

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"The law is often naught else but the will of those who impose it."

—ST. JUST

Threepence

In this Issue:
People and Ideas - p. 3
When the Press Washes its Dirty Linen - p. 3
Which Road to Freedom? - p. 4

19, No. 25

June 21st, 1958

Reaping the Harvest of Divide & Rule in Cyprus COMMUNAL RIOTS

One of the tragedies of the present rioting in Cyprus between Greek and Turkish Cypriots is the abandoning of homes by both groups. Having lived together for years in villages and towns, Greeks and Turks are now moving to some of these quarters where they are in the majority. Roots are being torn up, a situation which is partly due to the cynicisms for Cyprus manipulated by Whitehall. But personal animosity means little to Governments who consider them to be unimportant compared to the glory of the Greek and national pride (British imperialism, of course, is more important than, and quite different from, Cypriot which is irrational and chaotic in expression!).

Fortunately, the British electorate is unmoved by what is happening to ordinary people in Cyprus. We must assume, since they are personally involved, that they will care. This disease of indifference which is eating into the hearts of people is in evidence throughout the world.

Those who rule do nothing, but when it is politically expedient to encourage anything which merely resembles international brotherhood, and, therefore, are responsible for the continuation of violence.

In Cyprus, British policy has been one of divide and rule. The authorities have argued all along that the Turkish minority must have protection (as if they really cared), which was merely another justification for their remaining in occupation. They have manned the civil police with Turks, and even at the height of the recent rioting, which was Turkish initiated, there were more Greeks being arrested than Turks. It was reported in the *Times* when the first arrests were made that: "The proportion of fifty Greeks to thirty Turks left witnesses dumbfounded".

The Turks, the British authorities have maintained, were loyal to Britain, which the leaders of the Turkish minority no doubt were, and would have remained so as long as it was apparent that it was Greek Cypriots who were the main target for British repression. Now, since it is thought the political situation may change, Turkey, which is part of the Western alliance, is encouraging by broadcasts and other means the Turkish riots in Cyprus.

Greece has informed the United Nations Security Council that the attacks on the Greek population have been premeditated and thoroughly planned (there are signs that this is true), and that there were reports of collusion between British security forces and Turkish attack-

ers (not, we think, unlikely). Independent reports from Cyprus quite clearly indicate that the authorities have been slow to move against the Turkish rioters.

An unexpected (?) excuse has been given to the British authorities to reinforce their military personnel on the island. Two thousand paratroopers have already been flown in and others are standing by ready for action. An officer is reported as saying that: "Morale has been booming ever since we had our orders to move". The implication of this is obvious. Restless men who have been carrying out routine jobs in army barracks are ripe for killing which will relieve the boredom of 'peacetime' military life.

Meanwhile, two groups of peoples who could be living together in harmony instead of divided by misplaced loyalties, are thrown into conflict, and three Governments haggle over a little island which is only important to them because primarily it is valuable as a military base. Divided, Greek and Turkish Cypriots are taking part in their mutual destruction.

To-morrow (Tuesday, 17th June), the Government's proposals for Cyprus will be published as a white paper and debated in the Commons. The proposals are not expected to grant full determination to the Greek Cypriots nor partition as desired by the Turkish minority. It is likely that after to-morrow there will be more violence in the streets of Cyprus, British troops will be

More Russian Denunciations of Tito Mr. K's Doubletalk

LIKE a frustrated lover who has failed to dominate his partner with soft words Khrushchev is trying to discredit Tito in the eyes of those communists who might have a sneaking regard for the partisan hero by condemning his immoral flirtation with the West.

In a speech to the Bulgarian Party Congress, Khrushchev now tells the confused and battered communist rank and file that Stalin's Cominform had done right to expel Yugoslavia in 1948. The (convenient) Tito doctrine of 'different roads to socialism' which was accepted by

Khrushchev three years ago has now been rejected.

Khrushchev says he cannot refrain from . . .

" . . . asking the question which deeply the Communist movement, at the same concerns all Communists everywhere. Why do the imperialist bosses, while striving to obliterate from the face of the earth the socialist states and squash time finance one of the socialist countries, granting that country credits and free gifts? . . . Everyone knows that the imperialists never give money to anyone without a purpose, just for the sake of 'beautiful eyes'. They invest their capital in those enterprises from which they hope to receive a good profit. If the imperialists agree to give assistance to a socialist state, they do not take such a step in order to strengthen it."

It is true that imperialists never give away anything for nothing (who should know better than Khrushchev?) but, this has not stopped Moscow from asking the United States for long-term credits. Does this mean that Khrushchev is admitting that he is a revisionist traitor precipitating the downfall of the Soviet Socialist State?

Russia Wants to do Business with the United States.

Russia's Khrushchev sent a letter to President Eisenhower offering to buy U.S. products—paper-processing machines, refrigerators, automatic vending canteens, etc.; offered to sell some U.S.S.R. raw materials, e.g., manganese, platinum, chrome; dropped a broad hint that the U.S.S.R. would like some U.S. credits to buy U.S. heavy machinery.

(*Time*, June 16th)

A Press Conference on That Dirty Word

LAST Friday a Press Conference was held at Friends' House by a delegation of the first representatives of British pacifist organisations to go to the Soviet Union. These had just returned from their mission and were eager to convey to the press the glad tidings of Moscow's well-known love of peace.

The press, including the representative of *FREEDOM*, were not very impressed. The *Telegraph*, the *Express*, the *Indian*, the *Spanish* and the *Swedish* were all there, not forgetting the *Daily Worker* (who took the biggest number of photographs).

It seems, although the delegation did not know it, that they arrived in Russia during a 'Peace Week' even (why even?) the circus had a banner proclaiming the virtues of peace in several languages. This was fortunate for none of the delegation knew Russian. However, they had 'implicit faith' in the veracity and accuracy of their interpreters. The 'Peace Week' was a prelude to a conference in Stockholm to be attended by world delegates.

One of the main 'concerns' of the delegation was to investigate the rights of conscientious objectors in the Soviet Union. There was, it was claimed, a conscience clause in the Soviet Constitution, which, because it was never used, was superseded by the 1939 law which eliminated it. It was claimed that objections were heard, even now, by people's courts. These objections were totally religious but there were officially no Tolstoyans in the Soviet Union. 'Naturally' all the Russian churches were for Peace although none were pacifist. The Soviet Peace Committee expressed their readiness to give careful consideration to the suggestions made by the British group on the matter of recognition of conscientious objection.

The star performance at the 'Peace' circus was a discussion with none other than Nikita Khrushchev himself. The Reverend W. W. Simpson of the National Peace Council was most impressed with

the time given to them by Khrushchev. He was meant to be. Nikita was in turn impressed with his famous afternoon tea at Windsor which of course, shows that Nikky's heart is in the right place. A free exchange of platitudes seems to have taken place at this *tete-a-tete* with Khrushchev during which he reassured the delegates in his bluff, frank, peasant way "There is nothing which we would want to steal from the United Kingdom".

The general position of the people the delegation met was that the Hungarian situation was now merely an academic subject for discussion since it had all been settled.

There was no opinion expressed or asked for on the French situation since the delegates rarely saw an English paper except once when they saw some back numbers of (you'd never guess!), the *Daily Worker*, so they were quite ignorant of current affairs—including, complained one, of the Test Match result—which even the British Ambassador didn't know.

The general opinion of the Soviet Peace Committee was that the Soviet people had put pressure on the government to ban the H-bomb, which that government had done.

One of the members of the delegation was very impressed with the high intellectual level of the people they met. The SPC seemed to consist of intellectuals, which is not surprising when one considers that it must be a semi-official body specifically designed to impress delegations such as this one.

It is little wonder that 'peace' is regarded in many quarters as a dirty word, when the Soviet insist on peace campaigns as a diplomatic and political weapon. Methinks they do protest too much and an overwhelming protestation of peaceful intentions and peace as a way of life is the clue to an intention that seems otherwise.

The dirty word scrawled on the walls of Europe is 'Peace' and these delegations are merely the chalk in Nikita's hand.

J.R.

A Statement from the Kenya Legislative Council Defence of the Indefensible

WE published in last week's *FREEDOM* part of a letter received by the *Observer* and given some prominence by that paper, from five men who are serving sentences in H.M. Prison Lokitaung in the remote Northern Province of Kenya. The letter contained allegations of ill-treatment, brutality, inadequate or contaminated water supplies, mail censorship, prohibition of visits by relatives and Official Visitors and unnecessary mail delays.

On 11th June, the Chief Secretary, Mr. W. F. Coutts, at a meeting of the Kenya Legislative Council, made a statement which denied all the allegations and at the same time mentioned the fact that the Government was already aware of them, and had in fact already completed an investigation before "the rumours were given wide publicity". As a result of the investigation, said Mr. Coutts, the Government is satisfied that the allegations are unfounded.

In spite of the considerable length of the statement it remains singularly unconvincing. Although it takes all the allegations in turn and puts an entirely different interpretation upon them, the impression which it makes is of a series of half-truths and excuses. Reading between the lines it is clear that prejudice and hatred exist, and above all, surprise that anyone should be particularly concerned at the fate of convicted criminals such as those in Lokitaung.

The following paragraph from the statement indicates this attitude:

"In making these allegations the convicts concerned described themselves as 'political prisoners'. That is quite incorrect. All of them are serving sentences following convictions in court for criminal offences. They include some of the Mau Mau organisation and one who had been sentenced for consorting with persons in unlawful possession of firearms."

But there is also an even more serious inference which may be drawn—that the Kenya Government makes a distinction between ex-Mau Mau leaders and political prisoners—which in itself implies that it considers they should be treated differently as prisoners. Can it be that the Administration resents the situation in which it is not supposed to treat such "dangerous criminals" in any way it pleases, just as it treated captured Mau Mau suspects during the uprising, with beatings and shootings—some guilty of terrorism not proven, others plainly innocent.

Perhaps the most important point of all lies in the fact that the investigation was carried out on behalf of the Kenya Administration by the Administration itself. This is tantamount to asking men who are under suspicion of cruelty to men they hate, whether they actually committed the crime, and then accepting their unsubstantiated plea of not guilty. From previous knowledge of the actions of Government officials and police in Kenya, par-

ticularly in remote areas like Lokitaung, far from the public eye, there can be no good reason for acceptance of their word since they must of necessity deny any allegations made against them.

It would not have been difficult to set up a completely independent investigating body, and indeed the very fact that this has not been done points to the obvious conclusion that there is something to hide. The statement says that Visiting Justices and senior officers have regularly visited the prison, but "it has not been possible to appoint Official Visitors". It does not say why it is that members of the Administration are able to visit such a remote area, but not independent people. There can be no valid reason.

In detail the statement, besides a tendency towards flat denials based on reports from the District Officer and resident Medical Officer, gives explanations for the necessity for closing the usual water supply and for water rationing (though it does not explain why the system of rationing employed should be a time limit—which is extraordinary—rather than a certain amount per head as would seem to be the obvious method); it states that censorship delays were caused by the prisoners themselves who failed to comply with instructions as to where the mail should be addressed (by any standards a patently contrived exercise). The statement deals with

Continued on p. 4

REPORT ON THE CO-OPS - 6

(Continued from previous issue)

UNTIL the last few years Fabian-Labour thinking has been based on the implicit assumption that 'the bigger, the better'. This assumption Labourites shared with, and possibly derived from, the Marxists who have always argued that increasing large-scale organisation of industry is a necessary condition for the development of a socialist society. All the Labour Government's nationalisation schemes of 1945-51 were constructed on this assumption. It is only since 1951 that some of the more percipient socialists have begun to appreciate that, beyond a certain size, large-scale organisation creates more problems than it solves. Even now, however, it is rare to find a socialist consciously attacking large-scale organisation and espousing the smaller unit. And when one does find such a socialist, he turns out to be, like G. D. H. Cole, something of a crypto-anarchist.

The typical socialist attitude is well displayed in the Co-operative Independent Commission's discussion of amalgamation. In its most extreme form it is best seen in the Hardie Minority Report which wants to sweep away the thousand-or-so autonomous units that make up the Co-op Movement and replace them by one or two national societies. The Labour Party's favourite millionaire business tycoon has clearly learned nothing from his brief tenure of office as boss of nationalised iron and steel. The majority of the Commission is rather more circumspect on this question, although to judge from Gaitskell's speech at the recent Co-op Congress its moderation is due more to tactical considerations than to any respect for Co-operative tradition. I suspect that the majority would have preferred to 'rationalise' the Co-ops rather more than is implied in the proposed reduction in the number of retail societies from 950-odd to 200-300. If so, they may

well be pleased that Hardie has produced a dissenting report of such a character: it may have the effect of stampeding Co-operators along the path of radical amalgamation for fear that worse may befall them.

In my previous article I argued that amalgamation is not likely to improve, and may indeed worsen, Co-op democracy. I shall now argue that it is unlikely to improve greatly, if at all, the efficiency of the Movement.

Over the years the Co-op Movement has developed a number of criteria by which to judge the economic efficiency of its constituent societies. The most obvious one is the dividend rate which might be regarded as roughly equivalent to a private concern's profit rate. This criterion is very crude since some societies deliberately charge above market prices in order to boost the dividend—the members, apparently, preferring this system of 'forced saving'. A more reasonable criterion is that of sales per member. This avoids the objection brought against the dividend criterion but, in its turn, is subject to a number of deficiencies such as the fact that memberships between societies are not strictly comparable—one society's membership, for instance, may be composed of individuals, several in the same family, while another's may be composed largely of 'representative' heads of families. A better criterion—the one plugged by the Co-op Union's research department in recent years—is sales per head of population, i.e. sales per head of the estimated population in the area covered by the society, irrespective of membership. This criterion has

the advantage of taking into account the extent to which a Co-op has 'penetrated' its potential retail market.

The Commission, of course, is well aware of these criteria. It is also well aware that all the evidence points to the conclusion that, on each of these criteria, the smaller societies are generally more efficient than the larger societies. Why, then, should the Commission advocate the radical amalgamation of societies into larger units? It makes some attempt to face this question but its answer is most unsatisfactory: if Crosland, a former economics don at Oxford, had received a similar answer from one of his students, he would, I hope, have given him a mere Beta Minus for his pains.

The Commission has written off the smaller societies for several reasons. One is that such societies cannot offer a really comprehensive service to their members, particularly in the dry goods field: they run a grocery shop or two and perhaps a pathetic attempt at a general department store. This may be admitted, while noting that some small societies have records of dry goods sales unmatched, proportionately, by any of the large societies. To admit this, however, is not to say that amalgamation is necessarily the best remedy. A better remedy, and one more in keeping with the Co-operative tradition, is federal action both at the national and regional levels. The Commission, in fact, has recognised this in its proposal for a national chain of Co-op multiples but, for some curious reason, has failed to relate this recommendation to its discussion of amalgamation. If we

do get a chain of Co-op multiples for footwear, etc. in the near future, then part, at least, of the case for amalgamation is destroyed.

A second reason that the Commission proffers is that in some areas small societies 'overlap' on another and their management is inefficient. But if, as the Commission argues elsewhere, local autonomy does not necessarily imply local monopoly of Co-op trade, overlapping may not necessarily be a bad thing: it is an offence to Co-op ideology rather than a serious waste of resources. *Quâ* consumer, indeed, I would welcome the opportunity which is general, for example, in Finland to choose between rival sources of Co-operative supply. Again, the quality of management in the smaller societies may be inferior to that in the larger societies but, if so, the Commission gives no evidence for its assertion. Certainly, the costs per pound of sales are often higher in the smaller societies. But this may be accounted for by the fact that many of them operate in scattered, thinly populated rural areas. There is no reason for believing that such costs, especially transport costs, would be reduced by making the smaller societies branches of one large society.

A third reason for the Commission's writing off of the smaller societies and the one on which it sets most store, is the fact that since 1948 the smaller societies have apparently made less trade progress than the larger societies. A neat little statistical table supports this conclusion. A neat little phoney statistical table. Its phoney character is evident when one realises that (1) it contains a statistical bias in favour of the larger societies; (2) it covers up the fact that many small societies show greater increases than many large societies; (3) it ignores the point that small societies with a high sales per head of population may be expected to grow at a slower rate than large societies with a rela-

tively low sales per head and, hence, with a deficiency to make good; (4) it overlooks the very important fact that population and, consequently, the movement of trade, is growing faster in cities, the home of the large societies, than it is in the countryside, the home of the smaller societies.

I am quite convinced that the Commission asked itself the wrong question. It asked: Are the smaller societies doing as well as the larger ones? It should have asked: Would they do better than they are doing (which on the whole is quite good) if they were part of a much larger society? If they had answered themselves the second rather than the first question, the answer would well have been different. I do not say that in no place and at no time is there a case for amalgamation. There may be: that could be decided only by a very close local study of local circumstances. I do say, however, that the general answer would have been in terms not of amalgamation but of federal action—a form of action which retains local autonomy and which is highly desirable on grounds other than economic efficiency.

For half a century now the slogan of 'Amalgamation! Amalgamation!' has been a catchword in the Movement, a panacea for all the economic ills that beset the Co-ops. The Commission, with its bias in favour of 'the bigger, the better', has taken neck and crop for the proposed slogan. In so doing, it has done a grave disservice to the Movement. There are many large societies with great voting powers at Congress who are only too eager to have their fondest prejudices confirmed by an 'authoritative' Commission. It is to be hoped that the small societies which have nothing to gain from amalgamation and much to lose will continue to resist the blandishments of the giants.

GASTON GERARD

(To be concluded)

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats.)

New Books . . .

Confessions of a European in England J. W. Huizinga 25/-

Cheap Editions . . .

The Informer Liam O'Flaherty 2/6

Handbook on Hanging Charles Duff 2/-

Second-Hand . . .

Omnipotent Government Ludwig von Mises 6/-

The Tree of Gernika G. L. Steer 5/6

Conscription and Conscience John W. Graham 10/-

The Importance of Living Lin Yutang 5/6

The Strange Case of Alger Hiss Earl Jowitt 4/-

The Weeping and the Laughter J. Maclaren-Ross 3/6

Everybody's Political What's What G. B. Shaw 3/6

Women and the Revolution Ethel Mannin 7/6

The Prince and the Pauper Mark Twain 3/-

Violence and the Labour Movement Robert Hunter 7/6

Homer Lane and the Little Commonwealth E. T. Bazeley 4/-

Our Social Inheritance Victor Branford & Patrick Geddes 4/6

Intellectual Crime Janet Chance 3/6

Hotel in Flight Nancy Johnstone 3/6

The Power House Alex Comfort 3/6

Four Issues of "Fact" Palmer, Hodge, Coombes and Prenant 3/6

Oil! Upton Sinclair 3/6

The Martyrdom of Man Winwood Reade 3/-

Pamphlets . . .

The Sociological Study of Co-operation Henrik F. Infield 1/6

We can supply ANY book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found!

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

CINEMA

The Warsaw Resistance

KANAL. Produced by Stanislaw Adler and directed by A. Wajda. (Academy Cinema).

IN 1944 the people of Warsaw rose up against their German tormentors. The men, the women and the children of Warsaw fought and died. They died in the streets and in the gutters and in the end they died in the sewers beneath their burning city. They fought and they died and that act that is for all times their glory poses again the problem that so many anarchists refuse to face.

The anarchist who glibly mouths his generalities about the evils of war and the futility of violence yet accepts the reflected heroism of those anarchists who died fighting in Spain. The anarchist who points with pride to the sailors who fought at Kronstadt. The anarchist who can accept the violence practised by the Russian and American anarchists. The anarchist who could sweat in defence of the Hungarian workers when they died on their streets should have the moral courage to acknowledge these acts and in doing so match his moral courage to these peoples physical courage. For the anarchist who vaguely talks of lying down in the paths of tanks or trains, as if they were driven by London taxi-drivers with a licence to lose, credits his enemy with those same moral values that he himself claims. For this form of moral blackmail can only succeed against those who have not the stomach to drive on, for should the tank or train driver drive on their sacrifice becomes as futile and as gormless as that of the Persians who lay down in the path of their idol Moloch. The anarchist who talks of non-co-operation and passive strike action against an enemy who wants only the ground he stands on . . . how futile this talk can become when we think of the millions who have had to queue and shuffle to their deaths like cattle. The millions in Europe who found even the act of dying robbed of its final dignity. Can we never say we will fight in defence of OUR society, must we only make a speech or hand out a pamphlet should we see a friend or a comrade dragged off to a certain death? Were the men and women of Warsaw and of the Hungarian towns and villages so wrong and are we so right?

Paul Tabori* reviewing an anthology compiled by Hungarian writers who had

suffered imprisonment and deportation under the German occupation quotes an extract from this anthology. It concerns the murder of his, Paul Tabori's, father. It is a terrible thing for a son to read and I would quote two sentences both taken out of context. "He was a 'gentleman', a citizen of Europe, a traveller" and "He wasn't afraid of death—he died in the gas-chamber at Auschwitz—because he knew it was only another journey . . ." Grant that I may not die like a gentleman. May my exit from this life be as noisy and undignified as my entrance. Here then is the film KANAL.

Cannes major prize winner. Produced in Poland and directed by A. Wajda. It can offer ninety-seven minutes of "entertainment" for us but it holds no answers for those who ask the questions. Are we right in refusing at any time and at all times to fight in defence of those things we hold to be good and true. For if we are, then the men and women of Warsaw must be wrong and if that is so then mark me among the sinners.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

*The Spectator, 6/6/58, page 723.

UNIV. LIB.

THE UNIVERSITY LIBERTARIAN,
No. 6, Spring 1958, 1s.

In the new number of the *University Libertarian*, Raymond Southall writes "On the Relevance of Philosophy", Miss E. Robb on "Morals—With or Without Religion" and Peter Woods on "Sex and the Unmarried". L. A. Burman contributes a study of Blake's Prophetic Books, and Alex Craig, a veteran champion of the liberty of printing and publishing, discusses "The Law of Dirty Books". George Woodcock continues his series of biographical articles with a discussion of Alexander Herzen, and Leopold Kohr, under the title "Trial by Lust" uncovers some of the legal paradoxes and absurdities concealed by such phrases as *a fair trial* and *due process of law*.

The *University Libertarian* is published three times a year, a postal subscription for six issues costs 7s. or 1 dollar. Single copies by post 1s. 2d. from 13 Brednerman Avenue, Manchester, or from Freedom Bookshop.

As Others See It

THE BARBARIAN SOCIETY

IT is obvious that a barbarian society leaving all to chance, believing in luck and irresponsibility, needs direction. If it cannot receive that direction from its elected leaders, it is soon drowned in confusion.

This is particularly true of barbarian societies. By barbarian, we mean, of course, "lacking in social graces". A nation may have huge machines, projectiles of great violence and stoves that do all the cooking and yet be a complete barbarism socially.

The activities of a barbarism one against another is punishment, revilement, contest for first dynamic supremacy with no thought of the rights of others.

The barbarism solves political problems with brutality, crime with punishment and social ills with degradation.

It is fairly obvious then that the United States of America—and the Western World—is a barbarism, wearing nylon shirts instead of bearskins . . .

The social code used identifies the barbarism and an "eye for an eye" is little better than law for the sake of sadism, mere animalism.

You can know a barbarism by its witch doctors, its concept of the other man's mind. In this society the mental witch doctor . . . believes sincerely man is an animal without soul or hope and, following Pavlov and other Russian teachings, that man works only for reward like "any other dog".

These are the brands of barbarism. Hate is deified above love, a deterrent to an action is better than a communication, the delusion is more palatable than the truth.

If we place the government on our chart of human evaluation, we find a craven psychotic. What would you think of the sanity of a man who sits in his house all day every day loading guns for fear of some mythical enemy? What would you think of someone who solved all his problems with threats of violence? You're right. Such a person would be insane. Just add up the characteristics of a government to-day, apply them as if done by an individual and make up your mind. Governments are insane. It is a big thought and one necessary to

digest if you are not going to go around all your life snarling impotently against "government stupidity". The insane aren't always stupid but they are certainly insane.

Of course, you could define government as "that body created by the aggregate irresponsibility of a people". The insane are irresponsible. That is why they are insane. If you lump all the irresponsibility in a nation into one body you would then have an insane body. Thus the government temper . . .

Now all this comes about only when you have a barbarism, where the social training of each person is so poor as to amount to a collective insanity.

To cure a barbarism one must make men socially grow up. And that is done with individuals. One works with individual people, not with groups.

(From *Certainty*, Journal of the Hubbard Association of Scientologists).

People and Ideas

Continued from p. 3
It could be supported for any length of time, the result would be the establishment of so formidable a controlling organ that what the world might gain in unity, it would lose in liberty. For only an executive authority of the most tyrannical omnipotence could keep such uneasy, clumsy, and cancerous colossi from disintegrating in violent explosion".

In fact, the more you think about the various proposals of this kind the more you doubt the political intelligence of the people who advocate them, and the integrity of the politicians who espouse them. Of the many fields of agitation and propaganda open to people who are looking for ways of ensuring peace, this seems to be the most fruitless. The more so since it diverts the energies of well-meaning people from more rational and rewarding activities. Herbert Read once posed the choice as being between one world government and a few million village halls. But you couldn't expect the Parliamentary Association for World Government to see the point of that one. C.W.

When the Press Washes its Dirty Linen in Public

AT the final session of the Commonwealth Press Union's conference in London last week, quite a lot of dirty linen was washed in public by the guest speaker Mr. Hugh Cudlipp (editorial director of the *Daily Mirror* and *Sunday Pictorial* group) who, while deploring those journalists of the "self-styled quality press" who by denigrating other newspapers were only strengthening "the hand of the enemies of the Press", proceeded to launch an all-out attack on the professional integrity of the *Times*!

It was all very well for the *Times* to frequently denounce the "disgraceful lowering of values" and the "irresponsibility" of the popular press, declared Mr. Cudlipp, but the *Times*' record in public affairs was not blameless. And he then proceeded to give examples of suppression of "news", "overt partiality" and sub-editing of correspondence; that a quarter of the *Times* of the previous day was squandered on "entertainment and trivia". Which is all very interesting and revealing, and it is to be hoped that such outbursts will serve to make at least a section of the public more critical, more sceptical of what they read in the Press as fact.

But what is also significant is that Mr. Cudlipp did not answer the charges made against the popular press, of which he, as editorial director of the *Mirror-Pictorial* group is one of the foremost exponents. All he could do was to argue that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones! Which is sound common sense from the point of view of those engaged in the press industry; from the public point of view it should be a matter of deep concern.

THERE is a growing tendency to look upon the daily press as a public service, as reliable as a railway timetable and as unbiased as a weather report. We talk of a "free press" in order to distinguish a "free enterprise" press from the government-controlled press of the Iron Curtain countries and fascist countries such as Spain. But in fact no press is free whose existence is dependent on advertising revenue and the maintenance of a minimum circulation, and whose outlook is directed to record circulations and whose shares are quoted on the Stock Exchange. Such a press is no more a public service, simply because it meets a public need for information (assuming that it does!) than is Unilever which (among other things) supplies most of the public's need for soap and detergents! Just as Unilever will stop producing soap if it is unprofitable in spite of the public need for soap, so will the Press barons stop producing "news" once it becomes unprofitable. They exploit our need but their first allegiance is to their shareholders.

In point of fact, the popular press have long ago come to the conclusion that the publication of straight news is if anything a handicap to increased circulation. Their success formula is sensationalism and the cult of the personality; their publications are not newspapers but daily magazines. They depend for their existence on a public bored with the daily routine of life, uninterested in ideas or principles; a public lacking either the interest or the energy to want to be informed on the political and social problems of the world

to-day but conditioned to react in determined ways to particular situations. The popular press which has been largely responsible for this conditioning, far from wishing to change it, simply feeds on it and in the process goes on feeding it! Mr. Cudlipp was probably quite accurate when he declared that he did not find "hatred and contempt of the popular press among the readers of the popular press". (Indeed, it appears that 44 per cent. of the *Times* readers also read the *Daily Express* and 24 per cent. the *Daily Mirror*!)

BUT what a dangerous and anti-social attitude this is! The lack of professional integrity which it implies, is the more noticeable in view of a growing sense of public responsibility in most other professions. One shudders to think of the consequences if the general attitude of doctors, architects, designers, musicians, painters, teachers and even scientists was the same as that of the journalists of the popular press. It is true that few professional men are uncompromising to the point of jeopardising their careers and defending what they consider to be right at any cost to themselves. But to our minds, it is equally true that in the past fifty years professional standards have risen except in the field of journalism. Where are the journalists with the integrity of a Brailford? News-gathering to-day is a matter of collecting official hand-outs, of contacts with the right persons for advance information, for "leaks"; interviews with the leading politicians (last Monday's *Evening Standard* for instance splashed across its front page Randolph Churchill's "I QUIZ THE TURKISH FOREIGN MINISTER" but gave more space to the headline than to the result of the quiz!) and what the taxi-driver has to say about the situation. What it's all about, the social and political background, that is of secondary interest, and an informed press patch takes time and the daily press is more concerned with catching newspaper trains to Aberdeen and Land's End with a headline one better than its rival, than with informed, accurate reports.

IS there a way out? The pessimists argue that with all their faults the *Times*, *Manchester Guardian* and even the *Daily Telegraph*, which remain in the old tradition of newspapers supplying news, are available to all who feel "hatred and contempt" for the popular press, and yet between them their circulation does not amount to that of one of the worse examples of the popular press. So what hope is there of breaking the vicious circle of a conditioned public which gets the press it wants?

We think that the acceptance of such an argument invariably seals the fate of a free press, in the true sense of the word, for all time. Yet nothing in society is so static, so cushioned from outside forces that it can remain unchanged—for the worse as for the better.

But its monopoly in the field of information has been shaken by the emergence of the Radio and now Television; the shrinking of the world by the growth of communications has in some ways lessened its importance, in others, of course, it has increased what should be the responsibilities of the press, since the affairs of nations are more closely interlinked than they were a century ago.

Thus it is clear that there can be no telling what changes in opinion may occur in the next few years so far as the Press is concerned. The struggle that is taking place at present in the Fleet Street area is the sordid one of big business, between purveyors of a commodity fighting to be among the survivors in a shrinking mass market, but the process of disintegration could be hastened by a boycott of the Press on the part of readers as well as journalists and contributors.

... I Wouldn't Start from Here

"Moreover, regrettable as it may seem to the idealist, the experience of history provides little warrant for the belief that real progress, and the freedom that makes progress possible, lies in unification. For where unification has been able to establish unity of ideas it has usually ended in uniformity, paralysing the growth of new ideas. And where the unification has merely brought about an artificial or imposed unity, its irksomeness has led through discord to disruption."

—B. H. LIDDELL HART:
"Why Don't We Learn from History?"

YOU may remember the story of the man who was asked the way to Guthrie, Oklahoma. "If I was going to Guthrie, Oklahoma," he replied, "I wouldn't start from here." This was how I felt when a friend told me last week that he was participating in a conference organised by the Parliamentary Association for World Government, representing in some way I couldn't fathom, the professional organisation to which he belongs. When I suggested to him that the Parliamentary Association for World Government exists primarily to advance the political careers of its organisers, he started talking about peace, international control of atomic energy, a World Security Authority, and so on. But if I were looking for peace, I wouldn't start by seeking World Government. I would go in search, not of unification, but of fragmentation.

But how does one begin to explain this to someone who accepts the principle of government and can only offer, as a solution to the problems and perils

IN other words not only should those who denounce the popular press go on denouncing it but should also refuse to have anything to do with it! Mr. Cudlipp was quite right when he exposed those people like Aneurin Bevan who had called "the British capitalist press 'the most prostituted in the world' and then promptly wrote for it. And at a fat fee too. Participation in what he excommunicates as a brothel should surely be regarded as a dubious source of income".

Mr. Cudlipp picked on Mr. Bevan for obvious reasons (though is he not a bit behind the times?), but what he said could be applied to a large section of our publicist-professional men who also profess "progressive" ideas, and who denounce the yellow press in private, if not in public. They must be made to realise that their collaboration in the yellow press, whatever their motives, however uncompromising the ideas they express, serves to perpetuate that press, to give it prestige, not to undermine it. If one needs to underline this fact one has only to refer to the Beaverbrook press which has at some time or other employed the cream of Left-wing journalists* who have come and gone without changing the newspapers' policy or the public's lack of taste and discrimination.

Just as government and the State have never been undermined by the infiltration of those who profess to want to change or destroy them, so the yellow press will remain what it is, yellow, sensational, pandering to man's worse reactions and frustrations (which is all that the cult of the personality as well as the destruction of "personalities", in which these same newspapers engage is in fact) so long as its critics think it can be changed from within.

Just as the State and government will wither away once we, the public, withdraw power from them by setting up our own organisations from below, so the yellow press will disappear when the dissemination of news and information is something we, the public, the community, initiate and support.

A free press is a public service too valuable to be left to a bunch of millionaires to manipulate and to National Advertisers to finance!

*Tribune for instance has probably supplied more leader and feature writers for the *Evening Standard* than any other paper, and was not "Low", in his hey-day contributing cartoons which poked fun and derision at his boss?

brought about by government, an attempt at bigger and better government? Simplest perhaps to point out how, even in governmental terms, the effort is utterly futile. It is reasonable to assume that even the advocates of world government are not in fact thinking of a world government, legislating alike, from some central spot on the equator, for Clitheroe, Chungking and Cape Town, but for a world federation of governments. Now the federative principle is a good principle (for an anarchist discussion of it see Camillo Berneri's pamphlet *Kropotkin's Federalist Ideas*), but its successful application, whether to government or to more useful human activities, requires certain conditions, which the intellectual giants and glib "progressives" who advocate world government and world control of this and that, just never get round to mentioning. Capt. Liddell Hart, the military historian, referring to the "numerous attempts throughout history to find a solution in fusion", points out that "history teaches us that in practice this is apt to mean domination by one of the constituent elements".

You could illustrate this graphically by analogy with engineering experiments—the resolution of forces, centres of gravity, conditions of equilibrium and so on, but it is perfectly plain for all to see in the actual examples of successful and unsuccessful federations. The deduction that one is bound to draw is that units of disparate size cannot be joined federally without their being dominated by the largest. This is why successful federalism is impossible without decentralisation, and why Proudhon actually equated the two, declaring in 1862 in his book *Du Principe Fédératif* (which Mr. J. Hampden Jackson in his new book on Proudhon calls "the best exposition of the federal principle that has ever been written"), that all his political ideas were reducible to the formula: *Political Federation or Decentralisation*.

IN our own time the recognition that successful federation depends upon decentralisation comes from Prof. Henry Simons in his "Economic Policy for a Free Society", where he declares that:

"A great virtue of extreme federalism or decentralisation in great nations is that it facilitates their extension toward world organisation or their easy absorption into still larger federations. If central governments were, as they should be, largely repositories of unexercised powers, held simply to prevent their exercise by constituent units or extra-governmental organisations, then supra-national organisation would be easy if not almost gratuitous. Indeed, such great-nation decentralisation or deorganisation is both end and means of international organisation".

E. S. M. O. — or ORGANISATION MOON

AFTER NATO and SEATO what could be a more obvious step than ESMO (Earth-side of the Moon Treaty Organisation), or possibly a Defence Organisation based upon the co-operation between the West and the planet Mars (PMTO).

There have been rumours, unconfirmed as yet, to the effect that such organisations are being discussed in Washington and London at secondary level, though the Heads of State are said to be in immediate and constant touch with the members of their staffs who are laying the preliminary plans.

Amidst the confusion of conflicting reports, and the likelihood that each and every Western ploy has its equal and opposite Iron-curtain counter-ploy, two (if not more) facts almost certainly emerge:

1. It is accepted by all sides that Space Treaties in general present a serious international legal problem, and that this alone might possibly prove to be an insurmountable obstacle. (It will be recalled that a similar situation exists where the North and South Poles are concerned—and of course to a lesser degree the difficulties presented by the legal aspects of "Territorial Waters".)
2. It is not accepted by all sides that any other side has any legal rights where outer-space is concerned—particularly in the cases of the Moon and the planet Mars which have hitherto been regarded as jointly owned by members of the United Nations Organisation—though there is some legal diffidence in this respect, for it has been put forward that Nations which would be members of UNO were it not for their own internal legal problems, should also be regarded as co-owners of certain planets. It is unquestionably a valid argument that the international law of trespass shall not

apply where the moon is concerned, and some experts would extend this principle to an extent previously not acceptable.

Thus, even if you think in political terms, the notion of federation if it is to be successful, is inseparable from that of decentralisation. But do you hear the world government pedlars talking with this minimum of understanding? Aren't they the kind of people who would laugh most heartily at for instance, Welsh or Scottish nationalism, for their atavistic parochialism, though, in political terms, that is what decentralisation implies? Leopold Kohr, who in his *The Break-down of Nations* makes a very astute and persuasive study of this question, sums it up thus:

"For the principles of smallness and division, solving so many other problems, solve also the problem of union. They are, in fact, the most fundamental principles underlying all successful regional or continental unions, international federations, or world states. Only small states can be united into healthier, larger organisms. Only small states are federable. Wherever a large state participates in a federal union, the federation cannot last. In due course, it will either become a centralised state operating in the interest of its largest participant, or it will break into its component parts once the immediate reason for its creation, such as fear of a common enemy, has disappeared. If survival is desired none the less in such a case, it can be accomplished only by applying the principle of division to all disproportionately large members who are to a federation what cancer is to the human body. This may be impossible. But if large member states such as participate in the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, or the European Council, cannot be divided, their union cannot last even if it is technically possible to bring it into existence. The only thing that can ensure continued union is a cancer-free small-cell pattern".

But it is exactly the big powers which represent the threat to peace that makes people advocate International Security Authorities and Police Forces; the "great powers" which "by their very definition recognise no master", the powers which would only participate in any international authority if they could either use it as the instrument of their policy, or veto any decision unfavourable to themselves. "Let us assume," writes Kohr, that

"the great powers were willing to endow an international organisation such as the European Council or the United Nations with the forces necessary to render them effective also in the face of their largest participants. The result would be a military and economic burden on the world of such monstrous proportions that it could not be supported for any length of time since the great powers, in addition to their federal contributions, would of course continue their own stupendous armament expenditure in order not to forfeit their coveted

Continued on p. 2

Which Road to Freedom

DEAR FRIEND,

It is oft repeated that there are but few readers of FREEDOM who use the paper as a vehicle for the diffusion of ideas. I am sure that this is not because of any paucity of ideas, rather because most of us have now become so sceptical and cynical, that we know almost for a certainty, that in the moribund set-up that pervades our lives, nothing short of a miracle would see any of our ideas or suggestions come to fruition.

The Political and Economic situations appal us. FREEDOM may or may not succeed in putting its finger on the pulse of the problem; whether right or wrong it is a voice crying in the wilderness. The question is; is there anything concrete that can be attempted, at least for the future? Gradualism is usually condemned as getting nowhere slowly. But full-blooded revolution usually gets nowhere at all, they all lead to a Cromwell, a Napoleon or a Stalin. In a revolution there must essentially be sides and this has always been a stumbling block. Usually the sides occur within the Ruling Classes, at the very best between the Ruling Classes and those aspiring to rule. The use of the People in these debacles is particularly nauseating and detestable. The use of the Peoples' name in an attempt to wrest the government is the height of blasphemy.

Once, not so very long ago, the People would go along, they were naïve enough, enthusiastic enough to believe in this or that particular cause. They are not so keen nowadays, they too now can successfully enjoy the pursuit of money, they too can now engage in conspicuous consumption. Furthermore they are educated—educated in civil obedience,

they are prosperous and appreciate the remunerations of civil order. In fact they have been so cushioned against the rough edges of life, so protected against the whims and fancies of wicked squires and capitalists and their ilk, that the only way they now do anything is by being ordered to do that something. They obey their Government and they obey their Trade Unions, because it is convenient for them to do so, it is the best way to protect their cherished routines and material comforts.

If I am right and I feel all evidence points to support my conclusions, including the present fiasco in France—if ever a nation was capable of revolution, if ever a nation had a better chance, when there was literally no government in the saddle and they meekly accept, without bloodshed, a person tantamount to a dictator. Quite clearly one and all are so pleasantly occupied pursuing money and making money and enjoying the comforts money can bring, that any agitation, left or right of centre is frowned on with the greatest disgust. If de Gaulle has read his Machiavelli he can't go wrong—don't interfere with their property or their women and you can get away with murder and substitute Glory for Freedom and you will even get into the school text books. Where was the power of the Communists during this *coup d'état*? They were in preponderance in the National Assembly of the Third Republic. The supreme paradox is, as I see it, that this does prove the Anarchist Case—trains run, shops open, commerce continues, with or without government. The general hypothesis is proven, how then to put it into action? How then to do away with the State?

Kenya Denials

Continued from p. 1

allegations of brutality in an equally unconvincing way, but is nevertheless satisfied of their lack of foundation:

"All convicts at present serving sentences in the prison concerned were asked by the investigating officer if they had any complaints to make on the score of ill-treatment. Only one complained orally that he had been struck some time ago by an askari (prison warder), but he told the investigating officer that he did not wish anything about this to be included in his written statement."

It is only too understandable that men who may have been brutally treated do not necessarily say so if they think that the treatment will merely be repeated should they complain. It depends upon *who is asking*, and on behalf of whom. It depends upon their assessment of the probable results. Why did the only man who did complain not want it written down—can there be any logical reason for his action other than fear of the consequences?

As to the ration scale it is stated that this is fixed on the advice of the Medical Department with occasional local variations in the scale on the advice of the M.O.:

"... all convicts receive a balanced ration, including meat, and a vitamin supplement in the form of oil, tablets and yeast food which are allowed to augment by vegetables cultivated in the allotments within the prison."

It is impossible not to speculate upon the varying interpretations which may be put upon the phrase—"allowed to augment". Perhaps on occasion as a punishment—convicts are *not allowed*... Possibly the allotments are not too sizeable "within the prison". Why is a vitamin supplement necessary except in cases of an unnatural deficiency. Why pills except for those who are ill—do the members of the Kikuyu who are free have to exist on pills, or do they just eat food?

The statement says that so far as health is concerned the M.O. responsible, who lives within 100 yards of the prison, visits it regularly once a week (does he walk 100 yards to the prison more often in the case of an emergency—or does he only call on Thursdays even though a prison-

New York Readers Note:

LIBERTARIAN CENTRE
now at
86 EAST 10th STREET
(between Third & Fourth Avenues).

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

FREEDOM certainly recognises the solidarity of this levathan, if revolution is futile against it, what then is not? How can we fight against the organisation deemed necessary for the organisation of millions of people? The population and complexity of the Mid 20th Century World, I for one cannot comprehend it, seems to demand a new approach of thinking. We can only conquer with ideas, and in this age of specialization, where more and more is known about less and less, a general concept of a way of life cannot be understood, not even by the intellectuals. The whole of thinking to-day seems to be dedicated to the destruction of ideas.

We must take a vital interest in education, this is not a blasé statement, it behoves us to think about and decide about what we should teach a child. Education at the moment is often worse than a waste of time, it harms the child, it conditions him. A free society, with all the artificial amenities that civilization can give, can only be built on a first-rate ethos of education. There have been many proposed roads to freedom but with things as they are, and not as they ought to be, this I think is the only way. Our first duty should be to protect the child from any insidious attacks, from any attempt to inculcate it with ideas it cannot understand.

Already the child must battle against organised religious practices and pressures brought to bear by martially organised institutions. Nevertheless we should try to find a means which would assist a child into becoming a free man. A child, as a child, is free, it is his environment and education that enslave him. If we believe that our philosophy was once, and should be still, the natural order of things, then the real aim of education is to keep the child as he is and not try to develop him into anything but a human being. Put into different language, the aim of all education is to make the position of the State untenable. Many people, bodies, societies, political parties have published their solutions to the problem of education, most of them unqualified to do so. I suggest we do the same, even if we do not publish them, that we get together and hammer out our ideas and put them into writing. It may be just another windmill that has been tilted at, but education, in theory at least, has taken great steps since its inception, in 1870. It may carry in it the seeds of salvation and a brighter future for mankind—in some hands it could do the opposite—and if we think our solution to the problem of living together is the correct one then we should make our contribution to what may well be the swelling tide of emancipation. Skegness, June 11th. W.M.

FREEDOM PRESS

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One*
Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity*
Vol. 3, 1953, *Colonialism on Trial*
Vol. 4, 1954, *Living on a Volcano*
Vol. 5, 1955, *The Immoral Moralists*
Vol. 6, 1956, *Oil and Troubled Waters*

each volume paper 7s. 6d.
cloth 10s. 6d.

The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FREEDOM at 5/- a copy

E. A. GUTKIND: *The Expanding Environment* 8s. 6d.

VOLINE: *Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed)* cloth 12s. 6d. (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) *The Unknown Revolution* cloth 12s. 6d.

V. RICHARDS: *Lessons of the Spanish Revolution* 6s.

JOHN HEWETSON: *Ill-Health, Poverty and the State* cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

RUDOLF ROCKER: *Nationalism and Culture* cloth 21s.

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI: *Neither East nor West* paper 7s. 6d., cloth 10s. 6d.

ERRICO MALATESTA: *Anarchy* 6d. *Vote—What For?* 1d.

★ Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications: *Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute* cloth 5s. *Journey Through Utopia* cloth 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.I.

Problems of Propaganda

DEAR COMRADES,

S.F.'s criticisms of FREEDOM seem to me to be unjust, or perhaps directed at the wrong target. I can only speak for myself, but I have read every issue of FREEDOM for nearly ten years, and I still look forward to its arrival every weekend. In fact it is one of the great pleasures of the week.

Not every issue is equally interesting to me, because I am not equally interested in every possible topic. Generally speaking however, I am not disappointed.

The tragedy of the anarchist movement, and of the "left", the "progressives" and the "liberals" in general, is a failure to mobilise a sufficiently strong psychological force to overcome the authoritarianism of the majority of people. The anarchists and the other associated groups speak with the voice of reason, but men are not governed by their reason but by their feelings.

Possibly this is what S.F. is getting at. To condemn FREEDOM as dry and dull seems to me to be quite fantastic. But it would not be unfair to say that the anarchists, like the other "progressives" (hideous expression, but there seems no other comprehensive word) seem to have no other resources than that of reasoned argument, which is quite inadequate to influence people.

The forces which confront us are authoritarian fanaticism and authoritarian apathy. There have been some anarchist fanatics, but most lovers of liberty are easy-going folk. When they come up against the fanatic they are overthrown, or at least pushed on one side.

Apathy is an even more powerful force. I do sometimes argue with people in defence of anarchism. I attack their authoritarian philosophy of life. Sometimes they laugh, sometimes they are cross, but sometimes I have the really weird experience of discussing with a person who just goes on with his authoritarian arguments, after having listened courteously to mine, as if I had said

Has S.F. a Shadow Ed. Board up his Sleeve?

DEAR COMRADES,

I can't quite make up my mind whether S.F.'s letter in last week's FREEDOM was merely a provocative epistle just for the purpose of stimulating correspondence, or whether it was a genuine expression of his thoughts. Anyway it has tempted even an ignoramus like myself to put pen to paper and send the result to you. If S.F.'s letter is genuine then surely he should have a few more practical proposals to offer for the revitalizing of FREEDOM? Can we hear more from him about them?

His letter has perturbed me slightly. I've been reading FREEDOM now for a few years. I have always considered it intelligent, and extremely readable, now since reading S.F.'s letter I'm wondering if I too am in a rut, and that maybe any critical faculties I may have possessed are blunted.

Surely his proposal that the Editors of FREEDOM should find a dozen or so people in London (responsible ones of course), to run the paper for a few months can hardly be regarded as a serious one. But if such it turns out to be then I can only assume that S.F. must have a few people in mind. Could it be that there exists a "Shadow" Editorial Board for FREEDOM? What an interesting possibility.

Come on S.F., let us hear more, please. Yours sincerely,
D. OFFORD.

London, E.12.

Last, but not least!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 24

Deficit on Freedom £480
Contributions received £321
DEFICIT £159

June 6 to June 12

Donaghadee: J.T. £2/0/0; Oxford: Anon* 5/-; London: W.E.D.* £1/0/0; London: S.B.* 2/6; London: E.T. 5/6; Nottingham: H.R.L. £1/1/0; Skegness: R.W.M. 5/-.

Total ... 4 19 0

Previously acknowledged ... 3 16 11 7

1958 TOTAL TO DATE ... £321 10 7

GIFT OF BOOKS: London: Anon.

*Indicates regular contributor.

nothing at all. He listens, or appears to listen, without actually hearing anything I said.

Because I believe that man is naturally anarchistic, I believe that in some way this fundamental anarchistic quality must be got at. I do not know how it could be done, unless every human being could undergo some form of psychotherapy, which aimed at freeing him from the conditioning he or she had undergone from childhood.

A Reichian would say that the world is sick because most people are "armoured", tense and rigid in body and mind, full of fears and hate. How can one get through to these people? How can one mobilise the life-force in them, so that once again they can behave with the spontaneity and grace which is their birthright?

Criticisms aimed at FREEDOM as a paper, and at the anarchist movement as a whole, are often due to a feeling of real frustration. One asks oneself, "Why does nothing ever happen? Perhaps the others are not doing enough? Perhaps I am not doing enough?" One generally tends to blame other people, because one usually feels oneself to be doing the best one can (one understands one's own difficulties better than an outsider, or at least one is more aware of their extent).

In reality however, no one is to blame.

The criticisms are unfair in themselves, but something is wrong somewhere. Anarchism has been preached for over a hundred years in Europe, but it seems less likely to succeed now than it did fifty years ago.

Yours fraternally,
London, June 9. ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Every Sunday at 7.30 at
THE MALATESTA CLUB,
32 Percy Street,
Tottenham Court Road, W.1.

LECTURE - DISCUSSIONS

JUNE 22.—John Greig on
FREEDOM & ITS APPLICATION
JUNE 29.—Tony Gibson on
PARANOIA AS A SOCIAL FORCE
July 6.—Arthur W. Uloth on
MAN AGAINST SOCIETY
JULY 13.—Donovan Pedely on
ANARCHISM & DEMOCRACY
Questions, Discussion and Admission all free.

★ Malatesta Club ★

SWARAJ HOUSE,
32 PERCY STREET,
TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1.

ACTIVITIES

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
London Anarchist Group Meetings
(see Announcements Column)

Trad Jazz at the Malatesta

Every Friday and Saturday from 7.30

THE MALATESTA JAZZ BAND

Members (1/6) and their guests (2/-) only.
MALATESTA CLUB
32 Percy Street
Tottenham Court Road W1
Jazz Men welcome
Organised by IAC

Every Wednesday at 7.30 (prompt)
BONAR THOMPSON speaks

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:

12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies

12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 14/6 (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.I. England
Tel.: Chancery 8364