

In this Issue :

The Environment  
of Freedom - p.12

Thought Control  
in U.S. Libraries - p. 3

Coronation Reading - p. 4

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"We are in fact enemies of all authority, for we realize that power and authority corrupt those who exercise them as much as those who are compelled to submit to them."  
—MICHAEL BAKUNIN.

Vol. 14, No. 22

May 30th, 1953

Three pence

## MAKING AMERICA SAFE FOR DEMOCRACY

# 12,000 DEPORTATIONS THREAT

THE Communist bogey has now reached such extravagant proportions in the United States that the government has announced that it may deport twelve thousand persons of foreign origin because they do not seem loyal enough. Aliens who have settled in America are to be screened and others who have been accorded naturalization may have their naturalization papers revoked and be deported. Such action may involve as many as twelve thousand deportations.

The Attorney-General gave these names to a Combat Communism Conference in Washington recently, in the course of which he declared: "We have abandoned the pussyfoot attitude of our predecessors, and the administration is now giving the Federal Bureau of Investigation the equivalent of the Special Branch of other political police organizations full backing." He added that other dozen organizations had been added to the list of two hundred organizations deemed subversive by the government.

### Effective Totalitarianism

Just how far the American government is prepared to imitate the Communist States in its campaign "Combating Communism" was shown by a speech of Dr. Robert Johnson, State Department International Information Administrator, who is quoted as having said that "to

do a positive job of truth propaganda abroad they must eliminate any person who is not in sympathy with the aims and principles of the Government." Every person "must be what I would call a genuine American."

A more totalitarian statement could scarcely have been made behind the iron curtain or in the fascist countries. It effectively throws overboard the claims of democracy for the right to oppose the government and the right to overthrow it are written into the American Constitution and Declaration of Rights.

The tendency towards this kind of menacing of people who have independent views has however been apparent for many years not only in the United States but elsewhere as well. During both the wars of 1914 and 1939 the British government took powers which permitted it to stifle opposition "in defence of the realm", and all liberal minded people, as well as some eminent jurists, have pointed out the dangers of abuse of such powers. There can be little doubt that the fear of Communism in America is being used as a whip to stifle freedom of thought and expression and opposition to government, in exactly the same way as the Nazis used anti-semitic feeling. In both cases the extravagant fear of Communism and the anti-semitism had themselves been whipped up to fever heat by the governments involved before they were used in the attack on civil liberty.

### Deportation of Berkman and Emma Goldman

There must be enormous numbers of people in America of fairly recent foreign origin. The threat of investigation and deportation can only tend to enforce conformity out of sheer fear. The threat of investi-

gation has become like the threat of the Gestapo on the stairs, with deportation as the equivalent of the concentration camps. If deportation is actually carried out and the people are in fact to be sent back to the Central European countries from which the majority of them emigrated to America the distinction will disappear for they will undoubtedly be thrown into concentration camps on arrival. No doubt legal and administrative difficulties will arise and it may not be practicable to deport many people, but the threat will serve the purposes of a government determined to rule by fear.

This threat is no new one in the States. During the Red Scare after the Russian Revolution, many Russian anarchists like Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman who had been brought to America as children by their families fleeing from pogroms or economic misery, were summarily deported back to Russia. Neither Berkman nor Emma Goldman after their escape from Bolshevik Russia, were ever permitted to re-enter the United States again. Berkman died in France, Emma Goldman in Canada.

Thus the rule of fear continues to spread and the distinction between the Communist world and the ironically-called "Free" world becomes ever more obscure.

## The Strike at Weir's

A GIFT for the Stakhanovites of Fleet Street has just been made by the workers of Glasgow.

In the engineering works of G. & J. Weir, members of the Amalgamated Engineering Union refused to start work while James Stirling was still employed there, for Stirling had been refused a union card by the local branch.

What made the incident news-worthy, however, was the fact that Stirling was the fastest worker in the whole of Weir's—which employs 1,500 Clydesiders. He was earning an output bonus three times that of his workmates—270 per cent, as compared with the average 80.

This of course made an ideal occasion for a Fleet Street homily on the needs of the nation for more productivity at reduced output costs (i.e. less wages) and how the workers of Weir's were standing in the way of their country achieving the independence and stability and rightful place among the nations and all that.

### Membership Lapsed

What had happened was that Stirling had been working at Weir's (with a union card) up to five years ago, when he left to start up in business on his own. Four weeks ago he came back to the firm, who generously bore him no grudge for having set up in competition with them, but his union membership had lapsed, and he was refused re-admission.

A week ago union members refused to start work alongside him, so he resigned. The workers, however, have strenuously denied that they took strike action against him because he worked so hard, but simply because he had no union card.

But this sounds a bit lame, since the thing to do then was to get the local branch to give him a card. He was ready and willing to join, and the fact

that a man's membership had lapsed once should not be a reason for excluding him for life afterwards.

Clearly there was more to it than that, and the Weir's workers would have done better to have boldly stated what it was. The fact of the matter is that a man like Stirling is a menace to the existing bonus rate. It's all very well for Fleet Street journalists to wax indignant about Mr. James Stirling being denied the right to earn a 270 per cent. bonus but they don't have to contend with the fact that if a boss sees his average bonus percentages treated with such contempt his first reaction is to raise the norm.

### In Effect—a Wage Cut

It was reported that one of his fellow-workers on the night shift called out to Stirling: "Go easy. You're making us all look silly," and the fact remains that however ambitious, quick and hard working Mr. Stirling may be, there will certainly be other workers who, with the best will in the world, simply could not stand the pace he sets.

And if his special ability (his firm described him as "a first-class tradesman") leads to the norm being raised—his fellow workers, in effect, suffer a wage cut. For if they go on producing the same, they will earn less. To earn the same they must produce more.

Thus does the competitive wage system divide the workers against each other—as we have always maintained. What is more, it deprives society of the best efforts of the productive workers.

Have you still to renew  
your Subscription to  
**FREEDOM?**

## MATCH MONOPOLY ATTACKED

AFTER sitting on it for seven months, and cutting out certain portions which it considers are not in the public interest to publish, the Government have now issued most of the text of the Report by the Monopolies Commission on the match industry.

And a very tight monopoly the industry is, too. The British Match Corporation controls 95 per cent. of home production and, in conjunction with the Swedish Match Corporation, 85 per cent. of international trade.

These Corporations control not only the production of matches but also of match-making machinery; included in its wide circle of subsidiaries is a group of companies which were bought up and then closed down.

Prices are fixed so that the least efficient units of the operating group make handsome profits—with even bigger profits for the more efficient factories.

We used to hear a lot a few years ago about the everlasting match, which could be used time and time again. This Report on the monopoly in the industry shows why we have never been able to benefit from that invention.

## THE ASPIRIN EATERS

TEN million aspirins are taken in Britain every day—making "a picture of a nation tired and sick," a doctor told 200 women yesterday.

The London police sickness rate has doubled since before the war, a commission was investigating bad health of national service recruits he said.

The doctor was Dr. Franklin Bicknell, vice-chairman of the Food Education Society; the women, delegates to the National Women Citizens' Association conference in London.

Cause of the bad health, said Dr. Bicknell, was bad food.

He told the women that:

Bread was processed, removing the vitamins.

There were chemicals added to kippers, haddocks, cakes, sweets and ice cream.

The delegate called for more Government-backed research into food processing.

News Chronicle, 14/5/53.

## The Press and the Coronation

ON the surface enthusiasm for the Coronation in this country seems to embrace all classes and to be genuine enough. Not only are public buildings covered with decorations, but many working class houses and flats also have their photographs of the Queen and festoons of patriotic bunting. At the same time it is common enough to hear exclamations of weariness, of thank-God-when-it's-over kind of sentiment, equally generally expressed.

What makes it difficult to assess

the significance of all this is the appalling coronation pressure which the press have maintained with gathering force almost since the New Year. Never a day passes without some trifling aspect of the queen's routine receiving the loudest publicity, while the Sunday papers have searched out details of the lives of the remotest members of the royal family. It has been left to the weekly illustrated papers to carry this excess to the absurdest limits. Gift photographs in the shape of centre pages in colour have provided a repetitious gallery for many consecutive weeks, and it is plain that each paper vies with its competitors to capture circulation and capitalize the coronation. Even sober papers like the *Manchester Guardian* print the coronation service in full and give columns of detail about the order of the procession.

It would not be unfair, in short, to say that the press in this country has gone coronation mad. Such a massive propaganda can hardly be without effect on a population with whom the royal family has always been popular. But it is probably also true that the press has in part defeated its object. People buy papers and magazines for news and original articles. They are not unnaturally irritated when the same subject engrosses such a large part of every issue they buy, week in, week out, to the exclusion of other matter. The good-will of the people of Britain towards the sovereign is not completely proof against a sense of boredom.

Perhaps such a feeling might be expected to be less apparent in the country districts and small country

towns for there the coronation festivities have taken the form of organizing local activities which draw quite a number of the local population into active work, and the nature of the activities is often not without local usefulness. But the common-sense so general in rural communities is less tolerant of the whipped-up emotions of patriotism, and more hard-headed in asking "What's it all for, anyway?" so that the end result is much the same, in making an attitude of general goodwill towards the royal house become mingled in considerable degree with impatience at all the fuss and insincere excess.

This is not the place to enquire in detail and depth into the social significance of the symbolism which the royal family represent in our society. It is plain that the pagentry of a traditional ceremony provides the circuses which offset the drabness of the daily bread. And perhaps there is here the clue to the failure-through-excess of the newspapers: for the bread and circuses idea demands that the circuses should be splendid but *unusual* occurrences. Coronations are not all that common it is true, but when every detail of procedure, every aspect of royal family life is dinned into the people for months on end the sense of the unusual begins to wear a little thin.

Nor is there much doubt that the same considerations apply to other aspects of the social and psychological symbolism of royalty. The affection which many people but especially middle aged and elderly working class mothers feel towards the Queen and her family is under-

## UNIVERSITY CENSORSHIP

IT is not only in American universities where thought control is in effect. Censorship and rigid control of student activities has always been one of the functions of the Proctors of British universities. So far it has not gone to the lengths of the political interference that is being experienced in America. Here it is in the religious and "moral" fields that control is strongest.

We remember, for example, that the late Norman Haire was asked by the Oxford "Heretics' Society" to lecture, and in his title appeared the dreadful word "sex". This was objected to by the Proctors, for although both men and women work and study at our universities, biological differences have to be studiously ignored. So Dr. Haire talked about "morality", not "sex"!

Latest incident is the banning of the Cambridge undergraduates' magazine *Granta*, which has been suspended for the rest of the year because of a poem about God which appeared in the issue of May 2.

The poem was written by Antony de Houghton (a descendant of Lady Godiva) who was brought up in the Catholic

religion but now describes himself as an agnostic. The Proctors considered the poem "highly crude and offensive" and took action after complaints had been registered by clergymen, a London graduate and senior members of the university had objected to it.

The author, however, says that "The poem does not seek to degrade the idea of God: that has been done already, which is what the poem states. So the crudity of some of its language is inevitably appropriate. There have always been individuals, and possibly collectives, using the name of God as a means to greater gratification of destructive passion. The poem was provoked partly by anger at that state of affairs."

The present editor of *Granta* has been suspended from studies until June 11, but the Cambridge Union Society (Students' Organisation) decided by 104 votes to 46 that the punishment is excessive and to be deplored.

It seems the reactionary nature of university authorities have not changed much since Shelley was sent down for his atheistic writings at Oxford!

Continued on p. 3

2 VIEWPOINT ON

"Only the slaves have the right to violence to free themselves; only the violence that frees is legitimate and holy."—GARIBALDI.

Anarchism, Coercion & Violence

agreement might be compelled by events. However, be this as it may, many of the disputants are often apt to forget that this question of violence is not so simple as they at times appear to think. The purpose of this essay is to endeavour to elucidate in a more detailed fashion than is usually the case, some of the implications of the use of violence by anarchists. The usual argument of the advocate of non-violence is that violence is always coercive. Is this true? Not necessarily. Coercion is the compelling of a non-invasive individual to act against his will. It is an act of invasion. Coercion is almost always violent in character, whether the use of violence is immediate or ultimate. But to use violence does not mean, per se, to use coercion. Violence can be used in two ways—as a means of liberation or as a means of coercion. By an act of invasive-coercive violence, an individual ceases to be non-invasive (that is, respecting the equal rights of others to determine their own lives) and becomes an aggressor: a governor. Benjamin Tucker, in his "The Relation of the State to the Individual", clearly shows this. He writes:

"Now what is aggression? Aggression is simply another name for government. Aggression, invasion, government, are interconvertible terms. The essence of government is control. He who attempts to control another is a governor, an aggressor, an invader; and the nature of such an invasion is not changed, whether it is made by one man upon another, after the manner of the ordinary criminal, or by one man upon all other men, after the manner of an absolute monarch, or by all other men upon one man, after the manner of a modern democracy. On the other hand, he who resists another's attempt to control is not an aggressor, an invader, a governor, but simply a defender, a protector; and the nature of such resistance is not changed whether it be offered by one man to all other men, as when one declines to obey an oppressive law, or by all other men to one man, as when a subject people rises against a despot, or as when the members of a community voluntarily unite to restrain a criminal. This distinction between invasion and resistance, between government and defence, is vital. Without it there can be no valid philosophy of politics. Upon this distinction and the other considerations just outlined, the anarchists frame the desired definitions. This, then, is the anarchistic definition of government: the subjection of the non-invasive individual to an external will."

To state the question thus is to immediately signify that the use of violence cannot be considered in isolation, but only in relation to the social philosophy and ends of the users, since violence is merely a mode of behaviour, like building. One can build a house to live in, or one can build a gas chamber to force others to die in. The act of building itself is neither good nor bad, what decides one's approval or disapproval is the end to which it is put and the motives behind it. The question of our use of violence, therefore, becomes

meaningful only when considered in relation to our attitude towards human relationships: that is, to work for the elimination of the principle of authority and so create the necessary condition for liberty. Violence then, when considered from an anarchist standpoint, can take two forms:

- 1. Invasive-coercive: when used for the purpose of maintaining or securing domination over another with the view of compelling obedience to authority.
2. Non-invasive-liberative: when used for the purpose of freeing oneself from the invasion and domination of another, or when used to repel an attempted act of coercion.

I consider that there is nothing in the anarchist attitude which excludes the use of the second form of violence—though obviously it is preferable to achieve our ends by non-violent means wherever possible. The distinction between coercive and liberative violence may become blurred under the stress of a revolutionary situation, and our criterion for the use of violence therefore should always be that of extreme necessity. But we must not let these considerations blind us to the fact that violence has been successfully used for liberative purposes in the past and may be so used in

the future. Furthermore, it must always be kept in mind that we are not considering this question from the position of one of two parties of equal status and liberty, but from the position of the invaded, the oppressed and the governed. Any action which is taken against authority and which does not seek its re-impulsion is liberative in character, whether violent or not.

The existence of the authority of man over man—government—implies invasion and coercion. Any attempt on the part of the ruled to liberate themselves from the oppression of their rulers, which is considered to constitute a real threat to the stability of the status quo, will be met by violence on the part of the State in an endeavour to compel the ruled into submission. During the last thirty years, for example, the British State has not hesitated, when necessary, to use violence on its subjects in this country (let alone on its colonial native populations) as its actions during the 1926 General Strike and the hunger marches of the unemployed in the 1930's demonstrate. To use violence as a means of self-defence against such attacks from authority is justifiable. What is not justifiable is to use violence against non-invasive individuals and groups. The plea of a government that it is using violence merely for defence against ag-

gression is an invalid one when judged from this criterion, since government violates by its very nature (aggression, invasion, coercion) the condition upon which self-defensive violence can be used, that is: to liberate oneself from invasion, or to repel an attempt at invasion. Governments use violence in order to maintain a system of perpetual invasion and exploitation of the masses, not for self-defence in the sense that the term has been used above.

The purpose of this essay has been to propound the thesis that anarchism does not exclude the use of violence for liberative or self-defensive ends. With regard to its use for coercive and invasive ends anarchism is in diametric opposition. Our whole energies are devoted to working towards the achievement of the free society of anarchy in which neither the desire nor the opportunity for invasive acts exist, security against them being provided by both the social consciousness of the individuals who compose it and the absence of any power structure whereby such acts are permanently institutionalized and sanctioned. In such a society even the violence which is necessary of self-defence may impinge upon us will be rarely, if ever, used into the structure of governmental terms will be regarded with horror and of the barbarities of civilization.

S. E. PARKER

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY (OPEN 9-6.30; 5.30 SATURDAYS)

- Second-Hand Books... Our Soviet Ally (1943) Fabian Society 1/- Inquest on an Ally (1948) Paul Winterton 5/- A Physicians Tour in Soviet Russia Sir Jas. A. Purves-Stewart 1/- The Face of Spain Gerald Brennan 10/- Living Thoughts Leo Tolstoy 2/6 Free Expression in Industry James J. Gillespie 3/- Walden H. D. Thoreau 3/6 Bread and Roses Ethel Mannin 5/- Boys in Brown (Borstal) Reginald Beckwith 2/- Kaiser Wakes the Doctors Paul De Kruif 2/6 The Anarchist Peril (1894) Felix Dubois 15/- Consumer Co-operation in the U.S. Bertram Fowler 4/- Seven Women Against the World Margaret Goldsmith 3/6 Freeland Theodore Herzka 5/- Decentralise for Liberty Thomas Hewes 3/6 Europa in Limbo Robert Briffault 5/- We the Living Ayn Rand 3/6 Periodicals... The Libertarian No. 4 3d. Individual Action No. 11 3d. Perspectives No. 3 2/6 Pamphlet... The Crown and the Cash Emrys Hughes 6d.

Obtainable from 27, RED LION STREET, LONDON, W.C.1

Book Review

The Catholic Terror

Terror Over Yugoslavia, by Avro Manhattan. Watts, 10s. 6d.

"All in all the Croats and Serbs are two worlds, the North and the South pole, which can never come closer without a miracle from God. Schism is the greatest evil of Europe, almost greater than Protestantism. In it there is no moral, no truth, no justice and no honesty."—CARDINAL STEPINAC in his Diary.

THE real meaning behind this statement found expression in the events which followed in Croatia. It was not a miracle from God that finally "united" the Croats and the Serbs, but brutal violence and forcible conversion of the Orthodox on the part of the Ustashi, which resulted, within three months of the formation of the Independent Catholic State of Croatia, in the deaths of 120,000 people; in it there was "no moral, no truth and no justice".

Terror Over Yugoslavia

The historical background to the State of Croatia, its reign of terror and final collapse are dealt with in detail by Avro Manhattan in his latest book Terror Over Yugoslavia. This is a most timely publication appearing, as it did, just before the visit of Marshal Tito to this country, because of the horrifying glimpse it gives us into the sufferings of the Yugoslav people from yet another totalitarian force.

Our attitude to the Tito regime was made clear enough through the columns of FREEDOM at the time of his visit, and needs no further elucidation. What perhaps needs mentioning for the benefit of the uninitiated, is that, unlike the Catholics and the Stalinists our opposition is not for political or religious reasons. Neither of these two totalitarian creeds are opposed to torture and violence, but to anarchists brutality is brutality whoever executes it and we will continue to resist it wherever it occurs.

Catholics Collaborate with Hitler

On April 6th, 1941, Hitler attacked Yugoslavia, and on the 10th of that month the German army entered the capital of Croatia. At the same time the leaders of the Ustashi were announcing by radio the Independent State of Croatia and appeals were made to the Croat soldiers to use their weapons against the Serbs as "we are already fighting shoulder to shoulder with our new allies the Germans and Italians". Pavelic, the catholic dictator, was welcomed back from Italy by Archbishop Stepinac who implored the Lord to give Pavelic His divine blessings. Later, Stepinac with other members of the hierarchy were elected on to the "Sabors, Totalitarian Parliament".

The new State of Croatia, once established, followed the usual pattern of Catholic-Fascist collaboration. "All

political opponents were banished or imprisoned. Trade Unions were abolished... the Press was paralysed... Catholic teaching became compulsory in schools, offices and factories. All other religions were ostracized and went to the fear of their lives."

Thus the tragic extermination of the sands of people had openly begun in Croatia. The machinery of the Catholic Church swung into action; priests, bishops and archbishops directly and indirectly took part in the murder of women and children. In the name of Christianity—"Christ and the Ustashi and Christ and the Croats march together"—the Catholic Church was once again on its way to making "one pasture and one shepherd".

The sickly details of this period in Yugoslavia, documented and authenticated, should be read by everyone in any doubt as to the true nature of the Catholic Church as a political power. That its present policies may not be as peaceful as recent pronouncements of the Pope have given the faithful to understand, may perhaps be judged from the words of the "martyred Stepinac": "I look upon the West to use its atomic power to impose Western civilisation on Moscow and Belgrade, before it is too late."

R.M.

1 Ustashi: Nationalist Army composed of bands of Catholic terrorists.
2 Now exiled in Argentina and furnished by Rome with a false passport, he carries on propaganda for the Ustashi with the blessings of the hierarchy and the intention of returning to Yugoslavia.
3 Out of a population of 6,700,000 only 3,300,000 were Croats. 700,000 were Moslems, 45,000 Jews, 2,000,000 Orthodox Serbs.

One of the primary goals of the radical movement has always been the freedom of the individual. The concept of freedom, however, is capable of being interpreted in a number of different ways, and the various schools of radical thought have never been able to reach agreement about what constitutes freedom, and still less concerning the way in which it is to be attained.

At one extreme are the economic determinists, who conceive of freedom—as, for that matter, they conceive of everything else—as a byproduct of a high material standard of living. Freedom for them is essentially 'freedom from want', or more precisely, 'freedom from work'. According to their conception, man is free when he does not have to devote more than a very minor fraction of his time to physical labour—his chief enemy is nature, which he must enslave and put to work in order to 'liberate' himself from toil. Once this has been accomplished, and the technological resources of society stand in relation to all men as the working class now stands in relation to the leisure class, man will at last enter the realm of complete freedom, where he will fill his extensive leisure with pursuit of art and science. Until then, anything that contributes to the increase of the technological resources—at present the great panacea is atomic energy—no matter how much it may interfere with concrete freedom in the present, is a necessary step in the direction of the ultimate liberation of mankind.

At the opposite extreme is the philosophy of naturalism, as exemplified by such thinkers as Tolstoy and Gandhi, who see freedom as an outgrowth of an organic way of life, and who would therefore do away with most of the technological advances of the past few centuries, and return mankind to a simple peasant economy, integrated with nature, and thereby achieve the inner strength that is the basis for freedom. This school of thought finds expression to-day among many socialist pacifists, and in a slightly altered form, in the sex-economy theories of Wilhelm Reich.

THE ENVIRONMENT OF

In most respects, these two extreme positions are diametrically opposed to one another, but there are some ways in which they are very similar. Both of them assume that nature is exemplified by an essentially animal existence, unreflective and unintellectual, and that civilization is completely antithetical to this. Further, they both assume that freedom is a byproduct of the proper material environment, almost as a reflex action. Both seek to 'liberate' man from what they believe to be a hostile environment, and think that as a consequence of this he will automatically become free.

In their criticisms of each other, both of these two viewpoints are frequently capable of making valid points, although they are usually too biased to be able to see the entire picture. Thus, the machine cultists are undoubtedly correct in their contention that man cannot be considered truly free when his time must be devoted to an unending struggle for a bare existence; while the nature-worshippers are equally accurate in pointing out that industrial society has regimented the majority of the workers, making them mere extensions of the Machine, and has thereby deprived them of freedom in a more devastating manner than any previous system. Neither of them are willing, however, to pay much attention to the criticisms of the other, contenting themselves with pointing out defects, and drawing the superficially obvious conclusion that their own position must be therefore correct. The issue, as they are inclined to see it, is total industrialization versus a complete return to nature; they both think in terms of unilinear progress, but advocate opposite termini of the Historical Railroad Line. That there might exist other alternatives which embody some of the features of both of their systems, they do not care to recognize.

II

The concept that freedom is a corollary of abundance, and therefore can only become universal in a highly devel-

oped economic system, is an aspect of the general nineteenth century theory of progress. According to this hypothesis, freedom is essentially the ability to engage in creative work in the arts and sciences, and the chief limiting factor to freedom is the necessity of labouring long hours at menial tasks. The minds of primitive peoples and peasants are considered to be completely enslaved by superstition since their level of productivity is too low to permit them to spare any time for reflection and intellectual speculation. Once the material resources of mankind had increased sufficiently to permit a small number to enjoy leisure, a certain amount of intellectual curiosity began to manifest itself, and ever since, freedom has been a prerogative of the leisured classes. The great technological developments of the industrial revolution laid the foundations for an economy in which everyone can enjoy almost unlimited leisure, and in which therefore freedom will be universal. This conception is almost invariably held by state socialists—Marxists and otherwise—although it was first elaborated by the liberal bourgeoisie.

Like most aspects of nineteenth century progressive thinking, this conception of freedom is grossly oversimplified, and to a considerable extent its emphasis on only one of the necessary conditions for freedom obscures and even contravenes a more rounded approach to the subject. It is unquestionable that leisure is closely related to freedom, but it does not at all follow from this that a highly developed technology is either necessary for leisure, or necessarily produces it. On the one hand, it is quite possible, as has been demonstrated by many primitive peoples, and by numerous individuals in more complex societies, to achieve a great degree of leisure on a low technological level, by limiting one's material wants; and on the other, it is entirely possible that a complex industrial system might create a situation in which the production of goods becomes such an

## THE CORONATION

Continued from p. 1

standably very real and sometimes seems startlingly intense. It is difficult not to feel that it represents some kind of idealized family feeling. But just as the hunger for circumscribed and dreariness of the life of poverty and the soulless work which so often goes with it, so the intensity of idealized family feeling is fed by the actual emotional difficulties of real family life. If the pattern of family affection actually provided emotional satisfaction in real life, the need for projected feeling onto the royal family would be far less.

And it is of course the same with the feelings of community. The family, we are told, symbolizes a sense of national unity in a sense quite absent, because of divisions in part, but much because of the meaningless pattern of urban life in an advanced industrial economy. The fact is that in towns few know their neighbour and have no sense of community in their district. It seems that the sense of social fellowship, the desire for communal life is deep-seated in human beings; it is denied and starved by a competitive and poverty-creating social and economic system, it seeks outlet in substitutive feelings of "oneness" by means of the royal family symbols.

All these considerations help to explain the ability of the people of Britain to absorb one of the most concentrated, tedious, and sustained campaigns in the history of the press. But it may well be that one of the end results may be that the disparity between the desired reality (communal feelings and family affection) and the symbol of royalty will be underlined, and produce a sense of disappointment and frustration. If this is so it may give satisfaction to the pedants of revolutionary teaching who may claim such a result as a milestone in working class education. But disappointment and frustration are chilling experiences which are all too common already in the lives of contemporary populations, and anarchists would wish to replace them by positive joys and social and individual satisfactions corresponding to actual human needs.

# Thought Control in American Libraries

IN an article entitled "Intellectual Freedom and Libraries" appearing in the February, 1953, issue of *The Librarian and Book World*, the author, an American librarian, instances some recent developments in the struggle between the opponents and exponents of Freedom of Thought in the United States.

Following the adoption of the Library Bill of Rights in June, 1948, and its amendment in February, 1951, a group of American librarians met last summer to discuss and expose the two basic fallacies put forward by the advocates of controlled thought, viz: "(1) that there is incompatibility between national security and individual rights, and (2) that national security grows out of conformity". The group also formulated some fundamental principles which could be of assistance to librarians in opposing attempts at censorship of books and other media of communication.

That such a step was necessary was soon made apparent when in the autumn a concerted attack was made against the provision of Communist and other literature by the Boston Public Library. The *Boston Post* initiated the campaign by a series of articles in which it stated "We believe that pro-Soviet literature should be suppressed in our public libraries... We believe that we are in a fight to the death... We believe that to permit pro-Communists to circulate their poison among our people is sheer stupidity."

As a result of the very considerable pressure exerted upon the libraries, the City Council convoked a public meeting "to determine why library funds had been used to buy materials such as the above", at which both sides of the issues raised by the *Boston Post* were examined. At the next meeting of the Library Board of Trustees a resolution was passed by a 3 to 2 vote endorsing the principle of free provision of reading material to the public without censorship, but at the same time a rider was added stating "We are determined... that the facilities of the library shall not be abused for the planned infiltration of communist propaganda. The director has therefore been instructed accordingly to effect arrangements designed to prevent abuse or misuse of any communist material in our possession". It is not difficult to foresee that this latter provision will allow the *Post* and its adherents ample scope for renewing their attack against the Boston Public Library.

Another example of intolerance is reported from Los Angeles, where U.N.E.S.C.O. was the target of the thought controllers, as being tainted with internationalism, atheism and communism. The particular subject of the attack was a pamphlet entitled "The E in U.N.E.S.C.O.", prepared under the guidance of the schools superintendent for the use of teachers. The pressure exerted in this case was so strong that the use of the pamphlet was first temporarily suspended in the city schools.

and finally it was permanently banned. This action was followed by an organized programme of investigation into subversion (here extended to include expressions of progressive thought far removed from any taint of communism) in all textbooks. In protest the Californian Library Association resolved at its Annual Meeting last October that they favoured "teaching U.N.E.S.C.O. in the public schools of California, and opposing the censoring of books and materials on subjects relating to U.N.E.S.C.O. and world understanding from classrooms and libraries of all types."

The author concludes: "What is even more important is that these case studies as well as others have created an atmosphere of precautionary speech and action in our American communities. It must be abundantly clear, however, that

national security does not grow out of the conformity urged or practised by volunteer arbiters of morals or political opinion, or by organizations that would establish a coercive concept of Americanism."

The attack on the libraries is but one phase of the general movement to restrict academic freedom, freedom of speech and freedom of thought which is so rapidly gaining ground in the United States to-day. The lesson which must be learnt is that Intellectual Freedom can only be defended *in toto*; to attempt to deny the right of freedom of expression to any person or group is incompatible with a belief in the independence and dignity of the human spirit. The American liberals who acquiesced in the early attempts at censorship of communist media of information are now finding to their cost that they

too can be the subjects of attack. The importance of the American experience for us lies in the fact that a country with an avowedly democratic tradition such as the United States is as liable to the technique of thought control as a totalitarian State. What is happening to-day in America is but symptomatic of a world-wide trend towards conformity, and the same attempts at censorship, the same refusal to tolerate independence of thought, have already made their appearance in this country, though they are as yet relatively undeveloped. It is by studying the technique of "the volunteer arbiters of political opinion" as exercised in America in all its aspects, that one can at least be in a position to recognise the thought controllers for what they are—and to recognise also that one's intellectual liberties can only be safeguarded by oneself. A.B.

## Letter from Sweden

# Swedish Capitalists on the War-Path

AFTER several years of favourable conditions on the labour-market, during which "peaceful" relations between the workers and the bosses have prevailed, the Swedish workers are again being reminded of the fact that the class-struggle has not been superseded and that their bosses have not said farewell to arms. The harmonious conditions, which the politicians have been boasting about as a truly democratic achievement, have apparently come to an end. The capitalists, who have used such high-sounding words about mutual interests in building a democracy without disturbances, are now getting more and more aggressive.

During the past years we had full employment and there was actually a shortage of labour, and as a result of these favourable conditions there has been a considerable increase in wages. In several important industries the increase has gone far beyond the collective agreements between the trade-unions and the employers' association. The bosses were compelled by the circum-

stances to overbid the organizations. Thus, the powerful Unions cannot by any means take the credit for wage-increases or improved working conditions.

However, the situation in the labour market has now changed: the supply of labour is greater than the demand. Local crises have occurred and especially within the textile and the shoe-manufacturing industries some time before the negotiations concerning new wage agreements were opened. Wages had not increased in the same proportion as prices, although the bosses have been making enormous profits. Consequently the workers expected a fair raise when the old agreements expired. But quite the opposite was the case. Instead of obtaining wage-increases the workers were threatened with temporary or permanent unemployment. Of course, the bosses knew that they would not have to face a free, militant labour-movement, but a compromising and appeasing politically ruled organization.

There are still quite a few unsolved questions in regard to the new agreements. Workers in the food-industry are, at the time of writing being thrown out of work by the bosses' lock-out. After long drawn-out negotiations, in which the labour attempted to reach a peaceful agreement, the bosses finally took action. The dispute is over a mere 10 crowns a week increase. The demand is a modest one and very much justified as the workers within this particular industry are among the worst paid workers in Sweden.

However, the bosses are in general against any increases and would rather try to reduce the wages at a favourable opportunity. The struggle is on, and it is too soon to predict the final outcome. L.O.—the Swedish reformist trade union—is closely related to the govern-

ment in power, which also participates in the negotiations with the bosses in order to reach a solution of the conflict. The situation is somewhat critical and it is suggested that a special committee of investigation should take over the negotiations.

The question is whether the economic situation is such that the demands of labour cannot be met. The financial reports prove beyond any doubt that the leading industrial concerns and enterprises have been making enormous profits. But as a result of the appeasement-policy advocated by the reformist organizations the capitalists have been allowed to make huge profits while the workers were persuaded to accept a wage freeze in order to maintain the economic stability of the country. The social-democratic Government didn't consider the huge profits by the co-operations as a danger to the financial equilibrium, and no restrictions were laid upon them at any time. Only the Syndicalist Movement, S.A.C., emphasized that these profits were more responsible for the inflationary process than any increases in the wages of the workers. The syndicalists also advocated that a certain percentage of profits could be put into a special crisis-fund, if it were true that an immediate wage-increase would jeopardize the country's economic stability. Of course, neither the social-democratic politicians nor the reformist trade union leaders would consider such a proposal. Instead they advocated the freezing of wages and helped the capitalists to build up their power. The workers were promised rewards when "times were better".

L.O.s and the Government's promises are worth nothing. And it is not the politicians or the capitalists who suffer the consequences—but the Swedish Working Class.

Stockholm.

Gustaf Lövgvist.

# FREEDOM

all-embracing preoccupation that leisure is utterly impossible. One has only to look at the war-economies of the industrial countries in recent years to observe the way in which the interests of production can dominate a society, and there is no guarantee that the development of the technological resources of society will ever, in itself, lead to a system that is willing to curtail production in the interests of greater leisure for all. As the labour-time required to perform certain processes is reduced by improved machinery, new demands can mysteriously develop or be deliberately created by those in control of the economy. If the society is one in which material wealth is the dominant preoccupation, there is quite literally no upward limit to the amount of production that can be required. It can be argued that the tendency to produce unlimited quantities of goods, without concern for their utility or necessity is a characteristic feature of capitalism, and that once industrial society is itself 'liberated' from capitalist property relations it will reverse this tendency and produce only for use, but there exists as yet no concrete evidence that this will actually take place, and what evidence we do possess points in the other direction. Soviet Russia has been rid of capitalist property for nearly thirty years, yet more than any other country, they are obsessed with the idea of unlimited production.

Morover, leisure alone is not an adequate guarantee of freedom, even assuming that a stage may someday be reached when industrial society will achieve its productive saturation point. Much depends on the type of leisure and the intellectual and moral atmosphere in which it exists. The leisure of the privileged classes throughout history has seldom been employed for creative pursuits or intellectual speculation. Far more frequently it has been compulsively filled with protocol, an endless series of 'social obligations', sport, or

simple debauchery. And whatever increased leisure industrial society has from time to time provided has not been of such a variety to conduce to much optimism on this score. Indeed, industrial society, to an ever increasing extent, demands the power to dominate not only the working hours of the individual, but his 'free' time as well, filling it with mindless diversions like movies and comic books, dehydrated education, and an ever more elaborate secular ritualism. Universal literacy, and a widespread attendance in universities has not resulted in a great increase in the productions of the free intellect; instead, it has degraded intellectuality, and enslaved the minds of men as completely as any savage superstition.

## III

The concept that freedom is inherent in a state of nature is a very ancient one and is present in many of the major theologies from the Garden of Eden myth of the Old Testament to the Tao of Lao-Tze: Its current vogue, however, is largely among those intellectuals who have become disillusioned with the fruits of the Century of Progress, and have, in their rejection of the theory that technological progress is the basis of all good things, gone to the opposite extreme.

The fundamental assumption of this belief is that there is a way of life that is natural for humanity to follow—a way of life that is instinctual and intuitive like that of the lower animals (whether this way of life is ordained by God, or determined by instinctual drives, sexual or otherwise, makes very little difference in the philosophical implications of the approach) and that to deviate from it can only result in frustration and maladjustment, which preclude the possibility of exercising one's native capacities, and render one susceptible to domination by some form of external authority.

In its more elemental form, this philosophy advocates a life which is completely the opposite of civilized standards:

a return to the mores of the simpler savages (D. H. Lawrence). On a somewhat less absolute level, the values of the 'unspoiled' European or Asiatic peasant are the criterion [Tolstoi, Gandhi and their followers]. And there is a variety of related systems based on specific instincts, which are somewhat vague about the exact nature of the society they advocate, but which are no less emphatic in their rejection of civilization and their championing of the values of the way of nature.

The concept of nature is undoubtedly an extremely useful one in social thinking, but this concept is by no means as simple or straightforward as the back-to-nature philosophers tend to proclaim. Man has many natural requirements and impulses which must be gratified, in one way or another, if he is to achieve a satisfactory adjustment to life, and one of the chief functions of an intelligent libertarian philosophy is to determine the social environment in which these requirements are most adequately met. To assume, however, that this task can be accomplished by a simple intuitive approach which equates nature with lack of sophistication and intellectuality, and assumes *a priori* that if man can be 'liberated' from mechanized living and returned to a simple animalistic way of life all his problems and anxieties will be eliminated, is grossly to underestimate the human capacity for error. Many primitive peoples have achieved marvellously satisfactory adjustments to life, but there are others whose adjustment is even less satisfactory than that of present-day industrial society. It cannot be assumed that primitivity, and the satisfaction of certain biological and psychological needs guarantee a stable and harmonious existence, that is resistant to authoritarianism.

(to be concluded)

HOLLEY CANTINE.

★

(This article first appeared in the American review *Retort* (Vol. 3, No. 2)

# WORKER'S CONTROL IN PRACTICE

It is not often that we hear workers' control mentioned in Labour Party circles to-day. All the more interesting therefore, to see the following report in Tribune of May 15:

## CINEMA RUN BY MINERS

THE Empire Cinema at Porth, gateway to the once turbulent Rhondda Valley, does not look much different from other local cinemas. Nothing about it suggests that it is, in fact, an offshoot of a successful experiment in workers' control. Yet it is precisely that. For, like the adjoining Institute, the Empire is owned and controlled by the members of the Lewis Merthyr Lodge of the National Union of Mineworkers.

Because of the particular background against which it grew up, the appalling lack of amenities in the mining valleys and the absence of a numerically strong middle class, South Wales trade unionism rarely confined its energies to the narrow field of industrial relations. In many villages, it is the miner's lodge rather than the council which is the focal point of social activity.

The Lewis Merthyr Lodge exemplifies this. It is some years now since it decided to take over the Institute, which has a lending library of 5,000 volumes and what was until recently the only public reading room in the town. After this first step into public ownership the Lodge, uninhibited by fashionable "new thinking," encountered no internal resistance when it took others.

Bryn Rees, its jovial and energetic secretary, told me that the cinema was bought seven years ago. A small sub-committee drawn from members handles

its affairs and arranges film bookings. The manager—Bryn prefers the term "supervisor"—is a former miner, as are the two projectionists. All three left the mines because of silicosis, and were trained for the new jobs by the Lodge.

Cinema profits are ploughed back into other activities. Some seven thousand pounds, I was told, had already been given away. Sports clubs in the valley have benefited greatly, as have old age pensioners' organisations.

The Lodge does not stint itself in providing educational facilities, either. Not only have classes been sponsored, but regular batches of students are sent to NCLC week-end schools (arriving, incidentally, by privately hired car).

The Welfare Committee which directs all this is elected by the annual general meeting of the Lodge, six of its dozen members retiring each year. Small sub-committees exercise detailed control of different activities.

Youngest, and certainly the proudest, of these committees, is the one which runs the band. This band, whose full name would stretch across a column, was taken over in 1949. And since then it has won a bewildering string of championships.

Charles Owen, its miner-secretary, reeled them off for me with quiet pride. Last year, by no means an extraordinary one, brought them first prizes at Bridgewater, Bristol and Reading. This year they were first in the South Wales Festival, and look forward to the *Daily Herald* contest with justified confidence. Their broadcasts are frequent—three already this year and another booked in June.

Conductor Oliver Jones, a former collier, is now occupied with the newly organised Junior Band, intended as a nursery and training-ground.

No financial difficulties hamper this work. Two thousand pounds will be spent on instruments this year and a further seven hundred on uniforms. Most of this will be drawn from cinema profits. Administration is both efficient and economical.

Yet, oddly enough, not one of the Lodge officials seems at all conscious that their collective energies have spilled over into fields rarely associated with trade unionism. They are intensely proud of what they have done, but hardly feel that they have made an important practical contribution to the problem of how democracy can be injected into industry. It just seems natural in Porth.

A visit to Lewis Merthyr is a certain cure for defeatism. Here we have an

outcrop of the democratic socialism of the future. And, to echo Lincoln Steffens, it works.

## Anarchist Comment :

From the strictly Anarchist point of view, of course, there are things in this example of workers' control with which we disagree. It can be said that the miners are acting just like capitalists; that they are running an enterprise for profit and using the profits they make to further their interests elsewhere.

It might have been more interesting if they had set out to run the cinema on a non-profit-making basis, showing at what a low entrance price it could be run without shareholders to be kept, and perhaps running a sort of consumers' council as well to encourage audiences to state their choice of programmes and in fact "communist" the business more.

But to do this is to misjudge the motive behind the Welsh miners' actions. They quite clearly do not regard running a cinema as an end in itself. It is only a means to an end within capitalist society—a source of income for the welfare schemes in which they are really interested.

The significant thing for us, however, is that this is one more example of the ability of workers to run their own enterprises in a co-operative and efficient manner—and in this case the enterprises are outside their everyday work. How much more obvious does it become that workers could also successfully run the industries in which they work, if they really set their minds to it?

## LIBERTY LEAFLETS

I WOULD be grateful if you could insert the following notice in *FREEDOM*:

I have just commenced publication of a series of leaflets entitled 'Liberty Leaflets'. These are designed to present in as concise and fundamental a form as possible the anarchist attitude towards all aspects of human life. It is hoped that these leaflets will provide a handy means of presenting our ideas to interested members of the public, as such, they are not intended for indiscriminate distribution, but rather for distribution to people who genuinely desire to understand our point of view. No. 1 is now ready and sample copies will be sent upon the receipt of a 1½d. postage stamp (Comrades outside the British Isles need not include postage). All communications should be addressed to the undersigned at: 79, Warwick Avenue, London, W.9. S. E. PARKER.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

### on "LETTERS TO THE EDITORS"

The only reasons for not publishing readers letters ought, in my opinion, to be (1) Sheer grammatical and rational incoherence. (2) Irrelevance to issues dealt with by *FREEDOM*, and (3) Lack of space.

While I do thank the editors of *FREEDOM* for the number of letters of mine they have printed, in which respect they have served me better than any other national paper, ("Peace News" for example is practically closed to any view not based on religion); nevertheless there remains the fact of those they have not printed, or only partially printed. Since the editors dispose of reason No. (3) by their repeated request for more letters, am I to understand that I was guilty of offences (1) or (2)?

Why do not the editors tell us what they consider "suitable", and what subjects they feel are unduly neglected by correspondents.

Re the question of "Tito".—The essential difference between the various "materialistic" reform movements (liberalism, socialism, communism, anarchism, etc.), and the religious outlook, is that the former believed man to be a social being who could achieve a more satisfactory social life by altering his political and social institutions, while the latter believed man to be essentially evil. To the "materialist" the social aspirations that terminate in a Stalin or a Tito must appear essentially tragic rather than wicked. Therefore I consider, as I said before, that your catalogue of Tito's crimes was more suitable for the "Catholic Herald" or the "Methodist Recorder" than for *FREEDOM*.

Stockport, May 11. JAMES R. HOWES

In your issue of the 9th instant, in replying to Mr. James Howes, you state your concern about the small number of letters you receive, which are suitable for publication. You say: "Certain subjects always seem to stimulate correspondence but often, far more important questions are apparently unnoticed by our readers, if we are to judge by their silence." Then

you tell us how you deal with what you consider unsuitable contributions. True, you are the judges of what you consider suitable for publication, and are the responsible parties for same. But pray Sirs, is it at all possible that you may be mistaken at times?

What is a more important subject than the Land Question? If there is a more important one, will you please kindly tell me Sirs, so that I can make your wisdom mine? Last September I sent a letter to you on this question, asking for your views on the subject and giving my own shortly, but it appears they found their way into your handy basket by the side of your desks. What is the cause of the trouble in Africa to-day, or the cause of the trouble in Egypt, or Korea, and elsewhere but Land?

It appears to me, you determine which persons, which facts, which versions of the facts, and which ideas shall reach as such your public, but they are not always correct, as I know from my own personal experience.

Portsmouth, May 11. A. M. J. McHATTIE.

OUR choice of letters for publication is not determined by any rigid pre-conceived pattern, and for this reason we will not be drawn into laying down any hard and fast rules which will guarantee the publication of certain letters and the rejection of others. Obviously, as editors we must accept the responsibility of publishing or rejecting contributions to *FREEDOM*, and we recognise that in unscrupulous hands this responsibility is open to abuse. But since one of the objectives of *FREEDOM* is to establish a feeling of mutual trust between its publishers and its readers, such "crimes" as are attributed to us by Mr. McHattie, if true, would be most unproductive to the building-up of confidence among our readers both in the accuracy of our facts and the sincerity of our comments.

# CORONATION READING

FEW people would deny that the monarchy is more secure in England to-day than it has ever been. The rising revolutionary and radical movements of the 19th century were predominantly republican, a fact for which the unpopular monarchs of the 19th century—including the Widow of Windsor—were mainly responsible.

It is interesting to note in passing, incidentally, that the hacks who are trying to see some significance in the fact that we now have a Queen on the throne are quietly passing over, in their comparisons, the Victorian era, and stick closely to the reign of Elizabeth I. This can only be because, although Victoria's reign saw quite unparalleled imperialist expansion and capitalist prosperity, it was also the time that brought more degradation and poverty to the people of these islands than any other and there are still plenty of folk alive to-day who remember this. The baleful influence of Victorianism, too, is even now not completely worked out of our "way of life"

In other words, Victoria's reign is a little too near in time to be glorified with any conviction. There is, however, nobody still alive who lived under Elizabeth Tudor and all that most of us know is that taught in the history books; of the dashing adventurers Drake, Raleigh and Benbow, the great Shakespearean age in the English art of writing. Of how the people lived our school books tell us nothing, so all the writers in those educational journals, the Sunday papers, can concentrate on the glory with little fear of contradiction.

And talking of education—how large a part has that played in building up the monarchy in public esteem? In his pamphlet *Down Your Street*, George Stone (Editor of the *Socialist Leader*) reminds us that "since 1870 there has been a system of free education in this country and children have been steadily indoctrinated with the idea of the King as the 'projection of our ideals' and the 'perfect father figure'."

This "educational" process, together with the tremendous propaganda machines of Press, Radio, Film and now T.V., using modern advertising techniques with not a few tricks learned from Dr. Goebbels, have contrived to sell the Coronation—and through it the institution of monarchy—to the British people as the greatest show on earth.

And so it should be. Any showman, however inexperienced, could hardly fail to make a show with the £2,000,000 plus that the Coronation is costing us. Emrys Hughes, almost alone of Labour M.P.'s has also produced a little pamphlet, *The Crown and the Cash*, showing how much

it cost us to maintain the monarchy all the time—not merely at Coronation time. It's an expensive luxury, claiming £475,000 a year in Civil List grants to the members of the Royal family.

Mr. Hughes reminds us too of such necessities as the Royal yacht, recently launched at Clydebank by the Queen which is to cost £1,800,000, but is, of course, to "serve the cause of humanity as a hospital ship" in the event of war. It's rather strange though that, while use as a hospital ship it will cost £110,000 per annum, but when in commission as a Royal yacht (for the Royal couple's entourage) it will cost £145,000—£35,000 or £100 a week more! How fortunate that the cause of humanity can be served more cheaply than the monarchy!

Emrys Hughes concentrates on the cost of the monarchy. George Stone attacks more the existence of the institution itself and looks at the sham and hypocrisy and what lies behind it from a world point of view. These are both excellent pamphlets for use in argument, but mass hysteria being whipped up then it is, the republican will have a hard time on hand for a long time yet.

DOWN YOUR STREET, by George Stone. I.L.P. 3d.

THE CROWN & THE CASH, by Emrys Hughes. M.P. Civic Press, 6d.

Both available from Freedom Books

[Readers are also reminded of the cover of the (April) issue of *THE SYNDICALIST*, which carries a leading article on "China and the Circus" and concludes by asking "How about working towards making Elizabeth the Last?" and carries a letter by Cypher incorporating that idea.]

## MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

### LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

#### OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting  
HYDE PARK  
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

#### INDOOR MEETINGS

At 9, Fitzroy Square, Warren Street, London, W.1.

JUNE 2—No Meeting.

The meetings will be held on TUESDAYS at 7.30 p.m.

### NORTH-EAST LONDON

#### DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM

Alternate Wednesdays at 7.30 p.m.

JUNE 3—Discussion on DOSTOEVSKY'S "THE POSSESSED"

### LIVERPOOL

#### DISCUSSION MEETINGS at

101 Upper Parliament Street, Liverpool, 8.  
Every Sunday at 8 p.m.

### GLASGOW

#### OUTDOOR MEETINGS

from now until further notice at

MAXWELL STREET,  
Sundays at 7 p.m.

With John Gaffney, Eddie Shaw,

### MANCHESTER

#### LIBERTARIAN GROUP

Meetings at  
LAND O' CAKES HOTEL  
Gt. Ancoats Street, (by Daily Express)

at 7 p.m. on 2nd & 4th Sundays in every month. June 14, 28, etc.

Enquiries to:

J. Pinkerton, 12 Alt Road, Ashton-Under-Lynde, Lancs.

## FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:  
12 months 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)  
6 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)  
3 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies  
12 months 27/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)  
6 months 13/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

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