

Freedom

ANARCHIST FORTNIGHTLY

Vol. 11, No. 11

May 27th, 1950

Threepence

"Just as machines in England act like human beings, so do the human beings appear to be machines."

HEINRICH HEINE

Where is the 'Liberal Opinion' of Today?

Tyranny in South Africa

Malan's Apartheid Laws Legalise Segregation

RECENT weeks have seen the conclusion and inception of various discussions between the governments of the Western nations for the purpose of unification of defence programmes and what not. The consolidation of the civilized world into two super blocs continues apace and is freely described in the endless publicity handouts and newspaper reports as being of tremendous significance for the men and women of the West. So, no doubt, we are, while we submit to State administration of the external affairs of our lives, there is no denying the importance of what those who rule us do.

Nevertheless, it is difficult not to feel rather wearily that it has happened before. "Decisions of tremendous significance" have been taken every few months throughout our conscious political lives. Mostly their importance turns out to be transitory only. And in any case, the solemn, pompous antics of those who rule us only acquire their importance because they rule us. They are important to us because we don't make these decisions; and for the same reason they are in another, but equally real, sense utterly unimportant to us.

Not all political decisions, however, are in this weary

category of mere administration. There are some that touch the deeper springs of human feeling. Movements to terminate slavery, to emancipate women, to relegate the exploitation of children to a shameful limbo—all these have touched more resounding chords in the heart. But it is characteristic of our society that such trends receive only trifling publicity compared with the green table manoeuvrings of the Bevins, the Achesons, the Schumans.

"Freedom is the most ineradicable craving of human nature; without it, peace, contentment and happiness, even manhood itself, are not possible.

The fight for human freedom is the supreme issue of the future, as it has always been in the past." Noble words. They were uttered 16 years ago by Field Marshal Smuts. Meanwhile, with only nominal opposition from Smuts' party, the Malan administration in South Africa is consolidating its Apartheid policy, the policy of rigid race segregation which is a denial of the most elementary principles of human freedom.

No Comments to Offer

The press in this country, so vociferous about day to day political manoeuvrings, has almost ignored this issue which sets back the clock of progress and which touches fundamental human relationships. We read that the British and American broadcasting experts are conferring to launch a joint campaign to defeat Russian radio jamming. The aim of our joint broadcasts, it seems, is to bring the truth to the Russian people; a laudable object. The publicity organs (which, as Truman recently said, have a grave responsibility in creating an informed public opinion) might well bring a little South African truth to the

British people. Apartheid means segregation. It means racial discrimination, is all of a piece with the Herrenvolk stuff that Hitler and Streicher used to put out. It is a basically immoral, utterly hateful conception; and, moreover, it is entirely at variance with British tradition in this country of liberalism.

Fifty years ago even so autocratic a tyrant as the Tsar of Russia found it difficult to carry out an absolutely ruthless policy because of the power of "liberal opinion" abroad. Such opinion saved the heroic Maria Spiridonova when she killed the

PAGE FOUR

ATOM WORKERS GET ANTI-BOMB LEAFLETS

MOST dramatic of the demonstrations by the tax refusal committee of the American Organisation, Peacemakers, this year (see Freedom, 1/4/50) was that conducted by Jim Otsuka, only one of the tax refusers' group to be jailed last year (reports the U.S. War Resisters League).

Going to the heart of the problem, Otsuka went to the giant A-bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tennessee, armed with leaflets. He got inside the grounds in a bus carrying employees to work. Upon alighting from the bus, he started handing out his leaflets. He was soon seized, but not before he had given out a number of them. He was held for questioning and then released.

More Arrests in Spain

THE Barcelona police have announced the arrest on May 14th of thirteen members of the Spanish underground, according to an Associated Press report. Those arrested include: "Jose Iglesias Paz, identified as a national delegate of the C.N.T.—the forbidden Labour Confederation of Anarchist Trade Unions in Spain."

The police announcement said the thirteen men, operating under orders

directly received from anarchist headquarters in Paris, committed a number of highway robberies and assassinations in the Barcelona area. A large quantity of explosives, ammunition and arms was seized at the time of the arrests.

How unoriginal the totalitarian police announcements are. Mussolini's O.V.R.A. always blamed "headquarters in Paris" for any subversive activity, and Franco as a good pupil of Italy's sawdust Caesar, carries on the tradition. Elsewhere in this issue we refer to the publication by the Spanish "underground" of the Spanish syndicalist paper *Solidaridad Obrera*. We wonder whether Franco's police will suggest that too is being directed from Paris headquarters? Presumably any explanation is better than admitting that after eleven years of Franco's barbarous regime the Spanish workers are still resisting!

★

Statistics on Franco Spain

SOME official statistics on Franco Spain published in a recent *World-over Press* despatch, throw a light on the regime which its apologists might consider.

"The low standard of living in Spain made the Peninsula, long ago, one of the world's most acute focal points of tuberculosis. Before 1930, the T.B. rate was between that of Latin America and the Balkans. In 1931, the year in which the Republic was proclaimed, 1,221 persons died of this disease for each million inhabitants.

"After five years of better social conditions under the Republican regime, the number had dropped to 965. Following Franco's war, in 1940, the rate had risen again to 1,009. Since then, with the dictator in power, the figure has gone on increasing until, in 1948, it reached 1,382—the highest ever known in Spain and one of the highest in the world.

At the same time, official statistics (*Anuario Estadístico de España, 1949*) indicate that the number of poor people received in asylums and hospitals in Spanish inhabited in 1940. Three years later the number had risen to 53,309. There are no later figures, possibly because almost a third of the benevolent institutions have been closed, or have disappeared.

In 1931, there were 1,618 suicides. At the end of the Franco civil war, in 1939, there were 2,328. After the Second World War, in 1946, when it was seen that the Franco regime would not be overthrown by it, the number was 2,854. But in 1948, in the full reign of dictatorship, suicides numbered 3,452.

P.S.

WHY DID THE VOTERS VOTE?

THE reasons why large proportions of the population voted in the General Election—or any election for that matter—have been the cause of much speculation among those of us who consider voting just a waste of time.

The only conclusion at which we were able to arrive was that people vote as they do for reasons of self-interest—although it is patently not in the real interests of any one of us to continue supporting the existing social system, and the ballot really infers a vote of confidence in the basic set-up of our time, since none of the parties for which we could have voted (not excluding the Communists) advocated any fundamental changes in the structure of society.

We have been charged with being cynical, with having an axe to grind, and with being the enemies of democracy because we have advocated the withdrawal of support from superficial political squabbles by a conscious refusal to vote and a substitution of direct methods of achieving a free society. Some of our arguments at election time were based on the contention that most people sub-consciously recognised the unrealistic nature of politics, feeling the gulf between the antics of governments and their own needs.

The High Poll

From our own observations prior to Polling Day, we asserted a general apathy towards the election, but when results started to be made known the next day, the remarkably high poll made us appear to have been wrong. More voters than ever before—some 83% of the electorate—had gone to the polling booths to register their preference for one set of politicians or the other.

Had the parties' electoral campaign machines, then, really done their job? Had the conscience of Britain, then,

really been stirred by the struggle between the principles of Socialism and of Capitalist Individualism? We could hardly believe so, but for lack of evidence had to wait and see.

Now some evidence has come to hand. Mass-Observation, the organisation which, through personal observers and questioners, seeks to analyse public opinions and motives (rather like the Gallup Poll) has published a pamphlet called *Voters' Choice*, in which it presents a report of its observers' findings from a questionnaire presented to 600 people in six London constituencies. And while Mass-Observation (M-O) stresses the incompleteness of their findings so far, nevertheless some interesting information emerges.

Effects of Electoral Campaigns

To begin with—how effective were the parties' campaign machines? The two main parties, Labour and Conservative, have tremendous means at their disposal. As soon as the election date was announced there was a rush to hire halls and meeting places throughout the country. But in the six boroughs from which M-O took their survey, 86 per cent. of voters went to no meeting at all! And only 5 per cent. of voters went to meetings of more than one party.

Did the voters, however, stay home and read the election literature that poured through their letterboxes? 56 per cent. of them did, but 44 per cent. of voters read no election leaflets at all. Even among those who did read them, it is anybody's guess as to the effect on which way they voted. One woman's remark, "I have glanced through them, but I think they are a waste of paper," showed an attitude very similar to that expressed in our own "anti-election manifesto".

Least likely to attend meetings or read leaflets are those who are doubtful which

way to vote. Of the 14 per cent. who did attend meetings, nearly all knew which way they were going to vote, and supported meetings of their "own" candidate only. "In other words," say M-O, "those for whom the propaganda is basically prepared are the least likely to come in contact with it, let alone be influenced by it."

The general attitude seems to be to distrust what candidates say at election times, but to judge them on what they have done when in Parliament. "The spasmodic appearance of election propaganda is likely to excite little more than indifference or scorn."

The Politicians

As far as public attitude to the candidates was concerned, a charming smile or a good photograph on a leaflet (many people will look at a photo but not read a message) seemed as likely to win a vote as anything—though baby-kissing does not go down as well as it used to.

It is interesting to note that only 6 per cent. of the voters had any contact apart from meetings, with their M.P.s during the five years since the 1945 election. But we can be sure, can't we, that Members of Parliament can truly represent the 94% of voters whom they never see or hear from!

The influence of the party leaders is interesting to weigh up, too. As many people were persuaded by Mr. Churchill's

Hands Up!

THE *Observer* has just held a competition amongst its readers for "an Epigram of four lines on the predicament of a Member of the present Parliament." One of the prize-winning entries was:

I really must contrive to wait
And make or mar the Welfare State.

Only anarchists would spoil it
By careless visits to the toilet.

To which we feel obliged to reply:
The anarchists, I'm bound to add
Do not in Parliament believe
They do not need to Ask their Dad
The needs of nature to relieve.

radio broadcast to swing from Labour to Tory as were persuaded by Mr. Attlee's broadcast to swing from Tory to Labour! Among Tory supporters, no fewer than 22 per cent. expressed disapproval of Mr. Churchill. Though a good war-leader, he was thought out of touch with peacetime conditions—and too old.

Election Issues

The domestic issues in the election which seemed important to these voters ranged from Housing to Controls—with Housing seeming most important to 2 out of 3 voters. Except under the vague heading of "international ideas", war and peace were not mentioned. And rightly so, for only the Communists—for the sake of the Party line of the moment—used these as election issues. This rather indicates that the electorate realises that any government is likely to follow the same course with regard to foreign affairs and therefore, war. Since the Communists were thrown completely out, it might also be inferred that the majority of people would rather have an atomic war than the Communists in power!

Reasons for Voting

On the whole, M-O found few signs of complete apathy. Amusing examples were discovered, like the woman who said: "I suppose its in the blood. My mother used to tell me never to vote Labour and I have obeyed her," but in general it can be seen that electoral activity helps few people to make up their minds. Most judge the government on its past record as it affects them. The Health Scheme, Pensions, etc., win votes; lack of housing, the cost of living lose them. Middle-class voters seem to be the ones who have swung away from Labour. It all adds up to show that people don't care very much about politics, but support those who can give them most. Which is understandable, but somewhat short-sighted in view of the little governments can really give us, and as the ability of capitalism to develop and extend reforms comes to an end, the two alternatives will become clear and elections will become even more meaningless. The paths we could take will lead us either to totalitarianism or—the free society without government.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

STARTING A COMMUNITY

DEAR COMRADES,
 For some time past, a group of people meeting in Hampstead have been discussing, on and off, the desirability and possibilities of forming an Anarchist community. Little in the way of concrete action has come of these discussions until the last month. Now there are ten or fifteen of us who have reached a point where we can no longer live as individuals talking about the idea and we are determined to arrange a community. We have already seen several properties, a number of which have been very suitable.

The basic group has already agreed to the complete pooling of incomes and material belongings. In the initial period it may be necessary for a percentage of the people to be working outside. Ideally we should like to find it unnecessary to rely on this outside income but the lack of enough capital forces us to make this compromise.

It is our object, however, to establish as soon as possible a sound agricultural economy and minor industries, such as weaving, pottery, hand-made furniture, which will be initiated by the members of the community themselves.

In Brief:

TOO DISGUSTING

OF the Hydrogen bomb, one British atomic scientist, Dr. G. O. Jones, of the Clarendon Laboratory, Oxford, said recently:

"If I, personally, am asked to help in developing a super bomb, I shall say, 'No, I am sorry, it is too disgusting.'"

Quite right, Dr. Jones, but there's no need to be sorry!

LEVELLING UP?

SIR Stafford Cripps, Chancellor of the Exchequer, said in a written Parliamentary reply to-day that the number of incomes in 1948 between £250 and the income tax exemption limit of £135 was about 9,250,000.

No information was available about the number of incomes below £135.

[Number of people officially estimated to be liable to pay income tax in 1947-48 was given as 21 million.]

Evening Standard, 3/5/50.

Meetings and Announcements

- UNION OF ANARCHIST GROUPS: CENTRAL LONDON**
 INDOOR Lecture-Discussions every Sunday at 7.30 p.m. at the Trade Union Club, Great Newport St., W.C.2 (near Leicester Square Station).
 May 28th. Whitsun. No meeting
 June 4th. Speaker: Albert Meltzer "LESSONS OF THE SPANISH REVOLUTION"
 June 11th. Speaker: Sam Fanaroff "COMMUNITY LIVING"
- GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP**
 OUTDOOR MEETINGS every Sunday at 7 p.m. at MAXWELL STREET with Frank Leach, John Gaffney, Eddie Shaw, J. Raesio
- LIVERPOOL ANARCHIST GROUP**
 Open Air Meetings every Sunday, 7.30 p.m. on Lewis's blitzed site
- COLNE & NELSON DISTRICT**
 Discussion Group held fortnightly, Sunday, June 4th at 3.0 p.m. at Twisters and Drawers Club, Cambridge Street, Colne (Lancs.)
- NORTH EAST LONDON GROUP**
 Discussion Meetings fortnightly, 7.30 p.m. May 30th. Eric Maple "RANDOLPH BOURNE'S 'THE STATE'"
 JUNE 13th. TED MANN "THE WORLD FOOD SHORTAGE"
 Enquiries c/o Freedom Press
- HAMPSTEAD**
 Discussion Meetings are held every Tuesday at 8 p.m. prompt. at S. Villas-on-the-Heath, Vale of Health, Hampstead, N.W.3
 May 30th. Sam Fanaroff "PROBLEMS OF ANARCHISM"
 June 6th. S. E. Parker "ANARCHISM AND THE STATE"

A very important consideration in the community will be our hope to be able to allow our children a freer growth than we have had and at the same time allow ourselves more of an opportunity of individual development than is possible outside the community. An opportunity, in fact, to express Anarchism in practice.

It is impossible through the medium of a letter to elucidate all our aims and principles, but we hope in the near future to conduct a series of meetings where these will be fully discussed.

The organisational activities are in an advanced stage and we are very anxious to hear from anyone who is interested in the community as it will facilitate our final arrangements. Please address all communications to:—

PIP WALKER,
 5, Villas on the Heath,
 Vale of Health,
 Hampstead,
 London, N.W.3.

FREE UNION AND FREE LOVE (see last issue)

I RATHER think your correspondent G. is confusing two issues—monogamy as a basis for the family, and extra-marital continence. I don't see that his argument that frustrated parents bully their children has much to do with the issue. Orthodox morality has plenty of mis-statements to its credit, but it is quite unreasonable to attack monogamy in the family simply because moralists have upheld it on irrational grounds. At the moment, the experimental evidence that changes of parents and home instability have far reaching ill effects on children is overwhelming. Primitive societies which practice group upbringing make entirely different demands on the individual, and give him far more extensive support, than any culture based, as a free industrial society would have to be, upon personal choice. The argument against repeated changes of parent has nothing whatever to do with morality—it rests entirely on the need, particularly marked in any non-coercive society, for mature individuals. The effects of repeated change on the child are closely similar to those of repeated intrauterine disturbance on the embryo. If we do not want immature or defective personalities in society we can't afford it.

Intra-marital continence is quite a different issue. If both partners accept each other's requirement of what has been termed a "sexual holiday", rather than using it, as now, as ground for breaking up the family, a case could be made for it, but isn't the need for a perpetual sexual adventure being rather overstated? Pretty well all the cases of partner-switching which pass through the hands of the psychiatrist are examples of adult immaturity. The need for perpetual variety, while not a moral problem, is far more typical of the mate-selecting adolescent than of the normal adult. In adults, it is almost always "escape-behaviour" arising from a neurotic compulsion.

Surely the important thing is that any individual who has needs of this kind should be able to satisfy them without having to break up the reproductive pattern of the family. Many cultures have tolerated this type of behaviour in the male, and G's suggestion only extends this right to both partners. At the moment jealousy, which is far more cultural and social than inherent in the individual, is

as he says, a social institution, and plenty of wives or husbands who have no wish to break with each other do so because it is the appropriate social gesture. Personally, I would derive pleasure rather than pain from other people's admiration of a woman I loved—how far others would do so I don't know. Surely the essence of cuckoldry is deception. With a genuine mutual respect between partners deception would hardly arise.

None of these problems can be generalised about, either in the terms of orthodox morality or in those used by your correspondent. If new patterns of society emerge, they will lay down their own requirements, and individuals will need and find different solutions. The really significant problems are the provision of a mature and stable background for child upbringing, free of insecurity, change, and the type of parental neurosis which G. describes, and a far greater toleration and understanding between reproductive partners. If we can provide sufficient parents who are genuinely adult, and do away with the operative aspect of marriage, jealousy, which is only "salutary" in comparison with apathy, can be left to take care of itself on the lines suggested by Malatesta. People may still be hurt, as in any personal relationship, but they need not consider themselves insulted, betrayed, or entitled to some kind of vengeance—it is, after all, perfectly possible to love two people at once. The free love issue would not be a real one in any society which managed to fulfil these conditions.

ALEX COMFORT.

ABOLITION OF PROPERTY

A CORRESPONDENT in the April 29th issue of Freedom, reduces the arguments on the sharing of consumer goods in M.L.B.'s article "The Abolition of Property" (Freedom, April 15th), to absurdity in order to show that they are an "over-simplification".

But surely it is an over-simplification to imagine that because scientific developments can create abundance, there will be enough of everything immediately after a revolution. The purpose of the system of collectivising which M.L.B. described is to ensure that "even if the production of industrial goods does not expand so as to provide each individual with all the commodities he requires he will be able, nevertheless to have access to them."

Obviously, once we have reached an "equality of abundance", such schemes will only be necessary insofar as they simplify housekeeping, but it would be folly to ignore the need for some such arrangement until the supply of consumer goods was equal to the demand.

ABC OF AUTHORITY

(Continued)

P is for Power. Every man longs for power and security, because the brain of every human baby is so much more highly-developed than the rest of its body that it can recognise its own inferiority and dependence. There are those who believe that this corollary of intelligence, rather than intelligence itself, has given men power over other things; that the sense of insecurity has made men live in communities, and the sense of inferiority has made them work to conquer nature.

But longing for power over other people, and security at the expense of other men, is not the same as longing for power over nature and security in friendship. It is not the baby who recognises merely the superiority of adults, but the baby who is forced to recognise the Authority of adults, who longs for power over his fellows when he is grown up. Authority breeds authority.

(To be continued) D.R.

FROM PAGE ONE

Malan Consolidates Misery

brutal governor of Tambor. Where is liberal opinion to-day? In the past it sprang from the educated classes, the well-informed. If the daily press carries almost nothing about race tyranny in South Africa, the working class can scarcely be blamed if it expresses no opinion. But it is different for intellectuals and cultivated people. The literary reviews have given much space—and much praise—to the biography of the Rev. Michael Scott, that determined individualist who has so vigorously and courageously taken up the cause of South Africa's suppressed coloured, people. The literary papers and even the radio have given a boost to Paton's book *Cry the Beloved Country*, which describes the racial discrimination. There can be no doubt that the intellectuals, the people who used to form the liberal opinion of the world know about what happens in South Africa. To-day it is not fifty years ago: they do nothing about it.

Identity Photographs

Malan's Apartheid laws make it compulsory for everyone to carry an identity card complete with photograph, and be categorized as White, Native, or Coloured (i.e., of mixed parentage). The hardening and codifying of colour prejudice, the race laws which annul the idea of "equality before the law", is no doubt necessary because opinion generally is finding segregation unnatural and difficult to maintain with moral equanimity. It has to be propped with legal supports.

The effect is to give official sanction to a rigid caste system which leaves administration in the hands of the whites; low-paid "coolie" labour to the Africans, and for the Coloured, the despised social outcasting which bourgeois society traditionally inflicts on "half-breeds". The misery of the African (and the immigrant Indian) population has for years been a standing shame of democratic hypocrisy. The new laws con-

RESOLUTIONS FROM THE International Anarchist Congress—6

We publish below the sixth instalment of translations of the resolutions passed at the International Anarchist Congress held at the end of last year in Paris. (Previous articles appeared in our issues of 21st January, 4th March, 1st, 15th and 29th April.) The views expressed are, of course, not necessarily those of Freedom. We must point out that certain difficulties arise in the interpretation of the current resolution. The French word "syndicalisme" has been translated as "trade-unionism", since it does not necessarily imply syndicalism in the English sense. It must also be remembered that the trade-union movements of different countries are of a widely different character in different countries.

ANARCHISM AND TRADE-UNIONISM

THE class struggle and the emancipation of the proletariat are not identical with the ideas and aspirations of anarchism, which seeks, beyond the immediate aspirations of classes, the economic and moral liberation of the human individual, and which looks towards a society free from authority, and not to a new power structure—that of the majority over the minority.

Anarchism has always considered the abolition of classes, and the ending of the economic servitude of the majority of human beings, as an absolutely necessary and essential step in the achievement of its final aim. Anarchism must always oppose those who, in the name of the "emancipation of the proletariat", follows means which contradict the ideas of anarchism and are an obstacle to the realisation of the aims of our movement.

It opposes, likewise, participation in the struggle proclaimed by Marxist socialism, that is to say, through parliamentarism and through a corporative trade union movement having only in view the amelioration of the conditions of the workers. These means can only favour the development of a new bureaucracy. The anarchist methods for destroying class oppression can only be those which allow the affirmation of the individual personality: direct action and individual resistance; in other words, active and passive individualism, whether of a single person, or of a multitude.

—Friedberg's motion at the International Anarchist Congress, Amsterdam, 1907.

ANARCHIST SUMMER SCHOOL 1950

This year's Summer School will be held in London on August Bank Holiday weekend.
 All enquiries to: RITA MILTON,
 79 Platts Lane, London, N.W.3

THE accumulated experience of the anarchists, and of the trade-union movement, since the period when the motion was adopted by the Amsterdam Congress have confirmed its fundamental correctness: the trade unions, insofar as they have been instruments of struggle towards the strictly political ends of the "Left" have facilitated the trend towards the totalitarian corporate state, and led towards technocratic bureaucracy.

On the other hand, when unions (and syndicalist movements) have been influenced by the anarchists, who have sought to convert the economic problems exploited into an ethical problem, following popular aspirations—as was the case in Spain—they have contributed a step forward towards freedom.

To-day the unions are in a state of decadence, and must seek new methods adapted to the present situation, of confronting the exploiters, through binational and international ramifications, and continually changing methods of increasing power.

We believe that the union struggle take up its work again in those countries where the question of State Control has not yet risen, if only it will avoid the influence of parliamentary politics, recognise the inadequacy of reform, and if it will make a profound appeal to the support of its future members, a positively libertarian struggle.

In countries where the problem of State Control already exists, new methods must be studied, capable of effecting a remembering that, without popular support it is impossible to build a movement.

We believe also that the unions should have, in the unions a fruitful basis for spreading their ideas. Moreover, experience shows us that, for the union movement to have a real social effect, it must win support in the workers' movements.

The point of view which sees the union anything more than a step towards a future society is erroneous, also the point of view which sees the possibility of action within the framework of the present, that is to say, under the pretext that they are authoritarian elements. We think the scope of workers' organisations should be on the activity and the orientation of the people who compose them. The F.O.M. in Argentina, and the C.N.T. in Spain are examples of this. In short, we deny the values and the advantages of the struggles of the unions can win, and do we deny their defects, which we consider are fewer than the possibilities that they can offer.

It is thus necessary for our movement to take into account the fundamental difference between anarchism and workers' organisations or trade-unionism (organisation ouvrière ou syndicalisme), between the means and the end, and it must avoid confusing the two different concepts.

The idea is the aim, the end. The rest is accessory, transitory, and circumstantial.

(To be concluded.)

Special Appeal

May 6th to May 19th:

London: H.W.F. 5/-; London: R.R. 2/6; Anon. 2/6; Los Gatos: L.M. £1/15/0; Cambridge: H.E.H. 2/-; London: V.T. £1; London: F.H. 5/-; London: A.B.F. £1; London: J.H.R. 1/6; Anon. 2/6; York: H.A.A. 9/-; London: W.C. 1/6; Gosport: F.G. 5/-; Liverpool: H.H.J. 10/-.

Total ... £5 1 6
 Previously acknowledged ... £108 10 7
 1950 TOTAL TO DATE ... £114 12 1

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

FREEDOM
 Anarchist Fortnightly
 Price 3d.

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

Special Subscription Rates for 2 Copies
 6 months 7/6 (\$1.50).
 12 months 15/- (\$3).

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made payable 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.