

"Where anarchy has slain in hundreds, despotism has sacrificed millions upon millions, with this only effect, to perpetuate the ignorance, the vices, and the misery of mankind."
WILLIAM GODWIN

In this Issue:
OUT OF THIS WORLD
MORE ON FORCE & VIOLENCE
ANARCHY!
CORRESPONDENCE

Our Good Kind Friends

THE POLICE

A MAN appearing at Edinburgh Sheriff Court last week on a charge of trying to defraud the Post Office of £10 had his left arm in a sling and his right arm hanging loosely by his side. His solicitor told the court that after refusing to have his finger-prints taken his left arm was broken by the police on the Wednesday night and the following morning they broke the other arm. Commenting on the allegation, Mr. Allan, the deputy public prosecutor said: "The police are entitled to use such force as necessary in the execution of their duties". Mr. Allan's superior has ordered an enquiry to be held, and while reiterating Mr. Allan's contention, added however that "no-one would suggest that [in using reasonable force to carry out their duties] they should break anyone's arms". Even if he thought otherwise he could hardly have said so without arousing considerable public criticism.

We do not believe that the police today are any more brutal than they were in the past. The "disquieting" feature today is the fact that the brutality goes on even though the chances that many cases will receive publicity is much greater than it ever was in the past. For it means that the forces of law and order feel

strong enough to exceed their legal powers in the full light of publicity, questions in the House and "Public Inquiries". Yet the forces of law and order are numerically much weaker than they were, and in any case represent a minute fraction of the population as a whole. It would follow from this argument that their growing contempt for the "rules of the game" stems both from an awareness that in spite of publicity the public is impotent or too lazy or indifferent to act, and because they have been given *carte blanche* by the government, and an assurance that old-fashioned civil libertarians will be fobbed-off with

the kind of rigged inquiries which invariably produce glowing reports on our police, our prison warders and other custodians of "justice".

★
GOVERNMENT, as the instrument for regulating the social and economic life of the community, depends on the approval or acquiescence of a majority of the public for its power to legislate, and implement its policies. No government can by terror or the force of the law hold down an openly hostile, militant as well as thinking, people indefinitely. To argue the contrary is to ignore the facts of history or

to be the conditioned victims of the kind of propaganda which is the outstanding feature of this age of mass-communications.

Of all the "isms" that have sprung from Man's imagination—or lack of it—only the anarchists have conceived a society in which the affairs of Man are regulated by mutual consent, by agreement, without centralised power, without the threat of violence for their implementation. There are socialists who believe in social and economic equality, and in the abolition of the capitalist system; there are Freethinkers who seek to destroy religious myths by rational argument; there are Paci-

fists who seek to abolish war just as there are active opponents of capital punishment, racialism, colonialism, nationalism, literary censorship and 11-plus segregation. There are the champions of progressive schools and for the preservation of our "national heritage"; there are the platoons who annually defend our "rights of way" and the "eccentrics" who are the spokesmen for the gypsies' "way of life"; there are the anti-noise and the anti-ugly militants just as there are the birth control and sexual freedom publicists. We anarchists support all these initiatives, for the obvious

Continued on page 3

OPERATION PORTON

THE unilateralists have paid so much attention to the dangers of nuclear weapons that we often forget the equal dangers of chemical and biological weapons. The balance should be partly restored by the publication of the *Silent Death* pamphlet last Easter and by the Porton demonstration last weekend, though the former was rather overshadowed by the *Spies for Peace* pamphlet, and the latter has been rather overshadowed by the resistance to the visits of President Kennedy and the King and Queen of Greece.

Silent Death is an indispensable companion to the *Black Paper*. It is a 10,000-word pamphlet produced by the Cambridge University CND and the Putney and Wimbledon working group of the Committee of 100. It describes the various chemical and biological weapons our rulers are kindly preparing for our defence—nerve gases, psychological gases, radiological and incendiary bombs; bacteria, viruses, toxins and hormones. It ends as follows: "A larger, better, more fully documented publication is already being prepared, and we shall use with discretion further information." Let's hope the *Spies for Peace* give them some.

A few weeks after Easter, the London Committee of 100 decided to organise a demonstration on June 29th at Porton Down. Here, five miles north-east of Salisbury, is a string of War Office establishments for research into chemical and biological weapons—including the Microbiological Research Establishment, the Chemical Defence Experimental Establishment Allington Farm (which provides animals for the MRE and the CDEE), the Joint School of Nuclear and Chemical Ground Defence, and a large War Department Range. Each of these establishments is a "prohibited place" under Section Three of the Official Secrets Act of 1911, and to the east there is a restricted area between one and three miles wide which stretches for five miles between the Salisbury-Andover road and railway.

"Operation Porton" was organised in the usual way, by London

Committee working groups who planned the details of the actual demonstration, and by London Committee members who reconnoitred and mapped the objective and prepared the leaflets and posters. But on Monday evening, June 24th, the State stuck its nose in. Some Special Branch officers raided the home of the National Secretary of the Committee of 100 during a London Committee working group meeting, and searched the house and the people at the meeting. Other Special Branch officers raided the homes of other Committee members, taking a thousand copies of *Silent Death* from the home of the convenor of the Putney and Wimbledon working group, and yet others raided and searched the Committee office in Finsbury Park. The Special Branch followed Committee members around London for the rest of the week, raided the Committee's

printers on Thursday, and attended the Committee's public meeting at Conway Hall on Friday evening. It all looked rather like December 1961.

But the Committee of 100 was undeterred, and Operation Porton was carried out. We gathered in Salisbury on Saturday afternoon, June 29th, after being delayed by heavy rain and heavy traffic. The public meeting was a wash-out, police stopped the march around the town, and our departure for Porton was confused. It didn't matter. Soon after 2.0 we began driving up the Salisbury-Andover road to the perimeter of the restricted area. The official plan was to assemble at Figsbury Ring, at the south-east end of the area, but it was clear we wouldn't ever get in there. So we drove on, stopped at various places along the road, climbed over gates and fences, and began walking across the area towards the high security establishments on the other side. Our intention was not to enter these hor-

rible places, but simply to draw attention to their existence.

Against us there were more than a thousand Scottish and Irish soldiers of Southern Command, hundreds of Wiltshire and Hampshire policemen, scores of military policemen, dozens of army trucks and armoured cars, motor cycles and radios, and a few helicopters and spotter aircraft. The groups of demonstrators managed to get well into the area because we had the advantage of surprise. But every group of demonstrators was eventually halted by the soldiers, loaded into trucks, and driven to another part of the perimeter. There we were told we were *not* being charged with breaking the local by-law against trespass on War Department property (*whose* property?), and told we were not to come back.

Two groups escaped this fate. One managed to walk right across the restricted area from the Pheasant Inn on the A30 to Porton village. And one later group, made up of

Continued on page 3

STATUS BOOSTER, UNOFFICIAL HOLES FOR THE USE OF

A CLERK in the New York City's Department of Personnel has been gaoled for incorrectly punching holes in cardboard and plastic punch cards.

The man, Alfred Nisbett, 38, from Brooklyn, operated an IBM electronic computer in the department.

According to the position of the holes on the computer punch cards, employees were placed in jobs which ranged from so-called unskilled labour to that of Chief Commissioner of Investigations.

Now the Chief Commissioner himself, Louis Kaplan, has revealed that Nisbett has been acting all along as an unofficial status booster.

By punching extra holes or leaving out holes on the computer cards, employees had improved their rating with the department overnight.

"Sometimes just out of friendship and sometimes for a few hundred bucks" says the report, Nisbett helped at least 22 persons on their way to the top before being discovered.

NOW ON SALE:

ANARCHY 29,

an enlarged issue containing an 18,000-word account of the "Spies for Peace" story written by all sections of the libertarian left, and discussing the REAL official secret, the reception given to the RSG revelations and the implications for the future of the activities of the "spies". The issue also contains a review of the film "The Damned" (about a secret underground government establishment) and the reactions of public schoolboys to the recent article on anarchism and the public schools.

Order extra copies of Anarchy 29.

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

Is it a Moral Issue?

WE know no spectacle so ridiculous as the British public in one of its periodical fits of morality. In general, elopements, divorces, and family quarrels pass with little notice. We read the scandal, talk about it for a day, and forget it. But once in six or seven years our virtue becomes outrageous. We cannot suffer the laws of religion and decency to be violated. We must make a stand against vice. We must teach libertines that the English people appreciate the importance of domestic ties. Accordingly some unfortunate man, in no respect more depraved than hundreds whose offences have been treated with leniency, is singled out as an expiatory sacrifice. If he has children, they are to be taken from him. If he has a profession, he is to be driven from it. He is cut by the higher orders, and hissed by the lower. He is, in truth, a sort of whipping-boy, by whose vicarious agonies all the other transgressors of the same class are, it is supposed, sufficiently chastised. We reflect very complacently on our own severity, and compare with great pride the high standard of morals established in England with the Parisian laxity. At

length our anger is satiated. Our victim is ruined and heartbroken. And our virtue goes quietly to sleep for seven years more.

It is clear that those vices which destroy domestic happiness ought to be as much as possible repressed. It is equally clear that they cannot be repressed by penal legislation. It is therefore right and desirable that public opinion should be directed against them. But it should be directed against them uniformly, steadily, and temperately, not by sudden fits and starts. There should be one weight and one measure. Decimation is always an objectionable mode of punishment. It is the resource of judges too indolent and hasty to investigate facts and to discriminate nicely between shades of guilt. It is an irrational practice, even when adopted by military tribunals. When adopted by the tribunal of public opinion, it is infinitely more irrational. It is good that a certain portion of disgrace should constantly attend on certain bad actions. But it is not good that the offenders should merely have to stand the risks of a lottery of infamy, that ninety-nine out of every hundred should escape, and that

the hundredth, perhaps the most innocent of the hundred, should pay for all. We remember to have seen a mob assembled in Lincoln's Inn to hoot a gentleman against whom the most oppressive proceedings known to the English law was then in progress. He was hooted because he had been an unfaithful husband, as if some of the most popular men of the age, Lord Nelson for example, had not been unfaithful husbands. We remember a still stronger case. Will posterity believe that, in an age in which men whose gallantries were universally known, and had been legally proved, filled some of the highest offices in the state and in the army, presided at the meetings of religious and benevolent institutions, were the delight of every society, and the favourites of the multitude, a crowd of moralists went to the theatre, in order to pelt a poor actor for disturbing the conjugal felicity of an alderman? What there was in the circumstances either of the offender or of the sufferer to vindicate the zeal of the audience, we could never conceive. It has never been supposed that the situation of an actor is peculiarly favourable to the rigid virtues or that an alderman enjoys any special immunity from injuries such as that which on this occasion roused the anger of the public. But such is the justice of mankind.

—LORD MACAULAY

on Moore's Life of Lord Byron.

THE PRINCE OF WALES was seen to drink a cherry brandy costing half-a-crown in the bar of a hotel in Stornoway, Lewis. President Nkrumah of Ghana said that there "is need to inculcate in our young people and our youth such virtues and disciplines as a spirit of service, love for work, a sense of responsibility, of devotion to Ghana and Africa, or respect for our elders and superiors, and of self-discipline and earnestness". . . .

DR. ANDREW MARTIN speaking at a meeting of the British Institute of International and Comparative Law said that experts accepted that in the event of a nuclear war some 200 million people would die in the first phase—more than five times the number killed in the Second World War. A further 1,000 million could be expected to die over a longer period from the effects of radiation. Up to 400 American children and 100 British children will die of leukaemia as a direct result of the last round of American and Russian nuclear tests. The Prime Minister of Western Samoa said that his Government was alarmed by the French decision to establish a nuclear testing site in French Polynesia, only 1,920 miles from Western Samoa. Fulham Fire Station (along with other L.C.C. fire-stations) has installed an Early Warning Device in the watchroom. When Fylingdales is operational it will give four minutes warning. This will take twenty seconds to reach Fulham. The current Civil Defence handbook (No. 10) advises the use of stirrup pumps. . . .

MR. JOHN F. KENNEDY, president of the United States made a sentimental and vote-catching journey to Germany (for Milwaukee), Ireland (for Boston), Britain (for Auld Lang Syne) and Italy (for New York). He did not visit Africa as their ancestors (in the deep South) have a rather anomalous electoral role. Police in Harlem beat up negroes after a rally. Police said that two hundred negroes walked down a street, knocking over garbage cans, breaking bottles and scattering litter. A correspondent in the *Daily Mail* writes: "It has taken the whites centuries to learn how to settle down together to some kind of demo-



cracy. The coloureds, quite rightly, have the law on their side on education, that will come right before long. Patience, brothers!". . . .

"THE TIMES" reports: "Nairobi's first African mayor, Alderman Charles Rubia, has appealed to citizens and visitors to help to solve the problem of beggars in the city by not giving them anything". Nurses and staff at Sundridge Hospital, Kent, have threatened to stop work if 12 gipsy families set up camp 100 yards away. The hospital

matron said, "We wouldn't mind so much if they were the old type Romanies, but they are the modern, untidy lot." Municipal authorities at Hastings have sprayed the caves occupied by 'beatniks' to make them unfit for habitation. 400 gypsies and travelling people were ordered by Cambridge police to quit Stourbridge Common after twenty-four hours. They were banned from occupying the traditional Midsummer Common site where there has been a fair for 752 years. They ignored the order to move and after a hurried meeting between Cambridge City Council officials and the police it was decided that they could stay for ten days. . . .

A SHAREHOLDER at the annual meeting of the Ritz Hotel suggested that free accommodation should be given to Queen Fredericka of Greece whenever she visited London. The suggesting was booed and shouted down and the proposer said, "I was almost thrown out". The Committee of 100, planning a reception for the Queen, was raised by Special Branch. Documents about the Porton demonstration were taken, the demonstration was however held with about 500 demonstrators, 53 of whom were arrested. On a railway bridge at Chalk Farm was inscribed,

"Who sells his skill to breed the germs of war,
Is not a scientist but a clap-filled whore".
Porton Committee of 100.

THE UNITED STATES Supreme Court by an eight to one majority held that organized prayer and devotion in schools violated the constitutional ban on an established religion or any official position for or against religion. A spokesman for the majority said "In the relationship between man and religion, the state is firmly committed to a position of neutrality". . . .

THE CHAIRMAN of St. Dunstan's told a reunion that men were still going blind from injuries received in the First World War. . . .

TWO NUCLEAR disarmers were arrested at a demonstration by supporters of the Committee of 100 and members of the Glasgow Federation of Anarchists. It was held at a "prohibited place" at Inchterf, Stirlingshire, Scotland. 1,500 students demonstrated in Tokio and Kobe against the security treaty with U.S. and the visit of U.S. nuclear sub-

marines to Japan. It was reported that "at least" four students and twenty-five policemen were injured. . . .

BRITISH TROOPS wandered over into the Yemen. Five were killed and eighteen captured. A British soldier on manoeuvres believes he may have fired a mortar bomb which brought down a Belgian aircraft with thirty-eight deaths. A British soldier seeking to present a suitcase of documents to the Russians called at a British officer's house in error and was subsequently arrested. A new War Minister was appointed in view of his predecessor's errors (unconnected with the above). . . .

PLEA FROM the heart of *Peace News*: "On Aldermaston march I met a London girl, about 18, named Gill; further I know nothing about her. I should like to correspond. Where is she? Hans Metz, Spoorstraat 13, Utrecht, Holland." *Way Out*, the exceedingly serious magazine, carries the following: "A Manual for Simple Burial, by Ernest Morgan. A very helpful, 60-page booklet on how to obtain simplicity, dignity and economy in funeral arrangements by advance planning \$1.00 from School of Living". JON QUIXOTE.

BOOK REVIEW

An Enquiry into Violence

"BLACK SHIP TO HELL" by Brigid Brophy—Secker & Warburg, 50s.

THIS work, which is Miss Brophy's first in the field of non-fiction, was first published in May of last year, and since then has largely been ignored by reviewers. This neglect of such a large work would seem strange, until shortly after commencing to read it one realises that this is one of the most uncompromising and direct works on the entire question of violence in man that has been published for a long time. I would even go so far as to say that it is perhaps the most fundamental analysis of this problem that has ever been published. It is because of this fundamentalism and its unaccommodating attitude to the fads, foibles and cult of personality that bedevils contemporary psychology, philosophy and culture that it has been received with cold silence rather than the howls of derision that are the stock-in-trade of talents much smaller than Miss Brophy's, and why this most stimulating book was not the most discussed work of last year, and why the controversy it could have raised was too much for many minds to wrestle with. One can draw the conclusion from the treatment that "Black Ship" has received (or rather avoided!) that it has a lot to recommend it to people who do have open and lively minds and who are willing to explore new dimensions of dreadful things that have become commonplace, but are none the less outrageous merely because our minds have become hardened to them through custom or habit.

Miss Brophy's most valuable asset in her philosophy (apart from a rich and warming humanity that is present throughout the entire book), is a genuine grasp of the significance and urgent importance of the discoveries of Sigmund Freud. Armed with this, she clearly demonstrates how the full significance of this work has never been permitted to seep through to the mass consciousness of mankind, and although the name of Freud is known to most people, the work of his "improvers" and "interpreters" is much more widely read than that of the originator of psychoanalysis himself; many of whose ideas would still evoke the gasps of horror that they did amongst his contemporaries.

Miss Brophy's view of man then is non-mystical and worldly, set within the spectrum of the entire animal kingdom (not apart or above it as religions like to place man), from which attitude she shows him in a realistic context as a biological specimen; not as "one degree below the angels". In the particularly enlightening passage that deals with man's relationships towards other living animals she shows how what is generally termed our "natural" superiority over animals of the non-human kind brings about a state of mind that often finds its expression in anti-social ways. It is in extending and exploring the whole ideas of social behaviour that she demonstrates how the logical end-test of values is in terms of what is "anti-life" rather than the more limiting idea of a thing merely being "anti-social". We are shown how what some people call the most noble and worthwhile in man receives the inspiration for its motivation from built-in biological impulses to

destroy and damage rather than to help and protect, and until the existence of this primitive urge is acknowledged man will continue to be shocked and dismayed at the overt manifestations of his own latent subconscious sadism and masochism, and remain impotent in understanding why mankind appears to be bent headlong in pursuing its own destruction.

The first part of the book contains an extremely well-reasoned and often quite amusing rejection of religion, and draws upon such varied sources as the Leopold and Loeb murder in Chicago of the 'twenties; an opera by Mozart; and the works of George Bernard Shaw to underline the basic validity of what Freud had to say and teach, and how the ailment of mankind is perhaps more deeply rooted in its mind than earlier philosophers could have realised. From

all this it is clear that Brigid Brophy is an intellectual in the proper meaning of the word, and her erudite knowledge of classical philosophers and scholars is equalled by the understanding that she displays for modern thought. It is this knowledge allied with a lucid and sympathetic understanding of man that makes her reasoning so crystal clear and reasonable.

The whole argument is vitally important, and is thus of special interest to readers of this paper. Sooner or later man will have to find a solution to the increasingly pressing problem of violence, and in this book Miss Brophy has made a great contribution to the solving of this by suggesting that man can only face his dilemma through an understanding and acknowledgment of his own biological urge to destroy, and reasoning just why we sometimes feel impelled to commit violence either directly (as on the battlefield, etc.) or indirectly (as in the abattoirs, etc.), or feel compelled to delegate our own individual authority to leaders or

"those who know better". The price that has to be paid for this indulgence however is in terms of guilt, and this further enmeshes the individual into secondary actions that will satisfy his subconscious wish and need to be punished. "The people have a sense of guilt; of being in debt to the leader and the country; and this they seek to expiate by suffering for the leader and the country". This point alone gives a clearer understanding as to why one often hears right-wingers blathering on about "national traitors"; for many, an agony is only bearable if it is shared. People are not encouraged to examine the underlying cause of their latest sadism any more than they are encouraged to understand their own sexuality; perhaps this is because they have an uncomfortable suspicion that the two are more closely linked than they would like to believe. Miss Brophy penetrates this problem with remarkable clarity, and in writing about the soldier's role in war shows that "the subconscious

Continued on page 4

CONTROVERSY

More on Force and Violence

DEAR COMRADES,

It seems to me that the important subject of violence and force might be approached with more care and charity than is being shown by some. For instance J. Chamberlain refers to people who say "we must use violence". But what people? Surely what has been said is that we must be prepared to use violence if required.

John Whitfield claims that anyone who accepts violence has been brainwashed by a violent society—yet he makes no real assessment of the true case of the person who advocates violence in self-defence. What I consider natural and healthy is self-defence, what I consider unhealthy and unnatural is martyrdom and masochism. If an occasion arises when one can only preserve oneself by use of violence—then I claim it is good to use violence when so placed; my estimation is that it is better to kill than be killed.

It seems self-evident that one's cause is defeated when one is dead, and I resent the assumption that my viewpoint is conditioned by our violent society.

John Whitfield is muddled about the workers. According to him 40% of these work on armaments. We will assume these statistics are correct (source?). In the event of a social revolution I want arms eliminated, not armament workers and I want all the workers—that is everyone—to run society in the interests of all.

We would find the armament workers being constructively employed, the non-productive workers being productively employed (no bureaucracy!) and the various parasites having to work. This is an immense proceeding and, although it can be sketched in this way for the sake of argument, the changes would not be so cataclysmic, because there would obviously be a period of transition and adjustment.

Lastly, John Whitfield claims that all revolutions which began with violence developed within them authoritarian and bureaucratic strata, but Michels has claimed the iron law of oligarchy not violence as being the root cause of such developments. It is also evident that

if violence did produce these unwanted results it may not always have this effect. I know authoritarian pacifists—indeed Kenneth Kaunda is now struggling with the Federal Government in Rhodesia for his share of the Army, yet he is supposed to be an adherent of non-violence. I know pacifists who support Governments, which is the institutionalisation of violence. John Papworth defends the activities of nationalist leaders who go into positions of Governmental power—yet Papworth is a pacifist.

The truth is that there is nothing inevitable about the emergence of a hierarchy in a revolutionary movement. Violent action, of course, can certainly provide authoritarians with a chance to assert themselves, but this does not answer the arguments for violence. In the same way sadists, psychopaths and criminals use violence, but this is no final argument against violence. There are dangers, grave dangers, in using violence, we must not want to use violence, but we must be prepared to use it. J.W.

DEAR FRIENDS,

I assume from Diana Shelley's letter in *FREEDOM* June 15th that she is one of those people whose anarchism consists solely of thinking how nice a free society would be and trying to enter into controversy in the columns of *FREEDOM*.

She obviously has a different sense of morality to me. To me that which furthers individual or collective happiness is good and that which furthers unhappiness bad. Therefore I see the violence of the State as bad and the idea of the masses overthrowing the State to set up a free society as good. Violence would be necessary in a revolution because though we might convince the majority of the population I cannot convince us convincing the Fascists, monopolists, militarists and state worshippers who make up a small, hard core minority, who have the means and the will to destroy enough members of the majority (if that majority were to re-

main non-violent) as to completely stamp out revolution by branding fear into the hearts of the masses.

State violence is disgusting not simply because it is violence but because it is the tool with which the State conducts all its disgusting policies. State violence turns man against man. Anarchist violence is commendable because it will put an end to the disgusting policies of the State and will unite men in a free and equal society instead of dividing them in inequality and injustice. Diana Shelley, however, sees all violence as "bad" and would probably far rather see a peaceful (as states go) liberal state than "wicked" violent anarchists ready to overthrow such a state to establish a free society. I agree with her statement that means cannot be separated from ends but this poses no problem for me; I see violent revolution to establish a free society as good and free society as good and consequently ends and means are quite compatible.

She says "violent revolution has not appeared so far to be at all compatible with the achievement of the free society"; has she forgotten the Spanish Civil War of 1936 whilst still remembering the Russian Revolution of 1917? However, when has non-violent revolution been shown successful in the establishment of a free society.

I do not understand her reasoning by which she contends that if we convince the majority, violence is unnecessary—the State is a small minority not a majority and would remain even when the majority were won over, as countless despotisms have proved. In fact in such a situation far more people would probably die if the revolution were non-violent than if it were violent.

However, does all this really matter? I want a free society and believe that it is necessary to convince the masses of anarchism and so, I do not doubt, does Diana Shelley. We are nowhere in sight of a revolution so let us spend our time trying to gain converts and not arguing as to what form our non-existent revolution should take.

Fraternally,
Upminster, June 17. CHRIS ROSE.

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

- Anarchism: A History of Libertarian Ideas & Movements George Woodcock 7/6
- Prostitution and Society Vol. 1 F. Henriques 50/-
- Berlin: Success of a Mission G. McDermott 16/-
- Tragedy in Dedham: Story of the Sacco-Vanzetti Case Francis Russell 42/-
- The Joy Ride and After A. L. Barker 18/-
- Power Howard Fast 21/-
- The Labour Government 1945-51 D. N. Pritt 37/6
- A Social History of the French Revolution N. Hampson 35/-

CHEAP AND NEW EDITIONS

- The Socialist Tradition Alexander Gray 17/6
- The Bodley Head Jack London 25/-
- Kama Sutra Vatsyayana 6/-

SECOND-HAND

- The Two Germanies (1939) Kurt Von Stutterheim 4/-
- The Sudden View Sybille Bedford 5/-
- Rome Under the Terror (1945) M. de Wyss 4/-
- Fundamental Problems of Marxism Plekhanov (Imp) 3/-
- Foreign Trade and World Politics (1926) Herbert F. Fraser 3/6
- The Financier Theodor Dreiser (Binding damaged) 3/-
- Essays on the Materialist Conception of History Antonio Labriola 3/-
- The Industrial Revolution of the Eighteenth Century in England Arnold Toynbee 3/6
- Way Stations Elizabeth Robins 5/-
- Russian Economic Developments since the Revolution (1928) Maurice Dobb 5/-
- The Good Society Walter Lippman 3/6
- Journey into Chaos Charles Wolf 3/-
- Marching with the Times 1931-46 Douglas Goldring 3/-

PERIODICALS

Anarchist Student No. 2 6d.

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

Anarchy!

July 6 1963 Vol 24 No. 21

OUR GOOD KIND FRIENDS

Continued from page 1

reason that each one of them stems from the authoritarian, capitalist society which we seek to destroy.

So what with the passive majority and the active minority which depends on the existing political machinery, and legislation as the "proper channels", for its agitations, it is not surprising that governments can ignore the people if they so choose, and the police are presented as our friends.

★

FOR a whole number of reasons, too numerous to examine in detail here, governments and the Law are at present at a low ebb in the eyes of the public.

To our minds the real significance, the lesson of The Spies for Peace Story which is featured in this month's ANARCHY, is the way it exposes the weakness—yes, the insecurity—of the so-called security forces, and of the State if and when it were to be challenged by the full force of a determined and substantial minority of the people.

laws which most people are determined to break. There is a limit, even in a so-called police state to the physical size of the security forces; on the other hand mass communications can be, and of course are, used to brainwash the people, to instil in them an unthinking respect for authority, for government, and to create the impression of a security service which is everywhere all the time, watching, listening, and equipped with every gadget that science can provide to further its task.

Last week, for instance (an anonymous group calling itself "Direct Action for Abortion Law Reform" published a document describing a "relatively safe" technique for procuring a miscarriage. According to last week's Medical News, Scotland Yard are now investigating. They may or may not trace those responsible for this pamphlet but the fact remains: that they were impotent to prevent it being published and distributed in the first place.

★

WHAT with the revelations of inefficiency in the recent Spy trials, the Profumo scandal (that is the aspect of it dealing with the workings of the secret services), the Spies for Peace, the various Committee of 100 demonstrations (openly organised thereby giving the authorities all the time they needed to prepare their counter-measures, and yet revealing the fundamental weakness, and inability to cope in the event of simultaneous mass demonstrations at war establishments throughout the country), the "image" of government has taken a severe knocking. Generally speaking, throughout the world, there is a growing "disrespect" for government, which, we repeat, does not necessarily lead to anarchist solutions.

As we were saying, all this is to be expected. But to be forewarned is to be forearmed. This applies to the authorities (at Porton 250 demonstrators met a reception committee of 1,000 troops, 350 police, two Auster planes, two helicopters, half-a-dozen armoured cars, a score of radio lorries and numerous miscellaneous other Army units) as well as to the people. "Spies for Peace", "Direct Action for Abortion Law Reform" are two small but significant pointers that certain tactical lessons are not being overlooked.

"BUT how could anything run properly in a society where there was no central control and authority to enforce things?" Well just consider how things do run in a society with central control and a long tradition of coercive authority. I am about to relate something not based on theory, or on second-hand information, but because we never really know how things go under contemporary methods of organisation and control, until we experience them at first hand.

In the middle of last December my daughter travelled down from Scotland, sending her suitcase by "Passenger Luggage in Advance". At it did not arrive, her brother went to St. Pancras station to collect the suitcase in person. The luggage clerk had no written record of it but conducted him through a vast, rambling, untidy hall littered with assorted luggage, goods and junk. The suitcase could not be found. Various telephone calls to various departments of British Railways throughout December and early January produced no result. The suitcase could not be found.

After I had seen my daughter off on the train back to Scotland in mid-January, I determined to find the case if it were in London, and set out on a voyage of exploration. Having again searched the wilderness of St. Pancras luggage hall, I was told that it might be at Euston Station. I went there in my van, and was stopped by two policemen who were engaged upon "booking" other vans for their offence of parking there. I explained my mission and was told to drive over to platform X where the parcels office was. En route, another policeman stopped me and told me that there was no way through—a one-way road. I must drive out of the station and round to the special goods entrance. This I did, a detour of about 1/4 mile through the neighbouring streets. On platform X I found a place marked "Livestock and Perishables Only", but no parcels office. Eventually I found a porter and asked him where the parcels office was. "Platform X," he said and turned on his heel. I checked up very carefully that I was in fact standing on Platform X and asked another porter. "I'm looking for a suitcase, I want the parcels office," I said. "There," he replied, pointing straight at the notice saying "Livestock and Perishables Only". "But my suitcase is neither alive nor perishable, and I have been told by two policemen and another porter that it may be at the parcels office on platform X."

"Can't help that. That's all there is; we don't handle nothing else here now—not since November. All the rest has

gone to Marylebone Station."

I went there. At Marylebone Station I explained the whole story to the sympathetic luggage clerk, a grave and courteous Pakistani. "I am sorry, Sir, but you have been misled. If your suitcase was sent from Dumfries, and you live in that north part of London, your suitcase could not come here; it would go to the depot at Finsbury Park."

I explained to him that as the suitcase had been lost for a month, obviously it had not taken the right route and it could possibly be here. Anyhow as I had taken all the time and trouble to come here I meant to have a look.

"That is very irregular, Sir. I am afraid I must ask you to see Mr. Y about it if you insist. Mr. Y is on the third floor up those stairs."

Mr. Y's office was a version of the parcels hall at St. Pancras, except that it was strewn with bundles of papers instead of luggage. He expressed the opinion that the courteous Pakistani clerk was barmy and that he ought to know that I should look for it just up the road at Rossmore Road depot. On my way out I paused to pass on this opinion to the clerk in question. Arriving at Rossmore Road, I was told by the man on the gate that I could not drive in, and that any fool would know that the entrance was in Lisson Grove. Having driven in the right entrance I found myself in a wierd enclave which occupies about 400 acres west of Regent's Park, the size of a fair-sized farm. Like much of the property belonging to British Railways it looks as though it has been abandoned to rot. Chaotic piles of crates stand about, interspersed with bits of rusty iron and disused machinery. Gangs of men move around or stand around amongst piles of assorted luggage. There was a row of B.R. lorries drawn up, each one displaying a poster urging the public to send goods by British Railways for "safe and speedy delivery".

Having explained my mission to several people, I was eventually directed to an office where a clerk triumphantly produced news of the suitcase—a telegram from the station in Scotland from where it was dispatched, announcing that it was lost. Together we wandered in the wilderness inspecting brown suitcases, but could not find mine.

I confess that a whole morning spent in this search disheartened me, and I went to no more railway depots—not even to Finsbury Park. We did a certain amount of telephoning; it was possible to spend a couple of hours at a stretch on the telephone speaking to different departments who passed the

back on to another. British Railways is a curiously leisurely disorganisation. The senders of the suitcase made a claim for its value and then B.R. started a rumour that it had been found in Liverpool. I expected it to be sent back to the senders in Scotland, whereas they expected it to be sent on to me in London, and so by the time we had got this sorted out the rumour died down and B.R. denied the Liverpool story.

One Saturday morning in March a man called at my house and said that he had come to investigate a claim for a lost brown trunk. I explained to him the difference between a suitcase and a trunk and insisted on his hearing the whole story. He did not seem surprised. In April I got a cheque in compensation for the lost suitcase, and I cashed it quickly for fear that, like fairy gold it would turn to leaves or ashes if I delayed. £39 was not bad compensation.

One Saturday morning in May another man called at my house and said that he had come to investigate a claim for a lost brown trunk. I experienced a sort of deja vu, but rallying, I stoutly denied that I had ever lost a brown trunk on the railways. He did not seem surprised, and prepared to leave, but before he left I mentioned that once, long ago, I had lost a brown suitcase, but that I had received full compensation for it two months ago. At this he expressed mild interest, and on being pressed, I gave him a shortened account of the saga. All that interested him was the personal appearance of the man who had called on me before. Did he really look like that? What kind of car did he arrive in? He assured me that there was no-one in his department whom it could possibly have been.

Now it is June, and I am wondering just when they will deliver the suitcase. Also, when they have delivered it, will they demand the £39 compensation back again?

The only moral to this Kafka-like story is that when people fear the breakdown of the authoritarian and complex structures of modern society, they should pause and consider just what it is that they will lose. In case someone tells me that farce of the lost suitcase is a comparatively unusual occurrence, let me assure the doubter that for ten successive years I used the services of British Railways in transporting equipment to children's camps, and on not one single occasion did they fail to make some stupid blunder. If they were a new, makeshift, pioneer venture one might attribute their monumental inefficiency to inexperience, but in reality they are a tribute to the gross chaos of capitalist Britain, now given a post-war new look by State control.

In the anthropological study of primitive peoples we come across social institutions which are, to us, quite bizarre and pointless; hugely wasteful means are employed to reach trivial ends, and the naive perpetrators seem blind to the irrationality of their conduct. Anthropologists of the functional school claim that such ritualized expenditure of human effort in an apparently pointless fashion is not what it seems; the latent function of these institutions serve grave and important bases of the tribal life. What awful social catastrophe would we risk if we destroyed the structure of British Railways? I for one am willing to risk it, comrades! G.

OPERATION PORTON

Continued from page 1 demonstrators who had already been in and out of the area once, was arrested and charged with trespass. This also happened to a few individual demonstrators, such as those who refused to co-operate with the soldiers when they were halted, and those who managed to get within a few yards of the Microbiological Research Establishment. Altogether 53 of us were arrested.

At 6.0 we re-gathered at Allington village and held a short meeting. Most of us had been well inside the restricted area at least once, and none of us had been in the least deterred by the antics of the Special Branch. Some of us went straight home from Allington, soaked but satisfied. Others went where our comrades were being tried in a school at Amesbury, ten miles north of Salisbury. About half a dozen had their cases dismissed, because they hadn't been properly warned; about half a dozen were remanded, because they refused to give their names or decided to fight their cases; about half a dozen were sent to prison, because they refused to be bound over; and the other 35 were fined between £2 and £5 with 5 guineas costs, and bound over.

Operation Porton was another small victory in the present phase of the unilateralist movement. Only about 300 people turned up, but

there was heavy rain as well as the rival attraction of Birch Grove and the future attraction of the Greek visit. This demonstration put Porton far more emphatically on the map than the one ten years ago. Silent Death has been reprinted by the Committee of 100. Our personal relations with the soldiers at Porton Down were far better than with the airmen at Marham airfield. None of us wasted time in violence, and only a few of us wasted time in sit-downs outside gates. Our commando technique was successfully used against superior numbers with superior equipment. All we lacked was the sort of imaginative touch which the East Anglian Committee of 100 might have given us: gauze masks weren't good enough. But we gained some encouraging experience, and we had an entertaining day out in the country. We lodged a personal and political protest against the so-called scientists at Porton who prostitute their knowledge and skill to undo all the work of their predecessors for three thousand years. Now we must move on to the next stage—the royal visit from Greece next week, and our return visit to Greece at the end of the month. In the meantime, sit down (or walk on, rather) or pay up, and remember that the Committee of 100 is hard up as the Freedom Press. N.W.

1963 Anarchist Summer School

The LAG/FLA Summer School this year will be held at Brian and Maureen Richardson's: "Greenways", Knockholt, Kent, August 3rd to 5th. The theme for lectures will be "What is the Anarchist Scene?" and we are hoping to have speakers from various parts of the country.

The fee will be 2/6d. per day (1/- for children) or 1/- per day (6d. children) for those with their own tents. (THIS IS FOR UPKEEP, TRANSPORT AND RENEWAL OF EQUIPMENT). Hot evening meals will be provided (for 5s.) on Saturday and Sunday evenings for those booking beforehand—otherwise catering will be done individually or in groups. The L.A.G. stoves etc., will be available for those without equipment.

Closing date for bookings and fees: July 23rd.

Details of how to get there and what food can be ordered will be sent to those booking. (N.B.— Food has to be ordered a week beforehand).

The Prostitution of Handmaidens

SIR,
Re the article by G on Common Wealth's pamphlet *What do People Think of the Bomb?*—A Survey of Public Opinion (FREEDOM 22nd June, 1963): may I, as the villain primarily responsible for prostituting the handmaiden science, speak up on my (enjoyable sounding) practices?

The article opens up with two fine old debating gimmicks. First comes the "curtain rises on a dark vista of hell" trick (second cousin to guilt by association)—the mood is neatly set by pondering on the Nazis, Lysenko and the nastier characters from *Animal Farm* before enter stage left, Common Wealth. Second comes the "straw man". Up goes the imbecilic argument (in whose name?) that a small party is pure because it is small and behold, with consummate skill, we hack the argument to death leaving straw all over the place.

Follows swiftly the irrelevance, Common Wealth is a small party which has small meetings which "deflate the ego of these politicians". The Oxford meeting, attendance two, came after an Oxford meeting, attendance none, which came long after a famous Newcastle-under-Lyme Town Hall mass rally, attendance one, who turned out to be the chief speaker's mother-in-law. Thus our egos are rapidly inflating. The stock-in-trade of any minority group is very often a matter of making loud noises at nobody—so what?

We chose Oxford for the poll area because we have a prospective parliament candidate there says G. You bet your life we did old son. If my Aunt Aggie has a birthday party I'll try and persuade her to have it there too and why not? "Oxford," says G, "has a large and very special University and is therefore one of the most atypical towns in Britain for polling." Why? We didn't poll the University and G would be surprised to know how far, say the Cowley workers, have resisted being rendered atypical by "a large and very special University". Of course the

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

Research Bureau is a political organization, it's very topics are picked for political reasons but that doesn't mean that it's research as such can't be honestly done—unless your mind, being exhausted by the complexities of life, simply equates political with dirty and rests, tired but triumphant, with this great thought.

Back again to a quick dab at "guilt by association" with a swift reminder of Hitler and the lads in the beer hall.

Then we arrive at criticism with content. Crime one—percentages which do not always add up to 100%. It happens once on page six on the attitudes to sit downers question when a number of people gave answers which couldn't be classified as for, against, or intermediate and uncertain. These answers were mostly a simultaneous declaration of being strongly for and strongly against. Since the percentages given are proportions of total sample, they wouldn't in this case add up to 100% if you totted them for ever.

Crime two—"treating data as a singular noun"—guilty he screamed and was led sobbing from the court.

Crime three—on the power of the atom bomb question we presented the correct figure last and got a 'tendency to pick the middle' effect. True and a sloppy job of question structuring it was, but not as bad as the even bigger one we detected post-hoc and pointed out—forcing all forms of opposition to the H-bomb into one omnibus question instead of 'open ending' it.

Crime four—no raw figures given of sample size. Sample size 308, reason for confidence in it, two halves sampled separately tallied well, totals tally well with semi-repressed commercial survey published by Sanity, proportions of age, sex, occupation and educational background tally well with national proportions. Reasons for limiting sample size, legs gave out. Reason for not publishing size of sample, to anyone not familiar with sampling procedure it would look hopelessly small. (Ah the wicked deception of it all).

Crime five—date of survey (actually November 1962 to January 1963) not published in pamphlet: alleged motive, to keep it selling. On the nose both times. If you put January 1963 on the cover it wouldn't sell (though still valid) in February 1963. So this gets flogged merrily until December 1963 when it will be obsolescent and remainders will travel on to the waste paper gentlemen. G's article in general—sort of strained isn't it? "I'm forever blowing bubbles" orchestrated by Wagner. The pamphlet describes a tolerably well done survey with fairly interesting results sponsored by a party on which G is as much an authority on as I am on the Seventh Day Adventists. Yet G devotes roughly 1350 of his 1650 words to a strictly no-data (datum?) all black pastiche thick inlaid with carefully toned political swearwords like "self-styled", "preen themselves", "stooges", "stalking horse", "cash in", "overweening contempt", "trappings", "phony", "rottenness and corruption" and so on and so forth.

Enough. Let the brothers and sisters whose taste runs to a little prostitution of handmaidens send one shilling to the address below and from the pamphlet decide whether (G gives us the choice) we are "ignorant" or "disingenuous".

Yours,
12, High Street, DON BANNISTER.

Mothers & Children

COMRADES,
As FREEDOM does not carry small 'ads', may I trespass on correspondence columns to announce that I have, at present, accommodation to offer to two working mothers of under fives? Space available is three rooms and kitchen (ground floor, some garden)—degree of communal living depends on mothers, though baby-sitting is established household responsibility.

I would also be glad to hear from comrades interested in (and prepared to work or pay for), the reestablishment of an anarchist day school in London.

MARGARET KING,
76 Ansdell Road, S.E.15.

Variations

DEAR COMRADES,
I should have thought that Pat Parker would have agreed with me, rather than taking the position that she does. The thing which distinguishes anarchism from most European philosophies is that it allows a multitude of interpretations, none of which represent the absolute truth.

In this respect it differs from the various kinds of Christianity, all of which claim to represent The Truth. It differs also from Marxism, for the same reason.

There is another aspect of it too. At the moment in FREEDOM a discussion is raging under the heading *Against Finality*, and I can't help wondering if this may not be due to a misunderstanding. Surely what we are hoping to achieve is not a final perfect society, but a changeover in the basic pattern of human societies? Hitherto all advanced civilisations have been to some degree authoritarian, and history is largely the story of the authoritarian society in all its phases; tribal, feudal, monopoly capitalist, state-capitalist, mercantile, industrial, monarchical, republican, etc., etc.

The free society, if we succeed in bringing it about, would vary in much the same way. It too would have a history of thousands of years of change.

Far from this being unrealistic, it seems to me that this is the only sensible thing to expect. Human beings cannot be tied down to the same social arrangements, or not exactly the same, for millennia.

Of course, whether we shall be able to bring about this fundamental change from authoritarianism to freedom is another matter. This distant future cannot be foreseen. However, it seems quite a reasonable possibility, and certainly more so than it did a few years ago, when the only possible future seemed a totalitarian state.

In the field of technology, the most fantastic achievements have been brought about. In the field of human behaviour too, great changes have been accomplished, mankind having changed over from a nomadic food-gathering existence to a settled food-providing one.

Why therefore is it "unrealistic" (and

almost immoral) to claim that it may well be possible to change over from an authoritarian social structure to a libertarian one? And why is it also wrong to suppose that anarchism is a multitude of philosophies, rather than a single, cut and dried belief?
London, June 13. ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

God

COMRADES,
Hooray! Someone has found, as I knew they would when I wrote my Buchman review, a non-authoritarian religion. But I do not recant. My God is still an authoritarian God, and, when and if, I get to heaven, I shall start inciting angels to disobedience and other activities prejudicial to the safety of Heaven. I hope my present comrades will help! The most I can say apart from quoting (or is it misquoting?) Bakunin (If God existed it would be necessary to destroy him) is that some believers are less bloody than others.

If in fact Comrade Feak's God is *simply and solely* another term for 'permanent reality' why not call 'permanent reality' permanent reality and be done with the irrelevant term God. I see no objection to this, if Comrade Feak means what he says.

As far as I am concerned the anarchist believes that he, and he alone, must be responsible for his actions. But God is a Superior Being, to whom one owes obedience (if the subject ceases to be obedient he also ceases to be a subject). How can the anarchist justify obedience to an imposed superior authority, unless it be his conscience? (Maybe religious anarchists believe that God is another name for conscience as well as permanent reality) I ask these questions, not because I want to annoy Comrade Feak, but because I want to know the answers? Until I hear them, very convincingly, I shall retain my partially facetious and partially serious hatred of the religious 'set-up'.

Fraternally,
C.R.

VIOLENCE

Continued from page 2
homosexuality implicit in the soldier's calling has not exhausted itself when it has established the soldier's comradeship feelings towards the men on his own side... the unconscious eroticism of fighting can come to expression only by fusing itself to the acknowledged aggressive impulse." We are shown how the subconscious mind subverts the conscious one into leading us exactly into the paths that the subconscious longs to tread! Quoting Shaw's play "Heart-break House", Miss Brophy shows how "the whole truth about our personal sadistic phantasies in an erotic context is summed up by Hesione Hushabye's dictum 'Yes; cruelty would be delicious if only one could find some form of cruelty that didn't hurt'... If we succumb to this vision (of destruction) it will be because Beethoven, Wagner, Signorelli and Shaw were not enough for us—art being precisely what Mrs. Hushabye was looking for, a method of being cruel that does not hurt". It is to art and culture then that Miss Brophy turns for a means of solving this dilemma, and shows, often through classical mythology and historical example, how man may safely channel off his hidden wishes for destruction with good effect.

Naturally there is much that I have had to leave unmentioned in a review of this size, but I hope I have shown that a work of this magnitude and profundity does deserve serious attention, and no thinking person can fail to gain from a study of this book. It is refreshingly devoid of the usual authoritarianism that one has come to expect in books dealing with psychology, but is full of a tenderness and feeling that makes for optimism and hope. No cut-and-dried solution to our common problem is given, but the journey along which Miss Brophy takes us is full of signposts and sprinkled with enlightenment and compassion and Miss Brophy's own personal fearlessness and strength that is perhaps best shown in the closing paragraph of this very important work.

"Civilisation's hope of surviving the present bout of the struggle lies with the mighty Eros. Yet just as we cannot deny and cannot afford to ignore, so we ought not to despise this Eros's descent from a smaller god. There are few ways in which man can be more innocently employed than in making love. In one form or another, it is to this tutelary deity that we must commit and commend ourselves—and to his mother who, as Lucretius pointed out, because she alone can conquer 'Mars potent in arms', is 'alone able to bless mortals with tranquil peace'."

D.G.

WOW!

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT JUNE 30th 1963

Week 26		
EXPENSES: 26 weeks at £70		£1,820
INCOME:		
Sales & Sub. Renewals	£	£
Weeks 1—24	761	
Weeks 25 & 26	170	
		931
New Subscriptions:		
Weeks 1—24 (197)	211	
Weeks 25 & 26 (20)	25	
		236
		1,167
DEFICIT		£653

DEFICIT FUND

Hounslow: L* 2/6; Lincoln: J.R. 14/-; Bradford: J.E.P. 2/6; London: P.S. £3; Oxford: Anon* 5/-; London: A.H. 4/-; London: M.K. 4/-; London: J.S. 5/-; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 3/-; J.K.W.* 2/-; Bristol: F.P.E. £1; Epping: R.J.H. £1; London: D.B. 10/-; Oxford: B.E.H. 10/-; Leiston: A.S.N. 10/-; New York: K.L.G. 10/6; Manchester: J.McE. 10/-; Edinburgh: C.McK. £1/8/0; Torino: V.A. 3/-; Napoli: L.E. £1; London: A.A. 4/-; E.Rutherford: A.S.* 7/-; London: S.C. £2; Glastonbury: D.A.P. 8/-; Farnham: D.M.B. 4/-; New York: N.S. £4/17/0; Los Gatos: (per l'incaricato) p.proceeds social June 16 £26/15/0; Toronto: L.I. £1/12/6; London: E.S. 2/6; Bromley: O.O.D. 5/-; The Hague: H.K. 8/-; Avon, Ohio: E.McG. 14/-; Mount Vernon: F.D. 7/-; New York: B.M. 14/-; London: A.A.L. 14/-; Liverpool: S.H. 12/-; London: M.M. 8/-; London: R.S. 8/-; Pinner: Z.W. 8/-; Glasgow: J.H. 11/3; Isleworth: L.K.W. 4/-; Seaford: D.T. 5/-; London: P.A. & J.B. 10/-; Tenterden: H.K.H. 5/-; London: H.S. 16/-; London: B.S. 5/-; High Wycombe: J.R.G. 10/-; London: P.B. £1/17/0; Basinstoke: C.B. 5/-; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 3/-; J.K.W.* 2/-; Wembley Park: F.E.S. 8/-; Broxbourne: A.L. 10/-; Bromley: M.D. 8/-; Henley: I.W.I. 4/9; London: M.G. 5/-; London: B.B. 10/-; Merriott: M.A.W. £1/8/0; St. Paul's, Minn: M.S. £1/15/0; Swanley: J.M. 4/-; Leighton Buzzard: A.E.S. £1/8/0; Hamburg: W.F. 8/-; Stroudsburg: F.C.B. 14/-; E.Rutherford: A.S.* 7/-; Wakefield: M.R. 1/6; Castle Douglas: J.A. 10/-; Latham: D.W. £5/5/0; Manchester: M.G. £2/8/0; London: J.McE. £1/8/0; Pittsburg: O.S. £1/1/0; Oxford: Anon* 5/-; Nunceaton: D.H. 4/10; Southend: P.O.* 5/-; Belfast: W.G. 3/-; Bradford: D.R. 3/-; Cheltenham: L.G.W.* 10/-; London: D.S. 5/-; Surrey: P.B.* 10/-; Freiburg: A.A.R. £1/14/0.

TOTAL 82 3 10
Previously acknowledged 435 7 6

1963 TOTAL TO DATE £517 11 4

FREEDOM PRESS PUBLICATIONS

- SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'
- 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

CENTRAL LONDON

Prickly Subjects will be discussed at Central London Meetings at "The Porcupine", 48 Charing Cross Road, London, W.C.2 (Leicester Square tube), commencing 7.45.
JULY 7 S. E. Parker: Anarchism without Ends
JULY 14 Jack Robinson: The Sacco-Vanzetti Case.

HYDE PARK MEETINGS

Sundays at 3.30 p.m., Speakers' Corner. Weather and other circumstances permitting.

EDINBURGH

Would Anarchists in or near Edinburgh please contact Alasdair Macdonald, Torphin, Torphin Road, Coliston, Edinburgh.

ROMFORD & HORNCURCH ANARCHIST GROUP

For details please contact:—
John Chamberlain, 47 Upper Rainham Road, Hornchurch, Essex. OR Chris Rose, 34 Newbury Gardens, Upminster.

SOUTHERN FEDERATION

Will those interested in activities please get in touch with Ken Parkin, Ye Olde Tea House, Lyndhurst Road, Brockenhurst, Hants.

BRISTOL FEDERATION

Will any interested readers contact:—
Ian Vine, 3 Freeland Place, Hotwells, Bristol 8.

OXFORD MEETINGS

For details please contact:—
Laurens Otter,
5 New Yatt Road, North Leigh, Nr. Witney, Oxford.

GLASGOW FEDERATION

Meets every Thursday, 7.30, at 4 Ross Street, Glasgow, E.2 (off Gallowgate).

OFF-CENTRE DISCUSSION MEETINGS

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 Leslie'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.

First Thursday of each month, Tom Barnes', Albion Cottage, Fortis Green, N.2. (3rd door past Tudor Hotel).

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

Second Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Sid Parker's, 202, Broomwood Road, Clapham Common, S.W.11. (Tube: Clapham South, Buses: 37, 49 and 189).

3rd Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Donald & Irene Room's, 148a Fellows Road, Swiss Cottage, N.W.3.

Notting Hill Anarchist Group (Discussion Group)
Last Friday of the month, at Brian and Margaret Hart's, 57 Ladbrooke Road, (near Notting Hill Station), W.11.

N.B.—No June meeting at Notting Hill.

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.