

AT the time of the publication of the Beveridge Report in 1942, an Editorial in FREEDOM's predecessor WAR COMMENTARY concluded with these comments:

The Beveridge Plan proposes only the salving of the sores of capitalism, not the removal of their cause. The problem it "tackles" arise only because of the poverty of the workers inherent in the wages system. So long as capitalism exists the workers will be poor, Beveridge or no! Remove the cause of insecurity and poverty—capitalism, and such plans are unneeded.

But even under capitalism, if a worker has a regular job at a (comparatively) decent wage, such plans as this are useless to him. The making of such a report indicates the contemplation of the standardisation and codification of permanent poverty. It is well to recall once again the oft-quoted saying of Leo Tolstoy, "The rich man will do anything for the poor man, except get off his back".*

One has only to mention the fact that the main feature of the Beveridge Plan was "a far-reaching scheme of social insurance against 'interruption and destruction of earning power,'" and point to the present plight of old-age pensioners and of the growing army of unemployed and homeless, to appreciate the wisdom of the anarchist comments on capitalist planning, which was made just 20 years ago. Then the need for cannon-fodder and the maximum use of all the country's natural resources, services and manpower, in the struggle for power, resulted not only in the government wooing the miners, the railwaymen and the land workers, and reclaiming land and industrial plant, and services that had been allowed to become derelict during the inter-war years, but included, what appeared to be, generous promises that once the "blood, toil and tears" would be unloaded in sufficient quantity on Germany and Japan, a future of prosperity, full-employment, womb-to-the-tomb security, would be opened up to the ordinary people of this island.

To the extent that the British public was made these promises by Churchill and at the first opportunity it voted him out of office, showed a healthy cynicism. That the only alternative appeared to them to be the Labour Party indicates how skin deep was the cynicism, and how un-revolutionary was the British public in spite of what it had been through!

WE refer to the past, not because we have a nostalgia for the "good old days", but because it is so obvious to us that fundamentally nothing has changed since the "bad

*"Scavengers of Misery. Our View of the Beveridge Report" (War Commentary Mid-Dec. 1942).

A Crisis of Government —or of Capitalism?

old days", and that this specially needs to be pointed out just now when the capitalist economy appears to be on the threshold of yet another "crisis" and when the people are "thinking" that, by permission of the present administration (government), their quinquennial vote should perhaps be cast for Her Majesty's Official Opposition, to see whether they can manage to produce the rabbit of full-employment-and-prosperity from the top-hat of capitalism! To our minds they are in for bitter disillusionment. We shall be told that the alternative to voting against the present government is to re-elect it for another five years by abstaining. Assuming that there is not a massive, positive, revolutionary abstention from the polls, that will probably be the result, we agree. But does it matter all that much which Party wins the elections? As anarchists we may be considered prejudiced in this matter of voting, and governments. Listen instead to what *The Observer's* Economic Editor, Samuel Brittan, had to say recently:

One of the myths of British politics is that there is a huge difference between the Conservative and Labour Parties. Businessmen in particular tend to suppose that a change of Government would bring a radical change to the whole economic environment. Faced with this myth it is hardly worth saying: "No such luck! The basic approach of the

two parties is all too depressingly similar" (Jan. 27).

Mr. Brittan brilliantly debunks a recent Macmillan speech in Liverpool in which he blamed increased unemployment on "uncertainty about the outcome of the next election" (if this were true, we suggest he should "go to the people" post-haste!), and the slow-up in investment, to the possibility that the elections would return a "party wedded to widespread nationalisation, high taxation and inflationary policies generally". Mr. Brittan points out that the Premier is "entitled to his little joke", adding that whatever else nationalisation did "it was a godsend for the investors involved. "Where would the shareholders be if the Labour Government had not bought them out after the war at prices far exceeding the present value of these loss-making industries?" And we would add,

SPANISH REFUGEES THREAT?

MADRID, FEBRUARY 16.

Eight French O.A.S. leaders living in Spain have been arrested by Spanish police. This is the first result of the visits to Spain of M. Frey, French Minister of the Interior, and of General Ailleret, French Chief of Staff. A bargain was reached by which "activist" refugees in both countries would be suppressed. (*Observer*).

that by way of confirmation, the Tory government after 12 consecutive years in government has not denationalised these industries. Just as we would ask, why if the Labour Party stood for socialism and the abolition of privilege, did it not use the six years it was in office with an absolute majority, to remove the profit motive from industry by wholesale nationalisation and abolish the House of Lords (rather than seek to invade it with its nominees)? Surely the answer is that whatever the intentions of governments the real power are the financiers and the industrialists. More "radical" than the 1945 Labour Government was the Popular Front Government of Leon Blum in France in 1936 which was soon driven out of office by the "200 families" who patriotically crippled the French economy by mass exportation of their capital. Blum, himself a socialist-intellectual-millionaire was paralysed when faced with such a situation!

★

THE Labour Party leadership today, in spite of Gaitskell's death, has as much intention of introducing socialism if elected, as we anarchists have of "standing for election!" Even the *enfants terribles* of *Tribune* have only "a Tutor in economics and industrial relations at Ruskin College, Oxford" to offer

In this Issue:

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN
WALDEN & WALDEN 2
THE ANARCHISTS
AROUND THE GALLERIES
WAY OUT OF THIS WORLD

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

N.I.C. AND THE 40-HOUR WEEK

THE National Incomes Commission, watch-dog for the Government over pay conditions of service, has this week been inquiring into the 40-hour week without loss of pay agreements in the Scottish building trades. These agreements were made late last year. The plumbers are already working the 40-hour week and the other trades are commencing this coming November.

The Government set up the Incomes Commission after the "pay-Pause" failure last year and this is the first case that has been submitted to it. Because of the failure of their guiding principle of 2½%, this new agreement is seen by the government as a further threat to its policy. It considers that the extra cost of granting a shorter week will not be absorbed in higher productivity, for this is its policy, that reduction in hours and any pay awards must be made in relation to an increase in productivity.

These agreements for a shorter working week in Scotland, have already been settled, but the Government will try to prevent the introduction of a 40-hour week for building workers in England and Wales. They will use this inquiry as a general attack on the shorter week and pay increases.

The National Federation of Building Trade Employers, who had nothing to do with the Scottish agreements, has stated to the Commission that the nation and the building industry cannot afford a 40-hour week for building workers. This answer was to be expected from them, for the employers are in a bit of a spot. They know that when this Scottish agreement takes effect in

November, building workers in the rest of the country will be pressing for a similar agreement.

The employer's spokesman, Mr. Kean, talked of this possibility and of the industrial friction that would arise if there were differences in the working week. Mr. Maude for the government thought that this friction would decrease with geographical distances. Mr. Kean treated this reply with some derision.

Later, Mr. Kean said "that Government evidence at present is very largely a statistical exercise. As we see it, industrial relations are very far from being a statistical exercise. It is a matter of balancing one factor against another; it is really more of an art than a science; it is the practice of the possible".

The employers do not like this heavy handed attitude of the Government, which they feel could make it harder for them in their relations with the unions.

The National Federation of Building Trades Operatives have boycotted the Commission's inquiry, because it feels that the agreements already concluded between unions and employers are "subject to or might be amended by the decision of any outside or unauthoritative body". This statement by the N.F.B.T.O. goes on to speak of arduous and dangerous conditions in the building industry, of the high rate of accidents which are partly due to the long hours worked.

"Our operatives are still working the same hours per day in conditions much more conducive to strain and industrial

accident. We claim that there is a direct relationship between the length of hours worked and the accident ratio."

Conditions in the building industry are bad, for the safety regulations are often ignored by employers and with sites exposed to all weathers, workers do not have the same amenities that are available in other industries. A shorter working week is long overdue. The 44 hour week was gained in Scotland in 1919, in early post-war years, the building industry was one of the few working 44 hours and it was only in 1961 that the 42 hour week was won. Only two hours taken off the working week in 41 years.

The employers have said that the introduction of the 42 hour week only meant extra overtime. This is true of most firms, for the average per week is between 49 and 50 hours. Most of them also pay more than the union rates. Their only interest is to get the job completed in the shortest possible time. Because of the speed in construction and huge profit margins, they can easily afford the extra rates.

Bonus schemes, which the unions agreed to in 1947, add to the wages, but this only serves to increase the firms' profits as the men work harder, out of all proportion to the small return. With basic wage rates so low, 5/10½d. for craftsmen and 5/3d. for labourers, it is no wonder that men work overtime and go for a job with a bonus scheme. At the moment, the unions are negotiating for a 1/6d. per hour increase, but as usual with a large pay claim, the union only wins about a quarter of the original

claim.

The employers and the government will use N.I.C. to fight any advancement in the conditions of workers, using it as a platform to put their case. The claims of the workers are long overdue and can only be won by the efforts of the workers on the building sites.

What is needed for a start is a ban on all overtime. When I have questioned union officials on this point their answer is that it can only be done with 100% union membership, but look at the exhibition side of the industry where there is 100% membership. There are no bans on overtime there. Only by men working the basic hours, can higher wages be won, giving rise ultimately to an increase in the number of jobs available.

The number of unemployed in the building industry during January was 256,000 and even before the bad weather, it was 90,000. These unemployment figures are not known, or completely ignored by Sir Keith Joseph, the Minister of Housing, who also has connections with Bovis, the building contractors. He has written this week "We have got to take system building seriously because, with the burden on the building industry, which is likely to grow, and with the shortage of building labour, which is likely to continue, industrialisation is our only way to the greatly increased output of housing which we must have." (My italics).

With the industrialisation of the building industry, although the number of new jobs will increase and output per man will go up, less labour will be required when the first expansion needs are satisfied. To avoid even more unemployment, further cuts in the working week will be needed.

P.T.

ANARCHY 25

ON SALE NEXT WEEK. IS ON
Science and
Technology

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

Man's Inhumanity to Man

SINCE the end of the Second World War the old belief that modern evils are due to man's loss of faith in traditional religious theories has gained wider support than usual, finding its adherents even among the more intellectually lively, the sort of people who would normally be rebels against the past. Doubtless this is to be expected in an age of rapid change and widespread disaster. There is however no justification for such an attitude whatever. Ages of Faith were also ages of doubt and misery, caused by fear of the supernatural. Persecutions were endemic right through the glorious Middle Ages, and one does not usually persecute if one is sure of one's position. Witch hunts in those days did not mean that a man ended by losing his job, or had to spend a year in jail. He suffered one of the most terrible deaths that human beings can inflict on each other, being burnt alive at the stake.

In the sixteenth century the religious domination of the Catholic Church, which had never been very secure, was broken by Protestantism. This did not however make things either better or worse, religious wars went merrily on, and persecutions continued as they did before, only there were now two persecuting faiths at work instead of one.

It is only fair to point out that a secular philosophy of power, that of Machiavelli, had already made its appearance. The massacre of French Protestants, or Huguenots, which took place in Paris on Saint Bartholomew's Day, in August, 1572, was a product of both the secular philosophy and religious bigotry, for it had its origin in the

"THE MASSACRE OF SAINT BARTHOLOMEW", by Henri Noguères, George Allen and Unwin, 25s.

planned assassination, for purely political reasons, of one man. Perhaps as many as 50,000 lost their lives as a result.

The death of the French Huguenot leader, Admiral de Coligny, was planned by Catherine de Medici, who was the mother of the king and the real ruler of France. She feared his influence over her unbalanced son. Originally she had tried to bring Protestants and Catholics together, for she dreaded civil war, which might lead to her eventual overthrow. Her sole interest being the security that power brings, or is supposed to bring. It was only when the Protestant power began to threaten her own that her attitude changed. The Huguenots were coming to form a "state within a state".

The French religious wars had a peculiar, almost secular character, because the Huguenots were not simply heretics to be exterminated, they also constituted an obstacle to national unity. Nationalism was already growing, and was to become the religion of the future. The Huguenots were not only the last victims of medieval supernaturalism, they were also the first victims of the new faith.

An earlier attempt to assassinate de Coligny, by gunshot, failed. This had been craftily arranged by Catherine in such a way that had it succeeded it would have implicated the rival family of Guise (for the faithful could hate each other as heartily as they hated heretics, or—moved solely by considerations of power—plot each other's downfall as coldly).

This failure meant that the supporters and followers of de Coligny, assembled in Paris for the marriage of the King's sister to the Protestant King of Navarre, became suspicious. Now it became

necessary not only to kill the admiral but the entire Huguenot nobility, along with their servants, bodyguards and all the rest, and the Huguenot population of Paris who might come to their rescue or exact revenge.

The king had to be won over. After all he was technically the ruler of the country. This was accomplished almost at the last minute by persuading him that there was a Protestant plot on foot to overthrow him. (Many Catholics still believe that there was, but there is no evidence of it).

Charles IX was what English history books used to call "a weak king". Up till the very last moment he was favourable to the Huguenots. They constituted a gifted and industrious section of the population. De Coligny was a father figure to him, an ally against his domineering mother. His mistress too was Protestant (she was spared). Yet once his resistance had been beaten down he swung right round to the opposite extreme, and gave the word for a general slaughter. (A medieval law apparently gave a king the right to punish his subjects by massacring them, so a faint aura of legality hung over these proceedings).

Paris had stifled throughout a long hot summer. Once the massacre had begun it spread like a forest fire, and no one could control it. Religious hatreds took over where Machiavelli left off, and for days Paris was in turmoil, echoing to the roar of gunfire and the screams of murdered men, women and children.

The kind himself took his place upon a balcony, his sporting gun in his hand, and shot at his Protestant subjects who were trying to escape from the city by swimming the Seine. The court ladies amused themselves by examining the bodies of the Huguenot nobles piled up in the palace yard. They were particularly interested in the genitals of one man, who had been rumoured to have been impotent. It added piquancy to the situation that some of these girls had spent the previous night with some

know a great deal about the massacre, from different points of view, and Henri Noguères has written a very vivid, hour by hour account of what occurred, almost as if it had happened only a few years ago.

Modern historians seem to dislike being asked what lessons for today are to be drawn from their researches, but in this case it is a perfectly sensible question. One need hardly enlarge on the modern parallels. History may never repeat itself exactly, but it often reiterates the same general themes. The Bartholomew's Day Massacre is still a live issue, whereas other Parisian massacres, before and after it, have been forgotten. Until the end of the last century, and very probably still today, there were Catholics who believed that Catherine de Medici had acted wisely, and nipped in the bud a dangerous conspiracy.

What Protestants too could do, when their turn to be in power came, North America and South Africa (many Africaners are of Huguenot origin) have shown with horrible clarity. Today's victim is tomorrow's tyrant.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

WALDEN & WALDEN 2

"WALDEN" by Henry David Thoreau, and "Walden Two" by B. F. Skinner*, are two related books which raise questions of interest for those who concern themselves with anarchism. The first is an account of two years (1845-7) spent by the author in the woods of Massachusetts. The second describes a fictitious community run on the psychological principles worked out by Professor Skinner. Both are attempts to describe an ideal life, and the way to achieve it. I shall first briefly indicate the content of the two books, and then mention some of their implications.

To begin with "Walden". Thoreau set out to demonstrate that a man can achieve a satisfying life without depending on modern (i.e. 19th century American) technical advances, and indeed that he is better off without them. He concentrated on simplifying his life during the two years of his experiment. Thus he built a small hut to live in with as little expense as might be, and ate only such food as could be easily and cheaply obtained. He worked as little as possible, devoting the remainder of his time mostly to reading and to the study of the countryside around him, from which he seems to have obtained a deep and somewhat mystical satisfaction. He had rather few dealings with other people, and apparently did not find this unpleasant.

"Walden Two", on the other hand, deals with a community. I may mention that, although the account is fictional, it is reasonable to think that such a community is, at least in principle, possible. The psychological work of B. F. Skinner has been mainly concerned with developing the technique known as "operant conditioning". Essentially, this involves the presentation of rewards, or reinforcement, it is possible both to when they respond in the manner desired by the experimenter. By specifying in great detail the exact contingencies of reinforcement, it is possible both to change an animal's behaviour drastically, and to render any desired behaviour extremely persistent. In his novel, Skinner supposes that these principles are applied to a small community by its psychologist founder. The behaviour that is engendered embraces everything that conduces to a successful life for the community, such as socially useful work and co-operatives attitudes. The rewards are those things, ranging from praise to material goods, from which the recipient derives satisfaction. The result, Skinner claims, is a community of contented individuals, coerced by no authority, and influenced only by receiving what they want.

In order to consider the success of these attempts to achieve a happy life, it is necessary to give a criterion of happiness. I suggest that an individual may be said to be happy when he continues his course of action, although not prevented from changing it. Clearly, Thoreau is happy on this criterion: the case of the inhabitants of "Walden Two" is less clear, for it is far from certain that the effect of a full-scale programme of operant conditioning would actually be on adult human beings. It is very likely, judging from our present knowledge, that the desire to behave in certain ways may be engendered and made persistent. This makes it hard to apply the criterion given above: for it may be

that the possibility of a wish to change has been prevented.

Now as to the relevance of these works to anarchism. The essence of anarchism, in my opinion, is the belief that every individual is able, and has the right, to direct his own life, and that this is inseparable from happiness. Thoreau's book may be seen as a demonstration of the truth of this, and indeed Henry Miller calls Thoreau an anarchist. But both Thoreau, and anarchists who more or less follow his approach, fail to consider how suitable it is for others. It is clear that for the satisfaction of many of their needs human beings depend on others. This is true of all, but particularly of children, the old, and the infirm. Thoreau offers no suggestion as to how such needs are to be met. Similarly, while it is true that an able-bodied man can reduce his dependence on civilization to a minimum, there are many for whom this would be hard or impossible. Far from rendering their lives freer for what they consider important, the absence of technical devices would handicap them still further. In Skinner's book, these difficulties are met; but he then faces the objection, from an anarchist point of view, that the members of his community are not directing their own lives, but merely behaving as the founder wishes. Skinner's answer to this is that, in any case, they are behaving as they wish. To resolve this point would involve a discussion of the question of free will.

These two books seem to me to raise several questions which I think important, but to which I cannot give conclusive answers. Is happiness the supreme good? If so, how may it best be achieved, and in particular, is freedom essential to it? If freedom is essential, how far must it be restricted by our dependence on others? For my part, I can see no greater good than the happiness of every individual, and I think that our increasing knowledge of human behaviour will eventually tell us how we may achieve this. I believe that freedom is conducive to happiness, but I can find no unanswerable argument to show that it is essential. The third question requires a discussion to itself, too lengthy to be attempted here.

I.K.R.

*"Walden", by Henry David Thoreau, publishers, New American Library of World Literature (Signet Classics edn), 3s. 6d., 1960.

"Walden Two", by Burrhus Frederic Skinner, publishers Macmillan, 1948.

PRESSMEN CONDEMN MANAGED NEWS

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 5. The inter-American Press Association said last night that the United States Defence Department's concept of "managed news" and "news as weaponry" was a threat to a free and responsible press and served to distort the truth. The association's committee on freedom of the press will discuss the "managed news" concept, first expressed by a Defence Department official during the Cuban crisis last October, when it meets in Jamaica on March 27 and 28. (British United Press).

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

Prison Etiquette (ed.) Holley 7/6
Cantine and Dachine Rainer
In the Struggle for Equality
B. Yelensky 17/6

REMAINDERS

Pierre-Joseph Proudhon
George Woodcock 12/6
The London Years Rudolf Rocker 7/6
A Socialist Anthology
(ed.) Norman Longmate 10/-

REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

Fear of Freedom Erich Fromm 7/6
Chants of Labour
(ed.) Edward Carpenter 2/6
Reflections on Violence
Georges Sorel 11/6
The Art of Loving Erich Fromm 4/6
Memoirs of a Revolutionist
Peter Kropotkin (ed. J. A. Rogers) 10/-
The Tourist Guide Jaroslav Hasek 5/-
Communitas
Paul and Perceval Goodman 10/-
William Morris: Selected Writings
and Designs (ed.) Asa Briggs 7/6
Key to the Door Alan Sillitoe 8/6
Courtroom USA 1 Rupert Furneaux 2/6
The Loneliness of the Long
Distance Runner Alan Sillitoe 2/6
Coming Up for Air George Orwell 3/6

SECOND-HAND

Commonsense and the Child Ethel Mannin 3/6; Kipps and the Research Magnificent H. G. Wells 4/-
(Following all Pocket editions).
Hymen or the Future of Marriage Norman Haire 2/6; Narcissus on Anatomy of Clothes Gerald Heard 3/-
The English Constitution Walter Bagehot 2/6; The Making of Modern Egypt (1909) Sir Auckland Colvin 2/6; A Modern Utopia H. G. Wells 2/6; Essays Ralph Waldo Emerson 2/6; Unto This Last John Ruskin 2/6; The Crusades Sir G. W. Cox 2/6; Frederick the Great F. W. Longman 2/6; The Puritan Revolution 1603/1660 S. R. Gardiner 2/6; The Houses of Lancaster and York James Gairdner 2/6; The French Revolution 1789-1795 B. M. Gardiner 3/-; The Era of the Protestant Revolution F. Seebohm 2/6.

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

Facts on Katanga and the UN

"TO KATANGA AND BACK", by Conor Cruise O'Brien. Hutchinson, 35s.

GET hold of this book, buy it, borrow it or steal it, for it is certainly a great book, combining real adventure and current controversy with a serious and provocative assessment of the United Nations.

O'Brien's human portraits are one of the most unforgettable features; the picture of Tshombe is fascinating and that of his powerful aide Munongo, gruesome. The author's contact with these men and with many others is of an intimate nature and especially interesting is his strongly held opinion that Munongo was the main centre of power in Katanga, and that behind the screen of an African front the Union Miniere held the reins of power. This contention is well substantiated time and again and it is evident that Munongo was closely tied to the more extreme OAS mercenaries.

The account of Lumumba's death provides much speculation, and the following is particularly noteworthy: "According to a witness before the UN Commission on the death of Lumumba, 'M. Munongo, who was awaiting his arrival, came towards M. Lumumba and, after making some remarks, took a bayonet from the rifle of one of his soldiers and drove it into Lumumba's chest'. A Belgian mercenary, one Ruys, then, mercifully, dispatched Lumumba with a bullet through the head. After being preserved for some time in a refrigerator belonging to Union Miniere, the body was dissolved in phenol." This Munongo, whose father once ate a three-year-old child in an attempt to regain his virility, haunts this book.

The death of Mr. Hammarskjöld is also open to one's doubts. According to O'Brien "In Elisabethville I do not think there was anyone who believed his death was accidental." Here again the suggestion is that Munongo might

have been responsible, together with OAS officers. That Hammarskjöld's death was convenient to some people is certainly true.

Sudden, mysterious death apart, this book also provokes much thought over Britain's role in Katanga, especially with relation to Rhodesia. After the visit of Sir Roy Welensky's Consul with the British Consul in Katanga to Mr. Tshombe the Katangese paper *L'Echo du Katanga* carried the following report (1/9/61): "The British Consul conveys his Government's sympathy to the Katangese cause."

"President Tshombe received the British Consul, accompanied by his Vice-Consul, who came to convey the sympathy of their Government with the Katangese cause. They declared to the Head of State that their Government was following the situation in Katanga with much attention."

"At the same time another delegate from the British Government, coming from Salisbury, arrived in Elisabethville to take stock of the situation after the departure of the European technicians." To this is added the truly astonishing information concerning the use of Rhodesian troops by Tshombe, the Rhodesians only fighting by night and crossing back into Rhodesia by day.

In a review one cannot cover very much in a book of this sort, for there is so much; I have concentrated a narrow light on only a few of the more startling disclosures. The episodes of UN fighting, the differences between official UN information and the actual facts and, not least, Dr. O'Brien's Irish humour and courage are also important features of this book. I especially liked the description of the British Consul: "Civil almost to the point of friendliness" and very human is the love affair with Maire his future wife.

But I cannot convey any more than a gist of "To Katanga and Back"; this is not a book to review—it is a book to read. J.W.

February 23 1963 Vol 24 No 7

**A CRISIS OF GOVERNMENT
— OR CAPITALISM ?**

Continued from page 1
socialist government did not, in 1945, when it had a large majority than the present government, vote capitalism out and socialism in, in 24 hours! The simple fact is that the Labour government of 1945 had no intention of dispensing with the capitalist system, even assuming that it, or any government as such, had the power to legislate on a fundamental question of this order.

So long as governments are changed by quinquennial elections, or overthrown by coups d'état, palace- of other authoritarian-revolutions, the authoritarian structure of government remains. And so long as there is government there must be privilege, and sooner or later this must give rise to an economic- as well as a power- elite, which fosters among the people dependence on social and economic incentives as the visible rewards for effort, ability, and skill, as opposed to those of approval, self-satisfaction and community.

whole Common Market issue has been most noteworthy for the almost total public ignorance of the facts of the situation.

Would it? Within the framework of the so-called Constitution, and the functioning of the political parties, so long as the parliamentary parties are a law unto themselves it is difficult to see how the public could influence the situation. "Serious public discussion" can only make the public want to dispense with the politicians, as opposed to Peace News' advocacy of "far greater Government intervention in the economy"; it means, surely, control by the majority; capitalism is controlled by a minority in the interests of a minority. How then can "serious public discussion" in the interests of the public change by discussion a system which exists to protect and further the privileged interests of a minority? It just doesn't make sense.

THE Labour Opposition for obvious reasons is attempting to convince the public that all our present troubles stem from bad government, and that they have all the answers and the cures for unemployment, housing, defence and the rest. The real crisis is not of government but of the capitalist economy. A most significant article appeared recently in the Westminster Bank Review (a summary of which is printed elsewhere) in which among other things it is suggested that for the first time since the war "the productive capacity of industrial countries may now exceed current and prospective demand". It seems that this point has been reached in the U.S. and Britain, where in both countries steel production is significantly less than capacity. In West Germany the same trend is now appearing—one leading steel firm has called on W. German steel producers to unite in cutting back production at least for the time being. It is also significant that unemployment has reappeared on the W. German industrial horizon. And, according to the Guardian's Financial Editor (Jan. 21), the "gloomy prospects for this country has nothing to do with the Common Market talks" but it exists "because there is at least an even chance of an economic recession in Western Europe during 1964".

Those who talk of expanding the economy, and becoming more competitive, seem to overlook the fact that all countries are trying to do the same thing, and that even in the event that this country becomes more "competitive" in its prices and increases its exports the effect will be only temporary since the country from which it has taken away the particular market will have that much less to spend on imports, and since the largest importing countries are also the largest exporters as well, it is a vicious circle. It would not surprise us in the least to see Britain seeking to solve some of her financial problems by an increase in trade with Russia which clearly is an expanding market.

But whatever short-term measures are taken, the problems will re-emerge larger than before, and as long as governments are made the scapegoat, the public will not understand that the real cause is the capitalist system, and that the only cure is its destruction and the re-organisation of production for the satisfaction of mankind's needs and not for the profit of a few.

JOHN HENRY MACKAY'S novel *The Anarchists** must be almost the only novel about anarchists by an anarchist, unless one counts Ethel Mannin's *Red Rose*, a fictionalised biography of Emma Goldman, or *Comrade, Oh Comrade*, which is really concerned with the Left as a whole. This is very curious, when you come to think of it. The anarchists have produced a vast mass of literature, but have rarely turned the spotlight on themselves, and when they do it takes the form of questionnaires and scientific surveys. I suppose this is a healthy tendency really. At least it is the very reverse of morbid introversion.

Even Mackay's book is only barely a novel. It is subtitled "A Picture of Civilisation at the Close of the Nineteenth Century", which sums up the intention of the author perfectly.

Mackay was half Scottish and half German. He belonged to the individualist-anarchist school of thought, and popularised the work of Max Stirner, whose book, *The Ego and its Own*, published in 1845, had by the 1880's been almost forgotten.

All the characters in *The Anarchists* are real people, though, so as not to help police spies, they are either unnamed or given pseudonyms. The two principle ones are Carrad Auban and Otto Trupp. The first being Mackay himself, perhaps somewhat idealised, and the second being an anarchist-communist whose real name was Otto Rinke. A great deal of the book is devoted to the dispute between these two. Auban usually has the last word in debate, but Trupp generally has the crowd on his side, because he is able to appeal to their emotions. Not that he does so in any dishonest sense, but Auban's philosophy seems to the majority of the revolutionaries to be a cold-blooded creed, and they instinctively turn from him to Trupp.

One is inclined to feel that Mackay rather over-states his case when he claims that the anarchist-communists are headed for disaster. He seems to have foreseen an anarchist-communist revolution which would follow the course actually followed by the authoritarian-communist one in Russia and China. This particular prophecy at least did not come true. He hardly discusses the

possibility of an authoritarian revolution. He may be said to have been the Jeremiah of a revolt that never took place.

Of Kropotkin he says, "He was a Communist . . . In splendid essays, which appeared in one of the foremost English magazines, he had attempted to lay down the "scientific foundations" of his ideal, which he believed was rightly called Anarchy. But even these labours, which gave a general idea of the extent of the information of the author in all matters of Socialism and of his enormous reading, did not enable Auban to picture to himself the possibility of the realisation of these theories. And he saw also the delusive faith in this new yet so old religion yielding nothing except a new evil harvest of despotism, confusion, and most intense misery . . ."

When I read this the first time I thought that there was a misprint somewhere, a "not" was missing. It gave me something of a jolt to realise that such was not the case. The author says what he means, without interference. To him the gentle communism of Peter Kropotkin represented a new tyranny, potentially, even if it never came to fruition. One feels that Mackay would not have been surprised by Kropotkin's support of World War I.

Auban draws a clear distinction between his sort of anarchism and that of Kropotkin and Otto Trupp. Auban believes in property and a system of exchange, and laughs at the anarchist-communist idea of placing all the products of society in communal store houses, to be drawn from at will. He regards such an idea as impractical, and uses against it the "human nature" argument that reactionaries alone use. As a result his friends become suspicious of him, because they misunderstood him, and believe that he has become a supporter of *laissez faire* capitalism and the *status quo*. No one however doubts his integrity.

Auban denounces anarchist-communism as "vague", but his own ideas seem on some points to be equally so. He believes in education and the slow advance of reason to bring about the social changes he desires, not in social revolution.

His economic ideas seem to be based on the conception of a means of ex-

change which operates without interest. So no accumulation of a means of exchange which operates without interest. So no accumulation of capital can take place. The individual has the right to the possession of what he has himself produced. It is understandable that to men and women who had come to believe that property and money were the origins of all their misery this doctrine would have less appeal than communism.

He says, "You say the State must fall in order that property shall fall, for the State protects it."

"I say the State must fall in order that property may exist, for the State suppresses it."

"It is true you do not respect property: your own property you do not respect; otherwise you would not allow it to be taken from you day after day. Expel illegitimate property, i.e. that which is not really property, but alienism. But expel it by becoming proprietors yourselves. That is the only way in which to really 'abolish' it, the only reasonable and just way, and at the same time the way of liberty."

"Down with the State in order that labour may be free, which alone creates property! So I exclaim also,

"When money shall be freed from all forcibly protected privileges . . ."

But at this point his friend, Otto Trupp, can bear it no longer and breaks in,

"What! Is even money to remain? Wretched money which has corrupted, debased and enslaved us all?"

The parties to the dispute are really speaking different languages. However the dispute is not quite so academic as it sounds. The free society, when these problems will become acute, seems even further off now than it did in 1887. Yet, a couple of years ago I remember speaking on communities, and I mentioned the difficulty that arises when someone who has come into the community, bringing some furniture, let us say, wishes to leave. The community may find itself in difficulties, since it has been using this person's chairs and tables, and now finds itself deprived of them. In the audience there was a religious pacifist who strenuously objected to this. In his opinion, when a person entered a community all his possessions become the community's for good, otherwise it would be no community at all, properly speaking. (I believe such is, or was, the practise of the Bruderhof). I expressed the opinion that such an idea

Continued on page 4

AROUND THE GALLERIES

THE NEW LONDON GALLERY at 17 Old Bond Street, W.1, have designated the 30 year old American painter R. B. Kitaj as their man of the month and this most influential of the Bond Street galleries have given him the full treatment meaning that the press, Lord Snowdon and the critics have stood to attention to extol in coloured supplement, posed photograph and humbled prose the work of this Ohio artist.

In personal conversation with through the singing pen of Brian Robertson, Kitaj most emphatically denies that his work comes within hog-calling distance of the school of "pop" art but the very necessity of denial obviously, for good or ill, decrees the public and the leaders' classification of his work but it is of small import only inasmuch as a few students of the Tottenham Court Road group claim that they owe an allegiance and a debt to Kitaj in their superficial and crudely creative homage and patronage to what is to so many of them an alien social strata.

But this exhibition has a particular relevance to us as anarchists for Kitaj has turned to the political left for a number of titles and themes and among them is the use and literal inclusion of names known and honoured within the anarchist movement. Kitaj himself is uncommitted in any way to any active participation with those who carry a banner, march in protest or hand out the pleading leaflet, for his is the intellectual and the emotional approach to a philosophy and a way of life that finds its outlet upon the silent canvas. We who are committed must be grateful that the hidden names should hold the eye and irritate the mind of the *haut monde* but truth demands that we judge these paintings as works of art and not as visual polemics favourable to a belief that we advocate. If we condemn the fawning critic of the totalitarian States for crying the non-existent virtues of a

simpering rhymster as he hymns the glories of his latest political master, if we despise the deification of an artist who pawns honour for the privilege of painting, without warts, the political gangster of the day; if we laugh at the latest hepped-up version of the royal family and spit upon the spew that is written by the critics of the establishment to commend it, then we in our turn must honestly and openly judge work that favours us. And for the record! find that much of Kitaj's work is banal and slipshod with an inherent crudity of conception and execution that owes more to lack of craftsmanship than to deliberate design.

It has been fashionable over the last twelve months for the Tottenham Court Road boys to scrawl within their contrived designs not only the reproduced work of better artists but the names and sleazy little declarations that make their offerings the property of a cult-coterie. The homosexual shyly and for a private campfire giggle adds the names of his playmates, sad little messages are written to the late Marilyn Monroe and the faces of fashionable murderers are used to pad out a canvas but when these names and titles, of so often so little import, are swept down the sewers of history what shall we be left with but a collection of work that is the product of men who appear to lack the elementary essential of their craft. Using a simple theme they have been forced by lack of personal ability to pad important areas of their canvases with the gifts of posters and magazine reproductions not because they feel a use for collage but because the elementary lessons of *trompe-l'oeil* has never lain within their curriculum. In reproduction they hit the eye like a Guinness advertisement but when one has trudged across the Town for a personal assessment one finds only too often that the passage that one admired was painted by an unknown

hack and grafted into the general body of bad workmanship by the fashionable creature of the moment.

Much of what I have written I apply to Kitaj's work but if we judge it as the ephemeral work that flowers so often and for so short a period in the fashionable galleries then let us say that in spite of its faults it is pleasing to the eye and provides an exciting talking point for those who are emotionally involved with the anarchist movement and for that I for one owe a debt of thanks to Kitaj that he should publicly espouse my own beliefs. But for those who only demand amusement from the artist there is the work of William Copley at the Hanover at 32a St. George Street, W.1., fulfilling an evident need for Copley's urchin variations on themes of Delvaux are worth a smile.

In place of Delvaux's somnambulant moon-women Copley offers the juvenile dream woman, bovine in features, mammary glands and buttocks as big as footballs and wearing her pubic hairs like a nosegay of dead violets; with a Copley catalogue that carries a sad and sentimental essay from the cynic Robert Melville that will outlast the paintings. These crudely painted trollops should make an ideal gift for any small boy having personal problems, but for those who value painting as an art and as a craft then let them make their way to Burlington House, where, included among the 102 paintings of the 'Art USA Now' exhibition is Ad Reinhardt's "Abstract Painting No. 4". As one crosses the huge room one approaches a canvas that is nought but a well of nihilistic black and as the light catches the canvas the hardly perceptible nuances of superimposed black emerge to catch the eye only to vanish with the approach of each passing shadow for this magnificent painting flies like a lonely black banner to mock the rubbish that the Town's dealers are hawking to pay the rent, for this painting is a declaration that an artist is among us again.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

LONDON FEDERATION OF ANARCHISTS

CENTRAL MEETINGS

meetings to be held at
The Two Brewers,
40 Monmouth Street, WC2
(Leicester Square Tube)
Sundays at 7.30 p.m.

FEB 24 Brains Trust
MAR 3 Tom Barnes:
Psychology and Anarchism
MAR 10 To be announced
MAR 17 S.F.:
The Great American Myth
MAR 24 Brian Hart:
Nestor Makhno
MAR 31 Dennis Gould:
Subject to be announced

OFF-CENTRE DISCUSSION MEETINGS

1st Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. at Jack and Mary Stevenson's, 6 Stainton Road, Enfield, Middx.

1st Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Colin Ward's, 33 Ellerby Street, Fulham, S.W.6.

3rd Tuesday at Brian and Doris Lellie's, 242 Amesbury Avenue, S.W.2 (Streatham Hill, Nr. Station).

Third Wednesday of the month, at 8 p.m. at Albert Portch's, 11 Courcy Road (off Wood Green High Road), N.8.

Last Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. Tom Barnes', Albion Cottage, Fortis Green, N.2. (3rd door past Tudor Hotel).

3rd Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Donald & Irene Room's, 148a Fellows Road, Swiss Cottage, N.W.3. Please note that the meetings at Fellows Road, N.W.3 are now on the third Friday, not the third Wednesday as hitherto.

Last Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. at George Hayes', 174 McLeod Road, Abbey Wood, S.E.2.

Notting Hill Anarchist Group (Discussion Group)

Last Friday of the month, at Brian and Margaret Hart's, 57 Ladbroke Road, (near Notting Hill Station), W.11. (N.B.—No February meeting).

OXFORD ANARCHIST DISCUSSION GROUP (gown, town and district)

Meets Wednesdays, 5.30 usually. Christ Church, Packwater Quad, 2, 6: Special meetings at 8 p.m.

FEB 27 Arthur Uloth:
Aspects of Anarchism
MAR 6 Tom Brown:
The Syndicalist Reconstruction of Society
MAR 13 Jack Robinson:
Philosophy of Anarchism

ANARCHY Nos 1-24 Still Available 1/9 Post Free

Freedom

The Anarchist Weekly

FREEDOM is published 40 times a year, on every Saturday except the last in each month. **ANARCHY** (1/9 or 25 cents post free), a 32-page journal of anarchist ideas, is published 12 times a year on the 1st of each month.

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM and ANARCHY

12 months 32/- (U.S. & Canada \$5.00)
6 months 16/- (2.50)
3 months 8/6 (\$1.25)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 47/- (U.S. & Canada \$7.50)
6 months 23/6 (\$3.75)

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

12 months 52/- (U.S. & Canada \$8.00)

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only

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



THE DEFENCE BILL for the coming year will total £1,800,000,000, an increase of £80,000,000. Councillor Joe Dutch of Chelsea asked the Council to consider increasing the grant to the Family Welfare Association to £200, it was said that the grant had to be approved by the Ministry of Housing who had ruled that the Council should not spend more than £100. A Conservative Councillor said, "It is not the business of this Council to go around helping people out of their scrapes—which frankly they got into by their own foolishness". Holiday-makers at Poole, Dorset will have to pay 3d. to sit on their own deck-chairs on the beach. Tendring Rural Council, Essex has decided to cease granting an eight shillings a week rent subsidy for pensioners occupying Council bungalows. A council spokesman commented, "They need not be worried, for they can always apply for National Assistance to make up for it". A petition signed by 15,000 people demanding a maternity unit at Hinckley, Leicester has been rejected by the Ministry of Health. Borough Councillors in Florham Park, New Jersey have banned the building of a community centre for aged women, because being a charity, it is free of local taxes, and they would lose too much. Paper bags used for refuse collection at Long Eaton, Derbyshire, were "better for the men, more hygienic for

the public and speedier". But the council is going back to bins because the bags cost too much. The G.P.O. has rejected a request for a telephone kiosk near old people's homes in Desford, Leicestershire, saying it loses £3,000,000 yearly on phone boxes. Free newspapers and magazines provided in the Bedford hospital group are to be cancelled as part of an economy drive. Looe, Cornwall, has refused to remove turnstiles from women's lavatories because they would lose £2,000 a year; St. Neots, Huntingdonshire, has just built a new convenience with turnstiles and it would be too expensive to change it; Bury, Lancs., have declined to act because they would have to pay attendants' overtime; Leominster, Hereford, has decided that turnstiles alone allow reasonable control, Bridlington has decided that an alternative access is provided and attendants are there in case of difficulty; at Westminster there had been no complaint and so turnstiles were not being removed but they would not be included in new conveniences. . . .

AN EXPLOSION, said to be 'caused deliberately' by Welsh nationalists, blew up an electrical transformer at Liverpool (England) waterworks site at Trweryn (Wales). Plaid Cymru's (the Welsh nationalist party) president said "Plaid Cymru can only speak for itself

as a political party and it is opposed to the use of direct action as a matter of party policy. The most important thing now is to remember what has happened in Trweryn in the past—how Liverpool walked into the valley, took the land, plundered the water sources, and destroyed the fine community there." This is the second time the transformer has been damaged. In September two men were convicted. Michael Randie of the Committee of 100 was released from prison after losing part of his remission for a protest on behalf of a sick fellow-prisoner. The National Committee of 100 met and discussed the possibility of broadening the committee's approach to include questions of social justice and of finding fresh forms of direct action. . . .

A THREATENING LETTER sent to a Liberal undergraduate who wrote anti-Fascist articles in *Varsity* turned out to be a hoax. The perpetrators were 'rusticated'. A press report that Prince Richard of Gloucester had a narrow escape from drowning was officially denied. So was the story that the Chinese had an atomic device. Mr. Macmillan said that the (false) explanation given to the French Government that Princess Margaret could not go to Paris because there would not be enough Counsellors of State was given "in full accordance with diplomatic courtesy and usages" Mr. Jaweb, new Minister of State Affairs in the new Iraq Government said to foreign journalists "the new regime is determined to smash Communism in Iraq. This has nothing to do with our relations with friendly Socialist countries, notably Russia, or our attitude towards other Communist parties in other parts of the world" The BBC quoted another spokesman describing the trouble-makers as 'anarchists'. The government are using arms supplied to the Kassem regime by the Soviet Union.

JON QUIXOTE.

THE ANARCHISTS

Continued from page 3
was atrocious, so to that extent I suppose I belong with Carrad Auban".
This particular discussion is closed when Auban puts to Trupp one of those "Have you stopped beating your wife?" questions.

"Would you, in the system of society which you call 'Free Communism', prevent individuals from exchanging their labour among themselves by means of their own medium of exchange? And further: would you prevent them from occupying land for the purpose of personal use?"

If Trupp answered "Yes" he would be admitting that society had the right to coerce the individual, but if he answered "No" he would be admitting the right of private property. In the end he answers "No", in effect. One may however suggest that in a free society both communist and individualist systems could flourish side by side.

The book is really divided into two halves, although the two themes alternate, chapter by chapter. More than half (225 pages as against 153 devoted to discussions of individualism and communism) consists of descriptions of London life in the late 1880's, as seen from the Left.

It would not be exaggerated to claim that the poor quarters of London, in particular the East End, was at that time very nearly as bad a place to live in as Belsen or Auschwitz. And this seething mass of misery was controlled by a few lightly armed policemen. (With, no doubt, the threat of the military in the background). It was not wired off. There were no towers equipped with machine-guns and searchlights. Presumably there was no need. The prisoners, for such they were, were too cowed to do more than stage an occasional ineffectual riot. Even conservatives now talk of modern society as a "sick society", but the society of the 1880's was as sick as ours, although (a bitter pill for national patriots) Great Britain was at that time at the height of her power. The genocide carried out against a large section of her labouring population did not seem to affect this very much. Evidently power is compatible with an immense amount of rottenness in society.

Although this great concentration camp has disappeared, in other respects Mackay's description of London portrays a place remarkably unchanged. I began to read the book sitting in a café in Villiers Street, right on the spot where the story opens. Everything was recognisable, although the beggar-women have disappeared. As far as the West End

is concerned, the permanence of London geography, in a totally man-created environment, is truly astounding.
So is the permanence of much of the atmosphere. A good deal of the book is concerned with the execution of the Chicago anarchists. We have all been to the sort of (hopeless) protest meeting that Mackay describes, where telegrams are read out and speeches made—to the already converted. *Tout ca change, tout c'est la meme chose.* The English governing class too are much the same as ever.
" . . . he observed the diners, he compared their confident, easy, elegant, but monotonous and uncharacterised appearance with the forms out of whose midst he had come . . ."

"Bloody Sunday", also fully described, very much resembles demonstrations in our own day, except that the military are no longer called in so readily. The modern London crowd is probably less desperate. But the "Teds" were there,

then as now.
"Another fifth of the crowd certainly consisted of the 'mob': fishers in troubled waters, professional pick-pockets, ruffians, idlers who make a better living than the honest working man, pimps—in short, all those who are always on hand, as nothing binds them. They were mostly very young. As the most personal enemies of the police, with whom they are engaged in daily struggle, they allowed no opportunity to pass in taking their revenge on them. Armed with stones, sticks and pocket-knives, they inflicted painful injuries upon the police; whereupon they escaped as quick as lightning, disappearing in the crowds without leaving a trace and emerging at another place the next minute with loud howls and shrieks, to vent their spite afresh. They were present, moreover, at all collisions, aggravating the tumult, intensifying the confusion, exasperating the rage of the combatants to the highest pitch of their wild shrieks."

Some things have changed little since 1891. The book was written when Mackay was in his late twenties. He had a long literary career ahead of him, and lived to see Hitler's rise to power. His books are now little known, though one of them, *The Downfall of Albert Schnell*, the tale of an idealistic school teacher exploited by a prostitute, was the prototype of Mann's *The Professor Unrat* which became the classic film *The Blue Angel*. In all of his tales two main characters appear, the conscious egotist who is able to resist the pressures of society and the idealist, conformist or rebel, who comes to grief.

To some extent the dispute between anarchist-individualists and anarchist-communists seems rather remote. The free society, whether individualist or communist, seems so far away. Yet at one time the controversy was bitter, and echoes of it still sound even today.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

**The Anarchists. A Picture of Civilization at the Close of the Nineteenth Century*, by John Henry Mackay, translated from the German by George Schumm, published by Benjamin R. Tucker, Boston, Massachusetts, 1891.

L'Ouvre Littéraire de John Henry Mackay, by Thomas A. Riley, texte français et notes de E. Armand, Edition réservée aux "Amis d'E. Armand", Paris, et 22 cité St-Joseph, Orléans.

†When I pointed out that this might mean turning someone out, if he decided to leave the community, with barely a shirt to his back, he replied, "Things can't be made too easy for people. They can't be allowed to drop out when things get difficult." The ferocity of these idealists! He would not however have described himself as an anarchist.
‡The original says "uncharacteristic", but I think that this hardly makes much sense in the context.

Keep it up!

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT FEBRUARY 16th 1963

WEEK 7

EXPENSES: 7 weeks at £70	£490
INCOME:	
Sales & Sub Renewals:	£
Weeks 1-6	182
Week 7	38
	220
New Subscriptions:	
Weeks 1-6 (52)	55
Week 7 (13)	15
	70
	290
DEFICIT	£200

DEFICIT FUND

Falmouth: R.W. 2/-	Ilford: C.S. 8/-
Cheltenham: L.G.W.* E4	Nottingham: H.D. 12/6
Fife: G.G. 8/-	Hounslow: L.* 2/6
Southend: P.O.* 3/6	Chalfont St. Peters: W.C. E3/8
London: M.H. 10/-	Dundee: A.S.L.R. E8/8
Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6	Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6
Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-	Swansea: R.G. 2/-
S. Oxhey: J.W. 8/-	E. Rutherford: A.S.* 7/-
Edinburgh: W.C. 8/-	Shoreham: M. & P.* 2/6
Woodbridge: M.H.R. 4/6	
	TOTAL 19 19 0
	Previously acknowledged 198 9 2
	1963 TOTAL TO DATE £218 8 2

*Indicates regular contributors.

FREEDOM PRESS PUBLICATIONS

- 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
 - Vol 11 1961: The People in the Street
- Each volume: paper 7/6 cloth 10/6
The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of **FREEDOM** at 5/6 post free.
- BAKUNIN**
Marxism, Freedom and the State 5/-
- 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/-
- JOHN HEWETSON**
Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d.
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
- HERBERT READ**
Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5/-
- TONY GIBSON**
Youth for Freedom 2/-
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.
Food Production & Population 6d.
- E. A. GUTKIND**
The Expanding Environment (illustrated) boards 8/6
- PETER KROPOTKIN**
Revolutionary Government 3d.
Organised Vengeance Called Justice 2d.
- Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:**
Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A tribute cloth 5/-
Journey Through Utopia cloth 16/- paper 7/6
Neither East Nor West paper 7/6