

'Mankind's subjection will continue just so long as it is tolerated.'

PROUDHON

In this Issue:

- THE PHONEY WAR
- ANARCHIST NOTEBOOK
- ON BEING 75
- ROUND THE GALLERIES
- CORRESPONDENCE

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

Shelter and Shoot Your Neighbour

'Life' and Death

THE American magazine "Life" devotes 12 pages of its current issue to "How to build shelters . . . where to hide in cities" which is prefaced by a letter from the President in which he informs the public that during the next eighteen months the government will be carrying out a survey of all public buildings with fall-out shelter potential and "the marking of those with adequate shelter for 50 persons or more". Shelters are being stocked

with one week's food and medical supplies and two week's water supply. "In the meantime—continues the President—there is much that you can do to protect yourself . . ."

This and the recent resumption of tests in Russia has been the signal for a nation-wide rush to construct shelters. Finance houses are ready to lend money on the spot for shelter construction; building firms are vying with each other to secure your orders. According to the *Sunday Times* Washington correspondent a good shelter from a construction firm costs a minimum of £350, though apparently the government will shortly produce the plans for a do-it-yourself shelter at £50. However one can well imagine the American public falling for something less austere; how could they resist "a special, uniquely designed shelter with a sprayed, leaded fibre-glass protective coating for protection against all rays"; and then of course it must be big enough to hold the gadgets of comfort. One manufacturer's advertisement is a "fall out shelter check list" to ensure that you forget nothing, not least a geiger counter!

According to the *Daily Herald's* New York correspondent there is an "almost furtive attitude" among those who have built shelters. This was explained by one of New York's C.D. directors as follows:

"Many people believe that strangers who haven't prepared will try to take over their shelter by force". The *Herald's* correspondent comments:

Consequently shelter manufacturers are often sworn to secrecy—since this is about the only way in which American families do NOT want to keep up with the Joneses.

Deep down they are ashamed of being so selfish, but the instinct for survival is strong.

This morality of each-family-for-itself was discussed in a recent issue of a Jesuit Magazine *America* by a Catholic priest in an article headed "Ethics at the Shelter Doorway" and he concluded that it is permissible to protect oneself by refusing shelter to a neighbour. Apparently many Americans were shocked by such words coming from a priest "but privately a large number of them share his views". Since these views were expressed, other men of God have condemned them. The Episcopal Bishop of Washington has declared the every-family-for-itself approach as "Immoral, unjust and contrary to the national interest" and he added "If we need shelters to ensure national survival, they should be built on a commun-

ity rather than an individual basis, and as a public rather than a private responsibility."

The *Life* ploy is that "97 out of a 100 people can be saved" from fallout if they use the shelters, but before you rush to build one for yourself let's try and understand what these figures mean. First of all it must be made clear that your shelter "would be no protection against blast" and that "if a nuclear warhead should hit within 10 to 15 miles of you, the house might catch on fire or be blown down around you. For this reason some people prefer to place their shelter outside". The advantage presumably is that your house won't fall on top of you, but nevertheless you stand a very good chance of having your shelter uprooted by the blast. So of our initial 100 people we must write off a number "x" who will be blasted out of this world. Of those left 97 per cent. will be protected from fall-out by spending a week in their shelters where radiation would be reduced to "at least one-hundredth of what it is outside."

Now the next consideration is what to do when the food and water supplies in the shelter run out. Dad presumably will try to get out of the shelter. A proportion of the Dads of America will find that they are trapped, so the survivors will now be 100 minus "x" minus "y" ("y" representing the number trapped who will die of suffocation and starvation in their shelters). Those

Continued on page 4

THE AMERICAN DILEMMA

JUDGING from the television and newspaper reports which reach this country, it appears that the average American ("a kindly chap") would support his government in the event of a showdown with the Soviet Union, even if this meant all-out nuclear war.

One can assume that the majority have not fully considered the possible consequences to themselves (or the rest of the world), believing with unthinking faith that their government will take care of them by some form of defence plan.

The boom in private underground shelters, ranging from the luxurious to the plain functional according to income and status, does not necessarily indicate a lack of faith in government defence measures but is an additional survival insurance for the family who can afford it.

Each shelter (separate purchase) is equipped with a gun and ammunition for disposing of shelterless neighbours who, in the event of surprise nuclear attack, might panic (understandably enough!) and attempt to get into the dugout of the man next door.

Moral issues apart, one can see in their tenacity signs of the spirit which won the early Americans the West and deprived the Indian of the right to live

NOT all Americans, however, disregard the moral and humanitarian issues involved in nuclear war, but it may seem paradoxical that it is often the men who care most about people who are primarily for survival even if, some argue, it means coming to terms with totalitarianism, with the loss of moral certainty.

The moral argument against "mere survival" or for "death before dishonour" does not necessarily spring from a love of truth, but is often used by reactionaries of all kinds whose opposition to totalitarian Communism is not based on any concern for the freedom of men.

Leaving aside the two extremes of argument (which can only be put to the test when men are faced with a real situation) it does seem that the threat of total annihilation has complicated the simple division in

some minds between violence and non-violence.

H. STUART HUGHES, Professor of History at Harvard, one of four American intellectuals writing in the monthly *Commentary*, argues against nuclear weapons but since he is not simply "for surrender" he reasons that:

the enemy should be met with real force but only on a human scale . . . (by the use of conventional weapons).

His argument is based on the theological principle that "war can be considered just only if the means employed are commensurate with the ends gained".

Although he supported the last war as "just" he believes that an atomic war would be so drastic in its results that the principle for which it would be fought, the defeat of Communism (presumably), would not justify the end. The argument seems to be one of quantity although his horror at the means is justifiable. It is not difficult to recognise the difference between, for example, death by radiation and death by shooting.

The chief opposition to Hughes' ideas comes from Sidney Hook, Professor of Philosophy at New York University, described as "America's leading anti-Communist theoretician" who argues that:

Survival is not the main issue . . . It is the supreme issue only for Communism in whose world nothing exists but history. The West, buttressed in part by belief in immortality, whether as a myth or fact, has always maintained that there are certain values more important than life itself . . . It was Aristotle who said that it is not life as such, or under any conditions that is of value, but the good life. The free man is one who in certain situations refuses to accept life if it means spiritual degradation. The man who declares that survival at all costs is the end of existence is morally dead.

On the practical issue Mr. Hook challenges the totality of the nuclear holocaust, and questions the validity of the argument put by Philip Green, Instructor in Government at Princeton, namely that the U.S. does not have the right to involve other nations in a nuclear war.

Hans J. Morgenthau, foreign affairs expert at the University of Chicago, doubts if the West would recover if 100 million Americans were to be killed and nine-tenths of the U.S. industrial capacity destroyed. But,

while it would be better to fight a nuclear war than to surrender he believes that such a war would be suicidal and absurd.

Mr. Morgenthau is prepared to be suicidal; the problem is that he is not the only one.

We hope to discuss these views in another issue of FREEDOM.

Strikes the Bosses Want

THERE is significant omission from the Press reports on the strikes that are at the moment silencing the steel mills of the Abbey and Margam works, Port Talbot, and have brought to a stop the factories of the great Rootes group of car manufacturers.

The omission is of the usual denunciation of the strikers as 'harming the national economy' and 'making our customers go to our competitors'—and all the other arguments used against workers defending their standards in a boom period.

Denunciation of the strikers is not lacking, of course, and there are the usual agitators being discovered at work. The blame must always be pinned upon sinister politicians and spineless, dumb workers who don't know what they are striking for, but haven't the guts to oppose the agitators in their midst.

But in fact one doesn't have to look far to see that the initiative in these two disputes is not with the strikers but with the employers—and neither is it difficult to see why.

The results of a poll recently carried out by the Federation of British Industries are, in the words of Sampel Brittan, Economic Editor of the *Observer*, 'as gloomy as anyone expected'. It seems that 'output is being held up by shortage of orders' and 'the number of industrialists who plan to cut their spending on new plant and equipment exceeds by a clear ten per cent. those who are planning increases'.

In other words, the Government's 'Disinflationary' measures are hav-

ing the desired effects: they are reducing home demands in an attempt to balance imports with exports. The car industry—one of the biggest users of steel—has had a very bad summer, and orders are today at the lowest ebb for many years. There are exceptions, of course—Jaguars among them—but certainly Rootes are not.

Although new models are being introduced at the Motor Show (the results of long term planning), manufacturers stuck with lots of last year's models are anxious to shift those before stepping up production on new ones. They are also anxious to save overheads, curb the workers' demands, trim the wings of the shop stewards if possible, and generally get into training for tighter competition.

All these are accomplished by a strike. If the workers can be goaded into striking just when the bosses want them to, and the strike can be made to fail, with attendant hardships for the strikers and their families and disillusionment with the shop stewards who were forced to call the strike, the bosses can look forward to a period of quiet for some time afterwards.

Not only that. By sacking their 8,000 workers, rendered idle by the strike of 1,000 workers at the subsidiary Acton factory of British Light Steel Pressings, the Rootes Company are saving themselves £70,000 a week in wages and overheads. At a time when orders are not coming in anyway, this is a great benefit, and the whole operation suits the company very well.

Similar factors are at work in the steel 'strike' in South Wales, and were at work in the recent dispute at Ford's, ostensibly about a tea break!

The Trotskyists are being blamed by the employers for having caused the strikes by their beastly agitation. And no doubt these politicians are proud to be held responsible by workers who think 'militancy' means 'having a go' at all and every opportunity.

But the class struggle is a two way affair and is not quite so simple a matter as that. The employing class is cunning, and what's more, has its pulse on events much more than the workers do.

In a recent 'Tonight' TV programme, Andrew Shonfield, a journalist on economics, said that when money is scarce it's as good a time as any for the bosses to have a strike.

Note that. *The bosses* to have a strike!

No wonder there is no serious drive by the Federation of British Industries to push the Government to make unofficial strikes illegal! They want the workers to be free to strike when it suits them!

What does this mean? It means that what we have been asking for a very long time becomes much more necessary: the workers must find more effective means of struggle than simply a walk-out strike. They must study the market also and use their judgment on what tactic of struggle fits a given situation.

Yes, the bosses are cunning. So must the workers be!

ANARCHY 9

IS ALL ABOUT

PRISON

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

THE Second World War began in an entirely different spirit from that of the aggressive tribalism of 1941. The general atmosphere was one of puzzlement. Grim prophecies, not unlike those made today regarding the effects of nuclear war, were made about the huge crowds that would stream out of the big cities when the bombing started. The task of controlling them, it was believed, would take up all the army's time, and divert it from fighting the enemy.

E. S. Turner devotes himself to the first months of the war, ending just after Dunkirk. To those who remember the period it will revive many feelings of nostalgia, of fury, of despair, according to one's point of view. The fact that the aggressive flag-wagging was absent, that dachshunds were no longer in danger of being stoned in the street, that C.O.'s had a relatively accepted status in the community, does not mean that it was a time of sanity. It was a time of muddle, confusion, vicious petty bullying by authority and divided counsels.

Bishops argued whether it was legitimate to pray for victory, since if both sides did the same it would result in a praying-match. A battle for God's attention between the magicians of the opposing tribes, like something out of the Old Testament, would hardly have looked dignified, although that was not the way it was put. Clergymen disputed whether one should or should not pray for Hitler.

The war was accepted with enthusiasm by some members of the community, who, through the Home Guard, had the opportunity to contribute to the common cause and gratify the aggression not normally tolerated in civilised communi-

The Phoney War

"THE PHONEY WAR on the Home Front", by E. S. Turner, Michael Joseph, 21s.

ties. Poaching flourished. Several motorists were shot dead, or seriously wounded, by trigger-happy citizens, acting as sentries. The blackout also took a heavy toll on the roads.

Aliens were rounded up and interned. It is useless to point out that wars are not won or lost by secret agents, but by the industrial potential of the countries involved. In this matter society pursues the M.M.P., or Maximum Misery Principle, known to sociologists as Uloth's Law, which states that, in an authoritarian régime, when two possible courses of action are open, the one that can be reckoned to cause the greater amount of suffering and hardship will be the one to be chosen. Whereas, in the eighteenth century, citizens of warring states could travel in the enemy's country freely, in the twentieth century despite great humanitarian advances in many fields, it now seems obvious that enemy aliens must be interned.

Mr. Turner treats his subject with a fair degree of cheerfulness, which perhaps is the best way to take it. However one must not forget that Hitler scored a partial victory. In order to fight totalitarianism, Britain became itself a totalitarian state. Not so complete a one as the Nazi one, but it was a step, several steps, indeed, in that direction. Moreover the attitude of the "Phoney War" survives in the "Cold War", for which it was in some measure a dress rehearsal.

I found most interesting the chapters dealing with evacuation of children, and the treatment of conscientious objectors. Mrs. Margaret Cole said that "the evacuation plan was drawn up by minds that were 'military, male and middle-class,'" adding that "only middle-class parents, accustomed to shoo their children out of sight and reach at the earliest age, could have been so astonished to find that working-class parents were violently unwilling to part with theirs."

"It is," says Mr. Turner, "a good point; yet what sort of evacuation plan one wonders, would have been drawn up by minds that were, say, civilian, female and working-class?" The answer is probably a better one, had they possessed the technical knowledge, or even without it. The attitude of the working-class mother is a natural one in this respect, since she recognises that it is not desirable to separate young children from their mothers, unless the mother is an extremely bad one. My memories of this period are of being bandied about from one rather reluctant family of middle-class relatives to another, performing a sort of swing from one end of southern England to the other. All of it was quite unnecessary as it turned out, since my home town was bombed only once or twice, and then most inefficiently, throughout the war. The experiences of many were much much worse. Some were "packed off", as the phrase is, to Canada, but this came to an end when a ship carrying children was sunk. Some internees also perished in like manner.

Mr. Turner treats the C.O.s gently, but obviously regards their position as untenable. Some who had been C.O.s in the First World War supported military service in the Second. A logical position if one accepts violence at all, since the totalitarianism of Hitler was far worse than the Kaiser's régime. In fact there is no comparison at all. But it was unfortunate all the same, since most of these ex-pacifists were now safely over military age.

Actually the number of C.O.s was much higher than in the First World War, and they were much better organised. They ran their own mock-tribunals in order to get into training for the real thing, which caused many worthy patriots qualms. The government, wisely, did nothing, knowing no doubt that there would not be enough of them to be dangerous.

In Germany C.O.s of course went to the concentration camps. In Britain they

were used. In fact it was impossible to perform any sort of work without aiding the war effort in some way. One conscientious objector finally said that it seemed that the only logical thing to do was to commit suicide, and the chairman of the tribunal triumphantly agreed with him, adding "or leave the country", which was not at all an easy thing to do by then. (An Italian soldier of the First World War is said to have deserted in 1917, and been at large till 1957, living by hunting with a bow, and food-gathering in the wild Abruzzi mountains.) Fortunately not all objectors were so negative. "A Norwich art student said that he hoped to spend the war teaching and lecturing in order to enrich the standard of culture in the world. The tribunal agreed that he should continue to do so".

Another objector was asked, "How would you non-violently resist a bomber?" And he replied that if he did nothing to retaliate the bomber would eventually go away. Not a brilliant answer, but not a foolish one either. Even the gun that a soldier carries does not really protect him. A bomb does not carefully avoid the armed fighting man, and make a dead set for the recalcitrant pacifist, or even the Home Guardsman who, by an oversight, has left his musket at home! Probably

in a fighting world the man who is obviously unarmed has, on balance, a better chance of survival than an armed one. But it does not always work.

The worst problem arises however when one comes up against the problem of a tyranny like Hitler's, Verwoerd's or Salazar's. Probably a non-violent resistance to such régimes would occasion no more physical suffering for the resisters than a violent one. But it will take some doing to overcome the way we have been brought up, which says "fight" or "run", and act non-violently. Nor do I see how, when the enemy is intent on massacre anyway, Germany, Angola, how one acts non-violently by exposing oneself unarmed and in the open (which is the real point, since the arms do not protect), since a chance to shoot you down is exactly what he has been waiting for. Doubtless eventually he will be overcome by your moral nobility and stop, but by then most of you will be dead, which is what he wanted anyway. Obviously there is some room here for some discussing.

Some objectors seem to have been equally concerned with the matter of coercion rather than, or in addition to, the question of violence. If they were already doing some form of alternative service, and then were ordered to continue it, they would stop. One can imagine that to someone who accepts war and the state as integral parts of life this would seem perverse. It is a position with which I personally have far more in common than with that of the purely religious pacifist, whose concern is limited to the issue of violence and bloodshed alone. Surely the basis of all violence lies in coercion? "Wars will cease when men refuse to fight", but men do not refuse to fight, because

they believe that men have a right to rule men, and are prepared to fight that this right may be maintained. Moreover, while, even in a world war, the majority of men and women never have the remotest thing to do with real fighting, even firing a gun in anger, let alone grappling hand to hand (in the Korean war only a small percentage of fighting troops even fired their guns when in action), practically everybody is faced with coercion, even in the minutest details of daily life.

It is possible that by a people used to many generations of self-regulation, freedom from taboos and irrational fears, a free militia could be organised to resist tyrants such as Hitler, without themselves degenerating into a barbarism as great as that they were fighting against. But such a people would be far more likely to have developed an adequate technique of non-violent resistance.

My feeling on setting down this book is one of relief that it is unlikely that all this will ever recur. The next war, if it comes, will have no time for the crushing of individuality, the disintegration of familiar life patterns, the brutalisation of existence. There will be time for people to swagger about with firearms and shoot those who do not hear their challenge. A rapid and total oblivion will doubtless overwhelm the citizens of the big cities, and those who live near bases. Probably they will know nothing about it. In the words of J. B. Priestley's terrifying prophetic novel, *The Domesday Men*, "When the clock strikes, you won't hear it." For the few hundred survivors, if there are any, the Stone Age may turn out to have many undreamed of compensations.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH

BOOKS?

We can supply

ANY book in print. Also out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found! This includes paper-backs, children's books and text books. (Please supply publisher's name if possible).

NEW BOOKS

The Fascists in Britain
Colin Cross 21/-
Humanist Anthology from Confucius
to Bertrand Russell
Margaret Knight 21/-
The Coming of the Welfare State
Maurice Bruce 35/-
The Squeeze: Cities without Space
E. Higham 21/-
Parliamentary Socialism: a Study in
the Politics of Labour
Ralph Miliband 35/-
Long Dream
Richard Wright 18/-

REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

The Idea of History
R. G. Collingwood 7/6
Principles of Social and Political Theory
Ernest Barker 7/6
Stalin: a Political Biography
Isaac Deutscher 10/6
The Revolt of the Masses
Ortega y Gasset 6/-
A Time to Love and a Time to Die
E. M. Remarque 3/6
The Outline of History
H. G. Wells & Raymond Postgate 36/-

SECOND-HAND

What is Christian Science?
M. M. Magorian 2/6
Red Star over China
Edgar Snow 4/6
In Denikin's Russia (1921)
C. E. Bechofer 5/-
Inside Buchannism (Imperfect)
Geoffrey Williamson 7/6
The New Scientific System of Morality
G. Gore 3/-
Prescription for Rebellion
Robert Lindner 12/-
The Military Strength of the
Powers (1939)
Max Werner 3/-
What are We to Do? (1938)
John Strachey 3/-
Walls Have Mouths
W. F. R. Macartney 5/-
Stride towards Freedom
Martin Luther King 5/-
Red Sky at Night
Ronald Matthews 3/-
The Last Days of Paris (1946)
Alexander Werth 3/6
The Economic Interpretation of History
James E. Thorold Rogers 6/-

Freedom Bookshop

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

17a MAXWELL ROAD

FULHAM SW6 Tel: REN 3736

Unwillingly to Jail

In the Editors' footnote to Brian Richardson's letter (FREEDOM, Oct. 7) we were made to say "But we should always be most willing to go to prison" which made nonsense of the rest of the sentence. We actually wrote that we should always be most unwilling to go to jail!

AN ANARCHIST NOTEBOOK

WONDER OF THE ELECTRONIC AGE

THE *Sunday Times* New York correspondent reports on yet another miracle of this electronic age we live in.

Dithering American shoppers will in future have their minds made up for them mechanically. On Monday next, for the first time in retailing history, an electronic brain installed in a shop in Dallas, Texas, will decide for them.

The I.B.M. electronic data processing computer, costing nearly £100,000, is in Neiman Marcus, Dallas's big, shiny emporium, where Texan millionaires and their wives have their charge accounts. To choose a present, you indicate on a form the recipient's sex, approximate age, profession, hobbies and what you wish to spend.

Punched into cards, this information is fed into the computer which "reads" the cards, scans the magnetic tape listing the 22,000 items stocked, and immediately picks ten it thinks best for the individual in question.

The monster is said to be able to make half a million logical decisions a minute. Presumably if still in agonised indecision a shopper can appeal to big brother to make the final choice from the ten possibilities.

Is it possible that after telling 100,000 husbands that what their wives want are mink coats, a new house or a new car, even the machine will revolt and the tickets that emerge will be less formal, and will tell them such home truths as "You're a bloody fool" or "What your wife needs is a good f—" or to enquiring wives "what your husband needs is a mistress". It would be a change, but alas, these wonderful machines have even less imagination than their creators and their operators, and they will only offer what their masters want to sell. They exist not to help people to be happier but to satisfy the greed of big business.

A WARNING TO SCIENTISTS

I HAVE for some time been warning my professional friends that in a few years time there will be a surplus of scientists and a dearth of gardeners, and that by the capitalist laws of supply and demand a gardener will be able to command a higher fee than some scientists. Well, it seems that such a possibility

is not far off after all. A report on scientific manpower, published last week by the manpower sub-committee of the Advisory Council on Scientific Policy, says that

the production of trained scientists and engineers is now likely to exceed 20,000 a year, the figure set as a target in 1958, and that by the end of the decade 30,000 scientists and technologists would be available annually. By that time, the report says, the annual demand for scientists in public service, education and industry would be somewhat less than this.

In the report it is estimated that by 1970 the country will have some 346,000 trained scientists and technologists, compared with 173,000 in 1959. The report estimates, however, that by 1970 the demand for trained people will amount only to 328,500.

YOUTH AND DEMON SEX

YET another headmaster has issued a warning about the "promiscuity" of present-day youth. He was addressing members of his school's parent-teacher association on "How we teach sex to your child", and in pointing out that children are reaching "maturity" far earlier now, he warned that "it is the responsibility of teachers and parents to see they fully understand the meaning of sex and do not misuse it". Unfortunately the newspaper report we saw did not in fact tell us how they "teach sex" in that school. The Head was, however, quoted as saying

"Teenagers now have ample money at their disposal to do as they like with and are virtually independent.

"They do not spend all their money on cigarettes. Some can be spent on contraceptives.

"Young children, mentally immature, have the power of gratifying their desires.

"It is not unknown for girls to become pregnant while still at school and the incidence of venereal disease is increasing. We cannot turn our backs on this problem."

And these remarks are not very encouraging. Obviously sexual desires can be better satisfied by the mentally mature than by the mentally immature. But then this applies to all activities. Nobody suggests that children should not read the Bible, or Shakespeare, or poetry, or listen to music until they are men-

tally mature; or that they should eat different food than their parents until they are old enough to appreciate the subtleties of French cuisine. The process of growing up is a process of exploration, very often of copying the adults. Whatever the biological aspects of reaching "maturity" earlier may be can this not also be explained in part by the fact that children are kept less segregated from adult activities than they were in the past. Or to put it another way, are not the parents of today less secretive, less inhibited in their relationships than they were?

If, as the headmaster asserts, young children have sexual desires then it seems to me that it's not "sex" that you have to teach the children but simply the hygiene of sex. A teenage boy of my acquaintance who was bubbling over with "affairs" during the summer holidays, in reply to my question "what would your mother have to say if she knew", said quite spontaneously "she told me that I could do what I like but I must not give any girl a baby". Surely this is all the advice which girls and boys need. All they need to put it into practice is to have access to the safest forms of contraception, and instruction in their use.

It may be objected that this boy's mother should have warned her son against trying to satisfy his desires with an unwilling partner. I approve of the sentiments, what I cannot agree with is that this respect for the feelings, the freedom of the other person, is specifically an aspect of sexual education. A child living in an atmosphere of mutual respect, of freedom and independence between the adults of both sexes, who recognise the freedom of the child as well as defending their own freedom in their relations with their children provide, by example, an ethical code universal in its application. To restate Eric Gill's dictum, "To hell with Culture", we would say "To hell with Sex", as something outside the values of everyday life, in a separate compartment, with an ethic of its own. Sex is an integral part of living. To "respect" your wife and abuse your neighbour is a myth. The man who abuses his neighbour will also abuse his wife.

LIBERTARIAN.

ON BEING 75

IF we use FREEDOM's 75th anniversary as our theme this week, it is not because we consider that longevity in a publication, no less than in human beings, is a sure sign of wisdom and rightness. Indeed too often is it a clear indication of senility and an ossification of thought, a nostalgia for the past and an inability to think in terms of the present. Since the main criticism of anarchists and anarchism is that our ideas are ahead of our times, these critics can hardly accuse us, on this occasion, of also living in the past! That accusation however comes from the Left: the Communist, Socialist and the self-styled "New" Leftists who, in fact, are so imbued with Establishment politics, with authoritarian ideas and organisation that when, we would almost say, *driven*, even beyond the limits of their faith in party politics, they discover and propound more or less libertarian solutions, their "discoveries" are hailed by a bunch of bored intellectual publicists (political and literary) as "original", "far-reaching", "revolutionary" ideas which keep the pot of mass communications boiling for a week or two. But the "New Left" (at their most "original" which is not very often), the Committee of 100 (when they start seeking a direction for their civil disobedience), the War Resisters, the Freethinkers, the Penal Reformers, the Sex Reformers, the Rank-and-Fileers, The Syndicalists, the Pacifists, the Socialists (when they are not simply concerned with winning elections) and the Communists (when they are not concerned with serving the interests of Russian hegemony) the moment they start thinking and stop sloganising, must surely see their particular interest as part of a whole: for their will be no sexual freedom without freedom of thought; there will be no socialism or communism so long as there is privilege; there will be no workers' control so long as there are bosses; there will be no disarmament so long as there are nation states, power politics and government; there will be no penal reform so long as there is social injustice. There will be no achieving of these positive aspirations so long as the

affairs of Man are regulated by government, state, privilege, authority, force and prejudice. This we affirm, and have, we think, illustrated over the years with example after example.

The fact that we have been affirming these simple truths for the past 75 years does not invalidate them; the fact that we have been saying more or less the same things—all that has changed is the emphasis and our way of expressing ourselves—surely does not make us "old-fashioned".

(Incidentally, what is "new" about the New Left? We invite readers to purchase a copy of *Peace News* for October 6, in which they will find contributions on "A New Political Basis", by two members of the *New Left Review* Editorial Board, viz, Edward Thompson and John Saville. What have they to offer? By-elections! Yes, by elections! And John Saville for instance is so concerned about the revolutionary nature of the Committee of 100 that he warns them of the

"danger of running ahead way beyond any real mass support. I am not arguing that this has already happened but it could easily enough. The sit-down and mass arrests is not a tactic that can be used every other week-end, and to be as effective as it has been up to the present, it must be combined with as wide a variety of different kinds of propaganda campaigns as are open to us."

But, dear Mr. Saville, it has not yet been effective! To be effective civil disobedience must not be a week-end outing but a daily occurrence. Resistance to government is obviously made of sterner stuff than some of the New Left oracles are prepared to bear. They believe in government; how can they be made to see that the purpose of civil disobedience is not to change government but to destroy the power of the ruling, privileged elite, by confronting it with the power of the people?)

OUR JUSTIFICATION

We were arguing that the passing of time does not invalidate the ideas embodied in the anarchist philosophy. Not only have the aspirations of anarchists been the aspirations of all men of goodwill throughout the history of Mankind. But the passing of the years—with the experience of the dismal failure of authoritarian Socialism and Communism in country after country—has also confirmed the rightness of the anarchists' insistence that the means are as important as the ends: that freedom can only be achieved through freedom or conversely, that authoritarian means can only lead to authoritarian ends. In FREEDOM's very first editorial in 1886 (reproduced in full elsewhere in this issue) this theme is put forcefully in the concluding sentences of the argument against Property:

We look for this socialization of wealth, not to restraints imposed by authority upon property, but to the removal, by the direct personal actions of the people themselves, of the restraints which secure property against the claims of popular justice. For authority and

property both are manifestations of the egoistical spirit of domination, and we do not look to Satan to cast out Satan.

Have the passing of 75 years made these criticisms less valid? Has the nature of government changed? Is the State stronger or weaker than it was 75 years ago? Has Parliamentary Socialism and the ballot box brought us any nearer to the achievement of socialism? Is there any signs of the "withering away" of the State after more than 40 years of authoritarian socialism in Russia?

The much acclaimed New Left is simply the old discredited authoritarian, Marxist, Left in modern dress. It would be a pity if the present flood of youthful goodwill and revolt were to be diverted into authoritarian channels, and exploited by yet another bunch of potential political leaders masquerading as revolutionary leaders! If only to prevent this happening, would be justification enough for FREEDOM and ANARCHY's continued publication!

THROUGH the long ages of grinding slavery behind us, Freedom, that unknown goal of human pilgrimage, has hovered, a veiled splendour, upon the horizon of men's hopes. Veiled in the trembling ignorance of mankind, their misty unreasoning terror of all that revealed itself as power, whether it were an apparently incomprehensible and uncontrollable natural force, or the ascendancy of superior strength, ability or cunning in human society. The inward attitude of slavish adoration towards what imposes itself from without as a fact beyond our understanding, that is the veil which hides Freedom from the eyes of men. Sometimes it takes the form of the blind fear of a savage of his "medicine" or his fetish, sometimes of the equally blind reverence of an English workman for the law of his masters, and the semblance of consent to his own economic slavery wormed out of him by the farce of representation. But whatever the form the reality is the same, ignorance, superstitious terror, cowardly submission.

What is human progress but the advance of the swelling tide of revolt against this tyranny of the nightmare of ignorant dread, which has held men the slaves of external nature, of one another, and of themselves? Science and the arts, knowledge and all its varied shapes of practical application by ingenuity and skill, the binding and enlightening force of affection and social feeling, the protest of individuals and of peoples by word and deed against religious, economic, political and social oppression, these, one and all, are weapons in the hands of the Rebels against the Powers of Darkness sheltered behind their shield of authority, divine and human. But they are weapons not all equally effective at all times. Each has its period of special utility.

We are living at the close of an era during which the marvellous increase of knowledge left social feeling behind, and enabled the few who monopolised the newly acquired power over nature to create an artificial civilisation, based upon their exclusive claim to retain private, personal possession of the increased wealth produced.

Property—not the claim to use, but to a right to prevent others from using—enables individuals who have appropriated the means of production, to hold in subjection all those who possess nothing but their vital energy, and who must work that they may live. No work is possible without land, materials, and tools or machinery; thus the masters of these things are the masters also of the destitute workers, and can live in idleness upon their labour, paying them in wages only enough of the produce to keep them alive, only employing so many of them as they find profitable and leaving the rest to their fate.

Such a wrong once realised is not to be borne. Knowledge cannot long be monopolised, and social feeling is innate in human nature, and both are fomenting within our hide-bound Society as the yeast in the dough. Our age is on the eve of a revolt against poverty, in the name of the common claim of all to a common share in the results of the common labour of all.

Therefore, we are Socialist, disbelievers in Property, advocates of the equal claims of each man and woman to work for the community as seems good to him or her—calling no man master, and of the equal claim of each to satisfy as seems good to him, his natural needs from the stock of social wealth he has laboured to produce. We look for this socialisation of wealth, not to restraints imposed by authority upon property, but to the removal, by the direct personal action of the people themselves, of the restraints which secure property against the claims of popular justice. For authority and property both are manifestations of the

egoistical spirit of domination, and we do not look to Satan to cast out Satan.

We have no faith in legal methods of reform. Fixed and arbitrary written law is, and has always been, the instrument employed by anti-social individuals to secure their authority, whether delegated or usurped, when the maintenance of that authority by open violence has become dangerous. Social feeling, and the social habits formed and corrected by common experience, are the actual cement of associated life. It is the specious embodiment of a portion of this social custom in law, which has made law tolerable, and even sacred in the eyes of the people it exists to enslave. But in proportion as the oppression of law is removed, the true binding force of the influence of social feeling upon individual responsibility becomes apparent and is increased. We look for the destruction of monopoly, not by the imposition of fresh artificial restraints, but by the abolition of all arbitrary restraints whatever. Without law, property would be impossible, and labour and enjoyment free.

Therefore, we are Anarchists, disbelievers in the government of man by man in any shape and under any pretext. The human freedom to which our eyes are raised is no negative abstraction of licence for individual egoism, whether it be massed collectively as majority rule or isolated as personal tyranny. We dream of the positive freedom which is essentially one with social feeling; of free scope for the social impulses, now distorted and compressed by Property, and its guardian the Law; of free scope for that individual sense of responsibility, of respect for self and for others, which is vitiated by every form of collective interference, from the enforcing of contracts to the hanging of criminals; of free scope for the spontaneity and individuality of each human being, such as is impossible when one hard and fast line is fitted to all conduct. Science is teaching mankind that such crime as is not the manufacture of our vile economic and legal system, can only be rationally as well as humanely treated by fraternal medical care, for it results from deformity or disease, and a hard and fast rule of conduct enforced by condign punishment is neither guide nor remedy; nothing but a perennial source of injustice amongst men.

We believe each sane adult human being to possess an equal and indefeasible claim to direct his life from within by the light of his own consciousness, to the sole responsibility of guiding his own action as well as forming his own opinions. Further, we believe that the acknowledgment of this claim is a necessary preliminary to rational voluntary agreement, the only permanent basis of harmonious life in common. Therefore, we reject every method of enforcing assent, as in itself a hindrance to effectual co-operation, and further, a direct incentive to anti-social feeling. We deprecate as a wrong to human nature, individually, and therefore collectively, all use of force for the purpose of coercing others; but we assert the social duty of each to defend, by force if need be, his dignity as a free human being, and the like dignity in others, from every form of insult and oppression.

We claim for each and all the personal right and social obligation to be free. We hold the complete social recognition and acknowledgement of such a claim to be the goal of human progress in the future, as its growth has been the gauge of development of Society in the past, of the advance of man from the blind social impulse of the gregarious animal to the conscious social feeling of the free human being.

Such, in rough outline, is the general aspect of the Anarchist Socialism our paper is intended to set forth, and by the touchstone of this belief we purpose to try the current ideas and modes of action of existing Society.

ROUND THE GALLERIES

STUPID GAME FOR BIG MONEY

THE "New New York Scene" at the New London Gallery at 17 Old Bond Street, W.1., appears as a must on the list for the footslogging London painters, for paint-spattered jeans and brooding eyes outnumber the well-heeled better types in this long basement gallery. That the inspiration for the London painters has shifted from the continent to the United States is undeniable yet of late there appears little to fear and little to learn. The Hard Edge school after a brief life appears to have shot its bolt and a more fluid style now holds the stage but that is more the work of gallery politics than of aesthetic values, for on the receiving end are the rich snob collectors and it is obvious that an important gallery catering to pop tastes can in a few brief months dictate which group is in and which group is out. Behind the gallery is usually the grey eminence of one man and if he can corner the market in pop

abstract painters he can write his own ticket with the dealers.

It is said that Coleman, of *Art News*, broke with Alloway in this battle for the stage of the New London Gallery with Alloway pushing his Hard Edge clique and Coleman re-grouping with the Fluid Abstractionist lads. All this would be a stupid game if it were not for the big money behind it for when a canvas sells for two or three hundred pounds a commission or a gift makes a nice Christmas present and already there has been one reported casualty and a familiar face is missing from the New London Gallery.

Frankly there is little that can be said about this exhibition that has not been said already. The American style of the moment is looser, their colours more garish but they exude a confidence that is lacking in these islands; but in the end all one can say is that the paint

has been slapped on to fill the canvas and when the brush has been laid aside little has been said. For the value of these canvasses is that as long as their artificial prices can be maintained they are simple and easy ways of investing money for aesthetically they could rot in the dealer's cellar until they are ready to be cashed. Time and time again we view these banal canvasses whose only interest lies in their echo of past masters.

Frederic Benrath's brown and oily wash, at Tooth's gallery of 31 Bruton Street, W.1., on first viewing evokes memories of Constable's "Branch Hill Pond" and as we approach dissolves into the spongy wash of Benrath's £120 "Eloges II", while Anna Meyerson at the Hanover Gallery at 32a St. George Street, W.1. may stick pieces of rough tin and/or chicken wire to her canvases, yet the only canvas that holds our gaze is the one where she has gilded the lumps of bitumen that spatter it, but like the Italian Primitives of which this is but a rude echo it lies embalmed be-

Parent Teacher Dissociation

DEAR COMRADES,
For the benefit of Parent and N.W., when I wrote that "teachers' salaries start at £10 a week and after 17 years reach £20 a week", I meant exactly what I said. It was intentional and it is a statement of fact. Of course that is the basic scale and of course there are headmasters and good honours graduates who are doing very well out of the present system. The basic scale, on which most teachers spend most of their working lives, is inadequate and the teachers' demand is that it should be raised. Differential payments have always been advocated by the employer's side. Where does Parent get the figure of £1,100 as an average teacher's salary? From Sir David Eccles? I haven't reached that figure nor have my average colleagues at our school with the exception of a good honours graduate and two old men, who with extra payments must get about that salary.

I am surprised to hear that Parent is content with a rate of pay that leaves him a 'comparative pauper', because personally I don't consider an average wage of about £15 is adequate for a worker or a teacher.

I shall be striking for three good reasons:—

- (a) Because I need more money and I have a family to provide for.
- (b) In solidarity with the militant teachers of the N.U.T. and against the strike-breaking tactics of the head teachers and local education authorities.
- (c) I also believe that teachers should control their own work and conditions and a movement that is prepared and able to strike could do just that.

Finally, "Parent" should realise that the government are planning a national wages policy. To do this they are using the teachers as guinea-pigs to see if this can be imposed and are discarding arbitration councils. The wage-freeze and the cutting of an agreed pay-increase, which the teachers face today, may well be a fore-taste of what workers in public and private employment can expect increasingly in the future.

Yours,
"TEACHER".
Brighton, Oct. 15.

Correspondence

Broken down System

DEAR COMRADES,
While endorsing, as a fellow class-teacher, the points made by "Teacher" in his letter, I think it should be made clear that teachers are not merely striking for a few extra bob a week.
Far from it. We are more concerned with the government's deliberate policy to smash our salary-negotiating machinery, the Burnham Committee. This is in line with all the government's recent steps to limit and control everyone's freedom of speech and action. Teachers are not the only people threatened: we are only the first victims, selected because we are thought to be weak and docile. "Parent" and other workers will be in it, too.

The government's alternative salary scales regarding differentials are a barefaced attempt to divide and weaken us by creating rich and poor teachers. The richer teachers, such as grammar school heads and heads of departments are intended to fall for the snob-appeal of middle-class professional superiority and so become fervent supporters of the Establishment. The rest of us are to be written off as mere teachers of "the hewers of wood and drawers of water". What contempt for 80% of England's children this implies!

Most teachers make a conscientious effort to get to know each child as an individual and to give each one the most suitable attention for his (her) personality and ability. To do this it has been long recognised that the largest class should be no more than thirty. But in this so-called Affluent Society most of us have to contend all day long with over forty. We can do our best, but with classes we only see once or twice a week we can only teach them in the mass, like rows of cod-fish on a fishmonger's slab. The worst examples of this are in the much-vaunted huge Comprehensive Schools which are just mass-production instruction factories, where the teachers scarcely know the tally-numbers of the classes, let alone the names of individual children in them.

Statistically-speaking then, all this means that in most classes there are upwards of ten children for whom there is no teacher. In the whole country it follows that there are two or three hundred thousand children without a teacher. If you think about some of the implications of all this, comrades, you will see that as far as 80% of the children in this country are concerned the education system has broken down. They are not being taught, they are scarcely even being instructed, they are just being kept out of mischief for a few hours a day while their parents are at work.

Far too many "experts" are quite ignorant or complacent, since most of them have hardly seen anything of education outside a university, public school or grammar school. But they lecture and write books, and letters to the papers, containing all manner of theories for the education of children they have never seen. How much do such people know of poor little Tommy Smith who comes to us in a hopelessly overcrowded and understaffed old elementary school (now dignified as a "Secondary School", but otherwise unaltered) unable to read or write anything at all simply because he has been almost lost in a huge Junior School class?

The only experts on the education of Secondary Modern children are the class-teachers who rub shoulders with them every day and mix with their parents and families. But it is the class-teachers who are to be left at the very bottom of salary-scales. The teachers of the elite, future recruits to the Establishment's obedient retinue of professional lackeys, are to receive all the plums. Watch them all vote Tory at the next elections!

The government's action towards teachers is not isolated. It is part of the general intention, unadmitted but clear to see, to establish a Corporate State with government-controlled unions and a docile working-class. We striking teachers are as far out on our limb as the Committee of 100 on theirs, but it is the same tree. There will soon be other branches for "Parent" and all his fellow-workers.

Yours fraternally,
ALBERT R. BRIMCOMBE.
Lincoln, Oct. 7.

SF

DEAR COMRADES,
There must be categories, boundaries, limitation of some sort, otherwise one cannot hope to discuss anything at all. If *The Lord of the Flies* can be counted as science fiction, so can *Robinson Crusoe*. If, as John Pilgrim says, science fiction has "moved out of the purely mechanical sciences and into psychology, sociology, ethics and politics", where is one to draw the line? The ordinary novel deals with these topics. If the creation of an imaginary future society is science fiction then this would include *News from Nowhere*, and indeed Amis does mention this book, but if an imaginary, agricultural future society why not an imaginary, agricultural past society? Is *King Solomon's Mines* science fiction?
One might say that 1984 was influenced by science fiction, but the science or technology is not essential to the action, and the scientific devices described are well within the reach of

us at the present day, or most of them. It is the story of an individual crushed by an extreme form of authoritarianism, and could equally well have been set in the days of the Inquisition.

I can see that there are difficulties and border-line cases. I have no wish to disparage science fiction, but considering the impetus given to the genre by Wells, the results are disappointing. Kingsley Amis says that he has been reading science fiction for years. I have only read a little of it. On the whole my impression of it coincided with his, but I noticed that he did not mention the anarchistic type of story which does appear sometimes. I suppose one sees what one wants to see. Mr. Amis is a socialist I believe, so he sees the "ordinary, decent man" kind of utopia, and overlooks, does not notice or forgets the anarchistic one.

Of course there are books that are really good and are also science fiction. *Brave New World* is probably the best example. But there seems to be so few. The speed of technical invention is very rapid. Prophecies are quickly fulfilled or outdated. The criterion of what does and what does not constitute science fiction must be that the inventions or discoveries written about are unfulfillable in the present or immediate future, or were so at the time of writing. (Jules Verne still counts as a science fiction writer, even though the sky is full of his flying machines and the sea with his submarines). So the writer is forced even further into the future, away from the present, which may explain why so few serious writers seem to attempt this type of story.

John Pilgrim presumably writes as an expert on science fiction. So does Kingsley Amis. When the experts differ, what does the layman do? I would be pleased to think that science fiction was more libertarian than Mr. Amis makes it out to be. ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

Angry Letters

DEAR FRIENDS,
I apologise for that "bloody rotten paper" letter. I agree that it was a poor effort and deserved much of the condemnation it received, though I still do not accept that FREEDOM is without blemish in its position about the danger of war as expounded in the "Myths of War" editorial.

The fact is, I wrote the letter in bad temper, my feelings having been roused by what I saw as an attack on two anarchists I particularly admire whose actions had led them (unwillingly, not as martyrs) to prison.

It has been pointed out to me recently that when one person criticises another

Family Death Traps

Continued from page 1
who are not so trapped will emerge with their geiger counters to discover that there is still plenty of fall-out about, but since the alternative to a dose of radiation is starvation Dad will venture forth to secure food and drink for his family. His first call will be at the bank—after all, no money no goods. To his dismay he finds that the bank is locked and a notice on the door informs him that the manager and staff are sheltering in the strong room. He calls at the food stores only to find the windows smashed and "the cupboard bare"—other survivors have obviously beaten him to the post. He makes for the country but on his way meets a C.D. warden all dressed up in his anti-fall-out suit who warns him that the fields, the surviving animals and the water supplies are all contaminated and will not be fit for human consumption for at least six months. Disconsolately he makes his way back to the shelter to die in the bosom of his family.
 $100 - x - y - z = 0$ ("z" in the equation representing the people who survived the blast and the fall-out but who died of starvation and thirst).

And the moral of the story? Pin no hopes on survival if a nuclear war is unleashed. If the "instinct to survive" is strong then we should be doing what we can to destroy the armament factories throughout the world and not wasting our time building self-contained family death traps.

ROUND THE GALLERIES

Continued from page 3
neath the weight of its gold leaf. Time has been very good to Spinello Aretino for its five hundred years has worn away the gilt from around the heads of his "Two Apostles" and his two old men no longer bow down beneath the weight of their golden haloes but in simple humility.

- CHARLES MARTIN
Towards a Free Society 2/6
- RUDOLF ROCKER
Nationalism and Culture
cloth 21/-
- ERRICO MALATESTA
Anarchy 9d.
- JOHN HEWETSON
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State
cloth 2/6 paper 1/-
- VOLINE
Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12/6
The Unknown Revolution
(Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21)
cloth 12/6

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:
Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949:
A tribute
cloth 5/-
Journey Through Utopia
cloth 18/- (U.S.A. \$3)

Let those who like Bontecou at the New London offer the ancient guts of a large TV set for £1,500. Meyrson at the Hanover or the rest of our junk yard devotees who can do nothing but assemble non-cultural oddments upon their canvases realize that in the end they will have achieved nothing unless they use the ability they may possess to willingly or unwittingly increase our sum total of human understanding. Foppa in his 15th century "Adoration of the Kings" could raise and gild their collars and their crowns but it was always subservient to his theme. Carlo Crivelli in the same century could create the Demidoff Altar-piece with gilt wood sticking out twelve inches and the keys of his painted St. Peter literally hanging from the canvas yet this only served to enshrine the whole and never for one moment halts our eyes from his painted statement, for like every good artist, Crivelli questions man's relation to his fellow man. Be it the dead or the risen Christ, the bowl of fruit or the painted landscape the artist if successful must make the spectator question the values of the society that produced the artist and his work.
The welded junk and the spattered canvases of so many of our contemporaries will offer neither a challenge nor a protest to those that follow, only an appeal for sympathy for a society that is sick, and rather than cure its scabs prefers to exhibit them.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

immoderately the outburst tends to reveal more about the critic than it exposes the victim.

This might well be true in this instance, because I recall that at the time I was accusing FREEDOM of rottenness I was feeling pretty sick with myself for having paid a fine instead of refusing to co-operate with the authorities as I should have done (to keep straight with myself, not to earn a pat on the head from the Editors. It was unfair to take my figure of speech about earning approval literally. I was obviously trying to draw attention to the bias towards destructive criticism so often shown in FREEDOM editorials).

I can't help wondering whether Tom Gibson's cross letter last week doesn't come into the same category as mine. He seems to be a highly emotional person with much in common with myself, and his "utterly pathetic" comment is surely as immoderate as my own outburst. Can it be that he is himself anxious to seek approval for his point of view?
Yours sincerely,
Kent, Oct. 16. BRIAN RICHARDSON.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP CENTRAL MEETINGS AGAIN!

- meetings to be held at
The Two Brewers,
40 Monmouth Street, WC2
(Leicester Square Tube)
Sundays at 7.30 p.m.
- OCT 22 Ted Kavanagh:
Anarchism and Violence
- OCT 29 Albert Meltzer: *The Soldiers' Councils on the Nile 1946: A Milestone in the British Revolution*
- NOV 5 Jack Robinson: *The Year 1880*
- NOV 12 Maurice Goldman:
Subject to be announced

Hyde Park Meetings

Every Sunday at 3.30 (if fine)

OFF-CENTRE DISCUSSION MEETINGS

- 1st Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. at Jack and Mary Stevenson's, 6 Stainton Road, Enfield, Middx.
- Last Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Dorothy Barasi's, 45 Twyford Avenue, Fortis Green, N.2.
- 1st Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Colin Ward's, 33 Ellerby Street, Fulham, S.W.6.
- 3rd Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. at Donald Room's, 148a Fellows Road, Swiss Cottage, N.W.3.
- Last Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Laurens and Celia Otter's, 57 Ladbroke Road, W.11.

JAZZ CLUB

New season's meetings will be held at 4 Albert Street Mornington Crescent NW1 at approximately monthly intervals.

BRISTOL

S. E. Parker will speak on: "Democracy—An Anarchist Viewpoint" at the Bristol Left Club, Shepherds Hall, Old Market Street, Friday, October 20 at 7.30 p.m.

Freedom The Anarchist Weekly

FREEDOM appears on the first three Saturdays of each month.
On the last Saturday, we publish ANARCHY, a 32-page journal of anarchist ideas (1/8 or 25c. post free).

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM and ANARCHY
12 months 30/- (U.S. & Canada \$5.00)
6 months 15/- (\$2.50)
3 months 8/- (\$1.25)
Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 45/- (U.S. & Canada \$7.50)
6 months 22/6 (\$3.50)

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

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

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

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

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

FINANCE!

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT 14th OCTOBER 1961 WEEK 41.

Expenses: 41 weeks at £70	£2,870
Income from Sales and Subs:	
Weeks 1—40	£1,255
Week 41	£28
	£1,283
DEFICIT	£1,587

DEFICIT FUND

Lincoln: A.R.B.* 5/-; Victoria, B.C.: B.E. 11/4; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; Fresno: p. proceeds outing Sept. 17 (per O.M.)* £5/5/-; S. Francisco: p. proceeds picnic Oct. 1 at Saratoga (per "Incaricato")* £35; Glasgow: J.H.* 5/-; London: G.B. 5/-; Belfast: Liam* 3/-; London: Anon. 2/-; Wolverhampton: J.G.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Bristol: Anon. £2; Surrey: F.B.* 5/-; Hull: H.N. 5/-.	
TOTAL	44 13 4
Previously acknowledged	744 6 10
1961 TOTAL TO DATE	£789 0 2

*Denotes regular contributors.

- SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'
- Vol 1 1951: Mankind is One
 - Vol 2 1952: Postscript to Posterity
 - Vol 3 1953: Colonialism on Trial
 - Vol 4 1954: Living on a Volcano
 - Vol 5 1955: The Immoral Moralists
 - Vol 6 1956: Oil and Troubled Waters
 - Vol 7 1957: Year One—Sputnik Era
 - Vol 8 1958: Socialism in a Wheelchair
 - Vol 9 1959: Print, Press & Public
 - Vol 10 1960: The Tragedy of Africa
- Each volume: paper 7/6 cloth 10/6
The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FREEDOM at 5/- post free.
- PAUL ELTZBACHER
Anarchism (Seven Exponents of the Anarchist Philosophy) cloth 21/-

