

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

THE ISRAEL-JORDAN TENSION

THE Jewish State of Israel is providing an object lesson for students of the State and of governmental morality. The recent border incidents with Jordan are no worse than those carried out by other States, and if they are to be condemned such condemnation must in no way be considered to denounce the Jews of Palestine but only the State of Palestine. It is necessary to make this clear at the outset for criticism of Israel can very easily be regarded as arising from an anti-semitic bias, or can form a nucleus for anti-semitic feelings later. Jews, moreover, and the many sympathizers with their sufferings in Germany during the Nazi period, are very ready to attribute criticism to an anti-Jewish bias and attempt to rob it of its force by such an accusation.

Anarchism has always defended the Jews as a suffering minority. It has not defended the extreme nationalism of some Jewish people and movements, and the wrongs done to the Jews in the past did not seem to justify in anarchist eyes the setting up of a Jewish State. It is our belief that the traditional anarchist hostility to, and criticism of the State as an institution are being daily borne out in the conduct of the Israeli government. It may be added that other new States (such as that of India) provide similar demonstrations which point in exactly the same direction.

Israel-Jordan Tension

A state of tension has existed between Israel and its neighbours since the inception of the Jewish State. The sudden influx of a young active westernized population into a potentially rich but backward area thinly populated by agricultural peoples was bound to have that effect, and the consequences must be laid less at the Jews' door than at those of the Western powers who created the new State and brought it to birth. Nor, in this connection should one forget those intellectuals and near anarchists who were ready

to lay aside their fears and criticisms of nationalism and the State simply out of sympathy for the Jewish sufferings in the past. Their sentimental acquiescence must take some responsibility for the consequences.

In actual fact this border tension has resulted in the deaths or wounding (according to official Israeli figures) of 700 Arabs and 300 Jews. These figures themselves show that the Jewish government is more concerned to prove that its force is more effective than Arab force than that one side has suffered more than the other, and is a pointer to the State attitude. According to the *Observer's* Tel Aviv correspondent tension began to rise on Sunday, October 11, when an Israeli settler was killed in his bed at Neveh Ilan in the Jerusalem corridor, and the next night when an immigrant mother and her two children were killed at Kfar Yahud. Two nights after this Jewish official forces launched an attack on the Jordan village of Qibya. Forty houses were destroyed and 42 men, women and children are said to have been killed.

Morality of Reprisals

The British, American and French governments have raised this matter with the Security Council of the United Nations. The Israeli Foreign Ministry retorted by expressing the hope that the Big Three Foreign Ministers would address their attention to "the only cause of the intolerable state of affairs along the Israeli-Jordan frontier: night incursions of armed bands, perpetrating brutal murders, attacking traffic and completely undermining the security of life and property in the area."

Even if it be granted that all this is true, what system of private morality can justify reprisals? The deaths of Israeli citizens are in no way "avenged" by the deaths of the same number or more Arabs not themselves the perpetrators of the original murders. And who, after years of tension, is to say what were the original wrongs which demand vengeance?

But it is quite otherwise with State morality. It is plain that the Israeli government ordered the Qibya raid to satisfy popular indignation and so maintain its political position. It is exactly the same for the Arab governments. Glubb Pasha, the con-

mander of the Arab Legion is quoted as saying that no improvement could be expected "until the Legion retaliates against recent Jewish forays and horrible massacres... If the Legion is to operate on the same basis as the Israeli Army, the armistice will rapidly come to an end and a state of war will ensue."

Similarly the Western appeal to the Security Council has been greatly applauded in Cairo, and the whole division of sympathies between Arab and Jew is being deepened and fed by all this public action by governments. In such circumstances tension continues and individual Israeli and Arab men, women and children are killed.

Against the State

It will be seen that everything that is happening follows the familiar pattern of actions by States. Many simple people imagine that because the Jews have suffered so much they will act in their own State differently from other people—differently and better. But this does not in fact happen (nor in India, nor Eire, nor any other new State) and it shows once more that the State is an institution which is fundamentally hostile to human solidarity, which readily serves human emotions and reactions which in individuals is unreservedly condemned.

American Witch Hunt News AMENDING THE AMENDMENT

IT is reported from New York that the Federal Government is seeking legislation to modify the fifth amendment of the American Constitution in a way that will prevent those who appear before Congressional Committees investigating subversive activities from declining to answer questions on the grounds that under a clause in the Fifth Amendment they are not compelled to be a witness against themselves.

The Fifth Amendment provides that no person shall be held to answer for a crime except on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury; nor run the risk of double jeopardy by being tried twice for the same offence; nor have private property seized without just compensation; nor "be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law."

THE LAW'S SENSE OF VALUES

It sometimes happens that the law makes a judgment which makes one feel that this monstrous institution has after all a human side. Such a moment came when Mr. Justice Hilbery discharged Mrs. Julia King after she had pleaded guilty to attempting to suffocate her husband while he lay dying in great pain in hospital. The judge referred to her devotion to her husband and to the strain which watching him suffer had imposed on her— aspects of criminal cases which are often almost deliberately ignored—and he expressed his judgment in most moving terms. In this case the law showed itself in its most understanding and merciful aspect.

Yet at the very same session, the very same judge imposed a sentence of ten years' imprisonment in a 58-year-old vicar charged with homosexual offences against boys. These extraordinarily Draconic sentences for homosexual practices continue to give amazement. It is usually stated in justification for them that the damage done to the children involved is incalculable. Yet for 50 years and more some degree of homosexual experience has been regarded as usual (if not normal) in youth, and is not treated

as being very damaging. Nor do many psychiatrists believe that boys become homosexual from such experiences. At most they may manifest a latent homosexuality, but this has its roots in quite other psychological causes connected with infantile sexuality.

Furthermore if the law is so concerned about the children why does it not seek measures to prevent the bringing of these cases into the public courts from adding to the damage? Again, many psychiatrists, and even some magistrates recognize that this procedure magnifies the affair quite disproportionately beyond its real importance, and that it is much better dealt with by sensible handling at a quite personal level.

In the present case the vicar was described by Dr. Mathieson, the Brixton Prison doctor as "not normal", and the Judge asked "no man addicted to this perversion can be regarded as normal?" to which the answer was "No".

The law therefore knows what the problem is that it has to deal with, but it is so bogged down in morality that it cannot approach the matter sensibly either from the point of view of the man in the dock or of the children involved.

50,000 MINERS DEMONSTRATE 12,000 ENGINEERS RALLY

A PROTEST march against Government changes in unemployment benefits was held by 50,000 miners in Cardiff on Saturday.

The demonstration—one of the biggest ever held there—was against the Government's decision to lapse Section 62 of the National Insurance Act, under which disabled, unemployed men received extended benefits.

The new arrangement requires men to prove to the National Assistance Board a need for money over and above the bare unemployment benefit. The miners see this as a revival of the Means Test and rallied to-day on behalf of their 3,000 disabled fellow-miners in Wales.

Speakers at the rally included James Griffiths, M.P., and Arthur Horner, secretary of the National Union of Mineworkers.

Mr. Griffiths, before giving a detailed history of Section 62 of the Act for which he was responsible, said: "It is a wonderful sight to see 50,000 demonstrate because 3,000 are effected." He congratulated the miners on the success of the petition of protest which has already been signed by 250,000 people in Wales.

The section was costing the country "a

"A thief passes for a Gentleman, when stealing has made him rich."

—FULLER Gnomologia. (1732).

paltry £2 million a year. By this stupid act the Government have brought back all the old memories of the 1930's again."

Naturally, it being a Welsh gathering, there was some singing and it was good to see that the Red Flag was sung with more gusto than the hymns.

The mean action of the Government on this issue must be resisted. What are other coalfields doing to follow the Welsh example?

A RALLY held by the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions brought 12,000 London workers to Trafalgar Square last Sunday.

The Confederation's claim for a 15 per cent. wage increase has been turned down by the employers, and in pressing their claim the unions are turning to public agitation.

Speakers at the Square included leaders from the various unions in the Confederation—which contains 3 million workers—and Jack Tanner, A.E.U. president and this year's chairman of the T.U.C.

Tanner is an ex-anarchist and syndicalist. How far will he go to-day in support of industrial action at the point of production to press for the wage claim he supports on public platforms?

KILLING ORGY IN KENYA

THOUGH we are being continually assured that resistance in Kenya is being broken down, the number of "bandits" killed or captured each week shows no signs of abating.

Army headquarters in Nairobi reported that during the week ended Oct. 10 "security forces had killed 100 Mau Mau terrorists and captured a further 108 in one of their most successful weeks since the emergency began. One European and ten African members of the security forces were killed and one African was wounded. Four terrorists surrendered between October 4 and 10, making a total of 41 since the "green branch" offer was made.

Meanwhile the Kenya legislature was still debating a motion by a member criticising the Government's handling of the Emergency. Apparently that member complained among other things that the government was not conducting operations against "Mau Mau terrorists" with the necessary vigour.

It is obviously a matter of opinion. The hangman has certainly been kept busy. Whilst the member was talking twelve Kikuyu were hanged for their part in the "Lari massacres of March 26". They were convicted specifically of murdering the wife of a headman.

THE A.P. reports from Washington (Oct. 14): President Eisenhower to-day made it a dismissal offence for government employees to refuse to testify before Congressional committees on grounds of possible self-incrimination.

The President issued an Executive order adding this to the existing grounds for dismissal of a Federal worker for security reasons.

The order permits action against an individual for "refusal by the individual upon the ground of Constitutional privilege against self-incrimination to testify before a Congressional committee regarding charges of his alleged disloyalty or other misconduct."

White House secretary James C. Hagerty said this was an effort "to close up all possible loopholes" in the government's security machinery.

WHY SO FEW ANARCHISTS?

A QUESTION that one usually asks oneself, after having been associated with the anarchist movement for a certain time, is "Why are there so few anarchists?" We see around us great and powerful political parties who count their membership by millions, and it is difficult sometimes not to be discouraged by it. It is a pretty depressing thought that the most rebellious thing that a person can do these days is to support a reformist politician like Bevan, or join the so-called Communist Party. The idea of anarchy attracts very little support.

Anarchism is very different from other political creeds. Instead it stands quite by itself, and the usual division of political theories into Left and Right hardly seems to take in anarchism at all. This complete break with everything usual is probably an important cause of the lack of public enthusiasm for it. Most people like best that which they are used to, or at least that which is close to it.

"Do you dislike the State?" "Support the Conservatives." "Do you dislike the

Capitalists?" "Very well then, vote Labour." "Do you want a revolution?" "Read the *Daily Worker*." It is clear that none of these solutions are going to change society fundamentally. All they are going to do is to make alterations in our social structure along the lines of what already exists. Therefore the majority of men and women are more likely to turn to them, because they do not want to launch out into the unknown.

A second reason for lack of general support for our ideas flows naturally from this. Our society is strongly authoritarian and has been so for a very long time. Totalitarian states may come and go, they have their rise and fall, but the principle of authority remains, and as humanity, civilised humanity at least, is used to it, it will cling to it.

The principle of rule of man over man runs through the entire organisation

of society from top to bottom. We come up against it as soon as we leave the womb, and it remains with us till we die. Small wonder then that anarchism seems impossible to many, even when they understand it theoretically. Such a break with the past is too great for them to adjust themselves to. Even many anarchists are partly authoritarian either consciously or unconsciously. Even if they are not inclined that way, there is still the danger that the constant need to compromise with present day society may cause them in time to lose much of their revolutionary fire, and make them inclined to accept conventional standards.

MOREOVER the majority of us are full of doubts and fears due to our upbringing, and have what has been called "the fear of freedom". It is all very well to sound the call to battle in

the fight for human liberty, but a great many will not pay any attention, and others will even shudder to hear it, because they do not want freedom. They want to continue their safe daily round. They do not want to "get wrong" with the authorities and the moralists. But still more do they fear the policeman and the moralist inside themselves.

These people, and most of us are to some extent of their number, fear life and themselves. They put their own aggressive impulses into the minds of others and then say, "But you must have a government." Naturally, if all men are ready to fly at each other's throats the need for a race of supermen, who will not do this, to act as a police force, is obvious. The anarchist puts forward the ideal of Mutual Aid, but he does not convince the majority, who do not believe it. "You have a too-idealistic view of human nature", they say. How

fired one gets of this objection to anarchism?

Fear of responsibility too plays a great part in turning people away from our ideas. One of the advantages of the authoritarian hierarchical society is that it absolves everyone from the responsibility for his own actions, provided they are in line with social demands. For example, the airman who dropped the atomic bomb was not responsible for his act. He was carrying out orders. The people who gave the orders however did not have the feeling of having committed a crime. They did not actually pull the lever, so it was not their responsibility either, and they can go merrily on ordering atrocities, till they find themselves on trial as "war criminals", and are surprised and hurt.

The beauty of a hierarchy is that one can always put the blame higher up. True, one can also be punished for the faults of one's superiors, a scapegoat has always to be found when things go wrong, but even in this case one has the feeling of being an innocent victim. Martyrdom has certain compensations, and once again one is not responsible. It is not one's fault, but the fault of those higher up.

On the other hand the criminal, who robs and murders for his own benefit, instead of waiting like a sensible fellow for a war, and then doing it with social approval, is made to feel completely responsible for his acts. Magistrates and judges thunder against the psychiatrists and sociologists, who seek to absolve the criminal from the guilt of his actions, by pointing out the pressures to which he is exposed. Evidently the lawbreaker is the only person in our society who is supposed to be a responsible human being.

Possibly I exaggerate this question of responsibility, but how many times have I not heard people blaming Parliament, the Russians, the Government, the law of supply and demand, or some other bogey, and been maddened by it!

"But we can't help conscription," said an R.A.F. officer to me once. "Parliament has decided for it."

"Yes, I know that war is wrong," another person told me, "in fact I should think that everyone knows it by now, but we've got to do what we're told, and carry on."

GIOVANNI BALDELLI.

Continued on p. 4

The Anti-Industrial Revolution

SPECULATIONS about men resembling robots, beavers, ants, bees, and termites are becoming increasingly frequent, and so are misgivings, warnings, and laments about the more and more machine-like structure of society, the automatism, the nudity, the efficiency and ruthlessness that extends from machine to mind, and the standardization of producers and consumers following that of industrial products. They certainly have lost the impact of novelty, and tend to acquire the lifelessness and anodinity of ideological clichés. The suspicion is also probably warranted that the offended feelings and loyalties from which they first originated have considerably waned or have disappeared altogether, their presence being but that of an absence for which one suffers less and less. The tone in which they are uttered, and the people who utter them, though perhaps not impugning their authenticity, certainly raise doubts as to their possible effectiveness. Not those who are most exposed to and most deeply affected by the mechanization of modern life but those who are still comparatively sheltered from it most loudly cry danger or expatiate most gloomily on impending doom.

If the conclusions of some recent surveys are to be believed, monotonous and semi-automatic work at a machine is preferred to one more varied and requiring alert shifting of attention, especially by girls, who find that while their eyes and hands are busy their minds are free to day-dream. Even work such as driving, in which the mind acts simply as a system of reflexes but is not free to wander because the order and tempo of stimuli are never the same, is not found particularly repellent by those who earn their living by it as they do not seem more unhappy than other workers nor exceptionally eager to change their occupation.

Workers on the whole are not professedly against the machine, nor are they conscious of some diminution in their humanity which they would lay at the door of mechanization. The protest against it comes more from imagination and projection than from direct experience. It is concerned more with the future than with the present, and the picture it conjures up ignores many historical complexities. As with most thoughts about mankind, and with those in particular that magically or oracularly prefigure its future, the protest against mechanization springs from a self-identi-

fication of the thinker with the whole human species. It is one's type of humanity that one sees threatened, and wishes to see survive. But types of humanity come and go, and there is no common measure for their excellence or happiness. As Leopardi remarked, our troglodyte ancestors were probably as happy or unhappy as we are. As for excellence, the humanist type is amply justified in holding himself superior to the functionally differentiated robot-like creatures that would thrive under a perfect and unchallenged mechanist dispensation, but, as it has been advanced, the pre-human beings from whom according to evolutionary theories we spring must have felt the impending birth of humanity as a fall, and it is highly probable that if the humanist type will be remembered by his non-human descendants it will be unregretfully, and, if emotionally at all, with a slight twinge of commiseration.

I MENTION these suppositions as those that best dramatize the deep and undeniable changes our civilization is undergoing—changes so rapid and violent at times that most individuals suffer from the strain, and some actually succumb. Momentous as they may be these changes are not likely to effect a radical biological transformation, but they do demand a continual effort of adaptation that often oversteps the limits of human resilience. The evolutionary assumption that shapes so much of our thinking urges us to this effort, and makes us accept unthinkingly that those who fail to adapt themselves should suffer and be eliminated. Prescinding from the evolutionary assumption, however, or at least from some of its modalities, there appears no reason why the unadaptable should be sacrificed, especially if, being probably a majority, they were to make a bid for reversing or diverting change, and for adapting conditions to themselves instead of themselves to conditions.

There has been a powerful combination of people, some of whom wanted to enrich themselves, and others to multiply the resources of man's fabrilty, which started the industrial revolution with an impetus that in spite of a few checks has lost nothing of its momentum, and seems indeed unlikely to spend itself completely at any predictable date. Another movement, however, is not altogether impossible, which concentrating more on the preservation and fair distribution of wealth, by setting limits to the exploitation both of men and of natural resources, and by insisting on other human potentialities, besides fabrilty, could well go down in history under the name of the anti-industrial revolution. The diagnosticians of our time, pointing out the general unhappiness produced by the supremacy of economics, by towns, state control, centralization, and all aspects of mechanization, show that the time and conditions are ripe for such a movement to start.

CONFINED at present to isolated utterances of psychologists and thinkers, it will not acquire any effectiveness while it relies on some illumined statesman to take the initiative or on the cultured members of society to create islands of resistance with no hopes of victory or power of offensive. An anti-industrial revolution can be carried out to a successful conclusion only with the participation of salaried workers.

I said above that the workers, generally speaking, are not clearly aware of the evils of mechanization. But they suffer from them nonetheless. The history of any revolutionary movement

shows that, especially at its beginning, one task confronting its initiators is that of revealing to the oppressed the reality of their oppression, the same as the strongest argument and most deeply rooted conviction of the exploiters is that standards of living have been generally raised through what is called their exploitation. Oppression and unhappiness are relative, historical, and subjective. Even Marx had to admit as much (*Capital*, I, 190) to prevent his theory of progressive immiserization from being contradicted by facts. The decisive factor in creating an anti-industrial revolution is not that the workers suffer from mechanization, but that they should clearly realize their suffering, locate its causes, and will to change the environment from which they operate.

The present labour organizations pin the attention of workers mainly on the economic aspect of their condition, and the remedy they propose to any other source of suffering is the development of social services which will correct but not revolutionize the present social structure. Through the intervention of a welfare State rather than by measures taken by humane or intelligent exploiters, their

policy remains fundamentally concerned with the interests of production and with adapting the workers to the conditions of an increasingly industrialised and mechanised society. What the workers must be shown is, instead, that there are evils which will not be ended by a taking over of production and distribution management from the capitalists by a welfare or a communist State. There is evil for salaried of all kinds not only in unemployment and cutting of real wages, but in having to be told what to do with the best part of their energies and time, in having their physical and psychological rhythms constantly interfered with or set from without, in regularly ceasing at appointed hours to be themselves in order to become part of an administrative or producing machine, in losing or never being given the chance to build their personality, in feeling replaceable and therefore unnecessary, anonymous, fragmentary and futile. Consciousness of these evils is the pre-condition of an anti-industrial revolution, which must be further accompanied by the conviction that the process of mechanization is not fatal, and that even if it is irreversible, the sum of evils resulting from it can be diminished or considerably lightened by being more equally shared.

Some Aspects of Love

FEW words are so systematically abused as "love". A quick peek under this blanket-term will reveal some strange bed-fellows. Just for a bit of puckish sport let us tip the bed over and have a closer look at its occupants as they tumble on the floor.

Among the lesser pretenders to the throne are those who "love" ice-cream, meaning they like it very much; or "love" little Audrey stories, meaning they are amused by them; or "love" flying low over the hedgerows—that is, enjoy such diversions.

The first serious claimant to hit the deck is a beautiful spirit called "aesthetic appreciation"—a long-winded title for a sight that leaves us breathless with delight. This hermaphrodite—for we shall find that all the occupants are either sexless or of either sex—appears with liquid eyes in such sentences as "How I love a flaming sunset", or "I simply love to watch a fawn in its natural setting". Sometimes it is simply this sort of love that is felt when we see a beautiful human face or figure, especially if it is a child's; much as one may be moved by the proportions of an abstract sculpture or the form or colours of a painting.

More often though, such admiration of the human form has to share the word "love" with a far lustier companion. It is this second sort of love, which we may call the "sexual drive", that dominates the modern scene, giving us the inescapable bedroom setting.

So methodically has Hollywood boosted, and commercial advertisers exploited, this biological urge that it has almost commanded the word "love" for its exclusive use. Shapely female legs sell everything from soap and cigarettes to cars and caviare. On all sides we are beset by this lovely limb. Its nylon shimmer drags our weary optics to the hoardings where it towers above us ten times as large as life. It kicks at us outlined in flickering neon tubes, or glows beside the darkened highway in phosphorescent hues. Only time and the shattering social effects of another world war separate us from the delirious day when our local cinema will tempt us to spend our vacations on the moon by an animated presentation of sexual intercourse in 3-D.

A special relation exists between these first two aspects of love that helps to explain why they are so readily confused. The first, aesthetic appreciation, when

relative to the human form, often triggers off the second, sexual desire. There is nothing to deplore in this so long as we bear in mind that there are other aspects of love that may be equally or even more important.

Next we come across the renegade in this mixed bag. The ugly, misbegotten child of our materialistic culture struts under the banner emblazoned "pride of ownership" on the front, and on the back, in smaller print, "jealousy". To some it must seem a sad commentary on human nature to reflect that from time immemorial in nearly all societies, jealousy has not only been regarded as compatible with love, but often enough used as the measuring rod of its intensity. Such a base motive is not often blatantly extolled in our own culture. Covertly, however, it is encouraged and lauded by playing an anthem to fidelity and slipping in the alien chord of exclusive proprietary rights while the audience is deafened by the crescendos of righteous indignation or lulled by the sweeter phrases that justly praise the warmth and intimacy of personal relationships.

As long as we allow this green-eyed monster to masquerade as a touchstone of love we shall be plagued with confusion and misery in our attempts to love and be loved. For, as an examination of the last of the creatures we have uncovered will show, jealousy is not a proof of true love, but a flat denial of it.

IN fact, our last candidate for the title of "true love" is something of an enigma in itself. Delicate sensitivity combines with a robust constitution that withstands the buffetings of reality. A serene exterior born of a sublime sense of security shields a core of passionate conviction. Such love has no concern with superficial distinction like the age, sex or bodily beauty of the person loved. These are incidentals, and love is felt for the actual individual, not the external appearance.

Love in this sense is the capacity to identify oneself with another. To accept their needs and interests as one's own. It is a selfishness that has an enlarged concept of the self.

It is the desire to see the loved one develop to the fullest capacity, which means that it can place no restrictions on this growth. Naturally, such growth

demands the widest possible range of experience and true love can know no jealousy when other individuals enter the scene to broaden experience and assist in the process of development. On the contrary, newcomers are welcomed. They are not rivals, but comrades in a common cause. (I nearly said "comrades in arms"). By enriching the life of the loved partner they do as much for the lover, who cannot be so blind as to suppose that he is such a compendium of virtue, skill and knowledge that he alone can meet all the various needs of his love object. Love in a social vacuum is almost inevitably stunted, for there is a limit to what each can bring to the relationship unless fresh experience is continually imported from other sources.

As long as the object of our affection is a small child or some dear old granny we do not as a rule feel the need to be possessive. Somehow, once the sexual aspect is involved we do not find it quite so easy to maintain this disinterested, altruistic attitude. Confuse true love with sexual desire and we become like the spoilt brat with a bag of chocolate eclairs who has made the discovery that to share material things means to get less of them for oneself. The idea of non-materialistic pleasures has yet to dawn. Nor, incidentally, has the fact penetrated our immaturity that sexual intercourse is not expendable in the same way that a finite number of eclairs must come to an end if eaten.

A few exceptional individuals, like the mystics, have so enlarged their concept of the self that they can talk of a "universal love", having lost their petty selves in an ocean of compassion. Lesser mortals, like ourselves, have to be content with less spectacular achievements. Our concept of the self has to be enlarged gradually—step by step, person by person. And, inevitably, we are brought up short whenever we try to understand and have sympathy for someone who has deliberately hurt us. Such advanced spiritual exercises are the prerogative of the saint.

Still, it is clear that true love cannot be restrictive. Essentially it is a desire to liberate. It is a curious fact that people who readily pay homage to love and freedom when considered as separate topics are horrified and disgusted at the mere thought of combining the virtues of such praiseworthy ideals.

BOB GREEN

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS

New Books . . .

The Free Child A. S. Neill 9/6

The Hill of Devi E. M. Forster 15/-

Second-Hand . . .

Revolution Raymond Postgate 12/6

The Goslings Upton Sinclair 6/-

Man's Worldly Goods

Forward from Liberalism Leo Huberman 3/-

Love's Coming of Age Stephen Spender 2/6

Essays in Freedom Edward Carpenter 3/-

The English—Are they Human? H. W. Nevins 3/6

Conspiracy at Meerut G. J. Renier 3/-

Certain Personal Matters Lester Hutchinson 4/-

Autobiography of a German Rebel H. G. Wells (listed 1901) 3/-

Toni Sender 3/-

Obtainable from

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

DEMOCRATIC ILLUSIONS

IN British Guiana the Constitution has been "suspended", the elected Government sacked and the homes of its members raided by the police. In South Africa the Constitution is being modified in those points which have so far prevented the government from pursuing its racial policies. And now in the United States of America the Federal Government is seeking ways and means—cloaked in legality, of course—to amend the fifth amendment of the Constitution which has so far proved the only stumbling block to the complete success of Senator McCarthy's sacred mission of "rooting out America's enemies".

Such actions, and proposed actions, as we pointed out last week, are causing alarm and despondency among liberal-minded people who cling to certain old-fashioned definitions of the meaning of political democracy. We do not think that anarchists can view these measures in the same light, though we should just the same be in the front rank of any agitation to defend and extend those few liberties we still possess; liberties, we might add, which though ostensibly incorporated in the laws of the land by the legislators were in fact recognised as a result of the agitation of the people.*

But we are not shocked when a member of Eisenhower's administration informs Mr. Norman Thomas, the veteran Socialist leader, that he would never knowingly employ a socialist in a government office, or when last week Mr. Eisenhower made it a dismissal offence for government employees to refuse to testify before Congressional committees on grounds of possible self-incrimination. The job of governments is to govern. The ability of a government to implement its policies largely depends on its ability to create around itself a State machine of men and women who identify their interests with those of the government but, perhaps what is more important, with the whole concept of government, and the maintenance of the *status quo*. From the governmental point of view, and that of maintaining the *status quo*, there is every justification for ensuring that the machine of government shall be operated only by those men and women whose loyalty is beyond doubt. For this reason too, there is full justification for "rooting out subversion" in the schools and Universities and every institution where the minds of the young are being conditioned to an acceptance of the existing social pattern.

When one understands that democracy means the right of every adult to cast his vote for one of a number of political groups aspiring to control the Machine, one is left with few illusions, and the bright lights with which the political pedlars of the "democratic way of life" seek to illumine that moribund word DEMOCRACY cannot deceive us for long. Every so often the lights fuse, and we see democracy as it really is, with its British Guianas, Kenyas and its Fifth Amendments. But the foolish . . . democrats learn nothing. They just wait for the fuse

to be mended so they may again be dazzled by the fairy lights!

MALENKOV. Eisenhower, Churchill and Franco hold many beliefs in common. They all believe in government and the maintenance of the *status quo*. When Mr. Lyttleton, the Colonial Secretary, declared at the Conservative Party Conference:

"Her Majesty's Government are not going to allow a Communist State to be organised within the British Commonwealth. Our friends can take that as a definite statement, and our enemies can attach to it all the importance that I think they should"

he was doing no more than echoing the sentiments expressed by the Krenlin, when they hold their spectacular trials, that the "workers fatherland" will not tolerate the "intrigues of those traitors who seek to re-establish decadent Western capitalism".

It is true that superficially the political climate is less oppressive in Britain and America than it is in Russia. Having said this we would hasten to add that where *fundamentals* are concerned all governments are the same. So long as the people of this country direct their political criticisms and agitation only against political parties and individuals and treat the whole economic and political structure of present society as *inviolable* so long will our governments be of the kind that tolerate "free speech", a "free press" and such of the civil liberties which distinguish the Eisenhower-Churchill types of government from the Malenkov-Franco variety. If the Russian and Spanish people become, from the point of view of the defenders of the *status quo*, as supine and manageable as their British and American counterparts it is possible that the free elections - press - speech will be granted in those countries too, in time.

WITH the exception of the tiny anarchist and social-revolutionary minorities there is not to-day in the so-called democratic countries any body of opinion which dares—even intellectually—to challenge the very concept of government, and of the State, or the bases of capitalist economy—as being *perhaps* the root cause of world unrest and human misery.

When a motorist discovers that his car will not start he can get out and examine the wheels, check his rear light and try the door handles, though it is unlikely that he would do this. What is more probable is that he will examine the engine!

In the world to-day, everybody is busily engaged in looking for the source of trouble anywhere but in the foundations of our society. Social historians present the facts admirably and without glossing over them. But which of them dares to draw conclusions in which they indict the social system instead of always laying the blame on inefficiency in production and distribution, or the soaring birth rate?

If to-morrow in the "democracies" a large body of opinion directs its energies from the sterile pursuit of reforming capitalism, to an open attack on the concepts of government, State, capitalism (State or private) then in direct relation to the intelligence and conviction with which that attack is conducted will the "democratic" governments reply with persecution and repression. And do not suggest that our governments are not capable of resorting to naked violence and repression. Whatever the merits of the situations concerned, British governments' record in India yesterday and in Malaya, Kenya and British Guiana to-day, shows they are not a bit less squeamish than the Francos and Stalins in the methods they are prepared to use when it is a question of defending the existing order, which confers privileges on the few at the expense of the many.

*As an example we could mention this clause of the Fifth amendment to the American Constitution which guarantees that no one "shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself", the original intention of which was to prevent confession by torture. It is fairly obvious that it was not the torturers—representatives of the government—who proposed the clause in the Constitution but those who were horrified by its use and who led the revolution against the government of George the Third.

VINDICATING THE LAW—

But What of Society's Responsibilities?

ONE John Desmond Hare, aged thirty pleaded guilty at West Suffolk Quarter Sessions to a charge of burglary and asked for four other cases to be taken into account—stealing property at Norwich, taking away a car without the owner's consent at Reading, stealing a car at Dorset and breaking into a rifle-range in Hampshire and stealing property worth £20.

It was stated in court that he had served two terms of penal servitude, was released in June and had committed all the present offences in August.

Sentencing him to ten years' preventive detention the Chairman, Mr. Gerald Howard, Q.C. described Hare as "a persistent and potentially dangerous criminal".

At Liverpool Quarter Sessions, Joseph Flood, aged 33, pleaded guilty to a charge of burglary and to two charges of attempted housebreaking. For the prosecution it was stated that, shortly after trying to break into a house, Flood was arrested and admitted the other offences. Detective-Inspector J. W. Bonner said that Flood had finished serving a four-year sentence in prison only four months before he committed the offences with which he was charged.

The Recorder, Mr. H. I. Nelson, Q.C., told Flood that there was no chance of reforming him and that he was a confirmed criminal. He sentenced Flood to preventive detention for nine years.

At Hertford Quarter Sessions, Alan Leyland, aged 24, pleaded guilty to charges of breaking into premises in Hertfordshire, Gloucestershire and Buckinghamshire, and asked that 26 other offences should be considered. Det.-Sergeant Hale said that Leyland had committed another offence while on bail. Leyland said in court that he had never had a home to return to after his release from prison and Borstal.

Sentencing him to seven years imprisonment, the Chairman Sir Harry Vaisey, described the prisoner as "a public danger".

William Connor (32), a miner, of County Durham, was sentenced to six months' imprisonment at Durham Quarter Sessions after pleading not guilty to stealing 6d. from the clothes of a colleague, Mr. A. Carr, of South Shields.

Fielder Philip Timms (22), of Charlbury, Oxfordshire, who was found guilty at Oxfordshire Quarter Sessions of stealing clothing from his father and brothers, told the Court that he could not read.

He was sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment so that he could have a year's schooling in Oxford prison.

Mr. D. A. W. Sanderson, governor of the prison, said that educational classes were held twice a week at the prison for those who could not read or write. New classes would start on October 5, and there were three terms in the year. Because of the normal one-third remission of a prison sentence, Timms would have to receive eighteen months so as to be in prison for a year.

Eighteen-year-old Philip William Lee was found hanging by his belt from the bars of his cell at Wormwood Scrubs Prison.

Lee, of High Wycombe, Bucks, had been found guilty at Feltham, Middlesex, of stealing a bicycle, and was remanded to appear for sentence on October 12.

IN the first two cases reported above the Law has admitted its failure to "reform", and though in their early thirties all that can be done is to "protect Society" by putting these men away for as long as possible as "dangerous" criminals. It is to be noted that these two men were not charged with acts of violence. All it seems they endangered was private property.

The third case is of a young man of 24, whose past and present will undoubtedly mould his future. That he even committed an offence while on bail is significant. Is there any doubt that when he is released he will again offend, and so qualify to join the first two in "preventive detention". Already at 24 he is described by the Law as "a public danger".

The remaining three cases are surely examples of the vindictiveness, the stupidity and the tragedy, respectively, in the application of the Law, and comment seems superfluous.

"Cleaning Up" in British Guiana

A REUTER report from Georgetown, capital of British Guiana states that last week Senior police officers raided the homes of about forty leaders of the People's Progressive Party and the party headquarters, carrying off documents, while more than three hundred British troops stood by. No arrests were made.

Furthermore, a party of troops under an officer drove up in a lorry to the home of Dr. Jagan, the ex-Premier. They disembarked and, with bayonets fixed, surrounded the modest two-storey house while Superintendent Puttock and two constables conducted a search. Dr.

Jagan, who had been up all night writing, was in slippers and pyjamas when the search began. Mrs. Janet Jagan left her home briefly during the search.

Police raids were also carried out on the houses of Mr. Rory Westmaas, the party's vice-president and organiser of its Youth League; of Mr. Sidney King, the former Minister of Works; and of Dr. Lachman Singh, the former Health Minister. The houses of Mr. L. F. S. Burnham, the party chairman, and of Mr. Ashton Chase, ex-Minister of Labour, were left alone.

"Investigating" American Schools

AT the end of last month the Board of Higher Education set up machinery to begin a full-scale investigation of subversive activities in the city's four colleges.

At its regular monthly meeting at Hunter College, it empowered a special committee headed by Gustave G. Rosenburg, a trial lawyer, to call in all members of the college staffs "and others" for questioning, and threatened "disciplinary action" against anyone failing to "co-operate fully".

The resolution also empowered the committee to require all witnesses to produce "such relevant books, records and papers as may be necessary."

A statement issued at the board meeting made it clear that the action was an outgrowth of the decision recently by the State Board of Regents to list the state and national Communist parties as subversive. Under the Feinberg Law of 1949 this made membership in those groups *prima facie* evidence of disqualification for employment in the New York public schools.

The statement pledged that the board would conduct the investigation "with discretion and with scrupulous observance of all the rights, privileges and responsibilities involved."

Dr. Cavallaro, chairman of the board, said three investigators already were at work examining the proceedings of similar investigations in Albany and Washington to ascertain what evidence existed as to members of the staffs of the city's colleges who may be members of subversive organizations. The board has

under its jurisdiction 1,900 staff members of Hunter, Queens, Brooklyn and City Colleges.

For the present, Dr. Cavallaro said, the board is using its own funds to finance the investigation. But he said he had been assured by Mayor Impellitteri that the city would grant \$35,000 to the board to reimburse it.

Earlier the same day, eleven members of the city school system were ordered to go on trial Oct. 26 on charges of insubordination and unbecoming conduct for refusal to answer questions about Communist party membership.

U.S. "PRESTIGE" IN EUROPE

CHICAGO, OCTOBER 11.

Senator Herbert Lehman (Democrat-Liberal, New York), who has just returned from a tour of Europe, said today that "never had the prestige of America been so low among the people of Europe." He went on:

"We are viewed by many people in Europe as a nation already under the shadow of an indigenous fascism. They believe that the American people have completely succumbed to fear, panic, and hysteria. The clamour of the demagogues and headline-hunters is heard overseas more clearly than any other sound."

Senator Lehman blamed most of this on what he called "McCarthyism".

—Reuter.

COMMUNIST NEWSPAPER CORRESPONDENT EXPELLED

Mr. J. R. Campbell, editor of the *Daily Worker*, has sent a letter to Mr. Oliver Lyttleton, the Colonial Secretary, saying that on Friday, October 9, Mr. Arthur Clegg, a *Daily Worker* correspondent, arrived at the airport of British Guiana to report on the events in that Colony. The immigration authorities at the airport granted him a three months' entry permit.

"However, on his journey to Georgetown his taxi-cab was stopped by police, his passport was confiscated, and he was taken back to the airport. A security officer there ordered, in spite of his protests, that his passport be made invalid for British Guiana, and served on him an order by the Governor denying him entry into the colony. His request for the right to appeal against the order met with the reply that there was no appeal in British Guiana against the Governor's order.

"No reason was given for the order and his request that he be allowed to protest to the Governor in person was refused."

POWER POLITICS

HAVANA, Oct. 16—Dr. Fidel Castro, young lawyer and student leader of Havana University, was sentenced to-day by the Urgency Court of Santiago de Cuba to fifteen years' imprisonment as the chief of the revolt of last July. Abelardo Crespo Arias, one of Castro's followers received a ten-year term. He is still suffering from a bullet wound.

Urban Communities via Anarchist Club?

THE IDEAS OF KARL JASPER

MAY I say how much I agree with the views on Urban Communities (and rural ones) put forward last week by our Rosendale comrade, W. Greenwood?

His eminently sensible remarks outline a method of achieving an anarchist community, and I hope he will forgive me if I pick upon one aspect of his suggested plan and move it forward from the end to the beginning.

His ideas were aimed at achieving the double purpose of raising the standard of living of the members and of acting as a means of propaganda for anarchism, and near the end of his plan came the suggestion of establishing a "community centre" where anarchists and non-anarchists could meet together for social and sporting activities and so inevitably anarchist ideas would permeate to an ever widening group of people.

This idea is essentially one which I have plugged here in London—the establishment of an anarchist club. And I would put it in the forefront of a community scheme for several reasons.

In the course of our propaganda work it is continually being driven home to me of the necessity of having premises where strangers can come to meet and discuss our ideas. Our indoor meetings, when they are running, are not a sufficient follow-up for our outdoor meetings, and I personally am convinced that the time is ripe for a definite step towards the establishment of an anarchist club in London.

Various schemes, run through the club, could raise funds for the eventual establishment—either through the purchase or renting of large premises—of a residential community, carrying the advantages outlined by comrade Greenwood.

The sort of club I have in mind would be a very simple one in the first place. All we need is a room large enough for meetings, with, preferably, a smaller

room adjoining for use as a snack bar. The larger room, when not used for meetings, would be equipped with tables and chairs and would be open every evening, and anybody would be free to come, have a light meal, tea, coffee, sandwiches, and be sure to find anarchists or near-anarchists there. Definite social evenings could be arranged, our range of lectures extended into gramophone recitals, poetry- or play-readings, our long-dreamed-of drama group could be established and all sorts of other activities could spring up.

In this way our scattered body of supporters in London would come together for mutual benefit, and those who wanted to create other forms of community would find others of like mind.

But this demands organisation and funds. Finding suitable premises at a reasonable rent—without a premium—is the first task. Once found, we have enough strength to decorate the premises to our own taste, build a counter for the sandwich bar, etc., put up shelves, fix the lighting or whatever is necessary. To put in tables and chairs, however, will

need some money and the rent may be such that we couldn't expect to cover it from collections at meetings or sale of snacks to begin with. We may need guarantees.

I estimate that about £100 initial capital could fit out a place reasonably well. May I therefore make a concrete suggestion to all our readers in London and to those provincial comrades who would like to have an anarchist centre to come to when in London?

Will they please write to me (at Freedom Press) stating:

(a) How much they could contribute to an initial Club Fund?

(b) How much they will guarantee to a weekly fund to cover expenses, if the club is not self-supporting right away?

Please DO NOT send any money now. I want first to gauge the measure of support for the idea. If there is not enough, the idea will be dropped.

London comrades could also help by looking for likely premises—preferably in a fairly central position. London, 19-10-53. PHILIP SANSOM.

The Ground for Anarchist Propaganda

FROM his letter (FREEDOM 10/10/53) I conclude that E.G. of Workop is inclined to my own view that the most suitable ground for sowing the seeds of anarchist propaganda lies where the dissatisfied and disillusioned leftists gather on the fringe of the Labour Party. Perhaps this is because I came to anarchism from this kind of socialism myself and feel that there are many left behind without the psychological "scars" of a break with catholicism or marxism to impede a smooth and painless transition from an

authoritarian to a libertarian viewpoint. I think that E.G.'s suggestion of an advertisement should be acted upon.

I do not, however, share his optimism concerning public libraries. Mine is a "strong, industrial" area and an anarchist paper in the local library reading room was not possible even when there was an anarchist librarian in the place! It isn't the librarians who choose the journals to be shown but library committees, i.e. local politicians, imitation Churchills and Attlees. Curtains for anarchist papers E.G.? Quite. But try if you like, other places may be different. I couldn't even get them to buy Richards' *Lessons of the Spanish Revolution*, the North Riding Head Librarian offered me a pro-fascist book instead and if it wasn't for the fact that he lives so far away, he'd have got a brick through his front window.

Being a Yorkshireman, I am not so keen on free copies. As long as you are willing to give away, they won't buy. FREEDOM may not be perfect, (I'd like to see more Peeke and less Baldelli), but it's too good to give away. Middlesbrough, Oct. 12. D. WILSON.

Why So Few Anarchists?

Continued from p. 2
I have even heard this, "We don't understand all that's going on, we're not told, so we had better leave it to those who do understand, they know best what to do."

Yet these same people laugh at the Romans and the Japanese for making their rulers out to be gods. How much superior are they?

★
ANOTHER, and rather obvious reason that causes many to shy away from anarchism is the fear of getting mixed up with an organisation that may come into collision with the law.

The average Englishman has a mortal dread of getting on the wrong side of the authorities. This is not due entirely to the fear that he has of them, but also to the fact that in his heart he respects them too. In most countries the police, the State, and the Government are attacked and vilified, and not only by anarchists. In England they are treated with awe and reverence.

But worse than the fear of the authorities is the fear of being unconventional. What could be more unconventional than to belong to the anarchist movement? Why, the very name condemns it. "Aren't anarchists people who throw bombs?"

Even those who have passed the stage of imagining the anarchists as a sort of Friends of Guy Fawkes League usually regard us as a crowd of curious folk in corduroys, sandals, and long hair.

But it is not only a question of convention. One must realise that familiarity attracts more readily than strangeness in most cases. Even a person who does not have any great respect for the conventions or law and order, is likely to be part put off by an organisation composed of mystics, "intellectuals", and queer characters in strange attire. It is very reassuring to such a person to find that the anarchists are much the same as himself. Fairly ordinary men and women who are in rebellion against our rotten society.

The worker who has revolutionary leanings, who has seen through the Communist racket, and is looking for something better, is liable to be put off by too much discussion on metaphysics. The bourgeois rebel who has comprehended the true nature of the God-Queen-and-Country hoey is likely to be thrown back to a disillusioned conservatism if he is given the impression that the anarchists are a set of "impractical idealists". Anarchism as a philosophy of life, and a political and social creed, is so much at variance with what everyone has been brought up to believe in that it is nice to know that the anarchists themselves are quite like everyone else.

TO sum up therefore, anarchism attracts few converts on account of its revolutionary nature, which is too unusual for the majority to digest. It is too great a break with the authoritarian traditions of our world. Indeed what is remarkable is not the lack of anarchists but the fact that such a movement exists at all.

The result of the authoritarian upbringing on most of mankind has been to develop a fear of being free. This fear manifests itself particularly in relation to personal responsibility, especially in questions of war, government, the State, etc. Man also has a great fear of man, and although he does not really like the policeman he regards him as a protection against his fellowmen.

Finally there is the fear of being involved with a subversive and unconventional organisation, which even if it does not get one into trouble with the police nevertheless is outside the herd and therefore suspect.

Men love their conventions even when they are hurt by them, because they protect them from uncertainty and the vague but none the less menacing dangers of the unknown. They cling to them devotedly. I do not suggest that anarchists should pander to this, and become conventional, but they should not allow themselves to become a clique of high-souled intellectual supermen, above the interests of common humanity.

As long as the anarchist is regarded as a being apart, his theories will not attract a great number. But if it is obvious that he is in fact just like any other man, except for his revolutionary beliefs and activities, then he will stand a better chance of winning people over to his ideas.

That there are dangers in this point of view no one will deny. But the possibility of the anarchist movement becoming commonplace and respectable is not very great.

The reason for the slow progress of our movement is due, in part at least, to its separateness from ordinary life. In the optimistic late nineteenth century, when the world was humming with new ideas, when everyone from the Primitive Methodists to the Macedonian Nationalists believed that the future was theirs, anarchism fitted in well in the scheme of things. But nowadays utopias are out of fashion, and we see a world where everyone has become "practical". Anarchists like everyone else are dependent to a considerable extent on forces outside their control, and the times it seems are not ripe for anarchist ideas. Eventually however it is more than probable that people will be forced to anarchise by the course of events, which will leave no other alternative open.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

FREEDOM PRESS

- E. A. GUTKIND : *The Expanding Environment* 8s. 6d.
- V. RICHARDS : *Lessons of the Spanish Revolution* 6s.
- MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI : *Neither East nor West* cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d.
- Workers in Stalin's Russia* 1s.
- SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM
Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One* paper 7s. 6d.
- Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity* paper 7s. 6d.
- TONY GIBSON : *Youth for Freedom* paper 2s.
- Food Production and Population* 6d.
- Who will do the Dirty Work?* 2d.
- PHILIP SANSOM : *Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step* 1s.
- ERRICO MALATESTA : *Anarchy* 6d.
- Vote—What For?* 1d.
- M. BAKUNIN : *Marxism, Freedom and the State.* cloth 5s.
- 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., paper 1s.
- The Education of Free Men* 1s.
- RUDOLF ROCKER : *Nationalism and Culture* cloth 21s.
- GEORGE WOODCOCK : *Anarchy or Chaos* 2s. 6d.
- New Life to the Land* 6d.
- Railways and Society* 3d.
- Homes orhovels?* 6d.
- What is Anarchism?* 1d.
- The Basis of Communal Living* 1s.
- F. A. RIDLEY : *The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age* 2d.

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

a whole incapable of answering, except in words they themselves cannot understand.

I am conscious so far of having objected on purely theoretical grounds. (It might almost be said my objection would bear no weight if the definite article was omitted before "anarchists") I know how a meticulous theorist can find intellectual grounds for criticising almost anything, and if my only criticism of the article had been intellectual I would not have bothered writing this. But I have a more valid objection.

Supposing that article had been read (as it probably was) by a person who knew nothing of anarchism and was seeking information. Such a person might justifiably have decided "the anarchists" were a theological study group, a branch of the orthodox church, or an outlandish but harmless mystical cult. As an anarchist I blush with embarrassment, and as a propagandist I shudder with alarm, when I consider what anyone so misguided must think of, hearing the word "anarchist". And (unlike the "bomb-thrower" school of thought) with evidence from a reputable anarchist journal!

I appeal to comrade Baldelli to admit that his answers, valid though they probably were, should not have been attributed to the anarchists; that they have no more to do with anarchism than the sincere and sensible remark of an architect correspondent to FREEDOM, that "it would be a pity to leave an unresolved duo on the South Bank."

If the architect comrade had said that was an anarchist statement (which he didn't) he would have been in error, in confusing anarchism with his aesthetic beliefs. Comrade Baldelli is in fact in error, in confusing his anarchism with his mysticism.

Bradford, Oct. 6. DONALD ROOM.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN AIR MEETINGS
Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.
TOWER HILL
Tuesdays at 12.30 p.m.

NORTH-EAST LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM

Alternate Wednesdays at 7.30 p.m.
NOV. 4th—Arthur Uloth
POLITICAL TERRORISM
NOV. 18th—Philip Sansom
SEX, SYNDICALISM & THE EGO

TYNESIDE ANARCHIST GROUP

A group has recently been formed in this area and will hold meetings on alternate Sundays at 7.30 p.m. at the home of D. Boods, 53, Louvaine Place, Newcastle-on-Tyne to whom enquiries should be addressed. The first meeting will take place on October 10th at 7.30 p.m.

GLASGOW

OUTDOOR MEETINGS from now until further notice at MAXWELL STREET, Sundays at 7 p.m. With John Gaffney, & others

SUBSCRIBERS

IN order to allow enough time for our American subscribers who were sent renewal notices marked Final, to receive them and to reply, we did not stop sending them copies of FREEDOM. They have now had more than seven weeks in which to reply. We must now advise those who have not yet dealt with their subscription renewal that we will not be sending further copies until we hear from them.

★
MORE than a half of the readers who were sent renewal notices have now replied. We shall be sending out further reminders next month. Readers will be saving us much office work and expense by dealing with their subscription renewals NOW!

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly
Postal Subscription Rates :
12 months 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)
Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 27/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 13/6 (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