

'The wage system is endurable only when contrasted with absolute bondage.'

HORACE GREELY

In this Issue:

ANARCHIST ATTITUDES TO REFORM
NUT CASES
BERKMAN ON WAR

APRIL 8 1961 Vol 22 No 12

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

THE *Evening Standard* in publishing a list of "Easter Monday attendance figures" showing that fewer people were at the Ban the Bomb rally in Trafalgar Square (32,000) than at either Goodwood races (45,000) or the football match at Stamford Bridge (60,000), implied, presumably, that more people were interested in one major football match than in the cause of nuclear disarmament. But why in that case did the Trafalgar Square rally dominate the *Evening Standard's* front page and spill over onto the centre spread and dominate that too?

There can be no doubt that one does not have to sympathise with the objectives of the CND in order to be impressed and moved by demonstrations such as last week's march, or the sit-down in February. For unlike the 60,000 football fans

A Welcome to All . . .

New Members at the CND Annual Meeting

who are *spectators* at a performance of 22 "stars", those who take part in these marches are both the actors and the spectators in a moving demonstration of solidarity. As one B.B.C. commentator put it, the reward for the marchers was the "rare experience of sharing something with so many others".

And whilst Aldermaston marches will not move governments they are perhaps important for the survival—and growth—of a movement such as CND. They are a kind of annual general meeting at which members feed their faith and encourage others to join them. We do not say this

sneeringly. Would that the anarchists could hold a four-day rally of anarchists and sympathisers a tenth the size!

THIS year, however, infiltration of the CND by Communists and fellow-travellers was most noticeable. This year, for the first time, banners of the political parties were much more in evidence. The argument for including the banners of branches of political parties and Trades Unions is that since the CND seeks to bring about its programme by constitutional means; that is, by influencing parliament and the government in power, the more support they get from the political parties the greater their chances. On the other hand the case for excluding the Communist Party is, to our minds, a strong one.

Quite apart from the widespread prejudice evoked in the minds of the public in general and more often than not for the wrong reasons to any initiative or movement which is sponsored or supported by the Communists, we believe that many sincere radicals who would be prepared to work with people of many different political and religious affiliations on determined issues, would be unwilling to do so if it also meant joining with members of the Communist Party. And for the reason that one cannot trust a party, or its supporters, which owes blind allegiance to the Russian régime and supports or opposes government, initiatives, policies and principles only at

the behest of the Soviet leadership. Such a party is without principles and unpredictable.

Its attitude to the CND is a case in point. Up to last year the party leadership was opposed to its members taking part (whether it was be-

cause they were not allowed to carry their party banners on the march, or whether they were afraid their members might be contaminated by contact with the pacifists and non-party radicals, we do not know). But
Continued on page 4

Sit-in extending

THE "sit-in" movement organised by U.S. Southern Negroes which celebrated its first anniversary in February owes most of the success it has had not to government or legal edicts but to a form of direct action generally frowned on by "constitutionalists".

Last year a handful of students from the Southern city of Greensboro decided to protest against the lunch counter system run by most stores whereby Negroes were only served while standing up, seats being reserved for whites. By this method store keepers could pander to the principle of white superiority and still benefit economically from the considerable purchasing power of the Negro.

In the beginning a few courageous students decided among themselves to protest against the insult by arranging to occupy seats at a few lunch-counter stores. They quietly asked for food and when they were refused they remained seated resisting any kind of reaction to the ensuing abuse from white customers. Finally they were removed by force by the police and some were imprisoned.

This method of protest spread spontaneously among students throughout the South, participants disciplining themselves not to react to any form of abuse so that the protest was truly a non-violent one. The result of this action has brought

about "lunch-counter integration in at least 85 other Southern cities".

There are signs that "the mood" in the United States is changing on the question of segregation except in some die-hard areas in the South, and it can be said that the "sit-in" movement was helped to success by the fact that store-keepers suffered financial loss through the successful economic Negro boycott and, therefore, more easily gave in to pressure.

The important point is, however, that in spite of all the utterances from Washington on equality and the edicts from the Supreme Court on man's fundamental rights, few practical demonstrations of public de-segregation emerged in areas where division is accepted as a natural condition even by many Negroes themselves. But a movement of determined people taking "illegal" non-violent action, in a year have brought about a change in a situation which would have gone on indefinitely if the decision had been left to the moral conscience of the whites who hold that the Negro is by nature an inferior being.

An important lesson has been given by the Negroes in the Southern States of America to those people who argue that social problems can only be solved successfully through the process of constitutional government.

We would not hold that the confirmed segregationist will change his attitude because Negroes are now sitting on seats previously reserved for whites, but it is arguable that greater social integration will in time lessen the white man's irrational fears, and with closer association discover that the black man is a "white man" after all.

The struggle in the South is not over and resistance is strong, but as far as the "sit-in" movement is concerned its fight continues.

In Atlanta, Nashville, Charlotte, Greensboro and High Point and other cities Negroes and whites continue to force the issue in cinemas, theatres and restaurants. Arrests have been made but the movement is growing which will extend to: "pray-ins, apply-ins (equality of employment opportunity), buy-ins (equal opportunity to purchase homes), study-ins and bury-ins."

ANARCHY 2

Journal of Anarchist ideas is NOW ON SALE

Contents consist of a symposium on WORKERS' CONTROL

Introduction: Looking for a Movement, articles on the approach to industrial democracy by Geoffrey Ostergaard, the gang system in Coventry by Reg Wright, workers control in the building industry by James Lynch, aspects of syndicalism in Spain, Sweden and USA by Philip Holgate.

ANARCHY is Published by Freedom Press at 1/6 on the last Saturday of every month.

SOMETHING FOR EVERYBODY FROM THE KIND MR. KENNEDY

PRESIDENT KENNEDY promised the American electors that if he were returned to power he would review the United States Defence programme. He has "kept his word" and last week sent his defence budget to Congress which shows that for the 1961 fiscal year he can manage on the \$41,371 m. (£14,000 m.) which is what his predecessor's administration reckoned it would cost to protect the American people from would-be aggressors. But for 1962 he will need an extra £700 millions to provide all kinds of new refinements to this invulnerable force of missiles and aircraft. We were particularly interested to see that he recommended the spending of \$39 m. for "increases in Army personnel strength to expand guerilla warfare units". Such units, one would have thought were rather out of place in the struggle against Russia, but of course they might come in very useful in Cuba, or on loan to some South American state in the throes of "revolution".

In spite of the fact that the Kennedy administration was going to ignore the various pressure groups from the Pentagon and the big industrialists (headed by ex-military men) it seems that his new programme very neatly satisfies everybody. For though he has "drastically reduced" development of say the B-70 (which was to have flown at a speed three times that of sound!) he has very conveniently found justification to increase the



Americans to Pay More

number of airlift aircraft from 50 to 129, for which an additional \$172m (£60m.) will be required. The shipyards will be delighted to learn that the submarine programme will be speeded up so that by 1963 they will be launched at the rate of one a month instead of 5 a year. Instead of 19 Polaris submarines by the end of 1963 there will be 29. (An achievement indeed in the war for peace). American shipbuilders and Admirals will also be encouraged to learn that the new President is recommending the spending of £14m. for the "construction of additional amphibious transport of the new type" and there will be a further £29 m. in new funds "for an increase in the Navy's ship rehabilitation and modernisation programme."

The Army is less favoured, but even so it cannot be said that the President has left them out in the cold. He is proposing to scrap 73 "domestic and foreign installations" as excess to America's needs but compared with the 7,000 military installations that exist in America and throughout the world, the cut is not drastic. And by way of compensation there is the £14m. in new

funds for increases in Army personnel strength, and the £80m. "in new obligational authority"—whatever that may mean—for "increased procurement of such items as helicopters, rifles, modern non-nuclear weapons, electronics and communications equipment, improved ammunition for artillery and infantry weapons, and torpedoes" does offer very useful contracts for industry and restores some of the dignity of the Army.

Max Freedman writing in the *Guardian* on the President's Message, declares that for the first time it "discusses specific defence questions in great detail, presents a philosophy to sustain a doctrine of

Continued on page 4

ANARCHISM THE BOMB WORKERS' CONTROL

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

PUBLIC MEETING

Sunday April 9 at 7.15 pm

Working Men's Club Hall

Clerkenwell Road EC1

(Nr. Holborn Hall)

Speakers from: Ian Celnick, Rita Milton, Jack Robinson, Donald Room, Philip Sansom, Frances Sokolov, Arthur Uloth.

ADMISSION FREE. QUESTIONS

The Anarchist's Attitude to Reform

REFORM or revolution—we still hear the old crude dichotomy postulated as though it were a matter of two alternatives and two only. This can be pretty depressing to one like the present writer who cannot see a dog's chance in hell of our society being changed in the foreseeable future by any sort of all-embracing radical overthrow of the existing set-up. Are we then to spend our time merely philosophising about an ideal state we have no hope of attaining? That is not my view, but it is one often enough attributed to anarchists by those outside the movement who see our scepticism regarding reform movements as evidence of a fruitless nihilism.

Put simply, the argument against the reformist approach is this: the conduct of social relations by domination and coercion instead of co-operation by agreement is not just one of many aspects of our society, it is basic and fully embodied in the institutions of government and law whose sanctions are the ultimate ones; it is this basis of our social organisation that is precisely what we reject; yet reforms are aimed at ameliorating or mitigating conditions in this or that particular while leaving the basis unchanged. Indeed, it is quite astonishing to see just how close people who would call themselves "progressives" or perhaps "libertarians" can get to the anarchist position on a whole wide range of specific issues while explicitly accepting the necessity for the rule of law as a fundamental and permanent condition. More simply still, they accept the essential synonymy of "law" and "order".

If anti-sociality, destructive aggression are thought of as basic human qualities requiring constant restraint then the need for the rule of law follows inescapably; but the result is not what I would call order, but rather something like "a structure imposed on chaos". To me, order implies an essential har-

mony; I think of the ordered pattern seen in the natural, unforced growth of a living thing; I think of the implications of the use of the word in its context of the final lines of Baudelaire's *Invitation au Voyage*:

"La, tout n'est qu'ordre et beauté,
Luxe, calme et volupté."

There is little suggestion of *beauté, luxe, calme et volupté* in the idea of a society so bursting at the seams with dissension that it can be held together only by the sanctions of a legal code and a police force. Anarchists, however, do not accept that this is the natural, inevitable order of things. How can we? To suppose it is to suppose that the human race is set totally apart from the rest of evolution. A tree does not need laws and policemen to make it grow upwards, indeed restraints would stunt its growth. Anarchists believe this applicable as an analogy to humans: believe spontaneous sociality to be the norm of human behaviour and that coercion itself creates the state of social ill-health wherein a police force seems essential. There is ample evidence for this belief in sociological, anthropological, psychological and educational studies; anyone who gives himself time to reflect will see that it is borne out by his personal experience (I do not propose to elaborate this argument, but simply ask the reader to put this question to himself: for how much of the time and in what areas is your decent reasonable conduct towards your associates in fact determined by the threat of sanctions?).

The trouble with the reformist approach at its worst, and I think it is this that has made anarchists so sceptical of it, is that it is not informed by this con-

ception we anarchists have of social organisation as an organic, dynamic thing. It is mechanistic: you weigh things in an exact balance, detect this or that element of injustice or wrong, and by carefully planned statutory adjustment redress it.

The trouble with this statement of the reformist attitude is of course that it is a caricature! Nobody in the least likely to have any influence really thinks like that these days. Our objection that the initiators of reforms have no idea of changing the coercive basis of social institutions holds good, but we on our side have to see that "the free society" is not all-or-nothing; society consists of people, and people, more or fewer of them, can be more or less free through an infinite range of degree, and can be freer in some respects and less free in others at the same time.

The anarchist philosophy is essentially humanist: we do not base our ideas of what is good upon some abstract laws, we believe life is to be enjoyed. Reforms of this kind that can ameliorate people's living conditions and they can remove certain restrictions and we ought to be glad to see any reform that has either of these effects. We ought not to look upon "reform within the framework of democracy, law and order" as all of a piece. In particular, reform of statute law is likely to move clearly in the direction of greater freedom of the individual. Look at this "programme" of desirable reforms drawn up by a "progressive" body fully convinced of the basic rightness of the rule of law:

- the abolition of all literary, theatrical and film censorship except for the protection of children under 16;
- the abolition of all legal interference with the sexual activities of adolescents under 16, provided both parties to an intimate relationship are under 18;
- reform of the Divorce Laws to permit immediate divorce by mutual consent, and divorce after three years' separation at the request of only one party to the marriage;
- the legalisation of abortion by qualified medical practitioners;
- the provision of free birth control information under the National Health Service;
- the enactment of the Wolfenden Committee's proposals on homosexuality between consenting adult males;
- the repeal of the Street Offences Act and the abolition of all legal discrimina-

tion against "common prostitutes";

- the abolition of police interference with the letting of accommodation by the hour to unmarried couples;

- the abolition of all restrictions on international travel, notably the requirement to carry passports, and—until this is achieved by international agreement—the granting of passports as of right to every British applicant;

- abolition of capital and corporal punishment;
- re-education to replace punishment as the principle governing the treatment of prisoners;

- reform of Court procedure, disallowing confessions to the police uncorroborated by objective evidence in criminal cases.

Surely we must be quite clear that the actual putting into effect of any of these reforms would have the direct effect of enabling or encouraging people to live more freely, more responsibly, more enjoyably in at least some respects. And any general spreading of attitudes of autonomy is bound to depend upon the degree to which society actually allows ordinary people to live in this way. The very toughest will behave anarchistically whatever sanctions society tries to apply;

but the very toughest are few, and even they could not claim to fully enjoy living surrounded by unfree people.

Perhaps the most pressing and legitimate ground for anarchists to be chary of purely reformist activity is the inordinate amount of effort liable to be expended in the achievement of modest advances. It would be hard to find a clearer example than the recent failure of Kenneth Robinson's Medical Termination of Pregnancy Bill to secure even a second reading. Enormous amounts of energy had gone into the preparation and presentation of this Bill and the ground prepared for it by a concentrated campaign of information and persuasion, to no effect whatever, and by parliamentary rules of procedure another five years must go by before anything more can be tried along those lines. Anarchists are few and can generally best use their time and energies in more direct ways of resisting the encroachments of authority upon their own and others' autonomy, leaving reform within the law to those whose thinking cannot, at present, take them any further.

ILL

Tasty morsel for a hungry Press

AT THE BEGINNING OF LAST MONTH a Swedish writer, Mrs. Sara Lindman was arrested in a Johannesburg flat with Mr. Peter Nthite, former national secretary of the African National Congress youth movement (and one of those formerly charged in the notorious treason trial), and both were charged with contravening the immorality law which imposes heavy penalties for sexual intercourse between white and non-white. They were due to stand trial this week, but the charges have been withdrawn on the Transvaal Attorney General's instructions. No reasons were given. Just before the announcement, FREEDOM received from its Swedish correspondent a report on the reactions in the Swedish press to the arrest of Mrs. Lindman, which is an interesting document, also because the writer is himself an African, and sees Swedish

Press reactions in perhaps a rather different light than a white observer might. He writes: The whole story of Sara Lindman "a well known Swedish author and very popular here" has now fallen into the hands of Sweden's bourgeois, sensational daily press.

The whole private life of this poor woman has been churned up to suit the hungry needs of the gutter press.

The authoress was reputed to have gone to South Africa (of all places) for a "change of environment" and to study the Zulu language. It is, however, very difficult to take her seriously—although one can deeply sympathise with her protest. When interviewed by a sensation-hungry Liberal newspaper she said things like "Now, I must protect Peter" and "I hope my family in Sweden are not ashamed of me" etc., etc. Are these the statements of a mature writer or the babblings of a politically unrealistic ignoramus?

She was starry-eyed with indignation at the actions of the police when they forced their way into her flat in Johannesburg. Actions no different to those of the police in other parts of the world. No different to the "democratic" actions of Sweden's Congo "police force".

Yet the press criticize South Africa's police methods, forgetting that the same institution in the "democratic" Scandinavian countries is used to maintain "law and order" in much the same way. They perhaps differ only in the way the State machine is manipulated. Colour laws are not enforced where there are no coloured workers to be economically exploited. If however this authoress had looked closely enough at Welfare Capitalism she could have found discrimination on her door step even against other Europeans, and Africans have also been known to be molested by Swedish authority for the same "crime" in question, and even deported.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

BOOKS?

We can supply

ANY book in print.
Also out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found! This includes paper-backs, children's books and text books. (Please supply publisher's name if possible).

NEW BOOKS

Political Philosophy of Bakunin 42/-
Pioneers of American Freedom
Rudolf Rocker 14/-
General Idea of the Revolution in the 19th Century
P. J. Proudhon 30/-
In the Struggle for Equality
B. Yelensky 17/6
Political Justice: Essay on Property
William Godwin 8/6
Anarchism and Other Essays
Emma Goldman 3/9
Marx, Proudhon and European Socialism
J. Hampden Jackson 8/6

REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

God and the State
Michael Bakunin 3/-
Does God Exist?
Sebastian Faure 1/6
The Spanish Labyrinth
Gerald Brenan 13/6

SECOND-HAND

Fallen Bastions (1939)
G. E. R. Gedye (damaged) 3/6
Soviet Atomic Spies
Bernard Newman 5/-
The Challenge of our Time
Koestler, Bernal, Forster 4/-
Zaharoff: the Armaments King
Robert Neumann 5/-
Science for Peace and Socialism
J. D. Bernal and Maurice Cornforth 2/6
The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism
Bernard Shaw 6/6
The Country of the Blind (U.S.S.R.)
George S. Counts and Nucia Lodge 5/-
Rise Like Lions (Paper)
William Gallacher 3/6
The Soviet Slave Empire
Albert Konrad Herling 8/6
On Liberty and the Subjection of Women
John Stuart Mill (top of spine dam.) 3/6
The Incomparable Aphra
George Woodcock 5/-
In the Castle of my Skin
George Lamming 4/6
The Human Use of Human Beings
Norbert Wiener 12/6

Freedom Bookshop

(Open 2 p.m.—5.30 p.m. daily;
10 a.m.—1 p.m. Thursdays;
10 a.m.—5 p.m. Saturdays).

17a MAXWELL ROAD
FULHAM SW6 Tel: REN 3736

Speed, Time & Death

IN the depths of the sea there are fishes who are all eyes and mouth. We know that such creatures exist. Their pictures are in all the text books dealing with the subject. Yet every time one sees them one cannot help being almost as surprised as if one had just discovered them for the first time.

We have known, in Europe, for sixty years and more, of the craze for speed and the worship of business which exist in the United States, and yet every time one studies any aspect of North American culture one is surprised anew by the things it can produce.

This novel deals with the advertising business, and with the cult of speed. But it also concerns itself with more sinister aspects of American life.

Why is it that in the United States there is this strange tendency to link sex with death? It is almost medieval. In Europe we seem to have passed the stage of regarding sex (and woman) as demonic. Or at least we are getting past it. Do the Americans derive this phobia from the Puritans who founded their country? It is strange indeed that such a technically advanced people, who appear on the surface to be so hedonistic, should have such an archaic attitude.

The connection between the joy of speed and of sex is explicit throughout the book. Speed can become a safety valve, a socially permitted substitute for sex. Hence the passion for driving fast cars, which often has fatal results.

The hero of the story, who is already inclined to fantastic infatuations, and has of course the now fashionable mother fixation, falls in love with the photo of a girl whom he has killed in an accident. It is a hit-and-run accident, which makes it worse. He stopped and went back to her, but he saw the lights of another car approaching and he panicked. Driving from the scene he himself has an accident. After coming out of hospital, filled with a strong sense of guilt for what he has done, he decides to atone, not by giving himself up to the police, but by using the dead girl's picture as the symbol for a road safety

campaign, that the advertising company which employs him is about to launch.

By this means he tortures himself, as he desires to do, and at the same time he keeps the dead girl "alive", if only in his own mind. Her face is soon on all the billboards across the country. To be close to her he goes to sleep on a piece of waste ground at the foot of one of these hoardings.

The story hinges to a large extent on the question as to whether he will or will not give himself up, and what will be the consequences for him and for his firm, if he does. Yet there is no suggestion that he is wicked because he does not immediately head for the nearest police station and "pay his debt to society". Very rightly, he is sympathetically regarded as a mentally sick person by almost all the characters, and the reader is invited to share their view.

But this sounds more humane than it is, because, when later in the book he rapes a girl in a field, there is not the slightest suggestion that he ought to confess to that. The episode is treated as if it were a necessary stage in his psychological cure, as if one of the best things possible for a young man on the verge of a mental breakdown is to go out and rape a girl or two!

Judging by this account, American life has a frantic, hysterical quality. Everyone is rushing about the whole time, soothing themselves with tranquilisers or by visiting the psychiatrist. To visit a psychiatrist is not regarded as a disgrace as it is in England. One feels that the policy of "keeping a stiff upper lip" would not enable the individual to survive very long in an American advertising agency. Probably he would crack up in a few weeks.

Sex-guilt must have a lot to do with all this, yet I think too that there is another cause. These people, by dashing about, wisecracking, talking in a

clipped slang, jumping into fast cars and rushing into the blue, are seeking to beat the clock. By travelling as fast as possible between two points they hope to save more time for themselves at each end of the journey. The policy is to conquer time. As men evolve to a certain level of consciousness they begin to see time as an enemy. It flows away so fast, and death is just around the corner. Hence the accent is on youth and speed, not out of a rich joy of life, but out of a fear of life—and death.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

SELFISH?

SUPPOSE I decide to be selfish, let me see what follows.

I refuse to take part in wars—there are two mugs to a bayonet—and I am not going to be one of them. As a result if everybody was selfish enough there would be no wars. One of the things I want (which if I am selfish I will get) is companionship, love, and affection: I cannot be myself by myself. I must treat the people I come into contact with with consideration and kindness—yet I will refuse to respect the conventional restrictions on social behaviour which cause so much unhappiness to so many. Only by co-operation can many of my goals be achieved; if I am selfish I will co-operate to achieve our common goals. Furthermore, being selfish, I will not spend time achieving results which are useless to me (such as developing armaments) nor will I labour to line the pockets of others who play no useful part in production. If we all produce only

things that will be useful to us then someone or other will produce (because he needs them) all the things that are necessary to satisfy us and these will be available to all. Once I feel a need for something I will set about getting it produced—and I will produce more than I need (or the group which gets together to make it needs) since I need other things that other people produce and which they will give me in return for the things I produce. It would be no use producing anything worthless since I would get nothing in return. I refuse to co-operate with anyone who would exploit me since I would be better off if I didn't. As a result no one can exploit anyone since no-one will be exploited. If I selfishly strive to be happy, and succeed, those around me will "catch" it and be happy too. One of the ways to increase happiness is to have an aim in life—let the aim be to be selfish—not, at first sight at least, the most difficult of aims. Selfish attention to our own needs seems to be a good basis for a good society to live in.

Bushey.

J.R.

The following is a condensed version of an article first published in FREEDOM in December 1927. We print it for the benefit of those who cherish any illusions in government and who think that they can be persuaded to change their policies by moral arguments or "ban the bomb" marches.

But equally important is the point made by Berkman that one cannot abolish war without abolishing authoritarianism as well. For today the vocal "ban the bomb" movement seems to believe that war preparations can be abolished without the need for changing the structure of society.

HOW TO END WAR

THERE is nothing more hypocritical than the talk of the Great Powers about disarmament or limitation of armaments. While they are talking about it and calling "conferences" to discuss the subject, they are proceeding to increase their military and naval strength. The "discussions" serve to make the people believe in the "good intentions and peaceful aims" of the various Governments and give the latter time and opportunity for war preparations.

Liberals who fall for this obvious game must be very naïve indeed. As to the masses, they are unfortunately too patriotic or inane—which is the same thing, essentially—to stop to ponder over the significance of the situation. The fact is that all the Powers are actually and intensively preparing for a new war in the near future. Here and there are already heard thinly-veiled hints about the "inevitableness" of another international slaughter.

That is the situation in Europe to-day; in the whole world, in fact. And the political atmosphere is charged with potential opportunities.

Yet as long as the implements of war will be manufactured they will also be used. For that reason—and it is merely one of the many—moral preachment alone can never abolish war.

There have always been movements in the history of man's progress that tried to make man happier and better by improving him instead of improving the conditions under which he suffered. Take Christianity, for instance. For two thousand years it admonishes man to be "better", but it has never lifted a finger to give him the opportunity to be better. If anything, he has become worse. True, he has learned to write and read, has obtained a smattering of so-called education, he has learned even to fly. But that has been accomplished without the Church and without religion. Indeed, in spite of the Church, which has always fought the efforts of science and popular education. But though man can fly now, is he "better" than before, in any sense whatever? Surely he is no more rational or human, unless the slaughtering of millions by modern artillery is more rational and human than the killing of a few hundreds with bow and arrow.

Anti-Militarist preaching can hope to have little more real effect upon human life and conduct than Christianity has had.

Moral preachments which are not coupled with the immediate material interests of the masses, and which do not offer the opportunity of actual application cannot become a vital influence in the behaviour of mankind.

By this I mean that anti-Militarist propaganda alone cannot prevent or stop war as long as existing conditions compel men to exist by means

long as there is opportunity and Capitalistic necessity for war.

To be effective, anti-Militarist agitation must begin with the parents, continue in the school, reach the workers in the munition factories, spread further to the masses at large and prepare them for international solidarity and general refusal to do war preparation and war service.

Yet even that would not be sufficient to bring about a complete cessation of war—as long as Capitalism and government exist.

More important than the methods I have mentioned is the effort to abolish the very system of subjection and exploitation—the system of authority and slavery—upon which our whole civilisation is founded.

Not only Capitalism. For we had wars long before there was any Capitalism. It is the subjection of man by man, of class by class, of nation by nation, of national territorial government and its consequent desire for expansion, that makes for war. In short, the spirit of dominance and authority, of compulsion in whatever form.

Unless we eradicate this spirit together with the institutions which foster its exercise, unless we entirely abolish both Capitalism and government, we cannot hope to have fought the last war.

I am convinced that it is more possible and more practical to abolish the twin gods of Mammon and Mars than to try to abolish the one while leaving the other intact.

I am convinced of it because the propaganda to abolish government and Capitalism touches the immediate, vital everyday interests of the workers throughout the world. Exclusive anti-war propaganda does not so deeply and generally appeal to those interests. For that reason you can, for example, induce a thousand workers to stop their work and strike for better pay. You can even organise a general strike in a given industry, on the basis of immediate improvement of conditions. But could we organise a general strike against war preparations? A general strike against war would mean revolution, and it is for that that we should work.

Social reforms, limitation of armaments, Leagues of Nations, and similar efforts are dangerous make-shifts that only confuse the real issue. Nor can the unseating of one Government and the replacing of it by some other accomplish any real, fundamental change in social life. Not even if such a Government calls itself "proletarian" and rules in the name of the "dictatorship of the working class." That is all mere shifting of political actors, while the scene remains the same. It is the scene that must be changed, the scene on which national and class struggles are taking place, the scene of Authority and Exploitation.

And should that change require another war, a social revolution, let it come and be the last.

THIS 'New Look' of MRA is the work of a group of talents from advertising, publishing, journalism and politics which have turned it, in the words of the *New Yorker* into a "form of evangelism which combines the advantages of mysticism, mesmerism, spiritualism, eroticism, psycho-analysis and higher-power salesmanship". To this impressive list we may add 'anti-communism'.

The basic tenets of the movement are living by four standards. Absolute purity, absolute honesty, absolute unselfishness, absolute love. Every day, 'groupers' have a 'quiet time' when they get into touch with God and note down their 'guidance' for the day and examine their lives in the light of the four standards. Any shortcomings must be 'shared' with fellow-Groupists at the first opportunity. The psycho-analytical release mechanism of the confessional is combined with the exhibitionist breast-beating of the public purge. Sins are frequently exaggerated to increase the salvation. Trivialities often find their way into confessions and also into 'guidance'.

The turgid stream of Moral Rearmament literature is full of platitudes. Intellectualism seems to be frowned upon, for example in *The Crowning Experience* the communist villain is shown against a background of books.

Examples of the intellectual heights of MRA are a song in one of their plays 'Sorry is a Magic Little Word'; the word play S(D)N—its the self (I) that makes sin; two kingdoms in another play are 'Eiluph' mei and 'Weiheitu'. I love me and we hate you—get it?, two very powerful slogans Jesus—'Just Exactly Suits Us Sinners' and Prayer—'Powerful Radiograms Always Yours'; and a thought from God via Frank Buchman—'It's the banana that leaves the bunch that gets skinned'.

This sloganizing seems to be a substitute for thought. In all their vast output of literature there seems to be no coherent explanation of Moral Rearmament in terms divorced from private personal experience—'changing' doesn't seem to be very thoroughgoing. The Bishop of Guildford has said that "its [Moral Rearmament's] sense of social wrong is very weak."

In a lecture at Mackinac training centre in 1943 the following brilliant analysis of Communism was given by Buchman: "Today I want to talk about great forces at work in the world. Sixty and more years ago you didn't hear much about the Communist Party. To

begin with there was only one man—Karl Marx. Then for a long time only a small group. Eventually world conditions made it possible for Karl Marx to do his work and Communism is the result."

With the minimizing of intellectualism the movement moves into totemism as defined by Harold Stovin in his book *Totem*. God is restored to his old job as tribal ju-ju to be appealed to in cases of difficulty or doubt, the hearty comradeship with all the psychiatric suspicions which this arouses, the boy-scoutish insistence upon absolute standards, the Puritanism of the anti-cigarette and anti-alcohol tendency in house-parties (see also Peter Howard's criticism of *Porgy* and *Bess* in puritanical terms), the ritualism in the quiet time, and pervading all, the group feeling of collectivity with the elimination of individuality.

The shedding of guilt and the feeling of righteousness from confession is a useful surrogate as, attested by the Catholic Church, the Moscow trials, the Chinese purges, the Salvation Army, the false confessions which any murder case brings up or any police detective can extract. The Moral Rearmament doctrines of 'coming clean' and 'sharing', utilize the euphoric feeling induced by confessing that one felt badly about the church trustees, didn't pay a college bill in 1935, defrauded an insurance company and got a job on an out of date testimonial (this confession was received so well, that later the amount defrauded was increased and the testimonial was not out of date but forged); felt jealous of a competitor in business; 'worried about the weather', etcetera, etcetera, there is no limit to the triviality of these 'sins'. It must, after all, be difficult to find original sins. The insistence of MRA on restitution leads to some embarrassing moments for the recipient of an apology for an incident which he had

forgotten—or even had no knowledge!

The second ritual of MRA is guidance—surrendering oneself to guidance. In the stress and strain of the modern world it is undoubted that there is value in some time being free for solitude and contemplation. But to place one's future in control of whims—very often far from divine in origin and then claiming them to be the voice of God is authentic mumbo-jumbo. Guidance has been given on expenditure on postage, on how much to pay a hotel, how much to tip the servants; guidance has been given to cancel war-time peace-meetings, to evacuate to the West country, to visit a cinema (nothing arose from this except that it "probably saved the Grouper from something which would have happened had she not gone to the cinema"), guidance has been given to buy a dress, throw up a University career, a three-year-old had guidance 'to eat more porridge'. Geoffrey Williamson in *Inside Buchmanism* refers to the vexed question of conflicts of guidance at higher levels in MRA. "A system has been devised whereby individual guidance can be 'checked' by a collective guidance, with ultimate reference, if necessary, to Buchman as head of the inner ring".

MRA makes no claims to being a religion, it has even in the last few years given up exclusive concentration on the Protestant, or even Christian faith, it proclaims itself an 'ideology' which is a vague enough term (the Concise Oxford defines 'ideology' as 'science of ideas; visionary speculation; manner of thinking characteristic of a class or individual; ideas at the basis of some economic or political system as *Fascist, Nazi*). Its whole religious basis consists in its four aspirations and the two devices of 'guidance' and 'sharing' with this insubstantial framework it has erected its 'ideology'.

JACK ROBINSON.
(To be continued)

NUT Cases

AT the National Union of Teachers' annual conference at Brighton, it was finally agreed that Nuclear Disarmament is no concern of the union, although individual members may feel strongly in some cases. In 1958 this resolution was first passed and the efforts of two individuals on the executive to bring the subject up again on the grounds that the union's hands should not be tied for the future was heavily defeated after discussion which pointed out the divisions which the subject of nuclear disarmament had caused in other bodies "seemingly better fitted to consider such matters".

Why "other bodies" or Unions should be more fitted to consider this within their "scope and aims" than the NUT is something of a puzzle since it is precisely for children that nuclear weapons hold most of their horrors in a way that previous weapons never did.

On the salaries issue however, the teachers were much more militant, declaring that "the achievement of a satisfactory basic scale must take precedence over all other aspects of salary policy", but apparently not over nuclear warfare!

The urgent needs of schools, youth clubs and other educational facilities were spoken of in a plea for more finance and more teachers. They called on the government, local education authorities and the public to show a better sense of social priorities in this, saying how more efforts were devoted to harmful influences than to provide young people with healthy activities that could "help them grow up and develop their character". The press, television and popular entertainments then came in for attack because "they had appeared to have abdicated all responsibility for the moral and spiritual welfare of young people." (Applause).

Sleepless Nights in Brighton

During the debate on education cuts, Miss Freda Cooke, a former president and a Manchester Headmistress (who appears to have had no sleep during her weekend in Brighton) said:

"Since I arrived in Brighton I have had my eyes opened, as I am sure you have. Last night I saw walking along the promenade at 1.30 a.m. a dozen young couples, not one of them over 17 years of age. At 6.30 this morning there

were 20 or so youths outside my hotel who looked as though they had been sleeping out or had been up all night."

"I thought: 'We have failed in giving these young people any incentive for real orderly behaviour. We have not given them the opportunity to become useful and socially responsible citizens because we have failed to provide the right kind of amenities and the money for the youth services.'"

This hypocritical moralising cant betrays the incredibly blinkered attitude of those 'concerned' in our education nowadays. To call for moral and spiritual responsibility in the press and television, urging stricter censorship over these; to urge a sense of social priorities from authorities and public; and yet to wash their hands entirely of the biggest threat to moral and spiritual welfare that ever has existed—the threat of nuclear weapons—is to show an enormous and terrible misunderstanding of the social problems they consider their prerogative.

Training in responsibility must be practised not preached in our schools and classrooms. To teach science without this is to ensure a new generation of bombmakers; and from whence came our present atomic scientists if not from the top stream of state education classrooms—the applauded successes that pass the exams and are patted on the head for their prowess.

Jam-jars or H-Bombs?

At another conference, that of the Education Welfare Officers' National Association at Whitley Bay, schools were attacked for allowing too many collections for charity because of the demands by a minority of children on their parents to cough up when the parents cannot provide the money thus causing the children "to feel keenly their inability to conform with the majority." One member said that children in his area were sent out to collect jam jars for funds, which he thought was "beneath the dignity of an education authority and should not be allowed".

While wondering if the parents could afford the empty jam jars, perhaps a more profound thought would be whether these parents can afford to pay taxes for armaments and nuclear weapons and not help charities. Who needs training in responsibility—the children or the teachers?

German Social Democrats Refuse to Join Anti-Nuclear March

The Social Democratic Party has refused to join in anti-nuclear rearmament marches at Easter, though three years ago the Social Democrats proclaimed an anti-atom death campaign in St. Paul's Church, Frankfurt. The most important part of this campaign was to be undying opposition to any kind of nuclear rearmament. At the time the Social Democrats opposed even the storing of nuclear weapons under American control in Western Germany.

Yesterday's announcement by the party chairman, Herr Ollenhauer, explained that the marches—which will start from rocket launching bases at Dortmund, Miltenberg, Hohne, Kaiserslautern, and Ingolstadt—had been organised by people with whom the Social Democrats do not want to associate themselves. The marches, he declared, were not the appropriate means of making progress towards disarmament.

Herr Ollenhauer made it plain too that his party now officially opposes unilateral disarmament. He said that marches and protests played into the hands of people who wanted to "leave things as they are"—meaning, presumably, a state of cold war with a divided Germany. These were the Communists, who would exploit such protests for their own ends. Herr Ollenhauer urged the making of every possible effort to secure general, controlled disarmament.

Opposition to unilateral disarmament may therefore be expected to feature in the election manifesto which the Social Democrats will publish in Bonn on April 28th.

LETTERS

Permanent Protest and Utopia

I MUST put T.G. right on some points. In his article in FREEDOM (1/4/61) entitled "Permanent Protest?" he writes, "Yet there are some anarchists . . . who neglect the pluralistic nature of anarchism and try to combine it with manism. They are utopians for whom the end of history is the realisation of the absolute spirit, or in the final analysis, its evolution to socialism. Such is the case with A. W. Uloth in his article: 'Permanent Protest—a creed of reaction?'"

This is a mistake. Perhaps I expressed myself badly. I do not see a utopian or free society as "the realisation of the absolute spirit". I am not a Hegelian. To me that kind of philosophising seems nonsensical. I believe however that human beings, if not suppressed during their upbringing, conditioned to accept authoritarianism, are by nature anarchists, and that therefore an anarchist society is at least theoretically possible. Whether it will ever come about is another matter. The odds are very heavily against it. However, to say that is a rather different thing from saying dogmatically that there never will be a free society in the future. This is imposing a blue-print on future generations if anything is.

A free society does not need a blue-print. It is perfectly possible to imagine a free society organised in a hundred different ways. It is also perfectly possible

Mr. Kennedy's Handout

Continued from page 1
military strategy, and considers defence matters in a broad framework of national policy". That may well be, and we are sure the American people are grateful to the President for philosophising as he spends their money on the latest refinements in the science of annihilation. But what stands out clearly in this budget is that there is something for everybody in big industry, and while the trade recession lasts it's fortunate that there is no similar recession in the Defence Business. Thank God for Mr. Kennedy. Any fears that he might be a CNDer or pacifist in disguise have been dispelled in no uncertain manner.

Footnote

While President Kennedy was preparing his Defence Message, and making tough speeches about Laos, his predecessor was just returning from a eight-day trip to Mexico . . . dove-hunting! But the ex-president didn't bring them back alive. "We shot dove every day and we got plenty of them. It's as good an eating bird as I've ever tasted." Poor Doves! Poor Peace!

able to imagine such a society growing and evolving over the course of time exactly as authoritarian society has done. To talk about "the end of history" is to plunge into metaphysics. But it is not too difficult to imagine an end to authoritarian history.

The reason why I called the ideal of "permanent protest" a reactionary one is that from reading the article by G. Molnar I got the idea that he envisaged authoritarian society as continuing forever. T.G., on the other hand, ends his contribution with the words, "Let the future generation decide their own destiny. They, if anti-authoritarian, would not need our prescriptions."

I can find nothing to object to in that. But the dogmatic assertion that authoritarian society will be a permanent feature of human life is far more likely to provoke submission than rebellion. Since if rebellion is foredoomed few will embark upon it. After all, one wants to feel that one is going to achieve something before one embarks on any task.

The utopian ideal, from an anarchist point of view, consists simply in this, that one believes a free society or societies possible, and works towards creating them. Of course one also wants to enjoy a certain amount of freedom in the present. There is no question of sacrificing the present to the future. Nor is the belief in a possible free society any sort of drug. If it were, authoritarian society would do everything in its power to popularise the idea of future anarchy, but, as one can observe for oneself, it ceaselessly popularises the idea "you can't change human nature", and man will always need authority.

But why should one bother to discuss a possible but remote future? I think the answer is that in a certain sense we get what we want, or what we imagine ourselves getting, if we wait long enough. The fantasies of authoritarian power, the authoritarian utopias so popular in the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries (More, Campanella, Bacon and their followers), are now being realised in our own day. "Life," said Oscar Wilde, "imitates art," and this is certainly true of human life. So that if our fantasies of the future are Orwellian, "a boot stamping on a human face—forever", with the face occasionally giving the boot a bite as protest, that is very likely what we will get.

We get what we imagine we will get, although sometimes not quite in the way we expected to get it! The Western world has pursued the ideal of abundance and now has it, and the result is not very satisfactory. The ideal was perhaps wrongly expressed by those who pursued it. At all events I am sufficient of a mystic to believe that it is very important to want the right things, in the right way. I think that one is more likely to achieve freedom and a free society if one believes one will, or at least that it is a theoretical possibility.

I feel that those who believe that it is wrong to credit the possibility of a free society do so because they do not want a free society. They do not want it because they have the same sort of aversion to it that the *laissez faire* capitalist has towards the ideals of equality and brotherhood. They feel that there is something "soft", unmanly, ignoble or weak in the idea of a free society.

Well, of course if one is exhilarated by life in authoritarian society, and finds the joy of battle in resisting social pressures, one is welcome to one's fun. Personally, I find a world of H-Bombs and concentration camps a bit of a bore. I can think of many better ways of living, and I am sure that I am not alone in that. Ways that are quite within the range of human possibilities.

London. ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

Freedom and Common Ownership

DEAR COMRADES,

In reply to F.B.:

I am glad that F.B. accepts that the individual has "freedom of choice to accept or reject common ownership". In so doing he implicitly commits himself to a pluralistic attitude which, applied consistently, leads to the view that common ownership is only one of the economic arrangements which can be entered into by free individuals.

His belief that economic development will force people to dispense with masters is, to borrow a word from Reg. Wright, a 'gratuitous' assumption, for which there is no real proof. To accept it means that "economic circumstance" is made an entity in its own right and men and women its puppets. Anarchism, as I understand it, makes individual decisions and initiative the basis for the creation of a free life and has nothing to do with the marxian mystique of economic determinism.

In reply to Reg. Wright:

There would have been little point in writing my letter if there were not differences between F.B. and myself. Having been an anarchist communist for quite a few years before reaching my present position, I can well understand his and F.B.'s view of ownership, and I am in agreement with their indictment of the type of ownership that rests on economic exploitation. It is a fact, however, that all anarchists do not agree regarding the type most likely to be compatible with freedom. If this confuses 'people's minds' it is unfortunate—the solution does not lie in a false statement, but in those concerned thinking the question through. It is, of course, easier to serve a soothing syrup of 'next phases' and similar intangibles—a typically religious approach.

It is precisely because I reject the millenarian idea of anarchism as a future

achievement and regard it as a present activity that I made my "demand": How can a free life be lived by people who are not free? For this reason my "demand" still stands and I will not withdraw it because Mr. Wright chooses name-calling as his answer.

For a fuller statement of my views on freedom and common ownership I would refer to my article "Anarchism and Libertarian Communism" which appeared in FREEDOM for April 4, 1959.

Finally, I would like to state, with reference to the letter of F. J. Auld, that

I do not consider my "proposals" consistent with the ideas of Henry George. According to Louis Wasserman: "Conventional political methods alone would suffice [to establish the single tax]. Candidates pledged to enact legislation for land tax reform would be elected to local, state and national legislative bodies" ('Modern Political Philosophies and What They Mean', page 159). Such methods are quite alien to my conception of anarchism.

Yours fraternally,
Bristol, March 26. S. E. PARKER.

CND - on to Anarchism?

Continued from page 1

already last year the Communists were more in evidence as a Party. This year they were right in. By next year will they have wormed their way into the top places of the CND? However ambitious Canon Collins and his friends may be, where it comes to the political game of infiltration they are babes so far as the Communists are concerned. In an interview with the Canon published in last Saturday's *Daily Worker* he said:

We do not affiliate with, or have affiliated with us, any other organisation. But we accept with pleasure the support of any individuals or groups who genuinely share our concern and wish our party to succeed . . . We welcome them all and we assume that they come on the march to prosper our cause. (Our italics).

★

SUPPORT from the Communist

Party, far from "prospering" a cause is a kiss of death as so many independent movements in the past have learned to their cost. The CND is in many respects a movement of people who are disillusioned with party politics and in particular is this true of the young supporters of the campaign who, says the Canon, not only are interested in politics but want "to release themselves from the threat [of the bomb] and play their part in seeing that the world survives". But, he added,

they feel that existing organisations including the political parties, lack sincerity and purpose.

This is a state of mind which neither the Labour Party nor the Communists can approve of, and with all parties desperately seeking the formula which will attract youth to their ranks one can well imagine that the party managers are less concerned with the objectives of the CND than with its potentialities as a source for recruiting members. But equally they might well consider that the more successful CND is in its development as a rank-and-file movement of protest the less faith will the new generation have in the party machines, and in that case their interest in CND would be to see how to smash it. So far as the Communists are concerned, the easiest way to halt the CND's progress is to penetrate it *en masse*.
The press, the Labour politicians and the government will then be able to point the accusing finger at CND and declare that it is a C.P.-dominated body. And the movement will die, in spite of increased numbers, simply because it will have been robbed of its main assets: its independence, its spontaneity and its integrity.

These assets not even the hacks and pimps of Fleet Street can write-off in their otherwise superficial accounts of the Easter marches. These are the assets which the *Evening Standard* editor could not ignore and surely explain why he could compare the Trafalgar Square demonstration unfavourably with a football crowd and yet consider it the most important feature story for his front and middle pages!

*It was noticeable that the youth sections of the march had more than a sprinkling of Communist Youth. Some observers with whom we discussed this aspect of the march went so far as to say that the CP dominated the youth sections. And yet the total membership of the Young Communist League as declared at the CP Congress last week was 2,500 for the whole of Britain. It would seem that a very large proportion of the YCL was on the march last week-end.

Support from the Communist Party might swell the numbers—for a time. But one thing is certain that the assets to which we have referred, and which account for the uniqueness of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, would be lost for good. And this would be a pity: not because we have illusions about CND achieving its declared aims but because as at present constituted it encourages the kind of individual responsibility which thinking people may well come to link with the anarchist rejection of all governments and all political tutelage.

HANGING IS NO ANSWER

Public Meeting
Albert Hall
Tuesday April 18 at 7.30 pm
Many prominent speakers.
Tickets 2/6 & 1/- from
National Campaign for
Abolition of Capital Punishment
14 Henrietta Street London WC2

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Every Sunday at 7.30 pm at
The Swan, Cosmo Place,
Southampton Row WC1
(Holborn, Russell Sq Stns)

APRIL 9 PUBLIC MEETING

Please note
All Welcome.
Liquid refreshment available.

OFF-CENTRE DISCUSSION MEETINGS

1st Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. at Jack and Mary Stevenson's, 6 Stainton Road, Enfield, Middx.
Last Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Borothy Barasi's, 45 Twyford Avenue, Fortis Green, N.2.
1st Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Colin Ward's, 33 Ellerby Street, Fulham, S.W.6.
3rd Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. at Donald Room's, 148a Fellows Road, Swiss Cottage, N.W.3.

Freedom The Anarchist Weekly

FREEDOM appears on the first three Saturdays of each month. On the last Saturday, we publish ANARCHY, a 32-page journal of anarchist ideas (1/8 or 25c. post free).

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM and ANARCHY

12 months 30/- (U.S. & Canada \$5.00)
6 months 15/- (\$2.50)
3 months 8/- (\$1.25)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies

12 months 45/- (U.S. & Canada \$7.50)
6 months 22/6 (\$3.50)

AIR MAIL Subscription Rates (FREEDOM by Air Mail, ANARCHY by Surface Mail)

12 months 50/- (U.S. & Canada \$8.00)

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only.

1 year (40 issues) 19/- (U.S. & Canada \$3)
6 months (20 issues) 9/6 (\$1.50)
3 months (10 issues) 5/- (\$0.75)

Air Mail Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only.

1 year (40 issues) 40/- (\$6.00)

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

17a MAXWELL ROAD
LONDON, S.W.6, ENGLAND
Tel: RENOWN 3736.

SELLERS AT ALDERMASTON AND WETHERSFIELD

Will all those comrades and friends who helped to sell our publications at last week's Marches please let us have unsold copies and settlement for copies sold. At present we cannot say how sales went though our impression is that we did not sell as many FREEDOM as last year mainly because of the bad weather. Quite a number of copies of ANARCHY were disposed of, the issue of Workers' Control being of special interest for the more political among the marchers.

Subscription Renewals

Though the response to our recent subscription reminders has been most encouraging there are still many readers who have not yet replied, among them some whose subscription is so long overdue for renewal that we marked their form with a "FINAL"—an indication that unless we hear from them promptly we should have to remove their names from our mailing lists. We have not done so yet and so they will be receiving this issue of the paper, but if they do not receive the next issue they should not blame the post-office, but themselves for not going to the post-office to buy a postal order to renew their subscription!

Deficit Defeated!

WEEK 13
Deficit on "Freedom" £240
Contribution received £257
SURPLUS £17

Received March 24th to 31st

Chicago: J.W. 7/6; Gt. Yarmouth: L.F.B. 3/6; Worthing: R.K.K. 5/6; Manchester: M.G. 3/1; Paris: C.D. 16/1; London: P.T. 2/4; Ramsgate: A.S. 4/6; London, N.W.3: P. & G.T. 5/6; Cleveland: D.H. 7/6; Stauntonville: A.G. 10/6; Belfast: D.M. 10/6; Belfast: K.G. 5/6; London, W.1: B.H. 1/11; Deep Springs: J.J.M. 7/6; Florida: O.K.R. 11/6; Hounslow: W.M.E. 8/10; Welling: D.S. 10/6; Braintree: A.L. 3/5; Westhoughton: J.M. 5/3; London, N.19: N.D. 5/8; Stockport: F.O. 4/6; Toronto: S.M.C. 11/10; S. Francisco: p.p. Social March 19, p.p. Incarnate 19/5; London, S.E.17: J.M.C. 11/3; Wolverhampton: J.G.L. 2/6; Stroudsburg: F.C.B. 11/5; New York: S.G. 11/8; Bangor: J.T. 13/15/6.

Total 35 15 9
Previously acknowledged 221 11 3

1961 TOTAL TO DATE £257 7 0

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
Vol 7 1957: Year One—Sputnik Era
Vol 8 1958: Socialism in a Wheelchair
Vol 9 1959: Print, Press & Public
Each volume: paper 7/6 cloth 10/6

The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FREEDOM at 5/- post free.

PAUL ELTZBACHER

Anarchism (Seven Exponents of the Anarchist Philosophy) cloth 21/-



FREEDOM PRESS PUBLICATIONS

V. RICHARDS

Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6/- VOLINE

Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12/6
The Unknown Revolution (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) cloth 12/6

CHARLES MARTIN

Towards a Free Society 2/6

RUDOLF ROCKER

Nationalism and Culture cloth 21/-

ERRICO MALATESTA

Anarchy 9d.

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:

Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949:

A tribute cloth 5/-

Journey Through Utopia cloth 18/- (U.S.A. \$3)