

'We too aspire to communism as the most perfect achievement of social solidarity, but it must be anarchist communism, that is freely desired and accepted, the means for safeguarding and increasing the freedom of all; but we look upon statist, authoritarian, compulsive communism as the most disgusting tyranny to have ever afflicted, tormented and shackled humanity.'

ERRICO MALATESTA

JUDGES' RULES
SACCHARINE REFLECTIONS
A CHILD'S GUIDE TO ECONOMICS
HARD CASES

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

RUSSIA FREE?

BUT WHO WILL DECIDE?

RUSSIAN science having successfully launched first dog, and now Man, into outer space, it was the turn of Russian politicians to launch a rocket at the vitals of capitalist society which would at the same time establish, once for all, Russian political leadership of the so-called "Communist" nations. From a purely political point of view the launch of this rocket was perfect. In European industry and Finance the Sixties and Seventies; with unemployment in America still exceeding the 5 million mark in spite of the affluent society; with racialism raising its ugly head in spite of racial integration on paper, and with Cuba round the corner, begging for Kennedy claim to new-look policies; with Africa in nationalist ferment and racial torment; with the Middle East at last aware that the weakest link in Oil politics is the pipeline; with East-West relations over Berlin, ostensibly critical

... the publication of the Soviet Communist Party's 50,000 word statement at this moment, with its emphasis on the need for peace and co-existence with the capitalist countries on the one hand, and pie-in-the-sky (Communist Party) sky-in-twenty-years (before you die*), on the other, cannot but create a mixture of hope, doubt, illusions and confusion in the minds of millions of humble folk whose main concern in life is where their next meal will come from. The nations of the Western bloc will have to meet the Russian challenge with two arguments: (a) that capitalism can offer higher standards of living than Russian "communism" and (b) by

*The Statement promises that "the present generation of Soviet people shall live under Communism!". Communism in their life-time.

methods which not only result in higher productivity (which means shorter working hours for the same standards) but also guarantee certain basic rights and freedoms to the individual.

To our minds the obvious positive gains for the people in the "West" (and to a lesser degree in the underdeveloped countries) from the Russian Statement will be that in defending the privileges and injustices of the capitalist society from the challenge of the "free food, free rent, free everything" (*Sunday Times* headline) Russian programme, the rulers of the West will have to appear to give more status as well as a larger slice of the cake of production to those who actually produce it. As down-to-earth anarchists we have no objection to accepting a larger slice of the cake when offered



unconditionally. What we also realise, however, is that the "cake" is always getting larger, so the larger slice may, relatively speaking, be no bigger than it was before; and that

for socially conscious workers, who wish to free themselves from the bondage of employment, it is not the size of the slice of cake that

Continued on page 3

Jumping-off-Ground to nowhere

ACCORDING to many political commentators we were wrong when we said a few weeks ago in FREEDOM that Berlin is just "another crisis" without substance, used by both sides for political reasons without either intending that it should develop into war. Maybe we were wrong but we can't be right all the time! Nevertheless we are still doubtful whether either East or West are ready to go to war over the "freedom" of two million West Berliners; the crisis is really about something else.

For years the Soviet Government has made periodic threats to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany, which the West feels endangers its own military position in Germany.

We would not deny that the danger of war is ever present (on the contrary the "balance of power" argument as a means of preventing war used by militarists, has never

been accepted by us). Soviet tanks in East Germany are not there to provide joy rides for the people, and it cannot be denied that Germany, united under Western supervision, or divided, with the Western powers still remaining in Germany, would constitute a military threat to the Soviet Union.

It is therefore a source of surprise that America is now "in a state of alert" when the latest Soviet pronouncements on Berlin contain no more than did the previous ones. The *Guardian* points out (July 27th) that:

Mr. Krushchev has not said that he intends to seize West Berlin by force. What he has said is that he intends to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany handing over Soviet responsibilities for supervising Western access to Berlin to the East German government. The greatest weakness in President Kennedy's speech is that he made no positive suggestions for dealing with that limited threat.

The Americans may have information about Soviet intentions which is not available to us, but with a Communist Government in East Germany it seems to us that if "Mr. Krushchev does not intend to seize West Berlin by force" Soviet withdrawal on paper would not alter the situation very much, except that the Russian government would be rid of the responsibility of the critical economic state of East Germany.

On the other hand a Russian withdrawal may well spark off an uprising in East Berlin which would topple the Ulbricht Government, a possibility of which the Soviet Government must be aware. Is this what it wants? It would seem unlikely since the Soviet position in Western Europe would be weakened. Therefore as we have suggested, the "Berlin crisis" is but a stage in the cold war providing a jumping off ground to nowhere

Britain's attitude to Berlin is reported to be "firm but calm". The Foreign Office in an official state-

ment said that:

"The British Government fully agree with the U.S. Government that we must make such preparations as are required to face the critical situation which may arise."

Calm but non-committal!

Much more decisive are the views attributed to the Defence Minister: that Britain is not prepared to go to war if Krushchev signs a separate peace treaty with Germany. When the American Defence Secretary arrived in London last week to assess British reaction to the idea that:

"Britain should be prepared to go to war—with nuclear weapons if necessary—if Krushchev signs a peace treaty with East Germany."—(*Daily Express*, July 25th).

he was told that:

... it makes no difference whether the East Germans or the Russians stamp the allied passes for Berlin as long as the traffic gets through.

If the Communists blockade Berlin and the Americans respond with the threat of war Britain would only be involved in a "skirmish" confined within Berlin. The recent economic deal between Britain and the Soviet Union make it clear that it is not in the interests of either to go to war with each other.

But since America is militarily capable of waging war on a large scale there is always the possibility that she might be prepared to risk this by "going it alone on Berlin" on the grounds that since a showdown is inevitable with Russia, America should get in first before the Soviet Government is fully prepared.

At the beginning we said that Berlin was just "another crisis", a weapon in the cold war. But we are only too aware that it is only a question of time before one of these crises will topple East and West over the "brink" into war.

R.M.

A PEACE DIRECTORY

IT is truly extraordinary that man has succeeded in achieving so much control over his physical environment, with so little over the development of his own society, which remains in a horrible barbaric muddle. Knowledge has been accumulated and brought into order in the field of the natural sciences, but although a great deal of knowledge exists in the field of human behaviour, it has not been brought into the same order, and in the realm of war and social injustice there is great confusion.

This is partly due to the isolation of the individual peace-worker. He feels himself isolated and cut off in the midst of a hostile environment. The scientific worker can contact others working in the same field as himself by means of one of the various specialist publications which circulate widely. Contacts are possible even across the Iron Curtain. But in the field of social reform it is very different.

If an inventor writes an article in a Scandinavian professional publication he may well, in a short time, receive a communication from New Zealand or Czechoslovakia, with information or suggestions enabling him to make rapid strides in his work, or which even place it in an entirely new light. While if a peace-worker succeeds in getting an article published, concerning a particular aspect of the problem of war and peace, it seldom reaches all the people who would be interested or inspired by it.

Light has been shed on the causes of conflict between nations and peoples in numerous scattered articles, books, lectures, films and plays, in works of fiction and non-fiction, but no one has yet made a general survey of these studies. Progress is delayed because there is insufficient exchange of knowledge. Individuals work in isolation, and the waste of energy is enormous.

The idea has been put forward of constructing a Peace Directory, and a large number of names, addresses and particulars of individuals who are working against war has been collected. The aim is to bring the peace-makers to-

gether by making it possible for them to get in touch with one another.

Of course, nobody can expect an invariably prompt answer from whoever he may write to. The person may be too busy to reply. But even so he may be delighted to receive something from someone of a like mind, and he may be able to make a good thing of what one sends out, and not use the Directory as a means of finding addresses for sending out common propaganda. It is intended for the exchange of information and ideas. The intention of the Directory may be spoiled if it is misused.

The first edition of the Directory is planned to cover Scandinavia in particular, but it will be international in outlook, and will include references throughout the world. The text and the titles will be in the English and the Scandinavian languages. The extent of the model edition will be limited by the financial resources available—or not available! It is not expected that it will be able to cover everything. It will be a cross-section, designed to show what is happening in the world at present. If this first edition is successful, later and more extensive editions will be produced. At the moment however the aim is to test the value of a Peace Directory, and produce a prototype for possible successors.

The causes of war are numerous, and they interlock with each other in a confusing way. No one will surely claim that there is one basic cause. In the Directory eighteen main divisions are made in attacking the problem of war. Really there exist no such dividing lines, but some system of classification is necessary. The Second World War was caused by factors of education, economics, psychology, sex, politics and geography. Clearly all these aspects need to be studied.

Anyone who is interested should get in touch with:

ULF CHRISTENSEN,
Bygdøy Allé 26,
OSLO,
Norway.
ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

ANARCHY 6

out July 29th
is about anarchy and cinema
and includes

THE ANARCHISM OF
JEAN VIGO

LUIS BUNUEL:
REALITY AND ILLUSION

THE INNOCENT EYE OF
ROBERT FLAHERTY

TWO EXPERIMENTAL FILMS
DISCUSSED BY
THEIR MAKERS

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

Order extra copies for your
cinematic friends

2
 WHATEVER we may think of the institution of the police force, every thinking person must be aware that he is vitally concerned with just what power the police have in society. Every institutionalized body has a natural tendency to increase the scope of its influence and the power at its command. This tendency is manifest in all the groups which make up the balance of power in modern society—political parties, trades unions, churches, army, civil service, industrial combines, etc., etc. Two groups are especially dangerous because of their direct control of the means of violence, the army and the police. The army in this country has given remarkably little trouble, historically speaking, compared with such countries as Spain and France. The police too, are a docile body in the hands of the ruling classes. But this docility should not blind one to the ever-present necessity of curbing police power in its everyday function.

The police are like dogs trained to watchfulness and savageness by their masters: but these masters well know the nature of the animals they maintain. Their savageness must be carefully restrained, first because they might bite the wrong people, and second, by shows of arbitrary savageness on too many occasions they may bring themselves into too great public contempt and so lower their usefulness to their masters. Also there is the very real

IN THE HANDS OF THE POLICE

fear of anyone who controls a savage animal; suppose this brute were to realize its strength and turn on me—what vestige of power would I have? So the police are kept more or less leashed, more or less muzzled with fussy bands of red tape.

The Judges Rules have been promulgated by H.M. judges at different times during this century, and are designed as rules issued by the judiciary as to how the police should proceed in dealing with the public. Rule 1 seems perfectly sensible.

"1. When a police officer is endeavouring to discover the author of a crime, there is no objection to his putting questions in respect thereof to any person or persons, whether suspected or not, from whom he thinks that useful information can be obtained."

And so on to Rule 2, which has a catch in it, probably due to the unintentional stupidity of H.M. Judges:

"2. Whenever a police officer has made up his mind to charge a person with a crime, he should first caution such person before asking him any questions, or any further questions, as the case may be."

The catch in the above is that it plainly releases the copper from all restrictions, for who can say when he "has made up his mind"? He can bark questions at a frightened suspect all night without issuing any "caution". If there is any question later on as to the irregularity of this grilling, the copper can always say that when he was asking all these questions he had not yet "made up his mind" to charge him.

Rule 3 reads:

"3. Persons in custody should not be questioned without the usual caution being first administered."

But what constitutes "custody"? If the police ask you, in a peremptory fashion, to accompany them to the police station, then keep you waiting for an hour in a cold room, then ask you questions for another two hours, they can justifiably claim that you were never "in custody" during this period. They had used no physical force to get you to the station, nor to keep you there, nor did they actually say that they would stop you if you chose to walk out. In such circumstances your presence was purely "voluntary". You were a mug to accede

The implications of the 'Judges' Rules'

to their request, but you were not "in custody" during the grilling.

Rules 4-9 deal with "the prisoner", i.e. a person who has been formally taken into custody. Rule 4, by itself is cryptic. Nothing in the foregoing rules gives it meaning.

"4. If the prisoner wishes to volunteer any statement, the usual caution should be administered. It is desirable that the last two words of such caution should be omitted, and that the caution should end with the words 'be given in evidence'."

Presumably everyone knows what "the usual caution" is by reading detective fiction. But I believe that many fictional sleuths do not take any notice of Rule 4 of the Judges' Rules. The picture becomes clearer with Rule 5:

"5. The caution to be administered to a prisoner, when he is formally charged, should therefore be in the following words: 'Do you wish to say anything in answer to the charge? You are not obliged to say anything unless you wish to do so, but whatever you say will be taken down in writing and may be given in evidence.' Care should be taken to avoid any suggestion that his answers can only be used in evidence against him, as this may prevent an innocent person making a statement which might assist to clear him of the charge."

As Rule 5 indicates, the two words to be omitted under Rule 4 are "... against you." Rules 4 and 5, in fact, rob the caution of its original purpose. The poor fool of a prisoner may not realize that he can keep his mouth shut until he is in a court of law. He does not realize that by threats, promises, blackmail and bullying the police can get him to say things which will be used against him when he is tried. The old form of caution at least nudged his elbow as to the danger in which he stood. It seems

that by Rule 4 the judges were anxious to get more cut-and-dried damaging evidence coming before the courts, and afterwards thought up the lame excuse in Rule 5, as though talking to the police after being charged would somehow help to establish his innocence in court. It may be remembered that that poor, innocent half-wit Timothy Evans was hanged on evidence of his own concoction when talking to the coppers at the station.

Rule 6 is just funny. It conjures up the picture of the coppers putting their fingers in their ears as the prisoner blabs out incriminating evidence. "No, No; don't tell us," they cry, "don't tell us a thing. Wait, we must caution you for your own good." But one copper is slower than the others in putting his fingers in his ears, and he hears a damning piece of evidence which he writes down in his notebook. He then cautions the prisoner "as soon as possible", stemming the man's flow of self-incriminating remarks. Here it is:

"6. A statement made by a prisoner before there is time to caution him is not rendered inadmissible in evidence merely because no caution has been given, but in such a case he should be cautioned as soon as possible."

Rule 7 sounds scrupulously fair. It reads:

"7. A prisoner making a voluntary statement must not be cross-examined, and no questions should be put to him about it except for the purpose of removing ambiguity in what he has actually said. For instance, if he has mentioned an hour without saying whether it was morning or evening, or has given a day of the week and day of the month which do not agree, or has not made it clear to what individual or what place he intended to refer in some part of his statement, he may be questioned sufficiently to clear up the point."

I take it that this means that if the prisoner says, "Well maybe I did bash 'im," then "whom?" is a permissible enquiry, but not "why?" Do you think that this is how it works?

The remaining two Rules complete the picture. The judges reckon to have ensured that the prisoner has every advantage before he comes to trial.

"8. When two or more persons are charged with the same offence and the statements are taken separately, the police should not read these statements to the other persons charged, but each of such persons should be given by the police a copy of such statements and nothing should be said or done by the police to invite a reply. If the person charged desires to make a statement in reply, the usual caution should be administered."

"9. Any statement made in accordance with the above rules should, whenever possible, be taken down in writing and signed by the person making it after it has been read to him and he has been invited to make any corrections he may wish."

One may wonder why the judges in their wisdom did not make the tenth rule regarding the punishing prisoners to facilitate their making voluntary statements, or regarding the number of hours at a street suspects may be questioned while the copper is making up his mind whether there should be a charge. But as we all know that the British police are a fair and gentlemanly body of men, such a tenth rule unnecessary.

There is another reason why the more Judges' Rules are unnecessary, too. In practice, the police are obliged to take a blind bit of notice of the Judges' Rules unless they want to. In 1919 the police secured the hanging of a man by methodically flagrantly in the teeth of the Judges' Rules. His counsel maintained that as the evidence was obtained by the police in an admittedly irregular manner, it should be ruled as inadmissible in court. Not a bit of it. The presiding judge deplored the flouting of Judges' Rules by the police, but ruled that it was perfectly in order to consider the evidence in court.

So there we are; the police are not bound by the Judges' Rules. They can and do flout them when it suits their purpose, and the most you can do if you suffer in the process is to take a civil action against the police, if you have the money. By what force are the police kept in

Continued on page 4

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

The Donkeys
 Alan Clark 25/-
 Indian Socialism
 Sampurnand 24/-
 Selections
 P. B. Shelley 8/6
 Some People, Places and Things that Will not Appear in My Next Novel
 John Cheever 16/-
 The Minister
 Maurice Edelman 16/-
 Inside Europe Today
 John Gunther 25/-
 Politics and the Novel
 Irving Howe 12/6
 The Living Screen
 Roger Manvell 15/-
 The Fox and the Camellias
 Ignazio Silone 13/6

SECOND-HAND

Bejay Calling! (1931) 2/6
 Great Britain & the European Crisis (1914) 3/6
 The Beveridge Report (lacks cover) 2/6
 Die irrliehe des Marxismus
 Pierre Ramus 12/6
 Report of Court Proceedings in the Case of the Anti-Soviet Trotskyite Centre (1937) 15/-
 No Friend of Democracy (the Pope—of course!)
 Edith Moore 2/6
 Collected Plays (Volume 1)
 Eugene O'Neill (Limited, signed) 15/-
 Havelock Ellis, Philosopher of Love
 Houston Peterson (damp-stained) 6/-
 Poetry and Anarchism
 Herbert Read (1st edition) 3/-
 Moribund Society and Anarchism
 Jean Grave 10/-
 Pages of Socialist History
 W. Tcherkesoff 7/6
 The Dawn in Russia (1906) (foxed)
 H. W. Nevinson 12/6
 Syndicalism and the General Strike (1912)
 Arthur D. Lewis 15/-
 Lost Property
 Paul Derrick 3/-
 America Faces the Barricades (1935)
 John L. Spivak 6/-
 On Liberty (soiled)
 John Stuart Mill 2/-

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

ROUND THE GALLERIES

NEARLY eighty years ago Joris Karl Huysmans created his creature the Duc Jean des Esseintes to mouth the gospel of the self-acclaimed Decadent movement and these pale followers of the Gautier-Baudelaire tradition sought and found their manifesto in the pages of Huysmans' "A Rebours". Yet none of them would have dared to prophesy that after only a generation almost every commercial gallery would be hawking the fruits of their revulsion of their fellow men and that when the dreary Des Esseintes sat in his curtained, cloistered room dripping his piddling drops of coloured essences into a tank of clear water to simulate the changing heaven's reflection in the streams and rivers outside his closed and bolted door his aesthetic aversion to the vulgarity of walking in the rain would have triggered off a chain reaction that would in the end win him the approval of the very bourgeois he professed to despise.

Gallery after gallery, week after week now offer us the saccharine reflections of talented and skilful people who would appear to have no contact with the sweating, dirty world through which they pass and the artist has deliberately degraded himself into a gallery hack churning out pretty patterns for the dealers to flog to anyone who wants a flat decorated with paintings to match the carpets.

From the Drian Gallery at 5 Porchester Place off Marble Arch that offers room after room of sweet, decorative

Saccharine Reflections

and useless canvases to the Summer Exhibition at the Redfern at 20 Cork Street, W.1., with its cluttered walls of framed and coloured slabs is to span the Town and witness the death of an age for what was a fashion has now become a fad and has now received the kiss of death in that it no longer frightens the Philistines; it only bores them.

Even the backwash of the unlamented "Situation" exhibition at the RAB Galleries in 1960 continues to wash up its debris and John Plumb is showing his spectrum paintings at the Molton Gallery at 44 South Molton Street, W.1., with the inevitable plummy catalogue foreword by his shutgun rider Lawrence Alloway and Roger Coleman's equally inevitable review in "Art News" to form the Trinity. Upon a background of bright flat colours, achieved by the use of emulsion paint, Plumb builds up a series of patterns by using different coloured strips of electrical insulation tape, quote "supplied by Smith & Nephew (tapes division)" unquote. It was once a term of jeering disparagement to label the academic boys as chocolate box cover painters but now the wheel has turned full circle and these works of Plumb's could be used by Cadbury's for their newest sweet box wrappings without raising an eyebrow in the dress circle. They serve as ploys to evoke an essay from Plumb's friends and for the rest let it be said that they amused during their brief moment.

Gallery One at 16 North Audley

Street, W.1., under the directorate of a slimmer, dressier Victor Musgrove is showing the watercolours of Otto Nebel, a 69-year-old Berliner who in his time was a notable contributor to "Der Sturm". To know Klee's work is to know what Nebel's paintings look like. Sweeter and more sophisticated yet they are still Klee's vision and though the catalogue may claim that Nebel has an affinity with Klee to me it would seem to be the affinity that Jim the Penman had with the Bank of England.

Of all those who are currently showing only Edward Burra at the Lefevre Gallery at 30 Bruton Street, W.1. has any lasting claim on our attention. An indifferent draftsman, his brilliant handling of his watercolours mark his claim in the English pantheon of our native artists. Unlike Rowlandson his are never tinted ink drawings, for his colours bubble upon his huge sheets of paper and are never isolated by a sharp dividing line but meet and merge so that one object exists in permanent relation to the other. Every critic has played with Burra's odd subject-matter and has chosen to ignore his two brilliant landscapes of green hills creeping back into a drifting ceiling of grey clouds and his beautiful "Early morning, fog" with only a strip of soft green to break up his lovely grisaille and if you have any doubts of Burra's skill as a landscape painter cover the bottom half of his "Burning house" with your catalogue and accept his sombre trees for their

pictorial worth and not their literary content.

While our accepted painters toady to a gallery of patronising critics and itchy-palmed dealers our sculptors scavenge the rubbish dumps for their material and the refuse of abandoned graves for their subject-matter. If that is too harsh a verdict then let Elisabeth Frink's work at the Waddington Galleries at 2 Cork Street, W.1. bear witness for me, for her brilliantly executed figures of fallen men if turned to flesh would turn the stomach, for these are the echo of the broken husks of the men and women who even at this very day are being dug from the ashes of the dead city of Pompeii, while the bronze creatures that stand upon the ledges within the gallery are perched like carrion crows within a charnel house.

For the newly-formed Groupe Icono of Abramovitch, Greatham, Rummel, Sheppard and Smith showing in the catacombs of the New Vision Centre at 4 Seymour Place, W.1., a portable acetylene welding kit and a scrap metal yard offers them an infinite variety of material and subject-matter. Only Sheppard shows a personal awareness and he will probably be the first to break away from the group while Rummel's future lies with the off-beat magazines, for to quote him for a conclusion:

"Words are for making word art works—not for monkey-theory—spinning on paint, steel or modern—sounds art works." ARTHUR MOYSE.

FREEDOM

August 5 1961 Vol 22 No 25

FREE EVERYTHING by 1984?

Continued from page 1

matters as much as who disposes of the cake they have produced! This, neither the governments of the capitalist world nor the socialist-nations-on-the-brink-of-communism will ever concede, whatever they may promise in their Statements!

The Moscow statement declares:

Having brought about a complete and final victory of Socialism—the first phase of Communism—and the transition of society to the full scale construction of Communism, the dictatorship of the proletariat has fulfilled its historic mission and has ceased to be indispensable in the USSR from the point of view of internal development.

The State, which arose as a State of the dictatorship of the proletariat, has become a State of the entire people, an organ expressing the interests and will of the people as a whole.†

Apart from the interesting distinction which is made between the "proletariat" and the "people" it is difficult to reconcile this "dictatorship of the proletariat" with the description of the Communist Party as "the brain, the honour and the conscience of Soviet society" or the concluding paragraphs of the Statement that

Under the tried and tested leadership of the Communist Party, under the banner of Marxist-Leninism, the Soviet people have built Socialism.

Under the leadership of the Party, under the banner of Marxism-Leninism, the Soviet people will build Communist society.

The Party solemnly proclaims: the present generation of Soviet people shall live under Communism. (Our italics).

As everyone knows—if they don't, they should look up Lenin on the subject—the dictatorship in Russia was, and still is, a dictatorship of the Communist Party (to be more exact one should say, of a caucus within the Party), and there is nothing in the *Daily Worker* summary which leads us to believe that the 20-year programme will do more than perhaps vest power in more (Party) hands than at present.

★

FOR years the C.P. lickspittles have been telling us that the dictatorship of the Party was necessary in the Socialist stage of revolution; that the "withering away of the State" would come about in the Communist phase of this government-controlled revolution. Well, here we are, on the threshold of Communism. After more than forty years of the most ruthless, the bloodiest dictatorship of all time; after more than forty years of brainwashing, censorship and isolation we are asked to believe that the Russian people are about to enjoy the first fruits of communism!

In 1919 the second programme outlined the task of building Socialism. Now Socialism has triumphed in the Soviet Union completely and finally. So the second programme has also been carried out.

Now the third programme is being put forward—a programme for the building of a Communist society. Communism, which had once seemed a mere spectre, has become the greatest force of modern times.

Part two of the programme begins with a description of what the Russian leaders mean when they talk of communism, and to avoid any misunderstandings we quote it in full.

"Communism is a classless social system with one form of public ownership of the means of production and full

social equality of all members of society; under it, the all-round development of people will be accompanied by the growth of the productive forces through continuous progress in science and technology; all sources of public wealth will gush forth abundantly, and the great principle from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs will be implemented.

"Communism is a highly organized society of free, socially conscious working people in which public self-government will be established, in which labour for the good of society will become the prime vital requirement of everyone, a necessity recognized by one and all, and the ability of each person will be employed to the greatest benefit of the people."

How many of our readers share the cold chill that went down our spines as we read this definition of communism? In spite of paying lip service to that "great principle", to "equality" and a "classless social system", the definition stinks of authoritarianism, of planning which may well provide all the calories and fill the belly but which forgets that man is a human being whose heart is more than a pump and whose brain is less efficient but much more imaginative than an adding machine.

For these worshippers of norms and five-year plans, communism is "a highly organised" society in which everybody is organised to work for the "good of society" and whose abilities will be "employed to the greatest benefit of the people". Their obsession with production and productivity—"the C.P. sets the task" of achieving in the Soviet Union a living standard higher than that of any of the capitalist countries"—leads them, on the one hand, to advocate shorter working hours, the elimination (where technically possible) of "hard physical labour", especially for women

The Soviet Union will thus have the world's shortest and, concurrently, the most productive and highest paid working day. Working people will have much more leisure time, and this will add to their opportunities of improving their cultural and technical level.

while, on the other hand, in their "Moral Code of the Builder of Communism" these advocates of "the great principle from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" lay down that in the "communist" era there shall be "CONSCIENTIOUS labour for the good of society—he who does not work, neither shall he eat".

Is it not curious that in a country where "Socialism has triumphed", where socialist emulation has been the order of the day for no less than 43 years, one should be so concerned with the work-shy, that when one reaches the communist, the easier, more affluent, stage in this social revolution-by-orders, one has to make provision to deal with them. "He who does not work neither shall he eat". Who will decide what is work? The Statement says that in the next decade Soviet society will "come close to a stage where it can introduce the principle of distribution according to needs".

If so, then our question is all the more pertinent. For even the anti-social as well as the poets and the Boxers of the communist revolution are members of the human race, and unless we are prepared to stand by and watch them die from hunger in the midst of communist productivity and affluence, they must eat. (Why, in capitalist Europe or the U.S. it is doubtful whether anybody would be allowed to starve!)

It may be argued that we have

laboured what is, after all, a mere detail in a vast social programme. But for us it is not a detail but fundamental to the success or failure of the social revolution. It vividly illustrates the chasm which divides us from the authoritarian communists.

★

WE anarchists, unlike the authoritarian Left, maintain that the ends do not justify the means; that just as it is said that you cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear, neither can you build the free society so long as people are accustomed to obey and to follow. The Russian Communists—echoed by their miserable and despicable fifth columns—are trying to put across to the workers of the world that the Russian people, after 43 years of a dictatorship without parallel for its ruthlessness and inhumanity, have achieved Socialism which, to quote the Statement, "has granted the working people the broadest guaranteed rights and freedoms".

★

WHAT a poor advertisement for Socialism these Marxist-Leninists are! After 43 years preaching the infallibility of ghosts, with a dogmatic fanaticism matched only by the Catholics, not only have they not achieved the productive capacity of the United States, but neither have they achieved the productivity or the standard of living of the

In an editorial headlined "1984", the *Daily Worker*, comatosed by the avalanche of words and promises from Moscow, cannot but declare that "Miracles have been achieved in the Soviet Union under the leadership of the Communist Party. Still greater miracles will be accomplished in the next 20 years". We overlook the "miracles"—undoubtedly the Dean of Canterbury has explained how these can be reconciled with "militant atheism"—but we cannot resist a reference to the blind faith King Street has in the next 20 years. Have they not learnt that in the Communist world you cannot foretell what you may have to say in two years, let alone 20 years! Think of what they were saying, the poems they were publishing, about Stalin twenty years ago. Yet when the orders came from the new bosses in the Kremlin they had to lick their own spittle.

American people. And, to our minds, as important, is the fact that in "Socialist" Russia there is less freedom of expression, less freedom of movement than in capitalist America. It is no use blaming the "imperialists". After all, whatever may be the external threat, the rulers of Russia have succeeded in sealing off their people from "contagion" by the plague-ridden people unfortunate enough to live under the whip of capitalism. Yet in spite of this policy of political eugenics, we read in the Statement that the builders of Communism will show "an uncompromising attitude to injustice, parasitism, dishonesty and careerism".

We are also told that there should be no room for law breakers and criminals in a society building Communism. But as long as there are criminal offences it is necessary to punish severely those who commit crimes dangerous to society.

We are also told that the Party proposes to enforce strict observance of Socialist legality, to eradicate all violations of law and order, abolish crime and remove all the causes of crime.

★

AT this stage some heckler should come up with the suggestion that we are an American stooge and not an anarchist. (Judging by the small number of letters we receive accusing us of this crime we assume, with regret, that the party-faithful dare not read us for fear of contamination). The answer is that we are no-one's stooge. Indeed, this writer confesses that, given a choice between living in the United States or Russia he would choose Spain, which goes to show how stupid such questions are! For what we have been arguing in these columns is that neither the capitalist system nor Authoritarian Socialism lead to the free society as understood by anarchists and libertarian socialists and communists. Though their ends are different in theory both capitalists and authoritarian communists and socialists use the same means. In the opinion of anarchists, such means must inevitably lead to similar ends.

The capitalist, laissez-faire soci-

ety based on production for profit finds itself more and more obliged to give to the workers a larger slice of the cake, even, in some cases, without a corresponding increase in production. The authoritarian socialists and Communists if one is really charitable, can be said to aim at the removal of the profit motive from production, but they retain nevertheless, because they distrust their fellow beings, all the sordid economic weapons of capitalism, such as incentives and differentials, to stimulate production and productivity. In the Tass summary of the Moscow Statement one reads that the higher standard of living aimed at will be achieved, in part, by "raising the individual payment of employees according to the quantity and quality of their work".§

The fact that reduction of retail prices and abolition of taxes are among the other measures, is clear evidence, surely, that the money system even at the "communist" stage of this revolution-by-installments not only will not be abolished but will be used both as a means of exchange and a stimulant to increased production. The worshippers of capitalism swear by the same God!

★

WILL there be communism, as we understand it, in Russia before 1984? We cannot say though we hope so and not only in Russia. But what we can say for certain is that the Statement issued by the Communist Party in Moscow last week telling the Russian people what they are expected to do in the next 20 years has nothing to do with communism or social revolution. A palace (kremlin) revolution, perhaps.

But there will only be "free bread, free rent, free everything" when there will be a free society! And the free society is not a question of legislation from above; enough people must desire it at least as much as the bread that sustains life in their veins. This is not wishful thinking—we have not said that the revolution is round the corner—but the hard "facts of life".

§The Times 24/7/61. Omitted in the *Daily Worker* report.

A Child's Guide to Economics

CHILD: Mother, what is dis-in-flation?

MOTHER: It's letting things down, like a balloon.

C: Has Mr. Lloyd let the ec-on-omy down then?

M: No, he's propped it up.

C: What is ec-on-comics mummy?

M: Not economics—economics. It's running the country's housekeeping. Like mother does.

C: Does your budget balance?

M: Of course.

C: Then why doesn't Mr. Lloyd balance his?

M: It's far more difficult.

C: Is it more difficult than the seal we saw at the circus balancing a fish on his nose.

M: Perhaps Mr. Lloyd doesn't concentrate as much.

C: What happens if Mr. Lloyd doesn't get the money to pay for his house-keeping?

M: Don't be silly. He always gets it.

C: Doesn't he ever get in debt?

M: Don't be silly. The country's always in debt.

C: Then what does he do with the money?

M: He spends it.

C: Does he spend it on good things?

M: Yes of course like schools, and teachers and houses and doctors.

C: It says here (points to newspaper) he can't spend any more on schools and teachers and houses and doctors. Does he spend it on silly things?

M: Of course not... Like what?

C: Like the time I spent my pocket money on soldiers and fireworks.

M: Of course not... I don't know.

C: Why must we pay more for everything?

M: To stop us buying them.

C: Will it?

M: Of course it will.

C: Why does Mr. Lloyd want to stop us buying things?

M: So that we can sell them abroad.

C: Why can't we make enough to do both?

M: Because it would disrupt our economy?

C: Why?

M: Because our manufacturers won't sell abroad without an incentive.

C: What's an in-cent-ive?

M: Money.

C: But if they get money here for selling things why must they sell them abroad?

M: How do you think they're going to pay people for making things?

C: By giving them food, clothes, teachers, houses and doctors.

M: Don't be silly!

C: Mother what is wage restraint?

M: Taking less money for more work.

C: Why is this un-pop-ular step necessary to balance our ec-on-omy?

M: So that we can compete in world markets.

C: Like pushing to the front in the super-market?

M: No. So that we can sell cheaper.

C: You mean get less money.

M: No we make more money by selling more goods that we pay less to produce.

C: You mean we cheat!

M: No... we don't. The manufacturers do.

C: Why don't they give the people who work for them enough money to buy the goods to save having to sell them abroad.

M: How would the manufacturers live?

C: Must they? Why must we have money mother?

M: To buy things.

C: Why don't I give you money for food and all I get?

M: Because you're one of the family and you don't work yet.

C: Do the unemployed pay taxes on things?

M: Yes, but they get it back.

C: Does grannie pay taxes.

M: Yes, but she gets it back.

C: Seems silly to me. Do you pay daddy for what he buys?

M: No, I help him by running the house.

C: Don't we help Mr. Lloyd by running the country. Why must we pay him too?

M: We don't pay him. He's looking after our money.

C: He doesn't look after it very well, does he? Does he get paid for doing it?

M: Yes, of course.

C: Is he going to practise wage restraint?

M: Yes.

C: Mother what are dividends?

M: Money that people get for lending money.

C: Does money grow?

M: No... don't be silly.

M: It helps people to work.

C: Can't they work without it?

M: Of course they can't.

C: Do you work for money?

M: Of course not!

C: Why do people get money for lending money?

M: Because... why don't you ask your teacher all these questions, that's what she gets paid for.

C: She's on strike!

†To avoid any accusations of quoting from the capitalist press we use the *Daily Worker* (31/7/61) version of the Statement. Students of our Free Press are recommended to compare this with the *Times* summary!

Standing Still

WEEKS 29 & 30

Deficit on 'Freedom'	£600
Contributions received	£563
DEFICIT	£37

July 16th to July 29th

Brooklyn: C.W.S.* £1; N. Orleans: C.W.S. £1/5/6; Salisbury: L.S. £1; Tampa, Fla. K.C. £1; Lund: G.T. 1/-; Truro: M.S. 3/4; Liverpool: G.W.W. 1/-; Surrey: F.B.* 10/-; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Wolverhampton: J.G.L.* 6/6; Exmouth: A.B.H. 6/2; Glasgow: J.H. 1/6; Letchworth: C.D. 9d; London: N.S. (Bot per P.S.) 10/-; London: P. & G.T.* 5/-; Tonyandy: H.D. 2/6; London: Anon. 7/2; Victoria: D.L.H. £1/10/-; Cheltenham: L.G.W. 5/2; Bilston: J.W.P. 5/-; W'hampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; W'hampton: J.G.L.* 2/6; Leeds: G.H.L. 2/6; Ilford: M.D. 5/-; Shoreham: M. & D.* 2/6; St. Helena: S.S. 4/6; Colman's Hatch: O.M.* £10; Brooklyn: C.S.* 3/4; Glasgow: T.H.* 2/-; Stockholm: O.H. 3/-; London: T.K. 5/-	Total	22 19 9
Previously acknowledged	540	3 8
1961 TOTAL TO DATE	5563	3 5

*Denotes Regular Contributors.

International
Libertarian Youth
Summer Camp 1961

As in past years this libertarian gathering of youth will take place at Remoulins, near Avignon, France, during the month of August.

English comrades will be warmly welcomed.

For further details write to:

F.I.J.L.

159 Ledbury Road, London, W.11.

GINEMA

LONDON
ANARCHIST GROUP
CENTRAL MEETINGS

L.A.G. Central London meetings are suspended for the time being pending the booking of a new meeting-place.

Hyde Park Meetings

Every Sunday at 3.30 (if fine)

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 Dorothy Barasi's, 45 Twyford Avenue, Fortis Green, N.2.

No August meeting at Fortis Green.

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.

NEW MEETING

Last Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Laurens Otter's 57 Ladbroke Road, W.11.

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 2/5c. 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.

R.J.W.

Hard Cases

THE literature of prison life is vast and impressive. The anarchist contributions of Alexander Berkman and Peter Kropotkin are amongst the best but Jim Phelan, Mark Benney, Peter Wildeblood, W. F. R. Macartney and Oscar Wilde are also substantial contributors in this field.

Two more drops have trickled into the ocean of prison literature, *Time Out of Life* by Peter Baker (Heinemann 21/-), and *Prison from the Inside* by Laurens Otter (Socialist Current 1d.). These are as different in their format as they are in content and in the personalities of their authors.

Peter Baker had, in his own words, "built up a minor business empire which, at its peak, including four publishing businesses, a printing works in Lancashire, a West End wine merchant's, an aircraft research, development and production unit, a proprietary brand of whisky, two investment trusts, a radio and television company and a property company". He gave up active direction and became the youngest M.P. in the 'House'. Laurens Otter (known to many readers of FREEDOM) is an anarchist, (an Anglo-Catholic, a Pacifist Nuclear Disarmament activist, he has served several terms of imprisonment (including six

months for his participation in the Foulness demonstration) and on one occasion went on hunger strike and was forcibly fed.

Peter Baker was sentenced to seven years imprisonment for what was described as "the usual irregularities of commerce". He was expelled from the House, spent a great deal of his sentence unravelling his affairs and in making abortive attempts for an appeal, which may have been prejudiced by the fact that he pleaded 'Guilty'.

Baker appears to have been a model prisoner. Whereas Otter found open prisons 'pure hell' with stricter discipline and no trust, Baker, with an Army (and presumably Public School) background found Leyhill to his liking. Baker appears to have been trusted throughout his sentence. He was a leader and a red-band and gravitated to all the soft jobs. That he never attained promotion to a 'screw' seems to have been a factor beyond his control.

Baker's book constantly looks back in exasperation whereas Otter's pamphlet is essentially forward-looking.

Baker is only interested in events to the extent that they effected him. After all he was innocent, he had built up a minor business empire, he was the youngest ex-M.P. He lists a hair-raising number of flagrant violations of prison rulings, for example he discovers that first letters from a prisoner to an M.P. were entered in the records as posted and destroyed. (This happened to Baker's letter of resignation from the House, sent to Morrison). He quotes P.O.'s

advising prisoners that 'a good wank' is a relief for sexual passions. He quotes an A.G. saying "black men are animals". Repeatedly he tells of an officer emptying a chamber pot over his cell-floor and instructing him to clean it.

Peter Baker notes the statement by an officer "... Every man who comes here is innocent. All the guilty men must be left outside. But, even assuming you are innocent, don't pin any hopes on anything or anyone now you're here. We've seen it happen too often. Once you're sentenced you're finished. It's not a question of justice or innocence or the Official Receiver or the Prime Minister or Uncle Tom Cobleigh. It's just that they can't afford to admit that they make mistakes".

Baker's deficiency is his failure to connect. He sees events of brutality, of injustice, of inefficiency, as isolated events not as threads in a pattern. Laurens Otter, like many prisoners of conscience has seen the pattern. He comments on the 'lack of point' and the 'imbalance' of much of prison life

Baker sees human interest in the fact that old acquaintances keep turning up in prison. Companions in the resistance, a fellow M.P. (of the other party), company directors. (He quotes an anecdote of one saying "The last time I saw you at your club we needed £100,000. If you'd given us the money, I might never have been here." Baker grinned. "If I'd given you the money I'd have been here a lot sooner"). He makes the ideal gossip columnist writing a Court Circular of Wormwood Scrubs and Ley-

EMOTIONAL
RENEWAL

THE two films now showing at the Curzon Cinema provide the viewer with a feast of all the elemental ingredients of life. Love, hatred, murder, revenge, innocence and, most important of all, emotional renewal.

The first of these two memorable films is a Swedish contribution directed by Ingmar Bergman entitled "The Virgin Spring". The story consists of the occurrences which develop in a family of a Swedish farmer. The beautiful daughter of the farmer is full of innocence and trust, an unknowing virgin. The farmer's maid, however, is wise to life and a hardened cynic, she is pregnant as a result of an attack by a strong man in the woods, she is bitter and jealous of the lovely virgin.

One Spring day the young daughter has to take some candles to the Church and she is accompanied by the pregnant maid, they have to pass through the woods and whilst the virgin has not a care in the world, the maid is full of fear. They meet an evil old man who promises to rid the maid of her pregnancy but she is frightened and runs away into the woods. Meanwhile the young daughter carries on alone and comes across some goat-herdsmen with a boy. They are despicable creatures and their intentions are obvious, after talking with the girl for a while one of the herdsmen seizes her and rapes her. It is a nauseating scene, the poor bewildered young girl rises and begins to wail, at which one of the herdsmen clubs her and kills her. Before she is barely dead they take off her clothes and flee, leaving her practically naked with the boy, who is scared and soon runs after his brothers.

That night the herdsmen call at the farmer's house, not knowing he is the father of the murdered girl. They beg a night's rest, but the boy is obviously deeply upset and when everyone is in bed the herdsmen lay into him for not being tough enough. The farmer's wife hears the boy's cries and goes to see what is happening; the herdsmen deny they have hit the boy but there is blood on his mouth. As the farmer's wife is about to leave, one of the herdsmen offers some of the clothes they have stolen, clothes taken from the murdered daughter of the mother who is with them. She recognises her daughter's clothes, notices blood on them, and runs to her husband barring the door as she leaves. She shows the clothes to her husband who takes his slaughtering knife to seek revenge.

The incensed farmer, who has a brave, handsome face, enters the room where the herdsmen lie with the boy and there wreaks his revenge in a most horrible fashion, he even throws the boy against the wall and kills him. For this last act he is deeply ashamed, but now he must go with his family to find his daughter. They find her lying dead and weep over her body; then the farmer kneels and prays to God asking for forgiveness and pledging that he will build a Church with his own hands where his daughter lies. They stoop to pick up the girl's body and as they lift her head a spring bursts forth of crystal clear water, they kneel in the water of the virgin spring, their guilt is purged, innocence is reborn. Thus this deeply moving film ends. For me the meaning is one of hope, that we can rid ourselves of the guilt that hangs around our necks if we pledge ourselves to do the work of God, or of our particular conception of God. The direction of the film is admirable, the acting is wonderful, the film is absorbing and strengthening. It is worth seeing.

As if this were not enough the accompanying film, "Ballad of a Russian Soldier", made by the Russians is perhaps better than "The Virgin Spring". Whereas the Swedish film is hard and tough, born of violence and revenge, the "Ballad of a Russian Soldier" is romantic and loveable. Indeed it is a film about unselfish love and of the effect War has on such a love, and on how this type of love will always suffer immeasurably because of War, and all that it involves.

The story is of a young Russian soldier who, almost by accident, destroys

hill. "I met many policemen in prisons—we had eight at one time at Leyhill and, on another occasion, some fifteen in the Scrubs." Perhaps I am condemning Peter Baker for not writing a different book. Laurens Otter might have written a better pamphlet but his acceptance of his guilt and his one-pointedness saves us much of the pomposity of Peter Baker.

In practically every book about prison ever written a list of suggested reforms are included, Baker's list has all the defects of his legalistic, egotistical approach. Many of his reforms do not touch on prison itself. He suggests (1) A First Offenders' Bill, reducing sentences for first offenders (surely this is already taken into account by magistrates and judges? Baker is merely pleading his own case.) (2) Extension of vocational training in prison. (3) Far higher pay for work (Laurens Otter points out that this would not stop 'the barons'. (4) Increased visiting and mail. (5) More parole and suspended sentences. (6) Better facilities for legal consultations. (7) Reform of the Home Office.

Baker welcomes the institution of reform-centres like Leyhill. It is a sign of the failure of the prison system that only the 'predictable' successes go to such places. The futility of trying to reform Laurens Otter—or come to that, Peter Baker!

He also welcomes the improvements at the Scrubs including the wide extension of 'association'. Laurens Otter points out that this being 'compulsory' it loses its charms. In the same way that prisons, based upon the voluntary seclusion of the monastery failed when this is made compulsory.

Surface prison reforms all seem to fail at the point. Perhaps it is true that the most effective prison reform is dynamite.

J.R.

Judges' Rules

Continued from page 2

order then, if they can snap their fingers in the face of H.M. judges as to the methods they use in practice? Well, basically it is you and I who limit the appetite the police have for power. How far they go depends on how far we let them go. Policemen are ordinary human beings, even if they have taken on such a peculiar job. By methods both constitutional and unconstitutional the power of policemen has always been limited by ordinary people. At the individual level the great thing is to call the copper's bluff. If he barks at you, "Do you mind giving me your name and address?" (a basically polite sentence) when he finds you walking home at 3 a.m., the best answer is, perhaps, "Yes, I most certainly do mind," and when he comes back with, "I must ask you to accompany me to the station," then the reply, "No thanks, I don't happen to want to," really calls his bluff. He knows that 100 to 1 he will make a damned fool of himself if he arrests you, so (unless he is a bad case) he will accept defeat. Such a trivial manifestation of civil rights is not unimportant, for it does matter that we have the absolute right to go about our affairs at any time of day without molestation from the police.

The police job must be a dreadful one—but men don't have to take to it. Techniques of bluff and bullying are their main stock in trade, and their appetite for this is limited only by the everyday resistance they meet with. The Judges' Rules are bumbling, inept and ineffectual, but since they exist they are a working basis for dealing with any close contacts with the police. I give you them for what they are worth. You could have considerable amusement out of quoting them to a copper in the proper context. G.

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
Vol 10 1960: The Tragedy of Africa
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/-

CHARLES MARTIN

Towards a Free Society 2/6

RUDOLF ROCKER

Nationalism and Culture cloth 21/-

ERRICO MALATESTA

Anarchy 9d.

JOHN HEWETSON

Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2/6 paper 1/-

VOLINE

Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12/6

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

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