results, whether they support our preconceptions or not. It is not good enough to read A. S. Neill because we like his ideas and not read those who criticize him. Personally, I would like to see more of us, those who are taking training in social sciences or engaging in research in this field. I do not want to try to turn anarchism into a sociological Party, the Society, from which non-scientists are excluded. I want to see something done which has not been done before—a concerted, unbiased, and properly documented attempt to disseminate accurately the teaching of modern child psychiatry, social psychology, and political psychology to the general public on the same scale as we have in the past tried to disseminate revolutionary propaganda. That most certainly does not involve any split between "worker" and "intellectual"—the worker wants the information, and wants it now, exactly as he wants the doctor, or as the intellectual wants food and coal, and in terms of mutual aid each relies on the other to deliver the goods. I think this is the complement of what other comrades are doing in industry by pressing for such things as workers' control and local autonomy—the two go together. And there is another side to this—most of us may feel depressed from time to time at the complacency of the public in the face of economic and industrial issues and of political injustice: we should have to be radiant optimists, I think, to anticipate any mass movement toward our ideas at the moment, or, if such a movement did miraculously occur, to believe that the English public, conditioned to live as it does and think as it does, could be translated at all suddenly into a higher level of individual responsibility. As a minority movement, our best chance lies in our power of forming opinion. By learning how free men are made, and why they are in short supply to-day, psychiatry seems to me to be filling a rôle which is not less revolutionary for being unspectacular. I want to suggest to you that it is here, where power, delinquency, and most of the other maladjustments which we want to see removed, can be attacked by the methods which got rid of epidemic disease that we may perhaps be able to make our most effective contribution to the kind of world we want.

Exhibition of Children's Pictures

HERBERT READ, in opening the third National Exhibition of Children's Art, criticised the scornful reference "obviously directed at this exhibition" made by Mr. Robert Birley at this year's Royal Academy banquet.

"He charged the organisers," said Mr. Read, "with encouraging the belief that the

children chosen for the exhibition were a lot of little geniuses, who would one day become Associates of the Royal Academy. He suggested that only a very small minority of children were gifted for painting, and that these few only should be trained and their works exhibited."

Mr. Read said that behind all this, were two fundamentally different conceptions of education. One, represented by Mr. Birley, regarded the child's mind as an empty sack into which the schoolmaster must stuff solid layers of knowledge and, if there were any room left at the top, a little poetry or art.

"The other conception which we hold," Mr. Read went on, "thinks of an infant mind rather as a seed containing infinite potentialities, germinating under favourable conditions and sending out a number of tender shoots."

"—his ideas are developed in "The Education of Free Men" (P. 1/4).

The exhibition which is at the Royal Institute Galleries, Piccadilly, London, is open every weekday from 10 to 8, until September 29th.

GOLDEN ASSES

A big consignment of a new translation by Robert Graves of *The Golden Ass*, by Lucius Apuleius, the second century philosopher, is being held by the Customs at Sydney, pending a decision whether it should be banned.

The owner of a bookshop said that expensive editions of the book are on sale. The Customs may object to the book being sold at a price (2s.) which would bring it within reach of the general public.

News-Chronicle, 22/8/50.

Erudite readers will recall that Godwin's "Political Justice" escaped prosecution by reason that it appeared in a form too expensive for general acquisition. But observed, when the question was debated in the Privy Council, that "a three guinea book could never do much harm among those who had not three shillings to spare."

From our stock . . .

Authority and Delinquency in the Modern State
Alex Comfort 8/6
The Colossus of Maroussi
A Field of Broken Stones
Henry Miller 1/6
Lowell Naeve 12/6

A Home of Their Own K. E. Barlow 4/6
Unpopular Essays Bertrand Russell 8/6
Hereditary Genius
Sir Francis Galton 10/6
The Bolshevik Revolution, Vol. 1
E. H. Carr 30/-
Seven Fallen Pillars John Kimche 15/-
Fred Bason's Diary 8/6
Socialism Over 60 Years
Fenner Brockway 16/-

The Naked and the Dead
Norman Mailer 15/-
The Death Ship
B. Traven 2/-
Journal of Sex Education,
August-September 2/-
Poetry London, August 2/6
Resistance (U.S.A.), June-July 3d.

JOHN OLDAY'S DRAWINGS

THE many admirers of John Olday's work will be glad to hear that an exhibition of his drawings and paintings is being held from September 17th until October 31st, at 28A, Tavistock Road, W.2 (near Westbourne Park Station).

His exhibition is open daily from 12 to 6 (including Sundays, except Thursdays).

Don't forget to order your Penguin, Pelican, Thinker's Library and Everyman's Library books from Freedom Bookshop!

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

