

New Earth	p. 2
Confessions in Russian Trials	p. 3
Yugoslavia	p. 4

Freedom

ANARCHIST FORTNIGHTLY

Vol. 11, No. 13

June 24th, 1950

Threepence

THE SCHUMAN PLAN: War Preparation!

WHY BE ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT THAT?

It is difficult for ordinary people to grasp in any concrete way the significance of the Schuman proposals to pool the iron and resources of Germany and France for their mutual advantage. The conduct of heavy industry affects the workers of the world in numerous ways, and yet remains a remote influence without any tangible effect except for those who work in it. At the same time it is obvious that the Schuman plan is a political event of great significance. The general pros and cons, and the particular difficulties involved have received sufficient discussion in the daily press, so that it is unnecessary to go into them here, but where they impinge on the problem which presents itself to anarchists. In this article, therefore, we shall try to consider the matter from the standpoint of anarchism—that is to say, from a broader and in another way from a narrower point of view.

The Question of War

First of all, it is necessary to ask why such a plan for international action (as the Schuman claim, for supranational action) should have been put forward at all? It seems clear that it is the necessity for the European nations to co-ordinate their heavy industry in the face of the military threat presented by Russia. Hence it is not reasonable to regard the Schuman plan as being part of war preparation. Of course, it has been said on the other side, that without justice, that the Schuman plan is one of its objectives is the removal of a standing cause of rivalry between France and Germany. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to regard the coming of a new war as being between France and Germany once again, as the result of these nations have fallen to the status of second class powers. Regarded as war preparation, therefore, it is difficult for anti-militarists to become over-enthusiastic about it.

At the same time, international rivalry being already intense, and capitalist economics being still unable to find a substitute for war preparation as a means of keeping industry going, it is quite obvious that some such attempt to co-ordinate war potential in the western nations is inevitable. In this paper we have consistently urged that the hopelessness of the circle of wars and war preparations, with

TAXI STRIKE CONTINUES

LONDON'S first official strike for a long time looks like being a long affair. 3,500 taxi-drivers are striking for an increase in their commission, only 50 are driving cabs for owners at the old rate of commission. They are mostly non-union members and are not issued with the Union's "No Blacklegs" label which is displayed by owner-drivers who are sympathetic to the strike, and on cabs belonging to those firms—the smaller ones—who have already agreed to the new rate.

Both sides in the dispute, the big employers (owning from 100 to 400 cabs) and the strikers, are determined not to give in. But the strikers are getting strike pay from the union and some are "doubling-up" with owner-drivers or working extra shifts for the small firms, so that it looks as though the workers will be able to hold out almost indefinitely. Meanwhile, the public has hardly noticed the strike, since there seem to be plenty of cabs about and it is only a small proportion of the population who use them anyway.

the increasing concessions of liberty to authority, make it a matter of urgency for intelligent and far-sighted individuals to devote themselves to altering the fixed factors (production for

sale instead of for need, responsibility in the hands of the few instead of resting on every individual, etc.) within which this civilised war dance revolves.

Political Questions

To return to the Schuman proposals. Great interest has centred on the unwillingness of the British Government to enter into commitments as the plan at present stands. The reason given is that the government cannot agree to surrender control of British heavy industry to a supranational authority, because British commitments to the Empire and to America forbid it, and that it would jeopardise planned economy. These practical objections are backed by theoretical considerations which are of greater interest to anarchists.

The effective control of heavy in-

PAGE FOUR

A. E. U. Approve Military Black-Legging —If Strike is Unofficial!

WHENEVER we think the servility of the Trades Unions has reached its lowest level, something else comes along to provide a new low.

At a conference of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, a resolution was put forward condemning generally the use of troops by the Government as strike-breakers. The Executive Council, however, through the President Jack Tanner, could not agree to the resolution unless the word "official" was inserted before "strikes".

In other words, the leaders of the A.E.U. condemn the use of troops in the unlikely event of there being an official strike in which the Government would find it necessary to intervene, but approve of the military black-legging to break an unofficial strike. Could there

be a finer example of the way in which union leaders are out to safeguard their jobs at the expense of the workers they are supposed to represent?

SWEET MIXTURE

IN this country, women's organisations do not have the power of public opinion they are reputed to have in America. Nevertheless, such bodies as the Housewives' League and the National Federation of Women's Institutes (the latter with a membership of women from the rural areas) represent quite a large number of potential voters and as such can command the ears of politicians.

Delegates representing 438,000 members of Women's Institutes recently met at their annual meeting in London, and discussed housing, cost of living, open-cast mining and—sugar. It seems the women feel the scanty ration of sugar pretty keenly, and are shortly to address a request to Food Minister Maurice Webb to "allocate a greater proportion of sugar to housewives to enable them to do more home cooking and preserving". And nobody who has even been to a Women's Institute bazaar or exhibition and tasted the jams, preserved fruits and home baking on show there would wish to do anything to prevent their continued and increased production.

Fear of a Glut!

In this respect it seems that atomic scientists could, if they can only forget those bombs for a little while, go quite a long way towards solving the sugar shortage. At the same women's conference Sir James Scott Watson, Director General of the National Agricultural Advisory Service, revealed that atomic scientists could produce sugar from water—and as much as even the Women's Institutes could need.

Meanwhile, Mr. Maurice Webb, considering only traditional means of sugar production, was predicting such an improvement in the situation that within two years we may have to be careful of a world glut! Then, we suppose, sugar will have to be destroyed in order to prevent a "deterioration of the market".

To and Fro

One of the reasons that sugar is short is that it, like nearly everything else, is in demand for the export drive. And, of all places, sugar products are being exported to—Jamaica, chief sugar-producing country of the Empire. A letter in the London Evening Standard (9/5/50) from the secretary of the Jamaica Manufacturers' Association, Mr. E. A. Hall, puts the matter clearly enough:

"Here in Jamaica we are selling large quantities of sweets and marmalades made in England. They are unrationed in Jamaica and rationed in England. Our own factories—which get only a very small quota of glucose and can make candies of only lower quality than the English—have to close down because of the mass importations.

"If we were a dollar country, it would be understandable; but you are only getting sterling for your sweets while you have to buy a large part of the sugar with dollars. To make confusion complete, many English people working in Jamaica are sending home sweets made in England to their relatives because those relatives cannot buy them in England.

"So sugar is bought in Jamaica (or in Cuba for dollars), is sent to England, made into confectionery, sent to Jamaica, and then sent back to England. Could there be a more ludicrous situation?"

No, Mr. Hall, that situation is ludicrous even under the general lunacy of capitalism!

ANARCHISTS ON TRIAL IN GENOA

LAST November, three anarchists in their twenties, comrades Busico, Deluchi and Mancuso, forced an entry into the Spanish Consulate in Genoa, locked-up the staff in a room of the Consulate and then made a search of the building for the Consul himself. Their objective, in the words of Busico, was to "make an attempt on the life of the Consul with a view to shock public opinion into taking up a definite anti-Franco position". But the Consul was away and the three young men burned a few papers, destroyed a portrait of Franco, and caused small damage in the offices with a German hand grenade. They then took down the Spanish flag and in its place hoisted the flag of the Anarchist Federation, "because we are no the kind of people who do something and then hide so that no one shall know whence the blow came". One was caught, the other was at large for two days, the third escaped to France, but later gave himself up in order to share the fate of his comrades.

After seven months in prison awaiting trial, the case finally came before the Tribunal in Genoa on June 1st. Busico recounted how the idea came to him. "In Spain," he told the Court, "I lived among the Resistance and there I came to know something of the infamy of Franco, of the many evils and the misery afflicting the Spanish people for which he is responsible. Go to see for yourselves the Barrio Chino of Barcelona! In the Spanish prisons the inmates and those held only on suspicion, are tortured in the most terrible way; and many are the prisoners who are 'taken for a ride'. This, and much worse, is Catholic and Franco Spain! I thought of acting from outside for the destruction of that dictatorship. Then, events decided for me. I learned of Alpuente, of Lopez and other comrades summarily executed and finally of the assassination of F. Martinez, my dearest friend and brother. I thought something different from the usual demonstrations with posters and similar ineffectual means should be used". And he then went on to describe his meeting with the other two comrades and what followed up to the time of his arrest.

THAT excellent independent weekly literary-political magazine *Il Mondo* (17/5/50), publishes a two-column article on the case which is both objective and sympathetic towards the idealism of the accused. Busico's statement, writes Aldo Garosci in *Il Mondo*, was presented

with simplicity and clarity. "But the case of Busico is not that of a young exile; it is the story of an exceptional person 'of the days of resistance', when people risked their lives with a human feeling of solidarity, because they thought or believed it possible to contribute something towards liberty in the world... Busico is one of those who, when liberation had come, were not satisfied with any kind of solution which would give them the means to earn a livelihood. Moved by his ideal of solidarity, feeling perhaps more strongly and clearly the anti-tyrannical lesson of anarchism towards a country which was 'entirely tyrannical', Busico went to Spain during 1947-1948 to help his comrades in their struggle against Franco." The writer goes on to explain what such a struggle involves: the differences between actually living these experiences and reading about them [the Spanish resistance] the dangers and that bread of daily solidarity which has a taste unknown to those who, during these past years, have lived for themselves only. "All these things," continues *Il Mondo*, "he explained and we understood them. But did the Court really understand them, in their human significance as well as in their social and moral meaning?" And the writer answers with a definite "No". The Court and the accused "spoke in two different languages"; it was inevitable that the proceedings could not proceed smoothly. In the first place, the Court refused to hear the testimony of a number of prominent Italians such as the well-known author of *Christ Stopped at Eboli*, Carlo Levi, and then strenuously resisted the efforts of the defence to use the trial to expose to public opinion the barbarity of Franco's regime. So that when the second comrade, Deluchi, spoke and said that he was "addressing the public," the Court firmly pointed out that "you address the Court, not the public." You

will address the public later when you are released," to which the prisoner replied, "How can I not address myself to the public if the Court will not hear me? When we talk of freedom, justice and solidarity it seems as if the Court cannot understand us." Tempers became frayed as the hearing proceeded and the Court adjourned when the prisoners were cited for contempt of Court, following a heated "You keep quiet! Let me explain" to the President by the third defendant, Mancuso. The defendants were then committed for trial at the Assizes. When they were taken back to prison, a large crowd of anarchists from Genoa, Spezia, Carrara and Alessandria gave them, in the words of *Mondo's* correspondent, "a moving demonstration" of solidarity.

SINCE we believe that *Il Mondo's* article on the trial is representative of progressive Italian opinion, we cannot do better than reproduce the last two paragraphs of Aldo Garosci's summing-up:—

"Perhaps the Court was prepared to be indulgent, but did not wish to permit the accused to give the case its full political significance. If this is so, then the defendants have won, for though they now run the risk of heavier sentences, they have been discussed and will continue to be the subject of discussion, and many will think about the issues and others may imitate them. But more than this, which is a question of justice (if Graziani has been allowed to explain and defend himself for years, why not listen to these young men with understanding, which no laws punish, because they are committed by States?) more than the very question of Franco's Spain there is a more elementary problem.

"Will the privileged classes, those who claim to have a hereditary right to security, never learn to understand those others who, after all, have saved our country, while they defaulted; those who struggle, without perhaps knowing their exact goal, to change the world? Will they never learn that to the fine words used to explain and justify the political society, there is someone who gives them a meaning? That after having explained during the war years that rebellion against tyranny was a sacred duty, one cannot suddenly close the door and say: 'Now nothing more will pass through here'? Incomprehension produces revuls, and the threat of revolt produces fear. Italian reaction comes from that." R.

"They are slaves who fear to speak
For the fallen and the weak
They are slaves who dare not be
In the right with two or three"
—J. R. Lowell

YUGOSLAVIA AND THE ENGLISH SOCIALISTS

YUGOSLAVIA occupies such a prominent position in the cold war which is proceeding between the Anglo-American governments and the rulers of Russia that it is only to be expected that there should be some special pleading. Yugoslavia must be supported because it serves as an example to other countries behind the Iron Curtain demonstrating that it is possible to defy Moscow and survive; because it is a key to the disruption of the European Russian Empire; because it is a barrier, linking with Greece (U.S. European Empire), to cut off the Russians from Albania and their direct access to the Adriatic. So run the arguments. It will be noticed that they are all strictly strategic, practical, "realist"—the kind of arguments which Conservatives and Liberals, the parties of the bourgeoisie, find no difficulty in accepting.

Ziliacius and Ballantine

But for the Socialists it is different, for they pay lip-service to an ethical outlook, and also claim to be concerned for the welfare of the working-class. For Yugoslavia to be acceptable to them, Tito's regime must possess a socialist gloss, or that gloss must be provided by the leftist apologists. An active advertising agent for Tito-socialism is Konni Ziliacius, only recently transferred from the rival firm of Stalin-socialism, and therefore very well equipped for his task. "For the first time in 30 years," he writes, "a major Communist Party are applying the Marxist Leninist social analysis and the lessons of the Russian Revolution, on lines of their own, to the problems of building Socialism in their own country and running its foreign policy." (*Reynolds News*, 14/5/50). In letters to the *Times* and the *Manchester Guardian*, he writes under the cloak of objectivity, criticising the Russian Government for its dictatorship over the satellites, and the Anglo-American drift towards Fascism and a new world war. It is comical to see him answered by adherents of his

former firm like Pritt, and reviled by the editorials of the *Daily Worker*!

Now Ziliacius is not likely to carry much conviction, for fellow travellers are rightly regarded with contempt, and readiness to change trains dilutes credentials still further. But he is an able exponent of partisan argument, and no doubt socialists in need of anti-Cominform ammunition will make unacknowledged raids on his exposition.

In a different and rather astonishing category is a pro-Tito article by Will Ballantine in the *Socialist Leader* for June 3rd. Like Ziliacius, Ballantine has recently visited Yugoslavia, and come back full of enthusiasm for Tito's regime. He writes mainly for trade unionists and describes the trade union structure of Yugoslavia—"all workers from the director downwards join the union of their industry." His account reads exactly like those of the Soviet trade unions in a Stalinist text-pamphlet. For example, the functions of the unions are to "educate workers to develop a socialist attitude towards work and the people's state," to organise "socialist competition, shock-work... strengthening work discipline... propagation of Marxism-Leninism..." etc., etc. In his peroration we read that "the socialist urge is everywhere, and the freeing of the people from state restrictions is in keeping with the teaching of Lenin. Freedom is a great thing in life, and having won economic freedom the Yugoslavs are sure that the teachings of Lenin are being put into effect." (But Ziliacius quotes a leading member of the government as saying, "We must admit that in the Socialist States we have not yet solved the problem of freedom...")

Truth from the Times

It is rather sad to have to quote the *Times* as being very much more truthful than this independent socialist. After outlining some achievements of the Tito regime, their correspondent declares: "Such considerations cannot, however, alter the fact that the country is still in all essentials a police State. Persons may be arrested without reason given and kept in prison for months without trial on a simple order from the Ministry of the Interior. Complete control of the Press, radio, and information services consolidates the government's power to overcome any organised opposition and enables it to indoctrinate the people, in particular the armed forces and the young." (*Times*, 13/6/50).

The *Times* goes on to point out that

Britain, with a population of 48 millions has a prison population of 20,000; but Yugoslavia, with a population of 16 millions has "anything from 100,000 to 200,000". That "there are, however, many other ways (i.e., than direct threats and open terror) in which the government also brings pressure to bear on possible opponents. The threat that a family's home may be requisitioned or that a man may lose his job and therefore a worker's (privileged) ration card is effective in inducing non-Communists to take their share in "voluntary" work". There is also a well-documented account of the running of the free peasantry in order to make them join the collectives which could well be an account of the Russian First Five-Year Plan.

Where does the Socialist Leader stand?

Now Ballantine's article was printed in the *Socialist Leader* without so much as a flicker of editorial comment. Is one to assume that socialists with so small a following that they can afford to be independent are going to underwrite this murderous regime of Tito's? What have they to say about the fact that the men now coming up for a show trial in Belgrade, charged with "treason because they attempted to flee illegally to Hungary," were arrested in August, 1948? They have been held without trial for 20 months.

For anarchists, "putting the teachings of Lenin into effect" does in fact mean a regime of brutal force and terror. But for the *Socialist Leader*, Lenin is a symbol of all that is strong and good in socialism and invoking his name must be taken to mean approval.

An Ethical Position

The bourgeois parties do not claim to be ethical, only practical, strategic, realistic. It seems that socialists have to disregard the truth so blatantly that even the *Times* stands up well to comparison; or they have to admit that dictatorship, suppression of all freedom, and the glad use of lying and deceit, are justified in the struggle for power; that one can justifiably forget the tortures, the concentration camps, the fear and misery; in fact, that "fascism" is merely a convenient term of abuse for the Right. Time and again events have shown that a decreasing number of socialists stand on the ethical ground which was once common in the working-class movement, but which has been steadily undermined by the teachings of Marx and Lenin. Anarchists will insist that there can be no forgetting the thousands of workers dead in the path of Tito's struggle for power. No forgetting that the Moscow-trained Tito was a thorough-going exponent of the Communist policy of extinguishing by assassination or indefinite imprisonment all revolutionists, even all liberal opposition. As for the bourgeois attitude, no amount of strategy, "realism", and the rest, can make toleration or support of a murderous dictatorship anything but a crime, a betrayal of humanity. J.H.

ABC OF AUTHORITY

(Continued)

S is for Syndicalism, which means the appropriation and control by workers of the capital goods with which they work. It demands the control of every industry by its workers, and is in fact the application of anarchy to the production of goods.

T is for the Teaching Method. Perhaps the most obvious way of helping to undermine Authority is to spread the truth that anarchy is possible and desirable.

U is for Unauthoritarianism. Not the least effective way of abolishing Authority is to refuse to exert it, or to submit to it in one's own life.

(To be continued)

D.R.

FROM PAGE ONE

Towards Centralisation and War

dustry in the Ruhr and the Saar would only be possible if the controlling authority had very wide powers. Democrats demand that any body possessed of such powers must be responsible to an electorate who appoint them and can recall them (we pass over the deficiencies of such conceptions in practice). Hence, if the Control Board envisaged by Schuman is to control even governments, then it ought to be responsible to some elected federal authority covering the area in which it exercises power. An alternative is for the Board to have nominal power over governments, but not to possess its own means to enforce its decisions. In this case the power would remain with the governments, who would therefore be enabled to disregard or modify the decisions of the Board and so defeat its ends. The problem is summed-up by a writer in the *Observer* (4/6/50): "If control is denied both to the individual and to the nations concerned, then the inter-

national authority will have only two futures open to it. If it is powerful enough to enforce its decisions, it will become an irresponsible managerial dictatorship; or, if it is not powerful enough for that, it will become a sham and a flop, and its impotence will be displayed at the first serious clash with really strong national or private interests."

The Labour Party Statement

It is not necessary to dwell very long on the sensational affair of the Labour Party's pamphlet on European Unity. The government, while refusing to be bound by the existing form of the Schuman proposals, reiterated its friendly interest in the general conception and desire to be kept informed of the progress of discussions. The Labour Party's pamphlet, discussing the plan, declares that it is important that an international capitalist cartel should not be set up, and warns against the

LETTERS

Free Love Controversy

DEAR SIR,

Might I reply very briefly to some of G's points? As he says, we are in pretty broad agreement—the more so since I entirely accept his remarks about "admiration"—I meant specifically that love for a partner ought to imply readiness to accept her complete freedom of choice. By intramarital continence I meant only restriction of coitus to a single permanent partner—what is normally described as "fidelity". On the psychiatric side of the desire for repeated change, however, I do not think that modern medicine treats all such behaviour as primary evidence of maladjustment, but there is enormous evidence that it is far commoner in personalities we should class as immature on other counts. This becomes clear from any study of the motivation of partner-choice (too big a subject to tackle here, but one which is fairly clearly treatable in terms of Freudian psychodynamics) and most clinicians would agree that even among people who are studied in their normal environment, and not because they come for treatment, insecurity and regression tend to go with marital instability and rapid change of partner. In part, the social attitude towards such changes provokes this, but there is much to suggest that failure to be satisfied with the family as a life-unit is very often, if not always, the outcome of childhood insecurity or of escape behaviour.

It should be stressed that social psychology has no business to be the apologist of "established social customs"—as I see it, therapeutic sociology aims to create an entirely new set of attitudes based on analysis of motivation and social behaviour. Whether it happens to support or reject an existing pattern will depend solely on what can be found out by observation and experiment. In our general attitude towards conduct problems, both your correspondents are therefore in close agreement: we seem to differ chiefly in the way in which we interpret existing evidence. It has been said in the past that too much ink is spent in discussing such things as family-patterns or sexual ethics. In view of the place which child environment plays in personality development, I think it is perhaps the most important single element in effecting social change, and whatever the true answer to the questions of home stability which we have been discussing, they seem a fundamental issue in any theory of social psychotherapy. The more we keep them in mind the better.

ALEX COMFORT.

SOCIALISTS IN THE ELECTION

AS an old reader of *Freedom* it distresses me that what appears to be deliberate inaccuracy with reference to Why Did The Voters Vote?

In the first paragraph, the statement is made that none of the parties advocated any fundamental changes in the structure of society. Surely it is common news to any reader of *Freedom* sufficiently alive to political life that the Socialist Party of Great Britain entered the lists with candidates duty bound to the abolition of the wages system. This is the most fundamental change that society could undergo. At most, in my opinion.

Comradely yours,
GORDON BEESON.

P.S. Replies . . .

IT is rather ironical that a supporter of the Socialist Party of Great Britain should accuse us of deliberate inaccuracy when the party line of the S.P.G.B. towards us is that all anarchists are at heart petit-bourgeois capitalists. This, you will admit, is just a bit inaccurate and must be deliberate, since all the Party's propagandists say exactly the same thing in the same words—and everyone alive to political life knows that potential members have to go through the catechism as laid down in 1904 before being allowed into the fold. (And "fold" is a pretty apt term in this case.)

To back up their inaccurate presentation of Anarchism, S.P.G.B. speakers never fail to quote out of context or mis-

interpret the writings of Max Stirner—perhaps the most easily misunderstood of anarchist writers, especially by critics who have obviously not read him—whose individualism would naturally make him anathema to such a mentally well-regimented body. Bakunin is sufficiently damned by having dared to disagree with the great God Marx, but on Kropotkin, whose theories of mutual aid don't quite fit in with the concept of the anarchist as petit-bourgeois-individualist-capitalist, these socialists remain silent.

However, I would agree with your probable retort that even if the S.P.G.B. are inaccurate (if not dishonest), that is no reason why I should be. But if you look again you will see that what I actually wrote was "... none of the parties for which we could have voted advocated..." (my italics). None of 625 constituencies, in only two of the voters fortunate enough to have a chance of voting for S.P.G.B. candidates so that the vast majority could not vote for that party's policy even if they had wanted to. In any case, the election party line is that they really hope to be able to put their policy into operation (sic), but they are "merely" to get an idea of the support that policy would have in the working-class districts. It is not out, but it seems an expensive way of getting information we could get them free.

★ From page three

Daily Worker and the Trials

fight and top adviser to Marshal military affairs, charged with "with the Russians for the overthrow of the government and for spying." *Daily Worker* was not representative trial but if we are to believe Associated Press report, the special court reacted in a less subtle manner, their shuddering Prague comrades shouting, "Smart!" when the General concluded his testimony means "death"; but instead of 20 years' imprisonment.

We have searched in vain for *Worker* report on this trial, and place at the same time as the trial. We understand the *Daily Worker* embarrassment in the matter, readers can swallow almost anything to what their stomachs can hold.

HOUSE TO LET

For one or two months this is one of the most beautifully furnished and comfortable villas of the district. 2,000 test above sea level, 3 minutes by car from the station from the world-famed Hotel in London in Beaulieu, with free use of wonderful swimming pool, 15 minutes from the famous restaurant Chateau de Madrid, 10 minutes from the sea, 15 minutes from the sea. Carlo, 4 masters' bedrooms and large living-room with beautiful view overlooking the Mediterranean, dining room, sitting-room, outdoor barbeques, 3 acres of beautiful garden. Magnificent pergola facing sea, where outdoor meals are served. All inclusive, 5 honest, well-trained French servants, excellent chef de cuisine, a gardener and a chauffeur. 2-car garage, guest-house with 2 bedrooms and bath, 3 meals daily, French wines, including champagne, laundry, linen and silver. Price: \$5,000 per month.

[Advertisement in *New York Herald Tribune*, 27/5/50]
Note—\$5,000 converted into sterling is £1,786.

Special Appeal

May 19th—June 16th:
Anon 2/6; London: B.G.D. 2/6; London: B.H.Y. 1/12; Fulham: W.E.D. 10/-; San Francisco: T.C. 2/-; San Jose: G.P. 1/15; Thundersley: C.W. 1/-; Glasgow: A.M.C. 4/-; Anon 2/6; Vancouver: M.P. 1/-; Cambridge: C.L.D.* 5/-; Colne: L.B. 1/-; Douglas: M.C. 2/6; Anon 1/-; Port Clinton: D.M.C. 10/-; New Eastwick: H.A.A. 2/6; London: K.J.M. 1/2.
Total £5 10 10
Previously acknowledged £14 12 6
1950 TOTAL TO DATE £120 2 6

*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 (U.S.A. \$1.50).
12 months 13/6 (U.S.A. \$3).
Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed, a/c Payne, and addressed to the publishers.

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

Meetings and Announcements

SUMMER SCHOOL IMPORTANT

REQUESTS FOR ACCOMMODATION have already been received from comrades in the provinces, who wish to attend the Summer School. London Comrades are urged to make every effort to provide beds for them.

Please forward details soon of available accommodation to:—
Pat Cooper, 613 Finchley Road, N.W.3.

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).

These lectures will be discontinued during the summer. They will recommence in the autumn.

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

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

LIVERPOOL ANARCHIST GROUP

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

COLNE & NELSON DISTRICT

Discussion Group held fortnightly, July 8th at 2.30 p.m. at Twisters and Drawers Club, Cambridge Street, Colne (Lancs.)

HAMPSTEAD

Open-air meetings will be held at White-stone Pond every Sunday at 3.30 p.m. Sunday, July 2nd, at 3.0 p.m.

NORTH-EAST LONDON GROUP

Discussion Meetings fortnightly, 7.30 p.m. JUNE 27th Sam Fenaroff "RUNNING A COMMUNITY"

JULY 11th Open Discussion "THE ABC OF ANARCHISM" Enquiries c/o Freedom Press.

MALATESTA MEETING

A meeting to commemorate the life and work of Errico Malatesta is being held at the Trade Union Club on Sunday, July 23rd, at 7.30 p.m. S. Corio, Mat Kavanagh and John Hewatson will be among the speakers.