

'I shall ask for the abolition of the punishment of death, until I have the infallibility of human judgement demonstrated to me.'

LAFAYETTE

In this Issue:

HYPOCRISY IN THE 'NEW' COMMONWEALTH
'OPERATION ABOLITION'
GUIDANCE IS GOOD FOR YOU—3
AROUND THE GALLERIES

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

Shorten the Rope?

NEXT Tuesday at the Albert Hall, there is a rally of the National Campaign for the Abolition of Capital Punishment. The organisers hope for much from this meeting. "A packed hall, plus overflow, may turn the scale!" is the slogan they use.

This worthy campaign poses the usual questions on reformism. The abolition of the death penalty would only be half-a-loaf, yet it could be claimed that it would be better than no bread. We have been treated to the mildewed crumbs of political compromise, after the last 'feast of reason and flow of soul'

DON'T ENTRUST YOUR LIVES TO THE SUPERMEN

Dr. Hugh L'Etang, a former airline medical officer, writes in *The Practitioner* about illness and the fortunes of war.

Hitler deliberately provoked war in 1939 because he believed he had not got long to live, says Dr. L'Etang. According to Goering he thought he had cancer.

An unsuccessful 1917 offensive by the French, which cost 95,000 casualties, was encouraged by a chief of staff dying of tuberculosis who wanted to be architect of a supreme gamble for victory.

The doctor names some top British officers who suffered from ill health in the last war.

Sir Dudley Pound, who became First Sea Lord in 1939 at the age of 62, often appeared to doze off. A colleague reported that he was asleep 75 per cent. of the time when he should have been working.

When he died in 1943, says Dr. L'Etang, a tumour was found in his skull—"it is only natural to speculate over what period of time the cranial tumour may have been responsible for fatigue and sleepiness."

The doctor names General Sir John Dill, a wartime Chief of the Imperial General Staff, who was criticised for his tiredness and lack of drive.

He had been suffering from severe anaemia, possibly for some time, when he died in 1944.

in debate on the amendments to the law on murder and capital punishment. These crumbs have satisfied no one.

Rank injustice has still been perpetrated. No doubt, the usual innocents have been hanged, the guilty have been reprieved, the accident of youth has saved some, the accident of insanity has hanged others. Some have died because their crimes were too terrible to be allowed by society, some have been saved because their crimes were too terrible to be the act of a sane person, some were reprieved because their crime had no motive, others were hanged because their crime was unprovoked.

Neither the 'hang-em-all' school with its baying Fleet Street pack nor the school that reserves hanging for the worst kind of murder have been satisfied. This compromise of a law is a half-hanging, making the Courts of Law more than ever seem a lottery and justice a 'housey-housey' game.

Half a loaf is worse than no bread for one can point to the prefabricated, cellophane-packaged, starch, soda and colouring matter and claim that 'at least we have some bread!'

Gerald Gardiner, Q.C. (chairman of the campaign) wrote to *FREEDOM* (30/5/59), stating that "capital punishment can only be abolished by members of Parliament" and doubting that the present Parliament (Conservative) would

disobey the Party's whip shortly before a general election.

It was pointed out by the editors in reply that the achievement of the abolition through mere parliamentary methods will not lead to 'an understanding of human frailty', or an arousing of 'deep social conscience and therefore the substitute for capital punishment will be equally offensive to feelings of decency'. The history of muddle and compromise in the last two years have borne out this reply.

The pattern of opinion on the death penalty is noted by Arthur Koestler in *Reflections on Hanging* when he points out the influence of party politics on the

administration of the criminal law. The monotonous pattern of Home Secretaries from both parties ardently defending capital punishment when in office and ardently attacking it when in opposition.

J. R. Clynes (Labour 1924) was an abolitionist until he took office as Home Secretary then he signed all death sentences as he was assured "it was the thing to do". Samuel Hoare (later Lord Templewood) opposed before office, then supported, then out of office (1951) the death penalty, wrote *The Shadow of the Gallows*, an abolitionist book. Chuter Ede (Labour) was an abolitionist, became Home Secretary and signed the execution warrant for an obscure van-driver called Timothy Evans, and in 1955 Mr.

Chuter Ede (in opposition) recalled his part in the execution of a man whose guilt was, in retrospect, to say the least, doubtful. In 1948 Major Lloyd George voted for the abolition of the death penalty, in 1955 he opposed abolition in the name of the Government.

The usual argument of these politicians in retaining and supporting what they know to be wrong is that public opinion is not yet ready for it. They are afraid that this revelation of 'softness' on their part will lose them votes. The shortening of the length of the rope by that great humanitarian, Mr. Butler, lost the Tories no votes. Why do all governments cling to the rope for dear life?

From certain veiled mutterings one would think that lynch law would break out if the death penalty were dropped. Lewis E. Lawes, one-time warden of Sing Sing points out that lynch law is prevalent in those countries and at the

Continued on page 4



Macmillan's 'Unity' Russell's 'Unilateralism' WILL THEY MEET?

HOW long will it be before Harold Macmillan and Bertrand Russell are both advocating unilateral disarmament from the plinth at Trafalgar Square?

In last Sunday's *Observer* Bertrand Russell explains what he and his friends mean by unilateral disarmament. And in the same paper is a report of Mr. Macmillan's address at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in which he advocated unity of the Western powers (on previous occasions he recalled that he had spoken of "interdependence" as the keynote of the 20th century). "Today I say interdependence is not enough," declared Mr. Macmillan. "We need unity—a wider unity—transcending traditional barriers; unity of purpose, of method, of organisation."

Mr. Macmillan's "Unity" speech is as "daring" as Bertrand Russell's letter is respectable. And so before long we shall not be surprised if "unilateralism" and "unity" find common ground.

BUT let us first present the two proposals. Bertrand Russell in his letter protests at the *Observer's* "serious misapprehension of the position of those who are called 'unilateralists', and since they have not yet agreed on a creed, he sets forth his opinions which were expressed at a conference on March 11 and "seemed to meet with general approval". He writes:

I do not advocate American unilateral disarmament; I advocate unilateral dis-

armament for Britain, and I think that the same arguments are valid for other allies of America in the eastern hemisphere. I advocate this as a step towards general disarmament.

The arguments for British unilateral disarmament are national and international. National in that Russia could wipe out our island in half an hour "without bringing on a general nuclear war". There is nothing Britain or America can do to prevent this. On the other hand if Britain were neutral "Russia would have no motive for such an act".

Internationally Britain adds nothing to the power of America, but only a very burdensome liability. Disarmament conferences, so far, have always failed since 1945. The best hope for success would be a proposal drawn up by neutrals making no change in the balance of power, but possible for each side to accept since it would not be suggested by the other side. Britain as a neutral could do important work in this direction.

Mr. Macmillan declared that it was natural enough that there should now be some in Europe who felt unhappy that their nuclear defence should be left purely in Anglo-American hands. But it would be undesirable to "alarm and perhaps endanger the world by appearing gratuitously to encourage the uncontrolled spread of nuclear weapons from country to country."

May not Mr. Macmillan at some stage agree with *Tribune's* slogan of "let Britain Lead"—or words to that effect—and leave the nuclear "deterrent" exclusively in the hands of the U.S.A.? He went on to say

"We want a ban if we can get it on nuclear tests. We do not want our allies to feel it essential to their honour or to their safety to pour out their money in wasteful duplication. Probably the West does not need an increase in

total nuclear power.

"Nevertheless this is a real problem. We cannot just ignore it. We must find a way of meeting the legitimate feelings of our European allies. . . . The health of the whole NATO alliance depends on finding a way of building a partnership in the nuclear as well as conventional field and to make it live."

Not only does he recognise the "feelings" and the "honour" of "our allies", which may well indicate that the British Government is prepared to make a gesture to satisfy these "feelings", and at the same time dissuade them from developing their own nuclear weapons, but he also says "Probably the West does not need an increase in total nuclear power". The latter remark is not all that far away from Bertrand Russell's "Britain adds nothing to the power of America but only a very burdensome liability". Russell's "burdensome liability" presumably refers to the fact that Britain's possession of her own nuclear weapons is but a drop in the ocean of American productive capacity but at the same time is the excuse for other minor powers on both sides of the curtain aspiring to possess their own nuclear "deterrents". Macmillan has surely gone part of the way to recognising this, for after all short of an alliance of Western Europe, a United States of Europe (at least as homogeneous as the United States of America) no power of the West alone can be on equal terms with America in military or economic terms. No Western power therefore can challenge America, but they could resent Britain's privileged position and attribute it to the possession of her own nuclear "deterrent". (Personally, this writer, considers these

arguments a lot of nonsense but the political game, as distinct from the real international crises which are crises generally of an economic nature, is played according to certain rules; you can try to call the other man's bluff but you do not call the bluff on which all politics is based! For if you did the whole pack or cards would collapse, and this, no politician will do for it would be the end of politics and professional politicians).

But to return to our argument. It may well be that at their recent meeting Macmillan and Kennedy discussed the disadvantages of Britain possessing her independent nuclear "deterrent". So long as Britain was the only minor Power possessing the "deterrent" one can understand her spokesmen, Tory or Labour, being conscious of having an argument the others lacked. But nothing is permanent, or static, and the possibility that in the near future France, W. Germany and who knows how many other nations will also have their H-bombs automatically neutralises the advantages Britain might have enjoyed—not, be it noted in its dealings with the potential enemy, but in arguments with its so-called allies! Maybe, therefore, the time is ripe to trade the British "deterrent" for some other temporary advantage before it becomes a permanent liability. Mr. Macmillan did say:

"In this world of missiles we must not overlook our conventional forces. They are as essential as ever . . . but we must try to share the burden more efficiently." Surely it was illogical that "our teams of military planners, scientists, and technicians should waste any of their efforts duplicating work and projects."

Continued on page 3

BIRMINGHAM PRINTERS VOTE RACIAL BAR

An emergency meeting of the *Birmingham Post and Mail* night chapel of the Birmingham Typographical Society decided by 38 votes to 24 to oppose the employment of coloured compositors. After the meeting the father of the chapel, Mr. G. Nash, and his deputy, Mr. A. Busby, resigned their posts.

Earlier Mr. A. Farley, the secretary of the society, had said: "This is a chapel matter. As far as the society is concerned, we do not take any cognisance of any man's colour. We are concerned purely about his craftsmanship and whether he can measure up to the high standards required."

Mr. C. Farrell, the works manager of the *Birmingham Post and Mail* Ltd., had said: "We shall have no trouble, whether we start these men or not. There is going to be no strike."

Already eight or nine coloured linotype operators hold union cards in the Birmingham Society.

(Guardian)

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

FREEDOM SELLERS WANTED

Hypocrisy in the 'New' Commonwealth

"FREEDOM" was about the only paper that predicted correctly the outcome of the Commonwealth Conference. In "Peoples, not Premiers" (18/3/61) the editors wrote: "Were we to speculate on the outcome of this Commonwealth Club's membership committee meeting we would hazard the guess that Verwoerd will not be re-admitted". And FREEDOM was right. Earlier in this same editorial the editors wrote: "While we do not think the outcome of these talks is in any way of world-shattering importance, it would perhaps be better for world opinion if Verwoerd and his gang were excluded from the Commonwealth on the issue of Apartheid than that they should be extended the good neighbour treatment." In FREEDOM (11/3/61) I expressed the opinion that "the Commonwealth is a myth, a figment of the imagination that is maintained by Royal pronouncements and political lies. In essence it does not matter whether South Africa is expelled from the Commonwealth or not". Now that South Africa has been expelled we can perhaps look at the effects of the expulsion and decide whether the editors were nearer the mark than I was. I will hope to show that the expulsion of South Africa on balance, is of little or no real importance.

One or two things surprised me about the effects of the expulsion, one tends to forget that though one personally rejects a myth and ignores Royal pronouncements the majority of people genuinely believe in some mystical alliance of Commonwealth countries. The

English-speaking South Africans were "numbed and shocked" to hear that the homeland had given them a rap across the knuckles, and in the same way the liberal and left press in this country really felt this odd conglomeration called the Commonwealth had been cleansed. *The Observer* exclaimed: "The Commonwealth has taken on a new lease of life", and the *New Statesman* cried: "Had the Union remained in the field the Commonwealth would have been publicly exposed as a sham." The editorial in the *Observer* really went to town (19/3/61) and stuck out the chest of the new British pride in announcing: "There is now a clear answer to the familiar question: What does the Commonwealth stand for? It can now be seen to stand for multi-racial co-operation between nations on the basis of mutual and equal respect."

It seems however that libertarians and Tories are the only realistic people to

honestly face the reason for South Africa's expulsion. Writing in the *Daily Telegraph* (17/3/61), R. H. C. Steed wrote of the Prime Ministers concerned that "So much did they prize the Commonwealth, so well have they assimilated its self-imposed disciplines, that they were prepared, having frankly stated their case and patiently listened to Dr. Verwoerd's, to put up with almost anything rather than risk breaking up the Commonwealth." Similarly Bill Christopher declared in *Workers' Voice*, Vol. I, No. 4, that South Africa had left the Commonwealth and it can be quite fairly stated that many of the P.M.s broke their backs in their endeavour to accommodate her... they didn't want Verwoerd to leave because of the danger to British investments in S. Africa." Yet the economic side of the Commonwealth set-up (the only feature of real concern to anyone, one feels) has hardly altered at all as a result of S. Africa leaving.

What indeed has happened is that everything in the economic sphere is much the same as usual, but starry-eyed liberals are caught on a line that the Commonwealth is now something new. Let us examine more closely both these aspects of the situation, the economic and the mythical, and also include an examination of the important effects for the anti-apartheid struggle that might be thought to have resulted from the expulsion.

Firstly the economic aspect of the situation. An editorial in the *Daily Telegraph* (17/3/61) reads as follows:

"Dr. Verwoerd has said that his country will remain within the sterling area and will hope to co-operate fully with Great Britain in matters of common interest. It may be therefore that, once the Stock Exchanges have recovered their equilibrium, there need be little difficulty over trade and economic affairs generally. Much in this sphere depends upon bilateral arrangement which need not be disturbed either by South Africa's republican status or by her isolation—so far as Britain is concerned."

In the *Daily Telegraph* for 28/3/61 an excellent article by Clive Van Ryneveld of the Progressive Party in South Africa further clarified the position from the S. African point of view. He asked "How will the exclusion from the Commonwealth affect us?" And went on: "The first question raised was the future of our trade preferences. Dr. Verwoerd and Dr. Diedericks, Minister of Economic Affairs, were quick to reassure us that the agreements entered into after the Ottawa Conference in 1932 would not lapse. In Dr. Verwoerd's words: 'Our trade and other agreements with England and the older Commonwealth countries need undergo no change.' And so we begin to realise that the expulsion of S. Africa from the Commonwealth is

almost entirely a matter of shocking a few naive English-speaking South Africans. To put it plainly, Business as usual!

The mythical question of the Commonwealth's "new lease of life" and the ending of a hypocritical sham is again quite untrue. As R. H. C. Steed put it in the *Telegraph* article: "No doubt there will be many voices saying: 'Now we have dealt with South Africa. The "White Australia" policy is next on the list.'" And as Dr. Verwoerd was quick to point out, certain members of the Commonwealth who fought for the expulsion of South Africa have little to boast about in the way of even nominal democratic government. Yet the supreme hypocrisy is left for dear old Britain in the best traditions of our noble land. In an article in the *Listener* (23/3/61) Sir Ivor Jennings writes: "The first effect of South Africa leaving the Commonwealth is that there can no longer be any question of handing over the three High Commission Territories—that is, Bechuanaland, Basutoland and Swaziland—to the new republic of South Africa." Yet a Reuter report quoted in the *Observer* for 19/3/61 informs us of the following from Maseru in Basutoland: "Six hundred men and women, said to be agitators and intimidators, have been gaoled here. The district commissioner also to-day banned the gathering of three or more people in the town—capital of this High Commission territory in Southern Africa—after attempts to persuade Civil Servants to join a general workers' strike for increased wages. The Basutoland Congress Party, the territory's most powerful political group, has sent a cable to Whitehall, saying the territory has come under a 'reign of terror by Government arbitrary

Continued on page 4

'OPERATION ABOLITION'

KNOWN Communists arrive to organize their dupes. The Reds are led by Harry Bridges. Other known Reds hand out literature, hold strategy meetings on the steps of San Francisco's City Hall. Inside the House Un-American Activities Committee is in session. The students fill the corridors. They chant and yell. They sing a well-known Red Union song. In the chamber, known Communists challenge the Committee to "Open the doors! Open the doors!" and let the students in. Of the 400 spectators in the chamber many cheer with the yelling Communists. A riot breaks out when the students in the corridors get out of hand. Hoses are turned on the students and finally each student is pulled by the arm or leg and bounced on his behind down the long wet marble starway of City Hall. This attempt at breaking up the Committee has failed. This riot is only one phase of a plan to abolish the Committee. The plan is called by the Communists, *Operation Abolition*. The Committee has called its 45-minute film on the student riot, *Operation Abolition*.

The film's distortions have been written about in *I. F. Stone's Newsletter*, *The N.Y. Post*, *The New Republic*, and, so it seems, every liberal and left paper and magazine in the U.S. The National Council of the Churches of Christ has put out a pamphlet, *Some Facts and Some Comments* which cites the film's inaccuracies and omissions. It can be had by sending 50 cents to the National Council, 475 Riverside Drive, New York 27, New York. Commentators on the right have, as expected, praised the film for showing the Communist threat in its true light. American Legion Posts, churches, business organizations and all groups considered "friendly" to the Committee have had easy access to the film. On the other hand, liberals and radicals who have read so much about the film and who are "unfriendly" to the Committee have not, in general, seen the film.

The liberal and left comment about the film has stressed its inaccuracies and omissions (i.e., Harry Bridges is seen arriving at City Hall before the riots when actually he appeared after, the non-violent demonstration on the part of many of the students is never mentioned, etc.). The papers of the left have taken great delight in finding these "movie bonners." They feel that they prove to the world that the film and the Committee are dishonest. To put this kind of thinking into practice, *Triumph of the Will* could be proven dishonest because it omits a sequence on Jews being beaten in the streets.

Operation Abolition is the most damaging document ever presented against the House Un-American Activities Committee. It shows the Committee allowing known Communists to invade the corridors outside its chambers and not doing a thing about it until violence was used. It shows the Committee encouraging Communists in the chamber to yell and scream, to be "martyred", until the police came and dragged the Communists away. The film shows only one difference between the Committee and the Communists—the Committee is In and the Communists are Out. Otherwise they are perfectly interchangeable.

This film is as honest a film about the Committee as will be made. The inac-

curacies and omissions the liberal and left press have exposed while factually correct does not lead to the truth. The truth is in this film as it is. The Communists and the Committee both are ugly and terrifying. The question is why do people look at the film and say, "The Reds should have their heads kicked in", or "The film is full of lies"? The truth does not touch either group. Just as the Committee need the Communists and the Communists need the Committee, the boosters and detractors of this film need each other. Both are ugly and terrifying. A.B. (New York).

DECENTRALISE FOR SOLIDARITY

"BREAKAWAY UNIONS AND THE SMALL TRADE UNION" by Shirley Lerner. (Allen & Unwin, 25s.)

IT is an axiom of trade union philosophy that solidarity is the source of the movement's strength. But although solidarity has provided the theme of many a speech and many a song, it has seldom been the subject of serious research. In this scholarly study Dr. Lerner breaks new ground and makes a valuable contribution to trade union studies by focussing attention on the causes and consequences of inter- and intra-union disputes.

The bulk of the book consists of four case studies. The first deals with the small 20,000 strong Chemical Workers' Union. Founded originally in 1918, this militant industrial union has had, ever since, to conduct a running fight with the general unions. Having refuted the groundless charge of being a breakaway union, it fought a seven years' long David-and-Goliath struggle, 1936-43, to gain admittance to the TUC. Affiliation to the TUC did not, however, end the struggle. Over-riden on the issue of affiliation, the TGWU and NUGMW have persisted in nursing their grudge against the smaller union by refusing to agree to its representation on the national negotiating machinery for the chemical industry. The net effect of this sorry tale of inter-union strife has been to encourage non-unionism and to leave a sour taste in the mouths of those trade unionists who take seriously the principle of solidarity.

Dr. Lerner's second study is a review of the TUC Disputes Committee's awards on jurisdictional cases, i.e. those arising when rival unions claim the right to organize the same group of workers. Taking the period 1924-57, she shows that there has been a marked tendency to whittle away the right of the worker to join a union of his own choice. The awards have favoured the big unions and in the post-war period not a single decision has per-

mitted transfers from one union to another. The right remains but it has become ineffective. The wishes of rank-and-file members have been sacrificed to the bureaucratic demands of the big organisations. The Bridlington Agreement which covers inter-union relations is clearly in need of revision.

The last two of Dr. Lerner's studies deal with breakaway unions. The first of these provides a classic illustration of Communist exploitation of the opportunities provided by an insensitive trade union leadership. As part of its 'Class-against-Class' line, 1928-1935, the C.P. fostered the development of new 'revolutionary' unions. One such was the United Clothing Workers' Union headed by Sam Elsbury and formed in 1929 as a breakaway from the Tailors' Union. On the orders of his political bosses and against his better judgment, Elsbury led the new union into a strike for recognition on the understanding that the C.P. would provide financial support for the strike. The support failed to materialise and Elsbury's remonstrances earned him only expulsion from union office and party—plus, of course, the label of working-class traitor. The UCWU folded up in 1935 when the party line changed once more and the result of all this so-called revolutionary activity was the demoralisation and disorganisation of the East End clothing workers.

The author's final study traces the history of various secession movements connected with the Post Office Engineering Union since the end of World War I. The interesting point that emerges here is that, in this Civil Service union, the politicians of both parties—when in office—actively opposed recognition of the breakaways. The political establishment has made common cause with the trade union establishment to prevent any change in the *status quo*.

The common factor linking these several studies—as becomes clear in the concluding chapter—is the growing bureaucratization of the trade union movement. Inter- and intra-union conflict in recent decades is one of the symptoms—along with apathy and unofficial strikes—of bureaucratic degeneration. The development of large centralized organisations has resulted in the ignoring of minority views within the unions: the officials have become remote from the rank-and-file and, as a consequence, react too slowly to the discontent that exists. The situation is further exacerbated by the centralization of the negotiation process which has reduced membership control over the terms of agreements and thus provides a further potential source of conflict.

In this situation appeal to the principle of solidarity is no answer. Secessionist movements occur because solidarity has broken down, because a group feels that its interests are no longer being met by those who control the organisation. The only sensible answer lies in eliminating the basic causes of secessions. Solidarity cannot be imposed from above and the ills of bureaucracy cannot be cured by more bureaucracy. The only practical solution lies in the democratisation of the unions. Dr. Lerner ends with a plea for a re-organisation of the unions which would decentralize decision-making and give branches—based on the workshop instead of the usual neighbourhood—real power. "The decentralization of some decision-making functions," she concludes, "may lead to a higher degree of solidarity among union members. A grass roots democracy may well provide stronger union organization and be more efficient than a centralized and bureaucratized democracy."

This is a temperate and by no means novel conclusion but one that needs reiterating today more than ever before.

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

- Science and Human Values J. Bronowski 12/6
- Germany Divided Terence Prittie 30/-
- Alexandria: a History and a Guide E. M. Forster 8/-
- Discrimination U.S.A. J. Javits 30/-
- Poems Vladimir Nabokov 12/6
- A Subject of Scandal and Concern John Osborne 5/-
- Underdogs (ed.) Philip Toynbee

SECOND-HAND

- Russian Portraits Claire Sheridan 6/-
- The Principles of Scientific Management F. W. Taylor 6/-
- Sighs and Spectacles Mary McCarthy 6/-
- Democracy and Socialism Arthur Rosenberg 15/-
- Freedom and Catholic Power Paul Blanchard 8/-
- Private Manufacture of Armaments (Vol. 1) Philip Noel-Baker 7/6
- Reflections on Violence Georges Sorel 25/-
- Sir Down with John L. Lewis (1938) C. L. Sulzberger 8/-
- Decline and Fall of the Labour Party (1932) John Scanlon 6/-
- The Seven Fat Years John Brooks 7/6
- Hollywood on Trial Gordon Kahn 8/6
- Forbidden Freedom Aymer Roberts 6/-
- The Passion of Sacco and Vanzetti Howard Fast 7/6
- Rats in the Sacristy Llewellyn Powys 6/6
- The Servile State Hilaire Belloc 6/6
- Those Human Russians (ed.) W. R. Hughes 3/-
- The Trial Begins Abram Tertz 5/-
- Savage Survivals (cover mkd.) J. Howard Moore 3/6
- The End of Economic Man Peter Drucker 6/-

PERIODICALS

- New Left Review, March-April 3/6
- Liberation, March 1/9
- Organismic Functionalism, March 3/6

Freedom Bookshop

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

17a MAXWELL ROAD FULHAM SW6 Tel: REN 3736

WILL THEY MEET?

Continued from page 1

And after assuring all concerned that Britain was not suffering from "creeping neutralism" he added:

"Happily, the present struggle was not primarily in the military sphere. The real test would not be on the battlefield but in the market place."

The urgent economic problem in Europe was to end the division between the "Six" and "Seven" groupings. "If this economic division persists, the political rift will inevitably follow, widen and deepen," he said. "This must, sooner or later, affect our military coherence and strength."

★

THE real test will not be on the battlefield but in the market place. It is a very frank recognition of what the anarchists (and a few old-fashioned socialists) have long been maintaining. And who can say that in the "market-place" Russia has, so far, challenged the industrial nations of the capitalist world? The struggle in the market place is between those very nations who are allegedly allies in the East-West struggle.

We do not know the ins and outs of the manoeuvres resulting in the creation of the "Six" or of Britain's reply with the "Seven". But just as it was not considerations of brotherly love that brought the Six nations together, neither, surely, was it some high principle that prevented Britain from joining in the first place. Now it would seem that Britain's industrialists favour joining the Six (whatever the other members of the Commonwealth may feel), and apparently Mr. Macmillan has secured Mr. Kennedy's support (in exchange for Britain's eventual abandonment of her independent deterrent?) and in their joint statement they declare that

they discussed how their countries could help to strengthen the free world as a whole, and measures "to ensure the cohesion, effectiveness of the Atlantic Community in a changing world." To this end they examined the world economic and financial situation, including the need for more effective assistance to under-developed nations. Both had recognised the urgency of further steps toward the economic and political unity of Europe. (Our italics).

★

ONLY a militant unilateral nuclear disarmer will fail to notice that President Kennedy's new "defence" policy puts the emphasis on conventional forces rather than on nuclear arms and that Mr. Macmillan in his address last week-end stressed that "in this world of missiles we must not overlook our conventional forces. They are as essential as ever". In the same speech he referred to the "health" of the entire NATO alliance depending on finding a way to build a "partnership in the nuclear as well as conventional field and to make it live". We do not think it impossible that the Powers could come to an agreement, which all concerned would honour, to ban nuclear warfare from their vocabulary, not because we think them motivated by any special love for humanity but because it is clear that such weapons are, to put it mildly, too efficient. Indeed, so efficient that their use would without a doubt obliterate mankind from our planet. And this writer has never been convinced that there is anywhere in the world today an Administration or Government so paranoid at all levels to unleash such a war of extermination. On the other hand the possession of these weapons by at least two

power-hungry nations tends to upset the conventional balance of power, to the disadvantage of the Big Powers.

The small and the weak nations are obviously able to achieve more by blackmail today than would have been possible in the bad old days of conventional weapons. The "independence" of colonial Africa is being achieved as it were in the shadow of the H-bomb (notice, for instance, how much slower is the process in Algeria, Angola and South Africa where the H-bomb blocs have so far chosen to ignore the struggle). Similarly in Cuba, Castro has expropriated American property with impunity only because he has relied on Russian threats being taken sufficiently seriously by the Americans for them to consider that the advantages of intervention are far outweighed by the risks of an armed clash with the Russians. The British, French and Israeli went further in Egypt but it was more the Russian threat of intervention than American disapproval, that made them beat a hasty retreat and seek the face-saving expedient of United Nations intervention.

The effect of this blackmail is that both power blocs are now vying with each other to provide economic aid for the underdeveloped countries, again not because they have any particular love for the "natives" but because the power game demands that you should get on economic foothold in those uncommitted territories before your enemy. Of course it is another form of imperialism, of colonialism, but it is not such a profitable kind, nor is the future as stable as it appeared in the old days. Nowadays you don't know when these ungrateful natives will bite the hand that has fed them, that is when they will nationalise the industries which have been financed with your capital, or when they will also accept aid from your enemy!

Much of this new state of affairs can be attributed to nuclear politics and while we cannot visualise the delegates at Geneva ever reaching agreement on world disarmament, even if they live to be a hundred years old, we can see agreement being reached for the abolition of nuclear weapons for the reasons we have exposed.

Because Bertrand Russell was a powerful influence in our youth, we feel sad that he should now be defending positions which theoretically, at least, may land him on the same platform as Mr. Harold Macmillan!

WITH Yeats at the Waddington and Nash at the Redfern this is a week for the Old Nostalgia even with Moretti edging into the act by announcing that he is Picasso's official successor but of all the clowns and hucksters only Jack Yeats will outlive his generation for he is the finest painter of them all. Doomed to flower in the shadow of his brother's reputation he reflected onto a canvas that blazed with ribbons of torn and ragged colours the stupidity and the beauty of the Irish people. The Waddington Gallery at 2 Cork Street, W.1. are to be congratulated for gathering together this collection of early Yeatsian watercolours. There is no hint of the magnificent later oils and if any comparison can be made it is that the early Yeats was a lighter, gayer, more rakish recorder of the raffish than his contemporary Sickert, that gloomy English puritan gingerly annotating his dreary version of lower middle classes at play,

(Continued from previous issue)

THE orthodox left-wing interpretation of MRA is that it is heavily financed by political reactionaries in order that it may advance their causes. The whole social background of MRA seems to reinforce this view. Its headquarters address in Mayfair, its hotel house-parties at Caux, and formerly at Brown's and the Hotel Metropole all back up the reported statement of Buchman "Why shouldn't we stay in posh hotels? Isn't God a millionaire?"

This accords ill with the other concept of Jesus Christ as a poor beatnik who got into bad company. The contention of the MRA is that they live on 'expenses only'. In 1936 Buchman claimed his private income did not exceed £50 a year. But . . . all their projects are financed by freewill offerings and 'where God decides, he will provide' and it would be a poor supporter of the groups who would defy the guidance of God that a project go forward.

Human will and determination is an underestimated quality and the fact that it attaches itself impartially to good, questionable and downright bad causes is undeniable. In fact a case can be made that the more dubious the cause the stronger the will that can be mustered for it. William James instances George Müller who maintained orphanages in Bristol and many other projects purely on the faith that if he let his general wants be publicly known and prayed for temporary necessities, believing that sooner or later (my italics) prayers are always answered if one has trust enough.

In slightly the same way the belief of some investors in the late Horatio Bottomley were not shaken even during one of his first prison sentences and after his release he started the organization of companies again.

There is faith in MRA's projects and the will (whatever the motives) to carry them through. The fact that MRA workers live on 'expenses only' is all relative, for a considerable proportion of the population are in a continual battle to achieve this standard of expenses and to live a life where 'merely' expenses were met would be bliss indeed! . . . especially on the Mayfair-Caux standard.

Arnold Lunn gives in *Enigma* a list of donations to MRA funds, being extracts from their account books. His list reads: MP £2, East London Mayor £10, Accountant £50, Officer £194, Typist 10/6, Clergyman £1, Welsh playwright £50, Bus driver 15/6, Doctor £100, Miners' leader £1, L.C.C. employee £1, Children's nurse £10, Exporting firm £500, Railway executive £5, Masseuse £7, 35 Workers £37, Captain, R.N. £25, Privy Councillor £2, Engineering company £1,000, Head, Oxford College £10, Kenya farmer £250, Headmaster £49, Textile employee £25. If these figures are really random selections and typical they show that MRA is dependent for half its income from industrial concerns and for about another quarter upon upper middle-class donations.

An ex-communist MRA said "that some industrialists contribute. I wish more did, every worker should rejoice when businessmen begin to invest in a force that is fighting effectively for social justice and a new world order."

It may be that many firms look on MRA as a type of communism-insurance and add them to their list of charities, but it is obvious that much of their money comes from individuals who genuinely believe in the aims and principles of MRA.

This upper middle-class bias of MRA exposes another nerve of MRA. Frank Buchman was most impressed by his

Guidance is good for you

conversion of Marie, Queen of Roumania and the concentration of MRA on the souls of the rich and socially prominent has been noted with a counter-apology "well . . . even the rich have souls, you know". Among the scalps hanging on the belt have been King George of Greece, the King of Siam and MRA's are adept in name-dropping in order to imply that certain celebrities are with them . . . if not actually of them. Among the well-known who have for any period consistently subscribed to MRA ideas are John McGovern (Catholic and ex-I.L.P.), Arnold Lunn, 'Bunny' Austin, Beverley Nichols, General Pershing, William Green (American trade unionist), Reginald Owen (film actor) and Olsen (of *Heilzapoppin!*).

The passionate quest of MRA for celebrities leads to some rather unfortunate associations. For example President Kasavubu (in the MRA advertisement 5th February), said, "You [MRA] have found the secret of liberation for Africa. All men must think how to give this moral basis to the country."

In 1955 Colonel Gamal Abdel Nasser cabled "I wish to welcome to Egypt the delegation of Moral Re-Armament. These principles and objectives are highly appreciated in Egypt, where all efforts are mobilised to restore moral values, social justice, human dignity, and freedom" (*An Idea to Win the World*). Twelve months later the Suez Canal was closed.

In *Ideology and Co-existence* it is tactlessly said, "Dr. Frank Buchman, who knows the Far East well, has paid nine visits to Japan since 1915 and has enjoyed personal friendship with four generations of Japanese leadership."

Everybody's silly sometimes and grab-all endorsements of a brand of cigarettes (for example) must catch the occasional non-smoker but MRA's passion for leadership does often mean they back the wrong horse and Buchman's offhand remark about Hitler is more a sign of political naivety rather than pro-Fascist leanings. On 25th August, 1936, on arrival in New York, he said:

"I thank heaven for a man like Adolf Hitler who built a front line of defence against the anti-Christ of Communism. My barber in London told me Hitler saved all Europe from Communism. That's how he felt. Of course I don't condone everything the Nazis do. Anti-semitism? Bad, naturally. I suppose Hitler sees a Karl Marx in every Jew!"

"But think what it would mean to the world if Hitler surrendered to the control of God. Or Mussolini (*sic*) or any dictator. Through such a man God could control a nation overnight and solve every bewildering problem."

A man who takes political guidance from his barber and who is capable of grammatical solecisms such as wondering what could happen if Hitler came under the control of God, Mussolini or any dictator is politically inept. But perhaps it was all a mistake and was probably a series of answers to unreported questions.

In the political sphere this snobbery is disastrous. In the entertainment sphere it is amusing. Williamson in *Inside Buchmanism* gives an account of Buchman's speech at the Hollywood Bowl during which he said:

"Moral Re-Armament is the scenario of a Golden Age—a God directed production—a preview of a New World Hollywood, that goes to every home, can become the sounding board for Moral Re-Armament to the nations."

And the *Daily Express* reports Dr. Buchman's conversation with (of all people!) Mae West, in which she said, "You are doing wonderful work", to which the Doctor, not to be outdone, says, "You are a splendid character." Miss West's come-back is, "I owe my success to the fact that I have been practising your philosophy in recent years". Dr. Buchman (his four absolutes working overtime), "You've done wonderful work, too, Miss West, in pleasing and entertaining millions with your charming personality."

JACK ROBINSON,

(To be concluded).



Around the Galleries

work and murder.

This will probably be Paul Nash's last major exhibition before all his work disappears into the limbo of the esoteric collections of those who claimed his friendship. The Right Hon. Sir David Eccles, P.C., K.C.V.O., M.P. has penned the valediction for this exhibition at the Redfern at 20 Cork Street, W.1., and Godfrey Winn has lent his "Cumulus Head" for this pale English ghost forever threatening to fade from the canvas caught the gutlessness of a certain type of English so much so that one feels that even the watery sunlight will wash his pale colours from off the paper and this is truly sad, for in 1931 he painted "In Andrew's Field" and because he used ink instead of pencil for his outline he

was forced to strengthen his colours accordingly but this is a work whose promise was never fulfilled.

A fresh gimmicky painter has hit the London scene via Biggins Gallery at 30 Old Bond Street, W.1. and it is worth at least a single visit. Brilliant is the operative word, for these gayly coloured, vibrant paintings have the eye-catching excitement of an Esquire illustration but just how long Moretti can gyroidal within his frames to please the dealers before he settles down to paint should and does pose an interesting problem. Alan Davie's paintings at Gimpel Fils at 50 South Molton Street, W.1. tend more and more to ape the covers of those cheap American pulp magazines of the thirties and the titles in his catalogue

offer the same pure corn; while Bernard Buffet at Lefevre's gallery at 30 Bruton Street, W.1. can only be regarded now as a dealer's painter for his canvases sail in with the same monotony and without depth or feeling they roll onto their grey backgrounds with the flat emptiness of worn linoleum pattern, for if one is wealthy enough to buy a Buffet one knows that one has only to put the money down and the ordered and the expected will be produced.

But of the living painters of the week Hermione Hammond at Arthur Jeffress at 28 Davies Street, W.1., and Albert Belasco at the Portal Gallery at 16a Grafton Street, W.1. offer the only painterly pleasure. Hammon who gives us the dying cadences of Betjeman's world offers a perfect foil for Belasco's sweet and naive cottage paintings of sloe-eyed women swanning through the darkness of his dreams.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

DEAR FRIENDS,

The recent discussion in FREEDOM regarding the possible revision of Anarchist ideas in a so-called changed world situation is worth careful consideration.

For myself I cannot see what these people would revise or why. I assume that they try to view things on an International scale and certainly FREEDOM comes close to this ideal in its limited space.

What is this changed world situation we hear so much about? That certain industrial countries have succeeded in making consumer goods more freely available than when Kropotkin wrote Mutual Aid? That in these countries we seldom now see hungry children begging in the streets?

But what of the other two-thirds of humanity? The life of these people are in many cases worse than those in which Anarchist ideas were forged. What advice would we offer them?

Do they realise how the "prosperity" of the industrialised countries was achieved (even allowing for their anti-colonial past), the women and children in the coal mines, the depressions, the millions killed defending the investments?

It seems to me that the Anarchist ideas are directly applicable to the world situation. Regarding Africa, Asia and South America, Kropotkin never wrote a truer word.

Where does that leave the Anarchist in the English-speaking world? Let us always remember that he is living in pockets of prosperity in a sea of poverty.

I think he must face the fact that the society in which he lives has developed too far along the Statist-industrialised path to achieve the original goal. He

LETTERS

may see a free society but it will more likely be an automated suburban existence giving him ample leisure to live more freely.

The Anarchist movement in these countries is already producing a type of critic who seems to understand this (articles by Alex Comfort, for example,) which are very stimulating to English-speaking readers would have little impact if translated into, say, Indonesian. On the other hand I believe that a translation of Kropotkin's *An Appeal to the Young* would be revolutionary.

The problem is always communication. If FREEDOM cannot manage translations of literature into other languages and I imagine that this is the case (not having the resources of the State Publishing House, Moscow), could not each individual try to make contact with people from these countries—students, etc.—who have probably never seen an Anarchist publication and yet understand our language? Why not a FREEDOM special on these countries?

This may seem a trivial solution to a massive problem but we do have one precedent in Anarchist history. In 1868—according to Gerald Brenan—Spain had never heard of Anarchism. Giuseppe Fanelli did the "translating" and we know how well our message was received.

Fraternally,
Melbourne, Australia. FRANCIS WEBB.

I AGREE with much of the philosophy behind J.G.'s articles, "Permanent Protest" (FREEDOM 1/4/61), but I consider that some of his assertions are unproved and have led him to false conclusions. Is it really true, for instance, that "Utopianism implies a reconstruction on the old authoritarian foundations", or that "Distraction and vagueness underlie the position of utopians"? Certainly, as Heraclitus pointed out, everything is in a state of flux, and that change alone, therefore, is real. No anarchist could point to a blueprint and say, "This is exactly how we will build future society." Yet he must direct all his energies to his march along a libertarian road. Along this road there will be many milestones. The most important milestone he can yet see marks the attainment of a classless society.

The history of libertarian progress during the past century may be discouraging to many. It certainly is a story of dissensions and sectarian squabbling. For many there seems nothing to show for all this. In the only countries where the old authority has been destroyed it has been replaced by state capitalism where real freedom is as remote as ever.

Certainly Camus is right to point out in "The Rebel" that, "all modern revolutions have ended in a reinforcement of the power of the State", giving us two Napoleons, Stalin, Hitler and Mussolini. Certainly mistakes have been made, but surely much has been learned, too, from such disasters as the Paris Commune, the Spanish Civil War and the misdirected path of the Russian Revolution.

Nearer home our libertarian education has been added to by the path taken by a reformist Socialism which has certainly not led to freedom or even equality. In its fear of freedom, result-

ing merely built up state monopolies where the individual is as much the chattel of the new bureaucrats as he was of the free-enterprise capitalists. The reformist state-capitalist Socialists have themselves become frightened by the Frankenstein monsters they built and have lost their impetus. Many of their leaders scarcely even pretend to be Socialists.

Anarchists should not be disheartened, however. In spite of so much misdirected energy there has been some progress towards real freedom. No longer are we mere pawns to be moved about a political or an economic chessboard. It has been slowly and unwillingly conceded that all men should have some, although not enough, say in the ordering of their lives and work. Once hesitatingly begun our steps towards a freer society cannot stop.

More encouraging still is the thought that in this country alone there are millions of unknowing anarchists dissatisfied and disillusioned by modern society. They are tired of being bamboozled by politicians, tired of being exploited by profit-seeking advertisers, sceptical of the efficacy of the drugs offered to them as opiates, such as football pools, the "telly", pin-ups, the doing of Society nitwits and sexual aberrations so gloatingly reported in the popular Press. The increasing popularity of even small revolts against the stifling power and nepotism of the Establishment, such as the "New Wave", are signs of a groping search for a better world.

I agree with J.G. when he says, "Let the future generation decide their own destiny." They will do, anyway. But surely we ought to do something more to give them a better starting-point than J.G. offers when he says, "... we unbelievers act here and without projects or programmes for the future." Mere aimless "Permanent Protest" would be destructive energy leading to the fragmentation of the Anarchist movement.

ALBERT R. BRIMCOMBE.

Continued from page 2
rule for junior officers." Is this, one may well ask, the "new lease of life" that the *Observer* editorial of the self-same day sees emerging as a result of the expulsion of that evil Government of Basutoland's neighbour, South Africa? Lastly we have one final matter to examine and contend. That is whether or not really matters to the struggle against apartheid in S. Africa that the Government has been expelled from the Commonwealth. I think, on balance, it really does not matter very much. If anything, the expulsion of South Africa will increase the determination of the Africans to keep to their policies, especially as, in the words of Dr. Verwoerd, "Our trade and other agreements with England and the older Commonwealth countries need undergo no change." No, the lesson to be drawn from all this is that the Governments of the Commonwealth countries will do very little to fight the evil of apartheid, and to depend on such things as moral force is to depend on obscure abstractions. R.I.W.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Every Sunday at 7.30 pm at The Swan, Cosmo Place, Southampton Row WC1 (Holborn, Russell Sq Stns) APR 16 Philip Sansom: Affluence and Anarchism APR 23 Jack Robinson: Capital Punishment: An Anarchist View APR 30 Bob Green: Kropotkin Revisited All Welcome. Liquid refreshment available.

Another Sit-Down

The Editor, FREEDOM, DEAR SIR,

On Saturday, 29th April, the COMMITTEE OF 100 and its supporters will occupy Parliament Square to hold a Public Assembly from 3 to 6 p.m. We are appealing for support for this mass non-violent demonstration, which is the follow-up to the sit-down outside the Ministry of Defence on the 18th February.

The Assembly will demand:— Unilateral nuclear disarmament by Britain.

The withdrawal of Polaris and other nuclear bases from Britain.

The use of money and resources, now squandered on nuclear weapons, for constructive purposes.

The Assembly will be preceded by a meeting in Trafalgar Square commencing at 2 p.m., and there will again be a supporting March. Volunteers and help of various kinds are needed. Will those interested please contact me at the COMMITTEE OF 100 office:—

13, Goodwin Street, N.4. Yours sincerely, MICHAEL RANDLE, Secretary.

London, April 8.

Shorten the Rope?

crime grow stale with repetition and rebuttal. Yet it is unfortunately necessary that they be repeated. They are the arguments that run through all discussions on crime and punishment.

The four motives that run through the whole bloodshot, rope-roven fabric of the penal system of which capital punishment is only a part.

Capital punishment is successful as a deterrent insofar as, whilst people have been hanged for murder who never committed one, no one who has been hanged for murder has ever committed one again.

Capital punishment is not concerned with reform of murderers nor compensation to victims or their dependents or to society.

Capital punishment by its ritualism satisfies the craving for vengeance which supposedly exists in society. At the same time it satisfies the cravings for notoriety and the poor crazed mind's longing for punishment and expiation of the guilt which often motivates the killer.

Defenders of the deterrent theory and capital punishment may point with pride to the number of people still alive (about fifty-five million in Great Britain) who

may have killed or been killed but for the death penalty.

Murderers fall roughly into three groups: (a) Those who think it worth while and are prepared to 'pay the penalty' (as the picturesque phrase has it). Anarchist assassins fall into this class. Deterrence has no effect; (b) Those who think they will get away with it. Failure forms no part of their plan; (c) Those who are temporarily or permanently insane or are acting in self-defence or on impulse. To them the deterrent is not taken into calculation. In this group fall the 'imitative' murderers, a product of the high-minded concentration of the Press upon the sensational aspects of crime. So it will be seen that deterrence has very little to recommend it.

To those who feel that with all its drawbacks of a reversion to the primitive (and incidentally, justice in some primitive tribes was more socially useful), vengeance is more satisfying we leave them to the thought that the cumbersome process of law, the infallible workings of prejudice, the fallible workings of evidence have all led to the most inexact of vengeance, the punishment of the innocent. The Oscar Slaters, the Adolf Becks, the Saccos and Vanzettis, the Timothy Evanses, the Dreyfuses, the Derek Bentleys of this world all cast grave doubts on the ability of one man to be another's judge.

How can the sanctity of human life be believed in in a world of H-bombs and the nine o'clock walk to the gallows? Life can only be venerated by living. The morbid pre-occupation with defence and the tortuous structure of law and order are symptoms of a death-wish which is the outcome of the system of the State.

The lip-service paid to lofty abstractions like Justice, the Rule of Law cease as the bolt is drawn, the vertebra snaps and two feet dance on air. The Law will be redrawn if it is necessary for the State to have a death. William Joyce, the Rosenbergs, Eichmann, Roger Casement, Poloda, Derek Bentley, Timothy Evans must all be offered up on the bloodstained altar of the State and in the words of a Dickens character: "It is better to hang a wrong fellow than no fellow at all."

It is easy to be cynical about the limited aims and possibilities of such a campaign as this for the Abolition of Capital Punishment. We anarchists see their point and agree with it. The greater always includes the lesser. But we would move the point to the consideration of crime as a disease, to the abolition of prisons and the abolition of the State which capital punishment rituals and prison serve only to buttress. JACK ROBINSON.

Continued from page 1
time when capital punishment is retained. For example in the Southern States of America in the 'twenties when (as now) the death penalty was imposed on negroes for rape. The appetite grows by what it feeds upon.

And since when have governments taken notice of public opinion? Does the government relax Sunday closing of shops? Did the U.S. government repeal prohibition before it became a dead letter? Governments have never hesitated to impose a law that flaunted public opinion. Indeed it may be argued that capital punishment is a mere affair of technical administration such as the size of prison cells on which 'public opinion' (whatever that is) has no competence to judge.

Indeed, it could be argued that private vengeance which is usually quick and passionate is preferable to the slow, cold-blooded intellectual processes of the law with its hair-splitting trials, its ritualistic black-cap, its concern for the health of the condemned, its concern for the welfare of his body and soul, its waiting for the due processes, and its final culmination in the technical process of the hangman who may, or may not, make a skilful end to all this. If in the annals of crime we could find one who said "I am going to lock you up for six weeks and precisely at the end of those six weeks I will employ some one to hang you", we should doubt the sanity of the criminal who did this deed. This criminal is the State.

The arguments for this crime to end

- 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/-

- 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)



FREEDOM PRESS PUBLICATIONS

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 s/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers:

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

KEEP IT UP!

WEEK 14

Deficit on "Freedom"	£280
Contributions received	£287
SURPLUS	£7

Received April 1st to 8th

Southend: P.A.O. 5/-; Dumfries: J.W. 4/-; Oxford: Anon. 5/-; Sydney: T.McM. 8/6; Liverpool: R.C.D. 19/10; Cambridge, Mass.: T.R.J. 5/-; Manchester: A.G. £1/0/8; Edinburgh: W.M.C. 4/11; Dublin: J.McC. 3/4; London: S.E.13: T.E.B. 3/-; Needham: Gruppo Libertario, per L.T. £5/19/-; London: S.E.5: W.G. 8/4; Detroit: J.C. 3/-; Germiston: V.D. 4/1; Bradford: J.E.P. 3/1; London, S.W.1: J.W. 12/9; Palma: R.D. 3/-; Bromsgrove: A.W.H. £1; Torino: G.I. 10/-; Oxford: Anon. 5/-; Newport Pagnell: W.S. £2 3/-; Epping: R.J.H. 6/6; Kingston, Ont.: L.I. 9/6; Calif: L.M. 13/3; Birmingham: G.O. £1/1/-; London, E.4: M.S. £3/10/-; London, N.1: S.B. 3/4; Leeds: G.L. 2/6; Newcastle: H.B. 7/2; Northwood: E.H. £1; Bronx: J.S. £1/15/-; Cheltenham: L.G.W. £2; Toronto: R.B. 2/-; Sevenoaks: B.J.R. 8/-; Santa Monica: N.P. £1/12/-; London: P. & G.T. 5/-; Hyde Park: 1/11.

Total 29 7 8
Previously acknowledged 257 2 0
1961 TOTAL TO DATE £286 14 8