

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"War is not a catastrophe. It is a means of government."
—JEAN GIONO

In this Issue:
and Notes - - p. 3
There Ought to
be a Law ... - p. 3
Who Pays to
Advertise? p. 4

Vol. 19, No. 42

October 18th, 1958

Threepence

DOES MAKARIOS READ 'FREEDOM'?

THE demand for Enosis on the part of the Greek-speaking population of Cyprus goes back more than 50 years. Before the First World War, when he was still a Liberal, Winston Churchill was saying that sooner or later Enosis must be granted to the Cypriots. But then, of course, Cyprus was under Turkish government, and it is always noticeable how tolerant, even concerned, the British can be for the demands for freedom of those small nations dominated by somebody else.

By the time Churchill was in a position to express in action his recognition of the validity of the cry for Enosis, he was no longer a Liberal (not that that makes any difference, but a change of label is regarded as an excuse for a change of policy) and Cyprus had been for 37 years a British possession—and that does make a difference.

But during those intervening years the importance of Cyprus to the British government had changed considerably. Churchill himself had declared that the Suez Canal Zone was indefensible in nuclear war and the Egyptians had made continued occupation a doubtful benefit anyway. Cyprus had become the most important naval and air base in the Eastern Mediterranean, since the Arab countries were feeling their feet and refusing to be as subservient as the British would like.

A New Significance

It was this change of status which brought new significance to the old demand for Enosis. It made British occupation look a permanent thing—indeed the British Colonial Secretary said there was no hope of giving up Cyprus—and it made of the island a target for the H-bombs of Britain's enemies in time of war.

So half a century and more of polite demand for Enosis has now been followed by three years of violent struggle, during which time we have made clear, we hope, that while supporting wholeheartedly the Cypriots' desire to be rid of British occupation, we have not supported the idea of Enosis—that Cyprus should be ruled by Greece.

The anarchist desire has been that the Cypriots should be free from government domination as such, not merely to switch from subjection by one set of rulers to another. Enosis, however, is a political demand, its adherents driven to terrorist activity only because political means are useless for achieving its ends in the circumstances. And the man who has come to the fore as the spokesman for the Enosis movement—Archbishop Makarios—is a politician, in spite of (or because of?) his cloth.

Independence, not Enosis

Now through all the recent years of turmoil in Cyprus, with the background of decades of aspiration behind him, Makarios has voiced only the demand for Enosis—union with Greece. Over the last month, however, he has changed his line. Now he talks about independence for Cyprus—Independence from Britain and Greece, and, of course, Turkey, the Third state bedeviling the lives of the Cypriots.

Now this move may be nothing more than a political trick by an

astute and wily negotiator. This is in fact how the Turks see it. Turkey is interested in Cyprus partly because one-fifth of the population of the island are of Turkish extraction, still speaking that language and keeping their own ties with Turkey. That human interest, however, is by no means the main interest for the Turkish government. The fact is that Cyprus is far closer to Turkey than to Greece and in view of the age-long and traditional hostility between the Turkish and Greek states (most uneasily joined now in NATO), Turkey is loth to have a Greek outpost just off her coast.

This is why the Turks support the idea of partition in Cyprus. It would give them a toe-hold, a legal right for the presence of Turkish troops on the island, an opportunity to keep an eye on the Greeks. These allies trust each other so, you know. And the Turkish interest has served the British well in providing a minority to be defended, an excuse for stalling the Greeks.

A Grain of Sense

Whatever the motives of Makarios, however, the fact remains that his latest proposal contains the first grains of sense that have been provided at the official level so far. For the first time somebody has suggested a move which takes into account the people of Cyprus as

much as the interests of Greece, Britain or Turkey—or the ruthless leaders of EOKA.

Now we are reluctant to claim credit when there is no real evidence that we have had any direct effect. But the fact remains that on July 19th we published a front-page article entitled 'Is There An Alternative?' in which we outlined what we conceive to be the anarchist solution to the present mess in Cyprus. We wrote:

The anarchist solution for Cyprus is that it should not be governed by either Britain, Greece or Turkey or any amalgam of the three, but that it should become an independent island with the Cypriots, whatever their land or origin, running their affairs themselves.

Not with a Cypriot government, but through local initiatives and co-operatives, co-ordinating over the island on a federal basis. Turkish, Greek or mixed villages or parts of towns could have their own autonomus communes for the arranging of their economies and, without imposing wills one upon the other, could work together in their common interests. In this way Greek would not dominate Turk nor vice versa.

We do not know whether Archbishop Makarios reads FREEDOM, but our readers must admit that it is an interesting coincidence that after years of stubbornly sticking to the idea of Enosis, he should suddenly change to an idea somewhat

Continued on p. 4

Pure Moonshine

WE are not the ones to belittle a great scientific achievement, and we must take it from the experts who should know, that the latest American success in pre-space-travel (or is it inter-planetic mis-silery?) is the most notable feat yet performed in this field; but nevertheless there are certain side issues which do have a somewhat ludicrous aspect.

It will have been observed that in between the enthusiastic cries of "wonderful first shot" from Jodrell Bank, there have been numerous appeals for the greatest possible care that the moon itself should not be struck by some wandering probe, or much worse, an explosive missile of some kind. Although in principle we find this concern for the well-being of the moon thoroughly praiseworthy, we could wish that the same consideration were being shown the planet upon which we have the doubtful good fortune to live.

The scientists, whose aim is the advancement of knowledge and achievement, are naturally worried that an indiscriminate lunar probe might strike the moon in an abandoned way, and disturb the untold

centuries of dust which lie upon its surface; for the dust may possibly contain space-formed molecules which could lead to discoveries as to the processes of "pre-life" molecule building—perhaps an element from which life itself began. More credible for the uninitiated is the possibility of contamination to the moon's atmosphere, of which there is only 10 to a 100 tons in all, and the likelihood of radioactive gases and debris, or burned-up rocket fuel disallowing for ever a full and complete study of the moon in its virgin state.

And this is indeed a familiar subject, for the columns of FREEDOM consistently discourse upon the evils of radioactive dust and related hazards. But this is what appears to us to be so ludicrous—that the scientists should be so concerned with contamination to a planet without life and yet maintain a resolute air of calm detachment in the face of known dangers to the human race upon the planet earth.

As we write, news comes to hand that the danger has been averted, the Pioneer has failed to reach its orbit and conquer Newton's Law. It has returned from 80,000 miles away and is all burned up. Not that its intention had been to strike the moon, but a mis-calculation might have brought about this tragedy. The next one up may do just that.

But this is not the only news, for Russia, true to her word has started once again the testing of nuclear weapons—which means that of the three Great Powers who possess the nuclear bomb, all three are testing hard. Why do the men in control of those activities allow this contamination of the earth to continue? Can it be that there are men in the world whose sense of values is such that the dead lunar past is of greater importance than the life of those on earth at present and in the future to come?

Eyewitness

The following letter was published in Monday's Manchester Guardian:

Sir—I wish to protest against the violent treatment of the young men who interrupted the Prime Minister's speech at Blackpool on Saturday.

I attended this meeting as a reporter for a Dutch newspaper, and I saw two of the incidents from close. Both these men were dragged out of their seats by the hair. On the way to the door they were repeatedly hit by members of the audience.

What happened later was far worse. One of the men was forced into a little room in another part of the building and beaten up by several people including some uniformed attendants. I did not see this myself but several British and foreign colleagues of the highest repute who saw the man being pushed into the room and come out again bleeding told me. I did see the blood on the floor when I arrived immediately afterwards.

I talked to the two men who were worst hit. They both had badly swollen and bruised faces. One had blood on his cheek and forehead; the other was severely shocked in the medical sense of the term. I know that these people—whose political views and methods I abhor—went to the meeting in order to create trouble. I realise how difficult it must be to remove them from the middle of a row of seats when they struggle against their necessary ejection. But there is no justification for bystanders hitting a man when he has been rendered defenceless—that of course was criminal.

Yours &c.

London.

T. H. JOEKES.

High Spirits & Sea Breezes at Blackpool Capitalism in Sheep's Clothing?

IT is difficult to say whether the high spirits in which both the Labour and Tory Party conferences concluded their deliberations were due to a closing of the ranks, the discovery of "real unity", and a "deep sense of purpose" among the respective delegates, or just simply that the air in Scarborough and Blackpool is so bracing that even cliché-worn politicians and flat-footed Trade Union leaders after a few days by the sea can rise to the occasion. For all they did was to repeat the same old slogans but with just that extra bit of enthusiasm, which the ozonised delegates present were quick to sense, as was clearly demonstrated by the indiscriminate applause with which each wave of stale verbiage was received. (At the Tory conference even the Stewards carried out their duties as "chuckers-out" with more zeal than even the Prime Minister thought necessary).

★

BUT seriously, the Labour Party conference was principally concerned with the problem of how to win the next election, and all discussion which attempted to recall Conference to principles was stifled by the platform along which were ranged the ageing shadow government desperately seeking to placate the "middle class" whose votes they need if they are to taste the sweet fruits of power before senility or the limbo of the House of Lords sweeps them from the political scene.

The Tories, on the other hand, are in power, and their leader, who makes his dramatic appearance only at the end of the Conference, to do the talking and not the listening, has

been "meeting the people", has been giving Eisenhower and Dulles sound advice over "Red" China, has reduced the Bank rate and increased the dollar reserves, and is sitting pretty according to the public opinion (or should it be the "personality") polls. The Tory conference was concerned not with winning the next election but of retaining power. And being sporting people addressing a sporting public (after all don't half the families of Britain complete their football pool coupons each week?) the outstanding slogan of the Tory conference, uttered by the greatest publicist of them all, Lord

Hailsham, was "Operation Hat-Trick". This combined military-sporting action would in Lord Hailsham's view not only mean that there would be another Conservative Government but "The evil, fatuous spectre of democratic Socialism, that contradiction in terms," would disappear "into the mists of time. We shall have taken the robber castle," he went on, "torn down its battlements, stormed its keep, and liberated its dungeons."

The only objection any sincere Socialist could have to Hailsham's outburst is that he is really much too flattering! For years the Labour Party leadership has been adding so much water to its already much watered wine of socialism that some defeatist socialists declare that they cannot taste the wine for the water! (But equally there are true blue Tories who declare that the Tory port of the good old days has been ousted by these upstarts whose political palate has been destroyed by compromise with port-type wines. These Tory idealists are regularly and unceremoniously ejected at "Tory" gatherings, just as the Socialist idealists are shouted down by theirs or expelled from the Party).

And, of course it is true that in the course of the past fifteen years the "ideological" gap between the two major political parties has been bridged: by the Labourites throwing overboard the ideological content of their programme, and by the Conservatives seeking an ideology which had a more popular appeal in an era of universal suffrage! At a time when the Labour Party is soft-peddling the principle of national-

Still Going Down Don't Stop Now!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 41

Deficit on Freedom	£820
Contributions received	£592
DEFICIT	£228

October 3 to October 9

Bordighera: K.W. 10/6; London: D.R.* 10/-;	
Enfield: J.E.S. £1/0/0; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-;	
London: P.F.* 10/-; London: J.S.* 3/-; Selly	
Oak: P.M. 5/-; London: W.F. 1/-; Leeds:	
M.F. £5/0/0; London: Anon. 1/-; London:	
Anon. 1/6; London: L.I. £1/0/0; Chorley	
Wood: S.E.E. 3/6; Wolverhampton: J.G.L.*	
2/6; Preston: R.S.M. 10/6; San Francisco:	
Part Proceeds picnic Pleasanton, Sept 21,	
per Osmar £35/0/0; Philadelphia: Grupo di	
Emancipazione, per A.C. £3/10/0.	
TOTAL	48 12 6
Previously acknowledged	544 6 1

1958 TOTAL TO DATE £592 18 7

Gift of Books: London: A.S.

*Indicates regular contributor.

Continued on p. 3

A STUDY IN TREACHERY

THE VICHY REGIME. By Robert Aron. Translated by Humphrey Hare. Putnam. 42s. 536 pages.

FOR those of us who expect little or nothing from politicians, the history of the Vichy Government serves to explain why, and at the same time should stand as a warning to others who expect too much. Although Vichy survives in most memories as "a stain upon the honour of France", it is certainly not considered to be the damning indictment of political double-dealing and corruption which Mr. Aron's detached account makes of it. Mr. Aron has not fallen into the trap of allowing himself to be biased, he has reported the facts, which speak far more strongly for themselves than if he had taken upon himself to give opinions or point morals. This is the strength of his book.

He confines himself to the actual history of the régime, and only discusses aspects of the German occupation, the Resistance and the war in general when there is a definite relevance to the subject in hand. The book is not 'difficult', but interesting and well written—it is also rather long (not a criticism, and expensive (which is).

The principal players in the Vichy drama were, over the years, Marshal Pétain, Pierre Laval and Admiral Darlan, of whom Laval was by far the leading evil genius. In 1940, as the French Army collapsed the Government hastily fled to Vichy—Pétain was considered to be the only man with sufficient prestige to hold the respect of the French people and at the same time negotiate a reasonable armistice with the Germans. He was 84 years of age, the hero of Verdun, "the father of his people". He was also an authoritarian with little time for democracy (and especially the French Republic's version), and he became the Head of State. His outlook resembled in almost every aspect that of de Gaulle's at the present time, a seemingly strange paradox in view of the fact that his

Government passed sentence of death upon de Gaulle in his absence in England.

In July 1940 Laval after an extraordinary mixture of lies, cunning and thinly-disguised blackmail succeeded in dispensing, for all practical purposes, with the constitution and acquiring complete power for himself and Pétain. France was governed by decree—by two Frenchmen.

But in the forefront of all the minds of all the politicians in Vichy was how best to treat with the Germans. Opinions differed between those who favoured collaboration in order to gain a preferential position for France in Germany's New Europe as advocated by Laval, and a policy of "National Revolution" supported by almost all the others, which was at the same time anti-German. Both factions being highly reactionary and anti-British.

In December 1940, Laval was beaten out of office, but almost immediately the Germans ejected his opponents. In February 1941, for fourteen months, Darlan came to power. Throughout this period he attempted to balance the voracious demands of Germany with the welfare of the French people, and the possibilities for resistance with the fear of "Polandisation". Meanwhile the French suffered semi-starvation, lack of freedom, the threat of reprisals, imprisonment or death and the possibility of deportation to work in German factories.

In April 1942, until almost the end of the Vichy régime Laval was back in power. He became even more collaborationist and quite convinced that his

Franco-German policy was the right one, until at last in 1944 when the outright Fascists, centred in Paris, were the only ones who would still deal with a Germany losing the war, and "Vichy" moved East.

But the story of Vichy is one of politicians of all parties adapting themselves to changed and changing conditions without thought for any of the principles involved. Worse still, from being men for whom expediency had long been a watchword, they became its abject slaves, and before long they and their followers became as enthusiastically totalitarian Fascists as their masters the Germans. The Jews and Freemasons were as usual the first to suffer, and eventually the French brand of S.S., the S.O.L. (Service d'Ordre Légionnaire), under Joseph Darnand, became well known for its deeds in the service of France, with its oath of allegiance quite plainly recognisable:

"I swear to fight against democracy, against Gaullist dissidents and against the Jewish leprosy."

The book shows only too clearly what really happens when the Government of a defeated nation comes to terms with its conquerors, and how easily it becomes used as an instrument for carrying out the policies which but a short time before it had been fighting. And how the supposed threat of 'anarchy' and disorder impels men to reverse their previous attitudes and collaborate with the erstwhile enemy—for the good of the nation. It is an ugly story of intrigue and betrayal, and men determined to remain in power at any cost. H.F.W.

Drawings of South Africa

PEOPLE LIKE US. Drawings of South Africa and Rhodesia, by Paul Hogarth. (Dobson, 12s. 6d.)

PAUL HOGARTH'S drawings are extremely good. He is primarily a documentary artist, recording in quick sketches the people and places he has seen, evoking the mood of the country and asserting the common humanity of all men. His line is flowing and pleasing; his composition unobtrusive; one would almost wish for more design in many of the drawings.

The total impression, however, left by this book is one of earnestness and simplicity. Mr. Hogarth is using his art to espouse a creed. He is not concerned with Africans and Indians as models but as symbols, as symbols of human dignity and strength; those whites who appear in these pages are symbols too, of brutality, indolence or bigotry. And, whilst this

is alright as far as it goes, the symbolism is the propagandist's not the artist's, and all propaganda oversimplifies. The propagandist's world is a black and white one: so is Mr. Hogarth's.

I regret particularly the omission of the Cape Coloured community whose whimsicality, humour and variety would have enlivened Mr. Hogarth's trip and his pages. I miss, too, the element of satire and absurdity which, in a way, South Africa cries out for.

But, with minor reservations (especially about the text, which is rather dull), I recommend this fine book by a sincere man and most powerful artist.

There is a preface by Father Huddleston. O.C.

CINEMA

A Film Worth Looking For

JUBULANI AFRIKA, photographed and directed by Jock and Jamie Uys.

WHEN I read, on the poster outside the news theatre, that one of the films on show was an 'Africa Colour Travel', my first impulse was to seek entertainment elsewhere. Travel films as a whole bore me; I suppose it is true, in fact, that monuments are 'historic' mountains 'grand', inhabitants 'kindly', etc., etc., but when they are presented by an enthusiastic voice reading a platitudinous panegyric, or cut in meaningless repetitive chunks to harmonise with some awful tone poem, they all look fraudulent and insipid. But *Jubulani Afrika* gave me a feeling of delight which I have seldom experienced from any kind of film. Perhaps part of the pleasure was due to the fact that I expected to be bored, so I must praise with caution; but without any reservations this is the best travel film I have ever seen, *Song of Ceylon* and *Congorilla* included.

The only commentary is a written introduction, saying something like "A wandering minstrel sings his way through Africa, collecting the music of the people at work and play." After that, the whole of the film is devoted to shots of tribal dances, street entertainers, men and women working to music, choirs and other tuneful scenes from life, linked by shots of an anonymous figure in a coloured toga walking across a landscape.

The direction of the whole film is done with such skill and charm, that in order to keep a sense of proportion, it is necessary to remind oneself at intervals that none of the scenes is as natural and spontaneous as it looks. The dancers must be aware of the cameras trained on them; the workers must be wearing their best clothes and using their best

singing voices for a special performance of work; the muffled song we hear at one point must have been dubbed, and does not really come from the recesses of a donkey-cart with a pair of feet showing over its edge. One of the sequences is of a group of men trying to shift a car which is stuck in a ford; one of them strikes up a song, and the rest join in, grunting out the rhythm with sweat pouring down their faces as they jog the car along. Suddenly the car lurches forward, and the four or five men rocking against the tail bumper fall backwards into the water. It is obvious gag and one realises on reflection that it must have taken hours to film, but like almost every other incident it looks completely accidental.

I cannot honestly believe that this film has not won many prizes, or that any reader who is acquainted with the cinema will not think me a pompous ignoramus, announcing what everybody knows. I do not even know what country or countries the film is about. It might be the whole continent south of Sahara, or it might be the 'native' reserves and quarters of the Union of South Africa; I recognised the unique stamping dance of the Zulu (from another travel film), and a Johannesburg rickshaw boy (from Arthur Mee's *Children's Encyclopaedia*), but everything else was new to me. 'Uys' is an exotic name to the English eye, and could be of some African language; but it might be Dutch. Someone, I suppose, could recognise the various exciting landscapes traversed by the chap in the toga, but my joy in the film was a joy of sheer ignorant emotion.

I was given the feeling which every boring travel film tries too obviously to

Marx and Anarchism

ACCORDING to Tony Gibson (FREEDOM, 9/8/58) "the fundamental Marxist concept of social dynamics was in some ways fundamentally different from anarchist concepts, but to some extent anarchism had been contaminated by Marxism". While this statement is brief to the point of uninformative, the relationship between Marxist and anarchist social theories raises interesting questions that are worth taking up a little more fully.

Marxist social theory is characterised foremost by an account of history which is deterministic and secular. Social events are not seen as the consequence of supernatural intervention (as in theology or in Hegel), nor are they treated as the outcome of individual 'good-wills' or 'ill-wills' (as, for example, in Rousseau). A great deal of metaphysical absurdity has been eliminated by the recognition of the social—as distinct both from the supernatural and the psychological—origins and functions of politics, economics, law, ethics, religion, etc. Marx's account of history is in terms of conflicting social movements, a salutary contrast to previous and subsequent theories of divine wills, *volonte generale*, consent, utility, co-operative tendencies, etc.

This aspect of Marxist social theory is realistic and can, with critical effort, be distinguished from the attendant metaphysics. By contrast anarchist social theory is much more diffuse and less systematic. Anarchists in the nineteenth century borrowed a great deal from Marx himself. Bakunin adopted, and emphasized, the doctrine of class struggle. But at the same time, betraying Proudhon's influence, he had notions of the "brotherhood of mankind" which were alien to Marx. The strongest solidarist strain in anarchist thought which persists to this day stands in hopelessly unresolved conflict with the acceptance of that part of Marxism which realistically insists on the incompatibility of the aims and interests of opposed social movements.

Because it is more thoroughly worked out and more systematically expounded Marxism is easier to appraise. Its chief merit is the treatment of conflict as a central feature of social life, as, for example, in the account of ideologies in general as distorted myths which arise in the course of conflict and which further it. Particularly valuable in this connection is the resounding exposure of the concept of the 'common good' as a specially important ideological device. Connected with this is the anti-indivi-

dualistic, deterministic appreciation of history which emerges, for example, from the compelling criticism of the utopian socialists. The crucial point here is that social being determines consciousness and not the other way round; individuals wishes cannot be socially effective when the social conditions of their effectiveness are absent.

This particular discovery can, of course, be used to criticise parts of Marxism itself and this is what to some extent anarchists have been doing, pointing to excessive instrumentalism, the main weakness of Marxist social theory. Marxism involves the error of monism. It attempts to reduce political, cultural, religious, etc. views and activities to economic ones, and it falsely represents social movements as mere economic categories and social institutions as mere mechanical devices in the class struggle. The strength of anarchist social theory lies precisely in the refusal to take a purely instrumentalist view of institutions, especially of the State; and in the refusal to reduce genuinely diverse social phenomena to an "economic structure". Thus anarchists can have a thoroughgoing theory of political power which Marxism evidently lacks. The theory of power, and especially the recognition that political institutions and processes have their own laws which apply to all who participate in them, is by far the most important contribution to a realistic appreciation of social life which has been made by anarchism.

Yet it remains true that traditional anarchist social theory is insufficiently worked out and, as a body, inconsistent and incoherent. The removal of this coherence cannot be successful without taking into account the realistic and the same time libertarian aspects of Marx's work, some points of which I tried to indicate. If this process of critical examination is what is meant by "contamination", then the contamination is long overdue and, for the sake of seeing the world as it is, urgently required. But the task of enriching anarchist theory by drawing on parts of Marxism is essentially a critical one requiring that Marx be treated not as an anarchist bogeyman, but as a thinker whose views when carefully examined will yield insights indispensable to those interested in arriving at an objective view of society. Strathfield, N.S.W. GEORGE MOLNAR

Anarchism and Welsh Nationalism

To the Editor.

DEAR SIR,

I am newly interested in Anarchism. There is one question that I particularly need to have clarified. I am a member of a nationalist movement, and I find a great deal undealt with and left for granted in connexion with political nationalism.

I can quite understand the anarchist's deep distrust of any movement that operates mainly through parliamentary elections, and seeks to substitute one state for another. But it is not enough that the anarchists should condemn this aim, and fail to offer an alternative solution for the problem that I am going to try to outline.

In the countries with which anarchism has been practically concerned such as Spain and Russia, the language and cultural complex have been of a dominant and colonising nature; or else in countries like Catalunya and the Ukraine, they have recently been strong and fully living in the lives of the people.

England too, like Spain and Russia, has colonising cultural traditions. The English have had no difficulty in keeping alive their language. When, therefore, the English anarchist considers the best organisation of his country, he does not have to spend any time worrying over whether the broad characteristics of the culture of the individual communities will be English. There is no problem. The picture in Wales is very different.

The Welsh have been losing their cultural distinctness over a period of more than five hundred years. Blame lies in part with the Welsh themselves. The development of this distinctness appears to have been curtailed in its full vigour with the loss of political independence. The serious problem is that, as the 'Welshness' has receded, nothing of com-

Continued on p. 3

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats.)

New Books . . .

Afternoon of an Author
F. Scott Fitzgerald 16/-
The Bodley Head Scott Fitzgerald 20/-
Conviction
(ed.) Norman Mackenzie 18/-
The Balcony Jean Genet 10/6
Soviet Marxism H. Marcuse 28/-
Epitaph for George Dillon
John Osborne & A. Creighton 10/6
A Time to Speak Michael Scott 21/-

Second-Hand . . .

A History of the Paris Commune
Thomas March 7/6
The Poisoned Crown
Hugh Kingsmill 3/-
War by Revolution
Francis Williams 2/6
Socialism: National or International Franz Borkenau 4/-
Studies in Religious Fallacy
J. M. Robertson 4/-
Radio is Changing Us
D. Cleghorn Thomson 2/6
The Heart is a Lonely Hunter
Carson McCullers 3/6
If All Men were Beggars
Albert Cossery 3/-
The Secret War for Oil (1935)
Frank Henighen and Anton Zischka 5/6
Pioneering Days
Thomas Bell 6/-
The Religion of Kindness
W. M. Gallichen 3/-
The Martyrdom of Man
Winwood Reade 3/6
The Transvaal Trouble: How it Arose
John Martineau 2/-
Stanley Baldwin: a Tribute
Arthur Bryant 2/6
Our New Masters
Colm Brogan 2/-
Why I am a Liberal
Sir William Beveridge 2/-
India and Freedom L. S. Amery 2/-
Freedom and Catholic Power
Paul Blanchard 12/6

Cheap Editions . . .

The Popes and their Church
Joseph McCabe 2/-
The Papacy in Politics To-day
Joseph McCabe 2/6
The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age F. A. Ridley 2d.

We can supply ANY book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found!

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

27, RED LION STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1

Capitalism in Sheep's Clothing?

Continued from p. 1

tion*, and is so qualifying the concept of "equality" that it has lost its meaning. The Conservative Party on paper at least, falling over backwards to disown the traditional capitalist, and seeking to pose as the champion of the People *versus* the State.

The publication of the booklet "Prospect for Capitalism" is an attempt by the Conservative Party to present Capitalism not as a swear-word (for the Left) but as an economic system which takes into account the aspirations and ambitions of a majority of the population and which therefore will, if not misrepresented, appeal to a majority of the people. Similarly the various Labour Party policy pamphlets—such as "Towards Socialism"—were the L.P.'s attempt to reassure the professional, the middle-class of this country, that the brand of "socialism" had nothing to do with Marx, was not revolutionary, and only believed in "equality" to the extent that "some are more equal than others", and far from discouraging "initiative" considered that "provided there is a decent minimum wage" they had no objection to a system of rewards which is related to the nature and difficulty of the work, the skills required and the responsibility borne.

Which is what Lord Hailsham says in his foreword to "Prospect for Capitalism!"

Capital became unpopular not because it failed but in the measure in which it succeeded. The demand that its benefits should be more widely shared, and that the freedom from restriction should not be allowed to develop into abuse of human dignity, became irresistible. The evangelical fervour of philanthropists like Lord Shaftesbury, and the political nous of statesmen like Lord Beaconsfield taught us the overriding necessity to discipline business oligarchies and profit motives with those traditions of service, obligation, and charity which had once tempered the rule of a landed aristocracy."

BUT the people of this country must be wary of these attempts to dress up wolves in sheep's clothing, however stupid Hailsham may appear when he makes an exhibition of himself or however convincing Macmillan may appear when he turns on his best bedside or fireside manner. Capitalism, according to our dictionary, is "the system that favours the concentration of capital in the hands of the few". Bearing in mind this definition the following from Hailsham's foreword has a cynical ring about it:

"It will indeed be the test of conservatism in the coming generation that it should not only create the property-owning democracy but should temper the materialism and acquisitive spirit of the many with a sense of service and responsibility, as once it tempered the excesses of the early capitalists and so confounded Marx."

In other words he wants the people to feel they have a stake in the capitalist society by owning their own back yard, but he does not want them to be much more ambitious

*On the other hand Lord Hailsham refers to the emergence of technical limitations on the development of capitalism which are more serious than the Marxian analysis: activities whose economic advantages or disadvantages cannot be measured in terms of their immediate profitability. He mentions the cost of cleansing the air and water, and road development as examples. Can one expect Lord Hailsham to come forward soon as an advocate of a limited nationalisation?

'There Ought to be a Law ...'

THERE ought to be a law against it!" It is at times amusing, astonishing or heartbreaking to hear how people put faith in the intervention for good of the legal power in the land, not only in problems of international politics or national economy, but also in what must seem relatively minor matters. At one time the radio programme "Have a go!" made a feature out of asking each participant what he would do if given the chance to pass one specific law. The most humorous incident occurred when someone told Wilfred Pickles that he would like to introduce Prohibition.

Numerous topics spring to mind, of varying degrees of seriousness, and presenting different aspects of the distinction between authoritarian and libertarian approaches. Perhaps it would not be wasting time and space to turn our attention for a while away from the affairs of politics towards some of these "unimportant" questions.

The moral voice of the Junior School teacher is lingering in our ears, nagging forth on the iniquity of taking birds' eggs from their nests. Her attempt to make us imagine a giant stalking about snatching children from their homes was not a sufficiently close analogy to convince us, but it would be an unjustifiable writing off of pedagogical authority to suggest that no diminution of plundering occurred as a result of the lecture. The less excited, uninvolved, colder, but more forbidding tones of the B.B.C. announcer pronounce the extended list of species whose eggs are protected by law, and give due warning of the fines impossible on those who break it.

The prospect is, that unless "something" is done, some of the rare species of birds might become extinct in England, with consequent loss to all branches of natural science, and to quite valid sentiment. And this due to the irresponsible activities of only a few adventurous individuals, who either did not understand or appreciate what they were doing, or else preferred the cash which could be realised.

By objecting to the coercive approach to any problem, anarchists play at least one rôle which leaves all constructive sociologists in debt. That is to really make people think why they do not want a particular act to occur, and by constructing various alternative approaches, fit it into its background. An interesting point, worth the consideration of anarchists, is how much value we attach to the fact that anarchism makes a contribution of this type to social theory, which may perhaps be construed as helping authoritarian society to work, certainly without bringing society any nearer to anarchism.

Here are just a few of these considerations related to the matter above. There exists the possibility of a positive approach. Means could be explored

than that even though the resolution following the debate on Industrial Relations "reaffirms" the Conservative Party's belief in "a partnership between Government, employers and workers" and many of the delegates talked in specific terms of workers as shareholders in industry.

The fact of workers owning their houses and investing their savings in shares in Industry will not change their position of inferiority in existing society, nor change society. On the contrary, if anything it will consolidate it. As the *Manchester Guardian* financial column put it "the more people with a monetary interest in the present system the less likely is the system to be disturbed by a Labour Government" (it being assumed that Labour is synonymous with revolution and change).

Capitalism cannot be reformed. If one believes in the capitalist system one believes in all those privileges which the socialists and the anarchists of the 19th century condemned, without ifs and buts, as offensive to the elementary dignity of the working man. Many of the rough edges of capitalism have been knocked off, not as a result of capitalists having a conscience but through agitation among their victims. But the main structure remains intact preserved not only by the Hailshams, but by the Gaitskells and the Bevans, whatever they may say at party conferences.

whereby the breeding of the species could be protected without interfering with its way of life. This is obviously more expensive than passing a law, but from the naturalistic point of view it would surely be more rewarding. Again there is the question of public interest. If there are people prepared to report misdemeanours to the authorities, are there not also enough to prevent potential offenders from doing their work, or at least to try to dissuade them?

These thoughts apply to some degree to the annoying problem of litter.

The penalty for spreading it was recently increased to £10. It is too early to see whether or not the result will be a miraculous purifying of the more popular parts of the British countryside, but at least one person was heard to remark, on unwrapping an ice-cream, "Well, we mustn't throw the paper on the ground now, must we?" An incidental by-product of this legislation occurred when a number of Communists threw leaflets in a political demonstration, but had to pick them up after policemen pointed out that they were offending against the anti-litter laws. Regarding the main question, it is far more disappointing to know and hear of the existence of the attitude expressed in the remark quoted above, than to see the waste paper on the ground. The latter can be evaded by going somewhere else, but a widespread lack of appreciation of beauty is far more difficult to get away from.

A series of controversial points are tied up with medical questions. There are at the moment, just a few specified complaints in connection with which it is illegal for anyone but a qualified doctor to operate. A certain section of medical opinion would like to see the list greatly extended to attack the various branches of the "Nature Cure" movement. A quite different motive lay behind the bill passed through parliament about six months ago, designed to prohibit the sale of spectacles except through medically authorised channels. It is inevitable that generally speaking, the person who practices in an accepted

way, and who ignores "cranky" innovations will almost always be largely in the right, and a majority of people will demand the orthodox methods of their own accord. Opinions differ considerably among both qualified experts, laymen, and past and potential patients about the validity of the claims made by unorthodox practitioners, but perhaps it will be generally accepted that among them are people of the highest ability and integrity, and also those of the lowest. Also, some desperate people patronise the latter type out of desperation and suffer as a result. Hence the appeals for legal control. Again, once legal power does fall into the hands of committees of bureaucrats with particular interests of their own, it is very difficult to put the brake on, and it is found that under the excuse of protecting the public, the government is repressing activities which seem dangerous to it. On the other hand, development of ability to discriminate and choose freely on the part of ordinary people would reduce the

Racial Discrimination in U.S.

NEW YORK, Sunday.

Harry Belafonte, the singer, is having difficulty in finding a flat in fashionable Manhattan, because of his colour.

"The turn-downs were very systematic," said Belafonte.

"Apartments would be available till it was time to sign a lease.

"Then when it was discovered the apartment was for me, something would happen—a deposit by another tenant had been forgotten or a partner had promised it to his cousin—all kinds of shenanigans.

"It has made me so angry I get tongue-tied."

Belafonte said he could find a flat for himself, his white wife and their two-year-old son, David, on a sub-lease or under someone else's name.

"But that is not the way I want it."

He plans to invoke his rights under a State law banning discrimination in private housing.

Land Notes

THE trouble with legislators, even when they are supposed to be protecting the weaker section of the community, is that they tend to go to ridiculous lengths. An instance of this is the recent legislation concerning children and farm machinery. The operator or farmer has been deprived of the power to use his own judgment in this matter, and consequently a large amount of enjoyment associated with farm life has been lost. It is true that farms are extremely well mechanised with quite dangerous machinery, but very often the tractor is more predictable than the horse. The gradual association with machinery I think in the long run prevents accidents and to prevent the active curious child from participating in the work that goes on around him is to divorce still further education from the realities of living.

THE beef prices must have been giving people a shock. In spite of the government endeavouring to encourage meat production, its efforts obviously are not enough. There are these considerations: firstly that an animal takes at least eighteen months before it is saleable and many farmers prefer a monthly milk cheque (or weekly egg cheque) instead of chancing the market. Pork prices are still quite high in the butchers' shops but, if the state of the pig market is anything to go by the price of pork should be very low in the shops.

With modern methods of broiler production the price of chicken is going to be lower than beef, especially as chickens are easier to mass produce than steers. Often the broiler chicken does not see the light of day until the tenth week of its existence when it is caught, put in a crate and carted by lorry to a factory where it is held in a state of suspended decomposition until it is sold. The general aim is to achieve the maximum weight with the minimum amount of food, with an optimum food conversion ratio. The atmosphere, light, and heat are strictly controlled and the birds are particularly prone to disease and should an operative be in contact with other poultry, it is possible for a lot of several thousand to contract coccidiosis. Therefore, the aim is to have two units of ten thousand birds which, apart from the beginning and the end of a batch, can be looked after by one man. The broiler

and the battery hen stand in the forefront of modern industrial development in agriculture. They are the stakhanovites, the heroes of Animal Farm, pushed to greater and greater effort on less and less food. At the moment if you have five thousand nicker to spare and a piece of land that will provide .75 square feet of floor space per bird, put up a broiler house and you will do well.

Personally I think that this is a very inferior food, but then I think that modern industrial society is an inferior sort of society with demands according to its nature.

In agriculture, however, there are many imponderables which do not manifest themselves in industrial activity. The demand for broilers means a demand for hatching eggs and therefore more intensive conditions for hatching egg production. A consequence of this could be the development of more disease and weakening strains. Already there is a tendency to return to more natural methods in the breeding of laying stock although they are housed intensively when actually laying. This year there has been a fall off of about 50% in egg production, not reflected in egg prices as there are about 250,000 more laying birds this year. This fall in production is thought to be caused by two poor breeding seasons in which there has been a lack of sunlight combined with wet conditions. It seems to me that to produce good quality foodstuff you essentially require conditions of maximum fertility that is attained by understanding the forces that go to produce those conditions. Scientific knowledge however is concerned with producing foodstuff with the maximum of profit.

Here, the artist must step in. By an artist I do not mean one who talks about art and regards himself as a superior person, who has no responsibilities and is above ordinary labour, but a man who applies himself to his creative work with vision, skill and imagination.

The man who applies only a monetary value to his activities is a moron and eventually will eradicate, if he has his way, all beauty and excitement from work and human relationships, and in doing this, from lack of imagination and vision, destroy the very things he hopes to attain by the power of money.

dangers involved by "putting something constructive in the place of" (at least the hecklers can be satisfied) the general feeling of apathy and dependence on having some authority to make the choice.

The three or four examples chosen in this discussion are not in themselves of great importance, but they are topical, and are all concerned with aspects in which it is obvious that the behaviour and attitudes of the individual person lie at the root of the matter, and that there exists a real pair of alternatives, one legalistic and the other libertarian. They are distinguished however in being so simple as to be unconnected with other problems. Gradually as we move to more serious questions where there is a clear choice, compulsory attendance at school, safety precautions in industry, laws prohibiting the colour bar, they are more involved, and at times when we reach international politics it seems that anarchists are asking the impossible.

Perhaps to devote some thought to the little problems might throw some light onto the workings of freedom and authority in society.

P.H.

SUITABLE CANDIDATE

Old Etonian Andrew Grimond, 19-year-old son of the Liberal leader, has been sent down from Oxford for failing his exams.

"I'm afraid it is absolutely final," he told me yesterday. "There is not even a chance of my being able to go back in a year or two's time.

"Naturally we are all very upset. But my father has been very sympathetic."

Andrew who was at Magdalen College, was reading philosophy, politics and economics. Twenty-five years ago his father, Jo Grimond, got First Class Honours in the same subjects.

In 10 days Andrew is off to Austria to stay with friends on a "forget-it-all" holiday for two months.

"May even be able to do a little skiing," he told me. "But then I shall have to find a job. I'm keen on doing something in television.

"Perhaps later I may go into politics."

News Chronicle 13/10/58.

ANARCHISM & WELSH NATIONALISM

Continued from p. 2

parable worth, or even of sufficient worth has developed. Not even a tone dialect of English has developed. With this decay, as one might expect, soon after goes the sense of community. The state of affairs resulting has to be lived with, before its third-rate nature can be appreciated.

We are not so naïve as to suggest that the establishment of a Welsh state is the panacea. But there is little doubt (even I suspect among our opponents) that a Welsh government would be infinitely more enthusiastic in its concern and support for the Welsh language and cultural traditions. Of course, the prime need is a much overhauled education system; but an official focus for Welsh self-respect, and a body of active support for the revitalisation of the language and traditions runs a close second. At the moment there is practically no support. The state-run television gives about fifteen minutes daily of news in Welsh dependent as to hour on the televising of such as the test match. When asked some time ago to aid Welsh publishing houses in sore straits, the government magnanimously offered one thousand pounds—to be shared.

It is difficult to explain to non-Welshmen just how obvious a cultural improvement an official focus for the use of the language would be. It is almost undoubted to us. Also it is clear to us that the only cultural future of any integrity open to the Welsh, is a continuation of a two-thousand-year-old linguistic tradition, modified and developed to keep pace with worthwhile modern trends.

Let no anarchist doubt that it is necessary to see healthy the cultural elements of the nation as a broad overall pattern, within which the individual communities display peculiar variations. The present state of Wales, a country fast turning into an uninteresting province of western England, is evidence of the truth of this statement.

What alternative can the anarchist give to the ending of the political vacuum by the establishment of a Welsh state? I would welcome an answer to this vital question.

A.A.

Tonyandy, Oct. 10. HYWEL DAVIES.

An American on the Difference in Race Relations Notting Hill Not in Deep South

WE print below a letter published in the *Manchester Guardian* of October 10th, which serves to illustrate the differences, at least of degree, between the situations faced by coloured people in the United States from those in Great Britain. Whilst we would not wholly agree with the second last paragraph, the writer has made the comparison clearly and succinctly. It should be added that Mr. Tracey is a native of Trinidad who has lived in the United States for the past fourteen years, during which time he has studied at four American universities.

Sir.—Several weeks have elapsed since the racial disturbances in Great Britain; it is now possible to view objectively in retrospect some of the startling statements attributed to British and West Indian sources which Washington newspapers prominently displayed. These statements drew attention to the alleged

similarity with Little Rock, Arkansas, in particular and the southern states in the United States in general.

The glib comparisons of the Notting Hill and Nottingham incidents with existent racial tensions in the American South are at least unsound, unwarranted, and unfair. To the non-white who has lived in America for even a few months they suggest a lack of knowledge of the true nature and extent of the coloured man's predicament in the United States. Beginning with the factors which have been most frequently blamed for the racial tension in Britain, we find no counterparts for the following in the southern United States:

1. The West Indian objection to not being served in certain restaurants. No non-white in any of the states of the Deep South would dare to sit at the counter in a "white" restaurant;
2. The West Indian objection to being discriminated against in certain dance halls. What non-white would even in jest climb the first step of a "white" dance hall in the South?

3. The Englishman's objection to having to compete with immigrant Africans, Indians, Pakistanis, and West Indians, for housing. In the South there just would be no competition; here non-whites are conditioned to accept stern reality;

4. The West Indian embarrassment at having to fight pitched battles on the streets of London. No non-white in the South to-day is so insane as to react to violence with violence—he fears extermination;

5. Competition between coloured men and teddy boys for "dates". There need be no further comment—this dissimilarity is obvious;

6. The British problem is only a decade old. The United States has had a hundred years in which to seek a solution;

7. The most glaring dissimilarity between the two situations is the manner in which the authorities of the two areas dealt with the lunatic fringe of the majority group. In London, teddy boys received sentences of up to four years in prison. In Little Rock there were no convictions of the persons most involved in the physical assault on several non-whites.

The problem of the American South is based primarily on the inability of the majority of southern whites to rid themselves of deep-seated prejudices. The British problem, on the other hand, would seem to be one of migration—the heavy influx of unskilled masses to over-saturated industrial areas. Had the mass of immigrants—for the most part unskilled, uneducated males—come from France, Germany, Russia, or any other country, the friction between the new and old slum area residents would have been inevitable.

No, lamentable though it may be, the situation of the non-white in Great Britain is far from analagous to that of the coloured man in the southern United States.—Yours &c.,

ERNEST A. TRACEY,
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.,
September 30.

Makarios Reads 'Freedom'?

Continued from p. 1
similar to ours only two months after our article appeared.

We claimed in our article, three months ago, that the anarchist alternative is the only practical one in Cyprus. But, we asked, is it possible? Makarios clearly thinks that an independent Cyprus is a possibility, under a United Nations guarantee and, no doubt, with himself as an influential figure in (or behind) the government on the island.

Contradictions

What Makarios has in mind, we are sure, is not an anarchist Cyprus, not even eventually, but the pressure of events and the steady worsening of the situation through the political shenanigans have surely driven him to the conclusion (for the man is no fool) that there is no solution at the level of British, Greek or Turkish power politics.

The British complaint against the Archbishop's proposal is that it is vague (as well as the suspicion that it is merely a delaying tactic against the British moves towards partition) and well it might be vague. For to introduce independence the Makarios way is to approach a path bristling with obstacles and with contradictions.

Our way has obstacles, too, but no contradictions. To be logical, therefore, Makarios must push his new proposal in an anarchist, decentralised direction. We think that, as an authoritarian himself he is hardly likely to do this. This

means that his proposals will get bogged down in the 'high level' discussions through which he will expect to get them considered and their effect—as far as the Cypriot people are concerned, and that is all that concerns us—will be nullified.

Inasmuch as they do represent, however, a move in the right direction, those people in this country who are more concerned for the Cypriots than for the military and imperialist interests of the British Government, should redouble their efforts to undermine that government's ability to stand in the way of the Cypriots' aspirations.

Who Pays to Advertise?

NINE times the amount of money spent on buying new books in this country is spent on advertising. The amount spent on advertising patent medicines for one year was equal to the profits of the papers in which the advertisements appeared. The amount spent on advertising in general was equal to 70% of the total expenditure on education. Dwight D. Eisenhower was recognized by less people in 1948 than recognized Elsie, the Borden's contented cow and to attain this height of fame somebody must pay. The question is who?

The expenditure in advertising in 1935 was £89m; 1938 £91m; 1943 £35-40m; 1948 £124.5m; 1952 £199m; 1953 £230m. The U.S. figure for 1945 was £600m.

In days of rising costs these figures are not significant unless expressed as per-

centages of the national income. In 1946-48 it was 1.2% of the national income; 1949 1.4%; 1950-2 1.5-1.6%; 1953 1.6-1.7%.

In the United Kingdom advertising consumes 1.2% of the national income; in the U.S.A. 2.1%; in Denmark 1%; France 0.34%; Italy 0.31%.

In 1935 the percentage of advertising consumers expenditure was 18% of Food, 12% of Toilet Goods, 21% Medical Goods.

Who gets all this money which it is claimed is well spent because by some subtle alchemy advertising is claimed to reduce the price of goods and so in the end pays for itself? The advertising managers of businesses, the advertising managers of newspapers and advertising agents, the billposters, the press agents, the consultants, freelance and staff artists, copywriters, printed letter specialists, layout men, public opinion researchers, public relations experts, pollsters, TV writers, actors, song-writers, sandwich-board carriers, handbill hander-outs all come out of our 1.7% of the national income.

And what do we get for it? Listen to the standards of the Advertising Association:

The ethical standard for advertising cannot be "the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth" simply because such a standard is impossible and the attempt to attain it would reduce advertising to complete ineffectiveness and prevent it fulfilling its legitimate and necessary function. The ethical standard for advertising must be a utilitarian not an ideal one.

It would be unwise therefore to go to advertisements for truth for if the truth were told about all products there would be no buyers. Does one then get information? Search through any periodical's advertisements and try and find out simple facts such as the price of commodities, where they can be purchased, what weight you get for your money, what time the masterpiece of cinematography is on, one would be disappointed and lost in a welter of superlatives, slogans and irrelevant details.

If one searches for the more embarrassing details such as how long does it last, does it do any real good at all? Do I really need it? One finds not a clue.

If like Diogenes we put away our lantern on advertising and return to our barrel for a study of that theology of money known as economics we find pro-

WE have been unable to find any anarchist who attended the Labour Party conference, and while making enquiries round the movement we discovered that one or two of the younger comrades were under the impression that it was the *Tories* who were gathered together at Scarborough. The confusion seems to have arisen in their young minds because of what they call the "socialist H-bomb" (which we have explained is for clothed negotiation purposes), and the Labour Party's defence of the public school system which anarchists consider to be a privileged institution.

Jan Mikardo, who wasn't there either, writing in *Tribune* last week-end seems to think that he missed one of the best Conferences in years. Under the pacific fatherly influence of Tom Driberg the conference, we are told, made a good start at creating "an image which the electorate differentiates very sharply from those of the Tories". It is possible that Mikardo was confused by distance.

Emrys Hughes, who did attend the conference, responded to the skilled oratory of Bevan with the comment that his speech was "that of a great statesman". But, he continued, "that's precisely what was wrong with it!" He suggested that the leadership of the Labour Party was as slow to educate as the British people, a view with which we do not entirely concur. On the contrary, the Labour Party leaders have learned quickly the art of getting into power which as professional politicians is their prime aim. In order to compete with the Tories

they have had to dress as well which has meant abandoning the fashioned clothing for the no look which allows them plenty "room for manoeuvring".

Only an agile man could manoeuvre in the space Bevan allowed himself in his speech on the H-bomb at Scarborough which our favourite person writing in *Tribune* suggested was as "tightly argued as a Greek knot". We quote the relevant passages:

"The use of physical violence to international disputes is now completely out-moded. . . ."

"War is not only stupid and inhumane—it has become irrelevant to the modern world." What was needed, there was "the patient pursuit of negotiable settlements when there is no crisis." It's impossible for us, with the amount of knowledge we possess as an Opposition, to say anything about any particular kind of weapon. We are not pledging ourselves to make it; we are pledging ourselves not to make it. We don't know what kind of weapon it will be. We really must leave ourselves room for manoeuvre."

At first glance this seems to be an honest admission that he does not know what is going to happen. Bevan knows and we know that Britain has an H-bomb now and still have one when the Labour Party is returned to power. We understand any reluctance of Labour Party leaders might have about calling it by its proper name—it's an embarrassing object to have on the conscience. According to Bevan, however, he would be even more embarrassed without it.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Regular Sunday meetings now held at "Marquis of Granby" Public House, Rathbone Street (near Percy Street and Oxford Street), 7.0 p.m.

October 19th. Philip Holgate on "Ibsen and Strindberg".

CROYDON AREA

Will all comrades and sympathisers interested in libertarian activity in the Croydon area please communicate with:

S. E. PARKER,
228, Holmesdale Road, London, S.E.25

A PUBLIC MEETING

On Wednesday, October 22nd, at 8 p.m., 27 Clapham Park Road, S.W.4. (Labour Party H.Q.).

S. E. Parker on:
"A Case For Anarchism"
Clapham and District P.P.U.

COMMUNAL LIVING SCHEME

Will those people, whether anarchists or not, who would like to contribute to social evolution and to their own enjoyment of life by trying out some form or other of community living please contact: J. D. COOPER, 54 Hillfield Road, N.W.6?

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:
12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 14/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

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

27 Red Lion Street
London, W.C.1. England
Tel.: Chancery 8364

FREEDOM PRESS

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*
each volume paper 7s. 6d., cloth 10s. 6d.

The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FREEDOM at 5/- a copy

E. A. GUTKIND:
The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.

VOLINE:
Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d., (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) *The Unknown Revolution* cloth 12s. 6d.

V. RICHARDS:
Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.

PETER KROPOTKIN:
The State: Its Historic Role 1s.
The Wage System 3d.
Revolutionary Government Organised Vengeance 3d.
Called Justice 2d.

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI:
Neither East nor West paper 7s. 6d.; cloth 10s. 6d.

HERBERT READ:
Art and the Evolution of Man 4s.
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism 3s. 6d.
Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.

The Philosophy of Anarchism boards 2s. 6d.
The Education of Free Men 1s.

RUDOLF ROCKER:
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

JOHN HEWETSON:
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

F. A. RIDLEY:
The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age 2d.

K. J. KENAFICK:
Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx paper 6s.

TONY GIBSON:
Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.

★
Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:
Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s.
Neither East nor West
Journey Through Utopia cloth 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

27, Red Lion Street,
London, W.C.1.