

The Myths of War & Peace

IN the kind of world set-up which regulates human affairs the possibility of war at some time or other is inevitable and it is naive of liberals and pacifists to fondly hope that the threat of war can be eliminated through the good offices of politicians and governments meeting over cocktails and caviar or in the more formal surroundings of disarmament conferences and UNO. It is naive and silly to imagine that wars ever start by "accident" or that every political crisis brings us to the brink of war. The pacifist propagandists are fast becoming like the boy in the fable who cried wolf so often when there was no wolf that on the occasion when he was calling the truth nobody believed him! We are not suggesting that the pacifists are liars, but we do suggest that they allow their hearts to get the better of their heads on the question of war. The game of

politics is not a slanging match, or a battle of wits between heads of government in which an ill-placed word, or a threat might well set in motion the machinery of war. As with an iceberg the real political dangers are below the surface out of view from a gullible public fed by the purveyors of mass communications with a load of sensationalism largely invented by fertile-minded hacks which pass off as "news". And, to our minds, only by trying to fathom the depths of politics; only by trying to understand how the system operates, who are the real rulers and last but not least realising that war is resorted to only when all else has failed, that those of us who want to see the threat of war removed for ever from our lives will be able to act at least with an awareness that we are at grips with the real problem.

along authoritarian lines all ruling classes must inevitably depend on the armed forces to maintain "law and order" (Kaunda, Kenyatta will realise this when the time comes to rule, as Nkhumba and Nehru did before them). So, in the authoritarian society if outside would-be aggressors exist or not, armed forces will still exist to defend the interests of the ruling classes. Pacifists should not overlook this aspect of

violence. After all, if they want international relations to be based on reason and discussion and not force, the first step is to seek to eliminate force from the organisation of our daily lives at all levels.

This digression is not altogether out of place since we would maintain that apart from their *raison d'être* for maintaining internal "law and order" the vast armaments programmes to which the major in-

dustrial powers are committed can only be explained in economic and financial, and not military, terms. For the "cold war" not only provides handsome profits and jobs for industrialists and workers respectively, but finances scientific research and the development of industrial techniques on a scale that private industry would be loathe, as well as unable, to finance at the expense of shareholders' dividends.

It may be said that such arguments cannot be applied to Russia's armaments programme. We agree that since the Russian people foot the bill either way, squandering man-

Continued on page 3

The Iceberg

LET us first deal with some of the myths of war, that is with the visible part of the political iceberg. (1) that nations would not engage in expensive armaments programmes if they did not expect to have to fight a war sooner or later. All governments argue that they are arming for defence and not with aggressive intentions. And unless one is prepared to look upon the Western powers as the defenders of

peace and individual freedom (overlooking such incidents as Cuba, Egypt, Angola, Algeria, Bizerta, etc., etc., as exceptions that prove the rule) and Russia as the would-be aggressor (overlooking the fact that in the past 16 years of "peace" they have had ample military opportunities to aggress the West, but have not) it is clear that the huge armament programmes of the major Powers cannot be explained in such black and white terms.

Since the present organisation of our society is without exception

N. Rhodesia Disturbances

A LETTER to the Times (24/8/61) from Lord Hemingford and Peter Calvoressi on behalf of the Africa Bureau contained the following significant observation concerning the disturbances in Northern Rhodesia: "Attacks seem to be directed" they write "against symbols of established authority rather than inspired by indiscriminate racial antagonism." These attacks were described as "reaching the proportion of a general uprising" by Richard Hall in the *Observer* (20/8/61) and throughout the last two weeks many reports have come in of sabotage, arson, unrest and violence. The official number of Africans killed by security forces is 18, but Kenneth Kaunda reports that 30 Africans have been killed, and at least 500 arrests have been made in the Luapula and Northern Provinces of Northern Rhodesia.

One should not forget that, up to now, no Europeans have been killed by Africans, and the tales of "violence" are little

more than the "attacks against symbols of established authority". Thus Roman Catholic missions have been burnt down, Government rest-houses reduced to ashes, Government schools set alight. In the Luapula Province a general strike was declared and "the majority of African workers in the remote, undeveloped bush territory obeyed the UNIP call to stay away from work." (*Daily Telegraph* 19/8/61). The day before it was reported that "branch officials of the United National Independence Party, impatient at delay by the party leader, Mr. Kaunda, to put his five-point "Master Plan" of civil disobedience into operation, had begun their own campaign". (*Telegraph* 18/8/61). Thus we notice again the initiative is with the local officials of the UNIP.

Direct action is spreading towards the Copperbelt, but it seems that here also it is not the leaders of the UNIP and the ANC who are at the forefront of the struggle. It is the militant rank and file

Kenneth Kaunda who is now again in this country for his second visit in the last two weeks, has put his mysterious "Master Plan" into operation by burning his Identification Certificate, and he expects more violence if no independent commission of inquiry is set up to investigate the "political situation". Kaunda has unmistakably shown his political approach and his distrust of his own people. It is true that men close to him in the Party are inclined to be vicious, but these people are intent on power and are thus at the centre. The real representatives of the people are in the local areas, near the people and with an understanding of the issues involved and a responsibility towards the people. Power is not the concern so much here, because that is to be had at the centre, freedom is much more the driving force. R.J.W.

Perpetual Crisis!

The response to the appeal we published in the last issue of FREEDOM for readers whose subscriptions had expired to renew them; for others to introduce new readers as well as contribute to our funds has not met with the response we had hoped for. But to those few readers who have, may we add our thanks to the post-card acknowledgements they have already received.

In next week's FREEDOM we shall be in a position to give the financial situation as at the end of August, and in future issues we hope to be able to give week by week a fairly accurate picture of the fluctuations in our fortunes (or misfortunes).

WEEKS 33 and 34
August 12th to 28th

Berkeley: R.E.J. £1/15/-; —: L* 5/-; East Sheen: P.O. 5/-; Glasgow: J.H.* 1/6; Petworth: C.B. 7/7; Wolverhampton: J.G.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Surrey: F.B.* 10/-; Stockholm: O.H. 10/-; Southend: P.A.O. 5/-; New York: N.M.C.D. £8/15/-; Leeds: G.H.L. 2/3; Victoria: B.E. 4/-; Avelly: S.J.L. 5/-; Nuneaton: D.H. 10/-; —: L* 2/6; Slough: P. & J.H. £1; Richmond: R.O. 5/6; London: P. & G.T.* 2/6; London: F.S. 6/-; Dundee: A.S.L.R. £5; Bradwell: B.M. £4/16/-; Seaford: D.T. 2/-; Maidstone: S.P. £1; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Wolverhampton: J.G.L.* 2/6; Welwyn: 'Mog' £1; London: D.R. £1/3/6; Glasgow: S.M. 8/-; London: K.L. 10/-; Los Gatos: Group (per A.D.) £17/10/-; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Wolverhampton: J.G.L.* 2/7; Brecon: L.F.F. £1.

Total 48 14 11
Previously acknowledged 578 10 1

1961 TOTAL TO DATE £627 5 0

*Denotes Regular Contributors.

'Shoot thy Neighbour'

ACCORDING to recent accounts in the press, there is, evidently, a growing philosophy, among Civil Defence officials in this country, that in case of nuclear attack "shoot your neighbour before he shoots you."

The August 9th issue of the *San Francisco Chronicle* reported that a Riverside Civil Defence official (Keith Dwyer) stated publicly that Riversidians should equip their bomb shelters with guns, as well as food, etc., so that when the bomb falls they can drive off invaders—including their next-door neighbours. He also said that Civil Defence has abandoned evacuating plans for Los Angeles and the surrounding suburban areas as nearly impossible.

The same article refers to another circumstance which was more fully reported in the previous Sunday's *Chronicle*, in particular, that a Nevada defence official (J. Carleton Adair) had put forward a plan for Nevada to form a 5,000 man militia "to protect our homes and people" from Los Angeles evacuees. Dwyer supported him in this, though

Adair's militia would be shooting his fellow Californians as a last resort.

Adair had warned earlier that an H-bomb attack on L.A. would bring millions of refugees into Las Vegas "like a swarm of human locusts—that will pick the valley clean of food and medical supplies." The armed Nevada militia would guide refugees to food dispersal centres and "push them along their way to the rear areas." He also noted that "we (the Nevadians) have an obligation to our own people first."

Another voice from Nevada, Brigadier General J. T. Roberts (U.S.A. Ret.) urged families to equip their shelters with shotguns.

Quite a stir among civic officials was raised by all of these comments; CD officials in Clark County, Nevada met with Federal CD officials to resolve the militia controversy. The board of supervisors joined by newspapers (in Riverside) referred to Dwyer's emotional instability and prepared to fire him. Dwyer made some comment about being "absorbed by his work".

Though their statements were a bit bloody, the civic officials outraged, and the typical reader of the everyday press shocked, the gruesome and pessimistic comments of the CD officials were probably more realistic in their implicit predictions as to what would happen to human relationships in the case of nuclear war than the politicians, mass-magazine strategists, etc., who calmly assert that, though 50 million (plus or minus ten?) would be killed in the process of blast, blaze, fall-out and starvation, the economy would be back to

normal, the society stable as ever and the government functioning in its present way (they usually say very little about the latter two), and the population back to the level before the war. If one stops and considers the disruptive effects of blast, fall-out and radiation, on the land, livestock, machinery, power-lines, one can see that the previous assumptions are extremely unrealistic.

I doubt whether most Americans, though I imagine Britons are somewhat more aware as they seem more complaining about the government's nuclear policy, are aware of the disastrous effects which would ensue upon the destruction of the industrial plants, communications, transportation, and wide areas of agricultural land, in addition to the dislocation of large numbers of frightened people from the target areas into the hands of millions of other frightened people not in the target areas.

Competition would be reduced to a very Darwinian level; the struggle for existence intensified to the point where culture breaks down, where every man must murder to survive—a situation which only exists among certain savages on small islands whose nutritional balance depends upon cannibalism. It is not unlikely that under the impulses born of hate, fear, and bitterness, primitive intolerant cults would arise out of the disorder, morbid little tyrannies and despotisms become the new form of the state.

In short a reversion to barbarism, even savagery for a limited period after the nuclear assault, of an extremely virulent war in any area attacked where central-

ization of the economy and of power (most modern states), was the rule and where high percentages of the population lived near potential targets in cities.

One wonders at the schizoid ignorance and the moral and ethical flabbiness of the people, and more intensely the power-élites, in all those nations which brandish nuclear weapons around, and make war threats constantly at each other: the U.S. the USSR, West Germany, France, etc. One also wonders at the numbness of will; the lack of the biological urge to self-preservation, that allows nearly all of them to continue supporting the policies and the activities of their respective governments, both in word and action, when the result of an "error" or an "accidente" in any of those policies or actions could result, not only in the deaths of millions of innocent (and not so innocent) human-beings, but in the death of culture and the severing of the slender threads of civilisation that save us from, at least, the more obvious forms of murder and mass brutality; the wiping out in a day or two of frantic nationalism, the great labour of mankind through the last 50,000 years to climb out of the caves.

Since the national state is of now the perpetrator of the war system (outdoing even 19th century and early twentieth century capitalists), the bureaucrats, politicians, and mass industrialists the greatest beneficiaries of the present systems, and the people, culture, art, and science, the greatest losers, an anarchist revolt against the state would be, contrary to conventional opinion, an affirmation of the human ideal the civilized and humanistic aspects of culture and life. Whereas supporters of the existing order of things are moving and/or drifting, as the case may be, towards savagery, the degradation of culture, and elemental chaos.

San Francisco.

MAURINE BLANCK.

ANARCHY 7

IS ALL ABOUT
ADVENTURE PLAYGROUNDS

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

"THE MINERS IN CRISIS AND WAR" by R. Page Arnot, Allen & Unwin, 42s.

IN the hey-day of Victorian individualism, it was the fashion to write the lives of 'pillars of the Establishment' in three, four or even five volume biographies. In our collectivist age, few individuals are deemed to merit more than a single volume. The fashion for the multi-volume work has been transferred from individuals to organisations. It is a mark, perhaps, of Labour's entry into the Establishment that trade unions as well as the great capitalist firms are now getting the full treatment. In the last few years the writing of Labour history has in fact achieved the accolade of academic respectability with the setting up of a special professional association—the Society for the Study of Labour History.

The present volume is a good example of the new fashion at its best. It is the third in a projected series of four relating the history of the British miners' organisations. Well-documented and scholarly, it provides a flowing narrative of the most important events in the history of the miners' struggle to improve their pay and conditions of work. Ever-mindful of the national and international background of this struggle, Page Arnot's volumes are

The Miners

a notable contribution to recent social history.

The period covered in this volume is 1930 to 1944. In the first of these years, a quarter of a million miners were unemployed. Two years later, when the depression was at its worst, the figure was 435,000—equivalent to more than 2 out of every 5

miners. In these conditions, the Miners' Federation was struggling for survival. Militant industrial action of the kind practised in the previous couple of decades was well-nigh impossible. The premium was on skilful negotiators of the type of Ebby Edwards rather than on militants like A. J. Cook. Under

STILL TO BE WRITTEN

It is an accepted claim that the generals plan their future campaigns on the pattern of past wars, and it is equally true that the politicians seek to stub their oratory with symbols half a century out of date so that in the age of the meta-machine gun they still draw the metaphysical sword. And even Churchill, that old master of rambling and ornate rhetoric, managed to send a shudder through even the most gormless of camouflage indoctrinated swaddies by declaiming that "the sun was shining on the helmets of our soldiers", and many a junior officer I/c Camouflage, questioned for the first time the wisdom of the most high. Yet while it is true that the soldier and the politician lean on the past for their guidance so too did the intellectuals in their conception of the vision and the horror of war.

A hundred films, a thousand books and countless poems sang of the Flanders slaughter-house and a generation of young men in 1939 accepted their place in the khaki and the grey armies fully prepared to accept the trench, the mud, the barbed wire and the rest of the bag of tricks and found instead the boredom of the barracks and the nightmare of time-killing 'bull'. They were a sober generation, intellectually and physically, and they accepted their call without heroics for the majority believed that this, for the British people, was the inevitable end of the grim game that had begun in the 'thirties and that this war was the logical and inevitable conclusion against the forces of the right personified in the German National Socialist Party and the grubby person of Adolph Hitler.

And they poured into the barracks and learned to erect barbed wire, dig trenches, bayonet straw men, bone boots and practice a fatuous version of street fighting more suited to the alleys of an eastern town and an unarmed population than an enemy learned in the ways of death. For even in 1939 the lessons of the Spanish war had not filtered through the British army. It was in the long evenings that the literary recruits sought their acceptance world and on army bedboards and in institutionalized canteens wrote and wrote.

They filled their diaries and wrote their memoirs and the preconceived phrases fell into place but never the events to justify them so that when after years of frustrating impotence the battle was finally met the pattern and the pictures had become too set to alter and they could but jot down the dates and the names of places.

Of all the myriad words that have been spewed forth there is none that can truly tell the tale and it is only Graves' "Goodbye to all that" with its casual irritation at daily death that is left to speak for the dead of two wars. Sven Berlin offers us his version with "I am Lazarus". A peace-time pacifist, Sven Berlin served with a forward observation group for a heavy artillery regiment. He was a tanker, for he says "it has been harder and rougher in the tanks—but richer, I think, and more real. Probably it suited me better", but as the choice of rank was limited one feels that he was making the best of a bad job. Yet his record of events is worthless for thought, form and feeling are completely artificial.

To write of English soldiers bashing out a rhythm of "We go to fight the Germans" is a slur on a race of cynics; and to write of the advance onto Calais as "September has already laid her golden hand upon the mellowing shoulder of the year before we started to drive north in pursuit of the enemy in his leopard coat" is deathless prose at its worst. But as Berlin records, he had

left emphatic instructions that in the even of his death his friend the Captain was to have his well-publicized notes. But Sven Berlin lived and we can have them for twenty-one bob. Yet they that would seek in this smug and culture-conscious book to read the true face of war will seek in vain.

The petty frustrations, the scraping of floor boards with safety razor blades; the awful majesty of being marched in on one's first military charge; the sense of doom when placed under close arrest; full kit at six in the morning on jankers, stand-to at four a.m. in the silence and the darkness, wearing only boots, shirt, army overcoat, helmet and rifle; the thieving N.C.O.'s the misery of the 2nd lieutenant who shares his private's common pool of timeless despair; the disgust at drawing the two-till-four a.m. stag when on guard; the three-sided square for the white-faced courts martial victim; the fascination of seeing the first German dead and the feeling of indignity and outrage when one encounters the first British dead; the drunken cooks and the pathetic shit-house wallah and the sense of security that one possesses as one lies on the pavement of a strange town hopelessly drunk yet still conscious that the uniform you wear will guarantee your safety as it did time and time again; and the sweet and glorious acceptance of the guilt of nihilism as, in small groups, you prowl through the silent and broken cities, abandoned even by the dogs . . . all this has still to be written.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

Edwards' leadership the M.F.G.B. survived and gradually recovered its strength in the '30's, but it was the war, rather than clever negotiations with slippery politicians, which was the real factor in restoring relative prosperity to the mining community. Faced with the prospect of military defeat, the British ruling class discovered its need of the men who, a few years earlier, it had been willing to consign to the industrial scrap-heap.

Apart from this change in the fortunes of the miners, the other main theme of this period is the establishment of a national union. The M.F.G.B. was a federation made up of some forty-odd county and district associations. The structure of the union reflected the structure of the industry. In the circumstances of depression and defeat, the federal structure proved a liability to the miners. The main hope of improving pay and conditions lay in securing a national agreement but this was not feasible so long as the mine-owners were able to play off one district union against another. After much debate and a good deal of haggling, the national union was finally achieved in 1944; the 55-year-old M.F.G.B. gave way to the National Union of Mineworkers.

In telling the story of this organisational transformation, Page Arnot presents it as pure gain. The N.U.M. is undoubtedly more powerful than the old M.F.G.B. As the ownership of an industry becomes centralised, unions too must centralise if they are to remain a match for the owners. But there is always a price to be paid for centralisation: increasing bureaucracy and oligarchical leadership. In the post-war years there are many indications that the N.U.M. has not escaped paying this price. It is to be hoped that Page Arnot, in his final volume, will provide a more balanced assessment of this organisational change than he has given us here. The federal principle may be out-moded in the era of the centralised collectivist state but, if so, this needs to be demonstrated and not merely assumed.

G.O.

SOCIALISM BY PRESSURE GROUP

GEOFFREY OSTERGAARD

an excellent account of the Fabian Society as a socialist pressure group (FREEDOM Aug. 12) fails to mention its other function—a front organisation for the Labour Party. Indeed he only refers once to the Labour Party, and then only in passing, which isn't really good enough, even for FREEDOM. It is worth noting that membership of the Society according to the little note in its frequent publications, "is open to all who are eligible for individual membership of the Labour Party" which effectively excludes anyone who belongs to most other political groups whether to the right or to the left; neither Liberals nor Communists have a chance of taking it over. The note adds that "other radicals and reformers sympathetic towards the aims of the Society may become Associates" (with no voting power of course). What it does not add is that the Society is actually affiliated to the Party, as one of the five "Socialist Societies" which send four delegates to the Annual Conference and which join the "Co-operative and Professional Organisations" in putting Arthur Skelington, M.P. for Hayes and Harlington on the National Executive Committee of the Labour Party. More informally, most of the top people in the Fabian Society are top intellectuals in the Labour Party.

The Society is in fact a sort of intellectual debating hall for Party disputes which might get out of hand if they were conducted in the popular Press, Transport House, the Annual Conference or the House of Commons. It is at the same time a safety valve for clever malcontents, a kite-flying device for the Party.

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

Russia and the West under Lenin and Stalin
G. F. Kennan 40/-
Culture for the Millions?
(ed.) N. Jacobs 37/6

SECOND-HAND

Wie Lebt der Arbeiter und Bauer in Russland? (1920)
Augustin Souchy 7/6
The Terror Machine
Gregory Klimov 8/6
The Industrial Revolution
W. Cunningham 4/-
Gypsies of Britain
Brian Vesey-Fitzgerald 6/-
New Data for Lenin's "Imperialism"
(ed.) E. Varga and L. Mendelsohn 7/6
Fanfare for Free Thought
Bayard Simmons 3/6
Der Freiheitsucher
John Henry Mackay 10/-
Seven Women Against the World
Margaret Goldsmith 12/6
Memoirs of Bygone Eton
Henry S. Salt 8/-
Lectures and Essays
T. H. Huxley 2/6
Man's Place in Nature
T. H. Huxley 2/6
Jesus Christ: his Apostles and Disciples in the Twentieth Century
Count Camille de Renesse 2/6
Justice and Liberty
G. Lowes Dickinson 3/-
National Welfare and National Decay
William McDougall 3/-
The Tragedy of Waste
Stuart Chase 3/6
Boys and Girls and Gods (damaged)
Naomi Mitchison 2/6
War Dance
E. Graham Howe 4/-
Democracy and Liberty
W. E. H. Lecky (2 vols.) 7/6 the set
Envy
V. Olesha 3/-
Erewhon
Samuel Butler 4/-
Erewhon Revisited
Samuel Butler 4/-
Further Outlook
W. Grey Walter 3/-
The Revolutionary Idea in France, 1789-1871
Godfrey Elton 8/6

PERIODICALS

Id, No. 6, July 1/6

Freedom Bookshop

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

17a MAXWELL ROAD

FULHAM SW6 Tel: REN 3736

IN THE BEGINNING WAS THE SLOGAN

THE conference was called for 1000 hours in J.C.'s Slogan Slogger" as he called it. Since J.C.'s motto was "The Ad. Business is 75% perspiration, 5% effluvia and 20% inspiration", we called it the sweat shop, with its Brancusi ash-trays and tear-shaped table.

J.C. was there at 1000 precisely. He was in Minif during the war, was the first employee of the B.B. C and D to have a crew-cut, and the first secret subscriber to the *New Yorker*.

The tape recorder was switched on. "Men," he said, "We have a new account. What our client has to sell is a food, a detergent, a patent-medicine with a long record of cures, an insurance policy and a status symbol."

"All at once?" said his dead-pain feed, Lewis.

We all knew what the product was, but in the advertising business this is not the main thing. "Our client has been in the business for literally thousands of years but he feels now that he's losing his customers."

"Could we re-style the product?" said Jensen.

"I think there are too many varieties of the product. Too many producers in the field."

"Our client feels he has the real monopoly of the product. All the others are imitation, but he doesn't like knocking copy."

"Wasn't a monopoly established once?"

"Yes . . . but it wasn't by our clients and they feel that while a monopoly is desirable, especially in the foreign markets, the methods used by their competitors are not quite . . . gentlemanly."

"You mean the threat-approach?"

"Quite."

"What has been happening is that producers have been successfully marketing inferior brands that only feature some facet of the whole product . . . Miss Richards will you circulate the notes by E.C. in *What?*"

We all dutifully studied the percentages.

"Our client," says J.C., "feels he has the monopoly of the product and he wishes to put over this point of view wisdom-wise, that is he feels he has an edge on his competitors."

"Isn't it possible, J.C., that they are claiming *too much* for the product?" said Thomas.

"Well . . . the promotion material, which has just been re-drafted, seems to substantiate their claims (Robinson, pass around the client's material)." Several thick black books with gilt edges were handed out.

"Wisdom-wise," said Thomas, "There's really too much material. The fire insurance angle, the catering angle, the love interest, and the cures all seem too much of a good thing."

"But our clients say it's all substantiated and you can't ignore our part without de-vitalizing the product."

"What about re-naming it?"

"What about marketing it as a specific against the disease of materialism?"

"No . . . the client wants to emphasize that it's no bar to worldly success."

"What about Godliness is Good for You?"

"You'll be twice the Man on Religion."

"It's Colossal, It's Christian, It's Crucifying."

The ball was now in play. "Godliness lasts the whole Life through . . . and Beyond."

"Those who meditate together, accumulate together."

"One-ness!"

"Wash in Lamb's Blood. Whiter than snow."

"Bread of Heaven makes inspiring intake."

"Manna for manners."

"Better live on your knees than die on your feet."

"Prevents that Krushchev feeling."

"Love that God!"

"He thought his sins were scarlet . . ."

"One in every three has it. Have you?"

"It was good enough for our forefathers. Are you good enough for it?"

"He is Coming."

"Just the thing for the End of the World."

When we get in on one of J.C.'s sweat sessions we all get sent. The ash trays heap high. Slogans flow from our lips. Through it all J.C. sits tense, waiting for the moment when he will raise his hand and say "Enough". Then the tape-recorder is switched off and we leave the room to return to our offices, purged and yet refreshed, knowing that later J.C. would play back the recording and from it choose the slogan he had decided on and plot out the whole campaign at a later session.

"Prove it for Yourself. Peak-praying power."

"The Best people have it . . . Are you good enough for it?"

"For Eternal Rest."

"In this Quiet Country Church he found peace . . ."

"The Refresher."

"The Prayerful Pause that Refreshes."

"You're Never Alone when you're Alone."

"Light up with the Light of the World."

"Are You Going to Heaven?"

"How would you like a free halo?"

"Three Hundred Bishops Recommend It."

"Are You Worried About the Future?"

"They Laughed When I Kneel Down to Pray."

"Are you a sheep or a goat?"

A ray of light filtered through the smoke-laden air, it rested on J.C. and momentarily a smoke-ring hovered over his balding crew-cut head.

"Enough!" he said.

THE MYTHS OF WAR & PEACE

Continued from page 1

power, raw materials and industrial equipment producing weapons which are superceded by the time they come off the production belts in no one's interest. Therefore one can only conclude that either Russia has aggressive intentions, or that her rulers definitely fear American aggression, or that there exists a powerful section of the community whose privileged position derives from the armament industry; or, finally, that Russia's self-declared military strength is largely bluff? We do not profess to know the answer, though we doubt, however much the ruling class in Russia may wish to increase its power beyond its frontiers, that it would be prepared to engage in war to achieve such ends. Such opinion, we would add, is not influenced by illusions as to their political ambitions.

In conclusion, therefore, we should say that we do not believe that today wholesale armament programmes and war are synonymous.

(2) *That the fate of mankind is in the hands of a few top politicians.* The implication of this myth is that Macmillan, the two Mr. Ks, and de Gaulle have the effective power to give the word to destroy mankind. This is utter nonsense. We would say that it is obvious that the Press, for instance, is more powerful than the top mouthpieces of the ruling class. The Press can make or break any of these men even as figureheads. (Is there not, at this very moment, a campaign in the millionaire Press to get rid of Macmillan? Criticism of his "leadership" has been outspoken in the past few months, and the howls of rage at his statement to the Press last Saturday while relaxing on the golf course at Gleneagles, that he thought the Berlin crisis was "all got up by the Press" and that "nobody is going to fight about it" were not limited to the *Sunday Pictorial's* whole front page splash to the effect

that "Macmillan drops a silly brick"). The histrionics of the politicians is all part of their profession; it's what they are paid to do, but no war has even been started over politicians calling each other names or for "dropping bricks". Summit meetings are held to maintain the myths of the supermen, the super negotiators who, when all seems lost, and war is just round the corner come together and speak to each other as superman to superman and world peace is secure until the next "crisis" is dragged across the world stage. Whereas the reality is that these men have their "briefs" and stick to them: all the "brinkmanship", and "tough negotiations" the mutual insults, the conciliatory gestures this is the showmanship, the visible eighth of the political iceberg.

(3) *That war may start "accidentally".* This seems to us one of the biggest myths of all. That someone will have to press buttons to launch the first missiles if war were to come, is probably true. But the idea fostered by the unilateralist propagandists that the button might be pressed by mistake, or the order given to press the button might be given by some paranoid officer is too fantastic to be taken seriously. War may start suddenly so far as the uninformed public is concerned, but for those who take the decisions, war is the culmination of months, or years of weighing up financial and political interests and trends and not an impulsive, intuitive decision by a political leader or adviser. Apart from the financial and political considerations the chances of military success have then to be considered and these demand a thorough assessment of the industrial ability to implement the military requirements. It is, of course, a process which is going on all the time; the decision-making machine is a large one, probably a cumbersome one which cannot press buttons impulsively!

Destroy the Myths of Authority!

IN trying to expose the myths of war and by implication the myths of peace, which are dear to the hearts of the unilateralists and the well-meaning Left, we are not suggesting that there is no point in agitating against war, against preparations for war and for a world of peace. What we are suggesting however is that in seeking to influence governments, shadow cabinets and political leaders of the dangers of war and to the need for disarmament, the pacifists and the propagandists of the Left are wasting their energies: (a) because no government will ever accept to disarm—the real rulers just won't allow them to! and (b) because the issue of war and peace lies deeply embedded in the financial and social system under which we all live.

We have, in the past, expressed our support for campaigns of civil disobedience, but not because we believe that governments will disarm if faced with a massive campaign, but because civil disobedience is the first and essential step towards self-government, and individual and collective responsibility.

The power of the State rests on the acquiescence of the overwhelming mass of the population; privi-

lege for the few will remain so long as the majority accept it as a normal state of affairs; inequality will continue to exist so long as too few people passionately believe in equality; power will remain in few hands so long as the people continue to believe (encouraged by the Press and the politicians) that they are powerless.

Our task must be to destroy the myths of Authority, not strengthen them by repeating them. To suggest for instance that the fate of the world hinges on the decisions of half a dozen political leaders of the Big Powers might of course provoke a few warm-hearted individuals to seek to eliminate them. (Whilst we would be the last to condemn their generous gesture, we would be the first to point out that the real governing power would remain and just install another mouthpiece). But so far as the majority of the people are concerned it would strengthen in them the feeling of impotence and helplessness. What all of us who genuinely seek peace in a world of free men must do is to help, encourage and incite our fellow-beings to become aware of their potentialities. And civil disobedience can be an effective "body-building" exercise!

MY theme in this symposium on anarchism and respectability is "are we respectable enough?", and in asking this question I am not concerned with the way we dress, or whether our private lives conform to a statistical norm, or how we earn our living, but with the quality of our anarchist ideas: are our ideas worthy of respect?

The word "anarchy" means "contrary to authority", which is sufficiently vague for us to be able to interpret it perfectly correctly in many ways. We could speak of a personal anarchism, referring to the way in which someone organised his life so as to avoid as far as possible the incursion of external authority. Or we could speak of a social anarchism, referring to a point of view which sought to oppose or limit or eliminate the principle of authority from our social life. Many anarchists combine both attitudes of course. The principle difference between them is that the first need not be a propagandist attitude, except by implication, and the second invariably is. And because it is, we have to be concerned with the intellectual respectability of the ideas propagated.

Because the most obvious externally imposed authorities in our social life are political and economic, and because as a social philosophy anarchism is historically linked with eighteenth-century liberalism and nineteenth-century socialism, both anarchists and non-anarchists alike have tended to assume that anarchism in its social aspect is a form of revolutionary socialism, or revolutionary liberalism, dedicated to bringing about, at some time in the future, by means of persuasion, or by means of a popular insurrection, or by means of mass industrial action, or by all three, an anarchist society.

I do not believe that this is an intellectually respectable idea. Not because it is unfashionable, or because it is unpopular, or because it is unlikely or improbable, or because of any defects of anarchism at all, but because human society is not like that. An anarchist society is not impossible. No kind of society is impossible. If you are powerful enough and ruthless enough you can impose any kind of society on people—for a time. But you can only do so by methods, which though they may be thought permissible for any other kind of "ism", are repugnant to anarchists, while the degree of social cohesion presupposed by the idea of "an anarchist society" could only, it seems to me, occur in a society so embedded in the cake of custom that the idea of choice among alternative patterns of social behaviour didn't occur either. I cannot imagine that degree of unanimity, and I don't think I would like it if I could. So we haven't got to worry about the boredom of utopia: we shan't get there.

But what do we do on reaching this conclusion? One reasonable reaction is to stress again the individual character of anarchism and declare like Robert Frost and Ammon Henacoy "I believe in the one-man revolution. We ain't going to get any other kind." Another reaction, and one which is a good deal less intellectually respectable, is to sit down and cry like a child whose toy has been broken, and conclude that because no road leads to utopia, no road leads anywhere, an attitude which in the end is identical with the utopian one because it asserts that there are no partial, piecemeal, compromise or temporary solutions, only one attainable or unattainable final solution. But as Herzen said:

"a goal which is infinitely remote is not a goal at all, it is a deception. A goal must be closer—at the very least the labourers wage or pleasure in work performed. Each epoch, each generation, each life has had, and has, its own experience, and the end of each generation must be itself."

ANARCHISM & RESPECTABILITY

[We are publishing, in two instalments, the text of Colin Ward's lecture at this year's anarchist Summer School. To avoid misunderstandings it should be pointed out that this is the personal viewpoint of one of the Editors and not a group statement. But it is in our opinion an important and controversial statement which deserves careful reading and should provoke much discussion.—EDITORS].

The choice between libertarian and authoritarian solutions is not a once-and-for-all cataclysmic struggle, it is a series of running engagements, most of them never concluded, which occur, and have occurred, in every society, and I think that those anarchists like George Molnar who see anarchism as permanent protest, have an attitude which is a good deal more respectable than those who in fact make it an attitude of permanent postponement.

Every human society, except the most totalitarian of utopias or anti-utopias, is a plural society with large areas which are not in conformity with the officially imposed or declared values. (An example of this can be seen in the alleged division of the world into capitalist and communist blocks: there are vast areas of the capitalist society which are not capitalistic, and there are many aspects of the so-called socialist

societies which cannot be described as socialist. You might even say that the only thing that makes life livable in the capitalist world is the unacknowledged non-capitalist element within it, and the only thing that makes survival possible in the communist world is the allegedly capitalist element in it. This is why a controlled market is the left-wing demand in a capitalist economy—along with state control, while a free market is a left-wing demand in a communist society—along with workers' control!) It seems to me that we could develop, in harmony with the attitude of "permanent protest" a counter-cyclical anarchist strategy here, that of opposition to whatever is the dominant social trend. Certainly I find myself using different arguments for anarchy—or rather stressing a different aspect of anarchism, when arguing with conservatives, than when arguing with socialists.

The Anarchist Yardstick

THE concept of a free society may be an abstraction, but that of a free-er society is not. It is at this point, when arguing with my fellow anarchists, that the growls of "reformism" or "revisionism" begin, because they assume that, having abandoned utopia, the next step is to go and vote for the Labour Party. But this is not what I would say at all, although on the counter-cyclical argument, there are perfectly intellectually respectable arguments for anarchists to vote—as someone put on the Freedom Readership Survey form: "to keep the other lot out". Personally I would use instead the anarchist scarcity-value argument. Since the anarchists are a minority, a permanent minority, it follows that we have a scarcity value in society, and like rationed goods, we have, in our social capacity, to reserve ourselves for those aspects of social activity where we can make the most effective use of our energies. For every hundred thousand people who will support some desirable item in a political programme, there are, say, one hundred who will support a really basic social change, and for this hundred there is perhaps one who will go the whole anarchist way. Thus even though we may on empirical or pragmatic grounds find some political measure completely worthy of our support, we don't want to use up our energies working for it, because there are plenty of other people to do so while we are somewhere else. Economists have a way of expressing this graphically: something to do with "indifference curves" which always slope downwards from left to right. Or a matter of diminishing marginal productivity!

Now having thrown the idea of an anarchist society out of the front door, I want to let it in again by the back window. Not as an aim to be realised, but as a yardstick, a measurement or means of assessing reality. When an economist speaks of "perfect competition" or a sociologist speaks of such-and-such a society, they are not speaking of

anything that exists or is likely to exist, but of a "model" or "ideal type" of an economy or a society, by means of which we measure what exists. It is a purely theoretical concept, but it is perfectly reasonable for us to construct such a model (though if we do we run the risk that the very people who resent the abandonment of utopia will shake an admonitory finger and say, "No blueprints, comrade!")

But here again I don't think we are intellectually respectable. You may remember that a few months ago FREEDOM published two letters, from a sixth-former and a university student, asking questions about anarchist theory, and the editor added a footnote saying "Here we have some 'objections to anarchism' by the young generation of the 1960's which we must answer convincingly if we are to hold and encourage their interest in our ideas". The sixth-former's questions were largely on the topic of the feasibility of an anarchist society, and he got two quite good answers. The university student's questions was "In a society where industries are governed by workers' control where does the capital for these industries come from?" He says that when he asked this question at an LAG meeting, it was greeted with general laughter, but I don't think it a funny question. It was this very point which G. D. H. Cole singled out at the end of his life, looking back on his guild socialist days, as one which syndicalist theory had simplified out of existence, and it is this point which the dissident Yugoslav communist theoreticians, in attempting to reconcile the theory of workers' control with that of a planned investment programme, have failed to solve. I should have thought it was a point worth talking about even if the answer was merely a suggestion to the questioner that, working on the assumption that anarchy was desirable, he should use his own special knowledge to try and find a convincing answer to his question.

(To be concluded)

Continued from page 2

Establishment and a nice dependent-looking façade for left-wing intellectuals who lean towards Social Bureaucracy but can't quite stomach the Labour Party. In its first capacity we see the defence, nationalisation and culture debates ritualised in monthly instalments, which gratify the protagonists while neutralising their rancour; in its second we see the research pamphlets, which are often prepared by members of the Transport House staff to foreshadow policy changes; and in its third we see special treats for uncommitted but sympathetic intellectuals, such as Kingsley Amis's *Socialism & the Intellectuals*, Wayland and Elizabeth Young's *The Socialist Imagination*—and we might also have seen Michael Young's *The Chipped White Cups of Dover* a year ago if it hadn't stepped too far out of the Party line, by suggesting the idea of "a new progressive party" (its original title) and been narrowly rejected by the Society's Executive Committee for that reason.

Make no mistake, the Fabian Society couldn't survive as a pressure group any longer than its mirror-image, the Bow Group, if it weren't constantly preserved as a front organisation by the Labour Party. It is quite different from the Young Socialists' organisation, which is openly run by the Party bureaucracy, or the New Left movement, which is genuinely independent; it manages to get the best of both worlds, chiefly because it has a tradition of political respectability (not to say downright timidity) which has percolated down to the Young Fabians, and so survives and remains the exception to the rule stated by Geoffrey Ostergaard: that pressure groups are normally highly unstable. The point is that its members can feel that they are more than mere intellectuals or mere politicians, and so save their fear of political or intellectual inadequacy respectively; at the same time the Party Establishment can feel that it is using the Society rather than the other way round (which is the simple truth), and so save its fear of either political or intellectual independence. This is why Fabians like Cole are so ineffective when it comes to the point—they can't last any longer in the Society if they oppose the Party than the Anarchists could 74 years ago. Thus the Horrabin tortoise plods on, winning race after race, only to learn too late that the hare changed the rules half way through. A.F.

IS NATURE BOY THE FREEDOM TYPE?

DEAR FRIENDS,

Libertarian's article "No Love for Sir" (FREEDOM August 12) reacted in my mind with one or two tendencies in FREEDOM which don't quite satisfy me, to give an expression of this discontent. It seems to me you have two standards for the judgment of a person's worth, or of the worth of the life he is leading:—

(a) A type of character you often extol is the hard-drinking, free-spending building worker, as free as possible from managerial control, getting on with the job without being pushed, contemptuous of 'toffs' and social niceties and of the finer points of the law. (Similar types in other trades, of course; and Reg. Wright's Coventry gang worker in the motor-trade largely fits in with this conception). In other words, a sort of nature boy of anarchism, leading your conception of "the good life" joyfully and naturally. Please don't get the idea I'm sneering at this conception, but I think that under present conditions it has grave limitations.

(b) Then there is what might be termed the "political" anarchist—the person who reads FREEDOM, thoroughly agrees with 60–90% of it, perhaps marches from Aldermaston or writes to newspapers about Holy Loch or tries to rouse syndicalist interests among his work-mates, etc., and certainly endeavours to base his dealings with everyone with whom he comes into contact upon real human standards. He probably worries because he has little power to put his anarchism into practice and because he has inevitably to compromise with many of the evils he deplors.

I am in the second group. I am a teacher of English in a Technical College, inexperienced but quite well paid because of high qualifications. My pupils are not legally compelled to attend, but do so through the socio-economic coercion of the standards of our society, rather than through love of learning. I share the doubts of any reader of FREEDOM about the value of this type of education. However, I try to be friendly and pleasant to my pupils and not to push them around more than necessary. I try to teach literature as something really living, a matter of vital ideas and values, and make no secret of my views on war, religion, social order, etc., etc. I sincerely believe (a) that since there is little hope of making education non-compulsory, the more libertarians in the schools the better; (b) that teaching is easily the most worthwhile job open to a twenty-two-year-old Bachelor of Arts—the normally accepted alternatives are nauseating; (c) that teachers as a class, libertarians, moderates, even authoritarians are not a bad set of people, less selfish than many and do not deserve FREEDOM's frequent sneers.

To return to my distinction between your two types of anarchist. If I could believe that (a) and (b) frequently coincided I could accept some of Libertarian's strictures. But is your nature-boy anarchist (again I stress I'm not sneering at the idea) really concerned with re-

forming society as the true anarchist must be, or is he just content to take what he can get from a capitalist organization. As well as being most attractively happy-go-lucky and free from stupid conventions, does he look after his parents properly when they get old, does he help his mates in times of trouble, does he deplore the colour bar, does he keep an eye on what his union is doing or hand over his responsibility to some 'politician'? I fail to see any international feeling in British Labour movements or the slightest trace of altruism or reformism in the average strike.

I started reading FREEDOM just after the big questionnaire, so I'm not quite sure how your readership is made up. Maybe data from that can confute what I'm implying. As it is, I get the impression that even in proportion of members, let alone in absolute weight of numbers, anarchism in this country cannot claim to be a working class movement, but just attracts individuals from all spheres. And I feel that in the present imperfect state of society, you've got to be a conscious anarchist if you're really going to help make the world a better place to live in.

On one point, Libertarian really let's the paper down. "... it is an interesting, reflection that a few thousand workers in the car industry, or at the docks who go on strike can do more to disrupt the life of the community than several hundred thousand teachers refusing to take their classes." As FREEDOM is always preaching (excuse the word) that this country is in an orgy of futile production, with quantity rather than social worth the criterion, the comparison, based on capitalist standards of importance, is unfortunate. By these standards, a strike of all the book shops and libraries in the country would produce even less disruption, but does that prove anything about the value of books to the community as compared with the value of cars?

With one or two other things I flatly disagree. My union, the N.A.S. appears perfectly capable of running a strike. The point about teachers being too proud to take supplementary jobs is absolute rubbish. He underestimates the possible respect and affection between teacher and pupil, and overestimates the average pupil's dislike for school.

His central point, that the schools are instruments of the state and too many teachers blindly accept this is of course regrettably indisputable, but the tone of the article strikes me as unnecessarily rude—the workers in almost any trade or profession in this complacent society could be castigated as severely. However, I hope Libertarian will accept this letter as an individual anarchist's point of view rather than as an apology for and defence of teachers.

How does Libertarian earn his money? If it comes to that, how do Arthur W. Uloth, Geoffrey Ostergaard, Donald Room, Colin Ward, etc. earn theirs—this is not a challenge but a genuine appeal—can you get by in this society without compromise? It will take more than Libertarian's article to convince me that I would be doing any more for society by shoving up offices for Shell Mex or making Triumph Heralds for America than by trying to communicate my love of English literature to G.C.E. candidates. I believe now I come to think of it that even the redoubtable Laurens Otter is a teacher, when not a guest of Her Majesty. Is this so? As it is I must keep teaching, being as unauthoritarian as possible, to keep my wife and pay the mortgage on my house and the bank loan on my motor-cycle, saving any specifically anarchistic activities for my leisure hours.

Yours sincerely,
D. HARPER.

[Our correspondent's letter calls for more comment than we have space for this week. We must categorically deny however that the "FREEDOM type is as described by friend Harper. It is wrong to idealize the working man and we can never be accused of having done so, but the fact remains that if we are to change the social and economic system the initiative will have to come from the working people of the country.—EDITORS].

Pacifists and the Police

DEAR EDITOR,

As S. E. Parker knows, I share his view that the police are an extension of the military, in modified but nonetheless unacceptable form. The relationship of the H-Bomb to the cop on the corner is a direct and definable one; both are sold to the public under one label: "Law & Order".

On only one point do I disagree, but it may be rather important. S.E.P. is mistaken in believing that police prevent no crimes. They do so because we humans will often do destructive things in secret which we don't do when being observed or likely to be. I think it is only when one thinks he is doing something wrong (by private definition) he is deterred by fear of being "caught". It isn't because of threatened punishment or the policeman's truncheon. Anyone walking along the street at night may pass the right person at the right moment and accidentally prevent a crime. Adequate street lighting is a deterrent for basically the same reason. We hate being caught doing anything which violates our own standard of conduct, however ill-formulated or inappropriate our standards may be.

To me this is not an argument in favour of policemen, but one which supports the case for doing without them. I'd like to convince my fellow-pacifists that certain useful functions of the police could better be done by ordinary community members.

London, Aug. 21. ARLO TATUM.

There are Publishers and Publishers

To the Editors of FREEDOM,

I am sorry K.W. devotes the last paragraph of his Lonnie Coleman review to an attack on the publishers of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* and the *New English Bible*—that is, Penguin Books in the first case and the Oxford and Cambridge University Presses in the second. I agree with K.W. about the merits of the two books, but surely the record of these three particular firms puts them above any accusation that they "pander to the uneducated"; on the contrary, they spend most of their time helping to educate the uneducated.

Nor is it so very discreditable that Allen Lane should make a fortune out of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, since he was the first person who dared publish it in this country, and he took an enormous risk and spent a lot of money when he did so. As for the University Presses, they make no fortunes at all, since all their profits are used to subsidise books that can't pay for themselves. If K.W. wants to attack publishers who make fortunes out of muck, there are some far more suitable targets than three of the best firms in the country.

London, Aug. 1. N.W.
[K.W. writes: My "attack" on the two publishers was not general, as the above rather suggests, but specifically for the untimeliness of their sensational promotion of sex and salvation while ignoring a new and frank approach to the problem of racial relations, surely a vastly more important subject in these days, though less profitable.—ED.]

Conversation with a Conspirator

DEAR COMRADE,

Karl Walter's article FREEDOM 12/8/61 is important for focussing attention that the crisis is now upon us. In the next few weeks the so-called statesmen are going to decide if those of us who want to live shall have a chance to do so.

Assassination will only lead to counter-violence and a violent disruption of the military machine and in the present stage of technology will increase rather than lessen the danger, especially, of an accidental war. Readers of FREEDOM may however like to avail themselves of an opportunity of exercising a more constructive influence on the situation by joining the Committee of 100 in their popular assembly and sit-down in Parliament Square on the 17th September.

That the danger of War is greater now than at any time since 1945, and that modern war will cause the destruction of most of the human race is beyond dispute. The Committee appeals to all—in the words of its President—to remember their humanity and to forget the rest and to join the demonstration. The objects are: No war over Berlin—No Polaris—Unilateral nuclear disarmament. As on previous occasions all

demonstrators are asked to remain non-violent throughout the demonstration.

May I appeal through your columns for massive support (best shown by participation), and that all participants who have not yet signed a "pledge-form" send their names and addresses to the Secretary, Committee of 100, 13 Goodwin Street, London, N.4.

Yours fraternally,
London, Aug. 26. FRANCIS DEUTSCH.

[A few readers have asked us whether "Conversation with a Conspirator" was a hoax. That it was not an imaginary conversation has been confirmed, but for the rest each reader must draw his own conclusions. So far as we are concerned we are not advocates of assassination; if we were we would certainly not publicise the fact in FREEDOM, but would go on with the job!

Historically it can be shown that assassination as a weapon of defence against governmental or group terror is sometimes most effective; as a weapon in the political struggle for power it has been used in all times by those who, however, once in power, condemn its use by other aspirants to the high places of government; and as a means of protest good men have resorted to it when the people have appeared blind and deaf to governmental terror and injustice. All these aspects of assassination could be illustrated with examples in our own time and it would be a heartless person who could condemn all these acts out of hand.

For this reason, and apart from the fact that we disagree with most of our correspondent's fears about "accidental wars, or that we are on the brink, etc." we find his approach too smug to be convincing!—EDITOR].

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.

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 25c. post free).

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM and ANARCHY
12 months 30/- (U.S. & Canada \$5.00)
6 months 15/- (\$2.50)
3 months 8/- (\$1.25)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 45/- (U.S. & Canada \$7.50)
6 months 22/6 (\$3.50)

AIR MAIL Subscription Rates (FREEDOM by Air Mail, ANARCHY by Surface Mail)
12 months 50/- (U.S. & Canada \$8.00)

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

Air Mail Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only.
1 year (40 issues) 40/- (\$6.00)

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers:

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

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/-



FREEDOM PRESS PUBLICATIONS

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)